

PODCAST: Stanley Kubrick: Whistleblowing satirik nebo AI transhumanist?, Kevin Barrett / Truth Jihad

[UR unz.com/audio/kbarrett stanley-kubrick-whistleblowing-satirist-or-ai-transhumanist](https://unz.com/audio/kbarrett_stanley-kubrick-whistleblowing-satirist-or-ai-transhumanist)

January 14, 2023

← [Helen Buyniski říká „Zvěrstva nejsou...
Kompletní archivyKevin Barrett podcasty
Sdílejte s Gabem](#)

Audio přehrávač



[Jasun Horsley](#) je autorem několika provokativních knih o filmech, konspiracích a jejich kombinacích. Jeho nová kniha *The Kubrickon: The Cult of Kubrick: Attention Capture and the Inception of AI* se možná zapíše do historie jako nejlepší kniha o Stanleyem Kubrickovi, kterou kdy autor, který Kubricka nenávidí, napsal. Jelikož mám Kubricka osobně rád a zjistil jsem, že většina jeho filmů má vykupitelskou společenskou a uměleckou hodnotu, změnil se tento rozhovor v něco jako debatu – takovou, kterou jsem zaručeně prohrál, protože Jasun je expert na Kubricka a já ne.

[Odkaz na video](#)

Níže je celý, ale mírně upravený přepis rozhovoru.

Kevin Barrett: Vítejte v Truth Jihad Audio-Visual. Jsem Kevin Barrett a mluvím se zajímavými lidmi z celého světa, kteří mají pohledy, se kterými se v mainstreamu často nesetkáte. Ale možná byste se s některými z těchto pohledů měli setkat. A můj dnešní host, Jason Horsley, má rozhodně velmi zajímavou perspektivu. A nemyslím si, že ho v dohledné době postaví na přední místa titulků mainstreamových médií. Je autorem nové knihy o Stanleyem Kubrickovi s názvem *The Kubrickon: The Cult of Kubrick: Attention Capture and the Inception of AI*. A je to pravděpodobně nejlepší kniha, jakou jste kdy četli o Stanleyem Kubrickovi od někoho, kdo Stanleyho Kubricka nenávidí, protože je pravděpodobně jediná, ale ve skutečnosti je docela dobrá. Takže, ahoj, vítěj, Jasone. Jak se máš?

Jasun Horsley: Díky, Kevine.

Kevin Barrett: Je to velmi provokativní, zajímavá kniha. A hned vám řeknu, že tady budu muset trochu debatovat. A zaručeně prohraju debatu. I když v žádném případě nejsem fanatický Kubrickův fanoušek, jsem svým způsobem obdivovatelem, který oceňuje – nevím, jestli baví, by bylo to správné slovo a v mnoha případech by to určitě nebylo – ale já Jsem jedním z těchto lidí, kteří jsou tak trochu umírněný pro-Kubrickův typ. A vaše kniha mě úplně nepřesvědčila, abych nebyl. Takže možná můžete položit argument proti němu. Většinu jeho filmů jsem v poslední době neviděl. Ve skutečnosti je jich pár, které jsem nikdy neviděl. A tak jste ve velké výhodě a měli byste být schopni se mnou úplně vytrít podlahu.

(Opětovně publikováno z **Truth Jihad** se svolením autora nebo zástupce)

[← Helen Buyniski říká „Zvěrstva nejsou...](#)

[Sledujte @truthjihad](#)



[RSS](#)



Print

• Kategorie: [Umění/Dopisy](#) , [Ideologie](#) •

Štítky: [Hollywood](#) , [Kubrick](#) ,

[Transhumanismus](#)

Souvisejícího zájmu

[BECOME A PATRON](#)

[Andrew Joyce](#)

[Když Hollywood jel správně](#)

Americká západní kinematografie jako výraz starších ctností

[Boyd D. Cathey](#)

[Gregory Hood](#)

[← Helen Buyniski říká](#)

[„Zvěrstva nejsou...](#)

Skrýt 26 komentářů [Zanechat komentář](#)



Komentující ignorovat
... sledovat Endorsed
Only
Oříznout
komentáře?

1. Irisříká:
15. ledna 2023 v
1:00 GMT • před
3,2 dny • 100 slov
↑

but I'm one of these people who's kind of a moderate pro-Kubrick type. And your book didn't fully convince me not to be.



How can anybody who values freedom dislike a director who gave us the inspired and inspiring *Spartacus*, a passionate ode to the indomitable human mind?

Spartacus was a most poignant plea against oppression and injustice, unlike anything Hollywood ever produced. It insightfully depicted the depravity of the Roman empire, in contrast with the dawn of Christianity as ethical system which ended it.

The story of *Spartacus* beautifully and sensitively carries showed that there is no civilisation without social ethics, and not social ethics without religion. How is it possible not to like Kubrick?

• **Replies:** [@Cpt Obvuios](#)

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

2. *Spartacus* didn't leave much of an impression, and neither did *2001*. *Lolita* is simply distasteful. *Full Metal Jacket* is more of a generic war movie than anything else.

On the other hand, *Doctor Strangelove*, *Clockwork Orange*, *The Shining*, and *Barry Lyndon* were all memorable.

• **Replies:** [@Emil Nikola Richard](#)

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

3. [Silesian 2](#) says:

[January 15, 2023 at 4:58 am GMT](#) • [3.1 days ago](#) • 100 Words [↑](#)

Spartacus rather stands out from the Kubrick body of work, doesn't it? It feels nothing like any Kubrick film: Its powerful message about the extremes at which men pushed to desperation might seek liberty has both the comic wit and cold-blooded arrogance of pompous Roman elites flowing in and around it seamlessly. Truly, it stands out from all other films of its genre, as much as from other Kubrick creations.

On another topic, I did not understand the brief mention of jinn by both men. Any clarification to be had?

• **Thanks:** [Iris](#)

• **Replies:** [@Kevin Barrett](#)

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

4. Franz says:

January 15, 2023 at 5:51 am GMT • 3.0 days ago • 200 Words ↑

For anyone neither pro or con, a truly fun book is by a guy named Leonard Wheat called *Kubrick's 2001: A Triple Allegory*. Having seen *2001* is a sort of prerequisite.

The book cost a bit much at the moment, wait till someone offers a used copy for a reasonable price.

The thing about Wheat's analysis — I've only read part, not all — Kubrick's title was a lot more than a nod to Classical Literature. Kubrick kept the ideas expressed in Homer and right from the start the show is a modernized, symbolic reconstruction of *The Odyssey*. Kubrick was not fooling around. It all fits.

Most people got the idea that *2001*'s chief astronaut, named "Bowman", is just a backhand nod to Homer but it isn't sustained. Well, either Wheat pays a lot more attention than most of us or he's reading too much in the cosmic tea-leaves, but it's interesting especially if you found the movie a fun puzzler. What I have read so far is solid; and if it's all there is, than Kubrick paid a splendid homage to the Ancient Greeks generally and Homer especially.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

5. Dumbo says:

January 15, 2023 at 10:14 am GMT • 2.9 days ago • 100 Words ↑
Hmm. Neither?

From Stanley, I like Paths of Glory. The ending song is great. Also the first half of Full Metal jacket, the second part is more boring. 2001 is great, but today it feels less impactful than at the time. Doctor Strangelove is good too. I didn't like his lolita, bad version of the novel. Clockwork Orange... Again, it's less good than the novel somehow, but it is more interesting than lolita at least. Barry Lyndon: great photography, boring movie. Shining: meh... But good technical innovations. Eyes Wide Shut: meh squared, despite interesting subtext. I haven't seen Spartacus.

In general, I agree with Pauline Kael about Kubrick.

• **Replies:** [@Iris](#), [@anarchyst](#), [@Franz](#)

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

6. Iris says:

January 15, 2023 at 2:58 pm GMT • 2.7 days ago • 100 Words ↑
[@Dumbo](#)

| Eyes Wide Shut: meh squared, despite interesting subtext.

You think that a legendary film director with world-class status, warning the public about what the unravelling of the Jeffrey Epstein sex blackmail network later fully confirmed, is not interesting enough?

Eyes Wide Shut was an important, prophetic and deliberate warning about how we are ruled, and by whom. We are just too brainwashed to understand it.

• **Agree:** [rabbit redux](#)

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

7. Emil Nikola Richard says:

January 15, 2023 at 3:05 pm GMT • 2.7 days ago • 100 Words ↑

@Colin Wright

Have you ever seen one of those crypto interpretations of The Shining where people go on about this or that mega non sequitur?

I always thought it was a silly movie.

2001 and Strangelove on the other hand I will probably end up watching 40 times if I live as long as the social security administration plans.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

8. Kevin Barrett says:

January 15, 2023 at 3:11 pm GMT • 2.6 days ago • 100 Words ↑
@Silesian 2

From the full transcript, available at:

<https://kevinbarrett.substack.com/p/stanley-kubrick-whistleblowing-satirist>

Jasun Horsley: And the short version is that I feel that artificial intelligence is is an oxymoron. There's no such thing and there never will be. But there are discarnate entities who know how to inform and influence and incarnate through technology. That's my basic thesis.

Kevin Barrett: The jinn.

Jasun Horsley: The jinn. Thank you. Exactly. So you're familiar with that? Of course, because of your own interest (in Islam). I feel we are seeing that.

Feed "jinn" into a search engine for the basic concept.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

9. iread says:

January 15, 2023 at 3:57 pm GMT • 2.6 days ago ↑

Woah! Go read Pauline Kael's review of Clockwork Orange, which she differentiates from the book by Anthony Burgess sufficient to suggest that Horsely has aced it. It being that which Kubrick is merely an example....of.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

10. Emil Nikola Richard says:

January 15, 2023 at 4:13 pm GMT • 2.6 days ago • 100 Words ↗

Jasun Horsley is a maddening writer. On one page is a notable insight about many of us. On the next page is regurgitation of Junk-Fraud pablum regarding his own neuroses. I will buy Kubrickon knowing this ahead of time. I will start to read it the day it arrives and might even finish it in one day if I have time. He is in the top 1% of podcast interviewees.

He does not know how to pronounce *data*. It is a trivial deduction he knows absolutely nothing about AI.

• **Replies:** @Corpse Tooth

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

11. Protogonus says: • Website

January 15, 2023 at 9:04 pm GMT • 2.4 days ago • 200 Words ↑
Philosopher Martin Heidegger (d. 1976) bitterly complained in writing at the very height of atmospheric nuclear testing globally, when opposed parties of satanic talmudists stood behind the American and Soviet Empires and engaged in a shadow-war about how to manipulate the goyim while slowly killing them. Not long after, 'Dr. Strangelove' would appear, as Kubrick, its director—an agent of the talmudists—decided to treat their universal horror-show as a joke. We remember it well.

Black satire was being used for diabolical purposes in 1964 as well as being sold for entertainment. It was a clever ploy, deflecting attention from the real danger to humanity. What were those talmudic purposes? Find out here, which is a case study very familiar to all and also similarly misunderstood by many:

[https://www.academia.edu/76372363/To Sevastopol With Love](https://www.academia.edu/76372363/To_Sevastopol_With_Love)

Note that to read the article, simply SCROLL DOWN; no sign-in or sign-on is necessary. Thanks.

Reply/Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

12. Dennis Dale says: • Website

January 15, 2023 at 9:08 pm GMT • 2.4 days ago • 100 Words ↑

I find it hilarious that Eyes Wide Shut turned Kubrick into the Jesus of Conspiracy Theorists when the whole point of the movie is “you don’t want to know”: you don’t want to know what your wife is thinking and you don’t want to know what the powerful do behind closed doors.

ffs

• **Replies:** @Kevin Barrett, @Socratesjr

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

13. Cpt Obviuos says:

January 15, 2023 at 10:42 pm GMT • 2.3 days ago • 100

Words ↑

@Iris

Well, considering the facts that Kubrick was brought in after the original director was fired because he and Kirk Douglas clashed, and that Kubrick had no control over the script or screenplay (all his movies afterwards gave him full control), it is unsurprising this is unlike any other film Kubrick made.

Also, the original Director of Photography (Russell Metty) walked off the set once Kubrick took over — Kubrick also had run-ins with the Studio and Kirk Douglas as well, major shock — and Kubrick ended up filming most of *Spartacus* himself; Metty bitched about this until *Spartacus* won the Best Cinematography Oscar in his name, which changed his tune, and after which he made many other great movies.

As for Kubrick, he disowned *Spartacus* and did not consider it to be in his oeuvre. I personally consider it to be a Kirk Douglas movie, as it was he who had control.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

14. Kevin Barrett says:

January 15, 2023 at 11:37 pm GMT • 2.3 days ago • 100 Words ↑
@Dennis Dale

The point of *Eyes Wide Shut* vis-a-vis the protagonist may be “you don’t want to know,” but film audiences DO want to know—that’s why they paid to watch it. The film frustrates that desire. The result is that people like Jasun dismiss it as a bad film. But I think the Operation Monarch subtext (Nicole Kidman is a mind-controlled sex slave, their daughter gets kidnapped by cult members at the end, and still Tom Cruise and most of the audience don’t see it) was the seed Kubrick planted in the film for those who *do* want to know, and who may one day get tired of being ruled by psychopaths.

• **Agree:** Irish Savant

• **Thanks:** Dennis Dale

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

15. anarchyst says:

January 16, 2023 at 1:21 am GMT • 2.2 days ago • 100 Words ↑
@Dumbo

I agree with you that the first part of “**Full Metal Jacket**” made R. Lee Ermey a consummate “actor”—*only he wasn’t acting*.

Having undergone USMC “bootcamp” myself in 1969, Ermey’s performance was spot-on.

My interpretation of the second half was the futility of war, especially when the “enemy” cannot be differentiated from ordinary civilians. I believe that Kubrick attempted to show the uncertainty and difficulties endured by both sides.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

16. Right On says:

January 16, 2023 at 1:40 am GMT • 2.2 days ago • 100 Words ↑
Spartacus was scripted by Communist Dalton Trumbo, so naturally the baddies are representatives of western civilization.

Actually, Crassus (Laurence Olivier) is the real hero of the movie. He put his money where his mouth was, got off his backside, and put himself in real danger, in order to prevent the slave revolt spreading. Without his success, there would have been no Conquest of Gaul, Antony & Cleopatra, Roman Britain, . . . , or all the grandeur that was Rome that is our common inheritance. *Roma invicta*.

• **Agree:** p38ace

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

17. Judson Hammond says:

January 16, 2023 at 3:23 am GMT • 2.1 days ago • 100 Words ↑
As I understand it, R. Lee Ermey was hired as a technical consultant on “Full Metal Jacket.” After Kubrick caught his act, he fired the actor who was supposed to play the drill sergeant and hired Ermey. Given the impression Ermey makes in the movie, Kubrick obviously made the right move. Probably the most abusive character in cinema till J.K. Simmons appeared in “Whiplash” in 2014.

• **Replies:** @anarchyst

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

18. Franz says:

January 16, 2023 at 5:35 am GMT • 2.0 days ago • 200 Words ↑
@Dumbo

| 2001 is great, but today it feels less impactful than at the time.

From the film buffs I've talked to over the last couple years, esp. during the lockdowns, *2001* is seeing a fascinating renaissance. Using no CGI and long stretches where it **seems** nothing is happening but it begins to percolate for those paying attention, the movie seems to have found its time.

Personally I see *2001: A Space Odyssey* as other saw Kipling's *Recessional*. The Bronze Age hero reaches his home in the original *Odyssey*. The space age hero regresses back from our era of mediocrity and empty noise and finds his youth again. Kubrick got from Arthur C. Clarke that you cannot separate space from time. A kind of trial must take place for the initiate to shed the 3,600 or so years of ballast we've accumulated.

Also I don't think Iris is wrong about *Eyes Wide Shut* either. Some of the things he said to Nicole Kidman indicates he was dead serious about the people who are pulling the strings. It might have cost him. Most global insiders live to 95, Kubrick barely made 70.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

19. Anonymous[195] • Disclaimer says:

January 16, 2023 at 10:58 am GMT • 1.8 days ago • 400

Words ↑

The older I get, the more I'm amazed that artists still make art. Creativity seems not just frowned upon and attacked, but more and more cancelled and punished. It takes balls, not just skill, to put out work that other feel duty-bound to attack.

That being said, I also don't think we should be forced...a la LBGT Nazis...to support-laud-praise any given piece of art. We're entitled to our opinions, hopefully well-informed.

My take on Mr. Kubrick:

Killer's Kiss (haven't seen)

The Killing (haven't seen)

Paths of Glory (liked) <https://tinyurl.com/ynstkbmm>

Spartacus (liked a lot) "I'm Spartacus!"

Lolita (liked)

Strangelove (liked a whole lot) <https://tinyurl.com/56vt7w7f>

Space Odyssey (liked a whole lot) "HAL, open the pod-bay door!")

Clockwork Orange (liked) droogs and eggiwegs and in-out/in-out, oh my!

<https://tinyurl.com/4hjudakn>

Barry Lyndon (meh)

The Shining (liked a whole lot) <https://tinyurl.com/4ezkn4ub>

Full Metal Jacket (liked a whole lot)

<https://tinyurl.com/2s37fugd>

Eyes Wide Shut (feminist shite)

Some people see *Lolita* as mere porn. In the book, Nabokov makes clear that *adult* Humbert is fixated on Lolita because as *young* Humbert, he wasn't allowed to mourn the loss of his first love, a girl Lolita's age. To me it confirmed the tragedy of not expressing feelings in a timely, healthy way.

It's one of my issues with men: they mock feelings because feminists overdo them.

We're all "bipolar" in the sense of having both right (intuitive) and left (logical) brain spheres. Health comes from balancing them.

Too much logic weakens social links, affiliations, love, and life.

Too much emotion weakens responsibility, duty, perseverance, love, and life.

In short, women need to stop being praised for being hysterical and bragging about unearned achievements. Less selfishness. It's not all about *them*. They need more shaming.

Men need to emote more and stop caring more about others than themselves (which is just a futile attempt to "earn love" which they should just just for breathing). Less self-abnegation, more self-care. Less self-reliance, more brotherhood. No more mindless Captain Save-a-hos, no more simps enriching bints who see men as mre money-mules. Guys *matter*. Men need more praise.

• **Replies:** [@Corpse Tooth](#)

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

20. [anarchyst](#) says:

[@Judson Hammond](#)

The actor who was replaced by R. Lee Ermey was given a part in Kubrick's *Full Metal Jacket*. He was the helicopter door gunner in a later part of the movie.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

21. Corpse Tooth says:

January 16, 2023 at 5:15 pm GMT • 1.6 days ago • 100 Words ↑

@Emil Nikola Richard

Jasun Horsley's "The Vice of Kings" is both a biography of his uppercrust Fabian family and an exploration of the pedophilia networks of the 1960s and 1970s that serviced the English aristocracy –perhaps the most wretched group of elites to curse the Earth. Demon-in-daylight Jimmy Saville features prominently in the narrative. Horsley, a capable writer, goes about his task as philosophical investigator, a smart choice given the lurid nature of his story.

• **Replies:** @Emil Nikola Richard

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

22. Corpse Tooth says:

@Anonymous

"Men need more praise."

Masculinity, as an ideal, a set of attributes, needs to be encouraged and praised. Men need to earn praise.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

23. Emil Nikola Richard says:

January 16, 2023 at 6:01 pm GMT • 1.5 days ago • 100 Words ↑
@Corpse Tooth

That is the fine part of the book.

The parts of the book I had to skim over were the repetitive unoriginal complaints about his mother didn't love him enough. Once is enough for that story.

I tried to find 16 Maps of Hell last night which I haven't read and it's missing in action.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

24. January 17, 2023 at 4:00 am GMT • 1.1 days ago • 100 Words ↑

It would have been better for Horse-Flea to rail against Kubrick cultists than Kubrick himself.

We can't blame Kubrick for the fandom. It's like Bob Dylan and Dylan-maniacs (some of whom crashed into his house and stalked him) were two different things. It'd be wrong to confuse Dylan with Dylanology.

The truth is, even without the fandom and cult, Kubrick's works have great value.

In contrast, take something like STAR TREK. Without the mindless fandom, it is absolutely nothing.

One thing for sure, unlike someone like L. Ron Hubbard, Kubrick was NOT trying to create a cult around him. Indeed, most of his works were underappreciated at the time and came to be highly regarded only later.

EYES WIDE SHUT is a masterpiece and only around now is a consensus developing around such appraisal.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

25. Anon[395] • Disclaimer says:

January 17, 2023 at 6:41 am GMT • 1.0 days ago • 200 Words ↑

“At it’s heart of hearts, I am convinced that The New Yorker is deeply, deeply evil.

I also suspect/believe that it’s article on Stanley Kubrick, prior to his death, was a hit piece

([https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1999/06/14/a-](https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1999/06/14/a-kubrick-odyssey)

[kubrick-odyssey](https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1999/06/14/a-kubrick-odyssey)). As Malcolm X Jr. (Malcolm Shabazz) said

before he was thrown off a roof, ‘first they character assassinate you, then they assassinate you.’ The New Yorker article was

followed by the medical assassination of Mr. Kubrick by a heart attack (hard to prove, but I would bet vast sums). I strongly

suspect the author of the article knew that was coming. Purpose: why would people feel inclined to turn over stones and leaves in

the death of an unsavory weirdo? The character assassination

protects the assassins. Finally, I consider Stanley Kubrick to be

one of quite a few psychopathy awareness martyrs. “Eyes Wide Shut”, it doesn’t get clearer than that.”

Who and what is The New Yorker?

<https://pathwhisperer.info/2018/01/23/trust-me-im-a-doctor-this-is-a-medical-treatment-psychopath-larry-nassar-md-molests-young-female-gymnasts-for-20-plus-years/#comment-139406>

• **Thanks:** Another Polish Perspective

Reply/Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

26. Socratesjr says:

January 17, 2023 at 3:42 pm GMT • 15.1 hours ago • 100

Words ↑

@Dennis Dale

My experience is that most don't want to know. They would rather live with a comfortable lie than an uncomfortable truth. The vast majority go to movies for entertainment, not for enlightenment.

The main stream news media is nothing more than a modern day Roman colosseum, a perverted form of entertainment. I have found that those who watch TV news have very poor analytical skills and short attention spans. For the majority, why would movies be different?

Concerning Eyes Wide Shut, we must consider that Kubrick died suddenly just after making the movie, very suspiciously, and according to some, by contract, this allowed the movie company to edit the film. If true, this discussion is like a jury having a verdict with half of the evidence missing.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

[← Helen Buyniski Says "Atrocities Aren'...](#)

Leave a Reply -

Remember My Information Why?

Emailové odpovědi na můj komentář

 [Přihlaste se k odběru tohoto vlákna komentářů přes RSS](#) 

[Přihlásit se k odběru všech komentářů Kevina Barretta přes RSS](#)