



Lisa Robinson

PICKERING CITY COUNCILLOR

If You Were the Devil, How Would You Destroy A Society?"

I asked artificial intelligence a simple question: If you were the devil, how would you destroy a society?

The answer I received wasn't dramatic or theatrical. It didn't involve chaos in the way most people imagine. It was far more subtle—and far more unsettling. The answer was this: you wouldn't destroy a society outright, you would confuse it.

You would blur the line between truth and lies until people could no longer tell the difference. You wouldn't need to erase truth; you would simply surround it with so many competing narratives that it becomes indistinguishable from opinion. Facts would become "perspectives," and certainty would be treated as extremism. Over time, people wouldn't just disagree—they would lose the ability to agree on reality itself. And once that happens, a society becomes easy to destabilize.

You wouldn't silence people through force, either. That's outdated. Instead, you would create an environment where speaking carries a cost. You would make examples of a few—label them, discredit them, isolate them—and everyone else would get the message. The result is not imposed silence, but chosen silence. People begin to censor themselves, not because they've changed their beliefs, but because they've calculated the risk of expressing them.

You would also ensure the population remains in a constant state of emotional reaction. One controversy after another, one crisis layered on top of the next—just enough to keep people engaged, but never enough to bring resolution. People become consumed by outrage, but it is directionless. They argue, they react, they exhaust themselves—but they don't organize, they don't unify, and they don't hold anyone meaningfully accountable. They are simply too distracted.

At the same time, you would divide them. Not just politically, but socially and culturally. You would turn disagreements into personal conflicts, and differences of opinion into moral battles. People would begin to see each other not as neighbours, but as adversaries. And while they are busy fighting one another, they stop paying attention to who is actually making decisions and shaping outcomes.

You wouldn't destroy institutions outright either. You would allow trust in them to erode slowly—enough contradictions, enough double standards, enough visible failures that people begin to question everything, but without offering anything better in its place. The result is a population that trusts nothing, and a population that trusts nothing is far easier to influence than one that is grounded in shared truth.

And if you wanted lasting impact, you wouldn't focus on adults at all. You would focus on children. You would shape how they understand truth, identity, and reality from the beginning. You would normalize ideas early so they are never questioned later. Because whoever shapes the next generation doesn't just influence the future—they control it.

The uncomfortable part is not the theory—it's the recognition. Because when you step back and look at the world today, these patterns are not difficult to see. Whether by design, ideology, or institutional drift, the outcome is the same: a society that is increasingly confused, deeply divided, emotionally reactive, and under growing pressure to stay silent rather than speak the truth.

This is no longer about political sides. It is about whether truth itself can still be spoken clearly and without fear. Because once a society loses that, everything else becomes negotiable—reality, rights, and even accountability.

If there is a way forward, it is not found in escalating the noise. It is found in rejecting it. In choosing clarity over confusion, truth over convenience, and courage over comfort. In remaining grounded while everything else pulls toward chaos. Because in a time where everything feels uncertain, the most powerful thing a person can be is not louder, but clearer.

And clarity, right now, is the one thing that cannot be compromised.

"Strength Does Not Lie In The Absence Of Fear, But In The Courage To Face It Head-On And Rise Above It"

You are Reading

DURHAM'S
PROFESSIONAL GRADE
NEWSPAPER

★ *Durham's Best* ★
JOURNALIST - COLUMNIST



THE Mr. X Files

By John Mutton
CENTRAL EXCLUSIVE

Karmageddon

By Mr. 'X' ~ John Mutton
CENTRAL EXCLUSIVE

Why Zagreb's Transit Embarrasses the GTA (And What That Says About Us)

I didn't go to Zagreb looking for a transit lesson. But I got one. And it wasn't subtle. The Moment It Hits You. You step onto a tram and something feels... off. Not broken. Not chaotic. Just... easy. No schedule checking. No stress about missing the next one. No wondering if it's actually coming. It just shows up. Every few minutes. Like it's supposed to.

The Difference Is Psychological

In the GTA, transit is something you plan around. In Zagreb, transit is something you trust. That's the entire game. And once you feel that difference, you can't unsee it.

Let's Talk About Home

Back here in the GTA—and especially across Durham—we've built a system that quietly tells people: "You should probably just drive."

We:

- Stretch bus routes across massive distances
- Run them infrequently outside peak hours
- Design roads for cars, then try to "fit transit in" afterward

And then we act surprised when ridership lags.

The Lie We Tell Ourselves

We say:

"We don't have the density for that kind of system." Zagreb kills that argument. It's not Manhattan. It's not Tokyo.

It's a mid-sized city that made a decision: Transit is core infrastructure—not a social service.

What They Got Right (And We Didn't)

Zagreb built: - A tram network that actually covers the city - Frequency that eliminates planning - Priority lanes that beat traffic - A unified and simple system

We built: - Patchwork transit

- Political compromise routes
- Systems that compete with traffic instead of beating it.

And Here's the Part That Should Sting

We pour billions into: - Roads - Interchanges - Expansions

Then debate transit funding like it's optional. Meanwhile, cities like Zagreb treat trams the same way we treat asphalt: Non-negotiable. The Real Issue (Mr. X Translation) This isn't about trams. It's about priorities.

You can't: - Charge high development charges - Talk about intensification - Promise climate goals ...and then fail to deliver reliable, frequent transit. That's not planning. That's contradiction.

The Fix (And It's Not Complicated)

- If you want people out of cars: 1. Frequency first — every 5–10 minutes minimum
2. Dedicated lanes — transit must beat traffic 3. Network coverage — not just corridors
4. Stop over-planning, start building.

Final Word

Zagreb didn't outspend us. It out-decided us. They chose a system people could rely on.

We chose a system people tolerate. And until that changes, all the talk about: - housing - affordability - climate...is just that. Talk.

Mr. X - Because sometimes you have to leave the country to see what's broken at home.

THE Mr. X Files
OFFICIAL T-SHIRTS!

ONLY **26.99**

Order Now!
stickermule.com/backasore

DONATE YOUR OLD COMPUTER

Help a Local Family in Need

We repair and refurbish donated technology and provide it to families who need access to computers.

We Accept:

- ✓ Computers
- ✓ Monitors
- ✓ Scanners
- ✓ Printers
- ✓ Cell Phones

Pickup Available
or Drop Off At Our Office

136 Simcoe St. North – Suite 4
Oshawa, Ontario

Call Us Today
905-432-2657

Your old technology can make a real difference.