DECEPTION, LIES & BEAUTY PRODUCTS

Time to put commercial beauty products where they belong

WRITTEN BY QUEEN V

Written by Queen V.

Published by

Natural Beauty Products Queen

Australia

The Beauty Land matrix – a false reality

What do you think of when you think about commercial beauty product companies and the industry as a whole? What is the image that has been advertised, marketed, PR'd, educated, and coerced into you since the day you were born?

Let me talk about what I think most of you think it is, and the very reason so many of you hold the very strong belief that by using commercial beauty products you are 'being so very careful with what you put on your skin.'

My aim for this part of the book is to establish that this couldn't be more wrong, and that you actually couldn't be acting more recklessly — not only with your skin, but also your future health.

Yes, despite most people holding this belief, not one person I have met so far has ever been able to name a single ingredient in any of their products — never mind what they are or what they do. And further to this, people hold the belief that using natural products is 'not being careful,' even though I can name every ingredient in there and tell you exactly what it does for your skin, biologically and chemically.

As if nature is dirty and contaminated.

Let's work toward setting that false belief straight and leaving little room for confusion as to which one is the 'dirty and contaminated' choice — that you are most definitely being reckless at best, completely irrational at worst — putting anywhere near your beautiful human body.

And hot tip — it isn't nature and natural products.

So first, let's start with us — the masses, the consumers — and look at how they have taught us to view ourselves. Because it is how they view us. That way we can see where the manufactured gap in the beauty illusion is, and where it started.

See, the main problem here is you all seem to think that commercial beauty companies care so very much about you, the customer, and what they put in your products.

You really, really, really, really do.

To the point that you have put so much trust in them that, as mentioned before, most people don't know a single ingredient in their beauty products, what they are or what they do; and yet confidently, some even arrogantly, state that you are 'very careful with what you put on your skin'.

See how the math just isn't mathing there.

You think they care about you.

You think they care about your skin.

You think they care about how you feel about yourself, you know — 'worth it'.

Yes, in your mind, it is all about you the customer and they are just so focused and determined to make the best products with only the best ingredients for you — not them and their profits.

No, definitely you.

Let's start by fixing this so you can know what they really think of you, and in a later chapter we are going to look extensively at what goes into one of their high-end, very expensive industrial chemical filled products that you have been 'so careful with your skin' using.

Boy oh boy, is that going to be eye-opening and outright horrifying for a lot of you out there. Now I was going to save this little gem of a zinger for a later chapter, once we get really cooking, but it is so juicy and so delicious, you know, I just can't help but lead with it. A little entrée if you like, a little taster of what is to come!

Imagine these words leaving the mouth of the founder of the number one beauty company, L'Oréal. These are reportedly the very words that set the modern commercial beauty industry and what I would describe as their gaslighting, psychologically manipulative marketing in motion.

Let me set the scene first, so you have the context crystal clear.

L'Oréal founder Eugène Schueller, a chemist, founded the first incarnation of L'Oréal as — and you can't make this up, it works in English and French just as well, so I am going to give you both.

Société Française de Teintures Inoffensives pour Cheveux
Or, translated into English — The French Company of Inoffensive Hair Dyes, or the Safe Hair Care Company of France.

Now we are most definitely going to be referring back to this, oh yes, yes, we are, and it will feature in the flambé at the end of this, Part II of the book, so just note it for now.

His apparently 'inoffensive' hair care company was doing so well, he bought a couple of other companies, including a failing soap company called Monsavon. Now, long story short, because we are going into the long story later, the purchase of the soap company was a disaster, and year after year, the company lost money.

So in 1934, Eugène Schueller, sick of losing money, goes to an advertising agency. He wants them to create a massive publicity campaign to run over radio, and magazines, newspapers, and posters all over France.

These are reportedly the words the modern commercial beauty industry was built on.

Ready?

'Tell people they are DISGUSTING, they don't smell good, and they are NOT BEAUTIFUL.'

The reported words the modern commercial beauty industry was launched from. Read it again. From the same company peddling their products by telling you to buy them because you are 'worth it'.

Read it again. In 1934.

And you know what?

Insulting people, diminishing their opinion of themselves and making the 'people' feel bad about themselves, UNWORTHY and UNBEAUTIFUL — well, it worked so well, guess what?

It became L'Oréal's and by extension the modern commercial beauty industry that formed around it, go-to foundational beliefs about US — messages we've been bombarded with constantly and consistently over our lifetime in subtle different forms.

WE ARE DISGUSTING.

WE DON'T SMELL GOOD.

WE ARE NOT BEAUTIFUL.

Make no mistake, this strategy has been used very successfully to make a clear divide between an idealized image of Beauty Land and what they think of you, the lowly consumer.

And just in case you missed it, here it is again.

So just in case you had in mind that the commercial beauty industry was founded on the ideal of serving their much-loved customers, providing high-quality products where your health and wellbeing is their top priority and that they want nothing more than for you to feel good about yourself; well...how's that going so far?

Don't worry, the pan isn't even warm yet, we have so much more to go we are just adding a little oil, lubricating the pan if you like!

So far, we know that the modern commercial beauty products industry was started by a chemist, Eugène Schueller, when he started the inoffensive or safe hair dye company of France.

Now, did Eugène Schueller have any knowledge of human biology by any chance, because I feel like that might be important since the lab-cooked, synthetic, industrial chemical products being produced are going on to a human body.

Did he understand the biochemistry of skin, how chemistry and biology work together in humans, who at the end of the day are like walking, fully intelligent, self-contained natural chemical factories?

Did he understand that the horrific artificial chemicals he was creating and putting in said 'inoffensive' hair dyes, can in many cases pass through the scalp's skin barrier and enter the bloodstream — with the potential to contribute to serious health issues.

And again, I don't want to ruin the flambé later, but if what is being alleged in the current class action lawsuit regarding hair dyes turns out to be right, what is in there now appears to be just as concerning, if not more, to this very day.

Did Eugène have the knowledge and education in these most critical of areas as he made his apparently 'inoffensive' artificial hair dyes, before moving on to sunscreens that went all over the body and then beauty products?

No — just a certificate in applied chemistry that he attained at the age of 23.

All of his education was in chemistry, in which he excelled I might add, and graduated top of his class. What it seems he was interested in, was the creation of new synthetic, manmade compound chemicals and how cheaply they could be made — so he could make as much money as possible.

So, we have a modern beauty industry that was started by and born into the scientific area of CHEMISTRY. When really one could be right to wonder, if it should have fallen into the area of BIOLOGY and even more so BIOCHEMISTRY of the skin.

And not only it seems, was it born into the wrong branch of science, but Eugène Schueller's instructions to the advertising agency that day saw that the relationship between the industry and the consumers they rely on buying their products for their company to continue to exist — was one it appears, based on resentment, distaste and hatred of these stupid sheep who would not buy his probably very average soap.

These two very important trends started early and have continued to this very day.

Now, there are probably some of you out there thinking, well I don't think that is true. Of course commercial beauty companies care about their customers and what they put in their products.

There are so many brands, surely some of them are run by people passionate about making beauty products and who care what is in them.

Yes, that is what I used to think too. I thought it was my skin and my hair that was the problem, as we are told when their products don't live up to the benefits we are sold on.

No, it is definitely not that these apparently amazing products sold by apparently trustworthy commercial beauty companies, that just sucked and didn't work.

Who would think that. Right?

A person educated on the subject. Which is exactly what you are about to become beautiful humans.

It is here I strongly suggest you open, so you can refer to it as we go along, the 'Welcome to Beauty Land' document in the resources, available at https://cooklikeabeautyqueen.com/book-resources and then let's get down to business of clearing up who actually owns Beauty Land and it is going to become really clear, really fast, why it is that they appear to care only about profits.

First, we need to turn to page 2 where you will see a breakdown of the top 6 commercial beauty conglomerates and all the brands, that you may have thought were independently owned brands, are what?

Mostly owned by different, bigger conglomerates.

Clarins is the ONLY fully independent and family-owned beauty products company in the top commercial brands. The rest sit under the umbrella of giant conglomerate brands that routinely consume any little brand that starts to be successful.

So, what we see here is not lots of little brands all competing to make the best products and win their customers over, oh no. Quite the opposite, almost exclusively just a lot of big whales.

And when you learn the next part, you will see, it doesn't even matter which whale you buy from – all the whales ownership is linked back to the same people. And those same people make sure things do not change.

What do I mean by that?

Well, let's head over to page 3 of the attachment and first look at our number one company, L'Oréal and let's have a little look at who really owns L'Oréal.

Starting from the left, we can see the majority shareholder. At the time of writing (March 2026) the Bettencourt-Meyers family holds 28.57%, the direct heirs to the company.

Now you might think, see that is not so bad the original family still has control of the company, except the family has little to do with the day-to-day running of L'Oréal. More to the point the family itself is also run like a business and most of the profits from their stake in L'Oréal goes into their own personal private equity company called 'Tethys'.

Now as we go along, I will describe the corporate structures we are going to be looking at, and let's start with what a private equity company does.

Private equity companies are a form of investment partnership finance, in which a private equity firm, provides capital to an unlisted company (not publicly traded) using a private equity fund as an investment vehicle.

And this is the important part — private equity companies typically receive an ownership stake in the investee company in return for the capital. This is in most cases a controlling stake but can also be a non-controlling stake, depending on the goals of the investment.

Now once they have, in most cases a controlling ownership stake, they do what they do best — they reshape the private company, by let's say in their language, 'increasing the business's efficiency'.

How do they do this? They do it by reducing costs anywhere money can be saved, regardless of the effect on the business, those employed there, the actual product or service being sold or the flow-on effect that has on the consumer.

Their aim in doing this, massively reducing costs, is to make the business look more profitable once they finish pillaging it, then they either sell it or publicly list it, and get even richer.

So next time someone tells you they work at a private equity company, you will know exactly what they do for a living. Pillaging small businesses they promise to help, where it seems their only goal is getting richer at all costs.

Nice people.

And this is a good place to remind you to have your 'Psychopath Bingo' cards, available in the resources, open and be playing along!

Right, so next, we move over to our second largest shareholder in L'Oréal and at the time of writing that is the fine people over there at Nestlé with 20.16% ownership investment — which is a publicly owned company.

Now, talk about good corporate citizens with great ethics and values! Goodness me, all these people accusing them of being exploitative — must just be ambulance chasers looking for a payday. Right?

Well, let's have a look and you can make up your own mind.

Let's start with the mothers in third world countries whose babies suffered malnutrition, some of them dying, because Nestlé was accused of misinforming them and convincing them that their infant formula was better and more nutritious than natural breast milk. Yes, that ghastly natural source of milk for babies since the beginning of time, well before Nestlé arrived in 1905!

Yes, those mothers who put their faith in Nestlé, a brand they were told knew better than them and they should trust — THEY should really do better.

Right?

The same with the parents of the 6 babies that died and the 860 babies that were hospitalized when Melamine was found in Chinese-made Nestlé milk products sold in Taiwan, that were linked to babies getting kidney damage.

Are they sure? I mean Nestlé said it wasn't in their milk.

Did the Taiwan Health Ministry listen? No! They are nosy busybodies — and look, just because they found six types of Nestlé milk products that all contained Melamine when independently tested, I am just so sure it had nothing to do with Nestlé.

They said it wasn't them. OKAY.

And while we are here, I mean who do these children who were trafficked, forced into child labor camps on cocoa farms in Africa, regularly beaten and paid just fifty cents a day, think they are complaining? They should understand this is the price of always having to reduce your costs to increase profits for your shareholders.

What selfish little children wanting a childhood and basic human rights. Am I right?

What about those whiners over there in India in 2015, goodness me, making a big fuss because they found Maggi Noodles had up to 17 times the permissible level of lead in them. I mean, bit much wasn't it, the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India banning all their Maggi products and calling them unsafe and hazardous for human consumption.

What drama queens, huh!

And don't even start me on those idiots over at the Competition Bureau in Canada who in 2007 had the full nerve to think they could just waltz in and raid Nestlé's Canadian office and accuse them of price fixing.

I mean clearly, they didn't do it!

Apparently, they paid that nine-million-dollar fine because they felt like it, okay you cynics!

And if that isn't bad enough, just recently in 2024 those pesky, nosy Karens over there at the Spanish Audiencia Nacional, had the absolute balls to accuse them of forming and running a milk cartel in another milk price fixing scandal, that they ran for thirteen years.

Again, they paid that a €6.86-million fine because they wanted to give it to the farmers and because they believe in fairness. It might look like it was forced, but really, it was voluntary.

Trust me bro.

I really see why so many of you have so much faith in the corporations who consistently behave like such fine corporate citizens. No, you are right, they are such great and trustworthy people that are only focused on their customers' health and wellbeing and providing top-shelf products.

So now that we have established the fine and unblemished reputation of Nestlé before we look at who really owns Nestlé — let me quickly explain what a Public Company is so we all have the same information.

Put simply, this is a company whose ownership is cut up into little pieces called 'shares'. The amount of shares you own determines not only how much of the profits of the company you will receive, but also how much voting power you have and in turn power in the decision making.

The other thing that is important as we go on, because we are using the U.S. as our example, is that when a company owns 5% or more of a class of equity securities of a publicly traded company, they are required by law to file a beneficial owner report with the SEC.

Here they have to provide information about their company, their investment intentions, and provide information about accumulations of securities that may potentially change or influence company management or policies.

Now if you own over 10% your requirements under the SEC increase significantly and you are much more closely monitored. Keep this in mind as we go forward when we are talking about shareholders in publicly listed companies just like Nestlé.

Please note that all the ownership numbers presented were last checked and updated for this book 27 February 2026, because they change quite often. And that also while the numbers are interesting, it is the pattern here that is of the most interest and why I have it presented visually in the resources — it makes it very easy to see.

So, who are the top 5 investors in Nestlé?

(Publicly owned are in **BOLD**)

Nestlé

UBS Asset Management – 5.65%
BlackRock Inc. – 5.14%
The Vanguard Group — 4.58%
Norges Bank (Norwegian Bank) — 3.06%
Capital Research & Management Co – 2.88%

Now as we can see, we have two further publicly owned companies in there, so let's look at who owns them.

UBS Group (under which their Asset Management Group sits)

BlackRock Inc. – 5.61% (as below)
UBS Asset Management – 4.54% (invested in their own company)
The Vanguard Group – 4.5%

BlackRock Inc.

The Vanguard Group – 9.06%
Kuwait Investment Authority– 5.15%
Capital Research and Management Co – 4.82%
State Street Corporation – 4.10%
BlackRock Inc. – 3.84% (invested in their own company)

Again, we have one more new publicly owned company in there, who are their top investors?

State Street Corporation

The Vanguard Group – 13.13%
BlackRock Inc. – 8.81% (covered above)
State Street Corporation – 4.79% (invested in their own company)
FMR, LLC (Fidelity) – 4.78%

So that just covers all the fingers that are in the pie of **Nestlé**.

Back to L'Oréal, so far, we have the heirs with 28.57%, we have Nestlé at 20.16% which is publicly owned by all the shareholders listed above.

So, who else makes up the top shareholders of L'Oréal.

Well in at third – it is BlackRock Inc. – 2.17%. And we have already established who their top investors are above.

In fourth place – it is The Vanguard Group — 1.82% — a privately owned investment company. In fifth place — it is Norges Bank — 0.85% — a privately owned Norwegian Bank.

In sixth place – it is Morgan Stanley – 0.75% which is publicly owned, and who are their top shareholders?

Morgan Stanley

Mitsubishi Financial Group – 23.75%
The Vanguard Group – 7.54%
State Street Global Advisors – 6.54% – already covered
BlackRock Inc. – 6.00% — already covered
JPMorgan Chase & Co – 2.25%

Here again we see two more new publicly owned companies, who are their top investors?

Mitsubishi Financial Group

BlackRock Inc. – 7.68% - already covered
The Vanguard Group – 4.41%

JPMorgan Chase & Co

The Vanguard Group – 9.85%
BlackRock Inc. – 7.85% - already covered
State Street Global Advisors – 4.65% - already covered
Morgan Stanley – 2.46% - already covered

Wow, it really seems like some of these company names seem to repeat a lot. Like they are all kinda, I don't know, incestuously related.

When you look at it on the resource document we are following along on — doesn't it look a bit like a horrifying inbred family tree.

Let's look a bit closer at a couple of them and see what is going on.

BlackRock Inc. owns shares in:

Nestlé - 5.14%
UBS Asset Management - 5.61%
State Street Global Advisors - 8.81%
Morgan Stanley - 6.00%
Mitsubishi Financial Group - 7.68%
JPMorgan Chase & Co. - 7.85%

The Vanguard Group (privately owned) owns shares in:

Nestlé - 4.58%
UBS Asset Management - 4.50%
BlackRock Inc. - 9.06%
State Street Global Advisors - 13.13%
Morgan Stanley - 7.54%
Mitsubishi Financial Group - 4.41%
JPMorgan Chase & Co. - 9.85%

There are 7 publicly owned companies represented across our top 6 shareholders — and across the shareholders of those shareholders.

What I am trying to say is that they both, BlackRock Inc. and Vanguard, effectively have a finger in every single pie available to them in the ownership of L'Oréal stocks.

Do we think that maybe this is because they are collecting voting rights so that they can increase ownership and control without triggering additional SEC filings?

I don't know. I am asking.

Now I want to ask all the people that claim they are so 'careful with what they put on their skin', because they have so much faith and trust in the good folks over in Beauty Land, who out of all of the shareholders and people with voting rights at L'Oréal in reality, do you think it is that cares so much about you and your skin?

The private equity firms? Businesses whose aim it is to, what I would describe as pillaging struggling businesses they promise to help, so they can get richer and usually someone gets poorer, i.e. the original owners.

Do you really think they care about you? No, they seem to care about MONEY AND PROFITS above everything else. That appears to be their job description.

The publicly owned companies that are run and controlled by shareholders that are all either private equity firms or investment management companies.

Do you really think they care about you and what goes in your products?

No, they care about SHAREHOLDERS AND PROFITS, how cheaply the product can be made — and that seems to be the priority. That appears to be their job description.

So where are all these people you put all your trust in and tell me you are 'being so careful with what you put on your skin?' So careful, it seems that most people have no idea — not one ingredient worth of idea — of what is actually in your products.

Where are they?

Show me one company listed among the top shareholders in L'Oréal, and you tell me which one or ones you think are so trustworthy and care just so very much about you and your skin and your future health?

Are you starting to realize in the harsh light of reality, you are no more to them, than one in 8 billion consumers they want to take as much money as they can from, and give as little in return as they possibly can.

Should we do a second company? Maybe sneaky Queen V has this all set up and the other top 5 beauty companies are completely different? Sure, let's do it!

Unilever (British company)

So, we saw who actually owns the number one beauty company, French based L'Oréal; so who are the top shareholders in second place in the beauty industry — British-based Unilever? Well, in first place, drum roll please — it is BlackRock Inc. — 7.63%, and we have already seen who owns them.

And what about in second place? Are you ready to be shocked? It is The Vanguard Group (I know!) — 5.54% and they are privately owned. In third place it is a privately owned 'charity' investment trust, Leverhulme Trade Charities Trust with 1.83%. Nothing ringing bells there!

In fourth place it is UBS Asset Management — 1.28% we have already seen who their top shareholders are. And lastly, we have a new publicly owned company, T.Rowe Price Assoc. Who do you think might be their top shareholders, take a guess...

T.Rowe Price Assoc.

The Vanguard Group – 12.11%
BlackRock Inc. – 9.52% — already covered
State Street Global Advisors – 6.49% – already covered
Goldman Sachs Group – 4.02%
Charles Schwab — 3.70%

Now there are four publicly owned companies in there and we have already covered BlackRock Inc. and State Street, but who owns Goldman Sachs Group and Charles Schwab?

Goldman Sachs Group

The Vanguard Group – 9.67%
BlackRock Inc. – 7.75% — already covered
State Street Global Advisors – 6.52% – already covered
JPMorgan Chase & Co. – 2.63% - already covered
Morgan Stanley – 2.49% - already covered

Charles Schwab

The Vanguard Group – 8.47%
BlackRock Inc. – 7.55% — already covered
Dodge & Cox — 4.31%
State Street Global Advisors – 4.09% – already covered
JPMorgan Chase & Co. – 3.78% - already covered

Well would you look at that, once again our good friends BlackRock and Vanguard have a finger in effectively every single pie available to them in the ownership of Unilever stocks — A British Company.

What about third place, Estée Lauder an American Company? Well take a look for yourself on the document in the resources. How are we looking? Solid?

What about fourth place, Shiseido a Japanese Company? Take a look, what do you think? Same, Same?

What about fifth place, Procter & Gamble an American Company? Take a look, see if a pattern is emerging.

And our sixth-place company Johnson & Johnson an American Company. Take a look.

See the truth with your own eyes.

And we could keep going and going and it is the same, it is the same, it is the same. So, who effectively owns and controls Beauty Land? Our top two are:

The Vanguard Group
BlackRock Inc.

And in there with them many other privately owned or publicly owned investment management companies and private equity firms that you all know the names of.

And what is the main job of these top two companies?

The Vanguard Group

The Vanguard Group is an American, Pennsylvania-based, investment firm founded in 1975 by John C. Bogle that manages more than $11.6 trillion in assets under management in late 2025 (latest reported figures). Yes, that is trillion with a 'T'.

Vanguard investors own the funds that in turn own the company. This makes the people who invest in the funds, the owners of the company.

Unlike traditional stockholders in a company, the investors do not have a say in operational aspects of the company, such as its leadership or operational strategies.

Sounds like a dictatorship!

However, this model means that all the company's profits directly benefit the clients who invest through Vanguard, not outside investors or stockholders. So, all the money you give to the

Vanguard Group by buying from any of the companies they invest in, largely STAYS in the Vanguard Group and their select group of rich investors.

Now what else, other than the beauty industry is The Vanguard Group invested in? Well, let me give you just a small sample of the 4,274 corporations (that they have **over 5%** invested in as per SEC filings), many of which you likely use daily (this does not include the commercial beauty companies we have already highlighted):

Technology/AI

NVIDIA Corp
Microsoft Corp
Apple Inc
Amazon Com Inc.
Meta Platforms Inc.
Google (Alphabet Inc.)
Netflix Inc.
Oracle
Tesla
Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co
Palantir
General Electric
Samsung Electronics
Uber Technologies
Adobe Inc.
Spotify Inc.
CrowdStrike
DoorDash Inc.
Intel Corp.
PayPal Holdings Inc.

Finance

Visa Inc
Mastercard Inc
JPMorgan Chase & Co.
Bank of America
Wells Fargo
Goldman Sachs Group
HSBC Holdings
Commonwealth Bank of Australia
Royal Bank of Canada
Citigroup Inc
S&P Global
National Australia Bank Ltd
Westpac Banking Corp. (Aust)
Barclays PLC
ING Bank
Lloyds Banking Group PLC
Deutsche Bank AG
London Stock Exchange Group
Industrial and Commercial bank of China

Resources
Chevron Corp.
Exxon Mobil Corp.
Shell PLC
BHP Group
Constellation Energy Corp
Rio Tinto PLC

Consumer goods/services
Walmart
Costco Wholesale Corp.
Home Depot
Alibaba Group
Coca-Cola Co.
Nestlé
McDonald's
Walt Disney
AT & T
Toyota Motor Group
PepsiCo Inc
Sony Group Corp
LVMH (Louis Vuitton)
T-Mobile Inc
British American Tobacco
Starbucks
Nike Inc
Nintendo Co Ltd
Hermès International
Royal Caribbean Cruises
3M Co
Colgate-Palmolive Co
Westfarmers Ltd
Hilton Hotels
Marriott International

Big Pharma
UnitedHealth Group Inc
AstraZeneca
Novartis AG
Pfizer Inc.

Military Industrial Complex
Lockheed Martin Group
RTX Corporation (Raytheon)
Northrop Grumman
Boeing

Now that is 80, a mere 2% of all the global corporations they have ownership interests **over 5% in**. If you want to see the full list click here.

BlackRock Inc.

BlackRock Inc. is an American multinational investment company, based in New York City that was only founded in 1988. Yet, BlackRock Inc. is the world's largest asset manager, with U.S.$13.5 trillion in assets under management as of late 2025 (latest reported figures).

So, what else, other than the beauty industry, are BlackRock Inc. invested in? Well, it is 5,455 corporations they own greater than 5%. Do we think they might be not only the same, but an expanded list as The Vanguard Group?

Well, let me save making this book painfully long, they are almost identical, with just a few more on there. If you would like to look through the 5,455 companies, click here.

And here most of us were thinking WE lived in a 'capitalist free market' society, where WE have choice over what and who WE buy from. Where competitors compete for your hard-earned, highly taxed dollars by trying to offer the best products — not own stakes in each other's businesses!

Tell me because I would like to know, where is the motivation to do anything **but** permanent price fixing and manipulation of the market to just keep increasing profits? You know, since many of them seem to be investors in what is meant to be their competitors' business and all.

The truth is it doesn't matter which brand you buy because the money all goes to the same people, because they have a stake in most of the brands across most the important, profitable industries.

They don't care what 'choice' you make because they know ultimately, the money is coming to them and you are getting some generic product, regardless of the choice you think you are making.

See — you think you go to the supermarket and are being given choices. Right?

And you are, between which commercial brands owned by the same people and have the money to pay the highest price, not only to get on to the shelf but the best positions on the shelf (it matters!).

You see a whole aisle of beauty products, and you think 'wow, so many choices from all these brands that just care so much about me and my skin!' Not really, they are mostly being dictated by the same investment management companies and private equity firms, where the money you spend will largely go back to the same place.

Could it be that you have been manipulated and hoodwinked into thinking you are buying from a 'trusted brand' who makes you all these wonderful promises — when in reality you are just giving your money to the fine people over there at The Vanguard Group, BlackRock Inc., and their little group of rich, greedy buddies who own everything?

That is not choice — that is the false illusion of choice.

Choice would be allowing smaller independently owned companies and brands to actually compete in a fair market, where the money goes back to US and OUR communities. Not centralized conglomerates, for whom it seems enough will never be enough — so the money is hoarded, and WE are all poorer for it.

And you know why I know, this won't be changing any time soon?

Because guess who owns the supermarkets? You won't believe it. Even in isolated little Australia, let's look at who really owns the two biggest supermarkets, which just happen to be publicly owned:

Coles Supermarket

State Street Global Advisors Australia — 5.09%
The Vanguard Group — 3.61%
Vanguard Investments Australia — 2.41%
BlackRock Inc. — 2.02%
Norges Bank — 1.59%
Geode Capital Management — 1.14%
State Street Global Advisors Trust Co — 1.08%

Now if there were any new or different companies from the beauty industry, I would drill down, but since they are EXACTLY THE SAME, let's just move right on along to our second Australian supermarket.

Woolworths Supermarket

State Street Global Advisors Australia — 5.07%
AustralianSuper Pty Ltd — 4.99%
The Vanguard Group — 3.61%
BlackRock Inc. — 1.79%
Vanguard Investments Australia — 1.74%
Norges Bank — 1.66%
State Street Global Advisors Trust — 1.10%

Now look at that pesky AustralianSuper company that has wormed its way into what would otherwise have been the perfect reflection of the companies that seem to own most of the beauty industry! It is privately owned by its superannuation members and all profits benefit its members.

So that IS good isn't it, a couple of dollars in profits, 4.99% will stay in Australia and actually benefit the Australian people from their two biggest supermarket chains.

Other than that, those profits are mostly headed overseas to American Investment Companies to be spent on things we all want so very much!

Like developing vaccines that it seems to many of us, were forced on entire populations in many parts of the world for what is now a highly debated disease.

Yes, WE really loved that – can WE have some more, please?

Political 'donations' and don't WE all just love those very 'non-corrupt' politicians who don't represent US the people, getting their pockets stuffed a little fuller with their totally-legal, 'political donations?'
Of course WE do! WE love seeing incompetent people getting richer while we get poorer because of their decisions – can't get enough, can WE?

And more war, because we can't have the military complex making all these apparently 'totally necessary' weapons and not making any money from selling them.

Come on beautiful humans, WE need to be more reasonable!

WE need to understand that our children, our brothers and sisters, our neighbors' and our fellow humans' lives are <u>such a small price</u> for these companies to pay so they can sustain and build their massive profits year after year.

Really, to them it seems this is a tiny, minor inconvenience these things are you know – the death and extreme trauma they inflict on millions of people every year.

They can't just take a year off you know! Goodness me.

What would they tell the shareholders, the other investment management companies that are meant to be their competitors? Huh?

No profits, well how do you think that is going to go down?

What WE don't seem to understand is that no war means no weaponry being used, no death and most of all no profits and that is NO BUENO for the 1% that actually run the world behind the illusion!

Sorry girls, I know Beyoncé had you all believing it was us girls that ran the world, but I can fully assure you that women aren't really offered a seat in the 1%. They are occasionally tolerated if they happen to be a pesky heir they can't get rid of, as we will learn with L'Oréal.

But other than that, they really would prefer, I mean insist — you are a man, because men are doing such a wonderful job running the world.

Right?

Back to our mostly American investment company-owned Australian supermarkets where I think I was, before I got all fired up and went on a bit of a very relevant tangent.

We were talking about how small independent beauty brands are unable to get on the shelves at said supermarkets and that the choices you think you have, are an absolute illusion because they are in fact, owned by the same people, who also own the supermarket.

So how do they keep little brands off the shelf? Because they can't make it look like they are acting in ways that are 'anti-competitive', right? Well, there are some flimsy 'laws' put in place by politicians receiving very legal 'donations' — but this is no problem to the fine people in Beauty Land, easy work.

They have this little system where, and you are going to love this, they double the profit on every single product that ever touches their shelves by charging brands 'slotting allowance' fees — to buy their position on the shelf — to even get in front of the customer in the first place.

Yes, BEFORE you even sell a single unit! And then of course they profit additionally from the huge mark-up they put on the unit of product itself.

Now, if you are a big commercial brand owned by the same people who own the supermarket — who cares, right! That slotting allowance fee is coming straight back to you. It is a win-win for them.

You have to look at it from their perspective. You do!

What benefit would it have for them to allow independent natural beauty brands, run by people who are passionate about improving people's skin, on to the shelves?

It would probably start to affect their what?

Profits.

That's right beautiful humans — you are starting to see the real game here.

Oh, no, no. No they won't have that, they want you (and currently you are) buying their brands, from their supermarkets, putting it in a car from a brand they own, that you fill with petrol from service stations they own. Then you go back to your home that 95% of is also made from materials from companies they own and filled with other things from other companies they also own.

So ultimately most of the money you spend, anywhere in the world — all the profits go to back to them to be hoarded by them, just how they like it.

Are you starting to see why big brand beauty products and big brands generally dominate our lives? And it is not the superiority of their products, goodness me, no!

It is access. They have ownership stakes in the supermarkets, big pharmacy chains, petrol stations — anywhere large numbers of products are for sale, you can near bet your bottom dollar, they effectively control it.

So, when people say to me, 'well if raw natural beauty products were that good for people, why aren't they everywhere?'

It is because that is not how the game is played my beautiful humans as you are probably starting to realize.

The set up around the commercial beauty products industry is like a protective force which effectively makes it extremely difficult — near impossible, one could say — and I guess I am — for any of those pesky little hippy products that actually change people's lives to ever see the light of day.

And that is the reason why real, actually natural beauty products will never get a seat at the supermarket aisle. These conglomerates know that is the quick way to a slow death of what, in my opinion, has been a very lucrative game for them. One where they have set up the rules to make sure they are the only ones who ever win.

Again, where in what I have told you is the 'free-market system' I was under the impression we lived in?

Where is it?

It seems to be just like commercial beauty products, an absolute illusion we have been marketed, advertised and PR'd into for so long — we never questioned it.

They said, 'trust me bro' and we went, 'sounds good' and never thought about it again.

And although I have used Australia as an example to demonstrate how all the money goes to one place, you can simply replace your country in place of Australia and look at who owns your supermarkets, and you will likely find the same thing in nearly all parts of the world.

So.

Who runs Beauty Land and, it seems the world in general?

The Vanguard Group, BlackRock Inc., and all their little buddies that they own part of anyway, many of whom are featured on the very resource document we have worked through this chapter.

Do these people sound like they care about you or your skin or your future health — like you 'think' they do?

Or, do they sound like they care only about profits, money, power and making sure they keep as much of it as possible, so we the people, don't have any?

I don't know. I am asking.

It seems to me it is an illusion that you have real choice, it doesn't matter if you buy L'Oréal, Lancôme, Garnier, Dove, Clinique, Tom Ford, Aveda, Olay, Aveeno, Neutrogena, Revlon or Nivea or the many, many others they own — they are brands by name only.

They create the illusion of choice.

And most importantly, they care just so little for US as you will see as we go on in Part II of the book — it really is inconceivable to most decent, normal people.

As it might be to you right now, it's a lot to take in.

But don't you worry, because now we know how the industry itself is set up and run, next we are going to take a scalpel and symbolically dissect L'Oréal.

Yes, let's force open the mouth of the beast that started this game and really get to know it — from the inside. This case study will conclude at the end of Part II of the book. And it is then, together, we can prepare for what is to come if I, and I hope soon you too; have any say in it.

The metaphorical slow death of the Commercial Beauty Complex as you all start waking up and realizing that in reality, you were worth so much more than this all along, and now it is time for it to stop.

It is time to put the power over our bodies and what goes on it where it belongs.

In the hands of the people we trust.

US.