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As Sir Francis Bacon wrote, “Knowledge is power.” I commend this book to anyone seeking understanding.

James Grundvig, coincidentally of Scandinavian (Norwegian) descent, worked for 30 years in engineering as a project manager, developing skills he would use to research how, who, where, when, and why, after his son was diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder.

Very skillfully, using a technique resembling a mixed genre of cynical romance novel weaving in and out of the macabre, Grundvig introduces characters in “Erecting the Monolith,” builds his case in “The Cult of Vainglory,” and treats us to exposure of the horrific problem of “Cracks in the Monolith.”

He begins the story at a meeting in Puerto Rico at which data on the danger of aluminum to the human body is discussed. He notes that the meeting was not open to the press—shortly after a meeting in Maryland that discussed the dangers of mercury to the human body got some bad press. A third meeting that soon followed in Norcross, Ga., known as the Simpsonwood Retreat, was private. There, officials from government agencies mingled with pharmaceutical industry people. They needed to formulate the message that vaccines do not cause autism, and finding the right messenger became the priority. The candidate would need to play ball, be a foreigner, be known in CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) circles, and work from a script.

Using the literary tragedy technique of introducing the main character by an event at the beginning of the end, Grundvig reveals that Poul Bak Thorsen’s trail has been uncovered on his first day on the job of the director of Aarhus University in Denmark. More than $1 million in grant money from the American University in Denmark.

Grundvig states that the “Weaponization of Government” is about “taking over your lives at a very young age…and vaccines are the first place to start.” He speaks of the “Vaccine Deep State,” (a term we are hearing a lot lately), which has no separation between Congress, CDC, FDA, NIH, and big pharmaceutical producers.

James F. Coy, M.D.
Fruitland Park, Fla.


Groundbreaking journalist and bestselling novelist Tom Wolfe, author of The Bonfire of the Vanities, A Man in Full, and I Am Charlotte Simmons, now applies his virtuosity to the source of all of humanity’s achievements. As he describes it, the inspiration came from surfing the internet and coming upon a web node about “The Mystery of Language Evolution.” The article announced that heavyweights linguists—linguists, biologists, anthropologists, and computer scientists—are giving up on answering the question of where language comes from and how it works.

“’The most fundamental questions about the origins and evolution of our linguistic capacity remain as mysterious as ever,’” they wrote. The biggest name in the history of linguistics, Noam Chomsky, concluded that despite an explosion of research on the problem in the last 40 years, what it had produced was a colossal waste of time by some of the greatest minds in academia.

Wolfe writes: “Now, that was odd…. I had never heard of a group of experts coming together to announce what abject failures they were.”

Wolfe then delves into the theory of evolution, including a far-from-flattering portrait of Charles Darwin. He notes that the originator of the theory was actually Alfred Wallace, a self-taught British naturalist who suffered an attack of malaria while studying the flora and fauna of a volcanic island off the Malay Archipelago. During the paroxysmal fevers, he came down with a fervid desire to record the revelation that had occurred to him about how evolution works. He wrote up a 20-page manuscript “on the tendency of varieties to depart indefinitely from the original type,” the
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first description ever published of the evolution of the species through natural selection. He sent it with a cover letter to Charles Darwin, with a humble request to pass it along to others if he felt it worthy.

Darwin was aghast. This outsider, a barely educated “flycatcher,” had independently come up with his idea! Darwin rushed his Origin of Species into print, and managed to establish his own priority despite gentlemanly gestures that appeared to generously give some credit to Wallace.

Wolfe obviously lacks respect for Darwin’s cosmogony or “Theory of Everything.” He compares it with that of the Algonquians, the Apaches, the Tlingit natives of the American Northwest, and even Rudyard Kipling’s Just So Stories. He observes that the Egyptians visualized the dung beetle as the creator, and the Navajo Indians cast the biting midge in that role. A later cosmogony was “a dead ringer for the Navajos,” Wolfe writes, except that the creator was even smaller, namely, a single, undifferentiated cell—or “four or five” of them. It’s the only theory recent enough that people knew the name of the storyteller: Charles Darwin.

Darwin did try to explain everything, including speech. Animals, after all, have their forms of vocal communication, some of them quite complex. Their vocalizations had to evolve into human speech—somehow, despite the lack of evidence; it was self-evident. Darwin did try to explain everything, including speech. Animals, after all, have their forms of vocal communication, some of them quite complex. Their vocalizations had to evolve into human speech—somehow, despite the lack of evidence; it was self-evident. Darwin became obsessed with trying to fill in the details, but ultimately was unsuccessful.

In an essay entitled “The Limits of Natural Selection as Applied to Man,” Wallace stated that he did not present anything that “in any degree affects the truth or the generality of Mr. Darwin’s great discovery.” Except, writes Wolfe, Wallace had systematically demolished the point that was dearest to Darwin’s heart, namely, that human beings are merely the most highly evolved species of animals. Wallace clearly implies that there is a cardinal distinction between man and animal, following from the three cardinal assumptions in Darwinism: First, “natural selection can expand a creature’s powers only to the point where it has an advantage over the competition in the struggle for existence—and no further.” Second, “natural selection can’t produce any changes that are bad for the creature.” And third, “natural selection can’t produce any ‘specially developed organ’ that is useless to a creature…or of so little use that it is not until thousands and thousands of years down the line that the creature can take advantage of the organ’s full power.”

Based on these, there are two main features of humanity that cannot be explained by natural selection, Wolfe explains: the skin, and the “organ of speech.”

Man has been called the “naked ape.” Other primates, even in the tropics, have hides or coats of hair that protect them to the point of making them waterproof. But the virtually hairless back of humans makes them highly vulnerable to wind, cold, and rain. This cannot possibly have an advantage. For time immemorial, mankind has been using animal hides or other things to clothe himself.

Then there was the fatal flaw: speech and the capacity for abstract thought. After Darwin failed to explain the origin of speech in his book, The Descent of Man, the subject of the origin of language “entered a dark age that was to last for seventy-seven years,” Wolfe writes. The silence ended with Noam Chomsky, who introduced a radically new theory of language in the 1950s. Man was born with a built-in “language organ,” Chomsky proposed. The organ contained a “deep structure” and a “universal grammar.”

Chomsky is a philosophical giant, a “genius of geniuses,” writes Wolfe. His output of linguistic papers climaxed in 2002 with his theory of recursion. Recursion consists of “putting one sentence, one thought, inside another in a series that, theoretically, could be endless.” He asserted, as Wolfe explains, that “Every language depended on recursion—every language. Recursion was the one capability that distinguished human thoughts from all other forms of cognition…recursion accounted for man’s dominance among all the animals on the globe [emphasis in original].”

Then along came the equivalent of a fly catcher: Daniel L. Everett, a former Chomskytite, demolished the Chomsky theory by a 25,000 word article in Current Anthropology entitled “Cultural Constraints on Grammar and Cognition in Pirahã.” Everett lived in the jungle in the vast Amazon with a small tribe of people and managed to learn their language. It was definitely not recursive. He eventually wrote one of the handful of popular books ever written on linguistics: Don’t Sleep, There are Snakes, an account of his and his family’s 30 years with the Pirahã.

Wolfe concludes that speech should be recognized as a fourth kingdom of earth. We have the animal kingdom, the vegetable kingdom, the mineral kingdom, and now regnum loquax, the kingdom of speech, inhabited solely by Homo loquax. And people still do not even know quite what speech is.

“To say that animals evolved into man is like saying that Carrara marble evolved into Michelangelo’s David.” Wolfe states. Wallace and Everett provided the intellectual ammunition to demolish Darwin and Chomsky, and Tom Wolfe’s biting wit uses it to deadly effect. His inimitable style is speech at the pinnacle of its power.

A reviewer of the German translation writes that science has made colossal progress in the past 150 years but has foundered on the most pressing question of human history: What is the origin of human speech? Researchers from Charles Darwin to Noam Chomsky, he states, have never stopped announcing grandiose successes that amounted to nothing, defaming critics instead of admitting their own errors, and generally describing the emperor’s new clothes in the scintillating colors. But speech, the foremost accomplishment of mankind, is not to be explained either with the theory of evolution or with scientific systemizing.

Wolfe does not reach the conclusion stated by John the Evangelist: “In the beginning was the Word.” But in my view, he comes perilously close.

Jane M. Orient, M.D.
Tucson, Ariz.


For those remaining few who believe they are in full control of their own thoughts, Shadow Men will be a revelation. Napoleon is a forensic psychologist who has examined the who, what, how, and why of the widespread use of psychological operations (PSYOPS) on everyday people. His extensive research and references keep this book from being dismissed at first glance as conspiratorial bunk.

The book is well-organized and clear about its ultimate point: to explain the reasons behind, and methods of social engineering. Napoleon prepares the reader for the meat of the book with a
few chapters supporting his view of why we are susceptible to mind control. He explains how a direct external control, for example physical force, becomes internalized by the use of symbolic displays of such force. Citing scientific research on “mirror neurons,” he concisely presents the neuro-biology of how we can be made to conflate symbolic displays of virtual reality with our objective reality.

Sadly, he predicts that physicians may become virtual in the near future, noting that doctors rely more heavily on “the numbers” and not the fated art of arriving at a clinical impression by touching and looking at the patient.

The “shadow men” are those corrupt individuals behind the scenes who have an insatiable desire for wealth and power and thus must control the rest of us. They inhabit the industries necessary for control, e.g., banking, government, data management, and the media-entertainment complex. Napoleon provides a lengthy psychological assessment of the typical shadow man. He cautions the reader that the shadow men succeed as long as we, their victims, remain unaware that we are being manipulated.

An example of a common PSYOPs technique is “free floating fear,” an amorphous, intangible, ever-present anxiety-provoking state of mind. Once this is cultivated, the government offers salvation in “protections” that result in giving up many constitutional rights in exchange for a sense of safety.

The discussion on “labeling theory” is particularly apt in today’s political climate in which identity politics has become the norm. A label becomes a simple way to characterize people, eliminating the need to engage or make an effort to explore the complexities of their character.

Mind control aside, the volume of well-documented factual information about religion, world history, and American history is the book’s unexpected bonus. Numerous illustrations break up the dense information and add to the depth of analyses. The chapter on America’s Founding Fathers, complete with detailed forensic psychological profiles, is worth the price of the book.

Anyone who has read the best-selling classic, The Creature from Jekyll Island: a Second Look at the Federal Reserve by G. Edward Griffin will recognize and appreciate the detailed information about the history of financial institutions and the Federal Reserve.

Napoleon’s theories about cultural change through social engineering are provocative. Many of his examples are spot-on. The next time you see a direct-to-consumer televised pharmaceutical ad, look and listen carefully. As the voice-over is listing the drug’s deleterious and sometimes fatal side effects, the drug-takers are happily picnicking, jogging, frolicking, or otherwise looking perfectly healthy. Mission accomplished: the impact of the side effects is thoroughly diluted.

The book is fascinating and disturbing. The information can be overwhelming if not read in smaller doses. Napoleon leaves the reader with a 12-step deprogramming program. The first step is accepting the fact that all of us are vulnerable to mind control.

Marilyn M. Singleton, M.D., J.D.
Redondo Beach, Calif.


With the current opioid epidemic, and the appalling failure of recovery and rehabilitation programs, fresh thinking on the subject is urgently needed. Marc Lewis, a neuroscientist and professor of developmental psychology, has his own personal story of recovery from addiction. His previous book, Memoirs of an Addicted Brain: A Neuroscientist Examines His Former Life on Drugs, was said to be the first to blend memoir and science in addiction studies.

In addition to his own story, Lewis tells the story of five patients with different addictions: heroin, methamphetamine, alcohol, binge eating, and cocaine. He explores what in their early lives led them to the trap of addiction, how it affected their lives, and how they ultimately managed to escape.

Rather than as a disease, he sees addiction as a type of learned behavior. It rewrites the brain, and uses some of the same neural circuits that are involved in love. The circuits involve the ventral striatum, the orbitofrontal cortex, the amygdala, the dorsal striatum, and the prefrontal cortex. These parts of the brain might be the focus of what Freud might have called the libido, but instead of love or the satisfaction gained from accomplishments, the reward center just craves the substance or addictive behavior. Neurotransmitters such as dopamine play a role, but Lewis does not think that attempts to chemically manipulate the brain are the answer. He believes that what is learned can be unlearned, and he writes a great deal about neuroplasticity.

“It all comes back to feedback,” he writes. He explains how addiction takes over the “motivational springboard for habit formation.”

Lewis frequently speaks about how these neural circuits and mechanisms, which we need for survival, were “bequeathed to us by evolution.” He has a chapter headed “A Brain Designed for Addiction,” as though evolution were a purposeful, intelligent entity capable of designing anything. I found his emphasis on evolution to be a distraction. The point is that these neural circuits exist, and we need to learn how to help the patient turn them to good rather than to destruction. The concept that “what fires together, wires together” makes practical sense.

Lewis briefly acknowledges the disagreements about the existence of free will, which has no locus identified in the neural circuits. Perhaps the “breakdown of will” reflects a corresponding breakdown in communications between the left prefrontal cortex and the motivational core, he suggests. The question of free will is, however, very pertinent in deciding whether addiction is a disease.

G.K. Chesterton writes in his book Orthodoxy, “Evil is a matter of active choice, whereas disease is not. If you say you are going to cure a profligate as you cure an asthmatic, my cheap and obvious answer is, ‘Produce the people who want to be asthmatics as many people want to be profligates.’” One may be cured of a malady by being a passive patient. But changing anything in the moral realm requires an active will. Chesterton’s theology and Lewis’s neuroscience will at least agree that on this basis addiction is not a disease.

I think this book may help patients, the families of addicted patients, and their physicians understand a little better what the experience of addiction is like. It offers a message of hope, as well as what may prove to be some very useful therapeutic approaches.

Jane M. Orient, M.D.
Tucson, Ariz.