THE MATRIX REVEALED Volume 1

JON RAPPOPORT Interviews ELLIS MEDAVOY (Part 1 of 3)

About ELLIS MEDAVOY

Ellis Medavoy (pseudonym) was my original source for interviews that broke new ground on www.nomorefakenews.com

He was, before he retired, a master of propaganda and PR, and worked to push important stories in front of the public. These stories were game changers:

AIDS

Epidemic outbreaks

It Takes a Village

And they were all fabricated.

That's right, fabricated. They were pieced together from shoddy evidence and forced into the public consciousness through media outlets.

But behind every such story, there is a campaign, and behind the campaign is a "formulator."

This is what Ellis calls himself sometimes. Meaning he invented the stories on assignment from higher-ups and then sold them to the media.

He was told what to make real, and he did.

He's living comfortably these days, and as he says, "not writing my memoirs."

Crafty, thoughtful, generous, thorny, irritating, nasty, sarcastic...these only begin to describe the man. He has mellowed a little, but not to the point of being "a cooperative witness."

Ellis and Jack True and Richard Bell are primary sources on The Matrix. The real one. They have plumbed the depths.

Ellis is the man who knows how stories are invented for public consumption and how high the lies are piled.

Not long after we met for the first time, he said to me, "I can tell you how to run a world, you know."

I laughed.

"Really."

“Sure,” he said. “You make up something complicated. Then you insert it into the bloodstream of the society, and you watch it bloom. You make it complex enough that it will take armies of people to sort it out and argue about it, and then you have them. The other thing is, what you make up has to cost money. A lot of money.”

“Why?” I said.

“Because people want their lies to have value, and that is judged by how expensive they are.”

“Suppose the citizenry ends up paying for these lies,” I said.

“SUPPOSE?” he said. “SUPPOSE? Of COURSE they're going to pay. They're going to pay until it hurts. You know the old expression, Seeing Is Believing? That's bunch of crap. PAYING IS BELIEVING. Remember that.”

I have.

JON RAPPOPORT

March 16, 2001

Q: (Jon Rappoport) Did you ever formally work for the CIA?

A: (Ellis Medavoy) The CIA is many different things. Most of all, it's a symbol. Let me put it to you this way. I have never been an employee there. I have worked with other CIA people on their projects.

Q: Whom were you working for?

A: I can't answer that.

Q: Were you a bad guy?

A: I was "a bad guy," depending on your worldview.

Q: Did you work for NSA?

A: Not as an employee.

Q: For the Pentagon?

A: The Pentagon, over the years, has assembled a large number of black-ops projects, as they are called. Which is a misnomer. Some of those undertakings were using free-lancers. I was one.

Q: You have worked as a reporter.

A: Yes. Again, no names. Except I'll say that work paid a lot of bills, and I did a few shorts stints for the Herald Tribune, like a lot of other people.

Q: You were in Vietnam.

A: I know a lot about Vietnam. I know that our intelligence work there was quite poor, when it came to interrogating captured soldiers. Our jungle patrols which encountered sudden surprises could have avoided lots of deaths if we had treated the captured enemy properly… they would have given away troop locations.

Q: Okay. Let's talk about AIDS.

A: Why?

Q: Because it's there, okay?

A: No, really, why is that of any concern?

Q: Is HIV an engineered germ, a bio weapon?

A: That depends on where you're sitting.

Q: What?

A: For some people that's the reality.

Q: You're talking about belief.

A: Which is the same thing as reality. If you don't understand that about me, we won't get anywhere.

Q: So who believes HIV is a bio-weapon?

A: Some independent researchers. They recall a US House of Representatives Appropriations Committee hearing in 1969, where a doctor stated that a super-germ could be developed in 5 years.

Q: Was that a true statement?

A: His timing was wrong. Now they might be able to do it. It's not as easy as you think. In part because most germs are just not that dangerous.

Q: In 1969, was that Committee testimony really about the creation of AIDS?

A: Don't you know the answer to that? You wrote a book.

Q: I'm asking you.

A: I want to hear you say it.

Q: Say what? AIDS is not a germ?

A: That's right.

Q: AIDS wasn't created in that way.

A: No.

Q: But it was an idea.

A: The idea of a global plague. People were dying. But it's all about making the public believe in a particular causation, a causation which can arrive at any moment without preface and kill anyone at random. The perfect terrorist.

Q: You worked on that.

A: I was a propaganda specialist. I had many employers. Most of them were cutouts themselves. Their orders were coming from somewhere else and so on, up the line.

Q: You worked on AIDS. You've told me that.

A: I made the bad seem worse.

Q: Be more specific.

A: I don't think so.

Q: Come on.

A: You have to understand how we did it. We were people who were hired to get certain articles in the press, to make sure certain points of view were emphasized. That's what a PR person does. But we were off the books, so to speak.

Q: Were you an editor?

A: No.

Q: What was the point of view you were hired to front for?

A: That HIV was the sole and only cause of AIDS, in America, Africa and everywhere.

Q: Why should science need a person like you?

A: Because at the time, my friend, there was a lot of controversy. A New York doctor [Joe Sonnabend] had just been fired as the editor of a journal [AIDS Research] that was saying, in its pages, that there could be other causes of AIDS. It was a swirling period of time. We had to coalesce scientific and public opinion.

Q: Were you responsible for that editor being fired?

A: No. I believe AMFAR [a major AIDS fund-raising organization] handled that indirectly.

Q: So you got articles planted.

A: Sure.

Q: Were there lies in those articles?

A: AIDS is a lie. Therefore, everything after that is automatically a lie.

Q: The articles you had planted—

A: —Presented a kind of specious science that made it seem that HIV was the causative factor behind AIDS… when in fact that wasn't the case.

Q: You dealt with medical reporters.

A: Yes.

Q: Which ones?

A: Altman [at the NY Times]. Others. We simply made sure they were fed the proper information.

Q: But those reporters were already getting all the HIV baloney from press officers at US federal health agencies.

A: True.

Q: So?

A: Look… take the case of John Lennon. Everyone knew who shot him. Everyone knew the killer was mentally unbalanced. All the information was coming from police and FBI and other government people. But it was also coming from off-the-record sources from within the government. We arranged for some of those leaks to happen. That's one way it works.

Q: What did those off-the-record sources tell reporters about Lennon's murder?

A: That the killer was insane. That it was a clear case of a deranged lone nut. You know.

Q: He WAS deranged.

A: Yes. But he was also more than a lone nut. He was nurtured, to a degree, by handlers, who put him on the track to committing the murder.

Q: He was mind-controlled.

A: You could say that. Not in the classic sense, perhaps, but in certain ways. You take an unbalanced troubled person, you treat him with drugs—which further disrupts his processes—and then you feed him a slow strain of information which focuses his over sensitized attention toward a goal. He needs a goal. You provide it.

Q: And that was the op.

A: Of course. But you see, most of time, we deal in making sure that certain stories are omitted from the press. That's even more important. In the late 1980s, some Cubans who had been sent to the US by Castro…well, they were put in detention centers in Florida and Louisiana, and then a few of them were injected with diseases, like a variant of African Swine Fever, and then they were sent back. The premise was, they would spread the disease when they got back to Cuba. You don't want a story like that to leak out to the press.

Q: And with AIDS?

A: There was a period during which HIV was not as firmly established in the public mind as the cause of AIDS as it is now. Some reporters were looking into the possibility that HIV was bad science. Which it was. So we provided unofficial government sources who would tell these reporters that, not only was HIV the cause of AIDS, but it was far more dangerous than anyone suspected. It could kill at a range of thirty years. It could sit inside the body for all that time, doing nothing, and then it could come out of hiding and destroy the immune system. You see? Make it seem even more horrible, and then you get agreement on the lesser fact, that HIV causes AIDS in the first place.

Q: You were involved with that.

A: I was.

Q: You found the unofficial sources who would give that word to reporters.

A: Actually, I found medical people who would whisper this to government people, and then the government people would pass it along, off the record, to reporters. It was a rather delicate operation. You had to know your people to make it work.

Q: Why did the medical people do that? Why did they pass that 30-year-incubation nonsense along to government people?

A: Because… see, these medical researchers were afraid that their theory about HIV would be discredited. It was such a silly theory, really. In order to make it seem right, they had to posit the idea of a long incubation period for the virus. Which was really just bald speculation. But they had jobs and careers and salaries to protect. You find the ones who will stretch science beyond any rational limit and you use them. You have to know your people.

Q: Spot the weakness.

A: I believe public opinion must be coalesced in many ways. Otherwise, you have chaos. That's my training. It comes out of psychological warfare. Mass

communications research. You isolate a set of paradigms, you shape them, you refine them, you hide them behind cover stories, and you promote them to the public through the press.

Q: Why choose the lie that HIV causes AIDS? Why promote that?

A: Because that makes people more governable. You coalesce public opinion so that the public becomes more governable. Otherwise, people will just destroy each other.

Q: You believe that.

A: Oh yes.

Q: In other words, shaping public opinion is not just about getting lots of people to look at the world the same way. It's more.

A: It's getting lots of people to see the world as in need of order.

Q: Order imposed from above.

A: Where else is it going to come from?

Q: Doesn't sound like democracy.

A: Who cares about democracy? That's just another paradigm, just another model. Another thought in a sea of thoughts. It's a losing paradigm.

Q: You prefer global dictatorship.

A: If it's really global, and if it is somewhat benevolent.

Q: But you have your doubts at this late date.

A: There are too many Nazis loose in the world.

Q: Nazis?

A: Ideological or blood descendants of the German Nazis.

Q: Who are?

A: People. Just people. They also believe in order, in case you need to figure it out. But their brand is a little extreme for my taste.

Q: You'd rather have a nice guy at the top.

A: Not nice. Greedy, but not too greedy.

Q: Were you very active during the Cold War?

A: I made a lot of money then. Investing in the stock market. That was one of the perks of my job. I knew about defense contracts before they were let out.

Q: Did you have stories planted in the press during that time?

A: Sure. I was busy. We had to make it seem that the two superpowers were always on the verge of war. To justify the military build-up. We're talking about a few trillion dollars here.

Q: What kind of paradigm was the Cold War?

A: The kind that allowed the US government to fund an incredible amount of research and development carried out by major corporations. Then those corporations could comfortably adjust their new technologies to consumer products. And sell the products to the public. With all the R&D paid for.

Q: Is that happening now?

A: Yes. One example is surveillance technology which has been funded by the US government to "improve" the war on drugs.

Q: In the case of AIDS—

A: —As I said before, it's terrorism. You scare people. You make them want to obey authorities.

Q: Just like the War on Cancer.

A: Cancer is several different conditions bankrolled into one. It isn't just cancer. The result may be the same—wild cell growth. But the causes… you have all sorts of pesticides, for example, that can provoke the body into reacting in that way. They keep telling the public, through subtle hints, that cancer is the result of an immune system breakdown. But that's not really true. Cancer comes from the breakdown of a different body defense system. [Author's note: Today, Johns Hopkins scientists are claiming that the collapse of an enzyme system in the body can bring on cancer… this is basically a stolen idea from Dr. Stan Burzinski, a Houston MD who has treated patients for years with his own medications. Burzinski has been under attack from Texas and federal law enforcement people for 15 years.] Cancer can also be the result of nutritional deficiencies. This is well known in certain circles, but the information is suppressed.

Q: Getting back to you placing stories in the press…

A: One of my tasks, in the pre-Internet era, was to keep stories from the alternative papers out of the mainstream press. To draw the line between so-called real news and what I called cranky news… stories written by people with an ax to grind. I helped discredit papers like the LA Free Press and the Berkeley Barb. It wasn't too hard. A lot of the writers and editors there were socialists. Or they thought they were. Getting them labeled socialists was easy. Far-right and medium-right publications would pick up on that, when prompted, and they would say, "These traitors are publishing anti-American diatribes." In fact, some of those alternative newspapers were printing the truth about political special interests, corruption in high places.

Q: But you cut them out of loop.

A: Sure. "Revelations" about these "traitorous" newspapers leaked down from the right-wing newspapers and magazines into the mainstream eventually. I helped engineer that gradual process.

Q: What are some of the most highly controlled US newspapers?

A: I don't want to go into that.

Q: Why not?

A: Just put the Washington Post near the top of the list.

Q: Watergate?

A: That was a joke. It was never two young bucks, Woodward and Bernstein, finding out the truth, while the editor, Ben Bradlee, just sat there and held his breath, hoping his newspaper wouldn't go down in flames. Bradlee knew about the story before Woodward did. He used those two guys to go out and find out a lot of what he already had been told. The move to take out Nixon came from much higher levels. Woodward and Bernstein carried the water for Bradlee, and Bradlee carried the water for other people. And so on, up the line.

Q: Were you personally involved?

A: I was brought in to make sure that a few names would get exposed.

Q: Which ones?

A: Magruder. That's the only one I'll mention.

Q: Why was Nixon taken out?

A: Depends on which level you're looking at it from. That's always the case in a major operation. At every level, people have their reasons. Otherwise, they won't do anything. Ultimately, it was a destabilization op. Most of them are. Destabilize, and then create a yearning for order. Over and over. That works. It's time tested. It's mass psychology. You make the people feel afraid, and then you give them the answer. A new leader, a new law, a new assurance. You get the people to do this dance over and over. They get used to it. Calamity, answer. Calamity, answer. Calamity, answer. That's the formula.

Q: The newspapers…

A: Every major news source has to be trained. Like a circus animal. They all work the same way. You train them to take their news, their information, from certain types of sources. That's all you really have to do. Most of the time. If somebody gets too smart, you fire them or transfer them or promote them. Or if you have to, you blow up something somewhere else in the world and divert everybody, and then they forget what they were thinking about.

Q: You were involved in psychological warfare.

A: As a very young man, during World War 2. Got Americans to view the Japanese as animals, sub-human. Once you see how well it works, you begin to apply it to other areas. A lot of us learned our basic lessons during the War.

Q: How to manipulate populations.

A: What else are you going to do? One way or another, it's going to happen.

Q: As opposed to personal freedom.

A: I've never had much faith in that.

Q: So you were ideal for your line of work.

A: You could say that. I was born a cynic.

Q: Where do you see a lot of these Nazis you speak of these days?

A: If you mean Nazi in the generic sense…they like to stage medical events. Like AIDS. They like drugs as business. All kinds.

Q: Did you ever work reporters at the NY Times?

A: Once in awhile, but not out in the open. The Times has always been pretty well set up. Their sources for news are standard, they keep getting information from the

same official sources. The Times is like a great big ceramic elephant. It just sits there, and people in Washington and New York take their news from it.

Q: You say you were a hired man. I have to believe the CIA was somehow involved.

A: Who cares?

Q: A lot of people do.

A: That means nothing to me.

Q: The CIA—

A: —As I said, the CIA is many things. They are a front for the NSA. They are a grouping, a loose grouping of many separate interests. Most of which are not known to the director. The CIA helps businesses. I was involved with that.

Q: How?

A: You have US-based transnational corporations. They want to get into Third World countries and basically take them over. They need front operations to go in first. That sometimes means CIA. The public is supposed to think these corporations are good people who are trying to help the poor countries by building them up, by providing infrastructure. So I assisted in creating that public perception. Some people call this perception management. It involves the press, it involves convincing government agencies in the Third World. It sometimes involves spreading disinformation about recalcitrant Third World leaders.

Q: What sort of disinformation?

A: You know, so and so leader has three mistresses stashed in Paris, he has been robbing his own treasury, he is a Communist, he is a drunk. Whatever works. You study the country and you find out what lies will have the most effect. You may leak a story which is true or false—it doesn't matter—that the leader has been taking bribes. That often has the desired effect. People use it in Japan, for example, now and then.

Q: And you did this.

A: I didn't start the ball rolling. I was given my orders, and I provided the stream of information which the press picked up. My expertise was in dealing with people, with finding who would take what I had and run with it. You always need somebody like me. To grease the wheels. To give things the appearance of a reality that has abruptly surfaced. You shape the bullet. You give it the right spin and velocity. You fire it slowly at first, and you make it seem that the info is hard to come by. That entices reporters. Then you hook up a reporter with a source, a different source he

already trusts from other stories he's done. That reliable source feeds the reporter what YOU just gave him…it looks like two separate sources.

Q: Well, take the case of Bill Clinton.

A: A complex operation. But yes, it was just like bringing down a Third World dictator. Except, in Clinton's situation, the objective was really to bring down other people. You see, Clinton was a groomed president. He was a perfect type. A very good memory, very good sincerity in his speeches, he could do the presidential thing. He was on top of issues. He seemed real. He was a Jimmy Carter with a difference. He was stronger. He was Mr. Forward Looking. Bring us into a new era. All that. He was on the calendar to become president a long time ago.

Q: How long ago?

A: From his first term as governor. When I say on the calendar, I don't mean he was always a sure thing. Anything can happen. But he was at the top of a list.

Q: Whose list?

A: A part of the CIA that is not under the control of the director. A part that answers to a higher authority. And don't ask me who the higher authority is, because I don't know. But I know they exist. I can infer it from lots of material I've seen and lots of conversations I've had. It's obvious. And the "they" aren't really in the government.

Q: Then why all the scandals during his presidency?

A: Clinton's handlers badly exposed him. I won't go into details, but for instance that whole business with cocaine flowing into Arkansas at the Mena airport, in exchange for guns. That was real. Clinton, way back when he was governor, knew about it, and he was supposed to let it happen. His handlers told him that. That was a bad mistake. You don't take your fair-haired boy and put him in the line of that kind of fire early on.

Q: That happened while he was governor, before he was president.

A: That's right. The man came into the White House already carrying heavy baggage. It was sloppy. I've worked with some very sloppy people like Clinton's handlers over the years, and I know how it can get. People start dipping into the product themselves, they're cocaine addicts, they go out with too many women or young boys, they think they're invincible. They lose their sense of mission. In Clinton's case, people beyond his handlers had to intercede to protect the whole operation—and I mean they had to work very hard to cover up the fact that Clinton was essentially a groomed president. The public doesn't want to learn that their president was brought along by handlers for many years. That is not kosher. That breaks the paradigm. It soils the continuity, the illusion that everything is on the up

and up. So these higher-ups constructed a kind of take-down of Clinton. Along other lines. It's like blowing up an embassy on the other side of the world to divert the public from finding out about something nasty that is ready to spring out of the closet right under their noses. Only, in this case, it was Monica Lewinsky.

Q: She was the dupe.

A: An innocent in the woods. Completely. Given Clinton's need for that kind of interaction, she was placed in his path. And then, when the story broke, when it was leaked from several sources, not just the ones you've heard about, the press was kicked into high gear. Very high gear. It was a top-flight operation, very well done. A masterful diversion.

Q: And then Clinton was protected…

A: He wasn't protected from other tabloid-type scandals. But he WAS protected from deeper investigations. The sex, the Lincoln bedroom, the campaign donations, the firing of the travel staff, even the pardons and the Chinagate thing… you have to understand that the manipulators all consider these items to be on more or less the same level. You have to see this from their perspective. This is how certain sophisticated operations are accomplished. It's basically all charted. And the press is leaked the proper information in sequence. It's an art. The art of mass communications.

Q: Are you saying that all these scandals which are on the same level were MADE to happen beyond Clinton's own decisions, his own willfulness?

A: No. It's more complex than that. Think of it as a group of very able rug-cleaners following after a cat that keeps crapping on the carpet. They follow along, and then they reconstruct the path and the time-signatures of the cat's movements and they recast the cat's whole excursion into a ANOTHER sequence of revelations to the press and therefore the public. They build the after-story. They are good.

Q: At the same time…

A: At the same time, they're feeding the cat certain foods that will make him crap. And the soiled carpet is all on the same general level, and no one looks under the floorboards. Why would they? The carpet is a pretty spectacular mess.

Q: Were you involved with this Clinton operation?

A: No. But if I were, I wouldn't tell you.

Q: What are your feelings about UFOs?

A: Again, we're dealing with a multiple phenomenon. Part of the back-story is that forces within the Vatican are trying to label all reports of UFOs as the work of Satan. I personally think these forces are anti-Catholic, because if any such major pronouncement were made in a serious and public way, it would bring a great deal of scorn down on the Church, and these Vatican politicos know that very well. I know that, in certain circles, among people who toil in the same general fields I have worked, UFOs are viewed as a test balloon, a kind of sociological experiment aimed at discovering what will happen if enough people become exercised about these matters… in other words, you take a core idea, UFOs, and you float it out there and you see how it changes and how it is taken up or criticized by the populace. You see how it transforms, how it plays out, what groups form. It's all sociology, really, on that level. It's an experiment to find out how society changes when you introduce an emotional idea, an idea that makes some people say yes and some people say no. These things interest society-shapers. It's a game they play. Then they try to infer how other ideas might live and change and affect the world—by extrapolation.

Q: So on that level, what UFOs actually are has no meaning.

A: That's right. It's just an X you put out there and track like a sound that amplifies and decays and mixes with certain other sounds.

Q: But what about the UFOs themselves?

A: From my point of view, it makes no difference unless there are other species out in space who are really thinking about making their presence known. I can tell you this. There are some people among those who are balloon-testing this idea who really do think aliens are real. And for them, finding out how populations respond to the test balloon is important. They want to estimate the likely degree of chaos that could occur if aliens suddenly showed up in Boston or London. On a scale of 1 to a 1000 will it be 50 or 999?

Q: And the government cover-up?

A: It's not my field. I'm sure there is a cover-up of something, but I don't know exactly what. You see, for me it's all about the reaction. A colleague of mine once told me that saucers have been recovered. I didn't accept what he was saying as the truth, because I didn't exactly trust him. He might have been testing my own reaction. As far as I can tell, the balloon testers are a bit unhappy about what they have learned in their experiments. It appears that a great many people are anxious to make new alliances…in other words, the idea of UFOs is very appealing because people feel that it symbolizes a way out of some kind of impasse, a doorway into a better reality. Not in a religious sense, necessarily, although there is that. But just as an escape from the oppressive conditions of life. UFOs become a symbol of freedom. However, if the idea is floated over and over again, thousands of times, into the society…then some sort of inoculation could occur. It could begin to bore people who were formerly riveted. And that is a viable strategy, and it is being used.

Q: Overkill.

A: Yes. You can sucker people into other ideas forever, like the lottery. But UFOs? Maybe not. Maybe there is a psychological threshold beyond which relatively few people care anymore. It's old news. Diminishing returns. They actually quantify and chart these sorts of things. It's crude science, but they do it.

Q: The overkill of too many grade B movies.

A: In general, by trend, that's happened to the space program. Compare the public mind in 1970 to 2001on the issue. There's less interest. It's gone downhill. We're seeing a recent revival, but the trend is still downward. Maybe that's because TV and films have saturated the mind on the issue and a threshold has been exceeded. I'm sure there are propagandists like myself who would pinpoint the exact moment when the tide of excitement began to dwindle. Take 1996, after the film Independence Day. Maybe they would say that was the moment when a downward trend that had already been in motion for some time took a steeper decline. This is how some of us think.

Q: There is talk that some of the UFO groups have been penetrated by intelligence types.

A: That's definitely happened. Because these agents want to find out if the UFO groups actually know anything. And the agents spread disinformation to throw people off the track—because the agents have been told to do that by higher ups who know that the government is covering up something. Again, I don't know what that something is. But from the perspective of the sociologists, who are connected to a chain of command that goes up quite high in a different direction, the appearance of infiltrators, agents, in these groups is just another interesting development in the evolution of the test balloon. You see? It's something that happened. The government got involved in that way. Note it on the charts. Factor it into the equation. Follow it. See how complex and convoluted the whole business becomes.

Q: I have to believe that, beyond all this social tinkering and engineering, you really are interested in whether UFOs are real. Whether AIDS is caused by forty different things. Whether any kind of freedom can survive in the next century.

A: You're right. On some days I'm interested in those things. But on most days, I'm thinking about how we can create a world in which we don't blow ourselves up. And for accomplishing that goal, I've made my stand. Many years ago. You have to control the human being. You have to program. You have to guide the human mind into set paths.

Q: That's insanity.

A: By your definition. That's what we're fighting about. Whose definition will win.

Q: If there are aliens out there with advanced technology, they would become a very compelling wild card.

A: Yes they would. In which case, we would have to factor them into the equation too. We would have to analyze them as another race of psychologically pre-disposed creatures. And we would have to find a way of dealing with that.

Q: Do you ever wake up in the middle of the night and think that you're free?

A: Free?

Q: As in, you can direct the course of your life, and therefore so can everyone else.

A: Not really. I actually AM, in a real sense, free.

Q: But you think the masses aren't, and that makes you the elite.

A: I guess you could say that, yes.

Q: Back to the Washington Post. The owner, Katherine Graham—

A: —Hated Nixon. She wanted to teach him a lesson. I don't know all the details. I believe he was instrumental in denying her a TV license. But you see, again, she was used by others, by people who knew she could be used along that line. Her paper became the focus. Slowly break the Watergate story, and concentrate on all the people who were covering it up. That was the key. The cover-uppers were numerous, and they were rather easy targets. As far as I'm concerned, Deep Throat was simply one of the manipulators who was—like myself—feeding information to the press. Except he did it in a parking garage. And he had these two rather innocent reporters who jumped on what he was saying and loved it. See? That's why they needed Woodward and Bernstein, as opposed to more cagey veterans. The young guys—and Woodward wasn't quite so innocent—would swallow the whole unfolding story as it was being spoon-fed to them, and they wouldn't see the strings being pulled in the background. They were vital to the whole get-Nixon operation.

Q: Did you ever work in that way?

A: Yes. In Africa. I found reporters and government people who loved the idea that a new germ was on the loose and was going to be a plague. Great story. My job was essentially to find people who would accept the highly suspect idea that Robert Gallo, a man who had experience failing in the War on Cancer, was discovering a germ that would explain a great deal of death and suffering on a continent where the reasons for that had been known for centuries. It was a delicate thing. I had to use World Health Organization experts, and I had the backing of one or two people at the World Bank. I was one of the front men in what was essentially an intelligence operation. A pure disinformation operation.

Q: Were you ever challenged?

A: Not directly. Because I didn't present myself as an expert. I played my faithful role, as a purveyor of new information. You eventually learn how to be a source to the press and to governments. A reliable source. That's what I did for many years.

Q: You've read some of my work on the Oklahoma City bombing.

A: And I told you what you would run into. I told you that in an operation like this, the most important people, more important than the bombers, are the disinformation experts. They lay out whole tracks of potential investigation, before the event even happens. They construct four or five or ten false scenarios that are very tempting, and then reporters or researchers or law enforcement people come along and pull out a tag-end or two… and then they follow the false tracks. That takes time, and by the time they're done and mostly confused, everyone else has moved on. It's old news. I made my money based on the fact that the news-gathering business is very quick and very temporary. Today's big story is tomorrow's toilet paper.

Q: And there are people who build future time lines for this? Who make predictions?

A: On information decay? Of course. There is a whole meta-layer of studies, many of which are never published widely, which have to do with perception-management. How do you shift the public mind? How do you know the ways in which information will be naturally distorted? How do you avoid detection after you have created a false cover story? But in my niche, I was dealing with people. I had to know my people. How gullible, how suspicious they might be. How fast or slow to break stories to them. In 1965, when Sukarno was overthrown in Indonesia, a lot of the back story had to be hidden. The role of the Bechtel Corporation. The subsequent opening up of Indonesia to new predator corporations from the outside. Some powerful cover stories had to be floated, and they had to look like they were coming from impeccable sources. I was one of those sources, but I was massaging the press in Europe.

Q: Talking to editors, reporters.

A: God no! I was talking to the sources those reporters already trusted. Those were my people. These days, there is a whole layer of people who speak with editors and major media executives in America about the Middle East. This layer of sources has a particular job. To convince the rulers of the American media that the facts of the issue—how guilty Israel actually is in its conflict with the Palestinians—makes no difference at all. Because the overriding issue is building and maintaining friendly centers of influence in the Middle East who will help guarantee the flow of oil. It's a national security spin. And, for several reasons, it's working. Now, you might think this is a minor job. But it's not. It's very big. The rulers of the American media want a

justification, a rationale, a kind of priestly assurance that they're doing the right thing by omitting the Palestinian side. You see? It's like—in former times—a doctor who convinces a husband not to tell his wife how serious her disease actually is. The husband doesn't want to say "terminal" to the wife, and the doctor assures him that this is correct. To keep the secret. Or the old adage, "Don't tell the children." The children are the public.

Q: Grisly.

A: Maybe, but in my line of work it's necessary. Take the TV show, West Wing. There's an undercurrent on that show. You feel it at times. "Don't tell the president." You see? The president has enough to worry about. But on the show, unlike in real life, the president always discovers the little things that his people are trying to shield him from. And that makes the viewers think that, ultimately, everything is on the up and up.

Q: And in real life?

A: Most of my experience was with Carter. I don't mean directly. But Carter was presented to the public as the president who knew every detail, who micro-managed. The man who had his finger on the pulse. Who would never allow a corrupt thing to happen. This was after Nixon and the stand-in, Ford. But in truth, Carter was in the dark. Things happened on his watch…the world was being re-made right under his eyes, into a much more global affair. On many fronts. His closest advisors—Trilateralists and Council on Foreign Relations people—were running a very important show. "Don't tell the president." Carter was a creation of these people.

Q: Didn't he know it?

A: He did and he didn't. Carter had his own sources of disinformation. He wanted to believe that globalism was a humanitarian outcome. And trusted people assured him that this was so. He needed that assurance, and they gave it to him. Again, people like me are often used to tell others what they already want to believe. Listen, it's like the rich man who goes to the corrupt priest. The priest knows what the rich man wants to hear. That he is doing good, that he is living a proper life and will go to heaven. So that's what the priest tells him. Mouth to ear. And the rich man pays to hear that. In my work, I talk to the priest and I tell him what I know about the rich man—but I veil it, I cloak it as information, as fact, as story, as genuine and important, as well-intentioned. I don't ever bring up the fact that I know the rich man is insecure and wants to be sure he's going to heaven. I talk to the priest from a whole other angle, about other matters. And I weave in what he needs to know about the rich man. I know the corrupt priest is already thinking about the gift of money from the rich man, that he's dreaming about a new church or a new window or a new promotion that will give him access to a corrupt bishop who has a collection of little boys… I can't change that, but I can work with it.

Q: You're essentially saying that Carter was a dupe.

A: Of course not. He's a complicated man. A mixture of ego and believer and idealist and peanut farmer and scientist and leader, and he's also a mark for a con man. He needed certain assurances, and they had to come from the right people at the right time, and they couldn't sound like fawning malarkey. They had to sound like POLICY. They had to sound like a subtle penetration beyond the daily details of his presidency. But they also had to be assuring. This is not easy work most of the time. Sure, you get your young reporter with a massive erection for the big story. But you can't rely on that for your success. You're often dealing with very intelligent people. Sly people. People who are very cynical and yet vulnerable and who care as much about their legacy as about money. Clinton is another complicated creature. He has his obvious weaknesses, but you can't just press on them and expect him to jump and then call it a day. He had his Monica, but he also had his true belief in globalization, and he could stand up and deliver an hour off the top of his head on the details of GATT and NAFTA. What made him part company with some of his advisors was not so much the whole betrayal business having to do with his lying about sex. These people didn't know to play Clinton's fervor for working out the complex details of a policy package. They couldn't approach him with the right amount of awe and intelligence on that vector. Dick Morris could, and he lasted until his own sex scandal forced him out. Clinton put up with Morris because they could sit and talk for hours about campaign strategy. But Morris was not about disinformation. You take a Dick Morris who really does the work I did, and you would have a very able operator. Very able.

Q: Did you ever work with Kissinger?

A: If I had, I wouldn't tell you. Again, you're getting into the more subtle areas of my profession. Kissinger was a star in the Rockefeller empire. He needed his sources. You see, with a man like Kissinger, a loose cannon, there is always an externally mounted operation going on around him. To help him. And if necessary, to hurt him. So Kissinger had people around him as sources who were basically on his side, and he had others who were really against him. Against, in the sense that, they would try to bring him down if he needed to be brought down. Because Kissinger was always expendable, and people could see that he wanted to be public, too public. He wanted to be a Robert Redford of politics, a man who magnetized others by his so-called aura of power. That aura was manufactured. Kissinger didn't have it. It was a PR work of art. Kissinger had to go. He was a manipulator who wanted the spotlight. That doesn't work. He eventually wanted to become a Bernard Baruch or an ex-president, with a great statesmanlike reputation… But much more important than this, you have the division in political life between pure governing and medicine. This is a true operation of huge dimensions. It means that the politicians will never seriously challenge the practice of medicine. It takes layers of power and control and propaganda to enforce this division of power.

Q: This was one of your areas.

A: I played my role. "Doctor knows best." I'll tell you this. I designed a pilot project. I won't tell you the specifics on it, but it was launched to make medicine synonymous with absolute science in the minds of some political doubters, some heavy hitters who were thinking of challenging the effectiveness of modern medicine.

Q: In the US?

A: I won't say. I was able to connect with the reliable sources of these politicos, people they counted on, and in the process we staged some public opinion polls that showed these dissident politicians would suffer greatly if they really tried to expose modern medicine as a fraud in any way. We slanted the poll questions, we cooked the books a little, and we "proved" that such a course of action would be a complete disaster. It was very effective. They backed off. There were harsher measures waiting in the wings if we failed, but we didn't.

Q: Modern medicine is very important as a paradigm to people who want to control populations.

A: It's a central key.

Q: Would you say that governments are now in a lower position, so to speak, than the global medical cartel?

A: Yes I would. It's not obvious, but that's the case. And anyone who is interested in this thing called freedom would be well-advised to understand that.

Q: To understand, for example, psychiatry.

A: And its real motives. Psychiatry survives only through excellent public relations control. It is a ship with holes. But it has made its way through very rough seas, it's hidden its agenda and its failures—which are legion—and it has emerged with a reputation that is very difficult to challenge. Its connection to the major media is incredibly interwoven. I know something about this, from my work, and I can tell you that the PR has all been in the direction of making the human mind the exclusive property of psychiatry. That is the design of the operation. It has worked, and it keeps working.

Q: To unseat psychiatry would be to unseat the media.

A: There is no doubt about that. You could not win the war in any other way.

Q: Would you want to fight that war?

A: If I were thirty years younger, it might be interesting. As an exercise. From my position, I wouldn't do it. Not at my age.

Q: But some of the Nazis you aren't fond of live there, don't they?

A: Yes they do. The Nazis know how to train carbon copies of themselves. They can take a boy from Scarsdale and educate him into being a psychiatrist who will give drugs and shock treatments and believe he is doing the right thing. It's really a miracle of PR. Education constructed around a false science takes a certain kind of genius. You have to shore it up with a number of shortsighted assumptions and lies. Sigmund Freud, who wasn't a real psychiatrist, was an exceptional mythmaker.

Q: I think that's enough for now…

A: Yes. Let me offer one last observation. To challenge any massive power structure, you have to have a total willingness to discredit people. And then you have to find ways to make it stick. Modern society makes that job harder, because today we discredit everybody. It's old hat. We're inoculated against caring about that.

Q: Not completely inoculated.

A: No. If you work in the area of the most sacred cows, you still have an open field. That is, in a way, still fertile.

Q: And what is the most sacred cow?

A: Medicine, of course.

Q: You really think so.

A: I've spent time in many campaigns. Learned my tricks. In all my work, I've never seen a structure built up with more care and more buttressing than medicine. It's like a thousand cathedrals. I've studied the history of the Vatican church. And I used to think that was the most amazing edifice in our time on this planet. But I've changed my mind.

Q: Sometimes I call it Hospital Earth.

A: Yes. I can see why you would. Medicine is constructing total dominance over the human being. I myself go to a doctor when I need one. But the difference between that and…

Q: The medical cartel itself…

A: We are talking about two different worlds. For a time I was used to work on recalcitrant areas where medicine was lagging behind, where people were still suspicious, and I could see that behind me and to the side of me there were incredible resources available to win our war, to make medicine the new Pope, the

new king, the new general. Yet, it's faceless. That's the remarkable thing. There are no personalities. It's done as a silent army, with no visible leaders.

Q: But there are hidden leaders.

A: Of course. Otherwise you don't really get anywhere. The real trick is making it look like the advance of pure knowledge. Nothing else. There is no one to fault. It's all knowledge. That is the spin of all time. It really is. I stand in awe of it.

Q: Who are the hidden leaders?

A: If I read my subversive history correctly, the money flowed down from the royal families of Europe and some of the Knights Templar, and the Vatican, into the hands of European banking families, like the Rothschilds, and then to Rockefeller, and the Rockefellers eliminated all the competition in America and built pharmaceutical medicine. They funded the medical schools and the foundations and the research institutes and the medical societies. It's no accident that John D [Rockefeller], a ruthless baron, saved his reputation through the efforts of a PR man who suggested that he should be photographed for the press handing out pennies and nickels to poor children on the street. That is how his family built modern medicine. Through PR.

Q: The PR that said the studies and the "breakthroughs" were all legitimate, were all science.

A: Thirty years ago, we would have had something to talk about.

Q: We just did.

A: I mean tactics, strategy, organization, and plots against the monarchy.

Q: Do you think the Rockefellers still head up the medical cartel?

A: They have a great deal of power. But I believe that the generic Nazis I spoke of earlier—and I don't know any names—have taken over. They are the technocrats of the future. I found that some of these people actually believe their own fabrications. I was spinning yarn, making connections, and influencing perception. But once in awhile I would run into a creature that truly believed that…you know what I mean. They are dangerous if anyone is dangerous. They want to take over the brain in a very precise way and, as one of my favorite philosophers, Krishnamurti used to say, "We each need to become aware soon, we need to find our own unfiltered awareness, we need to discover what our own unique perception is, because in the next century they are going to do wholesale experiments on the brain, and then…things will be more difficult."

Q: You see a parallel between the old Vatican and modern medicine.

A: I would recommend an in-depth study of the Vatican for anyone. The doctor is built of course on the idea that a person must consult an intermediary, a priest, if he wants to make contact with the Ultimate.

Q: And who is the Ultimate supposed to be, in the case of the doctor? Who is the doctor receiving his Word from?

A: Mythically speaking, God. It's still God, although no one says it. Understand, I'm just talking about the myth. This is my area. I've done the propaganda in this area, and I see that the doctor is still the contact point for God. That's the unspoken feeling. God and deliverance from suffering and salvation. This is not just the subconscious expression of a need by the patient. It is that, but it's more. The medical superstructure is built that way. It's puzzling to me in a way, because it's so brilliant. You search and you don't find a hidden history about this. You really don't. In the case of the Vatican you can find it, if you look hard enough. You can see how those very brilliant people built their edifice. And what you can't see, you can infer quite easily. But here…it's different. It's almost as if the builders were following a blueprint that was invisible. They had other historical examples to work from. The Vatican, Egypt, Sumer. So perhaps that's it. You see, every PR man needs a hook. He needs leverage. He needs to feel it, to use it, to imply it, to bring it in behind his message. Science, absolute science and rationality. That's one strong hook. It's hard to challenge that. It's very useful as a myth. But behind that is God saving the patient. If you can tap into that—and I have, many times, in my work, even though I'm an atheist—the opposition withers in front of you. They feel it. They don't want to be seen opposing THAT. Politicians back off. That's why they will never challenge the role of medicine in this century. They would be seen as evil. In terms of sheer manipulation it's a winner like none other I've ever seen. So you see, we have here a global program that is going full steam ahead in this century. And it has the power of a religion, an unspoken religion, a global religion. I can't say this too strongly. It is a hidden religion, and that kind of force is even stronger than a religion that has all the trappings and the doctrine and the cathedrals. Walk into the Anderson Cancer Center in Texas sometime. I haven't been there in years, but you get a strange feeling…we are dealing here with a myth that can overcome countries without a single scripture. This is a PR man's dream...you see, there are always layers of hidden factors. Sometimes it's just political.

Q: For example?

A: 1954. Guatemala. When the CIA overthrew Arbenz, who was just elected president, it was because they needed to protect United Fruit, which Arbenz was going to nationalize and take away from some VERY high-up players. So the coup had to be cast in a different light. You know, Arbenz was a Communist, he was a criminal, the usual. That was one level. But United Fruit had some ties to IG Farben, the famous Nazi cartel. Josiah DuBois, an excellent researcher, would later discover that Guatemala was very much owned by Farben during the period of the second world war. THAT really had to be hidden. But, with modern medicine, you are also

hiding a psychological myth structure that gives the whole institution its power. It's much more sinister and much more hidden. It isn't just about concealing political relationships...

###END###

March 23, 2001

Q: The war on drugs.

A: Don't get me started. The Latin American presidents—Fox and Batlle—are saying they want legalization. I know PR people, let's call them, who spent years getting stories printed in the press about drugs. The scourge of marijuana, based on completely false studies.

Q: The public—

A: —The public thinks that the moon is made of green cheese if the right people say it is. Look, part of the major propaganda effort, the meta-effort, is to get people to forget there is a difference between freedom and "the right thing."

Q: What are you talking about?

A: This is key, believe me. I could show you how, through the use of propaganda, people now believe that drugs are always wrong and therefore no one should be allowed to use them AND that that conclusion represents freedom. Which is false.

Q: You're saying people don't know what freedom is anymore.

A: Exactly. They don't. They think freedom is getting other people to do "the right thing." And the REASON they think that… propaganda people have been at work for a long time bringing that insanity about. That illogic. You HAVE to see what I'm talking about. It's a little complicated. But it's so very important. Let me put it to you this way. When the country was born, the USA, freedom was considered to be a pretty precious thing. It was. It was supposed to mean that any person, or at least a lot of persons, could live their lives any way they wanted to, as long as they didn't interfere with anyone else's freedom. I mean, that was pretty clear then. Do you get it? If in 1800 you wanted to smoke pot and I thought that pot was disgusting, I had no recourse. It was a free country. And by the ideal of freedom, you could smoke. After all, freedom is freedom. This is a silly example, but you understand. Now, as time passed, it became clear to those who were in the business of manipulating society that, all in all, this freedom thing was a very bad idea. It made people hard to brainwash. So on a mind control level, a new concept would have to be introduced. It was, "morality above freedom." Groups of every stripe were encouraged to shout their morals from the rooftops and rail against the bad people… this was, in a real sense, a PR operation. It was divide and conquer, but more than that it was pour on the morality from all directions on the heads of the American people—beat them to such a degree with that flood that after awhile the idea of freedom would take a back seat in their minds to MORALITY. The ultimate result of all this, you could say, was Prohibition of alcohol. That never could have been achieved without a populace that was half-mad with the steady diet of overbearing morality-preaching coming from all corners of society.

Q: You're saying this is intentional, this inducing—

A: —This inducing of a moralistic fever. Yes. And it still is. War on drugs. Whatever. There are lots of examples. The basic propaganda operation is, make them forget what freedom means. Because freedom would dictate that you say, "If you want to use a drug, go ahead." Who cares? And of course there are other layers of lies used to keep people from seeing that simple truth. The fear mongering around the idea that if you let people use drugs, everyone will become either addicted or the victim of a crazy person with a gun on drugs. That's called PROPAGANDA. It doesn't work that way in real life. If you let people alone, some of them do stupid things and some of them don't. It's never "everybody." But if you can make people forget that freedom comes above morality, you have them. They're yours. Do you see that? If you don't see that, you see nothing. This is why I call it meta-programming. It's the programming that makes all the other programming work.

Q: You say this is going on now.

A: Absolutely. In fact, it's everywhere, if you can see it. The bringing on of morality as the most important thing. Look, you get thousands of people who come to believe this and they start forwarding the agenda themselves without any need for manipulation. That's always the case in any operation. You get true believers and dupes and all sorts of support from out of the blue. But I'm telling you, the meta-operation is intentional… and it is: MAKE THEM ALL BELIEVE THAT MORALITY COMES BEFORE ANYTHING, COMES BEFORE FREEDOM. This is the operation that destroyed America. The rabid teaching of morality. The truth was, when settlers came to America, they wanted a version of freedom, and even the Puritans began to loosen up. With freedom, you get the natural practice of morality. You don't need to teach it very much. You don't need to hammer it into brains. This was one of Walt Whitman's messages.

Q: Who ran this meta-operation to ram morality down everybody's throat?

A: People you would never know. Subtle people. People behind the censorship boards. Behind the funding of some of the big-city fire breathing churches. Behind the propaganda campaign on the evils of alcohol and marijuana. Hearst, of course. But others.

Q: Some people would say there is no morality left in America and that's what's killing it. Right now.

A: Yes. You may find this hard to believe, but no morality at all is the inevitable outcome of pounding morality into every skull. Accept that or reject it, I don't care.

Q: So the destruction of freedom was the major operation.

A: Always is, right? I don't have to tell you that. But HOW TO DO IT is the question, and I've just given you a big piece of the answer, a piece that is invisible, utterly invisible to most people. If large numbers of people ever got it through their heads that everyone could live by the rule of freedom—do what you want to as long as it

doesn't interfere with the freedom of others—if large numbers of people really saw that and grabbed it and lived by it… I would never have had a career in propaganda. Propaganda would not have worked. In order for propaganda to work in any form, people have to have forgotten the rule of freedom. I can't say it any clearer than that. I want people to see this. This is why I call it meta-programming. You have to install a bias against the rule of freedom first, as the first order of business, or else nothing further will happen.

Q: Have to.

A: Have to. The bonus is, if you use a huge overdose of morality as the strategy, on the other end you also get social chaos. Because, as I said, a great forced infusion of morality results in no morality eventually. Listen, I'm giving you strategies and understandings here that are known to true manipulators. They USE these understandings. In every group or nation or cult, you can trace the evolution of the use of morality as a tool of control. I'm not talking about civilized behavior. I'm talking about the use of morality to club people over the head with, for one purpose. To knock the freedom out of them.

Q: People have to go along with this. As victims. They have to submit.

A: Yes they do. And they become victims of this strategy because, in the main, they don't know what to do with their freedom. It's unfamiliar territory. It's like a void. So they fill it up with what other people give them—like a very stiff dose of morality… and then they forget about the freedom. They raise the flag of some cause and they march to it and they hate certain people all of a sudden and they feel a sense of power and they march along and now they're under the control of the manipulators—and NOW they can be brainwashed along many different lines. Do you see the progression? Do you see how the door is pried open to begin with?

Q: Back to the war on drugs.

A: Perfect example. Because we can add one more dimension to the picture I'm making here. Profit. Money. If people around the world couldn't be moved by moralistic statements about drugs, the drugs would never be illegal and then the groups that make billions of dollars would make pennies instead. Since legal drugs are dirt-cheap. Moralisms equal money.

Q: What about your favorite field, the medical?

A: Same thing. Press releases and statements appear in the media—the media is the voice of the manipulators, never forget THAT—and what is said is, we must defeat disease X, we have an obligation to defeat this terrible scourge, no one has the right to oppose this humanitarian effort, only a criminal or a dangerous person would oppose the defeating of this disease… you turn the moral screws, sometimes lightly and sometimes very hard. And people jump. You need them to jump. If they don't jump they don't support widespread vaccine campaigns and widespread giving of medical drugs and all the rest. You see, there is this moral thing here, and

it all proceeds from THAT, and as PR person you have to find a way to tweak that in the public.

Q: Giving away secrets here.

A: People are now so conditioned to receiving the moral message, you only need to hit it once or twice and you've started their engine. They're ready for the moral landscape and now you come in with the cheaper better drugs message and the vaccine message and you've got them.

Q: Moralistic people—

A: —Are like guard dogs who wear a sign on their chests that says FREEDOM. It's a sham and they know it deep down. They're basically dupes for the manipulators who are re-molding society in the shape of a Sunday school with uzis. One of the biggest current themes in societal propaganda is the community. THE COMMUNITY. I assure you, this is not real. It's not a real sentiment. It's created and shaped. It goes, "The right thing to do is care about your community and give to your community and join with your community and be one with your community and think about what your community needs from you and submerge yourself to your community…"

Q: This is a piece of propaganda. You've told me that before.

A: I'm telling you that again. It's a core idea. Once you install it, you can build out in a number of directions to influence people. You start with community as a moralistic idea. You say it over and over again in a hundred different ways. Community, community, community. And make no mistake, this is as moralistic idea. It's communicated with a flavor. You see it—

Q: —You see it after every school shooting.

A: Certainly. Now some people will say that community is, in fact, an excellent value. I'm not here to argue about that. But I'll tell you this. In Americas at this time, the biggest moralistic operation—intentional operation—propaganda operation—is around the idea of community. Why? Because it is being used to drown out the idea of the free individual. It's as simple as that. See, I believe that if left alone people would have a natural sense of community. You wouldn't need to launch soft pink bombs about it every five seconds. But that too is another issue.

Q: You seem to be giving a lot more credence to the idea of freedom as a reality than you were a while ago.

A: I go back and forth. If I didn't, I'd never be talking to you.

Q: Have you worked in this area that you're describing?

A: Moralistic operations, so to speak? Through the medical area. Very indirectly. See, I find a reporter, say, in Paris, and let's say that this reporter can write stories

about disease in the Third World. That's one of his areas. And then, unknown to the reporter, I have lunch with one of his frequent and reliable sources. And I sell the source on a story that is related to the reporter's area. It's about a school in Africa where most of the kids had been vaccinated against polio, but a few kids hadn't been. And those few got the disease, and they spread it to their own parents who spread it to the rest of the village… and so on. A tragedy. An object lesson about vaccines. You know. So the source likes the tale and he sells it to the reporter and the reporter writes it and the wire services pick it up and it goes all over the world.

Q: Where's the moralism?

A: Community! A small community in Africa that was decimated. Think. Where is this story playing? Not where did it happen, but where is it playing? In the industrialized countries. To readers who are themselves up to their eyeballs in propaganda about community. They hear this little tragic tale and it teaches them that one must always, always vaccinate. But the germ that carries that message is the moralism called community…

Q: There's a punch line here somewhere?

A: I worked on building this little story about the village with three people from various intelligence agencies in a town in Africa, I won't say where. The story is built. What actually happened in that school was completely different. But we put together our story, we found a few "witnesses" who, for a small inducement, would talk to a reporter if he happened along to check facts… this was a largely invented story I sold to half the industrialized world. With a built-in moralism called community that would deliver my message.

Q: It was a fake story.

A: If people believe it, it's no longer fake.

Q: We're back to your rationalization again.

A: Call it what you want to. Morality is the key. It's the way in to the mind.

Q: Back to UFOs... I've been reading the Robertson panel report of 1953.

A: Oh that. The CIA was quite upset over the massive sightings of UFOs in and around Washington DC in 1952. They had to put the lid on.

Q: What were those sightings about?

A: They were unidentified flying objects. That's all I know. But the CIA was determined to make nothing of them, to discredit all observers who came forward, to make people feel they shouldn't make reports since that would open them up to charges of being nuts.

Q: Put the lid on, as you say.

A: Sure. After all, the government is a jealous master. It wants all the attention, all the tributes, all the bowing and scraping to go to THEM. Again, this PR campaign to discredit the observers comes right out of the Vatican handbook from the Middle Ages. If you saw a miracle or a healing that wasn't sanctioned by the church, you were a heretic. You were possessed by the devil. The modern version of that is to label someone as nuts. As insane. As hysterical. It's a psychiatric proposition. The new priesthood. The CIA was loaded with psychiatrists as consultants. The CIA was the old Vatican, and their "investigators" in this area were the mental health experts. You see, if you read some of the work of the Church Inquisitors, you actually find language that sounds like psychiatry. Mental deficiency. Imbalance. Delusion. A lot of it is there. Freud knew that. He started from the same basis, only he brought in other ideas to justify a diagnosis of mental illness.

Q: Oedipus.

A: He was looking for a substantial ground on which to base a judgement of deficiency, psychosis. Talk about PR people. Since Freud's time, truckloads of them have been brought in to bolster the rationale behind psychoanalysis and various diagnoses. It was never a science.

Q: In the case of UFOs...

A: Hysteria. That's the fundamental term that was used. And Freud used it too. As an indicator of mental illness. The UFO debunkers, the PR pros, import a raft of reports about the behavior of crowds. A raft of terms. Hysteria. Mob psychology. The madness of crowds. That's the equation that's drawn. And with that equation they can make it seem that sixteen people looking for UFOs on a mountaintop, four of them technically trained scientists, are a mob. I prefer to look at political conventions to get my knowledge of crowds and mob psychology.

Q: "Look to the skies and you're crazy."

A: If you have a civilization where there are 34 official gods and goddesses, the rulers don't take too kindly to people saying they saw the 35th, the one nobody listed in the official manual. That's a crime in certain dynasties of Egypt, it's a crime in the Middle Ages in Europe. It's a crime in most places. But when you have a Bill of Rights, they have to use a different word. So they use insanity. Kook. Wacko. Hippie. It's all the same thing. I once knew an Air Force major who was actually called a hippie after he reported a UFO. It was quite amusing. This man had dropped bombs in Vietnam and he was a rainbow person all of a sudden.

Q: The CIA gets very worked up over UFOs.

A: One, they're obviously covering up something. And two, they want to be the kings of all intelligence gathering. You know, if they didn't see it, it didn't happen. This is perception management by outright fiat. It stings their insufferable pride.

Q: A Pentagon cold-warrior named Phil Corso writes a book about the Roswell crash. He says it's real. He says he guarded UFO technology for years and then released it to US corporations for back-engineering. And then the book disappears from the public consciousness.

A: I could tell you lots of stories about data mangling. About how people like me get stories squashed. It's SOP in the trade. If the story goes away without a whimper, most people assume there was really nothing to it. Remember the stories coming out of the Soviet Union about 10 years ago? People in a town saw a craft land. It got two days of coverage in the world press and then it went away like a bad meal. Into the black hole of lost reports. That wasn't just the fickleness of the press. It was the result of a counter-story but not one for the media. The counter was circulated: There was nothing to it. We, the press, looked like idiots for reporting it. It was based on bad information. The people were hysterical. Children were the observers. If a politician suddenly says something way out of line, like no one should pay taxes because the 16th Amendment was never ratified—he's blackballed in the press. He disappears. And then the public comes to believe he's imbalanced. They have dossiers on these people. And they'll use them if necessary.

Q: Who's they?

A: The FBI, the CIA. So and so had a mistress on the side. He's been drinking for years. He's an outcast in his own party. He's a supporter of militias. He's a racist. One or more of those things might be true. Or not. Or he actually had a brief fling for a week with a hooker, not a long-term affair with a mistress.

Q: Jimmy Carter said he saw a UFO.

A: He said it happened once. That's excusable, especially the way it was phrased. He didn't say the CIA was covering the whole phenomenon up. He made the statement like a folksy innocent. it was endearing, like, "Yes, in my mind I've lusted after women."

Q: Clinton told Web Hubbell to find out if UFos were real.

A: And he found out nothing. The wall of secrecy around this issue is thick. The truth is basically held outside the government. Some of the people who know the truth may be in government, but their allegiance is really to something else.

Q: To what?

A: Look, when I was active, I got my orders from certain people. I won't say who. Some of them were in the government, but I know that they were getting their orders from a chain that went up into SOMETHING that wasn't the government. It obviously wasn't my job to trace that, and I wouldn't have lasted a day if I had tried. I would have ended up writing obituaries for a small newspaper.

Q: Suppose I said that since about 1940, a group of people have been in charge of making the world seem like a place that cannot sustain a good standard of living for everyone—BECAUSE that is a lie. Because the opposite is true.

A: I would say you were crazy. Or, to put it more accurately, I would say it would be my job to make it seem you were crazy.

Q: But you know what I'm talking about.

A: You're taking things up quite a few levels here.

Q: Do you think the group I'm referring to may have been at the top of the command chain you mention... and that you were down the line somewhere receiving your orders?

A: Anything is possible.

Q: What do you think?

A: I think that illusions are very important to analyze, because when you view the content of the illusions that are being promoted, you can make better estimates of who the illusion makers would be.

Q: You sound like a lawyer.

A: No, I sound like a man who is retired.

###END###

April 20, 2001

Q: Have you seen the latest study on HIV out of UCLA?

A: The one with mice?

Q: Yeah.

A: More balderdash. They're scrambling.

Q: Why?

A: Mbeki and others are saying that HIV is not the cause of AIDS. The researchers are trying to build a better case for HIV.

Q: It's useless.

A: Shaping public perception is only useless if you fail. The truth has nothing to do with it. For years, I worked with reporters' reliable sources to bolster the idea that HIV causes AIDS…even though it doesn't.

Q: What was the purpose…

A: I did what I did because I was paid for it. HIV is the cover story that conceals efforts to depopulate the Third World. Engrave that in stone.

Q: What about Foot and Mouth disease?

A: A harmless disease. People like me use it to bring about the wrecking of economies. Kill all those animals. To do that, you have paint the disease as a grave danger.

Q: Let's talk about separate and sovereign nations.

A: Another myth. The media perpetuate it.

Q: Why?

A: Because it covers up the truth, which is that about 1000 men control the planet. Men who have no allegiance to any government or country.

Q: How do they control the world?

A: That's much too complicated to get into now. But there are front organizations.

Q: Like the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderbergers.

A: Sure.

Q: You believe that perception is changing.

A: The people of the world are being shown a great deal of television. The powers that be think it's good because it's a calming agent. Because it hypnotizes people. Because it gives people vicarious satisfaction and then they don't need actual satisfaction.

Q: Do you agree with that?

A: Up to a point. But TV also shows people who are poor what it's like to have money. So poor people come to see that they're being cheated.

Q: They could have more.

A: On TV, people who have money usually commit crimes to get it. Look at the shows. So poor people come to believe that crime is the only thing they need to do to get rich. Not just poor people believe that. Kids do. All sorts of people.

Q: So we get more crime.

A: At all levels. And people no longer believe in anything. Except money.

Q: Why do you care? You spent years manipulating people.

A: Because it's harder to manipulate someone who has no ideals at all. The whole world is becoming more stupid. Rich and poor. It doesn't matter. Stupidity was the never the goal of my work. I wanted to sway people in one direction or another, and in order to do that, people have to have a LITTLE IQ, at least. When everyone becomes focused on money alone, you're getting close to anarchy. And in anarchy, people are beyond control. That's when the soldiers move in with tanks on the streets to control the mobs.

Q: You think TV is contributing to this state of affairs.

A: Not think. Know. If you watch the screen every day and study it, you find out that TV teaches not one thing. Nothing. TV teaches nothing. It instills messages from the shows, but that's not teaching.

Q: What about the educational shows?

A: Meaningless. TV is a splash of images and voices. People do not learn anything of any depth from TV. They THINK they do, and then they can't remember it. It all goes away. I retired because TV is now doing my job. The fact of the set being on all the time produces a lobotomy far beyond anything I ever did. It solves everything.

Q: Now they have TVs in schools.

A: Sure. They show educational shows, and the kids pick up a few words and images and that's it. You can't learn while a TV show is on. You're a receiver. You're a machine.

Q: Is all this intentional?

A: I've seen hundreds of studies on the subject of television over the years. Some of them were never broadly published. The powers that be know what's going on. They are pushing it. You can bet the farm on that. A world poised in front of their TV sets. That's a wet dream for the owners of the planet. In front of the set, you learn nothing but you think you're learning. A terrific delusion. You watch your favorite people in the whole world, who are really just images made out of light. It's a religion. The stars are the gods, and they only show up as images made out of little tiny pieces of light. But people think they're absolutely real.

Q: But as you say there is this fly in the ointment.

A: People who watch TV insist on seeing crimes. That's because they feel trapped in their lives and crime is an emotional symbol for escape. But then this symbol is too scary, so people want to see the forces of good arrest the criminal. It's all a balance, see? There is the thrill of escape from utter boredom, and then there is the pulling back on the fishing line and the bad guys are brought to justice. This whole light show mirrors the human being who wants to escape and at the same time wants to be secure. The problem is, when people see so much crime on TV, they begin to decide that this is the only way to earn a lot of dollars. A rot sets in. A complete rot.

Q: TV being much more powerful than print or radio.

A: I worked mainly in print. But yes, when you had the Welles' War of the Worlds on the radio in 1938, it was a revelation. People actually believed we were being invaded from Mars. That's radio 60 years ago. TV is not literal in that way. People don't run out in the streets and start screaming because they see film of a hurricane 50 miles away. TV doesn't work that way. TV works more than radio to get at the symbols.

Q: What other symbols?

A: The law. The courtroom as a place of revenge against the people who, like the viewer IN HIS SUBCONSCIOUS MIND, dared to escape from boredom by committing a crime. But unlike the viewer, these people deserted their lives of quasi-normalcy to commit crimes, and for that they must be punished. So the message is, don't leave the herd. It's the push pull. "I want to escape, but I want security and authority."

Q: Radio did that too. The shows about the FBI and the cop shows and detective shows.

A: Not quite in the same way. That was about ideals. Good versus evil. TV is more base, more about fantasy life and the ways people work that out. You know, "I hate authority, but I have to obey." The contradictions that hold people in a haze. In about 1960, people began rooting for the monster. Remember? They wanted the creature from the black lagoon to kill everybody. It was a sign of the utter exhaustion of the culture. A sign of the urge for destruction. "Let's kill the culture." I

know just about everyone will disagree with me about this, but rock and roll ended up being about rooting for the monster.

Q: Burn the guitars on stage.

A: Yes. Take down the whole house. Look like a monster on stage and take down the whole culture.

Q: Why?

A: Because the culture began to look to people like there was no way out. See, this is where the whole plan of MEDIA begins to backfire. I saw that a long time ago. Media became a mirror, and people could look in that mirror and root for the bad guy, the monster, the hurricane, the earthquake.

Q: Anti-heroes.

A: Sure. The plan for control of the world isn't perfect. These neo-Nazi kids worship a certain kind of rock and roll because it looks like destruction to them. They love the long-hairs on stage, whom they'd ordinarily hate, because those musicians are implying that destruction is the only way out. We aren't going into space, so burn down the world.

Q: What?

A: The space program was cut down. The excitement was stopped. So get on a motorcycle and ride around, put up a Nazi flag, burn down a church. Shoot a kid in school. The message of this is, there is no escape from the walls of the culture, so kill it.

Q: You're saying this is a backfire of the World Plan for control?

A: In part, yes. People can't live forever playing with their own ambiguity about escape from boredom and obedience to authority. People go out of control and become destructive. But there are REAL Nazis who—

Q: --Love this stuff. They want to destroy societies and build a new fascist world on the ashes.

A: Count on it.

Q: You're talking about—

A: --A new prevailing atmosphere, which is Destruction. It forms an opposition to positive change in any area of human life. Why do you think news is now becoming nothing more than scandal and prurient fascination with scandal? It's a reflection of The Image.

Q: The image of what?

A: Of destruction. Of futility. Of boredom. Of drugs to cure symptoms.

Q: There are still specific issues.

A: Like AIDS, like wars, like negotiations, like stock market crashes, like new medicines, like national budgets, like taxes…but people are mostly bored out of their minds with this. They see these things as reflections of their own boredom, of their own trapped feeling, of their own frustration. There's a dangerous edge here. You move from mind control of people through propaganda to the overpowering desire to destroy all the symbols of the culture. To destroy the society.

Q: Propaganda and the lies that propaganda represents have contributed to this destructive state of mind.

A: I'm afraid that's so. That was my line of work. And most of us couldn't foresee what would happen. We just thought we could paint a picture of reality that was false, and everyone would stand up and salute that. And it was true. People did stand up and salute. They still do. But propaganda is waning in the face of this other impulse—to destroy. To grab money and deny ALL other reality. To kill the society and the culture. To do propaganda, you have to have some kind of culture to play off of. If culture is a dirty rag lying in the gutter, you can't get leverage to work your propaganda.

Q: So you think the Nazi urge to destroy is winning.

A: It's about 50-50 right now on the seesaw. We'll have to see. If education stays the way it is, we'll head further downward into oblivion, because no one will be able to think.

Q: And people will—

A: --People will insist that the authorities get tougher and build bigger jails and put soldiers in the streets. Democracy will become martial law while still pretending to be a democracy.

Q: What about the internet?

A: The last refuge of literate people who have access to information. It has possibilities.

Q: It needs support.

A: It needs more popular support. People have to desert their mainstream sources of news faster.

Q: You once did some research on alternative communities.

A: I was paid to do a private study. To see if that movement was really going anywhere.

Q: What was your decision?

A: A surprising number of these decentralized communities were just following a system of belief that wasn't much more intelligent than the culture at large. They were stupid, in a word. They had their little gods and their little rituals, but they had no diversity. It's like what you get when you take a single genetic line and breed it for a long time. You get weakness and craziness and a pallid result. A culture needs wide-open gene lines and ideas mixing together. It needs intelligent conflict and difference and also cooperation.

Q: Would a real space program have accomplished that? If we were already colonizing Mars and building space cities that would float out there?

A: Maybe. But look at NASA and the military. As long as they're in charge of this thing, you get clean-cut momma's boys trained to be soldiers going out into space. Picasso doesn't go. Stravinsky doesn't go. You don't give William Faulkner a supply of whiskey and send him on his way. It's like a single gene-line. It looks strong at first, but it has no shading, it has no dimensionality. It just has soldiers.

Q: You're sounding very pessimistic today.

A: What's wrong with that? I can lay my cards on the table now. Who cares? The truth, no matter how bad it sounds, can give birth to a new response. That's what we need. A new response.

Q: But you're a propaganda man. A social engineer.

A: I'm retired, as I keep reminding you. In retrospect, I can find new perceptions.

Q: You're saying if we reject box A only to build box B we get nowhere.

A: Yes.

Q: We need better decentralization of power.

A: Yes. Let me give you an opposite example. In 1958 or so, several black Americans approached an executive in the Dept. of Commerce. And they said, "We would like to buy land in Africa and start a new community. We'd build farms and businesses there and export goods back into the US. Can you give us any help." These men didn't want money, they wanted advice. They wanted some assurance that the US would be open to that kind of trade.

Q: What happened?

A: The CIA became aware of this little project, and viewed it as a threat. A threat to the structure of global trade and the structure of Third World nations. If there were a hundred successful communities like this in Africa, the idea would spread. But the CIA was itself becoming a front, a kind of dupe in certain ways for US military

intelligence groups. If bad things happened and were exposed, then the CIA would take the blame.

Q: I'm losing the thread.

A: The CIA told these black entrepreneurs that their idea wouldn't fly, that it would never grow to any size. They told them to forget it. The CIA's judgment on this actually came from US military intelligence. And military intell got its opinion from the Pentagon and the White House.

Q: So?

A: So a very large and complex central authority, with many layers, nixed a very good decentralist idea that a few people had. The central authority can always smell what decentralization of power is like, and they don't want it. They hate it. They see the ESCAPE from boredom and suffocation in it, and they reject it because they feel, "If I can't get free, no one will." That's the operating principle.

Q: And the conclusion is?

A: We need many many many decentralizing projects happening at once, to create a new culture, and they have to be smart and tough and at the same time, free enough to become more than little separate tyrannies.

Q: Like the internet.

A: Yes. A billion websites, and no one is asking permission and no one is asking for advice or help. I happen to know that these few men who were turned down in 1958 went on to build very successful businesses in the US. But they always regretted their decision not to build other communities in Africa.

Q: You don't sound like a propagandist today.

A: If you caught me tomorrow, who knows…I'm schizoid.

Q: Alternative medicine is an area where there are many projects going on at once. A huge number.

A: And that's hard to stop. That's what I mean. Decentralization from the mainstream. Massive. Simultaneous.

Q: You're downplaying the power of newspapers.

A: Of course—among those who can't read. But in a way, newspapers are more powerful than ever, because they target people who have more money and power. Go back and read old newspapers from 60, 70 years ago. And earlier. You'll find that reporters consulted many more sources for their stories then, different sources. Not just official spokespeople. They would talk to small-town doctors and lawyers and teachers and even private citizens. Civilians. Part of my work was to cultivate sources who would feed certain information to reporters—and part of the job was

to find more and more OFFICIAL sources who would leak specific information to these reporters…so that the overall effect was to get reporters to rely more and more on "the authorities." It worked. That has changed the landscape of news. See, if reporters are now taught to believe they have to get their stories from government and military and medical and intelligence and big-time financial sources, then the reporters learn they have to keep those channels OPEN. And in order to do that, to get stories that will pass muster with their editors, the reporters have to go along with these officials and not contradict them and not make them look bad. This is a form of conditioning of the news, and it has made a huge difference in the last 50 years. It's a jungle, and the reporters are taught that they have to find out what's in the jungle by consulting a certain three hundred people. That's where the "truth" will be. Here's how they are taught: If they don't follow that rule, then the three hundred people shut the faucet of information off on EVERYTHING, and the reporters are hung out to dry. They can't get stories to publish. They're finished in the business. Even so-called investigative stories that rely on secret leaks and off-center sources have to use some of the three hundred people. And that cuts the edge off the investigative stories. Instead of something saying that cancer may be a disease of nutritional deficiency—which would blow up like a huge scandal—the story says that nutritional factors probably play a role in cancer—and that story is considered a breakthrough piece—even though it's very tame and watered down and offset by quotes saying genetic factors are undoubtedly more important.

Q: I ran into that.

A: I'm sure you did.

Q: In the case of the Oklahoma City bombing, I tried to sell a piece to a major paper about the explosion. I had four explosives experts who were saying that the truck bomb could not have caused the profile of damage in the Federal Building. But the editor said I had to interview other bomb experts—and he actually gave me a few suggestions. Well those were the "official" sources, and they all said a truck bomb could have caused the profile of damage. My story was watered down right there. I found out that the official experts were lying. They refused to discuss technical manuals I had, manuals they were aware of, which confirmed that other bombs had to have been exploded to cause the specific damage the building sustained.

A: So if you had gone along with that editor you would have let him print lies. And your story would have been a yawn that disappeared in a day. Repetition is another major factor. If a paper prints a story about how an unseasonal high tide in Florida was actually caused by the Navy doing weather control experiments, and it runs on page three and it has a few experts saying this charge is absurd, the story goes away. But if the paper runs that story and follow-ups for a month, and it's the Miami Herald, then it gets picked up by other papers and it becomes a STORY. Without repetition, nothing happens. Every real story is saying, the world as we know it is finished. And if that message gets repeated every day for two months, the central paradigms of the society are finished in the minds of a lot of people.

Q: Watergate.

A: A lot of people can pinpoint their ultimate distrust of the US government to that story, and they still have that distrust. So what happens if you have 100 stories running every day which are all follow-ups on major earlier stories that reveal incredible scandals? You have a calamity for the powers that be. That's what you have. And the place that can happen is on the internet.

Q: But it has to happen every day, and the stories have to be current, a lot of them. They have to at least have roots in current events.

A: I would agree.

Q: So people can wake up.

A: They can.

Q: But you have to—

A: --You have to go at the taboos. The real stuff. The medical stuff. Money. The way money is organized secretly. You can't just write about some senator who has a mistress, or a faulty tire on a car. America thinks it's being very smart when it knows about a senator's mistress. It thinks it's rising above the mob consciousness. It thinks it's a giant step ahead of the idea that our officials are honest and honorable. But that's not so. To know about the mistress is NOTHING. To know about Monica Lewinsky is nothing. To know about a governor with his hand in the till is nothing. To know that a general is really gay is nothing. Unless those are just the teasers that pull the reader in, after which you get him in much, much deeper waters. I can't tell you how many times I got information leaked about the "mistress," so to speak. In my earlier days, it was my stock in trade. And always, the information would first be passed down to me from my "boss," and I would work to find a source who would take that tidbit and give it to the right reporter who would jump at it and print it. Of course, the person we were ultimately discrediting had made a far more serious mistake. He was going to oppose a piece of agenda of the real power elite. Or he was unknowingly going to be used—as in the case of Clinton—to discredit the CIA or some other important group, in which case the smear about the mistress was used to divert attention from the real exposure that lay just on the horizon. When the Lewinsky scandal hit the papers, Clinton had already done what he was chosen to do as president. He had, among other things, forwarded the whole idea of free trade—making the world safe for big corporations.

Q: At this point, I showed Medavoy a document I'd written, filed as "*MK Briefing #9, Shaping Society*" (note: MK is short-hand for "mind control"). I print it for you here.

MK BRIEFING #9: SHAPING SOCIETY

As discussed in my previous book, Seven Cartels That Run the World, there is a cartel map of countries. This map designates some countries as major players—

which means they will produce huge amounts of industrial goods and engage in back-and-forth trade with other nations. The remaining countries are designated as colonies. They will supply raw materials—resources, land, cheap labor—to the major players and buy back finished goods.

This map is secret.

The colonies do not know about the overriding cartel structure. They just know they are being used. Their leaders sell out their nations to surrogates for the cartels. Those surrogates are corporations which operate on a massive global scale.

This world map is concealed by a whole parade of world events which appear to relate to ideology, ethnic conflict, war, mass starvation, illness, and so on. These events are staged and encouraged by the cartels. THESE STAGED EVENTS ARE AN OVERLAY WHICH IS SUPERIMPOSED ON THE TRUE MEANING OF IMPORTANT INTERACTIONS AMONG NATIONS. THE REAL MEANING OF INTERACTIONS AMONG NATIONS IS THE MAINTENANCE AND SOLIDIFICATION OF THE CARTEL WORLD MAP.

Example: The so-called liberation of South Africa from its former policies of racialism was not a liberation. The world at large has seen the emergence of black leaders in South Africa as a total revolution. This is not the case. South Africa is a major player on the world cartel map. The same economic leaders hold the nation under control today as held it under control twenty years ago. These real leaders in the diamond and gold business, for instance, are cartel people. But the world thinks of South Africa as liberated. That delusion has been engineered by the cartels.

Example: The conflict between Quebec and the rest of Canada is seen by most people as a misguided and selfish effort on the part of Quebec to secede from Canada. In fact, there are people in Quebec who are seeking secession to escape from oppressive taxation policies of the national government of Canada. But those "tax rebels" receive almost no media coverage. If Quebec does somehow achieve independence, it will only occur when leaders in Quebec have been set in place by the cartels. Quebec—for all of the freedom rhetoric—will still be under the thumb of the cartels.

Example: The so-called liberation of Panama which took place some years ago, resulting in the capturing of Noriega, is seen by most of the world as the arrest of a dangerous cocaine dealer who had taken over his nation. Other people see through that, and realize that Noriega had been a CIA asset for many years, and engaged in drug trafficking with the blessing of that US federal agency. The invasion of Panama was, at the highest level, simply a means to ensuring the continued cartel control of the Panama Canal, which was soon due to pass into the hands of Panama.

Example: The periodic attempts at making peace between Israel and Palestine are viewed by most people as a very difficult proposition, stemming from the religious differences between Islam and Judaism. In fact, Arafat and the various Israeli prime ministers are all UNCONSCIOUS cartel surrogates who maintain a stalemate to

ensure that Israel will remain a strong military presence on behalf of the ENERGY cartel which controls world oil through its Middle East representatives, some of whom are rebellious now and then. (There are other clandestine things going on here as well.)

Example: The 1989 destruction of the Berlin Wall was seen by the West as a great step forward for freedom. The German people saw it as a means for the re-unification of their nation, which had been split in two after World War 2. But in truth, the falling of the Wall was an engineered event to bring the whole of Germany into its cartel-designated role as a major player on the world map of countries. And there are cartel Nazis who sought and still seek lands in East Germany which once belonged to the infamous Nazi chemical megalith, IG Farben. Farben still exists secretly, and it is a major, major cartel force—although the Nazis who control it today are somewhat independent of inner-core cartel control.

As you reflect on these examples, play back for yourself the dramas which the MEDIA cartel substituted in each case to overlay the real significance of the events taking place. If you do this, you'll see the degree to which the cartels fabricate world events, you'll see the webs of lies constructed to manufacture a false reality for the public.

This is mind control, par excellence.

BACK TO INTERVIEW...

Q: What do you think of this?

A: It's real. In the case of Israel, we are also talking about giving the world a daily example of conflict as the basis of all life. An object lesson that peace cannot break out. Hundreds of times, propaganda people like me have sabotaged peace conferences by leaking information that caused distrust to flare.

Q: You can confirm that this cartel map of countries exists.

A: Yes. If true peace on a global scale broke out, this cartel map of countries would be destroyed. It's conflict that keeps it in place.

Q: How is that?

A: If peace broke out, then countries would support independence everywhere. It would be a natural occurrence, and the designated colonies would overcome their problems and shed their oppressive roles. They would become major producers and traders, just like the designated major players. They would take control of their lands and their natural resources. And there is one other thing. To maintain a secret world map of countries and their roles--to maintain any secret, you need a lie. A secret and a lie go together. The lie is conflict. As long as THAT cover story reigns, people don't truly realize that, say, the bulk of Africa could start tomorrow to gain its true independence. The African countries could join together for their own

mutual advantage instead of fighting one another---fighting which is provoked by the cartels.

Q: There is some joining together of countries in Africa now.

A: Yes. But not to the extent I'm talking about. The cartels see to that. In many ways, through many lies.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

July 6, 2001

HOW CITIZENS CAN MOUNT THEIR OWN PR CAMPAIGNS

Q: Why is it important to attack an opponent? Why not let him fester in his own juices? Why not let the next day's news just sweep him into oblivion?

A: Well, the next day's news does do that. It does tend to make people forget whatever had been true yesterday, as if truth has only a one-day shelf life. But…there are exceptions.

Q: For example?

A: Let me start with a quote. I won't tell you where it comes from. "Sub-Saharan Africa is now being destroyed… Led by the British Commonwealth, the very political existence of nations of Africa is being liquidated. There is a deliberate policy in the Great Lakes region of Africa to depopulate it of its indigenous population… Some people think that Americans and Europeans should live there instead of Africans. Once the ethnic removal of the Africans has taken place, then they will sell the real estate to Europeans and Americans to live there… eastern Zaire is being carved up into small baronies. These baronies are run by corporations. One is a British Commonwealth company called Barrick Gold, whose highest representative is Sir George Bush, the former President of the United States. They have stolen gold and petroleum reserves in the northeast of Zaire. We have, in other areas, copper, nickel mines, that sort of thing, and diamond mines. These are being taken over again by concessions, using mercenary armies to control the territory."

Q: Are you going to tell me who said that?

A: Yes, but first I'll say he was, several times, a candidate for the presidency of the United States. This man, during his campaigns, made appearances on national television.

Q: So he had exposure.

A: He wasn't just a person in a small apartment talking to his friends. This quote is incendiary. It threatens to expose a major operation underway. Underway for some time.

Q: Of course what this man said is true.

A: You bet.

Q: And AIDS is used a cover story to explain the death and destruction and obscure these wars being waged to get control of the land and minerals—and eliminate the population.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: We've been over that before. I participated in the several operations to get stories about AIDS planted widely in the European press. Promoting the idea of AIDS as the scourge that is wiping out half the world. That fairy tale has been used many times for several different reasons.

Q: So who is the man who made the statement you just quoted?

A: You can see that such a man would be dangerous. He would have to be discredited.

Q: Yes? And?

A: Before I tell you his name, I should also say that in a PR op, it doesn't matter whether your target is innocent or guilty.

Q: Because?

A: Because there are many high-class political people walking around who are guilty of crimes. Realize that. All of them, any of them could be mashed up in a minute. They could be thrown out of office, put in jail, shunned by their so-called friends…

Q: But they aren't.

A: Exactly. Because there is no reason to. They aren't threatening any vested interest.

Q: They aren't exposing an op.

A: You have to know this. This is important. It provides the necessary background.

Q: So if one of these politicos is singled out for a PR attack, it has nothing to do with—

A: —the fact that he's done things that are illegal.

Q: Okay. Therefore?

A: This man who made the statement I quoted you… I frankly have no idea whether the bad PR aimed against him was true or false. AND IT DOESN'T MATTER. It does not matter. When you do PR, or what the intel and military people like to call black propaganda, guilt and innocence are entirely beside the point.

Q: Okay, who is the man in question?

A: Another thing. You have to forget what you think you know about this man.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Why?

A: Because everything you know is just the copy of what has been launched against him. What you think is what the PR boys want you to think—even though you believe you know the truth. You don't.

Q: Sounds like this guy is a friend of yours.

A: I've never met him. He could be a minor Satan or he could be the greatest saint who ever walked the Earth. I couldn't care less. I only know that he was the target of a PR op. If he had minded his manners and not spoken out, he would never have been targeted.

Q: The corollary of this is, this man could have been portrayed as a hero.

A: That's right.

Q: He could now be thought of as an American hero.

A: Right now. No doubt about it. It's all in the hands of the media. And the PR people. But given what he has said and written, it would never be in the interests of the cartels to put him on a pedestal.

Q: But theoretically—

A: They could have made him a hero. They could have twisted everything he said. They could have said he was a great humanitarian speaking out against human rights abuses in Africa. They could have said he was… any damn thing. And it would have flown.

Q: People would have believed it.

A: Of course.

Q: And you're sure that…

A: I'm sure that when I tell you who he is, you'll immediately insert into your mind every thing you've heard about him, and it'll all be bad, and for a second at least, you'll think all that bad stuff is the truth.

Q: And maybe it is.

A: Maybe. Maybe not. The point is, you have no idea. You're flying on the fuel of PR. You are filling a vacuum with what you've heard and read. And I can guarantee you that all that rumor and press are planted.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Put there.

A: Put there by people who were expressly hired to do that. Their general principle is: FIND THE WEAKEST POINT IN A PERSON THAT WILL GIVE YOUR OP THE HIGHEST REWARD AND ATTACK THAT WEAK POINT.

Q: Give me an example.

A: Someone is old. So you imply that he's senile or he's lost touch or he's suffering from an illness and he can't make sound judgments. You see? It could all be as simple as that. It could be that stupidly simple.

Q: Of course, on the other side of that coin…

A: You could have said he's a statesman. He's a gray eminence. He's a wise senior advisor. He has the whole wisdom of the ages in his behind.

Q: It plays either way.

A: Very convincingly. People form the images from the PR they are fed. They have the images ready to go. They just need them stimulated. The images are like archetypes.

Q: That's interesting.

A: Yes. It is. Take the gray eminence. People, at the drop of a hat, stimulated by PR, will suddenly imagine that so and so is a man of great wisdom. They see him whispering into the ears of the great and the near great.

Q: Bingo bango bongo.

A: From the PR to the press to the public mind. No interference. Direct.

Q: And this works because?

A: Because people are usually without real information of any kind. They are literally starved for real information. That's a troubling situation for a person. He has a need for summary ideas. Connecting ideas.

Q: And the images, the archetypes supply that.

A: Quite quickly and easily. It's a play on a stage and the public is being fed the characters. The roles. They are being fed an array of INTERACTING ROLES THAT EXPLAIN WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE WORLD. It's a sham.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: And what about a situation where a president, his image, is being debated. You now, "He's our savior. No, he's a dunce."

A: Well, with that you come to higher level of the game, in a way. What you see there is—to oversimplify it—two PR campaigns going in opposite directions. Each team is trying to forward its images.

Q: But at a higher level?

A: It's a game of intentionally presenting conflicting archetypes.

Q: For what purpose?

A: The purpose of creating a tempest in a teacup. The purpose of making it seem that the nation is really free and debate is open and conflict is healthy.

Q: But this is not the case.

A: Not ever. It's simply two opposed images. Whether either one is true or not is beside the point.

Q: And in fact?

A: Neither image is really true. The president is really a dupe for larger forces.

Q: Okay. Let's get back to this mystery man who wrote the quote about depopulation in Africa.

A: In his case, he didn't rate this higher-level game of two opposing images. It was a straight-out effort to smash him down.

Q: And what was his weak point?

A: He was without portfolio.

Q: What do you mean?

A: He was a lone gunslinger. He had no real machinery behind him.

Q: What kind of machinery?

A: No organized political party of any size. No PR people who could put favorable stories in the press. No big business funding. He also hung around with people who used him to promote their own fascist-type agendas. At least, that's what we HEARD. That may be true. Or it may not be. Doesn't matter.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Okay. So he had no real support. So how was he attacked?

A: Easy. The PR boys called him a quirky fellow. A professional crank. A lone operator. A voice out of touch with the mainstream. He did have an organization of sorts, so the PR people called it a cult.

Q: Was it a cult?

A: Who cares? I could tell you about a senator or two whose office staff, whose closest followers are a kind of cult. You see? This is what I'm saying. The truth doesn't matter. Only the image. That's how it works.

Q: I understand. Was this PR attack successful?

A: Sure, very much so. Stories did appear in the press. But it wasn't enough.

Q: Why not?

A: Because he wouldn't go away. And he got enough money to buy national television time. So they had to go a few steps further.

Q: Meaning?

A: They spread stories that he was backed up on credit-card debt. Backed up hard. That he was a credit cheater. They said he owed back taxes. Hell, there are studies that show major politicians owe taxes. That IRS employees owe back taxes.

Q: So this was the second layer of attack against him.

A: It worked too. But once again, it didn't take him out of the picture far enough.

Q: So what then?

A: A court case. A prison sentence.

Q: For what?

A: Something to do with credit. Fraud of some kind.

Q: Was it true?

A: I have no idea and couldn't care less. In my business, it does not matter one bit.

Q: Not one bit.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: That's right. All that matters is the attack and the victory. You achieve a smear and then the target is neutralized. From that point on, the public thinks the target is lying every time he opens his mouth. I knew a few people who were involved in this particular smear. And I'll tell you, talking to them you would have no idea whether the charges against this man were true or false. They were just painting a picture and selling it. It could have been the Mona Lisa or Mickey Mouse.

Q: The PR people get their stories to the reporters and the stories are published.

A: Or the PR boys get their stories to "reliable sources" who then get them to the reporters. The whole idea is to build up a chain of reliable people who trust each other. It could be a short chain or it could be a longer chain.

Q: And do the reporters check the facts of these stories?

A: They don't have to.

Q: Why not?

A: Because the stories are all about "a government source told the blah blah that so and so has been under investigation by the XYZ agency for several months…"

Q: That's how it starts.

A: And then you keep building the wave.

Q: And it doesn't matter whether he's guilty or innocent.

A: Just look at Clinton. You had several scandals percolating about him for years. Whitewater. Lewinsky. Chinagate. Vince Foster. Drugs at the Mena airport. Sex with other women. On and on. Impeachment. And yet, AT NO TIME DID THE PRESS EVER DECIDE TO STOP BELIEVING HIS STATEMENTS ON THE ECONOMY OR ON FOREIGN POLICY OR ON THE STATE OF THE UNION. He somehow managed to retain his position as the single highest official source for the press. Guilt? Innocence? In court or out of court, it means NOTHING.

Q: Okay. So who was this man who wrote the statement about depopulation in Africa?

A: When I say his name, just note all your instantaneous reactions. Just note them. All right?

Q: Okay.

A: Lyndon LaRouche.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Let's see.

A: No "let's see." Just give it to me.

Q: Well, it's exactly what you said. Loner, crank, leader of a cult, credit-card cheater. He served, what was it, eighteen months? He bought a big hunk of TV time every four years, when he ran for the nomination, for president, on the Democratic slate.

A: All right. Let me point out that you, like everybody else, picks up the same images about LaRouche. And that is no accident. It's because he was a target in a PR attack. And that attack was NOT mounted because he was a vote-getting threat to any big-time presidential candidate. It was mounted because he was saying things and writing things that blew open secret operations.

Q: He's out of jail now.

A: Yes.

Q: Other images about him—nut case, paranoid, liar.

A: Sure. They were all part of the attack. Part of the PR.

Q: Any more examples?

A: Pierre Salinger.

Q: After the TWA 800 crash.

A: He opened his yap and said it was a missile attack on the plane that brought it down and killed all those people. He was right. It was. So he was hounded out of the US back to Paris.

Q: And what were the PR images that were used to do it?

A: "He's old. He's lost it. He's been out of the country too long. He isn't an American anymore. He still thinks a conspiracy was responsible for Jack Kennedy's murder. He's fat. He eats too much. He's an elitist. He's a jerk. Real news people in America don't trust him. He was never anything but a writer for hire."

Q: It all happened very quickly. The discrediting.

A: They can do that if they have to.

Q: Who else?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Milosevic. Again, REMEMBER, whether this guy is a butcher of his own people is beside the point. He's already started to reveal the names of British politicians who helped him. And he's got American names too. And French names.

Q: It's all about the takeover of Eastern Europe by the cartels.

A: Sure. The rebuilding effort puts some of this territory into the hands of consortiums who want to take over the oil and minerals and the land. And the people who helped Milosevic set the conditions for the war there—the war that would result in the rebuilding and takeover—those people didn't want exposure. So they've tried to discredit him completely. Up front.

Q: So what are the images in the case of Milosevic?

A: He's crazy, mentally ill; he's physically ill and on the point of death. He's the biggest war criminal since Hitler. Meanwhile, it appears he's quite capable of standing trial and meeting with his attorneys and making threats to reveal names and so on.

Q: You said you'd talk about how citizens can mount their own PR campaigns.

A: Yes. It's different in this case, because you don't have reporters automatically feeding out of your hand. You have to work harder. You have to be tougher and you have to work over the long haul.

Q: Can you give me an example of such a PR campaign that's succeeding?

A: The one against aspartame. It's staggering along, not even following the right rules, and still lots of people are dumping their drinks and foods that contain NutraSweet. It's using the internet very well. It's a remarkable success, so far.

Q: So how do you do it the right way?

A: First, you have to be ready to DO it. Most people want ways to go against the controllers, but when you give them help they retreat. They never wanted answers. They just wanted to whine. So that's the first requirement. A few people who really mean it.

Q: What's a few?

A: Two, three. You'll get more later.

Q: What do you do then?

A: Well, the two people are together because they have a common target. They have to define that target, to make sure they are really in synch. What is the target.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Let's say it is federal agency XYZ. That is who you're going after. You have to know that. And then you have to know what you are trying to do to your target.

Q: And with a federal agency?

A: You don't start dreaming. You don't say, "We're going to put them out of business in six months." That's crap. You say, "We're going to make it much harder for them to do business. Specifically, we're going to make it harder for them to do the criminal things they do every day to people who are honest." That is your goal.

Q: That can be accomplished?

A: Yes. But it isn't like walking down the road. You have to work at it. No illusions.

Q: What's the overall strategy?

A: You're going to disrupt their peaceful routine. You're going to put them on the defense. When an agency is on the defense, they can't concentrate. They can't go on in the normal way. Every day when they come into the office they have a new fire to put out. That's what you're aiming for.

Q: Put them on the defense. How?

A: Let's say agency XYZ is in the business of attacking entrepreneurs. I'm keeping this very generic. Let's say that's how they make their living. That's what they DO, day in and day out. You have to know that. You have to understand that. Forget all the ideology in this kind of campaign. It's all nuts and bolts. Forget waving the flag or citing the law against them. Let other people do that.

Q: So putting them on the defense would mean…

A: They find it hard to attack entrepreneurs, which is what they do for a living. THEY'RE TOO BUSY DEFENDING THEMSELVES AGAINST YOU.

Q: You give them a new job.

A: That's right. Their new job is defending themselves against you.

Q: Do they know who you are?

A: Hell no. And you'd better keep it that way, for several very good reasons. You are operating just the way nasty PR always does. In the dark. Without names and without sentimental public speeches.

Q: Okay. What do you do?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: You will make it seem that the attacks against agency XYZ are coming from many separate places. To do that takes time. If you have no patience, if you can't count your small victories, you should forget all about it. THIS IS THE LONG HAUL. YEARS.

Q: And what do your attacks consist of?

A: Ultimately, articles in the press that specify instances where they persecuted innocent people. This is all human interest. This is NOT stuff about principles and the Founding Fathers.

Q: How do you define human interest?

A: Human interest in this case is a VICTIM. A live victim. A real person. A particular tale of woe. This isn't a syllogism. Not a generality. You have to be able to sniff the pain of the victim. The public has to feel that pain. Has to smell it.

Q: Tell a story.

A: John Jones started a music business in his garage, and in three years he built it up from garbage to a decent living. After all, he had to feed his two children after his wife Ethel died of cancer. You build the details. It's very bad literature, but it's great PR.

Q: And then?

A: And then agency XYZ entered into John Jones' life one day, in the person of Mr. Grim, a field agent with the Sacramento office. A visit was paid to Mr. Jones' house. Jones was told he had broken a law. He had done something wrong which could put him out of business and take that food off the table of his children. But it was all a mistake. But no one knew it at the time…

Q: Now, does this story about Jones have to be true?

A: Ah, well. With your usual PR attack, truth is the least of your worries. Because pros are doing it, and they know how to cut corners and let out little smoke puffs of innuendo. But in this case, with amateurs, it's a very big rule to stick to the truth.

Q: So it has to be true.

A: Absolutely. You are not going to lie about agency XYZ. You are going to stick to the facts all the way down the line.

Q: So the trick is…

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Building up your organization so you can find out these stories, a lot of them, put them into good form, in writing, and get them in the press.

Q: When you say the press…

A: I don't mean some Patriot monthly—although you could start there if you had to—I mean the local paper where the story actually took place. The Albuquerque Journal. The Des Moines Register. The Newark Star-Ledger.

Q: But those papers…

A: Don't worry. Agency XYZ has an office in each of those places. A field office. You don't try to hit the Washington Post. They'd dismiss you with a wave of the hand. Start local. The Idaho Observer does this well with local stories once in awhile.

Q: So you have to dig up the stories and you have to write them up.

A: Now maybe you're clever enough to find a good publicist, who is a pro who has actual contacts who are reporters. And if you have enough money, you can put this person on salary for a while.

Q: To plant stories.

A: That's what they do for a living. But this publicist better be on your side.

Q: Why?

A: Because if he's not, he'll blab to his friends, and pretty soon the wrong people will know that this dribbling little enterprise you're mounting, this attack, isn't really coming from two dozen places—it's coordinated. At that point, you're sunk. Media outlets will get wind of it and they won't print your stories.

Q: If the publicist is on your side, still newspapers could find out that all the stories are coming from the same basic source, the same person. The publicist.

A: The publicist has to be good. He has to be devious. If he isn't a real pro and if he isn't really on your side, it'll go down in flames.

Q: A pro like this could be expensive.

A: Yes. And there's a good chance your little group won't be able to sort through the possible candidates and find the right one. So it's often better to be your own publicist, in the person of several different persons, who contact reporters directly and try to get them to look at the material. This can get a little complex, but I'm giving you the bare bones.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Give me an example.

A: Okay. You've got your John Jones piece. You've written it up, after getting John Jones to talk to you. And you write it up, not as an article ready to go, but as a timeline of events. You've written about this timeline approach on your site.

Q: Yes.

A: You document the hell out of this timeline. You nurture this little baby. You blow on the spark. It's your gift to the world. And you call a reporter on the local paper in the town where John Jones lives, and you know which reporter to call because you've read back issues of the paper, and you know THIS is the guy who can get the nasty pieces done and printed. You call him, and you say, "I'm Mr. Crumple, and I have something I believe you'd be interested in."

Q: You tell him it happened in his town.

A: And he asks who you are, and you say, "I'm a friend of the victim's family," and John Jones KNOWS you are going to say something like this, because the reporter, if he bites, is going to visit Jones and talk to him. You want to hook the reporter. You want to keep your story straight. And you want John Jones to forget all about you and present the timeline and the emotion and all that as his own. Why not? It's the truth.

Q: So you mail this timeline to the reporter.

A: He sees it, and he discovers, to his surprise and delight, that it's all there.

Q: Predigested.

A: Not the usual hysterical crap that comes in from the public. A story with details. No flag-waving. No comments about agency XYZ except for the very bad thing that one of its field agents did to Mr. Jones. You see? No ax to grind. No reason for the reporter to doubt what he has. This is just the Jones family trying to tell their tale.

Q: The reporter'll go for that.

A: You pray he does. Now magnify that kind of situation a hundred times, and you have a crazy-quilt storm beginning to develop. Engineered by pure amateurs. Stories in papers all over the country.

Q: And now?

A: And now, in Washington, where agency XYZ is headquartered, people in the agency are starting to take notice. They're dealing with crap, more crap than usual. They're getting calls from local papers all over the US with questions about specific

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

cases, and these cases are NASTY, because they give a picture of the agency as a heartless bastard of a machine that is grinding down people's lives. And believe me, they will feel they have to deal with this. They will have to divert time and energy and people to deal with this. It's setting them back on their heels a little. They're on the DEFENSE.

Q: And then someone might send a sheaf of these newspaper clippings to a Congressman. Someone who is part of the attack team might do that.

A: And again, you do some research. Who is the Congressman who, by his past actions, shows that he hates agency XYZ? Do you see? You're building a house. Bit by bit. You're not trying to take down the agency building with a scandal that overnight will rock the capitol. That's a B movie. You're doing it the right way.

Q: And you're telling the truth.

A: Frank Smith has a car repair business. And until last year he was carving out a living by working hard and keeping his nose clean. Frank and his wife Cindy have three little kids. They take a vacation once every four years because they're putting away money for the kids' education. Frank never went to college but he swore his kids would. Then, because of a change in a regulation that many people think is unfair, agency XYZ forced him to repay a loan right away and… now he's unable to attend PTA meetings anymore because he has to work 16 hours a day and even then, it looks like his business will close…. human interest.

Q: How does the PR team find out about Frank in the first place?

A: Yes. That's an important question. Maybe John Jones, in the next town over, knows him, and he gave you the contact. Or maybe a news story was already written about Frank and you find it, and you go over there and interview him for an update, and you get the story printed in a bigger paper. Because now Frank has lost his house and who knows, he could wind up on the street.

Q: And when you go over there to interview Frank, how do you represent yourself? How do you get the interview?

A: Any number of cover stories will do the trick. You tell him you represent a small group of people called The Lower East Valley Government Loan Abuse Coalition. You never tell that to reporters, though. Or you tell Frank you have a small church group that… I don't care what the hell you tell him. Find something that works in each case. Maybe the best thing to do would be, actually form an ad hoc group with a bland name that's real, and use it for getting some of the interviews. Make something work.

Q: Somewhere down the line you could end up with a Congressional hearing on agency XYZ.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: If you do, don't stop there. The hearings are just a front. Don't rely on the outcome. Keep the stories rolling.

Q: Because…

A: Because your goal is to put the agency on the defense. When they're putting out fires, they'll be more timid about persecuting people in general. They won't want "another John Jones mess." And by that time, if it gets to the point of a hearing, the whole scene will be different. Groups will be publicly formed up to take on agency XYZ. The crap will fly in on the agency from many directions. You created the bandwagon. Others will have jumped on it.

Q: Now suppose that agency XYZ is really corrupt from the get go. Suppose it shouldn't exist at all, and it was a violation of the Constitution from the start.

A: That's fine. Other people will concentrate on that. And by your work, that fundamental flaw will have more legs in the press. But without the human interest angle, pressed on very hard over and over, you are doomed.

Q: So really it's the public you're trying to get on your side.

A: No. You're trying to get agency XYZ to feel what they perceive or imagine is public pressure. There is actually almost no public pressure to do ANYTHING about ANYTHING. There is only an imaginary universe in which people can be made to believe that the public is rising up in arms.

Q: Well, sometimes the public does really rise up in arms. Millions of letters to Congress about the FDA trying to limit access to nutritional supplements, in the early 90s.

A: Okay. But remember, that resulted in a watered-down law that the FDA is still trying to dismantle, along with the Codex Commission. The people who ran THAT PR campaign against the FDA were shortsighted.

Q: I know. The trade organizations for the supplement industry declared victory.

A: It's never victory. It's just another stage in the battle.

Q: People might find that depressing.

A: I couldn't care less. Look at the medical cartel. Do they ever declare victory? From now until the end of time they'll be planting stories in the press about the latest medical advance that will make life better for every person in the world. Most of it is a lie, but that doesn't stop them. Until the planet is depopulated down to under a billion people and everyone left is a robot, these cartels are not going to

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

quit. And even then, with a lobotomized world, they'll still push their propaganda. This IS 1984, and people better realize it.

Q: But people can do something about it.

A: That's what we're talking about. But people are trained like seals to believe that a magical something is going to come down from the sky and make the world right in one day. Or one week. That's the problem. And behind that belief, there's a lot of fatigue. The idea is to cut through that fatigue. To show an offensive like this can work.

Q: Why should you care? You built a career working for the bad guys.

A: I told you in another interview. I only care on Mondays and Wednesdays. The rest of the week I don't give a damn.

Q: Somehow I don't believe that.

A: Believe what you want to.

Q: I think you've gotten a conscience.

A: Perhaps. But I also like to solve problems. I like to see what works.

Q: You also told me you think they've gone too far.

A: That's right. The medical cartel. They're planning to take over the mind to a degree… after which PR won't really matter. It'll all be mind control in a way that no self-respecting PR man could accept. No matter which side he worked for.

Q: So that's your motive.

A: I don't think much about motives. It never paid off for me. It was all about strategy and getting your point home.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

August 10, 2001

I gave the following briefing to Ellis to read and comment on. Here is the briefing followed by the interview.

MK BRIEFING #5: MIND CONTROL BY OPPOSITES

The MEDIA cartel has long fronted a strategy that involves making cartel surrogates into heroes and claiming that these surrogates really want to create a paradise on earth.

A recent example: In the face of mounting criticism and protest from groups around the planet against genetically engineered food, Time magazine has just put a story on its cover (July/2000) which makes the public believe that genetically engineered rice, donated to the Third World by Zeneca Corp. (a cartel surrogate), would allow a million children not to go blind from endemic vitamin A deficiency.

This rice, engineered with several non-rice genes, could provide beta-carotene, which would prevent the blindness.

However, behind this story are the real facts. Rice would become the spear for introducing all sorts of genetically modified food crops into the Third World, which, grown in huge agribusiness fields, would destroy the market for the small farmer who can grow food suitable for local environments—including leafy green vegetables which provide plenty of vitamin A. Further, in those areas where the poor eat virtually nothing except rice, people would get an oversupply of beta-carotene, and this would cause a number of very dangerous disease conditions. The real solution to blindness and other nutri-deficient illnesses is the encouragement of thousands of small farms all over the Third World. In other words, agricultural diversity. In other words, keeping out the huge agri-biz corporations. In other words, actions that would hinder the ops of the cartels.

Finally, as usual, no human health studies would be done to assess the overall effects of growing GE rice and eating it.

The CEO of Monsanto Corporation, several years ago, gave a well-publicized speech in which he presented a messianic view of his company's efforts to feed the world. Monsanto in truth is one of the major GE offenders, which offers the world food crops engineered to withstand huge amounts of its own herbicide, Roundup. This toxic chemical drenches growing fields and the GI tracts of the people eating the special GE food.

Making the criminal seem like the savior is cartel MEDIA business as usual.

So it is also with decades of media hype about men like JP Morgan, Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Mellon. Using a distorted picture of free-market capitalism as the leading idea, the media have portrayed these men as the very essence of what America is all about. In fact, these men have brought into being a repressive brand

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

of cooperation with the federal government which has allowed them to create vast monopolies. The opposite of freedom.

None of the above deceptions would be possible unless a stark equation had been planted in the minds of the public: AUTHORITY EQUALS FREEDOM.

"Listen to the authorities. Do what they say and you will be led into the sky of freedom."

This contradiction is pure cartel.

We have just emerged from a phase called the Cold War. What was that all about? Well, for Americans, it is summarized in the following ide

"In order to protect the American way of life, we must be strong. In order to be strong, we must obey our military and political leaders and do exactly what they say. National security must be placed above personal freedom."

In other words, let's pretend. Let's pretend that the conflict between America and the Soviet Union was real, that it was born in a difference of outlook about freedom and collective control.

In truth, the Cold War was staged at the highest level of the cartels. It was a cartel op.

This op was in the planning stage before World War 2 even started. The Cold War was pure George Orwell. If you have not read Orwell's novel, 1984, I strongly recommend you do so. The Cold War was a pristine cartel op which would cast two great enemies in the spotlight.

Both America and the USSR would justify enormous expenditures and the (further) curtailment of civil liberties on the basis that everything had to be subordinated to the struggle for victory. Lies would be told to the people of America and the USSR. Many lies. Both populations would be given grisly portraits of the enemy that would be unverifiable. Lost in all of this would be the simple fact that the citizens of America and the citizens of the USSR were not enemies of one another.

Through media and political manipulation, messages would be communicated to the American and Soviet citizens:

OBEY AUTHORITY. OBEDIENCE IS FREEDOM. SLAVERY IS FREEDOM. LIES ARE THE TRUTH. LIES ARE NECESSARY. VICTORY IS ALL. LIES WILL RESULT IN FREEDOM. THE ENEMY IS STUPID. THE ENEMY IS CLEVER. THE ENEMY IS TIRELESS. THE ENEMY IS STRONG. WE MUST BE STRONGER. OBEDIENCE IS STRENGTH.

And so on. One of the great purposes of the Cold War in America was the strengthening of the MEDIA cartel. All important information would come from the elite media. The public would be hypnotized to accept the media as the single vital

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

source of all-important information. That would set the stage for a future in which citizens would implicitly accept the pictures of reality presented by the media.

The Cold War was formed in order to plant the idea that THERE IS ALWAYS AN ENEMY.

The cartels operate on the basis that, in order to lead the mass of people, you must direct their emotions toward an enemy. That mobilizes people. That keeps them in line. Without an enemy, the people will soon grow tired of external control. They will naturally drift into more natural freedom. The cartels know they must derail this drift.

As the Cold War proceeded, it became apparent to the cartels that absolute control was slipping away from them. More and more people were becoming suspicious of arbitrary authority on all fronts. Financial, political, medical, informational.

Therefore, paradoxically, the solution became, end the Cold War. End the Cold War and create new enemies to feed the level of emotion in people that has been trained to focus on an enemy. Make new and better enemies.

Gorbachev, a cartel cutout who could be used for many ops, was set loose to bring down the Soviet Union—as the easiest way to end the Cold War.

Then came the new and improved War on Drugs, War on Cancer, War on Terrorism, in order to create new enemies. And, oh yes, the War on Crime. And the War on Killer Viruses. These new enemies would be thrust into the limbo surrounding the end of the Cold War.

The War on Drugs would be used as a cover story for funding elite military groups in the US and abroad who would supposedly crush the drug trade. In fact, these army groups abroad would aid dictator-governments in smashing incipient revolution in their countries, keeping cartel politicians in place. In the US, military troops would become a recognized presence in fighting drugs—even though such actions are against the law. The American federal police and the American military would begin to blend, making it difficult to tell the difference between one group and another. America would move closer to a military state.

The War on Cancer would become a means for elevating THE DOCTOR in people's eyes to the level of a supreme authority, a priest. This War would try to divert people from the fact that much cancer is caused by chemical companies and their products. This War would instill FEAR, fear of cancer and a possible cancer virus and a possible cancer gene.

Likewise, the War on Terrorism and the War on Crime would actually, through covert cartel ops, encourage crime and terrorism, and bring more fear into the lives of people.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Behind all this, the Orwellian world was being transformed by the cartels into a reality predicted by another great novel: Brave New World (Aldous Huxley). The cartels realized that in order to maintain a high level of control over people, it would be necessary to develop technology that would affect brains and human energy centers. Control through drugs, through brain-affecting drugs, through gene-insertion, through the use of electromagnetic energies—to induce certain "cooperative" behavior and the illusions of satisfaction and happiness, regardless of external circumstances. That is the cartel goal for the 21st century. The Brave New World.

AND NOW THE INTERVIEW...

Q: So what do you think about that briefing?

A: Well, it has relevance for me, because I was in the middle of the Cold War. I finally saw through to the level you are describing. You see, in one sense, the Cold War was very real. The 2 enemies really were enemies. The governments of the USSR and the US. They weren't fooling around.

Q: And on that level, what was your job basically?

A: For a while it was the planting of stories in the European press that would make the USSR look all bad and the government of the US look all good.

Q: You didn't choose this job.

A: Hell no. I was for hire. I was paid to do this. I was completely neutral.

Q: And then what happened?

A: I got an assignment to create a diversion.

Q: What type?

A: I have to be careful here. Let's just say that certain "free world" bigshots, people in government, were caught in a very compromising situation. A few men. This involved women, sex, kinky stuff, a cover-up, a couple of underage girls.

Q: And it was going to come out in the press?

A: Maybe. They were on very thin ice. They were calling in all sorts of markers to try to squelch it. The level of exposure was dangerous. Highly.

Q: And you were brought in?

A: I was. Other people in my trade were.

Q: How many?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Who the hell knows? They pulled out all the stops. But they couldn't involve too many people.

Q: What did you do?

A: I was working with a few other spinners. We were looking for a diversion, an event we could pump up that would shut people's mouths about THIS scandal. It was tricky. It couldn't just be any diversion. It had to look so serious people would say, "To expose the sex scandal could endanger the whole Cold War effort." See? It had to be that kind of thing, where people would feel very ashamed of breaking the sex story, because it would damage people who were high up in fighting the Cold War.

Q: And you found something?

A: No. I wasn't that high up in the food chain. It wasn't my place to create the plotline. I was making suggestions, but the orders came down from a man I'll just call my boss. My control.

Q: So someone else cooked up the story.

A: Yes.

Q: And what was the fake story?

A: Again, I have to be careful. But basically, it was a spin at a time when…the story was, the Russians had a lot more nuclear weapons than we thought they did. There were all sorts of sub-heads to that, but that was it.

Q: I see. So no one could buck that.

A: No one could breathe. It was too shocking. It was death. The West was caught with its pants down…but not on the sex scandal. Suddenly, EVERYBODY had to scramble and account for their stupidity at "not learning about this sooner." It was a wild few moments.

Q: And no one would break open the sex scandal.

A: Right. Because national security and a lot of other things seemed to be at stake. Suddenly, everybody got very sincere and very solemn, and all the high ideals and proclamations got dragged out there. These men who were involved in the sex business…they were right there taking their turn talking about the grave consequences of the new revelations about nuclear weapons and how we would all have to gather together and re-take the nuclear lead from Russia.

Q: In other words…

A: This was complex.

Q: But it wasn't true.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Not at that moment, no. It was pure crap. The US had a major lead in the arms race. The story was invented. And it played. It fed into a lot of other agendas, do you see? A lot of military people in the US, for example, wanted to hear this kind of thing. They were elated. It gave them carte blanche to keep playing the Cold War game to the hilt, at an even higher intensity. And the CIA ate some crow, which a lot of people in the US government and in England liked a great deal…because why didn't the CIA know about the Russian nuclear capability earlier? See? It was a very clever stroke.

Q: Ratchet up the Cold War.

A: You bet your ass. Military contractors in the US were beside themselves with joy. A lot of favors got paid back with that one story. At that particular moment.

Q: Was Kennedy president?

A: I'm not saying when this was.

Q: What about the Soviet reaction?

A: They were plenty pissed off. They knew the story was a fake, but they didn't know why it was floated. They thought it was just put out there as an excuse for the US to go faster in the military build-up, which was true. But they didn't know the inner mechanics of where this story came from and why. It was complex, because at that time there WERE people who wanted to float a nuclear story like this for the obvious reasons—to build up the US military even faster. Spend more money. All that.

Q: How did you feel?

A: Like a man who had done a great job. I used every source I had in Europe and elsewhere to get this story full play in the press, and it involved a few preliminary leaks, you see, which made it seem that the whole story would have to come out, couldn't be hidden, couldn't be stopped.

Q: You worked it gradually.

A: Yes, but within a very short time. It was hyper-space. All within a week once the green light was given.

Q: And the sex scandal was squelched.

A: Completely.

Q: And everybody was happy.

A: Just about.

Q: So then what happened?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: I discovered that one of these men who was about to be exposed for kinky activities…he was actually a double.

Q: A double agent?

A: You could call it that. That's what I thought at first, because of the people who were involved in the sex situation. The relevant personnel. But then I found that he was much bigger than that.

Q: Meaning?

A: His government position in the West AND his apparent treachery in working for the Russians…they were both fronts. He was tied into other people who had another agenda entirely. I can't spell this out for you, but it was basically….you walk down the street and you think it's a sunny day and then you think it's raining and then you find out somebody is really controlling the weather, whatever it is. Doesn't make any difference.

Q: I see.

A: I realized that this man was working for people who were supporting BOTH sides in the Cold War. That's the best way I can put it.

Q: That must have been quite a revelation at the time.

A: To say the least. I was very confused for about a month. Now, I'm not saying this was the only way I found out about the real game, but it was a major step up in my knowledge.

Q: So…

A: So there I had been, basically working for the West. I knew the outlines of that game. Then I found out this was all wrong at a higher level. Something much bigger was going on.

Q: And how did you find out about this "double?"

A: Let me put it this way. I was led to that.

Q: You were led.

A: Yes. Because of my job in spinning the nuclear story, and because I knew about the sex scandal, I came to know something about the man in question…but although it seemed to me that I was finding out on my own that this man was working for others with a bigger [and] far stranger agenda, I was really being fed information to bring me to this higher echelon…by whom I won't say. I was, in a sense, being tested. Tested to see what my reaction would be when I saw through the veil.

Q: Why?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Because they wanted me for other work. Because I was very good at what I did. They had even bigger fish to fry, and they wanted to see whether, if they fed me something that would open my eyes but wouldn't really incriminate them…whether I would handle it, or whether I would balk and run.

Q: And you were thrown for a loop at first.

A: It took me about a month to see the picture I'm summing up for you here. It was a very hectic time. I was working non-stop. I was earning my pay.

Q: Spell out this "higher game."

A: The cartels were using and creating and bolstering the Cold War as a means to an end. Making what you could call the enemy-game a part of the human psyche at such a level that it would maintain itself as a living myth that could be tapped into at any time with any enemies inserted into the line-up. The enemies-game is as old as time itself. But this was the version of the moment. To install a rigid sense of national security as the overriding factor that would damn well justify the deflating of individual freedom on many fronts. Make national security the thing you couldn't refuse. And you see, it worked on the political players because the sex scandal went away. So how do you think it worked on the ignorant public? Like gangbusters.

Q: Because the enemy is so strong, we must all pull together and sacrifice…give up our freedom to object.

A: Sure. And that PLAYED. Until about 1966.

Q: So the Cold War was…

A: Was, "Eyes straight ahead. March. Don't waver. Fight to the death for our freedom against the enemy." Meanwhile freedom is diminishing BECAUSE we're all marching in lock-step.

Q: Orwell.

A: Straight out of Orwell.

Q: You've told me you studied that book.

A: I read it maybe twenty times. It was one of my Bibles. How to turn everything into its opposite.

Q: So how did you graduate into this new level of operation as a propagandist?

A: Slowly, at first. They gave me new kinds of stories to plant. They put me into a whole different area. They wanted to see how I would handle knowing that something else was going on. Something bigger.

Q: And what was this new area?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Medical.

Q: Right.

A: The 21st century, as we've discussed many times, is the progression from 1984 to Brave New World. Those are the two books. I could take a bunch of graduate students and use those two books and show them the blueprint for the Plan.

Q: In the sense that…

A: Once you fatigue people enough with the strategies of 1984, they are set up for the medicalization of society. Which is the brain stuff. The altering of the human brain with drugs and other approaches. Genes, perhaps. A brain-machine linkup. Creating a different perception of reality. Externally applied electromagnetic fields. In which people will feel happy even though they are slaves. You see, in 1984 it's really all about hysteria. The people are being driven into the wall with lies about wars and lies about enemies and lies about political structure, and the control over individuals is very harsh, and the leaders are not looking to create real happiness, not the fluffy stuff. Redemption, yes. Forgiveness, perhaps. The people are being fed pain and big brother is commanding them like a drill sergeant through their TV sets. But after that, after people sink into an acceptance of the delusions that are being foisted on them, then comes the science. The making of some kind of replica of happiness. The old order is 1984. You can call that the Plan from the dawn of time to about 1945. After that is the transition to Brave New World.

Q: And that's why the medical cartel is the prince of the cartels.

A: The prince, the king.

Q: 1984…

A: Leaves people with no moral conviction. It runs over that like a freight-train. 1984 is dark. Brave New World is sunny and light and the control is applied so that the interior life changes.

Q: So you worked on medical stories.

A: Yes. Making the medical cartel look good, look humane, look rational, look like excellent science that works. Especially psychiatry and neurology. And pharmacology. That became a major job for me. Because…they're experimenting on the human race, and they want their horrible mistakes which are legion, to look like advances and good science at every step until they get it right, until they have your brain in their hands from cradle to grave.

Q: In 1984 they take away freedom.

A: They step on it with big boots. They crush it. And while this is happening they're transitioning over to Brave New World. Orwell was showing us the political side, the creation of the enemies and the wars manipulated in the dark, just like the

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Cold War, so that people had to have faith that they were on the right side. They had to believe, because their rational minds couldn't deal with it. There was nothing to deal with. You couldn't tell the truth from the lies. It was impossible. And 1984 was MKULTRA. Inducing the fear. Finding the fear points and pressing on them.

Q: So you were accepted in this new echelon.

A: Yes, but I wasn't given any of this structure I'm giving you. I had to figure it out. All they wanted to know was, I could do the work. I wouldn't back away. I would plant lies of another order, another type. And they wanted me to know just one thing—that there was another level to the game.

Q: Why did they want you to know that?

A: So that I would understand that at this new level, the power over me was at least as strong as the power that was over me in my other previous role. And they like to play little games. They like to see what certain people will do when they get a glimpse of what's beyond the curtain. They like to show off a little.

Q: And if you had balked?

A: I wouldn't have. Once I was shown a little of the Beyond, I was their man. I was controlled. You don't say no. They had vetted me, and they hoped I would turn out all right. And I did. But they could have thrown me out the door in a variety of ways, and I wouldn't have been able to expose them to harm, even if I had wanted to. Not from my position.

Q: Because no one would have believed you.

A: No one. The average person, really, has more power than I had. Power to change the situation.

Q: Many people won't accept that the USSR and the USA were just mirror images.

A: Yeah. Well, the US WAS better, and more free, and had a better foundation. Much, much better. It was a whole different place. But what I'm saying is, that doesn't matter. It matters a hell of a lot, but the cartels just use both countries to reduce them to pawns in the 1984 game, that's what I'm telling you, and the Brave New World Plan won't care about nations at all. Brave New World is floated out there as a solution to the untenable and impossible situation of conflict and wars between enemies. The enemies are natural enemies, sure, and America does stand for freedom, although we can see how much that has faded, and the USSR did stand for much more overt control…but from the cartels' point of view, that's just the material they had to work with. Do you see? What the hell do they care whether America was a better nation founded on real ideals? It's a joke to them. It's just MATERIAL to work with. In the 1984 phase, they exacerbate the conflicts between these countries, they work those conflicts to death, and then they launch the ANSWER.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Brave New World.

A: Yeah. So that's what I was working for. And like I told you before, in another interview, the Brave New World…it finally disgusted me.

Q: And the sex story. What about the people involved?

A: The major players are dead now.

Q: Of natural causes?

A: Yes.

Q: During the Cold War, the world could have blown up.

A: The cartels were playing right on the brink. They had more control than anyone knows, but it was still there as a possibility. It still is there, with these weapons. So the rush is on to get the medical cartel more and more power.

Q: The science of the atomic bomb…of chemical warfare…

A: That was a given, it was a development that was there and it was going to happen. Controlling it and using it to the advantage of the cartels…they used it.

Q: Do you know much about how the propaganda game is played vis-à-vis the educational system?

A: Do you want to talk for another 50 years?

Q: What can you tell me?

A: They've got some sharp people. It's another layered operation. Many layers of PR. The main idea is, how do you convince people that public education is more than a sick joke? How do you make it credible.

Q: Like modern medicine.

A: Yeah. Studies, task forces, so-called technology, and meanwhile the Titanic is sinking. You showed me something, a test that eighth graders took in the early 20th century in the Midwest? And maybe 1 in 100,000 kids in 8th grade could get a decent score on it today?

Q: More like 1 in a million.

A: Yeah. I knew a few people a long time ago…they did PR in this area. They were putting together the powerful unions. Stumping for it. It's pathetic. I look at passion. Go to the colleges today and try to find it. It's like looking at a disease. There is no real passion. Except maybe in the sciences…and there they're operating on a false base.

Q: What do you mean?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Look, it's ALL about PR. Take Tesla, Royal Rife, this doctor, Koch, you've been writing about. They were buried by PR operations put together by people who knew what they were doing. So you get a wipe-out of the real knowledge, the real potential breakthroughs, and then on top of that you have kids learning about science that can't be the latest thing, because the latest thing was buried 70 years ago. It…an analogy would be someone studying how to play the violin by using his elbows, after the actual way to play the damn thing had been discredited for some reason or another. Do you see?

Q: And in the public schools?

A: They say, "Look, we have kids who can go to college and they have social skills, they can get along, they know a few things." The PR people do a dance, and yet when you make a kid sit down and write something, it looks like a spider dipped in ink was let loose on the page. To allow that takes PR. You have to spin it. You have to account for it and excuse it and say it's better than nothing. You have to say a lot of things, and then you have to outright lie too. But beyond that, you have to understand that the lesser IQ and lesser ability is like a planned state. It's planned to work out that way. The teachers and the school people---they're really the pawns. They work in the dark. They try. But way above them, planned lower IQ and ability…they are implemented like a train wreck might be planned. You move the train on to the wrong track over time, and you supply PR to make it seem like it's all right. The PR is the glue that makes people believe it's the best that can be done, or something like that.

I could get into a lot more detail, because I know something about curriculum, how you can make a method and an outcome look intelligent when really, underneath, the kid has very shaky basic skills. You can make this kid look like he's sophisticated when he really isn't. You feed him ideas that are pretty impressive on some level, and he finds a way to paraphrase that in his mind, and he makes you think he's very smart to the ways of the world and what's important…but really he's not. He's subtly programmed. He knows that something bad is going on with trees dying of diseases, and he can talk about that, but really he can't do the English. Not really. He can't. He's a nice child and he has a good heart, but he is programmed.

…you've seen kids like this. They seem to be wise beyond their years, but because some central element is missing from their learning, they are handicapped. They have to choose what they're choosing. They are directed. They are fed a given theme and they are plumped up with some nice ideas about that theme and they can converse about it…but it doesn't come from them. Not really.

…you see, in some respects the content of their education IS PR. They [the students] skate along on this, and they work it, and they just can't do any more than that. They are limited. They can't get a book and read it and think about it, not without using those ideas which were fed to them beforehand. And what people don't realize is, this is the plan. This is put into motion. It's not so hard to accomplish. You work hard and you make that the order of the day. And from that point on, the

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

kid, on a subconscious level, believes that everything is like that, everything is two-dimensional. And you get a nice android. This is mind control. The kid is trying to build a house and the thing won't totally stand up and he is programmed not to believe that the house will fall. He is programmed to believe that the house is all right, that it's the most modern house possible. And it IS a modern house but…inside himself the kid feels that something is wrong. It nags at him. He never read a book and thought about it on his own because he can't really read. Not well enough. It can be subtle. He looks like he can read, he can pass certain shaped tests, he sort of knows what the book said, but a connection is missing. A dimension isn't there because he…isn't good enough at it. Almost everyone suffers from this, but it's a matter of degrees. A link is never made.

I'm not necessarily talking about spitting back information. I'm not talking about the plot of the book. I'm not talking about being able to learn how to do something from the instructions in a book. I'm not even talking about that. I'm talking about…the book is not ACTUAL to this kid, it isn't all there for him because he has been taught in such a way that he will become an obedient person. Obedient to whatever. To good ideas, to good thinking, to good feeling. All that is subtly entered into him. This is not like a parent he is close to teaching him what is right…this is more like an absence. The way of the teacher has been altered.

The curriculum, as I say, has been turned into a sophisticated form of PR. Better to memorize a poem than learn how to talk about it when the learning is entered into you, when the whole system is a subtle form of getting you to believe this and that. Better to say, this is it, learn it, memorize it, give me the facts, that's better than convincing a kid that he is getting the latest ideas and that THEREFORE he is on the cutting edge.

The education system is turning out two-dimensional kids. The cartels damn well know this, and they make sure it proceeds along that avenue. Two-dimensional kids are easy to deal with, whether they turn out to obedient or disobedient. They're a small storm in a small bottle.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

September 28, 2001

Ellis views reality as a series of false portraits painted for the people by pros. In this interview, he talks about the 9/11 events and the aftermath.

Q: Where do we start?

A: We start by admitting that we may know nothing.

Q: That's your motto, isn't it?

A: Has to be. Otherwise we're sunk.

Q: What about the attack itself?

A: The perpetrators, whoever they were, are dead.

Q: Do you trust the FBI?

A: Are you kidding?

Q: They often lie.

A: The field agents follow orders, and they work the investigation as it is defined by the higher-ups. They are told what to look for, and when they find "contradictory" evidence, it is shipped off and hidden. That's how that works. That's how it worked in Oklahoma City. That's how it worked in the RFK assassination and the JFK assassination. The FBI is a political police. Let's get that straight. They are only in the business of discovering the truth when they are told to. It is a political police force, as one would expect, since the Constitution makes no provision for its existence. It was added for the express purpose of carrying out slanted investigations, for managing crime scenes, as far as I'm concerned. They manage data. That's their actual job. They are a wing of the government cartel, and they serve it. They plant evidence. They have survived as an agency in the past by blackmailing people. Hoover had evidence of the sexual affairs of JFK and RFK and he used it to maintain his power. Of course, the mafia had evidence that Hoover was a homosexual, and the mob used that to keep Hoover in his place—which is to say, Hoover made a habit of denying that organized crime even existed. He took that position because the mob had him blackmailed seven ways from Sunday. So we are talking about an agency that has been corrupt for a long time. Planting evidence, ignoring evidence. It's a certain skill. Sooner or later the young agents learn the realities, but they practice an extreme form of denial. You know, patriotism above all. National security above all. "I guess I was wrong. Poppa knows best."

Q: How has the 9/11 tragedy been spun?

A: First, bin Laden has been characterized as a madman. This follows in line with the famous lone-nut theory.

Q: Whereas the truth is…

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: He is a highly skilled operative. He is, in his own way, a general. I have spoken with several reporters who have interviewed him. They say he has always had a plan. A long-range plan. As you've written, this is a man who has had no country, no army, no single political base. And yet he has managed to put the world on the defensive.

Q: And the truth about him has been concealed because…

A: Forget because for now. Look at how. HOW. Stories in the press. That's how. The International Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, the NY Times…they have floated stories about him over the years. Bin Laden the bomber, the insane man, the man out to get revenge on innocent people. Forget morality for a moment. Just realize the characterization is false. He is a planner. He may be an insane planner, but insane gets you nowhere in understanding him. Planner gets you somewhere. I KNOW that in the past stories about this aspect of his character—the planner—have been suppressed.

Q: Why?

A: To keep the public from realizing that the US should have taken him out many times. To keep the public from realizing that for years control of Saudi Arabia has been his goal. If that truth were known, the US would have been forced to take him out, and the US was stopped from doing that.

Q: Stopped by whom?

A: By the energy cartel, which was using him as wild card—which he is NOT—in order to keep people focused on oil as the central game. Bin Laden has been painted as a symbol of the vague uncertainty of oil supply. He is that symbol. The energy cartel has wanted oil to be uncertain in the minds of the public, so that it, the cartel, could be seen as the good guy, the guy on the white horse, the group that holds fate in its hands. In that regard, bin Laden was very useful. Psychologically, a subliminal equation has been planted in the minds of the public: a bomb thrown equals the uncertainty of oil supply. This is not on the surface. This is below the surface. A bomb thrown in a café in Germany equals bin Laden equals terrorism equals the Middle East equals the uncertainty of the oil supply equals the necessity of trusting the energy cartel which gets that oil to the people. It's an old formula.

A: MAKE THE PUBLIC BELIEVE THAT WHAT IT NEEDS TO SURVIVE IS UNCERTAIN, IS NOT GUARANTEED, AND THEREFORE THE PUBLIC MUST TRUST THE AUTHORITIES WHO PROVIDE THAT ESSENTIAL SURVIVAL-COMMODITY. This is important stuff I'm telling you. It's the ultimate tease. It's the WATCH OUT factor. It works in all sorts of ways. Let me make a leap to another subject. Sex. For the past 30 years, since 1965 in America, sex has been shown to American men in millions of ways, millions of tantalizing ways. Men have come to believe that it is absolutely necessary to have some of this sex for the survival of their self-image. But how do you get it? What do you have to do? And the answer is, you have to figure out how to behave, how to talk to women, how to get drugs to give women,

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

how to have a nice apartment for women to go to, how to dress, how to act, how to think, how to present yourself. How to get around the specter of AIDS with women, how to drink alcohol, what brands, in what quantity, how to smoke, how to hold the cigarette, how to seduce, how to pretend, how to fake, how to buy a watch that sparkles on your wrist, what ring to wear, what kind of car to drive, whether you should act smart or stupid, whether you should be sympathetic to women or macho, whether you should wear a track suit or a tuxedo, whether you should buy flowers or cocaine. YOU ESTABLISH THE UNCERTAINTY OF A COMMODITY, and then you come in behind that with the authority who can get the commodity for you. In the case of sex the authority is BEHAVIORISM, a vague shadowy thing that has no face or real name, but men begin to mythologize this authority (just as people do with the energy cartel, another vague and shadowy entity), and men begin to believe that they must get sex by BEHAVING, which in part means CONSUMING and buying products, and then they will get what they have been teased endlessly into NEEDING DESPERATELY. It's the same game. And it is run as an OP. I used to have friends in the ad game who were psychologists, and they worked that game to the nth degree. In the case of oil, bin Laden was the tease factor. That's what he was used for. AND THEREFORE, HE COULD NOT HAVE BEEN PRESENTED TO THE PEOPLE AS SOME KIND OF GENERAL OUT THERE PLANNING A LONG CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE WEST. HE COULD NOT HAVE BEEN PRESENTED AS A PLANNER. THE PRESS HAD TO WORK HIM AS A CRAZY WILD CARD, AS THE HERALD OF UNCERTAINTY, THE LONE NUT WHO COULD GO OFF HIS ROCKER AT ANY TIME. In order to create the uncertainty factor about oil. It's an op, pure and simple, and the reporters who have written thousands of stories about him…those reporters have simply fallen under the spell of the main floated premises about bin Laden. But most reporters always fall under the spell. They work that way. They take a premise and they don't ask where it comes from, and they run with it. It's easy. They take the path of least resistance, and if they don't do that, they end up writing occasional editorials on op-ed pages and no one pays them any attention or decent money. But the premises, the PREMISES, they would come from people like me. That was part of my job. I wouldn't invent the premises myself, I would get a word from my "boss," my contractor, and then I as the sub-contractor would contact the so-called reliable sources of these reporters, and I would have meetings with these sources, and I would give them interesting details about a subject, details which embodied the PREMISE, and then those sources would pass that stuff on to the reporters. Down the food chain it goes. And pretty soon the PREMISE about, say, a bin Laden, is "common knowledge," and everyone believes it. Even within the CIA, this premise is floated, and the people there, just like the FBI field agents who get their marching orders on a case—these CIA people begin to investigate bin Laden from that point of view. You see? The people who originate the PREMISES, they create reality. Because you can find out facts which will support ANY central reality. So bin Laden becomes the wild lunatic who strikes at random because he's crazy—AND EVERYBODY AND HIS BROTHER INVESTIGATE HIM AND SEE HIM FROM THAT POINT OF VIEW, FROM THE GROUND OF THAT PREMISE. And within, say, the CIA, if an analyst tries to change the central premise and says, "Hey, you know what, this guy is planning everything, it all has a pattern and all roads lead back to Saudi

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Arabia," or something like that…that analyst is marginalized. He becomes placed off to the side. He is the "minority opinion," at best, and he is slid down lower on the scale of important people. And if he keeps up his protests, he is transferred out to a less important case. Just look at the American press over the last ten years on this guy [bin Laden]. Only now, reluctantly, are a few writers saying this nut case really has had an overall agenda that has cohesion in its details. LONG after the horse is out of the barn.

Q: What about the people who float the premise in the first place?

A: They are the reality shapers. That's what they do. They figure out how to position a symbol in the subconscious of the public. What that symbol will look like. What it will do. What effect it will have. They're looking at cause and effect on a sociological level. They're following the time-honored practice of the creation of symbols of people the public will never actually meet. Stereotype is too vague a word. This is pretty precise stuff I'm talking about here. It starts, for example, here: WHAT UNCERTAINTY DO WE WANT TO CREATE? See? WHAT DO WE WANT TO DO, WHAT EQUATION DO WE WANT TO MANUFACTURE IN THE SUBCONCIOUS OF THE PUBLIC? And this all goes back to the conviction that the public is a machine that can't think for itself. Therefore freedom doesn't exist. Therefore the public has to be shown what to think, BUT THE PUBLIC CAN'T KNOW WHAT IT'S REALLY THINKING, THE PUBLIC JUST HAS TO ACT ON THE BASIS OF WHAT ITS SUBLIMINAL REALITY IS THINKING FOR IT. THINKING FOR IT. JUST LIKE A MACHINE. But you see how it's done. This is so important because it shows how you can take whole agencies and set them off on the wrong track. The wrong premise. That was my bread and butter.

Q: But even the CIA…

A: I'll get back to them. Let's stick with bin Laden, the symbol. For the reasons I've described, the energy cartel wants him perceived as a nut case who can strike anywhere at any time because his brain is miswired. And so that premise comes down from above TO THE GOVERNMENT. Get the sequence here? IT DOESN'T START WITH GOVERNMENT. They're in the middle of the ladder. The cartel is on top and the government is in the middle. The cartel runs the show. The CIA is a helper for the cartel. It helps the cartel. But the sequence begins at the top with the energy cartel. If you don't know this, you're operating in the dark. You have no chance. The people who ran me, they were cutouts for one cartel or another. They were from, say, the Council on Foreign Relations, or WHO, or maybe the IMF. See? I never worked for the government per se. I was operating outside that whole command structure. In essence, I had a job that very few people even knew existed. Think about it. Just use a little common sense. You've got this guy, bin Laden, and his father was a bigshot in Saudi Arabia, a construction guy. He once got a King banished. (laughs) So he was big. And he has a few billion dollars. Now his son, Osama, is living there in 1991, and the US puts in a strong military presence, and Osama is insulted. His country, and US troops are walking around there, and Osama thinks Saudi Arabia should be a holy Islamic country. So he rebels and he shoots off

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

his mouth, and a few things happen. He leaves. He's disowned by his family, but he leaves with 300 million dollars. This is a highly educated man. He wants to start a war against US and he wants to win back his country. The intelligence on him…any idiot could figure it out. This is not exactly your lone nut. He is connected. So right there you know that you're dealing with someone who has potential for danger. So how come the intelligence in the ensuing years doesn't reflect this? Because the intelligence is perverted. It's skewed from the PREMISE THAT COMES FROM ABOVE. You see, you can paint a picture of anyone or any group just the way you want to. Take the CIA itself. What's the popular conception of the Agency? You just saw the show last night, the first show on CBS, The Agency. What was that about? The Agency has made a lot of blunders. It tried to assassinate Castro 40 times and it failed. Blunders. Bumblers. See? Honest people who try hard, but they do screw up. But then, really, if you throw all that crap away, and go back to Nicaragua in the 1980s, you find out that the CIA wrote a manual for the so-called Contras on how to do guerilla warfare against the Sandinistas, and the more you read that manual, the more you realize that this was a SYSTEMATIC program for destroying the Sandinistas. It involved the arrest, torture, and murder of key types in the society. Agricultural people, teachers, health workers, and so on. It was a careful plan. It was a warfare terrorist plan. Take out the key pillars of the society and it collapses. This was not bumbling. This was not blundering. This was not the public image.

Q: So was bin Laden involved in the 9/11 attacks?

A: Was the Vatican directly involved in a war against Martin Luther? They used cutouts. The Jesuits. It's the same deal. Bin Laden created a machinery of people and cells who could go anywhere and destroy anything. Once he set up that it could carry out long range plans and attack specific targets. So the answer is yes. But with a huge network that involves Iran, Iraq, Syria, and so on, and you've got some old Soviet influence in there too, it's like tracking down the Jesuit priests who attacked Martin Luther. You're working way down the ladder of influence. And bin Laden had some people working for him as lieutenants, and they could have mounted the 9/11 attack on their own.

Q: It's like the JFK assassination.

A: A network of people who have their own agendas and motives, and they're all woven into a long-range plan. From above. The WEAVE tells you that. You don't spontaneously get middle-level groups who suddenly all veer in on the same target. That's ridiculous. That's not history, it's fantasy.

Q: Now we have all sorts of stories in the press about many terrorists being investigated and pursued for their potential role in the 9/11 attacks.

A: Let me tell you how this works. First, you have the FBI and other police forces around the world making arrests. This is news. This is the minute tiny level of news. This gives you a spread. The public thinks, wow, these guys are busy. They're doing something. That assuages the public. That keeps them well fed. Most

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

of these people they're arresting are not involved. A few are. But it doesn't matter. What matters is the sense that the FBI is on the case. Hey, they just arrested McVeigh. Wow. Two hours after the bombing and they've got the man. Helluva job. They're quick. It's over. You don't hear "WE HAVE NO IDEA WHAT THE HELL HAPPENED." You don't hear that. You don't hear about AN ABSENCE of information. Information has to flow. That's the first rule of propaganda at that level. Information must flow. It must look like things are getting done. This is the OVERRIDING rule. Contradictions are fine. Who cares? The pilots are all dead and they used fake ID but we pretty much know who they were. No word about bodies recovered or fingerprints or DNA or anything like that. Just the overall impression that the FBI knows who the pilots were. They have airport video, they have Korans from hotel rooms, they have crop-duster manuals, they have airline flight manuals in hotel rooms. That's the impression. We are being fed. We are being given enough. It's enough. It's like the lake in the French painting that is really five thousand brush strokes when you get close. But who cares? If you back up ten steps it looks like a lake. Everything is okay. Now some of this FBI information is good information. But a lot isn't. It doesn't matter and it won't matter because even if they pinpoint some of these dead guys, it isn't going to get to the root of the operation. Everybody really knows that, but no one says it. YOU ARE NOT GOING TO GET A FIRM TRACE THAT LEADS FROM THE DEAD GUYS TO THE MASTERMIND WHO IS LIVING IN A HOTEL IN ALGIERS OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. See? With a few second's thought, anyone would see that. But people in the public don't see it because they're being assaulted with lots of very low-level information that has to do with suspects and evidence and that's all anyone wants right now. I have been involved in PR ops like this before. I know how it's done. AIDS is the issue? Let's get pictures of people dying, lots of people and empty huts because everyone is dead, and let's get statements from the medical people about the plague that is sweeping everybody away, and let's get something from a government official in Uganda, and some shots of hospitals from the outside---let's barrage the public with all this and some stuff too about HIV and how it works, and the vaccine in progress, and in five seconds the public has the picture, the impression. That's all you want. And then no one says, "But does HIV really cause AIDS?" No one says that. They are drowning in information. So if tomorrow Bush says, "Bin Laden is not merely the suspect, he IS the mastermind, he is THE DEFINITE ABSOLUTE MAN," it's over. There will be grumbling, and analysts will keep saying Iran and Iraq and Syria, but Bush will simply say yes, they're terrorists too. And it's done. BUT VERY FEW PEOPLE WILL SAY, WHAT ABOUT BIN LADEN THE GENERAL, THE PLANNER, THE MAN WHO HAS BEEN WAGING A TOTAL WAR TO TAKE BACK SAUDI ARABIA, WHY DIDN'T WE PURSUE AND DESTROY HIM ON THAT BASIS LONG AGO SINCE HE WAS A GENERAL IN THE FIELD WAGING A COHERENT DEFINABLE WAR AGAINST THE WEST? WHY WAS HE LET LOOSE TO ROAM? WHAT IS HE A SYMBOL FOR? WHO MADE THE SYMBOL? AND THESE ARE NOT ACADEMIC QUESTIONS. NOT AT ALL. BECAUSE ANSWERING THEM LEADS YOU TO THE ENERGY CARTEL AND THE INTELLIGENCE CARTEL AND THE PEOPLE WHO ARE DEVISING AND SHAPING THE WHOLE PICTURE OF REALITY WHICH IS STILL IN EXISTENCE. THAT PICTURE IS

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

THE WAR FOR THE MINDS OF PEOPLE AND IT KEEPS THE WAR, THE TRUE WAR, GOING.

Q: And if you don't answer the real questions?

A: You lose. You never get past the first few layers. Now, if you read and study history, you find out that in every case of these events, like the attacks two weeks ago, you get the IMMEDIATE RESPONSE, AND PEOPLE SAY WE MUST RESPOND RIGHT AWAY AND THEY ARE RIGHT ON ONE LEVEL, BUT CURIOUSLY YOU NEVER GET THE FOLLOW-UP. IT'S LIKE THAT WHOLE SEX BUSINESS. THE KID SAYS, I DON'T CARE, I HAVE TO HAVE SEX RIGHT NOW, WE'LL FIND OUT LATER HOW I'M BEING MANIPULATED BY MY YOU KNOW WHAT, LATER ON WE'LL SEE ABOUT THE FINER POINTS--BUT THE OVERALL OP, THE PROPAGANDA MIND CONTROL OP STAYS HIDDEN, THAT'S THE WAY IT ALWAYS WORKS OUT. ALWAYS. LATER ON THE HISTORIANS DEBATE THE FINER POINTS AND NO ONE REALLY CARES, AND THE SAME CARTELS STAY IJN POWER AND THEN YOU GET ANOTHER OUTBREAK AT A DIFFERENT PLACE AND NO ONE CONNECTS THE DOTS. THEY THINK IT'S EVENT 23567 WHICH IS DIFFERENT FROM EVENT 4352, BUT IT ISN'T. IT'S THE SAME STRATEGY. THIS ISN'T MAGIC. THIS IS HOW PROPAGANDA WORKS. And in this sense, all the FBI arrests and releases to the press, they serve a VERY important function. They PROPEL the immediate solution, which is the only solution. And even if Bush does try to make good his promise to track down terrorism everywhere in the world, it's all on the same level. It's guy A and guy B and cell 4 and outpost 12 and training camp 16 and cave 7. It's all on the same level. Even countries are really on the same level.

Q: So terrorism is controlled from above.

A: Terrorism IS mind control. It's supported by the cartels for various reasons. It's for the purpose of guess what, TERRORIZING PEOPLE. Big surprise. The loss of freedom. The imposition, by degrees, of a de facto military state. It's "we must fight the enemy forever and here is the latest report from the battlefield." Pretty soon whether you call it that or not, you DO HAVE A MILITARY STATE. But…and this is very important, you are conditioning people to accept little battlefield reports as the whole picture. Battle X, attack Q, assault V. You get people conditioned to the press reports on this level. And they feed on that. It becomes the daily diet. That was World War 2. Every day a new battlefield report. Nothing about the men who were supporting and financing both sides. Nothing. Just battlefield reports. Like in my example about AIDS. See? Same thing. This village wiped out, and that gay man, and this innocent person who just had a blood transfusion and that bathhouse and this country which has suddenly seen an explosion of AIDS. Battlefield reports. I learned that early on in my career. Run an OP by giving the press battlefield. That's what they want. At that level, you tap into the public fascination with cops and robbers. He did that crime, they pursued him, they finally caught him. Well, we bombed Iraq today. We bombed Iran. We attacked a serious terrorist cell in Miami. Battlefield. Except new terrorists rise up. Now, with nuclear weapons on the loose, you're dangling on the end of a very short string.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: And government leaders?

A: Most of them are without a real clue. They are woven into the cartel structure, into the cartel storefronts like the Council on Foreign Relations and the Bilderbergers. They are swatting the flies paid for by cutouts who ultimately represent the cartels…the press has alarge amount of leeway in covering an event like the 9/11 attack IF IT DOES NOT TRY TO ONNECT THE DOTS AT ANY LEVEL. For example, I'll bet you a nickel you will not see a story which connects the dots between "prior warning" and "government sting operation" in this case.

Q: What do you mean?

A: Look, since we don't really know what happened, let's return to the 1993 World trade Center bombing. There, the FBI had this mole inside the operation. Salem. He was told…

Q: To place inert materials in the bomb. The FBI told him that. I know.

A: Yes. He taped conversations with his higher-up in the FBI about this. Then the FBI said forget it, don't put the inert materials in there. And the bomb went off in the WTC and killed people. The NY Times ran a story about this.

Q: I spoke with the NY Times reporter who wrote that story. He wouldn't say anything.

A: Why would he? His job was on the line. But what about connect the dots? What about asking what happened between the time Salem was told not to ad the inert materials and the day of the bombing itself? This story was killed deader than a doornail. It was run and then it was killed. So we have to ask now, what exact prior warning did the FBI or the CIA have about 9/11 and what did they do about it? But no reporter is trying to get at that. The climate is impossible for that.

Q: The story about Salem is quite incredible.

A: It certainly is. And yet, no real follow-up. I spoke with a CNN reporter who told me it was completely out of bounds. They wouldn't touch it. The dominant paradigm is: These things just don't happen. You don't get the FBI being responsible for the first bombing at the WTC. By definition it can't be real. Therefore it ISN'T real. End of story. It's like daddy having sex with his daughter. It couldn't happen until it does.

Q: Same with the OKC bombing.

A: There has been a terrorist cell operating in OKC for some time. And yet it was never investigated after the bombing in any serious way. You have witness tampering down there. But it couldn't have happened, therefore it didn't. Daddy wouldn't do that. The cartels count on this factor of extreme disbelief for the success of their operations.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: What else?

A: Let's go back to that period when the CIA, through its cutout, the Pakistan intelligence service, was arming and training bin Laden in Afghanistan. I know something about that. From speaking with several sources, one in the press, I learned that the CIA knew exactly what they were getting into. They knew that bin Laden and others like him were extremely dangerous to the West. This was not some form of blindness. This one reporter for a wire service tried to get an assignment, early on, to expose this while it was happening. He had good evidence. He was talking to the right people. His bosses were very reluctant to have him go on this story. Then one day he was yanked out of there. He was given another assignment in another faraway place. That was the end of it. The reporter tried to write a book. He got no takers. He was shut out on every front. But when you realize that the CIA is actually a cutout for a global intelligence cartel that is linked up to other cartels, you begin to see that, in a very precise way, the CIA was tasked with effort of having all that heroin out of Afghanistan end up on the streets of the USA. It was, in fact, part of their job. But THAT goes against the dominant paradigm. It couldn't have happened. Therefore it didn't. Suppose you had a murder case, and the judge finds out that the prosecutor at one time had trained and funded the murder suspect. Don't you think the judge would throw up his lunch right on his desk? But people make all sorts of excuses for these "happenings." People will say and do almost anything to avoid looking straight at the situation. They will say that very smart people are actually stupid. They'll say that the moon is the sun. That's how people like me stayed in business. We could walk into a village in Africa where the water is filthy and practically kills you when you look at it, and no one has any food, and no one has a job, and we could say all the deaths were because of a new virus no one had ever heard of. And we were believed. Some people called us heroes.

Q: The disbelief factor.

A: It runs rampant. Most people's minds are little scooters. They're all set to go, and all you have to do is give them a whole pattern of little roads and alleys and they'll follow right along. The smarter ones will ask for a map, but they'll still take the exact same course.

Q: I've heard you talk about "the story of the day."

A: That's a concept that has become an integral part of the news business, but it was really invented by PR people. Now, with 24-hour coverage sometimes you need three stories of the day. The FBI PR people figure, well, we'll float out six stories today and hopefully one of them will get picked up as a lead piece. We'll go with the arrest of the three men in Florida and the thing about the flight school and the Korans in the hotel rooms and so on, and let's see how we do. The PR mandate is, show them we're busy. Show them we're on the case. Show them we're making progress. Build a story line. Give the press lots of little hooks and they'll get on their

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

scooters and go. Keep them moving from alley to alley to road to street. Don't make them think there is nowhere to go. Fill up their little gas tanks.

Q: And another phrase you used to use. The "assault factor."

A: Yes, that one. Fill up people's heads with so much information that they don't ask questions. It works. That's one reason that Salem story in 1993 disappeared. There were new stories every five minutes. You get 50 stories into print and one says Mars Disappears and everyone reads it and forgets it. There is no follow-up and after awhile people don't even believe they read it. They think it was a dream. It's part of the battlefield strategy. You run 100 stories about battlefield and one of them says, And we think there may have been a chemical weapon, and then no one follows up on it because it's shut down from above, the story is shut down, and pretty soon people scratch their heads and think, did I read a story about a chemical weapon? No, it must have been a mistake. I figure that about 1970 the overload really started. At that point people began to tune out. They were unable to think. The news became a carpet that unrolled in front of them, took them from one thing to another. It's gotten even heavier. We're seeing that now. With all the stories at the level of battlefield, the general public is less disposed to think about who might be behind all this. Even less disposed.

Q: Any other formulas or equations at work here?

A: Pin the tail on the donkey. I'll explain. In 1990-91, we had the Persian Gulf War. The lead-up and the war. Bush needed a reason to send the troops in. He couldn't say oil. Well, Kuwait, whose homeland had been invaded by Iraq, was a pretty brutal regime itself. Kuwait hired Hill Knowlton, at the time a huge PR firm in Washington, and paid them a very nice slice of cash to promote war in the US to the people: Send our boys over there. Pin the tail on the donkey. Find the person or thing that would justify to the American people supporting Bush's war. Find the donkey. Make it pay off. A lot of things were tried, many of them centering on Iraq's treatment of "our friends," the so-called gentle Kuwaitis. You might remember that the Kuwaiti ambassador's daughter posed as a nurse at a hearing in Washington and told a story about the incubators. The Iraqi soldiers who marched into the hospital and threw babies out of incubators to die on the floor. 312 babies. No one has ever been able to confirm that. But it may have put Bush over the top in his effort to make that war. Now, at one level, we have the search for the people or person who REALLY launched the attack on the WTC. At one level, there are people in the field who are trying to do their best, based on orders they are getting. But at another level, it's pin the tail on the donkey. This is the PR stuff. This is picture-making. Shall we blame Saddam? Bin Laden? Both? Shall we blame a bin Laden henchman? Iran? At this level, it's like taking a poll. What will fly the best? And I can tell you that right now there are people in American who ARE actually being polled, and one of the many things they are being asked is, How would you feel if it turned out that Saddam was behind all this, or some such. Polls take place all the time, and this sort of question is being slipped in there or gotten in through a little series of clever questions. It's being done. At this level, the poll isn't being used for investigation

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

purposes, it's about WHAT WILL FLY BEST WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. And there are people in Washington as well who are debating about what the best looking donkey will be for the American people. This has nothing to do with facts. It's all about the donkey. It's all about what will strike an acceptable and hopefully deep chord. That will keep people unified now and in the future as this war moves on. And whatever the donkey turns out to be, it will be trotted out and used. It will be dressed up just right. Hell, there are a hundred places and more on the Earth we could move into tomorrow saying we are here to stop brutal human rights abuses, and we would have a point. But the PR mandate is, we select and massage the right donkey, the one that will have some emotional legs for the American people. This will be done. It's like sending a photographer in to shoot an epidemic in progress for some medical group that is going to raise funds to build a hospital there. The photographer enters a village and there are dead bodies. There are always dead bodies. But he's thinking, at what angle should I shoot this for maximum effect? What will have the most impact? Suppose I get up in that tree and shoot down? Maybe if I get someone to move a few bodies over THERE, that will work better with the shadows from the rocks. You know. And in the case of the 9/11 attacks, that means that what we hear about the perpetrators will be what they think will move us. We will hear the result of the PR effort. It may contain some truth, but that's not the real point. Not for the long run. For the long run, they want us to hear what will start the adrenaline pumping and keep it pumping.

Q: Not reality.

A: Reality is what you make it. It's your pogo stick that vaults you to the next station on down the line.

Q: We're talking about some monsters here.

A: This society used to be glued together with a few ideals. Now it's glued together by everyone's cooked up explanation as to why what he's doing is the best thing under the circumstances. In that atmosphere, it pays to lie and invent lies and find the keys that will make people react in the ways you want them to react. I don't know whether you ever read a novel called The Ninth Wave. It was written, I'll guess, 40 years ago. It was about a young man who went to work for a presidential campaign. His childhood pal was working on the campaign too. Now the young man finds out that his pal has invented an ingenious system for polling people and then adjusting your message to reflect what people think and want. It's so ingenious it'll sway the election and give it to the candidate—whom the young man discovers is a noxious rat. So before this system can triumph, the young man takes his pal, who invented and controls this whole evil polling system—takes him out to the beach and into the water and KILLS him. Does that tell you how far we've come with PR in the last 40 years? Now if you DON'T do that kind of polling, your boss will fire you in a second. What I'm telling people here is, THEY think you are nothing. They think they just have to find out what will make you jump to the right or the left. Now if you realize that this is the case, then you should also realize that they'll say whatever the hell they want to about who pulled the trigger on the 9/11 attacks.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

They'll tell a story they hope will fly, and they'll tell more after that. Do you feel that the government has treated you honorably? Do you think that it has done the right thing most of the time? Don't kid yourself. If it did the right thing it would have long ago tried to detach government from crime, from many crimes. My job was to control people's minds through the media. What the media are doing now is not unfamiliar to me. It's no surprise. A REAL media would start, say, from bin Laden, start pulling on that string and go into his past and find all the sub-threads, and it would take a VERY VERY VERY hard look at the people he knew, the places he went, because he has been fighting a war, and some of his allies are strange people. People you would think would want to destroy him. You have to see what's there.

Q: Continuing...

A: ...I assume your readers are familiar with the basic cartels: money, government, military, intelligence, media, medical, energy. The 9/11 attack was a cartel op long in planning...it didn't happen overnight...it was planned by people who want to "destroy" the economy of the West...which means leveling it out so it isn't so far superior to everyone else's...it was also planned as a way to unite the globe militarily in its "hunt" for the traitors...an op like this has been in the works for some time....the terrorists are being used for this purpose....this is not simply bin Laden at work...although he is undoubtedly involved at some level of the tactical planning....

Q: Why didn't you say that before?

A: I was leading up to it, but I had to go for a bit...the CIA is a kind of terrorist organization of its own and it was used too to set this bin Laden up in the first place...we are looking at a series of debilitating incidents from way back leading all the way through Oklahoma City and then this one in New York...the planning re the Afghanistan-Soviet war was done on the chessboard of the cartels with a very long-range plan in mind...to end the Cold War...it was a part of ending the Cold War and it was a part of bringing into being a whole "army" of terrorists who would strike at the West...this is a prelude to the intell/military cartel takeover of many government functions around the world...it is a hastening of that process....all the PR on 9/11 is being done by very low-level people who are working the familiar psychological angles I described earlier...the psych. goals themselves are not low-level, particularly the one of keeping in place the idea that oil is uncertain and the supply may be interrupted and all that...you have to understand that the energy cartel has taken the threats of new energy technologies very seriously and they must keep the public thinking that oil is EVERYTHING and they do this by making people fear that it might be interrupted....but this 9/11 idea, maybe not the precise place, but the op has been on the boards for a long time...delivered as a shock to the system of America....the unimaginable blow which psychically freezes everyone and makes everyone want to obey and follow the leader...and of course the op is also to limit freedom and squeeze down on people's rights and so on, naturally....that always is part of these ops...the fact that airliners did it is significant, rather than just a bomb in the street...because now the whole system of our arteries of transportation will suffer, will also become uncertain in the minds of people and that fear, that lingering

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

fear will make more people just stay where they are, physically AND psychologically....stay at home, obey, give up your freedoms some more, trust in the authorities....the war mentality weaves right in with the Bush team that is in place....most of them want war as the basis for ongoing reality....in their minds many of them never gave up the Cold War...it's the search for enemnies, the lust for power and the search for enemies.....the cartels are not completely unified in favor of the 9/11 op....there is a signal or a code in this attack...this is, in one way, the willing sacrifice by the Rockefellers of one of their prizes, the WTC, which they built, on behalf of the larger cause, so to speak....this is a message to the cartels...it is saying, look what we sacrificed, now buckle down and do your work and let's achieve all of our goals without so much infighting and let's make this planet truly ours....it's a very stark message....almost ascetic in a way....remember in Ayn Rand's novel, The Fountainhead, where the architect Roark blows up his own creation because it was peverted by other people?...well, these men see themselves in that light in a way...of course they are nothing like that but they think they are....the question is, has their own "creation" of terrorists gotten away from them...that's always the question....one group invents a lower agent and the lower agent turns around and bites the hand that fed them...we'll have to see about that....but this 9/11 was an op, a direct cartel hit...these cartels want absolute power and they are upping the ante....

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

October 12, 2001

REMARKS FROM ELLIS MEDAVOY ON 9/11:

"A few things are missing from all the reporting about the 9/11 attacks. I would say the downplay and soft tone in the press is significant. This is PR in reverse. This is when the order goes out to shut the thing down and keep it on the back burner because you don't want attention…you want other people to get attention…you want the blame spread around to all sorts of other people, but you want to keep your clients in the shadows. That's an important component of PR…when to keep your client's name out of the paper….when to pull him out of the spotlight and into the shadows….so if we know who to look for, WHO IS ABSENT, that gives us a clue….and the two parties who are relatively absent are ISRAEL AND SAUDI ARABIA.

"I don't mean we're hearing nothing about them, but we're getting a lot less than we should…and that tells you that they're both trying to shrink away from revelations…about what? About their own involvement with terrorism or something very much like it.

"With Arabia, we have the situation that the Saudi government is blocking attempts to trace terrorist funding into their country. Sounds like quite an admission to me. Don't look in the closet. There's nothing in there but don't look.

"Also we have the fact that the chief of intell for the Saudis, Turki al-Faycal, has had a friendship with Osama bin Laden…and Turki also has a connection to the Taliban…and Turki was recently let go or quit his post….as several people have pointed out, some terrorists get their training, first, at fundamentalist colleges, with the money to pay for it coming from the Saudis….this is a regime, the Saudis, that is based on brutal treatment of its own citizens and on religious intolerance….more than that, it has a fundamentalist outlook that is in line with terrorist aims….it is a schizoid kind of place….all that wealth, all that technology, and yet the desire for some sort of world triumph of a militant version of Islam…..these and other facts about Saudi Arabia are being downplayed in the press…you're not reading a screaming headline: SAUDIS REFUSE TO DO BACKGROUND CHECKS ON TERRORIST HI-JACKERS WHO GOT THEIR VISAS IN ARABIA….you're not seeing that, because the PR and propaganda money is paying for something else, it's paying for soft-pedal, for omission….

"And with Israel, I can tell you that over the decades the Mossad has a tendency to do everything it can to focus the US on the bad deeds of Arabs…but Israel is being quite soft right now on the whole issue of the Palestinians…this silence is being viewed as respect for the dead in NYC and as a period of mourning and withdrawal from the usual push…it's being viewed in all sorts of ways, but one thing is not being said…Israel, an instant messaging company in Israel, got 2 hours advance warning of the attacks on 9/11, and some Israelis were picked up in NYC by the FBI as possibly involved….these stories have receded….yet there are some very nasty elements

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

within the Israel power structure who want to do WHATEVER it takes to push the US into supporting a total wipe-out war against Arabs…these groups for example, have staged raids on the Muslim holy shrines in Jerusalem, hoping for a massive war to break out…see what I'm getting at….for these extreme groups the 9/11 events ARE perfect because they would strengthen resolve in the West to attack Arabs and Muslims, escalating the war….so all in all I consider it quite significant that Saudi Arabia and Israel are receding into the shadows at the current moment….I know that part of the reason is, they are considered allies of the US…but this doesn't explain the whole shadow-silence….

"One would expect that the Americans would be willing to stand up and accuse ANYONE who might be aiding and abetting terrorists…but that is not the case….I'm saying the signs are pointing to certain elements in Israel and Saudi Arabia as being involved in the 9/11 events….Prince Abdullah, the man in charge in Arabia, is not your typical friendly pro-west cartoon…he is much more traditional and conservative….he wants to gather up as much power as he can but where he will go with it…we're not quite sure….

"I developed this little technique years ago. If I was trying to understand a complex situation with a lot of research, I would eventually put the research aside and write out a brief summary of what I thought happened, bringing in as much important stuff as possible. I would write down summary after summary, trying to make it simpler and simpler but yet including more and more. The summary might go from a page down to half a page and finally down to three sentences, if I was lucky and persistent.

"Well, for the past two days, I've been writing my summaries. Over and over. I'm not done, but I'm getting there. Here is my latest....

"Financed by heroin money and Saudi money, roughly ten members of the cartels secretly, as a rogue group, gave a signal to carry out a plot that had been formulated for at least two years: blow up the WTC and attack the Pentagon. The planning and execution of this mission were given some protection and cover by 'free-lance' elements of the CIA and the Mossad. The answer to the question WHY is covered by several escalating levels of answers to the question WHO BENEFITS. The Saudi (and other) short sellers in airlines and insurance stocks prior to 9/11, the new Republican administration in Washington with its old military hands, the military cartel which extends its spell over the affairs of humankind in a 'new endless war,' the 7 cartels themselves which ultimately support those actions which will cause confusion, fear, panic and psychic and political surrender by the many to the few."

I asked Ellis if he was satisfied with this formulation.

"It's getting there," he said. "If this OP has been handled right," he concluded, "every major person concerned as part of my summary would have already been provided PR cover, conscious PR support linking him to 'he's working to solve this night and day,' 'he's devastated like everyone else,' 'he's committed to punishing the

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

oppressors,' all the way up to much more specific stories. Everyone covered except the fall guy, which in this case is bin Laden. He remains unprotected, except when you think about it you realize he could have been provided cover too. But he wasn't. He has been shaped as an ultimate fall guy since 1993. And now his bell has been sounded."

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

January 25, 2002

This is one of those interviews I cherish. I think I know where things are going. I have plans. But then suddenly we're off into a whole other place. We're dealing with taboos or unheard of ideas, and I have to gallop to keep up. Well, the gallop is going to be very fast this time. Kentucky Derby style. Ellis had his own plans for us, and he pressed forward to exactly where he wanted to go. This guy is unique. He has certainly demonstrated in the past that he can be a real SOB, and yet he has his moments. Quite a few of them.

Q: Where do we start today?

A: I thought we already did. Okay. Let me get a few things off my chest. Most people think philosophy that goes deeper than a mild scratch on the surface of the skin is sheer crap. Most people believe that nothing comes from philosophy. Most people think that there is no reason to understand philosophy. If they only knew that propaganda is based on a kind of philosophy mixed with science, they would re-evaluate their position.

Q: What are you talking about?

A: Just let me finish. As I was saying, if you can build a world inside a vacuum jar, then all the information inside the jar seems true because it is connected. Do you see? If there is no world known outside the jar, then nobody has a basis for doubt.

Q: Connecting information is the key?

A: Right. If you can hook up lots of discrete pieces of information, then people get it coming in at them from many places.

Q: And then they think it's true.

A: Right. Like I was saying about 9/11, there is a world of information being built. We've got caves full of documents, we've videos of bin Laden, we've got this kid who is a dupe—Johnny Walker—who tells his American captors that he spoke with bin Laden and he knows that bin Laden planned and ordered 9/11—we've got the famous passport of the terrorist found near the WTC. We've got thousands of pieces of information that all hook up to tell the same basic story about who was behind 9/11.

Q: The self-contained world inside the vacuum jar.

A: Yes. Who would doubt it? You see?

Q: It's like the cosmology floated by the Vatican for centuries.

A: Sure. You get far enough inside all that information and you lose sight of the fact that none of it is hooked to anything OUTSIDE. You've got entities from here to

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Pluto, you've got all these different classes of angels with names and titles and job descriptions—it's so overwhelming that you swallow the whole thing.

Q: What does this have to do with philosophy?

A: It's all about time. Time and emotion.

Q: You've lost me.

A: Think. How do you build time?

Q: Build time?

A: Yes. You need two things to build time. You need a constructed time-line of events. That's the first thing. A chain of events which you tie together. It doesn't matter if the events really connect, and it doesn't matter whether the events are real. What matters is you have built that line, and it seems to make sense.

Q: And this means?

A: There is a fundamental human hunger for TIME.

Q: What?

A: It's like dessert or sex or fresh air. People WANT TIME. They want that sense of it, that there is flow and the flow is real. People want SEQUENCE.

Q: I see.

A: I hope so. If you can give people time, they flock to you. You are giving them a cornerstone of what they consider to be EXISTENCE. They have to have it. And that is what good propaganda does. It suggests or marks out the flow of time in a sequence.

Q: And it doesn't matter whether that sequence is true.

A: It doesn't matter at all. More than half of all history is fiction. It's a time line that is constructed to give people the sense that things happened in a certain way, in a certain order.

Q: Yeah?

A: Take evolution. Forget that the theory is full of holes. The PROPAGANDA which is said to be science suggests a flow of events. First came the amoeba, and then from that we got the multi-celled organism, and you go on from there. It feels right because it has that chain of events from before to after, from day 1 to day 456789. Evolution is a very easy sell. You fill up museums with fossils and bones and labels, and everybody buys in, because there is that beautiful idea of a time line of history.

Q: And all propaganda works the same way.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: It does. Now, you don't really need a complete and tight time line. You just need the IMPRESSION of one. That fills the human need for TIME. That need plays right into the profession of propaganda. And the theorists of propaganda know this. They may talk about it in different ways, but they know it. It's their bread and butter.

Q: You said time and emotion.

A: Yes. Emotion is like a proof of time.

Q: Proof?

A: Look. In order to construct a time line, you need human response to it. You need human cement, so to speak, to give the sense that the time line is real. Otherwise, you just have factoids.

Q: So you're saying—

A: I'm saying that the propagandist creates "a fact" that will result in a human emotion. I say fact X and the human being reacts with, say, outrage. Now we're cooking. Now we have a fact that gets an emotion sprouting all over the place. The emotion is the closer, the convincer. Now the human being really believes in the fact because, after all, he just responded to it! What could be a better "proof" than that? The human being is so self-centered that he believes his own emotion makes a fact real. He is saying, essentially, "This fact couldn't be a lie. Because I just felt ABC."

Q: It must be true.

A: Right. If I felt ABC, then the thing that made me feel that must be true.

Q: What about a movie?

A: Well, you walk into a theater and you paid eight dollars, and the screen is dark, and then actors you know come on the screen and do things. So you know that you are looking at fiction. But the New York Times is not that way. The New York Times may be doing the same thing that the movie is doing, but the citizen is not aware of that.

Q: Okay. So we have a fact and we have an emotional response.

A: These are the building blocks of reality, my boy. "The evil-doer, Osama bin Laden, blew up the WTC." That is the floated "fact." Then you get the emotion from the audience. THEN the audience thinks this fact must be true, because it came from an official source AND because they, the audience, reacted to it with FEELING.

Q: And it doesn't matter whether the fact was true.

A: It doesn't matter.

Q: What comes next?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: An invented chain of such facts and emotional responses. A whole thread. A story-line. History in the making. Reality in the making. This IS reality.

Q: And this is calculated.

A: I told you many years ago—and you used this—that if you can show the public other people dying all over the place, you can construct the name of a new disease around that image, and people will accept the "fact" of the new disease. Because they react. Because they FEEL. It works. That was and is AIDS in Africa. I helped build that time line. That was my job. You and I did at least one interview around that.

Q: Yes.

A: So this is PHILOSOPHY. The philosophy of what time IS.

Q: Wait a minute. Are you saying that without such time lines TIME would cease to exist?

A: Now you're catching on.

Q: Is that what you're saying?

A: Damn right.

Q: Don't you think that's quite an adventurous idea?

A: It sure as hell is. And it happens to be the truth.

Q: If I may be so bold, what then would replace time?

A: I'll let you figure that out.

Q: Oh no you don't.

A: (laughs) When I say things like this, people generally imagine that pure chaos would replace time and we would all devolve into a state of confusion and stupidity. But that's not necessarily true at all.

Q: Why isn't it true?

A: Because the unknown is not necessarily crazy. Maybe crazy is what we've got now.

Q: Okay, let's back up. You're saying that a chain of facts and emotion make up time.

A: I'm going to feed this to you in doses, okay? Let's say you're in ancient Greece, and you're sitting in an amphitheater and they're doing a production of Oedipus. The time line of events is unfolding, but the audience has no reaction. No emotion. The play as such ceases to exist. Now, what is there instead? People going through

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

the motions. It's not nothing. But it's not time. It's not history. It's not art. It's not the reality of Oedipus. It's "leaves floating in the breeze." Let's start with that. Or how about this. People in Africa are dying. But it's not AIDS. It's not HIV. It's not a virus. It's not destruction by some monkey virus that crossed over into humans. The time line and the emotions about AIDS have been cancelled out. People are still dying, but the lie is subtracted.

Q: Okay. And?

A: Take it on this level. Let's say that over the last year there have been 30 major news stories that have captured the attention of the public. But suppose instead, NONE of those stories produced the emotions that have been hoped for by the propagandists. Suppose the facts have been seen to be false. And now suppose that one layer below this, 50 MORE big news stories are suddenly seen to be based on fabricated facts. And 50 more and 50 more and 50 more. The "facts" no longer produce the emotional responses. What's left?

Q: You tell me.

A: Suppose the whole history of this world is suddenly seen to be pretty much a fiction of invented "facts." And suppose the thousands of psychiatric disorders listed in the DSM are suddenly not producing emotional response TO THE LIST in the public. And suppose the stock market is no longer viewed by the public as an accurate reflection of anything more than a list of horses at the gate in a race? And suppose that the last 10 big wars are now seen as NOT an unfolding of facts, but as the result of behind the scenes manipulations. AND SUPPOSE ALL THESE THINGS, THESE AWAKENINGS, OCCUR AT ONCE, AND OCCUR IN EVERYBODY EVERYWHERE. Do you think that our collective idea of time MIGHT BE CHANGED? Do you?

Q: I'd have to think about that.

A: You bet your ass you would.

Q: So you're saying—

A: That time is just what I said it was. And that time can be overthrown like any empire. And that my job, when you strip away all the crap, was really the invention of time. And time gets you into philosophy, and if you're unwilling or unable to get into philosophy, you'll never see the possible far shore. And just because you may not know what would replace time, that doesn't mean that time as we know it is eternal.

Q: So this is what happens to a propagandist who really looks at his own profession.

A: (laughs) Right you are. Right you are. See, any manipulator who really works his craft has a fear of what would happen if there was no manipulation. That's a

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

secret, and I'm revealing it to you now. All manipulators have that fear. It's one of the great things that drives them on. They feel a great need to invent time. To do it by fabricating facts which will produce in people emotions.

Q: I had no idea we were going to get into this.

A: It's too late now.

Q: You're forcing this whole conversation into a discussion of what reality is.

A: And why not? If we all shrink away from that, we are left with exactly what we have now. Which is the world as we see it. Let's go for the gold.

Q: What the hell. This reminds me very much of the Tibetan metaphysics.

A: It should. The culture of Tibet has a lot of unvarnished truth in it. Which is why everybody and his brother has been trying to destroy it or dilute it, and some of the best destroyers have been people who are supposed to teach that philosophy. The two cornerstones of Tibet are CREATION and the VOID. Step one, any being, any person, can create ANYTHING FROM NOTHING. And two, when you stop creating you end up with a great VOID, a great nothing. Mastery consists of being able to create consciously—and being able to stop creating. That's the whole deal. The daily newspaper of Earth is a perfect example of the insatiable need for more and more creation, no matter what. That's where I came in. I supplied the parade of facts, most of which were pure inventions, and I linked up those invented facts to form a message, a cover story, a thought-form that fed the masses. I served masters who wanted certain thought-forms to predominate.

Q: Which thought-forms do they want to predominate?

A: Fear, lack of hope, misguided hope, faith in the masters, a collective fate for all as opposed to the fate that results from the free creation by conscious individuals. 9/11 is a scenario wrapped around all those thought-forms. It is fed by those forms, and it feeds those forms. Back and forth, back and forth, like rivers flowing into each other.

Q: And all the medical propaganda you did?

A: Same thing. The medical cartel has the secret goal of making those thought-forms predominate. Do the math. Figure it out for yourself.

Q: We really are into philosophy here.

A: You have one level which is time. Time is invented chains of events plus the attendant emotions. Above that we have the level of thought-forms, which are the "messages" people derive from the lower level of time. Those thought-forms then become hidden sources and directors of action for people. People act ACCORDING to the encapsulated meaning of the predominant thought-forms. It's mind control. It's life on planet Earth.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: What about creation of the thought-forms from above, so to speak? The direct insertion of these forms into the consciousness of people.

A: That's the next level up. You know the old Roger Corman B movie, They Live. I think that was the title. If you wore special glasses you could see everywhere that signs and billboards contained subliminal messages. Messages like OBEY. PROCREATE. Well, imagine that the fields we have talked about are really there in the air, in the atmosphere, in the minds of people, as created—

Q: Created murals.

A: Yes, murals. Containing symbols and ideas, thought-forms, which people unconsciously resonate with and act upon—fields which predispose people to fall into a version of slavery. You know, at times in my career, I wondered why I was so damn successful. I would cook up a story and get it planted in the press—and everybody would bite like a fish. I understood it, but yet—I wondered. How come this is so easy? It's because my stories and the work of any good propagandist harmonize with what's in those fields, in those thought-forms.

Q: Are you presenting an analysis which dooms us all?

A: I used to think so.

Q: But now?

A: I have to admit that there are many people who have managed to position their consciousness outside these thought-forms, outside these fields. And THEIR problem is getting other people, the slaves, to do the same thing.

Q: And that's why you're talking to me.

A: Maybe. Don't put me in the altruism camp quite yet.

Q: Go back to time and emotions.

A: Fear, outrage, surrender, sorrow, remorse, resentment, loyalty—there is a whole string of them. All you have to do is sink someone in any of these and the rest tend to follow. People tend to sense their own personal histories as a line of these feelings. Their private sense of time. Now it is very clear that if people do not feel these emotions, if they respond in other ways, ways that are no less alive, their own sense of time tends to evaporate. That's what's called living in the moment. I'm simplifying here. For example, take a character in a soap opera. For most of his days, he's wallowing in one form of despair and suspicion or another. He's looking for a way out. And inevitably he finds it, for a few moments, when he falls totally in love with someone else who is in the same boat. You see? As if the only way out of this time trap is through romance. But the romance cools, or it is messed up, or there is a betrayal, and the person falls back in the mud again. But suppose the person got out of the trap altogether, out of the chain of events and their attendant emotions which he thinks make up his life. See? Suppose he did that. Would "the

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

absence of time" make him into a drooling idiot? I think not. I know not. Quite the opposite. Would he now be incapable of love? Absolutely not. So when I talk about what might happen if we ALL could dump our sense of time, I am not consigning us to some nut house. Quite to the contrary.

Q: You're talking about being immune to propaganda on every level.

A: Yes.

Q: You look at a show like West Wing, and what you're talking about here is the farthest possible thing from that.

A: I disagree.

Q: Why?

A: Think about it. What are these nutcases with sharp mouths who are roaming the corridors all addicted to? TIME. They can't get off the merry-go-round. They're scared to death that if they STOP, the roof will cave in. They occasionally swear they're going to tell the truth and stop the PR, but they "don't have time" for that. They have to keep inventing spin and fake facts and half-facts in order to—they think—get the public or the press or their colleagues in government to approve of them. For the next bill, the next election, for the sake of the Plan, whatever that is. It's a perfect little replica of what I'm talking about. Propaganda is at the heart of what these people are doing. They are inventing time-lines and hoping for attendant emotions from the get go, every single day, in every way. Now, of course, what's missing is a single stray thought about the deeper implications, about what we've been discussing here. And that is also my point. If people can't think deeper into what is really philosophy, they are lost. They will NEVER get off the merry-go-round. They will never see beyond inventing little time lines to get votes and get approval ratings. Extrapolate this out into the world, and you have daily life as it is lived by many people in the industrialized nations. Let me go a little further. In so-called real life, with Bush as the president, you have a man who actually believes in certain things. Which is to say, he has been led to believe certain things, and within his own world, he does. He is the planned antidote to Clinton. He's one half of the whipsaw we're going through.

Q: With Clinton being the other half.

A: Right. You see, Clinton was the phony, so now we need the "real thing." So Bush is placed in there as the sincere one. He is "the next pawn" in the lineup. He takes the pressure off the last eight years, where you had all sorts of people steaming about the reported and unreported Clinton lies and scandals. "Now we have a real man who really has ideals." But it's just a different kind of phony. Bush is very useful in this whole 9/11 business, which is one lie laid down after another. He represents the appearance of truth.

Q: In the medical area—

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: In that sea of lies, you get various "plants" to give the impression of truth. In that sea, I don't distinguish between the daily media and TV series. It's one deal. I'm talking about ER, the fabulously successful show of the last several years. It presents the one area where medicine is actually successful. The emergency room. Week after week, you see doctors putting people back together, and you get your faith that the medical system is really doing good things ALL OVER THE PLACE. When in fact, emergency medicine is the one solid area where medicine works. From time to time, you get these shows. It is no accident. The genesis of the idea for such a show, or the impetus, or the green light to make it comes from careful planning. It's management of our thinking. It's more mind control. We are set up for that time and time again.

Q: When you were working in this area, did you ever take part in planning a TV series?

A: No. I did my work through reporters and their sources. I was a source for the sources. I was a floater. In the history of AIDS, there came a moment when there was the danger that it might get out that the HIV tests were unreliable. A man at the Harvard School of Public Health had released an article that proved, mathematically, that the tests were giving lots of false positives. I was brought in to squelch that perception. I created a sort of stop-gap. I lined up doctors who spoke with key reporters and assured them that everything was okay. The tests were good. They were accurate to a very high percentage. I massaged the data, and I had doctors with pharmaceutical connections massage the data and feed the lies to reporters. That job was tricky, I can tell you. I had to find doctors who already had good rapport with journalists, and I had to get these doctors to make the right statements. At times, this required some arm-twisting. You know, I had to tell a few MDs that people were counting on them. Drug companies and their reputations were on the line. The future of medicine was on the line. A crisis in public confidence could cause the whole AIDS research effort to stumble and lose ground. I had to spin a whole story and wrap the thing in national security and whatever else, to make it stick. I was working my people. I called in favors. And at the same time, I preserved the sense that everybody involved was really doing the right thing. Pure lies. You would be surprised how often national security has been invoked to cover up medical scandals and lies. PR, propaganda, takes many forms. People just don't know. National security, for example, is a funnel through which lots of lies are made to pass, and the expansion of this theme of national security has PR specialists.

Q: What?

A: That's right. PR people who make their living from massaging that national security theme. I had a few friends who called this one PR guy Flag. Because Flag could take any stupid lie and convince people it was true because it had to be true because national security was at stake. This guy turned out to be a wizard at that. He could argue his case like a lawyer if he had to. He was subtle too. Very good. Flag was one of the people who showed me what time really is. He knew what he was doing. He used to say to me, "We're composing the future by changing the

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

present." He was very aware of the true way in which this kind of manipulation works. An ingenious fellow, the Flag. He read Kant, the philosopher. To him, Kant was the key. From reading him, he developed a whole theory about time and how it was manufactured seamlessly. I don't know whether Kant had the same theory. I don't think he did. But this guy, the Flag—he got his ideas from his reading of Kant. Many of these really good PR people believe there is nothing beyond the manufacture of reality.

Q: Well, I could quote you telling me the same thing.

A: I know. And on certain days I still believe that. But you've got me on a more reflective day. I've told you this before, but unless you've really done it, you can't know the exhilaration of floating a big lie and getting people to salute it. It gives you a whole new perspective on things. It opens a door in your mind. You see in very stark outlines how manipulation works. When Orson Welles put together that 1938 radio program on the invasion from Mars, and had half the country in hysteria because they thought it was a news broadcast, he felt that. I once met the great man, and spoke with him about that. He wouldn't have told me his real reaction, except that I knew what questions to ask. And he admitted it. He admitted it to a degree that went way beyond any of the public statements he's made on the subject. On one level, it was a tremendous kick. He saw something. See, every day people try to get by by telling little lies here and there, when they need to. People try to get over. But when you have time to build a really big lie, and you see how people react—if you can step back and watch the whole machine going into action, it's a mighty thing. You see the underpinning, so to speak, of all those little lies. I'm telling you how the PR game really works. I'm telling you the motivation and the kick of doing it. You exit from ordinary life and get into a different space.

Q: Of course you also have to divorce your mind from the consequences of what you're doing.

A: True, but that's not as hard as it may seem.

Q: Why not?

A: Because you already believe that people are deceiving themselves at every turn. That's how you rationalize it. And you also say, well, people are dying in wars all over the place no matter whether I exist or not. So what difference does it make what I do? You start out with a very bleak picture of the human race. And I mean BLEAK. As a person, you develop a very hard shell.

Q: You knew lots of people like that.

A: Of course I did. But look at war reporters, or reporters who cover countries where people live in a constant state of war or very brutal repression. Those reporters tend to band together, and they accept the situation. They know that, in a sense, they're making their living off other people's suffering. But they explain it all

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

away, even in the face of the fact that very little of their reporting changes anything. Actually, most of these reporters are giving their news outlets the party line.

Q: What's the party line?

A: That the brutal government is all right. Think about it. You don't see lots of stories pouring out of NBC about foreign governments and their daily sins. You see stories about war in a country or about revolutions or about people dying, but you don't see much about the government that is causing all this. Not in any great quantity. Most often, the blame is thrown somewhere else. Unless there is an overriding political reason to trash that government, as with the Taliban. Then the stories come in gushers. All of a sudden. Because someone higher up sets that agenda. How much are you hearing about the current government in Indonesia? If I had a green light, and a few people to help me, I could turn public opinion about that government on its head in six weeks. I could KILL that government. I could make it into the Satan of all Satans. In six hard weeks. In three weeks, I could make the government of China seem like the last people on Earth the US should want to talk to. I could go WAY beyond these little stories about "the repression of human rights." That would be NOTHING compared to what I could do. I could level that government into dust. So that no one in the US would ever permit the kind of trading with the enemy that is going on right now with China. I could make it very, very hard for any Western corporation to justify to its stockholders why it is in China doing business.

Q: Sounds like you'd enjoy doing that.

A: Got me on that one. Yes, I would. Part of my frustration is that I never got the chance to turn my talents in that direction. Given the nod, I could have wrecked the CIA, made it into such a collection of criminals it would have been disbanded. But of course, who would give me the okay? No one. There are very hard rules on that.

Q: Did you ever try something like that?

A: Oh, early in my career I went out on a few short limbs. I got my hand slapped and I saw the way the game worked. I never wavered again. But I did see how tight the game is in certain respects. When I looked at my own capabilities, at what I could do and what I WAS doing to create certain lies—let's put it this way. I KNEW how the world could be changed in a very short time if I and others like me had their leashes removed. Take the mafia, for example. By which I mean all sorts of organized crime from New York to China. I and others like me could bring it down. And I mean DOWN. I'm not exaggerating here. The power of PR is truly awesome when the green light is given and you have big-time media access on a continuous day-to-day basis. And when the powers that be want something to happen, to change. After all, in 1978, AIDS was a non-existent fantasy in the minds of a few people. And look what it is now. As we've gone over in these interviews, AIDS is a complete hoax. It doesn't exist. What all those people are dying of has nothing to do with HIV or any of that. And yet it is firmly fixed in the public mind now. Well, the

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

same thing could be done with the mafia. Or anything. See? ANYTHING. We could have had Pinochet out of Chile and on a plane to Geneva in two months if the green light was given early in his presidency in Chile. He would have been toast. We could bring down the National Cancer Institute in a few months. Boom. Just like that. I and others have scandals there that would cook your hair. NCI would become known as the Cancer Maintenance Institute. And we could cut the US government, which funds it, out of the picture so that no blame would accrue in Washington. A few bullshit hearings and that would be that. The government would be let off the hook. Given the right okay and a few resources, I could turn the whole picture of the Afghanistan war 180 degrees in three weeks. But of course in that case, some very big heads would roll. But the point is, it could be done. Now, if you KNOW that, you have a different view of reality. You read the papers in a different way. I read a news story and I can place it in context, as part of an operation that is underway. A PR operation. Sometimes I can tell who the PR guy is who's creating that story behind the scenes. But you see, there is no history of PR, REAL PR. Not like there is a history of art, of painting or music. An art historian can walk into a museum and tell, at a distance of fifty feet, what he is looking at on the wall. He knows who the painter is, and he can tell you a thousand things about that painter. But PR is a hidden history.

Q: A history that goes back a long way.

A: I have made my own study of it. It's quite clear to me that every government and organized religion in every society since the dawn of time has had its PR people. People who were paid to invent time. To invent time past, time present, and time future. The PR people were those who directly interfaced with the public on behalf of the ruling force. PR people also moved into the background. They were "advisors," and they were writers, and they were speechwriters. They were sometimes theologians who cooked up all sorts of metaphysics to justify the rule of the big King. Those talents were always recognized. And I'll tell you one constant theme through the history of PR. "There is really no such thing as the private ownership of property." Hammering on that, in one way or another, has always been an available gig for a PR guy. The reason is obvious. If people can own space, they can become free of the ruling force and free of the IDEAS OF THE RULING FORCE, and free of the TIME OF THE RULING FORCE. Now, these days, we have giant corporations which have thoroughly abused the private ownership of property. In many ways. So there is employment available for PR people who want to use that fact to spin off once again and say, see, this proves that all private ownership is bad. I know one or two people who make quite a nice living working that turf. They do very little else.

Q: This certainly ties in to the cartels.

A: The cartels are inexorably moving toward the elimination of private property in every way that they can. The whole Communist OP was an effort to float those ideas into the world society at all levels. And it has worked, even though the USSR is in shreds. Now "public property" is seen as the messiah by a great number of people

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

who also rightly see the mega-corporations as lunatics on the march. They think some kind of public ownership of everything will be a gentle shared loving solution. Well, that idea is a PR spin of enormous proportions. And the David Rockefellers of this world are ultimately behind that spin. These men of course own HUGE amounts of private property, and NOTHING would make them sacrifice an inch of it.

Q: You know, Ellis, from listening to you, I'd have to say you've had your share of close calls in your career. More of them than you'd like to admit.

A: Yeah, well maybe so. I wasn't your typical PR guy in certain ways. I chafed at my leash now and then. If I went out of school now and told you some stories, my cover would be blown. But I think you can see why some PR people drink themselves to death. They sell crap and they eat a little crap every day. And also, they learn some mighty things about reality and how it is put together. Some learn this lesson at a more fundamental level than others. When you learn that lesson, and you experience the HIGH from it, you want to tell what you've discovered. That's a very natural human impulse. But you can't. Not if you want your job. Not if you want to stay in the game. But I'll tell you this. There are people all over the world now who are, to one degree or another, in that position. They live good lives by normal standards, they invest their money and they think they're clever. They are quite rich compared with most of the sorry people who live in this world. They are hip to some version of "the game," and they give themselves glimpses of what lies outside the average version of time and reality. They nibble at that meal. But they also feel that they have to protect the system because they work inside it. And that division in their consciousness, if they're basically smart people, begins to gnaw at them. As they get older, they get nastier. In my travels, I meet many such people. They, just below the surface, feel like thieves. So they rationalize that feeling of being a thief to themselves. They explain it. They develop clever cover stories that they feed to themselves. They are their own PR people, doing PR on themselves, for themselves. I meet them in hotels, in restaurants, all over the place. Because I like to talk to people. If only they knew. If only they knew what I did. If only they knew what I'm seeing when I look at them.

Q: What are you seeing?

A: Brothers under the skin. I see them as PR guys doing their job on themselves. And now with this 9/11 thing, I'm also seeing how they use that to cover themselves with yet another layer of lies. Many of them seize on 9/11 as a chance to look even better to themselves. It works in one of two ways. Either they go along with the US government scenario to the hilt, and give you a whole dish of fake patriotism—as if they've finally found their real calling in life. Or they try to show you how hip they are about "what's really going on with 9/11." In the latter case, I can see them still clinging to everything within the system that they can grab, because that gives them money and comfort. Understand this. I'm not creating their own internal contradiction. They are. It's their guilt. It's their duplicity. It's their own feeling that they are trading stocks right and left, being oh so clever about it, and being "revolutionaries" at the same time. I have nothing against making money. Nothing.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

But they have this weakness, this guilt which is splitting them in half, and they're trying to play both ends. They are trying to hang on to both sides. It's their problem. It's their weakness. They can't walk out on either side. This is a picture of what's slowly happening to the so-called middle class. They're trying to wake up and go to sleep at the same time. And they're weak. They aren't big enough to handle it. They have to tell themselves all these little lies. They become little nasty people stuck in their own PR.

Q: A pretty savage assessment.

A: Yeah, well, take it or leave it. That's my observation. I'm not trying to convince anyone of what they don't want to see.

Q: But I don't think this is the whole of what you really believe.

A: I don't understand.

Q: I think you tend to like people, and you want to get them separated from their delusions.

A: There you go again, trying to reform me.

Q: Not really. I'm just digging.

A: Well, I have a family of sorts. I see what happens to the younger ones. I'd like to see them have a chance.

Q: Have you ever made an all-out effort?

A: I'm not sure what you mean. Once, I and several others thought about starting a newspaper. We drew up plans, but the logistics and the money were overwhelming. And there was also the matter of preserving our anonymity. That would have been close to impossible. So I talk to you.

Q: Instead.

A: Yeah.

Q: This newspaper—

A: It would have been what I'm talking about. PR efforts to expose the bad guys. The bad guys who ran the bad guys like me. It would have been a paper that could roll the ball in the other direction.

Q: Tell me a little about how a drug company promotes a new drug.

A: It's quite an operation. The company finds an area where they think they can make money. Lots of money. They scout out the marketplace and they find, say, that there is an opportunity for a new heart drug. They get their researchers—or they hire researchers to work on it. They come up with a compound. Then they

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

finance studies that compare the effects of this drug with other drugs for the same purpose that are already in the marketplace. Every single time, those studies show that their new drug performs better. There has never been a study financed by a drug company which compares their own drug with older drugs that shows the older drugs are better. NEVER. You can't find one. Then the company applies for FDA approval. I'm short-cutting the process here—but anyway, once the drug is okayed, the company wants lots of publicity. Their PR people go to work and get articles in the press. At the same time, the company might go the symposium route.

Q: What is that?

A: The company funds a symposium where papers will be presented which show that the new drug is wonderful. The company pays researchers to write these papers. The researchers are flown to the symposium, and put up in hotels. See, these papers don't need to be published in a journal. They're just presented at the symposium. Then, the company might approach a journal and offer to fund a whole issue which will more or less feature that drug or feature the symposium. And in that issue, summaries of the papers presented at the symposium will be printed. This part can work several ways. Of course, the researchers paid by the company always come up with glowing reports on the new drug. [See Trust Us, We're Experts, by John Stauber and Sheldon Rampton. Several variations of this con are described.] The drug company publishes some kind of PR release on the symposium and spreads that around, and it buys up lots of copies of the journal that features the symposium and gives those away too. Pretty soon you have a juggernaut made out of PR, and it works. Doctors believe the PR. They prescribe the drug. These MDs never stop and think that they have never read a study funded by a drug company which shows that its drug performs less well than a similar drug already on the market. These doctors are really true believers in the APPEARANCE of science, in what LOOKS LIKE science. It's all a religious scam in that sense, and a money scam and a PR scam.

Q: So it's no surprise years later when the drug turns out to kill people.

A: Everybody denies everything. But you have to keep in mind that we're talking about mid-level and low-level dupes here. The whole program of drug development is ultimately motivated from a place where the inner core of the medical cartel—the Nazis in white coats—WANT to kill people. Want to disable people. It's the plan. If you eat out a society from the inside, as you've written, you can work invisibly. It's war carried on without guns. It weakens all the threads that hold society together, and it makes society ripe for takeover.

Q: Has your family been visited by this drug disaster?

A: I had a situation a few years ago. I had to intercede.

Q: What was the drug?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: I won't go into details. But I had to wield some heavy influence. I had to make myself a real pain in the ass. I played the role of dictator, and I didn't take any crap.

Q: I guess that didn't make you very popular.

A: Popular is not in my lexicon. People think you have to be "fair." Their idea of fair is allowing people to get poisoned. I don't work that way. Now if a guy down the street wants to take Zoloft for years and end up with some brain malady, that's his problem. But in my own family, that won't fly. I know 50 ways to "treat depression" and none of them involves drugs. I'll put down my foot if I have to, and usually that foot ends up on someone's head. There is "a period of re-adjustment," as they say, and then calm prevails. I make a pretty good "counselor" when the situation calls for it. And I eat school officials for lunch.

Q: You believe that the medical cartel, in the long run, is the most dangerous cartel.

A: It's not a question of belief. I worked for them. I know them. There is nothing they can do that will surprise me or take me off guard. I've told their lies for them. That puts me in a unique position. The PR doesn't influence me, because I did the PR. I was in the bastard club. I know all about the bastards. And quietly, in the background, very far in the background, I've done some PR for people who were filing law suits against drug companies. Those plaintiffs don't know who I am, they just know somebody helped them in certain ways. I still have press contacts here and there, and I can still call in a few favors. I'll tell you something. Part of my outrage against the middle class—what you just heard me saying that sounded so harsh—comes from the fact that a lot of these people can stand by and watch their families go down the drain because of medical drugs. They won't lift a finger, and they won't file a suit. They're cowed, they're scared. For a long time I banked on that fear, because I was working that fear. Fear is what gave people like me a big edge. But after I retired, a few things changed for me. I could wallow in my guilt about it, but I'm not that kind of person. So instead I do my bit, here and there, to throw a few monkey wrenches into the machine of the medical cartel.

Q: You work against what you did before.

A: You could say that, but I don't think of it that way.

Q: How do you think of it?

A: There are thousands and thousands of drugs on the market. I'd say that 30 or 40 are all we need, and we only need those at certain times of crisis, and for short periods. All the rest are weapons. I know the scope of the war, and I know what the "invaders" are trying to do. That's all. I see the war as clearly as you see your living room. I can separate the dupes and the brainwashed from the money hounds from the prestige hounds from the real controllers who are spreading the poison under various guises.

Q: When you say "guises" you mean PR, propaganda.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Yes.

As I ended my interview with Ellis, Ellis made a few additional comments:

"9/11 is turning out to be exactly what we thought it was. A few of the mid-level planners were Mossad people. A few were from Germany. Most likely ex-East German police. A few were CIA. These people either are current or former members of the Mossad and CIA. It really doesn't matter. The links between certain key people are maintained whether they were or are in official service. So, at the mid-level, where operational plans were put together, we are looking at a kind of rogue INTELLIGENCE CARTEL OP. This cartel, like all the others, knows no national bounds. They're global. They work toward the goal of complete domination of information and complete domination of all intell OPS on behalf of the globalist scheme to run the world from a small group of men.

"My sources tell me there were also a few ex-KGB players in the mix, as part of the intell cartel.

"Every OP like this is a fear OP. Above all, induce fear. Keep people off balance, take away their freedom, and so on. Make them give up internally. Make them into victims. Make them count their meager blessings and retreat inside the system. Make them give up their futures.

"This OP has big payoffs for the military cartel. The expansion of the effort to build a global army that has allegiance only to 'peace-keeping.' Which means, wage war anywhere where the cartels want more land, more resources, and want to squash so-called independence movements.

"As you surmised, the Nazi-like elements inside the cartels were the originators of 9/11. They are impatient people. They want core destruction of societies. Some of the differences between these Nazis and the more slow-go people at the top of the cartels have been patched up. It's all in the damage control phase now. Damage control and make hay from the 9/11 attacks. The damage control is within the cartels. Smooth out anger and hurt feelings and so on.

"These cartels are, at the highest level, just a small group of people who can see that if they control certain key areas and if they can run these areas and turn them in certain directions, they win. [the 7 areas: government, military, intelligence, money, energy, media, medical] So these cartels really only exist in their minds and in their will, in the sense that they have identified the key areas, and they work those areas to turn toward the desired goals. The 7 structures are already there and growing. The few men at the top keep moving their subordinates to weld alliances among and within these structures. See? There is already a "natural" tendency for these 7 areas to hook up all over the place. Army people from country A tend to ally with army people from country B. And so on. So as this happens, this linking up, the few men at the top of the cartels encourage this and they make sure the enemies and the OPS are chosen so that these 7 structures gain more power and have enemies to fight. Terrorism is created by the intell cartel mostly, and then terrorism becomes

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

one enemy which the cartels can "fight." And in that fight, the cartels gain more power over the whole shooting match, the whole planet. [If you want to read a very literate and amusing and chilling metaphor for this create-the-enemy game, find GK Chesterton's novel, The Man Who Was Thursday.]

"About two-thirds of my sources tell me that remote-control of the planes that crashed into the WTC and Pentagon on 9/11 could definitely have been achieved. And some of these people believe that was the case. The planes were taken over and directed. This could happen again."

"There are two more cartels that are moving up in power these days. They already exist, but they have been not quite as powerful as the prime 7. The religion cartel, which is a confederation of the Vatican and certain key militant Islamists and other religious groups. And what you could call the transnational corporate cartel, which has been historically part of the energy cartel. These two are moving up on their own, and soon they could take their place at the big table."

"The medical cartel, as you wrote, suffered some loss of prestige in their bungling of the anthrax OP. They are in the process of bungling the smallpox vaccine OP as well, because lots of doctors know that anyone with a suppressed immune system—and other people as well—will get sick and/or die from the vaccine. The med cartel is trying to mend fences with the other cartels at the top level. They are still under fire, because their arrogant estimate of their own tight centralized control of these bio-attack OPS was a gross exaggeration. The alternative health movement, to name one vector, has been wreaking havoc with that centralized medical control.

"I'm still trying to find out what role David Rockefeller may have played in 9/11. His own Towers were destroyed, and he hasn't said word one yet about it. He is a snake. He spans several cartels [e.g., money, energy, medical] and is a VERY top player. A few of my sources think the Towers were chosen as a target to send a message to Rockefeller that his go-slow plans for world control are just too slow. I'm not buying that yet, although it may turn out to be right. You can never tell with David. He is the colonial "god" par excellence. You know, let us decide what to do with the bulk of the world population. He says he wants better medical care, and at the same time he funds all sorts of depopulation research. With him, the line between 'good medical drugs' and killing off populations is totally erased.

"Bush and his men are the chosen ones to prosecute this bogus war on terrorism. They were put there, in part, for that reason. They are big players compared with the man on the street, but in the ULTIMATELY big picture, they are mid-level. The people who made sure it was Bush and not Gore, knew, back then, that 9/11 in some form was going to happen. They knew it would involve invading Afghanistan for the oil/gas pipeline. And the drug supply. That means that Bush had a big push from the Nazi-like element within the top structure of the 7 cartels so that he would wind up in the White House. Bush himself has no knowledge of this. He's a classic dupe. But his father—that's a different story. His father knows all about HIS father's funding of Hitler. He knows about the global drug trade and how to make large $$

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

from it. He knows about depopulation as a "necessary tool" to "create order" in the world. He is kind of a fruitcake. One side of him is all family and sentiment and weakness, and then the other side is cold. He tries to convince himself that he really isn't doing anything bad, which is ludicrous…"

###END###

THE MATRIX REVEALED Volume 1

JON RAPPOPORT Interviews ELLIS MEDAVOY (Part 2 of 3)

February 1, 2002

As a retired propagandist, Ellis worked for many years behind the scenes spinning gigantic medical and political lies that "found their way" into the mainstream press. He's been there, he's done it, and he knows the ropes from A to Z.

Some readers will see that, in these conversations with Ellis, he is changing. In revealing more about himself and what he knows, he is stabilizing a new position for himself. I believe he takes another quantum leap in this direction in this interview.

Q: (Jon Rappoport) Will big PR companies which work on contract with big chemical companies ever get caught in a mess like Enron?

A: (Ellis Medavoy) Doubtful but not impossible. I have done a little work on these PR companies, and I have had the results passed along through a couple of friends to, shall we say, "interested parties." As far as I'm concerned, all PR people should be viewed as hired gunslingers. When they "come to town," they should be ready to disclose publicly every dime they have ever taken, and from whom. Because they are professional liars. That is what the heavy PR types are paid to do. A real propagandist takes X dollars from source Y? You automatically know he is lying for Y.

Q: Some years ago, that would have been you.

A: Sure. I've never denied that. Because I've told the lies, I know what a lot of the lies ARE.

Q: But you never worked for a big PR firm.

A: I was in a different world.

Q: How so?

A: I was paid through cutouts, who in turn worked for groups like the Council on Foreign Relations. And when I say the CFR, I don't even mean the official group. I mean people who were very high up in CFR, who were launching their own agendas. I needed cover stories for myself. I won't tell you what those covers were, but I was not in a position to be able to say, "I'm in PR for so and so." Because I wasn't. And because I existed by seeming NOT to be a PR or propaganda man at all. I was a floater. I moved around. And from time to time, I changed my own cover. It was not the easiest thing to do.

Q: I was just talking with a friend about Hollywood.

A: Don't get me started.

Q: How certain films like The Magnificent Seven, Bonnie and Clyde, and The Dirty Dozen trade on the public's love of star actors.

A: You mean, how they present villains.

Q: Exactly. Here you basically have murderers and thieves of people's hard earned money—but those roles are being played by actors with "a lot of box office charisma." So the public automatically forgives the characters their crimes.

A: Sure. The actor becomes the salesman for crime. It's a long-established art.

Q: And when these actors get into war movies, the public believes that war is really fought by Jim Coburn or Matt Damon, and war is well-lit and although the soldiers get dirty and blood-stained, the blood is basically clean and the dirt is clean.

A: As one who knows a little about war, I can tell you it isn't that way.

Q: Even so-called hard-nosed movies like Platoon. I mean, wasn't Charlie Sheen in that?

A: After Vietnam, no US reporter with a video camera has gotten close to the real action. If a network just played a whole week of uninterrupted programming of a war, close-up, without voice-over—just the real stuff—the public would have its collective head turned.

Q: Nobody moralizing.

A: Right. Just the footage up very close and relentlessly. On and on. No commentary. No attempt to persuade. No good or bad stuff. Just the war itself. Now you're talking about the real power of a camera. You see five or ten people getting blown apart, and it focuses the mind. The public is conditioned to expect commentary that makes it all into something else. But if the camera holds on a leg that is lying in a piece of ground all by itself—if the camera just stays there—the public is hoping against hope that some well-modulated voice will intercede and give what amounts to a rationalization. If no voice comes, the public is left with its own feelings and thoughts. See? No one is saying this is good or this is bad. No one is saying anything. There is no music. The leg is just there.

Q: Sentimentalizing is the word.

A: If you don't sentimentalize war, then people begin to wake up. The waking up isn't easy, but it happens. And then you transcend politics. And if you get enough people in enough countries viewing film like this, something will happen. Meanwhile, the network says nothing. It doesn't join the debate and the shouting and whatever. It just keeps showing the film of a war, close-up.

Q: Has anyone ever really tried this?

A: Are you kidding? They'd be shut down like airport in an ice storm.

Q: The critics who review these supposedly hard-nosed commercial movies about war, like Platoon, keep pumping them up as "so real." But that's just another layer of lie. And the public thinks, "Well, if that's what war really is, then it's not as bad as I thought it might be."

approval. When, last week, I talked about how propaganda really creates time, I stressed the role of eliciting emotions in the public. Here's a good example. In this case, it's by identification with the Hollywood hero who's toting the big gun in the war. If you get the audience to identify with the hero—the actor—then the public buys into EVERYTHING. That's why the star actor is such a precious commodity. He can get people to merge with him, emotionally. Same for the star politician. I think only very ugly people should be allowed to run for president. (laughs)

Q: Reagan said he was going to get the government off people's backs. But during his terms, the size of government increased fantastically.

A: And no one noticed. Because he was the matinee idol. People merged with him emotionally. And now his supporters talk about how he rallied the country and made people feel good about the US again. What they mean is, the public merged with him emotionally. It's an important distinction, and those who are in the propaganda business understand that. You can rot a country by playing this sentimental propaganda game over and over. You get the public to identify with certain "stars." It becomes the main point of life itself for many people—to make that identification. It becomes their whole life. Jonas Salk was made into that kind of star. So people accepted the polio vaccine as a product of their hero. Meanwhile, the vaccine was killing and paralyzing and infecting people right and left. I was never in the business of plumping up and creating stars. But I know people who were. They spent their years creating little gods. That's what they did.

Q: When I saw Bonnie and Clyde, I was amazed at how little that movie did for me. I saw Warren Beatty and Fay Dunaway being gunned down at the end. Not Bonnie and Clyde.

A: Well, you were outside the box. That kills the fun. The trick is, those stars give people a sentimental portrayal of the characters—which means, the public IS and ISN'T seeing the characters—which means, the whole thing is a kind of hoax and the public is playing along because it has certain emotions invested in the stars. Playing along means you get to experience, in a fake way, what is happening in the movie—and the public wants that FAKERY. It wants that pretense. Not to enjoy it or laugh at it. But to be inside it. "I want to be fake. I want to be fake by being a in world that is fake, and I want to be serious about it." "Serious" is the operative word here. That's what gives it all a very perverse twist. This is something that little kids do, but adults are supposed to be over it. It works this way in politics too. People buy the fakery whole hog. That is what they want. They want to live in that created world. Creating such a world is a job of the propagandist.

Q: How is this different from art?

A: Art wakes people up. The world a real artist makes has a certain quality that causes people to wake up, even though people temporarily live in that created world.

A: No. I mean WAKE UP. Morality may be part of that, but it isn't the central feature.

Q: Okay, let's move on. You wanted to introduce a point. Where do we start?

A: Domestic Control Hover Drones.

Q: Huh?

A: I don't know if you read Al Martin's reports.

Q: Some of them, yes.

A: His latest involves a demo of this drone. It's still in testing, but it's also ready to be sold to militaries. It basically flies around and stops people anywhere and asks them for ID.

Q: What?

A: I'm not kidding. It asks for an ID card to be displayed, and it can process that ID. Each drone is selling for $180,000 right now. They work in conjunction with a fixed remote base, or a Humvee nearby that is set up with a very sophisticated console. It allows a voice from a long way off to speak with a "suspect" on a street corner.

Q: Can it spy as well?

A: Sure, it picks up a conversation from 500 feet away. Very clear audio. My point is, people don't realize how tight the plan is to micro-manage freedom. They just don't get it. This is the future that is being planned. Now, in order to get to that point of science fiction as REALITY, you need lots of propaganda prep. Otherwise, you're going to have riots on a huge scale.

Q: You need staged provocations.

A: Exactly. Lots of them. Like 9/11. Like bio-terror. Staged bio-terror. So that people are prepped to think that drones and other such devices are NECESSARY. See?

Q: Yes.

A: The propaganda prep is vital to the cartels. THEY KNOW THAT. So when I say the press is controlled, this is one of reasons. This is one of the strategies. To publicize threats to safety to such a degree that people will WELCOME these awful restraints on individual freedom. People will beg for it. That's where the PR [propaganda] people come in. They plant story after story that states that crime and terror of one kind or another are TAKING OVER, and we must counter that.

same people.

A: Yes. Yes, and yes. Get used to it. Accept that.

Q: [going through notes] Yes, I have that Al Martin report. Someone sent it to me.

A: Now I'm giving you the background on that. Psychological warfare is the operative term here. Time and motion studies like you've never heard of before.

Q: Time and motion studies?

A: When I say the cartels want to control lives, I'm talking about minute to minute in the long run. What are people thinking? How can their thoughts be controlled? How can their moods be controlled? How can their sense of time be controlled? It's all about WORLD shaping. Time shaping.

Q: You talked about time last week. The creation of time through propaganda.

A: Yes. Let's take that one step further. Pace.

Q: Pace?

A: Pace and tempo. The media can present stories so that time seems to be moving fast or moving slow. More fast or more slow than the usual human sense of time. In either case the result is human anxiety, because the human internal clock tends to have an acceptable pace, an acceptable velocity. If you exceed that pace, or underplay that pace, the human being gets nervous. He gets thrown off. He thinks something is wrong. He thinks there is a problem, and he fishes around for a solution to that problem.

Q: Even though he doesn't know what the problem is?

A: (laughs) Yes. When you make people hungry for solutions, they unconsciously look to the authorities for answers of all kinds. You know the famous unofficial slogan of the military. "Hurry up and wait." Well, think about that. You get people to rush for no good reason, and then they wait around for no good reason, and what happens? You have trained subjects now who are conditioned to look to their leaders for all the orders, all the answers. It works. In fact, it works better if the problem is never really articulated. Which is what happens when you get a full media dose every day of the news. There is something wrong with this news, if you look closely at it. It's too fast, and it's too slow. The anchors and other people develop, unconsciously, a method of delivering the news—and the editors and others who tape it—also develop a weird style of rushing or slowing down the news. Both. This sets people a little on edge. They are primed for answers, for slogans, for official assurances.

Q: Most of this is unconscious on the media's part?

To produce an anxiety for answers, for solutions. This is all based on military research into the reactions of soldiers and civilians too. Hurry up and wait. You see this in corporate management styles too. Pressure people to produce meaningless work for unnecessary deadlines. Then have them sit around doing very little. Fast and slow. Work on that internal sense of human time and pace, and quicken it and slow it down—for no really good rational reason. This creates anxiety, and questions with no answers, and a heightened sense of: Give me an answer to ANYTHING and I'll take it. Just wrap up this anxiety in a ribbon and I'll buy it. I'll buy the answer.

Q: You were telling me earlier about the Afghanistan war as a news story.

A: Yes. First of all, realize that ANY news story can be made fast or slow. Any story can be shaped that way. Any story can be fleshed out into a thousand details or it can be shrunk to a one-liner. So a story to begin with is a flexible reality. It can be dealt with in an infinite number of ways. The war in Afghanistan could be made into a slam-bang thrill a minute deal, or it can be made into a slow tale with a new detail every 12 hours. The war doesn't dictate that. The people who create the story do that. In the case of this war, this was shaped from the beginning as a slow story. I'm not just talking about media access being slim and the Pentagon holding back facts. I'm talking about pace. The pace has been made to be slow.

Q: That's true. Why?

A: Because a slow story makes people want MORE.

Q: More war, in this case.

A: Yes. More action. It creates a desire for more war as the solution to a slow war. Which is exactly the plan, and not just in Afghanistan. In other countries "that harbor terrorists."

Q: So literally, the people who are really shaping this story are pacing themselves, as they say.

A: Damn right. And that makes people want more. More war becomes the solution to the anxiety produced by the sensation of a slow war. [read that last sentence a few more times] Which lines up exactly with the political agenda from the cartels. Stretch out this "war against terrorism."

Q: The anthrax OP was that way too.

A: Sort of. It started with a bang. Then it slowed down. Then it sped up again. Then it slowed down. I could graph it for you. Again, YOU HAVE TO REALIZE THAT THE ANTHRAX THING COULD HAVE BEEN PRESENTED AS A HARROWING THRILL-A-MINUTE TALE. You see? It could have been done that way. Every story is infinitely flexible in that way. But time is created with a certain pace, or changing

pace, to get people on edge where they will accept without question the answers or solutions from, in this case, the medical cartel.

Q: What about Watergate?

A: Aha. A perfect example. I would call that one the "gathering steam" approach. Enron is shaping up to be that way too. Sort of. A flurry. Then a slowdown. Then a gathering speed-up. With Watergate, you had these two rookie reporters who were being managed, without their knowledge, by Ben Bradlee and other people. Bradlee, the editor of the Washington Post, would never have let these two kids loose on a story that could destroy his paper's reputation if they got it wrong. In fact, there was a whole lot of information available fairly soon after the break-in. There were dozens of good leads. But the Post broke the whole thing slowly. Then, after a point, the stories started breaking every week and then every day. The pace was monitored. The pace was intentional. At every step, the idea was to exceed or underplay the innate average time-pace of the human being. This is a principle of information warfare. As I said last week, this actually gets us into philosophy and deep psychology, but most people are too lazy to go there.

Q: Of course, a lot of people would say that the way Watergate broke open was the result of the Post being cautious about getting the details confirmed and all that.

A: Don't you think I know that? That's not the way it really works at the highest levels. You have to see this in levels. Do you want a good operational definition of a reporter?

Q: Sure.

A: A reporter is a person who has had his own sense of internal time and pace tinkered with for so long that he works from that artificial platform in everything he does. He unconsciously turns out material in such a way that it will speed up or slow down the public's innate sense of pace. That is really what a reporter does at the level I am talking about. If you can digest that, you're half way there to seeing the REAL mind control at work here. Do you know how I know that about reporters? Because I dealt with them for many years. I worked with them through intermediaries most of the time. And I played on their sense of time. I messed with them to the hilt. I would give them too little, and then I would give them too much. And that made them into mind-control subjects for me. I would extend their already artificial sense of time and pace. I would stretch it. And that would make them anxious, and they would instinctively look for solutions to quell that anxiety. And the primary solution would be what I was offering: MORE INFORMATION. That is the game. I discovered that, and I played it. I remember once I just broke off all communication with a reporter. I left town. I took a vacation. I disappeared for two whole weeks. And then when I came back, I flooded him with more than he could handle. And then I stopped everything. Now—you don't have to tell me—I know this looks like something else. It looks like I'm just holding him on the string with information alone, or the lack of it. It looks I'm talking about feeding and then not

realized it was all about time. Time and pace. That's the fundamental thing here. The rate of information flow was the true factor. The less obvious and more powerful thing is time. You create someone else's sense of time. Speed it up. Slow it down. You'll see what I mean. You know all those Papal edicts and rules and announcements you can trace down through time issued from the Vatican? Well, those pieces of information were playing to the crowd of the pros, the Church pros, the priests and bishops and so on. These edicts were creating their sense of time for them. That's the reality of it. We are told by popular historians that the Middle Ages were a slow period. And that the Renaissance was a fast period. That's all bunk. That's just the way these "news stories" have been presented. You see? With different senses of time, of pace.

Q: Now, you're not undervaluing the effect of just telling people lies.

A: Of course not! That's what I DID for a lot of years. Let me draw you a little map here. First you have a human being, and you have the world, and most of the world the human being never sees. He knows very, very little about the world. So you get propagandists, and their job is to create a virtual world that sits, as Walter Lippmann once said, between the person and the real world. When you fill that virtual space with lies, you produce a false picture of the world. Obviously. But in order to make that happen, to make that virtual creation LAST, you must create time lines of events, and every event must produce in the audience an emotion. THAT'S how you create a sense of time in the person, in the human being, in the audience. A false sense of time, because it comes from outside the person—and because it's filled with lies. And now I'm adding another factor, which is PACE. The pace of time. Too fast, too slow. That is how you get that anxiety in the audience which makes them instinctively want a SOLUTION, and they don't really know what solution to what damn problem they are looking for. Some of the time they do, but a lot of the time they don't. On this level of PACE, they are completely in the dark. So they are "tuned up" to look for answers, and they are going to get those answers from the people who are hired to do that. Their leaders. The leaders are pawns and dupes of the cartels. The cartel answers are always in the direction of less freedom and more control. Okay? See, I could produce a daily news show for TV which would give the audience the basic facts of the news every day, and I could arrange it so that the show produces about 1/1000 the amount of anxiety that regular news shows do. I could pace the news so that it more or less tracks with the person's own innate sense of pace, and that way the result would be a general sense of calm. Of course, if I did that, it would also allow the audience to THINK, and very quickly they would grasp the real issues, and they would grasp the fact that there are certain choices—REAL CHOICES—which could begin to eliminate the problems in this world of ours. The news as we know it forestalls that. There are other techniques involved as well.

Q: Such as?

A: I'll give you one in a minute. But do you see what I'm driving at? You can sit there and say, "Who the hell cares about time, who cares about pace?" You can

intrinsic to all human experience that you can't ignore it. It's THERE. If we're too stupid and "practical" to delve into it, we are the ones who lose. Because other people are thinking about it. And those people are trying to control us. If you shed your stupidity for a moment and think about all the big run-ups in the stock market, the news covers that with speed. A speed that exceeds our normal internal sense of pace. Filled with anxiety, we search around for a solution to that feeling of anxiety. See? And the obvious solution is GET ON THE BANDWAGON. INVEST. BUY IN. TAKE THE RIDE. Okay. Here is another news technique. Its purpose is to confuse us, to befuddle us, to makes us feel that we can't get a handle on REAL solutions that actually work. Disjunction.

Q: Disjunction?

A: Yes. That is where you present a string of items that don't really belong together in a sequence. They don't belong together. You start with a murder. Then you skip to a piece about the war. Then you go to a kid trapped in an elevator, and the hero who got him out. Then you move on to a statement about the economy. Then you get into the weather, a preview about the longer weather report that will come later. Then you go to a "medical breakthrough." Then a story about an old sports hero who died. On and on.

Q: And they carry you through this whole sequence.

A: Yes. And you never get a chance to figure out what is going on. On another level, a deeper level, they are creating for you a little bridge of time, which is the sequence they have given you. They have their own mundane reasons for doing this, but at a much higher level, a whole different kind of manipulation is going on. THE CREATION OF CONFUSING TIME. AND WITH A SHIFTING PACE, SLOW TO FAST, AND BACK AGAIN. All in all, this time sequence GIVES YOU A WHOLE STRING OF VARIOUS EMOTIONS WHICH MAKE UP YOUR OWN SENSE OF TIME. Emotion A, then B, then X, then Q, then K, then B again, then L. You ride this line of emotions and you end up with a sense of time, and that time is EMOTIONAL CONFUSION—because the string, the sequence of emotions doesn't belong in that order. The sequence really makes no sense at all.

Q: But it's the news.

A: Exactly. It's presented in a very familiar studio with lights and anchors all dressed up, and clips of tape, and graphics, and commercials, and the people who are dishing it out have a sense—which they communicate to you—that this is IT. This IS reality. In this order. The news people on camera maintain a calm. They have the wand of authority. They are the arbiters of the flow of time, and hence reality. Do you see now why in earlier interviews I spoke about the surrealists? I believe I did. They were seeing through this sham of information. So they turned objects and space and even time on their heads. They re-arranged everything as a joke about the basic politics and philosophy of deception. They took the disjunction

s.

And I know this because I have sat around with some REAL propagandists and we have talked about this. Not yesterday, but years ago when we were all seeing the deepest possibilities of TV news for producing mind control. Here is what TV news really is. It is a fabricated sequence of occurrences which is strung out over a period of broadcast time, and in this fabrication the viewer is led to accept, on an unconscious level, that reality is a time line of emotions which are strong AND which don't really add up to anything. TV news is nihilism in a bottle. Nothing. No way out. No exit. A friend of mine once told that to Sartre in Paris, and the great one thought about it and said that was true. Reality designed and packaged to provoke emotions that go nowhere. That in fact cancel each other out in a strange way. The road to nowhere, every night on the dot. Now the half-educated people think that nihilistic effect comes entirely from the fact that the news bombards people with bad news and with no real solutions offered up. But you have to go deeper. To see how time is created. And when you see THAT, and when you finally realize how intrinsic the sense of time is to people, how they hunger after it, how they need it, then you are coming into port. Then you are arriving at what's really going on. And what I'm talking about today—PACE—is the cherry on top. Pace gives the audience that anxiety which makes them root around for any old answer, any old solution—and those solutions come from the authorities who have nothing good in mind for the masses.

Q: Last week, you spoke about a conversation you once had with Orson Welles.

A: I had more than one. He was a man who was deeply troubled by what he was seeing around him. He knew about propaganda from the ground up. Although he was driven out of Hollywood by William Hearst after he made Citizen Kane, which was about Hearst, Welles was also persona non grata for other reasons. He knew the score. I would say he completely failed to understand medical propaganda, but on other fronts he realized that the world was run through mind control, and particularly through media mind control. Late in his life, he learned a whole lot more about Hearst, and it made him even less happy. As a stage magician, he was well aware of all the ways you can fool people with time. With creating little sub-lines of false time and diversion and all that. I would say he is the only authentic genius I have ever met who also knew the real score. Who saw through all the ways of creating mass opinion. Most geniuses become passive about that. They accept the fact that "everybody else" is being victimized. Welles didn't. He was deeply angry. He covered it up pretty well, because he knew that if he struck at the controllers he would be in even deeper muck than he already was—but he was one smart cookie.

Q: Where have some of these studies on time been done?

A: There is one that is going on right now. Unless the facility is under too much pressure. Cuba. Those detainees from Afghanistan were subjected, at least for a short period, to what they like to call sensory deprivation. They have hoods on. They sit in empty rooms. And it IS sensory deprivation. But it is also SLOW TIME.

ect
someone to slow time? Very slow time. In MKULTRA, with the drugs, the LSD-type drugs, not only were they bringing on rapid-fire hallucinations with high doses, they were also creating fast time. Overload of the acceptable level of internal time passage. Slow down time. Speed it up. What is the range of acceptable time? What happens when you go outside that range in either direction? These crude experiments are just one aspect of a much larger overall effort to discover how to create time for someone that is so real that the person gives up entirely his own innate sense of time. How do you, for example, create a permanent sense of that time-anxiety which will force a person to seek ALL ANSWERS from his designated handler? And can you create such time for many people at once from a remote location, through the use of electromagnetics?

Q: Can you create such a false sense of time that is really permanent?

A: Well, now we are getting right back into philosophy, into metaphysics.

Q: How so?

A: Because the answer to your question depends on what a human being actually is.

Q: And most people don't want to visit that area.

A: Correct. They would prefer to be happy without knowledge. As if such a thing were possible. To answer your question, it is clear that you can damage the brain of someone. Of course. And in doing that, you can alter much about the human being as far as his behavior is concerned. But, the human being himself always has the capacity to liberate his perceptions. You can kill someone, and you can injure him, but he can exist on another level. He can NOT OBEY. He can form his own picture of what reality is. He can decide how to create reality, just as the mind controllers can decide how they want to do it for him. As a person who spent most of his working days figuring out ways to achieve mind control through the media, this question of what a human being really is came to fascinate me. I'm not a new age man. I don't work on believing that everything is just fine. But I have seen some things. I know you can turn a person into a zombie, with force applied from the outside, and I also know that a person will rebel against that in every way possible BECAUSE HE IS NOT A ZOMBIE. This very simple fact is very important. If a human is really a machine, why should he resist so purely the effort to turn him into just another kind of machine? This is something most people turn away from thinking about. They don't want to think about it. But I'm afraid that freedom is real. It can be trampled on and beaten and drugged and all the other things—but much to my own chagrin, I was forced to accept the fact that I was working against an irreducible fact: Freedom is there. It is real. The individual can create out of that freedom. I never wanted to admit these things. I fought against it. But more than my fight, I wanted to know what was what. That was more important to me.

Q: You could say you became a patriot by default.

A: (laughs) Yes. It was my last possible philosophic position.

Q: Does that help you know who is going to win the Super Bowl?

A: (laughs) No. But I'm betting on St. Louis. I'll probably lose. I used to be a betting man. I had a thirst for the unknown [who was going to win] because my work became so predictable. It was so easy to float lies to the press. I became so entrenched in it, so good at it, that I wanted something different. So I would bet.

Q: Did you win?

A: On balance? No. That made me curious as well. Could someone develop a formula, a complex formula that would allow him to accurately predict a sporting event?

Q: What did you decide?

A: That it was impossible.

Q: Because there are too many variables?

A: No. Because there is one variable. Freedom of action. Which means the capacity to create.

Q: A non-mathematical variable.

A: Yes.

Q: Which many scientists would say is a contradiction in terms.

A: It's their job to say it.

Q: A minute ago you mentioned experiments that have tried to gauge what happens when you force someone to go outside his normal internal sense of pace. What about this? What happens to someone when you force him to go very far outside that range, not just a little bit?

A: Lots of things. Depends.

Q: Do we in the industrialized countries live in a speed culture?

A: I see what you're driving at. Sure. We do. And when you push a person into a chronic speeded up condition of pace, one of the things you can get is rage.

Q: A generalized rage?

A: Yes.

Q: So if the pace of media images, on balance, gets a good deal faster—

A: You tend to produce, in many people, such rage. Other factors produce rage too, but this is one. And it's relevant. First the person feels like he can't keep up. He feels in a way that he's being left out of things, that other people are rushing past him. He turns to rage, and then he matches his rage with the rage of the others who are already on that speeded up pace. The need and ability to have four beers turns into the need and ability to drink twenty beers.

Q: The need to see damage and destruction played out in the media—

A: Also increases. "Show me a war. Show me an enemy."

Q: There is, for many people, a speed component in the effect of the SSRI drugs like Prozac and Paxil.

A: And the manufacturers have always known that. I liken one of the intentional effects of the medical cartel to directing a weapon beam at a porcelain vase. You keep directing that beam at the vase, and after awhile the vase begins to show little spider cracks. Then later you can see larger cracks, and the vase trembles now and then. And then still later, the vase will blow up. It will split into a thousand pieces.

Q: I'm seeing more and more efforts to define general medical conditions as both physical and mental. Not just to assure people that "it's all in their heads," although that is part of the strategy.

A: It's to increase the number of drugs they'll have to take. It's playing that weapon beam at the vase with more power.

Q: In your days floating lies for the medical cartel, how did you see the make-up of the highest levels of the cartel?

A: This is a difficult thing. I was not sitting in on meetings of the real big shots. I never got near them, except for a short moment near David Rockefeller. He is right there, at the top level. He is one of those grand kings in semi-seclusion, you might say. But very active. Potentially. He calls the shots whenever he wants to. He gives the appearance of being rather quiescent and generous. But he is at the top echelon. Very top. I have to say that, from my best efforts at research, the medical cartel is controlled by an apparatus that was put in place by Martin Bormann, Hitler's right hand man. Bormann appears to have escaped from Europe to Argentina in 1945, although some researchers say he killed himself. Bormann and Mengele, and a few other Nazis, connected for example to IG Farben, planned to extend their control over the pharmaceutical industry. Globally. And this necessitated control of the medical research establishment, in terms of setting research agendas, general directions—and destroying other directions. You don't need to run every lab in the world to control the medical cartel. You only need to make sure that toxic pharmaceuticals are in the ascendance in all areas. And of course you need lots of medical cover stories to keep your true intentions hidden and to get doctors to unthinkingly forward your goals. The basic premise that allows toxic drugs to flourish, and kill and weaken people [which is a med cartel agenda] is: "We are

killing germs. Therefore, the drugs must be innately destructive compounds to living tissue. A drug does kill. Of course, we are developing the least killing drugs that will still kill disease, and it's a tough and heroic and unending battle." And so on. Once you have all that in place, you can control the research agenda and no one will suspect what you are really doing. Bormann and Mengele and a few others established, through their "lieutenants," an apparatus that would continue to exist and dominate key areas of the medical cartel. Men like David Rockefeller have one great thing in common with these overt Nazis. They want depopulation. They want it on a global basis. Once you are in bed on that score, you are basically in bed on every score.

###END###

March 8, 2002

Q: It seems to me that vaccines are coming increasingly under attack.

A: The law suits in the US and England. The new round of accusations that Gulf War Illness was caused, in part, by vaccines. Yes. More and more parents becoming aware of the toxicity factors, too. They're organizing.

Q: What is the general medical-cartel response to this?

A: To find more need for vaccines. To invent new vaccines. To re-package their efforts.

Q: If you're attacked on four fronts, expand the war to 12 fronts.

A: Exactly. You're getting smarter as you get older. A little smarter, anyway.

Q: I humbly bow to you, oh Lord.

A: Sure you do.

Q: What do mean by re-package?

A: Well, take a few examples. A man runs a sports-betting service. He obtains a 900 number and advertises the number on the radio. People call and pay for his predictions. They lose their money. So, two weeks later, his sports service has a new name, a new ad, a different 900 number.

Q: And new glowing PR.

A: Right. Or a hair-baldness company gets an 800 number and advertises that it has a compound that will re-grow hair safely. After a few months, the orders for the product dry up, because it works rarely. The company gets a new name, creates a slightly different protocol, and advertises a new 800 number.

Q: This happens with medical drugs too.

A: Of course. A company invents a drug for cancer. It kills people. A few years later, the company—without removing the old drug from the market—invents a variation on that drug and tests it against the older drug—and reports that it works "even better." Re-packaging.

Q: And in this case, as vaccines are being attacked?

A: New vaccines—and newer vaccines—and more vaccines. The PR function is to assure the public that this is all based on good research, on "humanitarian" efforts to stem the flow of diseases. The researcher in his lab is portrayed as the hero.

Q: This re-packaging effort happens in crimes, too.

A: Yes. A murder occurs. The police come in, and after a month or two, there are no solid leads. So a press conference is held to announce that a task force has been created. Re-set. Re-package. Then, in a month or so, if the task force doesn't make any headway, another re-set might be done. The DA's office, it's announced, is getting into the act. Anything to convince the public that a new, higher power is taking over.

Q: But in some cases, no one makes any real discoveries.

A: In which case, fake clues might be discovered. But, yes, sometimes all re-sets go nowhere. Then you get an ugly scene, if the murder was high-profile enough. The public now is looking at something like a car stuck in the mud with searchlights on it. The wheels are spinning, but the car won't move.

Q: What then?

A: Everybody responsible for the investigation tries to hide, tries to blame someone else in the investigation. As I say, it gets ugly.

Q: The JonBenet Ramsey (JBR) case is an example of that.

A: Sure. A debacle.

Q: You've looked into this case.

A: It interested me. I followed the work of Donald Freed.

Q: He wrote a book on the OJ Simpson case.

A: Freed is a formidable man. He keeps his investigations very tight. He follows one line for a long time, and he digs up some very important information. He doesn't speculate much at all. I like his style. I wish more people knew about him. I'm looking at a transcript of a radio interview with him. It's very interesting. Because Freed shows he never got sidetracked. It's so easy to get sidetracked in investigating a crime. There are 5000 rumors, and you want to branch out. Freed keeps himself in check. This interview was about the [JBR] murder.

Q: I have the copy of the interview. You told me to get it.

A: First of all, Freed spent a year and a half just to nail down one very significant idea. Most people can't or won't do that. He kept tracking and he didn't let go.

Q: Where do you want to start with this?

A: Right at the beginning. Let's follow it through. First, Freed says he works by constructing a time line of events. This is in contradistinction to what most crime reporters do. Here Freed is building his own chain of events. Propagandists, as I mentioned in earlier interviews, do this all the time—but their job is to put together a string of lies and half-truths, to come to a lying conclusion. Freed is working in the same fashion, but he is working from truth to truth. So the first thing is, the Boulder

police got a call at 5:52 in the morning. A cop comes to the Ramsey house at about 6 AM. The body is found in the early afternoon. The cops mangled the crime scene. Whatever could be trampled on they trampled on. They actually asked John Ramsey to search the house for his daughter. As Freed says, this is maybe the weirdest move anyone has ever heard of. The father finds the child and he brings her upstairs and puts her body next to the Christmas tree. We also hear, as the investigation unfolds, that the cops of this small town or city, Boulder, did not take the offered advice of the FBI. The FBI wanted to help, but they were turned down.

Q: So it's as if the Boulder cops are doubly crazy.

A: Yes. They mangle the crime scene, they botch the whole first day, and then later they turn down help from the real pros.

Q: And that's the impression the public gets.

A: Yes. Amateur cops on the loose. They don't know what they're doing.

Q: The public is led to believe that nothing could be done to derail these Boulder cops, who are trying to act like the pros when they're not.

A: Right. This is very important, because that impression persists throughout the whole investigation. There is a scapegoat available. People can say, well, the crime was not solved because the local police didn't know their asses from their elbows. At this point, I would raise the red flag. A scapegoat is being created. Watch out. Something is wrong. Something is being manipulated, and it started on that first day.

Q: So where does Freed go next?

A: Well, he mentions that the FBI—at a later date--finally invites everybody to Quantico, to sort out all matters pertaining to the case. See, the public is led to believe that the FBI is very frustrated. It can't make headway. It is trying. So, finally, in desperation, it brings the people in charge of the case from Boulder, to try to bring some sanity to the investigation. Another red flag. This is me saying that. A red flag. Something is very weird here.

Q: Anymore about the first day of the investigation?

A: Yes. Freed re-states the fact that, for first eight hours of the investigation, there was only real police DETECTIVE at the scene, at the crime scene.

Q: Only one.

A: Right. The other cops there were not detectives. Then Freed says, wait. This, initially was a case that had all the earmarks of a kidnapping, or terrorism. And since that was so, how is it that the local cops could consider themselves experts on that?

Q: There was a note at the crime scene.

A: The note stated that the criminals were members of a foreign faction which "hates" the US, and is planning to abduct "bigwigs" inside the US.

Q: So Freed asks how the Boulder cops can be in charge of a crime that appears, initially, to have these characteristics.

A: Right. A damn good question. A question that no one else bothers to think about. But the more you do think about it, the more eerie the whole thing feels. Right from the start.

Q: In this radio interview with Freed, the interviewer, a Doctor Bob McFarland [KGNU—Boulder], then suggests to Freed that the cops might have treated this case casually from the beginning because they didn't believe the note.

A: And Freed allows for this. Basically, in retrospect we might say that the note "from the terrorists" was a fraud, but how could anyone have known it in the first hours? They couldn't have known it.

Q: Freed then makes an even more important point.

A: Yes. The FBI, since the famous Lindbergh law, has complete jurisdiction in cases of kidnapping. The FBI JEALOUSLY guards that turf. The FBI's budget—which, believe me, is a very big deal to the Bureau—is based on these turf areas of responsibility. Kidnapping, grand theft auto, interstate crimes, bank robberies. The FBI, as Freed states, "wrote the book" on kidnapping. Agents get special training. The Bureau is judged, to a considerable degree, by how well it does with kidnapping cases. The FBI has the absolute right to take over—IMMEDIATELY—in a case where kidnapping APPEARS to have taken place. If there is a note claiming to be from terrorists, that's enough.

Q: Boom. The FBI takes over.

A: This is "well-oiled machinery." The FBI comes in and the local cops are shoved to the sidelines. Right away.

Q: So the implication here is that something was stopping the FBI from coming into the case in the first hours.

A: Yes. And we both share an ex-FBI source, you and I. We have both talked to him. And he confirms that this is so. There was, in fact, a reluctance to take charge. There was a stoplight and it was very bright.

Q: Someone was pulling strings.

A: Look at what Freed says at this point. You're dealing with a big-time corporate executive here, John Ramsey. The corporation is Lockheed Martin. It is One with the federal government. That's me saying that. You have what looks like a

kidnapping or a murder of a family member of a Lockheed executive. You have a note. You have words in the note that spell TERRORISTS.

Q: And yet the FBI does not intervene right away. And as the case unfolds, the FBI is portrayed as the gee-whiz nice guys who are trying like hell to get their helping hand into the case—if only the Boulder cops will LET them.

A: Correct. Freed fleshes this out, step by step. He's really quite merciless. This is not someone you'd like to have on your tail if you committed a serious crime. He's an author, a playwright, a novelist—and I would say THIS is the man you'd want to have in charge of the FBI, if you wanted an FBI at all. This would be the type of man who could make the Bureau into a real police force. At any rate, he goes on to say that with the above apparent factors in the Boulder crime, the whole security apparatus of the US government would swing into action in minutes.

Q: And we have this confirmation as well, from our FBI source.

A: No doubt about it. He told me, "You take a note, a missing family member where the father is a major corporate executive, a statement of terrorism in the note, and the White House lights would blink on, even at 5 in the morning."

Q: You would get the CIA, NSA, and the Pentagon in on this right away. The US Attorney General.

A: Yes.

Q: Next, Freed states that "[t]the interface between the head Lockheed Martin Security and the FBI is elaborate and it's interlocking and it's complete."

A: And therefore a huge amount of communication would have taken place. RIGHT AWAY, as Freed asserts, the executives of Lockheed would have been told by either the FBI or Lockheed security, or both, whether their kids in Denver could go to school. Whether their wives could go shopping. And once again, we have confirmation of this from our FBI source.

Q: Yes. He says, "You have no idea how closely this would be done, with what attention to detail, how swiftly. This is big-time stuff we're talking about. This is showtime in all its glory. You don't fall down on this particular kind of job. You PREPARE for this kind of thing." He was extremely emphatic on this point.

A: Freed now puts a capper on all of this. And our FBI man concurs completely. Neither Lockheed Martin Security nor the FBI—in the Denver area—came to the crime scene. They didn't rush out there. Nothing of this kind happened. With that first call to the police from the Ramsey home—or very soon afterwards—this HAD TO HAPPEN. BUT IT DIDN'T. This is so absurd. This is like saying no one came to a scene of a plane crash from the Transportation Safety Board. They just forgot. They stayed home.

Q: Our FBI man made further statements which are absolutely in line with what Freed says. That is, no one from the FBI would want to trudge up to Capitol Hill and make a budget request--certainly not the Director of the FBI—when he would have to explain his Bureau's activities and have to account for why it did not move IMMEDIATELY in a situation where terrorists on American soil appeared to have been involved.

A: Also, FBI PR—and I know this VERY well—would have stepped in and taken responsibility for all statements about the case coming out of Boulder. Immediately. The crazy PR coming out of Boulder from local people would never have been permitted. But it WAS.

Q: Again, this is confirmed by our FBI source. He says the whole crime scene would have been taken over by the FBI. The whole neighborhood would have been taken over.

A: But it wasn't.

Q: Both Freed and our FBI source separately brought up the Abode Graphics case, where an executive had been kidnapped. FBI agents came in, in a swarm.

A: Another important point here. If in the first hours after that phone call to the police in Boulder, there was some doubt about the authenticity of the terrorist note, that still would not have prevented the FBI from invading the premises and taking over. They could not take a chance.

Q: Freed says the FBI would never have allowed the possibility of being embarrassed.

A: Yes. They never hang back in a case of this kind and wonder whether they should act. It is not the way they operate. But—THEY DID OPERATE IN THIS FASHION.

Q: All right. So the FBI did take a holiday here. The local office in Boulder did. The office in Denver did. Headquarters in Washington did. The security apparatus of Lockheed did.

A: The impossible happened. Understand that Lockheed Security was responsible for telling the execs that everything was safe. This is their JOB.

Q: So Freed—and our FBI source conclude?

A: The FBI and Lockheed knew with full certainty that this crime did not involve terrorists. They knew it right away. They knew that vaunted national security was NOT an issue. They knew THIS right away. They knew that Lockheed safety was NOT an issue right away.

Q: They knew too much too soon.

A: Yes. And they knew things they didn't want to find out by actually showing up at the Ramsey home and digging into the case and the evidence. They knew that THERE WERE VERY IMPORTANT PEOPLE WHO DID NOT WANT THE INVESTIGATION TO PROCEED IN A NORMAL FASHION AND RUN BY THE PROS. And when I say that, I know full well that many FBI investigations are cooked and slanted and run intentionally to obscure information. I'm well aware of that. We both are. I asked our FBI source about this. Here is what he said. If you know, up front, that the terrorist note is a fraud, if you know it is the only piece of information that ties the case to terrorists/kidnapping and, therefore, the need for intervention by the FBI, and if you know that quite soon the note is going to be shown up as a hoax, then you could decide to hang back. You could do that. You could judge that it's better, in this situation, to let the bunglers, the local cops, come in and do their idiotic work. SINCE YOU ALSO KNOW THAT THERE IS NO REAL DANGER TO THE EXECS OF LOCKHEED. You finesse the whole thing. You let the murder of the child stand as a "simple crime of murder." I'll say one other thing myself. There is also the possibility that someone in the Boulder police force—or more than one person—is a creature under the control of those who want the real origin of the crime covered up. And therefore the Boulder police WILL let John Ramsey wander about the house and find his child's body. Which is a better cover-up than what you could get by FBI agents in the first few hours.

Q: Let's be clear on another point. The Boulder police did notify the FBI of the crime.

A: The chief of the Boulder police did notify the FBI. Right away.

Q: And as Freed states, there was another chain of information here too.

A: The word about the crime goes from the Ramsey house to Lockheed Security, and then they call the FBI locally, and then that word goes to FBI headquarters in Washington—because you have a Lockheed executive involved here on American soil—and then the FBI in Washington sends back word to its offices in Denver and Boulder: Don't handle this. Stay away. Leave this in the hands of the Boulder police.

Q: Okay. Now Freed has spoken with Norm Early, who was once the DA in Denver, and was, at the time of the JonBenet murder, the vice-president of Lockheed Martin Security.

A: Right. And here is what Early said. "You know, I had a six-year-old son, and we have a security protocol and that letter [the note re JonBenet] threatened other executives. Where was the security? Where were the bodyguards? Where was the protocol? Where was the alert, the drill, the routine, the regimen, that we so carefully shared and worked on at Lockheed Martin? Not a word. Not a sound. Not a telephone call…[then in speaking with Lockheed executives and lawyers—Early relates to Freed his exchange with them] Well, there was no threat [they told Early]. How do you know that? Well, I don't know. We just knew. Well, think about it and I want an answer!…[after a still later conversation with these Lockheed people, Early

reported they said] You know, we stayed up all night wrestling with the question—agonizing with it. And you know, you're right. How did we know that the [note] was a hoax immediately? We might have known it in a day or two…"

Q: Very strange.

A: In the opinion of our FBI source, Early's remarks indicate that someone high up in Lockheed knew what was really going on, and wanted to cover it up. Someone knew, right away, that there was no threat to Lockheed personnel, and decided to let the whole security apparatus stand down because he was afraid that, if the Lockheed Security people got involved, they might discover how the murder was really committed. And THAT could not happen. Not only that, but if Lockheed Security OR the FBI moved in fast and hard, then both of them would have to move in, with no excuses--and one or the other might find the real criminal, the real murderer, the real reason for the murder.

Q: Which is?

A: Freed suggests that there was child pornography involved—actually, sex with children. And some very high-up adults were engaging in it. He hammers on the point that such people would go to any lengths to cover that up, because there would be nothing left of their lives if this was exposed.

Q: So those high-up people could be Lockheed executives.

A: Yes. Or other people who could control the reaction or non-reaction of the whole Lockheed security apparatus and the FBI.

Q: If the FBI could be controlled, that would certainly suggest that very important political figures were involved in the child sex and porn.

A: Here is what our FBI source told me. He said that such shut-downs of investigations into child sex and porn have occurred, within the FBI. He is aware of this. He said that the lid on this is very tight. He agrees with Freed on yet another point. If you are a person who is part of child porn, let's say, and if this is a widespread thing, then even if the murder of a child, per se, has nothing to do with you, you will do whatever is in your power to do to cover it up. Because the long trail could lead to you. You never know how far the investigation is going to go. Freed gives the illustration of the incident in Belgium. No one investigated the murders of children there until huge numbers of citizens came out on the streets in mass protests. And some of the people in the justice system in Belgium and in the corporate world there had been involved in trying to stop the investigation of the murders and the child sex. These people were not the murderers. They were, however, involved in child porn and child sex [with adults, with themselves], and they were terrified that this fact would be uncovered in the murder investigations. So, yes, it can happen. It has happened. [See *The Franklin Cover-Up*, by John De Kamp]

Q: Our FBI source also says that he is certain the cover-up in Boulder does have something to do with child sex.

A: He'll give no details on it at the moment. You mention child slavery and sex in a recent piece on your site having to do with DynCorp in Bosnia.

Q: How many people in and around Boulder and Denver would be implicated in either the murder of JonBenet or child porn/sex?

A: As usual, most of the people in the police and justice system there are simply unable to get past the curtain. Leads in the case have been ignored. Other leads have gone nowhere. You also have to look at the blackmail factor here. If a person is part of child-sex, there is a decent chance that some of his activities are on tape or film. In that case, he is a captive. He will scuttle any clue, block any road, in order to protect himself from public exposure. In my own work, many years ago, I knew of a few people who worked in this area.

Q: Blackmail?

A: Yes. They worked for intelligence agencies, or intell groups involved with corporations, or for very private groups that wanted to have something on people in power. Sex was offered, it was accepted, film was shot, photos were shot. Records were kept. This was mostly in Europe. But it was very competently done. These were professionals. A whole trial and error period was initiated with some politicians, with some corporate executives.

Q: What do you mean, trial and error?

A: To see what kind of sex the man was interested in, what he might become interested in if it was offered to him. This had to be done carefully. Trust had to be built up. It could take awhile. It has certain similarities to recruiting a spy. How far will the man go? Whom will he betray? With this sex business, the politician's family and friends might be scouted out. In other words, the potential target is investigated thoroughly. Anything you can find out about a target can be turned to good use. So, in any child sex and porn operation, there is always this element that can be used.

Q: There can also be a ritualistic element to all this too.

A: Yes. You bring a person in with a story about some mystical something. A rationalization. We are the inheritors of Power. It falls to us to do whatever we want to. For other people the impulses must be checked, but we are allowed to indulge completely our own impulses. You see? We owe it to ourselves to indulge our whims. It's part of the obligation of Power. It is how we pass through all the illusions of morality and come out the other side, into the bright light of truth. Everyone else must have morality, because they are all crazy. Without morality, they would commit murder on the streets. But we are the ultimately sane ones, and in order to become fully sane, we must systematically set about destroying our old

rules and restraints and teachings. Only in this way can we achieve our full potential. What I'm giving you here is chapter and verse of the underpinning of most of these secret societies. The rest of their teachings is decoration. The symbols, the images, the ceremonies. That all follows on the heels of what I'm telling you.

Q: This is important.

A: It is. It explains a great deal of the psychology behind these groups, within these men. And add on to that the fact that, when you lure someone into doing something he later regrets, he later feels very guilty about, he tends to become a captive. He has gone through the looking glass into serious guilt and in some cases very repulsive crimes. Will he able to back away or is he now trapped? Particularly if taped or filmed evidence of his crimes is waved in his face. But even without the blackmail, you are now into serious mind control, resulting from getting someone to do something horrible "for a good reason." Then if the initiate goes to pieces with guilt and remorse, his "friends" are there to pick him up and "explain" what is really going on. You see? They have a malleable subject in their hands at that point, and they can tell their tales of Power and The Mantle of Authority and No Morality and all that—and THIS time the victim has a new level of desperation about accepting all this claptrap, because he needs SOMETHING to make him think his rape of a child or worse was really, in some way, a sign of his crossing into true Glory and Power.

Q: It's like a reverse copy of the doctrine of the Vatican.

A: Yes. In the case of the Vatican, original sin by Adam and Eve is cooked up as "the crime that no one can escape from, the stain that brands every human." So one has to spend his whole life atoning and working out of that guilt. These secret societies turn that around and say, "We'll show them. We'll commit the original sin on purpose and far worse, and we'll keep doing it until we feel absolutely no guilt and no sympathy for the victims and nothing but Pure Power." Now, these two sides have been described as God versus Satan, but really it is not that at all. It's something a lot simpler. If you look at the original formulation by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, you see that the God-Satan opposition was set up in advance, as the categorical description for both sides, for all people. When I say God in this context, I mean, very specifically, the concept of God and all the attendant myth set up by the Roman hierarchy.

Q: You're saying that this concept of God is one that requires a life of guilt, and the Satan concept is one which calls for a life of crime.

A: Pretty much.

Q: On the propaganda beat, I see that articles are appearing which criticize the recent movie, A Beautiful Mind.

A: Well, they are criticizing it for several reasons. One of them is, John Nash, as portrayed in the film, recovers from schizophrenia because, as his character says, he

has been taking some of the newer anti-psychotic drugs. Whereas, in real life, Nash seems to have recovered because, in part, he stopped taking all the drugs To slip that pro-med message into the film—well, someone was careful to do that. They didn't have to do that. But they did. It was most certainly NOT an accident. That conscious choice was made. "We need to change what actually happened in the man's life." Whether a scriptwriter did that—we are told that one of the writer's family members is a psychiatrist or a psychiatric "professional"—we don't know for sure. But, to insert that change, or to leave it there even though the facts refute that pro-drug stance—in either case you are talking about conscious propaganda. You might say that one of the great meeting grounds for the medical and media cartels is Hollywood. If you make a film that says a person, a Nobel-prize winner, has overcome schizophrenia—whatever the hell THAT is supposed to be—with NO DRUGS and no psychiatric care—if you send that message out to the public, you are walking on a slippery slope. You are challenging the powers that be, who want to medicate everybody and make it seem all perfectly scientific. And if your hero in the film Nash, is himself a mathematician, a genius of the "science ilk," in very general terms, and if HE rejects all the drugs, then the subliminal message is: See, a real scientist has good grounds for turning away from the drugs.

Q: Of course, it's possible that some pharmaceutical money actually paid for that pro-drug insertion in the film.

A: Never overlook that. Pharmaceutical companies keep track of these things. Just as the FBI has a very strong opinion about its turf, so does the medical cartel. That is why you rarely see a movie made which actually challenges, head on, the real effects of med drugs. This is no accident. Films don't simply turn out not to be that way. There is an unwritten rule about this, and you rarely see it broken in a serious way. You might get a comment here or there which is disparaging on the subject of a drug, a doctor, doctors, and so on—but not a challenge out in the open where that is the main theme.

Q: Unless it involves a single drug firm which has done something wrong.

A: Correct. But you know, I have a feeling this is changing now. Based on several conversations I've been having, we may see something change here. There is certainly a lot more awareness about the toxicity of these drugs. I'm not predicting 12 blockbusters which score direct hits on the medical cartel, but—something. We'll see.

Q: Back to what we were talking about—this appropriated definition of good and evil framed by a religious organization. It seems to produce more evil.

A: Once you have such a definition in place, you can then go on and produce the most amazing mind control tricks. Because you're working with people who are so confused. In propaganda, the first lie makes the second lie easier. And the second, the third.

Q: This confusion. It seems to spread out into so many areas. Take money, for example. A person looks around and sees that the biggest chunks of money are in the hands of people of ill-will. So he concludes that money itself is a bad thing. Like a stigma. When actually, if people with real innovations had a great deal of money, they would be able to do so much to change the world.

A: In that case, the confusion stems from people believing that money itself is such a corrupting force that you have to avoid having any. It also stems from the fact that most people have no concept left of what this society should be based on.

Q: If there is no concept left of individual freedom, the whole tree rots. No matter how you try to work around that, you can't. You can't make a world in which everyone is happy if freedom is really gone. I am beginning to talk to a few inventors of alternative-energy devices. Of course, it just takes a second to see what these people could do to change things if they had some real seed money. But I also notice that one or two of these people are caught in the middle. They believe, rightly, that they must get money to go into production. But they also seem to believe that money is a stigma. As if they only retain integrity if they DON'T produce their innovations. As if their integrity is based on their FAILING.

A: You are talking about a classic form of mind control here. Every possible destination seems to be impossible or wrong. The person becomes IMMOBILIZED. He is then ripe for takeover, as they say about small nations.

Q: We have to get beyond that.

A: In your writing, I occasionally see the use of Buckminster Fuller's phrase, "brilliant success." That was one man who meant exactly what he said.

Q: Yes. You and I have talked about that phrase several times.

A: Fuller meant it to apply to nations, to the world, and to the individual.

Q: You can't have a brilliantly successful world without having brilliantly successful individuals.

A: I agree. I guess we've gone from the depths to the heights in this conversation.

Q: Back to the JonBenet case. I want to stress these confirmations we have gotten on key points from our FBI source.

A: He's quite reliable. He has certain contacts who have tried to follow up by talking with Lockheed executives about the crazy handling of the case in the first days. These Lockheed people are mum. On the record, off the record, they don't want to say anything. They still seem to be nervous about this. It's clear that protocol was not followed, and they don't know why. They don't want to know why. Or if they really know something, they are still stonewalling. They are avoiding the whole issue.

Q: I also want to point out that Freed is not saying he has absolute proof that a child-sex ring is involved.

A: Sure. But his inference about this is very, very believable. It's the most obvious answer. This is a very nasty subject. Revealing that major corporate executives are involved in child-sex or in covering that up? You've seen the recent articles about DynCorp employees in Bosnia who were selling young girls. Did this make headlines in major American papers? Did it get continuous hard-driving coverage? No. Instead, "national security" was invoked to choke off the story. I can tell you that for a fact. And still, it may not work. The story is oozing out in a lot of places, the containment is more difficult to achieve.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

May 31, 2002

As a former operative for several major players at the Council on Foreign Relations, Ellis speaks about omission as a weapon of info war.

Q: What about leaving out key parts of an event?

A: It's very useful. You know, sometimes you can badger a reporter a little and get him to tone down a story you don't want printed. For example, I knew a writer for the Times of London who was going to publish a very hot story about HIV. He was going to report that no one had ever proved it caused AIDS. This was at a time when everybody "knew" that HIV was the offending germ.

Q: What did you do?

A: I got him to omit one damaging fact. Which was, Robert Gallo had only been able to find HIV in a minority of the patients who had been diagnosed with AIDS. I got him to omit that.

Q: How did you get him to leave it out?

A: I talked with a "very reliable source" this reporter often used, and I convinced the source that Gallo had, in fact, isolated HIV from all but a few of his patients.

Q: That was a lie.

A: Don't I know it.

Q: But it worked?

A: Like a charm. The reliable source talked to the reporter a few days before the piece was going to be printed, and the reporter backed down. His story lost a lot of punch, and when it showed up in the paper, it was very weakly worded.

Q: You've talked to me before about what you call the code of the reporter.

A: Yes. The code goes, write about events and what people said, don't write about issues. Leave that for the editorial pages. It has worked out very well for propagandists like myself.

Q: How so?

A: Well, take the area of jury nullification. This is when the jury goes off to deliberate and takes the law into its own hands. It decides that, despite the evidence, and despite explicit instructions from the judge about how to deliberate, the case at hand requires special consideration. And so the jury finds, for instance, a defendant not guilty who, by the letter of the law, should be guilty. You know, the banker in a small town broke a law by recklessly using bank monies to save a few farmers from

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

bankruptcy caused by a water shortage. Whatever. The jury finds him innocent. Now this story can be tied in with many other cases in America where the jury has nullified the judge and even the law. But, most of the time, no such story appears. Because the reporter, for the most part, sees this as an ISSUE, and leaves it to the editorial writers. Or, the story does appear, but as a feature, not as a hard news story on page one.

Q: Leaving out material is a strategy of propaganda.

A: People like me often did their best work obtaining NOTHING. Getting something NOT printed. That was the goal.

Q: "Thanks for nothing."

A: Exactly.

Q: If there is a blue elephant standing in the middle of a room—

A: And if 50 people are looking at it, and if three networks tell these people everything BUT the fact that there is an elephant—and if the three networks are, in fact, saying that anyone who sees an elephant is nuts—well, then, what have you got?

Q: You've got a mess.

A: That's right. You have the UFO situation. You have millions of people who say they have seen these ships, and they are all considered nuts. Now ordinarily, you would say such a situation is insupportable. You would say this could never happen. You couldn't have all these people—including a number of acute professional observers--over here seeing X and then everyone else over there accusing those people of being nuts. Could not happen. But it has happened.

Q: So essentially the major media are saying, we're going to force this omission of reality down your throats. We don't care if you don't like it. The cat is out of the bag but we don't care.

A: Yes. That's why I bring up this extreme example. The process of inducing mind control can involve the shrinking of reality. You tell a person that everything he sees is okay, except this one section of it. This is not there, he's imagining it. So, to protect himself, the person shrinks down his concept of reality—to exclude the controversial area. If you can keep getting him to do that, in serial fashion, you'll have a person inside iron bars of his own perception. This applies to visual and moral and all sorts of reality.

Q: What's the fallout of this shrinking process?

A: You breed the germ of frustration and anger in people. It sinks in, waiting to be unleashed. It MUST be unleashed. The best outlet, overall, is a war. You foment an enemy, and point people in that direction.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: I suppose it works that way with money, too.

A: A very explosive situation. You train people to want myriad consumer objects. You set up a consumer society. And then you arrange things so that you essentially omit money. There just isn't enough money to satisfy the desire of people for those objects. Of course, the ultimate responsibility to see through the game falls on the shoulders of the consumer, as does the earning of money. But from the sociological perspective, what you get is a restless nation and people who are very frustrated. They want an outlet for their anger.

Q: Some of that went on in the JFK assassination.

A: Sure. In about three minutes, the American people smelled a cover-up. They perceived that something was very wrong. And then you had the long whitewash. The Warren Commission, with its imperial pronouncement. Still, though, the potential power links were broken.

Q: What do you mean? The real people who planned to kill and killed Kennedy were omitted from the press investigations?

A: Yes, but here is what I mean. Over the years since 1963, about 65% of the American people, give or take, have come to conclude that the Warren Commission is covering up the truth. 65% is a huge figure. And yet, where does it all go? See, the ACCEPTED power link goes through the major media to the government, which may feel it has to act because the TV networks are saying the Warren Commission is a hoax. But the networks don't say that. Instead, the 65% are saying it and reading it on the Internet. Which the government does NOT consider a power link in the chain. The government does not feel compelled to act because the Internet is pointing out a hoax. So there are no compelling power links in a chain.

Q: This sounds like one grand illusion.

A: It IS an illusion. On the surface of it, why should the government feel compelled to act just because CBS, NBC, and ABC are saying it should, and why should the government think that the Internet is of no concern? It's a psychotic situation, but there it is. You see? When the major media omit a story or a central fact, and when the government takes this as a sign that no action is therefore necessary, you now get a fake reality. A reality in which nothing is necessary.

Q: But how long can this massive imbalance continue?

A: That's to be seen. We'll find out. One thing, though. If political candidates began appearing all over the place who took their cues from the Internet, so to speak, who fashioned a whole new LEVEL of agenda based on what the American people think below the surface, there would be a revolution. At the polls. It would take quite a bit of time, but it would happen.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: This would be like a potential government waiting in the wings. A government which does take seriously what people are writing on the Internet.

A: Precisely. A new way to forge the links of power. Otherwise, what do you have?

Q: As far as I took my agenda when I ran for Congress in 1994, in LA, I wonder what would have happened if I had said I was running on the existence of UFOs and the truth about the JFK assassination.

A: You may not remember, but I suggested something like this to you at the time. You have to reach down inside people and tap their frustrations about putting up with lies. You probably would have lost anyway, but then someone else would have come along the next time and run on the juice you started to tap. You start making a road where none existed before. That did happen because you ran on a platform that had to do with medical lies. That actually worked. People have come along afterwards. But not in the political arena, not as candidates.

Q: Interesting.

A: Yes.

Q: There is quite a bit of rationalization by those in power, concerning what the public can handle and what it can not handle.

A: Yeah. Elitists always use that game. "If the public knew everything about A and B and C, panic would result. People would go crazy. Only WE can deal with the truth. So we have to protect the sheep and keep them in the pen of their own perception—a perception we work to shape day in and day out."

Q: I'm sure you remember the group called est. Some years ago, they did an experiment where they had some people on one of side of a locked chain link fence. And they kept them there for a whole day, and they fed them nothing. Then, on the other side of that fence, they had people who were having a big picnic. Food everywhere. Sumptuous food and drink. The people who were eating paraded past the fence and made a display of eating. After awhile—and it took awhile—the people on the inside began whining and asking and then begging for food. The people with the food laughed at them. And finally, the people on the inside got very pissed off. Very.

A: The omission was re-connected.

Q: Meaning?

A: People saw what hunger and plenty are like, side by side. I'm sure the people with all the food began to feel guilty.

Q: They did. That was a point of the exercise.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: That's like—you stage a two-hour debate on national television between those who say the Kennedy murder was committed by Oswald, acting alone, and on the other side, you have the good conspiracy researchers. You let all the debaters present their cases in depth.

Q: And what happens?

A: The conspiracists obviously blow the other side out of the water. And everyone in TV land sees it unfold. You do a re-connect of the vast omission of the truth.

Q: You could do a webcast of this.

A: You should do 100 webcasts of this. Then the pressure would begin to build a little.

Q: You and I are both aware of some very good research on HIV tests done by the journalist Christine Johnson. An example of mainstream press omission. [See Alive and Well, a site linked on my own site.]

A: Absolutely. She searched the medical literature and found over sixty reasons why the test would register FALSELY positive. The press never picked up on this. If it had, a storm would have developed in quick fashion. "Here are sixty vital pieces of information your doctor will overlook when he tells you, falsely, that you have AIDS." Can you imagine? But the point here is that by omitting this blockbuster of a story, the press shapes the public attitude and the public has no idea what is happening. No idea at all.

Q: You know that reporters know about Christine's work?

A: Of course they do. Some PR people I know have managed this whole threat to the medical cartel. They have gotten several mainstream stories about her work killed before they could be printed.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

June 7, 2002

MORE ON MEDIA CONTROL AND MIND CONTROL

Free-association can be a blessing or a curse. It is a curse when it is used as a weapon to corral populations in a mind trap. Example: As India and Pakistan hover on the nuclear brink, the public is being fed a line of these associations. NUKE EXCHANGE EQUALS NUKE WARNINGS PREVIOUSLY HANDED DOWN IN AMERICA RE TERRORISM EQUALS THE NEW MOVIE ON NUKES EQUALS CRUDE AND DIRTY NUKE DEVICES BUILT IN AFGHANISTAN EQUALS NUKES MISSING FROM THE RUSSIAN ARSENAL EQUALS MISSING PLUTONIUM FROM US BASES. Fear, fear, and more fear.

Note well: There is no conventional way to combat such a string of associations because they are inherently illogical. They prey on the human tendency to connect dots when similar words or phrases are used and taken out of different contexts.

You can't break the chain of such associations at any point within the structure, because there really isn't any structure. It's like asking a demolition crew to take down a building carefully when the building has been constructed with a series of imbalanced beams in the first place barely held together with spit and wire.

You can only take apart a string of such associations by stepping back and realizing that the whole mish mash was made, in the first place, as a delusion with a purpose.

A similar strategy involves shoving the same basic story at people from several different sources. People then believe it must be true. When, for example, you get the Dept. of Justice, and its underling, the FBI, and the president, and the CIA, and the Dept. of Defense all "confirming" that Al Qida was the basic planner of 9/11, the public is basically helpless.

All these sources may be repeating the same lie, but it doesn't matter. It feels as if the confirmations are pouring in from all quarters. A further attempt was made to bolster the 9/11 "evidence" against bin Laden by having Tony Blair release the final report from England.

Ellis Medavoy called this "the green bowling ball strategy." He explained: "You get a dozen media or government sources all rolling a green bowling ball at the minds of the population. A conclusion is reached. The green ball must be real. It must exist. There is no way around it. A propagandist like myself uses this approach. Alert many reporters to the same basic idea and you'll get a number of stories from different press outlets saying the same thing. On top of that, reporters you never spoke with will pick up on the story from the published reports and THEY'LL begin repeating it too."

The big lie. Used, of course, by advertising firms as well. Run the same commercial five hundred times on several channels, and people begin to accept the message.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

They may not believe it, but they accept it, and they'll choose the product in the store.

Medavoy continues: "This works with God too. If there are a hundred religions all talking about God, then independent of the question about whether God exists, people will accept his existence, simply because it's coming from so many angles. No one stops to ask, 'Is each religion really talking about the same God, or are they inventing their own constructs of what might or might not be the real thing?'"

Here is a corollary. If you have 500,000 cases of vaccine damage to children, the propagandists try to SEPARATE these accounts and, of course, bury them. The separation idea is: Don't allow press stories to be printed which tally up all the reports of damage, which tie them together. Keep it compartmentalized.

Ditto for damage from medical drugs.

Or for the thousands of cases of brutal intervention by Child Protective Services units in the lives of families.

Here is a principle of true investigation which counters these mind-control trends: BUILD UP THE CONFIRMED CASES OF PHENOMENON X, MAKE AN ESTIMATE OF THE DAMAGE CAUSED BY ALL THESE INSTANCES, AND THEN LOOK FOR CLUES WHICH INDICATE THAT THERE IS AN OVERALL AGENDA. THE AGENDA WILL BE THAT VERY DAMAGE, AS IN, CAUSING IT. THEN SEE THAT SUCH AN AGENDA MUST BE COMING FROM SOMEWHERE. THERE MUST BE INTENTIONALITY AT WORK. The major media reject, out of hand, such a strategy of analysis.

Okay. Here is the interview with Ellis Medavoy, retired propaganda expert extraordinaire. A man who at one time worked for several major players at the Council on Foreign Relations and other such elite groups.

Q: So size matters?

A: (laughs) It sure does, in the media. The bigger the media outlets get, the more they create their own audience.

Q: What does that mean?

A: It means this. People in the public begin to sense what kind of person you have to be to accept the news such as it is, and these people begin to re-cast themselves as that sort of person. As the ideal viewer.

Q: Reminds me of people wearing the logos of companies on their T-shirts.

A: It's a similar theme. Once the media reach a certain critical mass, in size, they actually create the blank shape which forms the ideal viewer or reader, and then the audience steps into that blank and fills it out.

Q: And that's because?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Whenever any organization attains a certain level of power and reach, it automatically becomes a god. People then ask, what does the god want of me? And with the answer in hand, those people then BECOME THAT.

Q: This act of compliance is conscious?

A: Yes and no. The person who re-shapes himself in order to comply is really acting on impulse, acting in a way he thinks is best and necessary, given the power relationships which exist.

Q: And the media companies? Are they aware that their very size initiates this "compliance response?"

A: No. All they know is, they control the market. But the principle I'm describing operates anyway. It's like the kid who lives in a small town 100 years ago. He sees certain things, six things he can grow up and do, and he tends to shape himself so that he'll become one of those personae who does one of those things. But in the field of media, it's more spooky, because these days people really have a lot of choices, and the fact that a lot of them create themselves as "the ideal viewer" reflects a strong unconscious drive: "THIS IS LIFE, THIS IS WHERE THE IMPORTANT INFORMATION IS COMING FROM, THIS IS THE GAME, THIS IS THE POWER RELATIONSHIP, THIS IS HIP, THIS IS THE LATEST AND THE GREATEST, AND THEREFORE THIS IS WHAT I HAVE TO BE."

Q: And within that framework?

A: A person can criticize the media, but he is really dickering over a limited range of options which are all imparting the same basic information. It's an illusion.

Q: People create themselves as receivers of information.

A: As "the best receivers."

Q: Strange.

A: Strange but true.

Q: From some of our mutual research, I'd say that certain esthetic factors are involved too.

A: Of course. The person sees all those neatly cosmetic anchors, sees the way the news flows so smartly on NBC, sees or feels the coordination of the voice-overs and the cameral angles—the whole presentation re-enforces the idea that NBC is a god. A god of art and hipness in the field of information. Therefore, the viewer wants to go with that.

Q: Just as he wants to go with a Corvette rather than a Pinto.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Yeah. Better yet, he wants to go with Tom Cruise's latest Mission Impossible epic rather than an old black and white film like Executive Action, which really tells you something about the Kennedy assassination.

Q: He wants to be the ideal viewer of Mission Impossible.

A: That's right. Even if he doesn't like the movie, he sees himself as the ideal viewer of it. Look at all those TV beer commercials. They're actually fishing for the ideal young male beer drinker. They're creating the environment and the atmosphere for that person, in thirty seconds, and the young kid fits himself into that blank framework and says, "This is me. This could be me."

Q: The ideal beer drinker.

A: Right.

Q: What else happens when media outlets reach a certain massive size?

A: They become fictionalized versions of themselves.

Q: What do you mean?

A: They begin to look like feature films.

Q: And therefore?

A: You get a schizophrenic effect.

Q: Explain.

A: On the one hand, Dan Rather looks completely credible. He is the man who gives the public the truth, the important truth. On the other hand, he looks like an actor who is hired to dispense official wisdom. The images that flow while he talks appear to be the most credible shorthand for world events that are taking place, but they also look like movies. Set pieces.

Q: So what does that split-effect produce?

A: Uncertainty creeps in, in the mind of the viewer. He begins to think that he is looking at the "truth" and also at fiction. For most people, this schizoid effect happens below the conscious mind.

Q: It's a contradiction.

A: It's a contradiction happening at the level of the subconscious.

Q: Producing this effect, from the point of the view of the networks, is not intentional.

A: Correct. It's inevitable, but not conscious.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: It's a little self-defeating.

A: More than a little. And there's nothing they can do about it.

Q: Why?

A: Because the more competent and esthetic the news becomes in its presentation [not in its facts], the more it begins to look like fiction, like movies. The more art the news displays, the more it LOOKS like art.

Q: So what can the networks do to counter that effect they don't want?

A: They don't have to do much. Because so many major world events these days are focused around huge structures—governments, corporations, armies, secret intelligence agencies, medical labs, and so on—the public rightly feels cut off from those organizations. And so the public looks to a source that will feed them, in capsule form, what is going on with those groups. Here is where the major networks step in and shine. They can sum up a jillion pieces of information in twenty seconds.

Q: Nevertheless—

A: Nevertheless, this process of erosion is going on in the subconscious of the viewer. He feels, on some level, that his favorite god—NBC, CBS—is more and more looking like fiction, like a movie. And, to bring up another issue, whatever its merits and drawbacks, smoking marijuana enforces this perception that all of network news is nothing more than an elaborate fiction made up by the little gods. All dressed up, looking like a cartoon depiction. Foolish, with foolish little fictional emotions and concerns popping out of the TV screen.

Q: Nixon as Donald Duck, as Scrooge McDuck.

A: Yes. Ted Koppel is more like Donald.

Q: So what's the long-range outcome of this growing sense that the news is fiction?

A: Revolution.

Q: Are you serious?

A: Yes. What if I were I to tell you that Internet sites set the table for a lot of the current leaks about the US government's prior knowledge of 9/11?

Q: You'll have to spell that out.

A: Okay. Granted that some of these leaks about prior knowledge are floated out there to discredit the US government and make it more impotent than it already is. But aside from that, other such leaks were made because the ground was prepared, because Internet sites were already "leaking" stories about prior knowledge. Fifty years ago, these leakers in the government would have kept their traps shut—would never have gone public. But the atmosphere now is different. It's more open.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: And this is revolution?

A: It's a sign of the coming revolution.

Q: Which will look like what?

A: Like a storm. Like a massive defection. Like a little old creepy foolish man crawling out from behind his huge façade of media perfection.

Q: I haven't heard you talk like this before.

A: I do change. I see things coming on the horizon. There is a storm ahead.

Q: You really mean this.

A: I do.

Q: What's changed your mind?

A: The dissidents are getting smarter. That's one thing.

Q: How are they getting smarter?

A: They're starting to imitate the general style of the media. Holding their own press conferences, for example. Looking more credible.

Q: And that will have an effect?

A: By degrees, yes. And when people in government, for instance, see that these dissident people exist and that they want to present real information in a credible style, they'll cooperate to a certain extent.

Q: Anything else?

A: The overall psychology of the public is beginning to change. People are starting to respond to their own unconscious perception that major media are behaving like purveyors of fiction. The more ridiculous the media appear in this light, the faster the defections will accumulate.

Q: Will it all result in people just going crazy?

A: Actually, I would welcome that.

Q: Why?

A: Because disaffection with these little gods is, in the long run, a cleansing process. At first there may be some chaotic consequences, just as there were when Martin Luther rebelled against the Church. But in the long run, change happens.

Q: But generations after Luther, I don't see large organizations of Protestants leading the way to a more enlightened world.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: I know. There is always the possibility that the kind of revolution I'm talking about will devolve into yet another mostly passive establishment. But maybe not. Maybe we're not doomed to repeat history in never-ending cycles.

Q: I'm really surprised to hear this from you.

A: You wouldn't be if you saw what I see.

Q: And what exactly do you see?

A: A crack-up on the horizon.

Q: What kind of crack-up?

A: The schizoid mind which currently accepts, uncomfortably, the contradiction that the gods of news are the apex of truth AND the makers of fiction—that mind is heading for a brick wall at a brisk clip.

Q: Is that right?

A: Yes. Especially since there are a lot of tigers out there who are pouring fuel on the internal mind-fire with investigations that go way beyond the normal parameters of the news.

Q: So you're saying that people will be forced to make a choice.

A: If they don't, they'll find themselves lying on their backs, blinking up at the sky, not knowing what the hell is going on.

Q: Why won't they just burrow in tighter, in their worlds of lies and comfortable illusions?

A: They'll try. But the pace of events and authentic disclosures of events is getting faster. I can see that.

Q: Still—

A: Oh, lots of people will try to wall off the truth. They'll try in every way possible. They're already trying with various drugs and other palliatives. But they're going to find out that there are tentacles which will reach in and grab them inside their self-made cocoons.

Q: You haven't suddenly become a proponent of the end-times and Armageddon, have you?

A: No. I'm against both of those concepts. They're just recurring reactions to the disintegration of societies, and they surface at various moments in history.

Q: Another cocoon.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Exactly. I'm talking about something a lot more serious. Information is supposed to be the result of what we perceive. It's supposed to be what we drag in from our net of perception of the world. If more and more people start to realize that their own apparatus of perception is really being shaped by their own surrender to outside sources of this information—the media—they are going to respond. They can't help it. They especially can't help it in an age where everyone thinks the key component IS information. The Information Age? Ever hear of it? That's a title that was never supposed to happen.

Q: Meaning?

A: Think. If you are a god that rules by perverting and omitting and changing information, and if you know that information received produces action on the part of people—and if you therefore want people merely to respond to information you give them without mulling it over and thinking about it too much—how would you feel if everyone started going around calling the Age in which we live the Age of Information? Don't you see? That's a bad sign for the controllers. That tells them that on various levels, people are waking up to the fact that information is a force, a mighty force. You, as a ruler, wouldn't want that. You would see this as a sign that people are realizing that all pieces of information are interchangeable. That piece A can be blacked out and piece B can be substituted. That's too much consciousness. That's a THREAT. That's a sign a lot more ominous than triple 6 or a pentagram or an eye over a pyramid. That's TROUBLE.

Q: A sign of?

A: Impending revolution.

Q: Give me an example.

A: Some years ago now, a movie called, I believe, The Net. With Sandra Bullock.

Q: I saw it, yes.

A: Well, what was that about? Information. How you could take a person and erase her public identity, and leave her in nowhere land. It forcefully made the point that public identity is a fiction, and you can work that fiction any way you want to. Ideas like this bleed into public consciousness. They have an impact.

Q: For example, the adored news anchor might just be a Max Headroom.

A: Yes. "Who is this person we rely on every night to give us the truth? Is he a real person with real opinions, or is he just a constructed identity?"

Q: Whose purpose is the "fictional creation of credibility."

A: Yeah. These ideas worm their way into people's minds, and fascinate them. They're a kind of food. They are also keen reflections about what actually happens in the Age of Information. There really are people out there who manipulate

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

information and therefore invent a construct for the masses. Realizations about that are contagious. They spread all over the place.

Q: And you're saying this contagion is speeding up.

A: That's right. Take the logo of a network like CBS. The more it is used, the more it is tweaked and worked to make it look perfect and apt and so on, the more it looks like an artifact built out of sheer art. That ultimate effect is unavoidable. That's what happens when you reach a certain level of manipulative sophistication. Ding. The bell rings, and people begin to stir out of their sleep. They look at this logo and they don't see Ed Murrow anymore, they see Disney-like effects and commercialism and sales and—

Q: You're saying a whole lot of people out there have moved up to a new level of perception, of consciousness.

A: Right.

Q: Whereas, if CBS had somehow been able to stick with black and white screens and Ed Murrow smoking his cigarette, it would have kept a much tighter hold on the minds of the public.

A: You've got it. That's what I'm saying. But the inevitable trend is toward more power and more art and more sophisticated design and technical means. Which works like crazy for a certain length of time—but then the law of diminishing returns sets in.

Q: It goes the other way.

A: Art wakes people up, as you're so fond of saying. And art is exactly what all the major media sources have been applying to their continuous outpourings of lies. At some point, the accumulation of mind-control power starts to back up in the opposite direction. Because the art is so well done.

Q: And that starts a revolution.

A: Whether anyone likes it or not.

Q: It just happens.

A: People can go around belittling the power of art all they want to. They don't know what the hell they're talking about. Art is a match that is lit inside every soul. The Roman Church has fought to keep all its own art in check, in balance, so that all those fantastic stain-glass windows and ceilings would not wake people up too much. They have experienced serious losses, serious reversals, serious defections because the artists they hired were too good. Because the public began to say, "That Michelangelo is fantastic." Instead of, "I'm looking at the precise way the soul is consigned to hell because of its sins."

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: It's like sprouting a new brain.

A: Sprouting a super-brain that responds to the art, and rejects the lesser level of planted information. I've looked at Michelangelo's work in the Sistine Chapel for hours, and believe me, it didn't get me to think about my dismal fate for one second. I thought about—

Q: Human creation of art.

A: Yeah.

Q: You probably saw the movie, Enemy of the State.

A: I did. A fairly silly film, but it did show what a government could do just by re-arranging and re-creating all the information about a person. That was part of the message. "If you have information we don't want you to have, we can change all the information about YOU."

Q: And 9/11?

A: Look for yourself. After all the bodies were cleared out, what was left? After the grieving, what was left? An emerging piece of Swiss cheese called INFORMATION, and everywhere people are questioning that now.

Q: After all the questions about what the government knew and when it knew it, the next step is asking whether the government scenario about who really caused 9/11 is true at all.

A: Yes. The matters you and other people were taking up the very morning of the attacks—they're contagions that keep spreading. Because more and more people have daily commerce with the reality, in one form or another, that information can be invented and changed at the drop of a hat. And if that is so, then a scenario about bin Laden and his thugs can be inserted, wholesale, as THE account of 9/11.

Q: Or that account can be removed, deleted.

A: That too. Deleted or added to files, just like the name and photo on a driver's license. See, take a show called The Agency. CBS. They're trying to give the CIA "a human face." But along with that, they keep showing this technician who uses a computer to make fake IDs of every imaginable kind. Or to make fake pottery implanted with a bomb or listening devices. They're spreading another message, and there's nothing they can do about it. The message is, INFORMATION IS INTERCHANGEABLE. Once you've got that in your skull, you begin, maybe timidly at first, to look at pieces of information called NEWS. You begin to get an inkling that the news is a fictional enterprise built on bits and bytes of anything they want to use. Use, delete. Use, delete. It happened when it really didn't. Or it never happened when it really did. Max Headroom. CBS. Peter Jennings. Mickey Mouse. ABC.

Q: A spreading disease.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: You can't stop it.

Q: I wouldn't want to.

A: Even if you did, you couldn't.

Q: And this is a revolution.

A: I can't say how long it'll take before the apples are really ripe on the apple trees, but it's underway. That process.

Q: And the outcome?

A: We'll have to see. But the controllers have a giant "spy" in their midst: The art of technology. The technology of art. The art of art. They use these things to trap minds, but there is a systemic leak. A leak that is intrinsic to the whole system. That is fundamental to the system. That can't be divorced from the system.

Q: This whole conversation gives me an idea.

A: I bet I know what it is.

Q: Go ahead.

A: I may not be reading your mind perfectly, but this is in the ballpark. You get a really good technical guy, and you have him make a perfect series of digital templates of Dan Rather. So good you can't tell the difference between the copy and the real thing. And you have this pixel- construct of Rather deliver the news every night on a website. The news he broadcasts is the kind of thing you write on your site.

Q: That's actually not too far off.

A: I didn't think it would be.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

December 13, 2002

Q: How do you look at this current Homeland Security business?

A: A business it is, to be sure. Let's take the best-case scenario, in terms of the medical fallout. Let's imagine that the mass smallpox campaign that will mean shots for 280 million Americans is NOT going to happen. It will stall. It will be put on the back burner. Let's imagine that.

Q: Yeah? And?

A: We will still have seen a very important link made.

Q: You mean in the public consciousness?

A: Right. Security equals vaccines.

Q: Security equals the right of the government to impose medical treatment at will.

A: And if anyone objects, he can be quarantined or worse. People have to see this as a step in a certain direction. Toward public acceptance of these equations.

Q: Capture the mind and the body follows.

A: It works.

Q: But suppose a lot of people die from the vaccine early on?

A: If they can't cover it up, then they're in trouble, just like they were in the swine flu vaccine disaster of the Ford administration.

Q: Do you think that's going to happen?

A: All I can say is, if lots of people die early on, they are going to do their best to cover it up and attribute the deaths to other reasons.

Q: This whole Homeland Security (HS) thing---

A: It's all for show, as far as the government reorganization part goes. Contractors, companies that get government contracts, are the big winners. But underneath that, this is like the creation of a Department of War. That's what it is. And the enemy is "terrorism."

Q: The name alone---Homeland Security---

A: That name was not just drawn out of a hat after 9/11. It was there, in the files, in the plans, for a number of years---waiting to be tapped. They could have called this thing any number of other names. HOMELAND is not a noun ordinarily used in America. It came out of left field.

Q: So what is the reason for using that word?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: It smacks of fascism. It puts out the impression that America is one mass of people under rule. It suggests that some SENTIMENT about mother or father or both is in play.

Q: Like in Nazi Germany.

A: Yes. It's an attempt to seed the mind of the public with an idea about a nation that: no longer has any ideals pertaining to individual freedom. You see? America becomes a single mass of motherhood or fatherhood that needs security and protection. Which is the core concept of fascism. Hitler is daddy. Mussolini is daddy. Mommy is a baby machine that turns out children whose main purpose is the defense of the Home.

Q: Home. Land.

A: A home is not a place where you have sophisticated political concepts about separation of powers. That's for adults only. Homeland means we have a big home and daddy rules so that everyone stays safe.

Q: Homeland is rife with sentiment.

A: It's a gloss of sentiment over steel. And the steel is rule from above on all matters.

Q: Homeland also connects to the flag and all the other sentimental symbols of a binding nature.

A: Yes, it's all about binding the people into one large mass. A mass has no real use for the separation of powers and checks and balances.

Q: Instead of, "Give me your huddled masses, yearning to be free," it's, "Give me your free people yearning to be huddled masses."

A: Yeah.

Q: Okay, behind the scene of homeland security, what is going on in, say, the medical arena?

A: Crisis drills.

Q: What is that?

A: Large PR agencies cooperate with the government/military/cops to run scenarios on handling crises that could develop if massive vaccinations were ordered.

Q: How does that work?

A: You set up targets. Reporters, outraged residents of areas where vaccinations are underway, doctors who are seeing deaths from the vaccines, politicians who

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

might take the public's side. Cops who object to arresting and quarantining citizens. Citizens who refuse the vaccine.

Q: These targets become the focal point for what?

A: Handling.

Q: What kind of handling?

A: Whatever it takes, with the least fuss possible.

Q: PR becomes the first line of attack.

A: Yes. These crisis drills were invented by the PR industry. They are simulations.

Q: For example.

A: Oil spill. Huge food recall. Drug recall. Anything a corporation might suddenly have to deal with. The PR pros put the corporate [or government] people through a long drill. People play the roles of inquiring reporter, outraged citizen, public interest law firm, the whole nine yards. And the corporate people have to respond on the spot. It's like a mock war. And then the PR people give advice in a post-mortem setting.

Q: I see.

A: So we KNOW that, in the case of mass smallpox vaccinations, these crisis drills have been done before now. There are plans in place to handle the fall-out.

Q: The managed society.

A: The tactic of anticipating every possible consequence and basically lying to change perception. But lying adroitly.

Q: Of course, in the swine flu vaccine fiasco of the 1970s, the lying was badly done.

A: Fortunately, there are a lot of stupid pros around. People who think they can shortcut ways of handling crises. There are levels of PR capability.

Q: Okay, if you were still working in this field today, how would you handle a potential death-disaster from the smallpox vaccine?

A: I would have, in advance, a number of medical "causes" for the deaths. The number one cause would be, "The enemy engineered the virus to nullify the effects of the vaccine. These deaths we are seeing are from the engineered virus, not the vaccine." So if, by chance, you do hear that one, realize what you are probably looking at.

Q: So the Australian researchers who recently engineered a mouse pox virus that turned out to be deadly---

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: It's great PR, isn't it?

Q: What?

A: I'm sure they did kill mice with the cooked virus, but it comes at just the right time---it's a precedent that can be referred to later, when the smallpox vaccine turns deadly.

Q: If that's true---

A: Look, for decades, germs in labs have been killing test animals, and some of those germs are mutating in the labs. They are artifacts of the lab environment. So the idea that mutated germs can kill animals is nothing new.

Q: I want to get back to this concept of the HOMELAND---I feel it's very important.

A: You have to go to the formation of the republic---the debates, the framing of the system of government. This was sophisticated stuff. Regardless of the plots and the sub-plots to kill off the republic right from the start, there was an attempt to enable personal freedom, and in order to do that, there was a limiting of the power of government. That was the essence. Whatever degree of patriotism was present then---it was linked to freedom.

Q: So in order to grasp freedom, to really understand how it could play out---

A: You had to see the checks and balances, the separation of powers, the power given to the individual states. These states were supposed to have a great degree of autonomy. They were supposed to be little nations, in a sense. Maybe I'm overstating that a bit, but not unduly. It was assumed that each state would go its own way. That would create a vast diversity of interests and plans. That was the schematic.

Q: Also, the nation as a whole was supposed to be above petty wars and alliances with foreign powers.

A: Yeah. That's right.

Q: But now, in 2002, not many people can imagine what a nation of states like that would even look like.

A: It's all been buried.

Q: Wars certainly help bury it.

A: That's one of the main functions of war. The whole nation moves toward becoming One. When it was supposed to be Many.

Q: Another concept that people today find it hard to conceive.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: So, once you get a grip on how this nation was built, at the beginning, you can see how far it was from any idea of HOMELAND.

Q: So you're saying---

A: Homeland is antithetical to the original and best premises of the framers. I'm not talking about sentiments here. I'm talking about hard political realities that were created at the beginning of the republic.

Q: Where did Bush get the word HOMELAND from?

A: Cheney. While Bush was pondering how to address the nation in the wake of 9/11, he had input from a number of speechwriters. Cheney sent him a short text on the creation of a homeland security post in the cabinet. That's the first mention of it I can find. But I'm sure Cheney got it from a file that already existed. This idea could have gone back years and years.

Q: I've found another association with the word HOMELAND: "ancestral."

A: Yes. The place where the ancestors lived. That takes you into shrines, burial grounds, emblems, shields, all that. Even if people aren't consciously aware of these things, they do catch the resonance. Rather ironic, since the Indians' homeland actually is America.

Q: And again, the Nazi connection.

A: Yeah. This area is complex and rife with associations. You may remember that David Dewhurst, a former CIA agent who was running for lieutenant governor of Texas, was campaigning on the fact that he had already been placed in charge of homeland security for Texas. He had an ad posted. The ad showed a soldier in front of an American flag. But the soldier turned out to be a Nazi Luftwaffe officer---and the ad was pulled. When the US was attacking Germany in World War 2, there were frequent mentions, in the US press, of "the German homeland." And in the US, during that time, we saw, in posters, various symbols of an American sort of homeland---for example, a little country church with its steeple cracked and bending over---and a Nazi helmet or black cloud leaning against that broken steeple. The caption was something like: THIS IS WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO SAVE. Not the Constitution. [The so-called OF flag was used in Bulgaria starting in 1944 by the Russians when their invading "Homeland Front" force "liberated Bulgaria" from the Nazis.] I digress a little, but it's also interesting that the word homeland is frequently used in the US press to refer to the Palestinians---the Palestinian homeland---a place that is under great attack because of geo-legitimacy issues, is in chaos, must be brought together and made into One---just the opposite of what the US is supposed to be. Here is quote from Hitler. He was trying to pump up his soldiers on the eastern front during the war: "With bated breath, the blessing of the entire German homeland accompanies you during the hard days ahead." Heimat is the German word for homeland, and the Nazis used it frequently. On top of that, you have to realize that the Nazis were bent on making a mythical connection between Germany and older

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

"pure blood" of the so-called Aryan superman, godlike stock. So to them, the homeland or the fatherland was very intensified, a place where the gods belong, a place whose people stem from this godlike stock.

Q: So it's code.

A: It's code for "the people who really belong in America." And the USA Patriot Act followed closely the same sort of [much more fascistic] legislation that Hitler got passed after the Reichstag fire of 1933.

Q: HOMELAND is an "inside phrase."

A: It tells the elite, "We are making America over into a Nazi paradise." But when the US media repeat the word ten thousand times a day, every day, the public swallows it.

Q: Anything else?

A: Yes. Homeland, the word, suggests the hearth and the mommy and daddy and the cottage in the hills---but in fact this homeland in the US is very highly organized and technical. And Homeland Security will increase that degree of organization, which is to say, control. Nowhere is this more evident than in the area of bio-attacks and the medical planning/response for that.

Q: In that regard, I have a very interesting report from a county in Tennessee.

A: Before you tell me about it, let me make another point. ALL local news is given very short shrift in the NATIONAL news. What I mean is, you rarely read about anything in the national news that spells out in GREAT detail what the federal government is up to on the local level. There is a good reason why. It's too chilling. It lets people know how intrusive the federal government really is. Okay? You'll see a piece here and there, but these pieces are almost like curios---as if the writer is saying, "Gee, look at this. The feds are sticking their noses in where they don't belong. How odd." When, in fact, it happens every day in every county in the US.

Q: That's a good preface. Okay, here is the item, as reported to me by a resident of Monroe County, Tennessee, which has about 38, 000 people. This person attended a local briefing on the mass smallpox vaccine plan. Monroe is supposed to handle, with its one designated vaccine center, 5000 people during one eight-hour shift. Two shifts per day. So, in five days, they'd vaccinate 50,000 people from the whole area. There will be 22 security guards at this one center. The people who attended the meeting were told that the whole plan will swing into action if ONE case of smallpox is detected anywhere in the US. Volunteers will also go to homes and nursing homes where people can't be transported to the vaccine center and shoot them up where they live. A local school transportation director will be in charge of getting other people to the vaccine center. Now, there are 117 of these vaccine centers across the state of Tennessee, and they are scheduled to be ready by February 28 of next year. The local hospital will, during the month of January,

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

handle the vaccinating of all medical personnel, and also 400 additional medical volunteers. At the meeting this person attended, there was talk of "video rooms." These are rooms where videos about smallpox and the dangers and so on, and the vaccine, are presented. Why? TO GET INFORMED CONSENT FROM THE PUBLIC BEFORE THE VACCINE IS GIVEN. And if a person refuses the vaccine, the county health director said, and if that person is found to have been exposed to the smallpox virus, the director can put the person under house arrest.

A: Yeah. This is what I'm talking about. This is happening all over the US right now. Gearing up. New infrastructure. Under the control of the US Public Health Service and its minion, the CDC.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

April 25, 2003

This interview is very interesting and near to my heart, because it points up a situation I have run into before: people who try to snarl independent researchers in arguments with one another. As always, Ellis is right on the money. We cover quite a bit of ground here on several related subjects.

Q: Funny, we have never talked about this before.

A: I know. Just an oversight.

Q: Where do you want to begin?

A: Well, from what you've told me, I know what you're looking for. So let me get to the point. In disease research, there is a lot of propaganda. It's necessary, because the germ hunters are making mistakes and lying most of the time. They say they have found a germ that causes a disease, and they haven't. Quite frequently, the disease itself isn't a distinct and clear situation, it's a list of symptoms which have been collected together. So the researchers need liars, and propagandists do that for a living.

Q: So that's one side of the equation.

A: Not exactly.

Q: What do you mean?

A: It's a three-sided equation.

Q: What's the second side?

A: The people who see through those lies and report their own independent findings.

Q: They become a problem to the first side.

A: Yes. So you get a second set of propagandists brought on board to discredit them.

Q: And what's the third side?

A: That would be the people who think that every new germ found by the germ hunters is really out of a biowar lab, devised to cause illness.

Q: Do they present a problem too?

A: To a lesser extent than side two. But when you've got side two and three, there is a solution.

Q: What's that?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Set up a battle between two and three.

Q: People have tried to draw me into that.

A: I'm sure you they have.

Q: I've received some emails recently over this SARS thing.

A: By "thing" I'm sure you mean fraud.

Q: I do. The emails have tried to draw me into some kind of debate with the people who are claiming that "the deadly SARS virus" came from a biowar lab.

A: And you suspect that at least some of these emails are from agents.

Q: Yes.

A: You're probably right.

Q: If so, their strategy is---

A: As you say, they want to draw you into an unseemly debate. If you take the bait and say "oh yes all those people with their biowar paranoia are crazy," then they send your statements to the biowar types, and see if they can stir up some emotion.

Q: Emotion is the whole point of the exercise.

A: Absolutely. You know, "so and so says you're crazy and you don't know the first thing about this and that."

Q: And then I get stirred up and say "well he is completely nuts" and we're off and running.

A: Exactly. A little turmoil is created, and pretty soon you're spending all your time defending yourself against a straw man set up to be your opponent.

Q: When in fact my opponents are the people who say the coronavirus is the cause of SARS.

A: Yes. There are certain agents of propaganda who take delight in watching other people tear each to shreds.

Q: I could name a few websites---

A: Don't bother. I know them. They are disposed to calling everything biowarfare. That's their point of view.

Q: Right.

A: But you see, who cares?

Q: Well that's my attitude. Everyone is entitled to his point of view.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Stick to that.

Q: I mean, there is really no way to know whether one of these people is an agent or not, when they email me and try to draw me out. I don't really care. My whole premise is, people can believe what they want, as long as they don't try to set me against other people who have their own ideas.

A: That's a proper policy on your part. I can tell you a story along this line.

Q: Go ahead.

A: It had to do with the East German biologist, Jakob Segal.

Q: I was in touch with him in 1987.

A: You know he believed that HIV was created at Fort Detrick, by US scientists.

Q: Yes. I also know his evidence was very thin.

A: Well, for the USSR, that didn't matter. They only cared that Segal believed in his own line of supposition. They wanted to use him.

Q: Right. To promote the idea, in the West, that America was the source of a lab creation called HIV.

A: Right. For the USSR, it didn't matter whether HIV really caused human illness or not. That was beside the point.

Q: Yes. I found that out early on. The Soviets were simply trying to blame AIDS on the US by saying it was made at Fort Detrick.

A: Actually, there were a few people in high positions in the USSR power structure who WERE interested in the truth, but as usual, they were run over by the propaganda machine.

Q: Segal answered one letter from me. He sent his file of so-called evidence that HIV was made in America, I studied it, and responded. I pointed out some of his errors of assumption, and told him it was time to really look at the facts.

A: And he never answered you after that, right?

Q: Right.

A: Because truth was not the point of the exercise. He was protecting his point of view, which was fine---but others were using him to attack the US.

Q: It worked, to a degree.

A: Absolutely. I know a few PR people who helped foist Segal's stuff into European newspapers in the 1980s. That was their job.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: And they were working for?

A: They were basically third or fourth level cutouts for the KGB.

Q: You see, I've never denied that biowar researchers are dangerous people. In fact, in my book, AIDS INC, I spent a long chapter laying out many incidents in which chemical and bio weapons were used or tested on populations. But I was simply saying that this is only one avenue of immune suppression, and there are many others.

A: Quite right. But these days, the people who see every germ as a biowar creation are getting more aggressive. They are on a roll. Some of them can't stop. And they become very good, unintentionally good, at scaring people out of their shorts.

Q: You know what I really think? Too many people these days are too impaired, mentally, to distinguish between different points of view. They stick to generalities.

A: What specifically are you talking about?

Q: In the case of SARS, those who think the coronoavirus is a bioweapon, and I, who show that the virus has not been proved to cause ANYTHING---well, all of us are agreed that some kind of scam is going on. So somebody picks up on the SCAM idea, and then he can't distinguish the details. He can't really figure out the difference between what I'm saying and what the biowar people are saying. It's all the same to him. But it isn't.

A: And you know what the propagandists say to that? They say THANK GOD. Because they thrive on people who can only see generalities. It's their bread and butter.

Q: Yes.

A: Jakob Segal got caught up in generalities. He was doing very poor science on HIV.

Q: I want to make one thing clear. I know some very bright people who have analyzed certain germs and concluded that they are lab creations. Whether I agree with them or not---it doesn't matter. They are not vague and unintelligent, not at all.

A: I agree. But some, like Segal, ran aground. He had no real evidence at all.

Q: I know.

A: I remember this one alternative doctor in the US. He spoke at an AIDS conference in LA. It was---I think we've discussed this incident before.

Q: I think I know the one you mean. I was a speaker there. At that conference.

A: Yes you were.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: And he was trying to make the point that HIV was a cross between two animal viruses, one of which---

A: One of which was visna, a sheep virus.

Q: And instead, he called it the Vishnu virus, which has to do with the name of a Hindu god. I was sitting outside in the hall at the time, and when he was done, two friends of mine staggered out and they were doubled over. I mean, they were in hysterics. I thought they were going to lose their lunch they were laughing so hard.

A: Yeah. Well, if you go back and look at the research that tries to link the visna and the bovine leukemia virus together and call it HIV, it doesn't add up. There is no good evidence that these two germs combined or were intentionally combined to create HIV.

Q: I lost a couple of colleagues over that argument.

A: We're talking about pseudo-science laid over the top of other pseudo-science, and it creates a popular myth in some quarters. It sounds right, and it looks right until you get down to a further and closer level of detail, and then it falls apart.

Q: You see, I decided about ten years ago, after talking with a researcher named John Judge, that the best policy was to acknowledge that, say, in the case of AIDS, the basic OP was to debilitate and wipe out populations---no matter whether you were saying HIV was a biowar germ or whether you were saying that the depopulation OP was far more complex, as I do. And I've stuck with that.

A: As you should. Debates that go nowhere are just distractions. Except you know very well there is a kicker in all this.

Q: I do. If people believe they are infected with a killer virus, biowar virus or natural virus, they tend to fold up. They think they're going to die. And that is where the rub comes in. Because I've spoken with many people over the years who told me that after they read my book on AIDS, they rejected HIV and they rejected the diagnosis they'd been given of AIDS, and that saved their lives. They recovered their optimism and their outlook and their sanity and they found ways to stay healthy without drugs.

A: Yes.

Q: Anyway---so we're talking about created and diversionary debates. Debates percolated by propaganda agents.

A: Divide and conquer, divide and conquer. Carve up the opposition into small groups and get them arguing with one another. It works all the time. Just look at the UFO community. It's a perfect target. Within that community there are a number of rather immature people who are basically entranced by a science fiction view of the universe. And I don't use the term science fiction disparagingly. I simply mean that these people tend not to do anything about anything. They simply argue and

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

disagree and gossip. That's how they live. So into that pot introduce some lies and some fake accusations and gossip and you've got a full-blown welter of childish emotion and nasty argument. But let me change the subject. You have a basic position about a lot of human illness. And that position colors your view of germs.

Q: What are you talking about?

A: You say that much of what we call human illness is really a failure of the immune system, and germs are mostly poachers who come in after the fact and mop up the decaying material in the body.

Q: I have no real quarrel with that. I've seen tons of evidence to support that position. And so have you.

A: That's right, I have. But I think we can take it one step further.

Q: I have done that.

A: Go ahead.

Q: What researchers have failed to do is investigate the effects of designed germs on the human body. A lot of people automatically assume that such lab-created germs always do damage. But the real question is, if a given designer germ causes harm, HOW does it do that?

A: This is crucial..

Q: And I think in many cases, researchers would discover that the effect is really toxic, just as a chemical is toxic.

A: As many foreign proteins are toxic, because the body is not geared to handle them.

Q: If you keep eating tree trunks and planks of pine, you are going to get sick. It has protein in there, but not protein that can be assimilated.

A: Right.

Q: So if I design some germ---which is composed of proteins---in a lab, and if that collection of proteins can't be assimilated or dealt with by the body, the germ in quantity might poison the body, not because the germ is eating up cells, but because it's poisonous. In that sense, it's just another toxin. But I would like to see more real research on this, because we need to see good evidence on various types of germs and their real effects. The immune system---

A: Is a very good defense apparatus.

Q: Yes. When it's intact.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: And as long as we have all these researchers going around assuming that every new germ they locate must be doing damage to the body, we have a diversion and a smokescreen that covers up the truth.

Q: Yes.

A: And my point is, propagandists work in this area by backing up those crazy researchers. They promote the idea that any germ just found by researchers is new---instead of realizing it may well be just a germ nobody has seen before that has been around for millions of years.

Q: There are millions of germs no one has yet seen.

A: Right. But as long as the propagandists' myth is believed, it is harder for good research to occur. Especially when the PR claims that every new germ is a dangerous one.

Q: A completely unwarranted assumption.

A: Completely.

Q: You see, this is what I want: "We found germ X. We've never seen it before. We don't know where it comes from. We don't know how long it's been around planet Earth. We can't find it in the human body, except for very tiny amounts. So we have no reason to suppose it's causing disease. Unless somebody can prove it's got a novel system of attacking the body, such that unbelievably small amounts of it cause great harm---and so far we have no such evidence. So we're going write off germ X as interesting but unimportant, until further notice." Let's at least start with that. Then we might get somewhere.

A: I'm afraid you're talking about a world that doesn't exist. So keep up the war against the virus hunters. Don't let them off the hook. They want to rule the universe, I think. We're dealing with that size of ego. Blinded by that ego, they're carrying out an agenda that is way beyond them.

Q: An agenda to create fear, loss of personal liberty, depopulation, debilitation.

A: As always. And that agenda is INDIRECT. INDIRECT. INDIRECT. They concoct a disease name, they accuse a germ, they introduce toxic drugs and scare tactics, they frighten people into submission. They diagnose people with a disease name, and the diagnosis itself has a hypnotic effect that causes immune suppression.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

May 23, 2003

Ellis on the disease scam. We discussed some very important points on disease and SARS. Before we began the interview, I had Ellis read the following article

Chicken-pox vaccine ineffective in curbing an outbreak of the disease

(December 23, 2002) You've probably read about the recent study that discovered the chicken-pox vaccine was ineffective in curbing an outbreak of the disease.

Normally, these findings are suppressed. But the most interesting thing was, health authorities stated that assessing the usefulness of the vaccine was made difficult by the fact that the disease itself is so mild.

Which raises the question: WHY BOTHER TO GIVE THE VACCINE?

No one dealt with THAT.

Nor did anyone think about the benefit to a child's immune system when the child NATURALLY overcomes chicken pox.

Let's see. A healthy immune system equals less disease in general equals a lowered need for medical drugs. A frightening prospect for the pharmaceutical industry.

Drug lords of the medical persuasion have a counter-strategy for the ever-feared condition called HEALTH.

Invent a medical condition which derives from a more or less natural occurrence. For example, baldness. Fund groups which begin publicizing the condition, as a "public service." In other words, the groups say baldness is bad, is fearful, is socially unacceptable, is embarrassing, is a sure sign that women will reject men. These groups ask for a "cure."

That's step one.

Then fund studies and research on medical drugs for baldness.

Then announce a breakthrough.

Then gain FDA approval for the drugs.

Then market the drugs.

Then pay for TV ads that present baldness as a disturbing condition, and offer the solution.

The coordination of all these fictions is called a CAMPAIGN.

When the drugs don't work well, and/or have toxic effects, develop new and "better" drugs. If possible, call the toxic effects of the older drugs "a new disease condition." If possible, say that certain men react poorly to the drugs because of a "genetic

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

predisposition." This leads to more $$ for gene research, which eventually goes nowhere. Going nowhere is a definite result that makes more gene research necessary.

It's a party.

Q: Okay, Ellis, you've read that article now. Comments?

A: It's right on. But how about we get into SARS, which is very much part of this whole scam.

Q: Sure. Where do you want to start?

A: With the concept of levels of deception. See, at a level BELOW the top, this whole SARS thing has to do with pigs.

Q: How so?

A: Well, coronaviruses are researched, in part, because they occur in pigs. You have lots of pigs in China. Some of those pigs become part of a transnational business in pork. There is a Britain-China connection there, through a company called British Quality Pigs, unless they've changed the name.

Q: But---

A: Just hold on. I'll get to the bugger picture. Anyway, when pigs are shipped around the world, as pork, or as whatever, you have a fear in the pig business community. Suppose a HUMAN disease crops up in which pig germs are involved. That could sink the whole industry. You'd have millions of pigs destroyed by government edict.

Q: And some of these big pig companies would lose billions of dollars.

A: Correct. Round about 2000, you had what was called a huge Swine Fever epidemic among pigs in England. The scapegoats for this were small British pig farmers and foreigners who brought in ham sandwiches----something crazy like that. I'm not kidding. But this was the cover to hide the fact that the really big global traffic in pigs occurs at a transnational corporate level. So if there was an epidemic, those big corporate players were surely the cause, and they had to be protected.

Q: Same deal with SARS.

A: Yes. If SARS were tied to a pig coronavirus, all hell would break loose. The big pig companies would be hit very hard, with the edict to destroy millions of pigs.

Q: This would be where the "mutated virus" hoax comes in.

A: Exactly. The medical big shots can call it a "new" coronavirus. You see? "They've never seen it before." It isn't the pig coronavirus at all.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: But meanwhile, the whole transnational pig business is holding its breath, because it's afraid it IS the pig virus that's causing SARS.

A: Correct. So there is a whole cover-up at that level. And the pig industry thinks that's the highest level of cover-up.

Q: But the pig industry doesn't know---

A: Doesn't know there is a whole other level of plot and cover-up to this story.

Q: And the higher level of cover-up is---

A: Is the fact that this is a major medical op, one which involves re-cycling old human disease---

Q: Like pneumonia and flu and even TB and calling it SARS.

A: Right. It's all about levels, as I said. As you have noted, vaccine campaigns always cause all sorts of horrendous illness. That needs to be covered up. You need a new disease name sometimes. I can tell you that in China, some cases of SARS are actually vaccinereaction cases.

Q: Not all cases, some cases.

A: Yes. You also have SARS cases which are really regular pneumonia and flu, and the Chinese government knows that. But they have to keep their mouths shut, because WHO is running a very high-level op to name a new disease and put the world into another episode of fear---

Q: Replete with quarantines and travel advisories and big economic losses.

A: Yes. And the pig industry is not really hip to these wider implications of the op. They're worried about their own $$$ and the chance that some pig virus has jumped species and is infecting humans.

Q: The pig industry has connections at WHO.

A: Every major industry in the world tries to plug itself into WHO, because WHO is the number one cover-story-making agency on the planet. You have some chemical disaster that could be laid at the door of a corporation, WHO is there to call it a disease outbreak caused by a germ.

Q: That doesn't work all the time.

A: No, not when the chemical spill is obvious to everyone. But there are other incidents that are not so obvious, such as the ongoing use of very toxic pesticides in the Third World.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Okay, so the pig industry thinks it's getting a tremendous break from WHO, because the coronavirus is being called a new germ that no one has ever seen before. Not a pig virus.

A: Yes. Whereas, at a much higher level, there is no new virus. There is probably no virus at all. Just some bullshit science cooked up by---

Q: By virus hunters at WHO and CDC, who say they've isolated a SARS virus, but really haven't.

A: Yeah. You've got it. They don't need a virus. They only need a statement that they've found a virus.

Q: Why do so many virologists tell the same lie?

A: Because they believe it and because they want to believe it. They have a system of isolating new viruses---very complex---

Q: It's like a sacred ritual---

A: And they ascribe to the ritual. What else do you need? You're ALWAYS going to find fragments of possible genes in the blood or mucus of people who are sick [or well]. And you can always do a complex set of inferences that wind up with the supposed discovery of a virus.

Q: That's the way the ritual works.

A: Right. You start with the possible isolation of what you think are gene fragments. They may be gene fragments or they may be something else, but from there you do all this inferring and wind up with a claim that you have found a new virus in the nose of a patient.

Q: Now, on the "flow chart" of this whole multi-level scam, you have an arrow that points to WHO from the pig industry.

A: Several arrows. And one of them is called GRATITUDE. See, the pig industry feels that WHO has just gotten them off the hook. So that industry is going to support WHO in a big way, on other issues, in the future. It's called building allies. Very important to the power of WHO.

Q: One of the major points of this whole SARS deal is that---

A: Is that WHO can level the economy of a nation or a city for a period of time. That is big, very big. That is---

Q: A flexing of muscles.

A: Better believe it. It's called naked power, and if governments doubted it before, they don't doubt it now.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: What about the WHO travel advisory laid against Toronto?

A: That had two motives. A little payback, via the US, for not supporting the war in Iraq. But on a higher level, it was simply WHO saying, "Watch out. We can bring a city to its knees OUTSIDE the arena of the Third World or the 'faraway world.' We can take the ax to a Western city and we can do it anytime we want to." Try to go back and find out the last time a global agency did that to a major Western city. I think you'll have trouble finding an instance in the recent past.

Q: But it worked this time because---

A: It was easy this time because the WHO/CDC nexus had already prepared the global consciousness through the anthrax scare, the smallpox scare, the West Nile scare, the mad cow scare, and so on. This is a whole op with many facets. It's a building thing.

Q: And you also had the Foot and Mouth scam as well, in England. A disease from which most animals easily recover without treatment.

A: In that case, the cattle industry had to take a hit. Ditto for mad cow. See, if the medical cartel as a whole is to succeed in wielding its power, it must, from time to time, punish some fairly heavy hitters. Otherwise, it's looked at as a weak sister with no real clout.

Q: It's not looked at as a weak sister now.

A: Right. You can trace a common thread that began with----well, you can go back as far as you want to---but let's go back to the Asian flu of the 1950s. Then jump forward to the Swine Flu debacle under President Ford in 1976. Then AIDS. Then a little Chronic Fatigue, Epstein Barr virus, mad cow, West Nile, Foot and Mouth, anthrax, smallpox, SARS. Scams all the way along the line. Preparing the public for a Global Health Police with major power.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

June 20, 2003

A THREE-WAY INTERVIEW ON THE AIDS AND SARS HOAXES

THE VIRUS HUNTERS UNMASKED

Introduction to the interview:

In my [PREMIUM CONTENT] newsletter [dated June 13, 2003],... a former researcher of some repute has all but admitted that ALL viruses are, in truth, fraudulent, when it comes to explaining human disease. *(Ed. Note: This interview is appended below in full).*

My own metaphor for what he says would run like this: if a child is drowning in a river as he clings to a log, and if the child has sustained a laceration on his head, do you send out a team on a raft to apply stitches and then return to shore without the "patient," or do you order people to bring the kid back to solid ground?

The virus hunters are carrying us all out into deep water with their lab manipulations. Even assuming the best of intentions, they are sheer morons.

AND THEY ARE IN CHARGE OF ALL NEW-DISEASE RESEARCH.

The story I punched up about a month ago, which revealed that a quarter of all cases of so-called SARS in Hong Kong were the direct effect of leaking foul water pipes in the Amoy Gardens apartment complex---that story has been forgotten in the mainstream press.

The virologists never paid attention to it. They were too busy lying about the coronavirus.

FIX THE PIPES, I wrote. I hope someone has seen to it.

Like intelligence agencies, the virus hunters don't even know anymore when they are lying to cover up their past lies.

They are operating in a closed universe.

Notice that in this breaking monkey pox situation, we hear nothing from scientists about how much virus they are finding in all the patients they have diagnosed.

There was a time when that was the key question in conventional circles. To have a prayer of saying that a germ was implicated in disease, you had to prove that it was present in enormous quantities in the blood or other body fluids.

No more.

As with terrorists (everybody and his brother is suddenly a card-carrying member of something called Al Qaeda or Al Qaida or Al Kayda), disease clusters are automatically the result of some rarely-seen virus.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

In the public mind, VIRUS has become synonymous with GERM. Virus has become the catch-all.

More reporters and authors and movie makers have been bamboozled by this term than there are flies on a piece of dung.

Dissident researchers, who are not asleep at the wheel, are beginning to make the case that the DNA sequence of HIV is really a sequence that comes from the human genome itself. In which case, what has been IDed as a deadly virus is actually, if anything, a harmless part of the human make-up.

But when the research methods of the virus hunters are as arcane and complex as the classifications of angels in the Vatican doctrine, how many people are going to raise questions?

Just as the Vatican was once the sole arbiter of truth-in-cosmology in the West, now we have people parading as scientists who are finding viruses everywhere they go.

These people are public menaces.

Who cares how many degrees they have after their names, or how well-ensconced they are in academic and lab settings?

Even on the Internet, the most adventurous forum for information on the planet, relatively few people ask the real questions.

Who knows that Luc Montagnier, the man who supposedly was the first to isolate what came to be known as HIV, has admitted that he never found viral particles in his research?

Who knows that the enzyme called reverse transcriptase, which is supposed to be the major clue that a retrovirus, like HIV, is present, can appear for several reasons that have nothing to do with retroviral activity? I mention this because both of the original "HIV pioneers," Gallo and Montagnier, actually INFERRED the presence of HIV from reverse transcriptase. Invalidly inferred.

That's right. Who knows that Robert Gallo, who stole Montagnier's research, likewise never isolated a virus, but inferred its presence? Or that HIV itself has never been found in human blood?

Just as people may speculate, without any evidence, about how many angels exist, researchers may speculate about how much HIV is in the body of people diagnosed with AIDS---but in both cases, this IS speculation. Perhaps interesting, but when these ruminations begin to be incorporated into a culture of medical coercion, everything changes.

These are just a few reasons why, when the papers carry new press releases about a viral outbreak, I reach for my very serious bullshit detector.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

I wrote the first book, *AIDS Inc -- Scandal of the Century*, in 1988, that revealed HIV was not the cause of human illness. Major sections of that book are on PREMIUM CONTENT. [The] first book-length cannon shot fired at the HIV virus hunters...

When the book came out, I was on a number of radio shows and gave many lectures. The hosts and the audiences were mostly stunned. They reacted like people suddenly dumped in cold water.

Then a few people tried to attack me. They learned I don't bow down before the men in white coats. I don't sit quietly while the experts try to assail my position. I gave them at least double what they tried to give me. For every ad hominem attack they launched, I sent back two. I talked louder if loudness was their weapon. I learned all that on the job. It was fun.

The upshot was, I saw through my own prior illusion about the white coats. Most of them were just people caught up in their own arrogance.

Anyway, tell me the last time you saw a full-on debate on national television between a "respected MD" and some well-armed opponent?

In another life, when you lived on Pluto?

Funny, isn't it.

They hide out with their imaginary viruses in the dimly lit places.

They appear briefly for press conferences and then vanish behind closed doors.

From a May 7 [2003] article posted on the *Boston Dig* (*), written by Liam Scheff, who deserves a Pulitzer for his fine series on HIV, here are several piquant quotes from major dissident researchers:

*(*Ed. Note: Boston Dig is digboston.com – formerly weeklydig.com. And, for the citation referenced, now see the following: (1) http://liamscheff.com/2003/05/letters-from-the-aids-debate/ and (2) http://www.altheal.org/overview/liamscheff.htm)*

From David Rasnick, chemist and AIDS advisor to President Mbeki of South Africa: "In '85 I was at a research meeting where HIV was being discussed. An AIDS specialist was asked how much HIV was present in [any given] infected AIDS patient…He answered, 'Undetectable. Zero,'"

This stopped no one from continuing to assume, blithely, that HIV caused AIDS.

From Dr. Rodney Richards, chemist, who worked on the design of the first HIV tests while at Amgen and Abbot Labs: "…[Luc Montagnier] looked in his [AIDS] patients' blood, but he couldn't find [HIV] there. In fact, no one has ever found HIV in human blood."

From Peter Duesberg, molecular biologist at U Cal Berkeley, called the father of the oncogene, former colleague of Robert Gallo: "Viruses are only dangerous the first

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

time you encounter them. Once you've made antibodies to a virus, you have immunity for the rest of your life, and the virus can't get you sick anymore. [This is the classical conventional view of viruses.] This is the opposite of HIV theory, which states: You become infected; you don't get sick; you make antibodies; and 10 years later, you get sick and die."

Rasnick comments on the HIV test kits, which contain certain proteins assumed to be present in the make-up of HIV. The tests look for antibodies in the patients' blood which will be drawn to those proteins---signifying an HIV-positive diagnosis: "None of the proteins in the Elisa and Western Blot tests have been proven to be specific to HIV or any retrovirus. For this reason, the FDA has not approved a single test for diagnosing HIV-infection."

Level upon level of insanity.

Rasnick: "Different races have different ranges of naturally-occurring antibodies. That's why blacks have a nine times greater chance of testing positive [for HIV---and qualifying for toxic drugs like AZT] than white Europeans, and a 33 times greater chance than Asians."

Rasnick is saying that this natural range of antibodies in black people will tend to react with the proteins in the HIV tests and produce a false-positive reading.

A very sobering thought.

Rasnick makes a follow-up comment on the nature of the standard AIDS drugs: "…the most toxic drugs ever manufactured and sold."

<u>And now the interview:</u>

Q: All right gentlemen, you've both read the June 14 article *(above)*. Comments?

MEDAVOY: It's right on target, and I can tell you, again, that those of us who were building the propaganda campaign on AIDS in the 1980s were fully aware of all these facts.

Q: Including the fact that HIV has never been found in a patient's blood?

MEDAVOY: HIV was, is, and always will be an artifact.

Q: What does that mean?

DOCTOR: They cooked up, not the virus, but the IDEA of the virus, and they pushed it out there and everyone saluted.

Q: There is no HIV virus.

MEDAVOY: Never was. The research was a fraud.

DOCTOR: They found some small piece of human DNA and called it a virus.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: But who was in on the fraud?

DOCTOR: In on the fraud? At what level? Montagnier and Gallo, two very poor scientists, used their own work to pretend they had found a virus. They knew they were lying, but they both, to varying degrees, were in denial about their own lies. Gallo less so than Montagnier. Gallo was more conscious and predatory.

MEDAVOY: At the highest level of the HIV op, people didn't care whether they found a real virus that didn't cause anything or a fake virus that didn't cause anything.

Q: Why didn't they care?

MEDAVOY: Because the op had goals that could be reached either way. The goals were: create a smokescreen in Africa, so that death from starvation, dirty water, vaccines, overcrowding could be blamed on a virus---which would allow the real causes to remain in place without correction. The other big goal was the targeting of groups like gays, African Americans, IV drug users---you know, a cleansing op. And all they needed for that was a phony test, a diagnosis, and the administration of very toxic killer drugs.

DOCTOR: Of course, there is always the goal of more new diseases with disease names and putative viruses that supposedly cause these diseases. Because with that, you can get everything you've had with SARS, and you can get medical-cartel control of populations. Fake diseases like AIDS and SARS are perfect for all this---except with SARS you didn't get a new drug that was pushed heavily. And therefore, SARS didn't spread everywhere.

Q: "SARS didn't spread everywhere" means "they didn't say it spread everywhere."

DOCTOR: Right.

MEDAVOY: It's pure fear. They are testing their own propaganda equipment to produce pure fear and then compliance.

Q: No virus, no new disease, just recycled old disease.

MEDAVOY: Correct.

Q: Is there this coronavirus? Does it even exist?

DOCTOR: My bet would be no. Oh, maybe they found one, at very low titer, in a few of the first patients. Meaningless. But that was all. Everyone else had regular flu or pneumonia or some other lung infection.

MEDAVOY: Here is how that scam works in the labs. First, somebody hands down the tablets from God. The DNA structure of what they say is a virus. Then everybody bows down [in the case of SARS scamming]. Then, after that, they pretty much ignore all the patients.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

DOCTOR: Right. They say it's hard to do a proper test on a patient. Takes weeks. All that. And they just concentrate on studying the DNA structure they have. They play games with it, and issue speculations about it. Most of the scientists are so brainwashed by their own methods, they are true believers.

Q: Do you know any researchers on SARS who are not true believers?

DOCTOR: I talked to one. He is privately livid. He sees what's going on. But he won't go public and blow the whistle. It would be the end of his career. I'm not taking about frank Plummer in Canada. He blew the whistle but concluded all the contradictions were just a "puzzle."

Q: Have you both read my article [June 16, 2003] *(appended below)* on the raccoon-biscuit connection to the outbreak of so-called monkey pox in the Midwest?

MEDAVOY: We've been talking about it. That one caught us by surprise. Biscuits containing the smallpox virus in a vaccine.

DOCTOR: The CDC is covering that up right now. They obviously know about it because they were the leading edge of that biscuit program.

MEDAVOY: Here we have the principle of BACKUP. See, suppose three scientists called a press conference and announced the biscuit-smallpox-monkeypox connection, and said that this was a terrible thing, and said that the CDC knows about it. Right?

DOCTOR: Worst-case scenario for the CDC.

MEDAVOY: REBELLION IN THE RANKS. How much worse could it get? But yet, the reporters are all trained like dogs to go to their best sources and seek confirmation, before labeling it a major scandal. Okay?

DOCTOR: And those top medical sources feed the reporters a line of crap and try to minimize the whole thing. They cook up a cover story for the reporters. They say this particular vaccine in the biscuits, which contains vaccinia, the smallpox virus, is "all sealed up" and repeated tests indicate that the vaccinia virus can't escape, and anyway, the whole vaccinia virus isn't in this vaccine, just a part of it, as a vector to carry in the rabies vaccine-----blah, blah---and they try to play the whole thing down.

MEDAVOY: And it probably works. I'm mentioning this just to show you that reporters and editors are programmed to seek out certain sources on certain stories, and if they don't get a clear green light from those sources, they won't run fully with the story. They'll do a watered down version.

Q: Yeah, like "coincidence discovered---anti-rabies vaccine contained vaccinia, but it had nothing to do with the current outbreak of monkey pox, which is a whole other thing."

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

MEDAVOY: Exactly. I'll tell you how all this phony viral science gets momentum, in the labs. For years and years and decades and decades, the researchers are subconsciously realizing that their research is way off the beam, is not producing results in any practical way. And so gradually comes the idea: "Since we're so far off, why don't we improve our accuracy by using more sophisticated methods?" You see? Liars simply find better microscopes and amplification techniques to tell the same kinds of lies they've already been telling. They think they can get out of the trap that way, but they just dig themselves in deeper----because their whole premise is wrong. It's the immune system, stupid, not the virus.

DOCTOR: I've known archeologists who've become so fascinated with little drawings on cave walls and shards of clay in the ground that they disappear into that world---and then, as an afterthought, because they have to, they write articles that sound like good science. Many of the virus hunters are the same way. They disappear into the little details of their tests and DNA sequencing and the rest can go to hell.

Q: As a doctor, how do you feel about the fact that there are these viruses out there that are not even viruses, but are lies about viruses?

DOCTOR: I feel like a priest who's thrown away his cloak and has stepped out into the street for the first time. I still wonder why Robert Gallo isn't in prison.

MEDAVOY: Hell, look at how researchers are punished for fraud, when they occasionally get caught. It's not different than the church trying to protect its pedophile priests. A slap on the wrist.

DOCTOR: Let me tell you something. I say this with 30 years of professional experience as a researcher behind me. If tomorrow the entire World Health Organization and the CDC disappeared, just vanished with no trace, we would see a gradual improvement of health on this planet. A steady rise. That's an absolute fact. Not because some better version of those agencies took their places, but because nothing took their places. Nothing.

June 13, 2003 -- AN INTERVIEW ON THE VIRUS HUNTERS

This week I'm interviewing a doctor who has done laboratory research on viruses. He is no longer in that field, and has retired from practice. His view on his former life has changed considerably. You will find his comments more than interesting.

Q: Why are the virus hunters seemingly in charge of every new supposed disease that comes down the pipeline?

A: That is an important question. The first answer is, the drug field is already overcrowded with antibiotics, the front-line medicines used for treating bacteria.

Q: So you're saying drugs for viruses would stand a better chance of making big dollars. But there are no real drugs that are effective against viruses.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Depends on how you look at that. There are antivirals against HIV. There is Vistide, which is an experimental drug you will find in use some places. Also, Ribavirin. Those are a few examples.

Q: Those drugs are actually chemo compounds. They kill cells throughout the body.

A: Correct. But so what? If companies can get them approved by the FDA, they make money. The field for drugs to treat viruses is wide open.

Q: Therefore, researchers try to say viruses are causing all these "new diseases."

A: Right. But there is more. The virus hunters, since Gallo and Montagnier, 20 years ago, have fought their way to the top of the research pyramid. They control the lion's share of funding.

Q: Which has nothing to do with truth.

A: It has to do with power. With what is in vogue.

Q: I mean, with SARS, a so-called pneumonia, there are 30 conventional germ candidates, and many of them are not viruses.

A: Exactly. So the virus hunters grab control right from the get go. They act as if it's going to be forgone conclusion that a virus is the cause.

Q: Power.

A: Yes. And they don't really care about what percentage of patients contain the virus, or how much virus is found in any given patient. They ignore all that. It's like a half-cocked mining expedition. Somebody finds a piece of gold dust in a mountain and assumes the mountain is a great stake.

Q: And when the mountain turns out to be very bad idea?

A: They move on. In viral research, you have to realize that there are no checks and balances.

Q: We've seen that with SARS.

A: That's right. You know that most people are not going to die from flu or pneumonia, which is really what SARS is. You know that most people are going to get better on their own, without treatment. So what difference does it really make? You can say a virus from another galaxy is the cause, and nothing changes. It's all a charade.

Q: And no one in the viral research field questions the science?

A: No one who wants to keep his job---except for a few brave souls, and they are ignored.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Can you give me another analogy?

A: Sure. A case of mild and brief and transitory diarrhea. Does it really matter what germ you say is causing that? It's self-curing. It appears, and then it goes away. But if you---

Q: Pounce on it and say you found a virus which is the cause, and you then begin to isolate patients and maybe give them a drug, nobody is going to question whether you got the cause right.

A: Right.

Q: What is your basic view of viruses?

A: There is a great deal of suppressed debate about the whole subject. Personally, I've come to decide that they are mostly harmless organisms that go their own way, unless the body in which they live is in poor health. Viruses are more or less crystalline entities that are on extended vacation. There may be exceptions, but I'm talking about what I consider to be the overall rule.

Q: But viruses are there, to be discovered.

A: And one crazy rule of medical research is, if you can find it, if you can discover it, you can make a case that it causes disease. Medical researchers aren't paid to find harmless things floating around.

Q: What about, say, the hepatitis B virus? If you share enough needles, you can get hep B.

A: Yes, but then you are talking about injecting these organisms right into the body, bypassing the ordinary controls, bypassing much of the body's defense system. That's a special case. And with dirty needles, you get all sorts of debris and other crap injected into the blood.

Q: But hep B is said to attack the liver.

A: Try an experiment. Take ten very healthy people and ten people with messed up livers. Examine each one and see how much hep B virus you find.

Q: What would be the outcome?

A: It's all cart versus the horse. Which came first? Did the germ attack a healthy liver and damage it, or was the liver in trouble already, after which the germ arrived and "fed on the problem?" If you have a healthy person inject heroin with dirty needles for a time, well yes, his liver is going to suffer. But in general, the trouble with the liver does not start with the germ. It starts with some kind of toxic load from chemicals.

Q: So as a former viral researcher, you don't put too much stock in the idea that viruses are causing people problems.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: That's correct.

Q: Is that why you left the field?

A: Pretty much. That and politics.

Q: Tell me a little more about the politics.

A: I would liken it to a collection of a lot of transmission-repair shops. They're everywhere. One is about as good as another. Sure, there are some sheer incompetents, but the rest are all on the same plane. Except for one thing. If they analyze every car that comes in honestly, they are going to cut themselves out of business. They need to find trouble. But here is where the analogy breaks down. With virologists, you get many people who actually have brainwashed themselves into believing that they are discovering very important things.

Q: And with all of them working in the field? With so many virologists?

A: The competition is fierce to occupy a position with a lab that has the inside track on new research. It's all about which lab you are working for. Are you in a little pond or a big one? Does your lab get a lot of funding or a little?

Q: I have been writing about the method by which SARS researchers supposedly isolated the coronavirus.

A: Yes. So much research is now done with the PCR test, or with sequencing operations to find the genetic code of the virus---it's a different game. You have to look at what they're really finding or not finding in patients. That is where the chain of trouble starts.

Q: Trouble?

A: Yes. A lot more attention needs to be paid to those "first few moments" when somebody takes a nasal swab from a patient. What is there? What do they have? Freeze that moment. Think. Observe. Is this really genetic material to begin with, or is it really just goop? There are all kinds of goop. Just as you would find goop if you took the cushions off an old couch and scraped around with a spoon. This is where the suppositions begin. This is where people think they have something unique. My experience is, it is not usually unique and even if it is, it is rarely important.

Q: So you're saying these researchers find goop and assume it is genetic material from a virus. That's their starting point.

A: Right. Because what are they looking for? What do they want to find? A virus. As I spent more years in this field, some very basic ideas slowly came through to me and gave me a little common sense. Imagine an ocean without pollution. What do you basically have? An environment that is healthy for the creatures and plants that live in it. After all---

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: They're surviving.

A: Yes. So something is working. Now, if you went in there and did tests on fish---

Q: You would find that they are carrying germs.

A: All sorts of germs. But so what? It doesn't seem to matter too much. The environment is fundamentally okay.

Q: But then you have oil spills and companies dumping tons of chemicals into the ocean, over a long period of time.

A: Right. And sooner or later, the environment itself is no longer so friendly to its inhabitants. More of them get sick.

Q: And then, when you examine samples of fish---

A: You will find the same germs. But now, since some of the fish are sick, the relative population sizes of those germs are changed. You'll get a lot of some germ. Do you call that germ the basic cause of the illness, or do you go back and see how the imbalance was created?

Q: You were not taught this analysis in medical school.

A: No I wasn't. An old veterinarian explained the basics to me.

Q: So how did the virus hunters come to dominate new disease research?

A: As I said, the field of bacteria was already well explored. Researchers were looking for something new. Drug companies wanted new types of diseases that could result in new classes of drugs. New vaccines. The stage was set.

Q: What about that class of viruses called retroviruses? HIV is a retrovirus.

A: If it is a virus at all, and not just a shadow inference derived from goop. Retroviral genetic sequences exist in the body. They always have, as far as I'm concerned. They are present in our DNA. If they had been causing us real trouble, we would probably all be dead by now, because we live with those sequences. I admit it would be interesting to discover their real role, but we know they are not harmful. But instead of trying to find out what those sequences are doing there, virologists assume there is a disease function, a harm function. This is mad science. It goes nowhere.

Q: Wasn't it Robert Gallo, about 35 years ago, who launched the idea that these viruses were causing disease?

A: He was the main player at that time, yes. First, he failed to find a connection between a retrovirus and cancer. Then he did the same thing with AIDS. Only in the latter case, he got the chance to lie on national television and the world was sold the

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

idea that HIV caused something called AIDS. I would say that moment made Gallo one of the biggest hustlers in the history of the human race.

Q: As you know, I've offered $10,000 to anyone who can find a published journal paper written by Gallo that proves HIV causes AIDS.

A: I can save prospective searchers a lot of time. There is no such paper. I and others have tried to find it.

Q: Don't you think disease research has taken a downward turn since then?

A: If you are talking about science by press conference, yes. Absolutely. SARS is another case. WHO and CDC locked up all that research and made their announcement and that was that.

Q: Does it piss you off?

A: It used to. No, it still does. But these days, I want to get more researchers to look at the "ocean," so to speak. The background context that is causing people to be disposed toward many illnesses.

Raccoon-biscuit connection to the outbreak of so-called monkey pox in the Midwest

June 16 [2003] – by Jon Rappoport.

MONKEY POX? BUCKLE UP.

Two very interesting sources of information have just come to my attention: Mary Sparrowdancer and Gable's Raccoon World.

One thread of their research, well cited, reveals that, since 1994, various state health departments, in conjunction with the CDC, have been launching programs of airdropping and hand-distributing millions of biscuits designed to immunize raccoons against rabies.

Two of the involved states? Texas and Ohio. Remember that.

These biscuits contain a genetically engineered vaccine that happens to contain THE VACCINIA VIRUS, which of course is the heart of the SMALLPOX VACCINE.

Hello?

The New England Journal of Medicine (Vol.345, no.8) describes the case of an Ohio woman who was bitten by her dog while attempting to pull one of these biscuits from his mouth.

She contracted smallpox.

I mean, why not? The vaccine in the biscuit contains the smallpox virus.

The rabies-vaccinia vaccine is called Raboral.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

So now we have this "outbreak of monkey pox" in the Midwest US. Monkey pox is indistinguishable from smallpox, even by electron microscope analysis.

The CDC has taken the lead in blaming prairie dogs and some giant Gambian rats for the monkey pox. The rats came to Texas from Africa, and the prairie dogs were shipped to the Midwest. The Ohio connection.

The CDC knows very well it has been involved in dropping vaccinia virus from planes over Texas and Ohio and other states. In the form of these biscuits.

Africa, one more time, bears the brunt of the blame.

Lawsuit, anyone? Multi-billion-dollar lawsuit?

"Damn. We've got some smallpox cases in the Midwest. We've been dropping smallpox-vaccine biscuits there for a long time. Texas too. What are we going to say? Hmm. Maybe we can blame it on prairie dogs and those big rats. You know, the rats come from Africa. Africa is always good for blame. Hell, the prairie dogs have probably been eating the biscuits, and then they got the smallpox virus. And then they passed it on to humans. So we'll call the whole thing monkey pox, since that was our original cover story for explaining why new smallpox cases in Africa showed up after we supposedly wiped out smallpox there in 1977. Yeah. That'll work. And we can come in behind all this and say that, right now, getting the smallpox vaccine will protect people against the outbreak of monkey pox. Which is the exact and perfect opposite of the truth, but that's our specialty."

Just beautiful, boyz. You're doing great.

Have a biscuit.

JON RAPPOPORT www.nomorefakenews.com

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

December 5, 2003

AN INTERVIEW WITH ELLIS MEDAVOY ON THE MEDICAL CARTEL

A brief but explosive conversation.

Q: So, Ellis, what did you want to say today?

A: It's about the show you did the other night on Coast to Coast AM. You know, they have somewhere between 5 and 7 million listeners all over the world. So the info you were putting out on the medical cartel is getting very wide exposure.

Q: I know.

A: It's the only game in town.

Q: What do you mean?

A: Think about healing. The history of it.

Q: What about it?

A: In the earliest societies, the healers were usually connected tight to the power structure-- -the priests, the little kings, the chiefs. If they [the healers] weren't so tightly aligned, they at least espoused some kind of cosmic mythology that aligned with the doctrine of the current power structure. You never got a healer saying, "Hey, forget about the official gods. I've got a god or two that really works and heals you." Never.

Q: What are you driving at?

A: Healing is always looked on as a function that should be part of the power structure. Why the hell do you think the Roman Church killed and burned and tortured all those healers? Because, if healing got out of the Church's control, people would begin to feel the Church was not all that important. After all, if you can get healed somewhere else…and even in modern times, right now, you see this same attitude reflected in the government---the FDA, the CDC, the US Public Health System, and so on. WHO is an agency under the wannabe global government, the UN. Healing is aligned with political power. It's perhaps the SINGLE BIGGEST ALLIANCE IN THE HISTORY OF THE PLANET.

Q: That's a pretty big statement.

A: I know. But it's true. So you can infer from that how much is at stake here in this revolution they call "alternative health."

Q: I've always felt that the most impressive revolutionaries I've ever met were in revolt against the medical cartel.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Of course. What did you expect? They are going up against the traditional alliance between government and healing. They're splitting it apart.

Q: So you think---

A: Go back to basics. The priest/king/high mucky muck says, "I have a direct pipeline to the greatest force in the universe." Now, how is it going to look---

Q: If there are thirteen healers off to the side who are snickering and saying, "Greatest force? We can heal and we aren't part of your entourage."

A: Now you've got it. You see? This is huger than huge. A cure for cancer IS a direct threat to the government of the United States. It isn't just a threat to the billion-dollar cancer industry.

Q: As soon as---

A: As soon as one of those guys you mentioned the other night, Dr. William Koch or Joseph Gold, gets resurrected and their medicines are used and people begin to be healed, there is a revolution---and people FEEL IN THEIR BONES a liberation FROM THE WHOLE POLITICAL SYSTEM…you have to understand this. And the whole system instinctively knows this, it feels the threat, it wants to destroy the threat.

Q: Yeah.

A: You use analogies to painting a lot. Well, let me give you one. In the world of deep, deep politics, let's say there is a big room and there are 5 paintings hanging in the room, and each one of those paintings is filled with light and power of its own.

Q: The political system will try to reduce the number of those paintings to one.

A: Too many sources of power are bad for business. It gives people dangerous ideas. And healing is perhaps the greatest power.

Q: To take this down to a mundane level, if people were being healed left and right, what would happen to the whole government healthcare net?

A: TO NOT NEED THAT NET?…the government does not like that idea at all. Way beyond any desire for real healing, the government has the desire for people to NEED the healthcare net, because that is a very big part of NEEDING GOVERNMENT.

Q: The same thing applies to the insurance industry.

A: Of course. If too many people stay healthy and too many others are cured once and for all of their diseases, what the hell do you think is going to happen? People are going to be less interested in buying insurance. Insurance companies WANT to pay claims---they know that paying claims is terrific PR for them---it proves they are THERE for people and that they are filling people's needs. This is one of the basic reasons insurance companies don't sponsor studies into healing modalities that really work against degenerative diseases. I mean, you'd think the companies would

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

want greater healing power unleashed across the world. That would equal paying out fewer claims and saving money. But that's not it at all. The companies want to pay out a lot of claims. They want that. It's the price of doing business in a world that is ill. In a world that is healthy, the insurance companies are broken and small and without clout. So, as we all know, the insurance companies have these numbercrunching actuaries…and what is their function? TO FIGURE OUT HOW THE COMPANY CAN DO BUSINESS IN A WORLD WHERE ILLNESS IS THE NORM. AND MAKE A SIZABLE PROFIT. BALANCE IT ALL OUT…

Q: So when you say the power of healing is always aligned with the current political structure, you mean the power of healing a little but not too much.

A: That's precisely what I mean. And if medical drugs kill 100,000 people in the US every year, that is part of adjusting the balance. And how would I sum up that balance? "How can we keep increasing death and suffering incrementally without the people catching on and throwing us off the roof tops? How can we heal and cure just enough but not too much? How can we keep control of whole enterprise?" You see, my boy, if we win this revolution, the socalled health revolution, THE WHOLE AND COMPLETE AND WIDE AND CENTRAL GODDAMN CORE REVOLUTION IS ALSO GOING TO FALL INTO OUR HANDS.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

December 10, 2003

AN INTERVIEW WITH ELLIS MEDAVOY ON GOVERNMENT AND THE MEDICAL CARTEL

This interview starts with two articles from the mainstream press. The first is about quarantine plans for the US, and the second is about the banning of most antidepressants for children in England.

After that, propaganda master (retired) Ellis Medavoy enters and we talk about how government and the medical cartel work together…of course with Ellis you never know where he's going to go.

December 9, 2003: The New York Times

If SARS Hits U.S., Quarantine Could Too

By DAVID TULLER

SAN FRANCISCO -- As the health officer of Alameda County, Dr. Anthony Iton is prepared to make tough choices if SARS re-emerges this winter or spring, as many infectious disease experts fear. The county, just across the bay from here, has identified two large buildings where, if voluntary steps to quell an epidemic were to fail, the authorities could sequester not just people who were sick but also people who might have been exposed to the SARS virus, Dr. Iton said.

The buildings, he said, could house up to 100 people and could be guarded to keep anyone from leaving.

"It's a virtual certainty that sometime in the near future we will see a SARS-like event in the United States, a highly communicable infectious disease that will require mass quarantine or isolation," Dr. Iton said.

Since last spring's outbreak of SARS, or severe acute respiratory syndrome, public health officials across the country have been spending extraordinary amounts of time and energy preparing for the prospect that the disease or pandemic flu, smallpox or something as yet unknown could require them to order a quarantine, a once common public health measure virtually abandoned for most of the past century.

In a draft SARS preparedness plan released this fall, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention advises states and communities to impose restrictions on people's movements based on the severity of an outbreak. In the event of a quarantine, the plan envisions extensive tracing of contacts of SARS patients, combined with a largely home-based, voluntary regime.

The plan, however, also calls for health authorities to cooperate closely with law enforcement, and to consider in extreme cases "electronic forms of monitoring," "detention facilities" and the establishment of heavily guarded quarantine "zones."

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

It also calls for respecting civil liberties and keeping the public informed.

Patrick Libbey, executive director of the National Association of County and City Health Officials, said the health authorities in many jurisdictions had been identifying possible buildings and preparing for possible outbreaks.

"People are taking this question absolutely seriously," Mr. Libbey said. "With the SARS outbreak, it really sharpened the focus on nuts-and-bolts planning."

Some issues facing health officials, Mr. Libbey added, concern legal processes for imposing quarantines, ways to house people and manage their needs, and the financing of such undertakings.

In New York City, the authorities have revised the health code to make sure they can legally quarantine people not just for known diseases but for suddenly emerging ones that present a major health threat, said Dr. Marci Layton, who is the city's assistant commissioner of communicable disease at the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene…

December 10, 2003: The Guardian

Drugs for depressed children banned Sarah Boseley, health editor Wednesday

Modern antidepressant drugs which have made billions for the pharmaceutical industry will be banned from use in children today because of evidence, suppressed for years, that they can cause young patients to become suicidal.

The Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) told doctors last night not to prescribe all but one of the antidepressants known as selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs).

The exception is Prozac, which is licensed for use in depressed children in the US. But the MHRA will warn that, at best, it helps only one child in 10.

The decision has big implications for drug regulation. The agency - which is the government's watchdog body on drug safety - has reached this point only after intense pressure from patients and campaigners.

They were concerned about patients - at first mainly adults - who appeared to have become suicidal on the drugs, and others who had got hooked and suffered distressing symptoms when they tried to stop taking them.

Public unease about these potential side-effects prompted the agency to investigate last year.

It has looked at the details of clinical trials of depressed children that were in the hands of the drug companies in the late 1990s. These studiesrevealed the problem of suicidal behaviour in children, but the companies did not draw it to the attention of the regulators in the US or the UK.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

It has become clear from the investigation that the regulators generally see only a summary of the data resulting from trials. It is prepared for them by the drug company only when it is seeking a license.

The agency became aware of a problem with Seroxat in children this year only when the manufacturer, GlaxoSmithKline, submitted data from trials which finished in 1996.

Pressure for a change in the regulatory system will inevitably grow. Two of the SSRI class of drugs have already been banned - or, technically, contra-indicated in children - by the agency.

The first, in June, was Seroxat, which goes by the generic name paroxetine; the second, in September, was Efexor (venlafaxine); joining them now will be Lustral (sertraline), Cipramil (citalopram), Cipralex (escitalopram) and Faverin (fluvoxamine).

Trials on children have not been carried out in all the drugs, but the completed studies show a worrying increase in suicidal behaviour among those on SSRIs compared with those given a placebo (sugar pill).

None of the drugs has a licence for use in children with depression in the UK, but GPs have prescribed more and more SSRIs for children.

It is estimated that as many as 50,000 children on antidepressants in Britain.

The agency will warn that patients should not stop their medication suddenly to avoid withdrawal symptoms.

The ban will cause problems for doctors because insufficient counselors and psychotherapists are available to offer the alternative treatment of therapy, and the bill to the NHS for such treatment would be much higher than the cost of the drug prescriptions.

Drug companies began clinical trials on the safety and efficacy of the SSRIs in children only after prompting by the US food and drug administration in the early 90s.

David Healy, the director of the North Wales department of psychological medicine, said: "It was standard practice for the FDA approving drugs like Seroxat (Paxil in the US) for adults in 1991 to write to the company and say this drug will also be used in children - it would be helpful if you could run trials in children so we can see what the safety profile is."

But trials that did not produce favorable results were neither published nor sent to the FDA or the MHRA.

The first major Seroxat trial in children was finished by 1996, but the results were not published until 2001. Data was also gathered in 1996 after a trial of Lustral,

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

manufactured by Pfizer, showing that 9% of depressed children on the drug became suicidal.

Dr Healy, whose own researches led to the establishment of the SSRI review, said yesterday: "They should have known by 1996 that there was a problem. GSK and Pfizer were asked to do this by the regulators so that we knew what the safety issues were."

The drug companies dispute that a problem exists. Only a tiny minority of children taking the drug become suicidal and their depression could be the real cause, they claim. GSK says several trials, not just one, were needed to establish whether its drug caused problems.

The SSRI review group, which has advised the Committee on the Safety of Medicines of the agency to ban the drugs from use in children, will now look at the safety and efficacy of the drugs in adults.

Q: Okay, you've read these two articles now---what do you think?

A: Well, look at the first one. You can see that SARS was an enormous success, just as I said it would be, in preparing populations for quarantines. And you're not hearing the ACLU screaming either.

Q: They're completely hypnotized.

A: You've got it. Quarantines and detention and the removal of all civil liberties to beat back a germ is acceptable.

Q: Frightening.

A: Oh yes. People are being trained, like monkeys, to believe that any member of society who DOES NOT FOLLOW ORDERS WHEN HE HAS A GERM IS A TRAITOR AND SHOULD BE SHOT OR DRAWN AND QUARTERED OR PUT THROUGH A SHREDDER. This is the direction we're moving in.

Q: It's like a new religion.

A: Precisely. The germ is the devil, and we must stamp it out if we are to be saved. So we have a new scarlet lette

R: HE HAS THE GERM, ISOLATE HIM. I can't emphasize this too strongly. SARS was a test run, an experiment to see---

Q: How well people follow orders.

A: When you boil it down, that's all it was. There was no germ at all, or if there was, it was harmless. This was an exercise, and they drew in Canada because they wanted to see what would happen in a modern city in an industrialized western nation.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: What did happen?

A: By and large, they got compliance. The population and the government knuckled under. There were howls and screams when they put the travel advisory against Toronto, but look at them now. Is anyone suing? Is there an investigation of the WHO? Of course not. Billions of dollars were lost, but there is no rebellion against what was done. Not really.

Q: So the experiment worked.

A: Yes. And it will keep on working until enough people wake up to the medical fraud behind the whole thing. The germ is an image, a horror movie, a little fear ball---and it is built up by the government scientists and the public buys it.

Q: But what is the public buying?

A: An idea. An image. Not a reality. As you proved in your articles, the virus itself, if it ever existed, was harming no one. The SARS deal was a mirage from start to finish. The people who were getting sick or dying---the few people---were ill from traditional lung problems, nothing more. So the public was buying an image.

Q: This is a far worse problem than wars against Iraq and Afghanistan.

A: In the long run, yes. Because the OP is much more insidious and pervasive.

Q: Okay, what about the second article?

A: Yes, most antidepressants in England are now banned for kids. Look at the US press today. Find this article. Find it if you can. I mean, this is very serious business, a big body blow for the drug companies. And where in the US press is this story? Is it on the front pages? Is it punched up? Do you see any big-time editorial writers covering it in the US papers? For example, if these drugs are now banned, we have to assume they were hurting kids badly, right? I mean, isn't that the implication? So where are all the human interest stories about that, and where are the outraged parents who are banding together and suing? Where is that?

Q: The story is being covered like a---

A: Like a very sober happening, and all the right people are making the right noises, and yes, it was responsible of the government to ban it blah blah. But where are the people who were actually damaged by the drugs? Why aren't media outlets going after that and covering it with a vengeance?

Q: This thing about the government banning it---

A: It just reinforces the idea that government decides. Yes or no. The government is in charge either way. Where is a grassroots ban of a drug? Where do you see the people banning a drug?

Q: What difference does it make if---

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: I'll tell you what difference it makes. If the government is always making these decisions, then the government is in charge of the whole store. And in the long run, governments want the drug companies to survive and will do whatever it takes to make them survive. Let me give you a little piece of alternative history that never was, okay? There never was an FDA. There never was a government body that was in charge of drugs. And so when drug A was released in 1916, and five hundred people died across the US, and the papers went crazy with the story, the government was forced to prosecute the drug company people. That's all. A crime was committed. And if the penalty was too light for the public's taste, the public went nuts. Because, you had no hypnotic "we're the government and we're taking care of EVERYTHING"---do you see? You just had outrage, because a crime was committed---and if a drug was released that was just plain ineffective, then people would say, THIS IS CRAP, and they would stop taking it-----and in the long run, you would have had fewer deaths from drugs under that system than we have had under the "protected" system we have.

Q: That's a very sobering analysis.

A: Yes. An open society works. We should try it sometime. What we have now is basically the illusion of protection, but the government is aiding and abetting the poisoners in their work.

Q: Suppose we had a history of tough prosecutions against drug companies, as you say, and--

A: And the sentences were nasty. Fifteen years hard labor. You know, a real deterrent. The companies would think twice about putting out toxic drugs that kill people.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

January 7, 2004

AN INTERVIEW WITH ELLIS MEDAVOY AND JACK TRUE (CIRCA 1992).

MIND CONTROL.

Ellis Medavoy is a retired propaganda expert who carried out many OPS for his employers, who were members of organizations like the Council on Foreign Relations (although they were not paying him in that capacity).

Jack True is the late hypnotherapist who did much groundbreaking research on mind control and ways of undoing it. He was based in LA in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and was a colleague and friend of mine.

Here's the interview.

(R = Jon Rappoport; T = Jack True; M = Ellis Medavoy)

R: Gentlemen, good to see you together. So what is mind control?

T: It's a condition in which a person thinks through a defined tunnel of opinion and accepted lies.

M: He looks through the tunnel and sees a very narrow version of reality.

R: But he doesn't believe he's brainwashed.

T: Of course not. If he did---

M: He would be a recovering mind-control subject.

T: Hypnosis is the key. When you accept an opinion about reality without investigating it yourself, and if that opinion narrowly defines reality, then you are in a light trance. You're adjusting your own consciousness to fit the received opinion.

R: So it's self-hypnosis.

M: It has to be.

R: Why?

T: Because without a self there is nobody there and the whole idea of mind control is meaningless.

M: He's right. If there is no self that is basically free and independent, then what are you brainwashing?

T: If you're just brainwashing a machine, you didn't need to do it in the first place. There has to be someone who is free---and then he is brainwashed. Ellis did his brainwashing with false facts, with false pictures.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

M: That's the most widespread form of brainwashing. That plus a passive state of mind and you've got it done.

R: Now, how far out does this extend? In other words, how many false pictures are we buying?

T: I once had a patient who went through several stages in realizing this. He began with the idea that he was basically a doctor who was practicing internal medicine at a clinic in LA. That's how he defined himself. Then he broke into a new view. He was a citizen of America. Then he decided he was a human being with certain inalienable rights. Then he decided he was an Immortal who had lived perhaps ten lives. Then he decided he was an Immortal who had lived hundreds of millions of lives. Then he decided he was an Immortal who had the innate power to make any choice about anything and make it happen. It went on from there.

M: What was important there was the unfolding process of that man deciding for himself what he was. At each step he unloaded a lot of false information or limiting information.

T: I once had a patient who discovered in therapy a time tunnel. He told me he could shuttle back and forth to the past and to the future. It wasn't my job to find out whether this tunnel was real or was an artifact of his imagination or what. I just played along.

R: And what happened?

T: He predicted the temporary stock market collapse in October of 1987. He did a lot of things that psychiatrists would have called crazy. If he had gone to a shrink, he would have been locked up and given brain-damaging drugs.

R: But with you?

T: I didn't care. I didn't care whether he said he saw a time tunnel or three giant fish walking down the street. It's all good, as far as I'm concerned. As long as the patient says he sees it, I accept it. I don't care.

M: Because you assume reality is a lot wider than the usual consensus view.

T: That's right. That's exactly right. Also, I don't have any need to force my opinions on the patient. I don't have a structure I'm trying to lay on.

R: It's like art.

M: That's right. You walk into a museum and you see five hundred different paintings. You just look at them. There they are. You don't try to deny different versions of reality.

T: Because reality is not one thing.

R: You accept that?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

T: I accept that we are living in a consensus reality---but when patients are given free rein to move about, so to speak, they eventually begin to find other versions of reality.

R: And this is good?

T: It's very good.

R: Why?

T: Because they begin to feel more free. And they have more energy. Energy blockages unlock.

M: You see, if I had been up against people like that, I could never have launched successful propaganda operations. You need a certain rigidity of character to get your message accepted.

T: You need people who are so locked into consensus reality that you're just adding one more piece of bullshit to the tower of bullshit they already have.

M: Exactly.

R: I think I've asked you this before, Ellis, but how does it feel when you launch a successful piece of propaganda?

M: Take HIV. I was, as you know, working on that for awhile, especially in Europe. The whole idea was to convince everyone that HIV was real and that it was killing people. Both were lies. But when the whole PR campaign went through the roof in terms of its success, and when everyone got on board, it was amazing. There I was, looking at the creation of a whole bogus reality, and everyone was buying it they way they buy traffic lights and soup and summer heat and taxes…this gives you a sense of the malleable nature of reality…you begin to think that the whole shooting match is just PR to begin with.

T: I take the same view. There is nothing written in stone.

R: Of course, if you're lying in mud on a battlefield with a gun in your hands and all sorts of shells are going off around you, that can get pretty real.

T: Hey. Consensus reality succeeds in just that way, by feeling very real and imposing penalties. But in fact, the war itself was just the next outcome of the consensus political reality that everybody was living inside of. It was the next artifact piled on all the other accepted artifacts.

M: Jack, if I was a patient of yours in a light trance and I said I saw a time tunnel, what would you do?

T: I'd say, what do you want to do?

M: And if I said, go into it and check it out?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

T: I'd say, go ahead…and then after a minute I'd ask for a report. It's pretty simple.

R: You learn from your patients.

T: Damn right. I go to the movies with them every day. It's very interesting.

M: Look, we recently had a war [Gulf War One]. Most people bought the reasons that were officially given. But the reasons given are NEVER the real reasons. This is what propaganda does. And when---

T: When enough people accept the false reasons, it's a solid brick of reasons. It's part of the structure. I'm in the business of taking apart structures. But I do it by letting the patient find new bricks, and then newer bricks, and then newer bricks.

M: It's like archeology.

T: Cities lying under other cities, all the way down.

R: And in this process, what's the function of hypnosis?

T: It just turns off all the radio stations in the head. It allows the patient the space to explore without interruption. That's all.

M: Jack does more by doing less.

T: I could put that phrase up as a sign in my office.

R: What about the use of psychiatric drugs like Ritalin with children?

M: Look, this whole thing is an effort to put society into a drug vial. This is a very high-level OP with a huge amount of PR going down into the minds of the public, so that people will accept these drugs, which are toxic. Weakens the whole society. Puts people into states of mind that are deleterious and non-productive. Makes everyone think he is ill. The Ill Society. The weak society. The obedient society.

R: And where is this OP coming from?

M: IG Farben.

R: The Nazi cartel that was broken up at the end of WW2?

M: No, the Nazi cartel that WASN'T broken up at the end of WW2. These people and their descendants are still very active. They own large shares in drug companies. They want to drug societies into submission. That's one of their key projects. You're already seeing, and you'll continue to see, activity from Germany to stifle the sale of nutritional supplements…

R: Have you ever been in contact with any of these Farben people?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

M: I've brushed up against them here and there. Very cold-blooded types. They have nothing to live for except destruction. If you put together Farben, the Bush family, and Eli Lilly, you have a very nasty triangle of influence.

R: You used to work for nasty people.

M: What can I say? I've shifted sides, except on those days when I see the whole human race as nothing more than a moronic failed species.

T: The man [Medavoy] lacks hope.

M: You got that one right.

T: Maybe we shouldn't be talking to him. Maybe he'll turn us in to the SS. (laughs)

M: Rappoport always gets on my case about my former work. He likes to needle me.

R: It's more than just a needle, Ellis.

T: I'm sure a good shrink would diagnose Ellis as schizoid.

M: So now you're jumping on the bandwagon too?

T: Why not?

M: The hell with you two.

R: [At this point, Medavoy got up to leave. I tried to persuade him to continue, but he wouldn't. Jack and I had gotten under his skin. Usually Medavoy was a lot more resilient to criticism. After Ellis left, Jack and I continued talking for a few minutes.]

T: I don't like him. He's a son of a bitch.

R: I know. But he has a lot of good information to impart.

T: He has a lot to answer for.

R: He knows that. I don't think he's sleeping well these days.

T: What made him quit his propaganda work?

R: He decided that human beings were better than he gave them credit for. His sister was in a car accident, and some stranger saved her life. Got her to a hospital in time. I think that was one of the turning points….

R: [In recent years, Ellis has privately contributed time and money trying to reverse some of the effects of his former work.]

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

January 30, 2004

I spoke with Ellis about the "US military" announcement that there is great confidence Osama bin Laden will be captured in the next several months.

Q: A very weird announcement, yes?

A: It is.

Q: What's the message here?

A: There are several possibilities. One, this is a warning shot fired off the bow of the Saudi ruling house---don't get nasty with us, we could arrest bin Laden and (pretend to) get him to talk about his relationship with you.

Q: What's another possibility?

A: The announcement is just pure nonsense designed to raise morale at the Pentagon.

Q: What about an October surprise in an election year?

A: Arrest him in the weeks before the election and Bush is back in office for another four years. Yes, that's very relevant.

Q: But it's not the whole story, is it?

A: No. Why issue this announcement, which would alert bin Laden, wherever he is, that he'd better get on the move and change location to a very distant land? It's ridiculous.

Q: We have to remember that---

A: That bin Laden has been a US asset, that he was brought in to fight the Soviets in Afghanistan...

Q1: continued....

Q: Okay, so what's the rest of the deal?

A: You have to ask yourself why the Pentagon would permit this announcement that bin Laden will be captured in the next few months.

Q: I'm asking you.

A: Think about it. Think about Saddam.

Q: What about Saddam?

A: Think about his capture.

Q: They took him out of a hole in the ground.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: I'm not talking about that.

Q: What are you talking about?

A: The media exposure.

Q: They released the story. It was major news on all the channels.

A: Yeah, but how was it done?

Q: What do you mean?

A: Think.

Q: What is this, a school lesson?

A: What did you actually see?

Q: Saddam getting examined by a doctor for head lice.

A: Really? Is that what you saw?

Q: What the hell are you talking about?

A: Were there any press there?

Q: Where?

A: Think. If you asked the public about this, a whole lot of people wouldn't know the answer.

Q: The answer to what!!?

A: Was it live or on tape?

Q: The capture?

A: All the shots of Saddam, with the beard.

Q: Oh.

A: Yeah.

Q: The whole thing was on tape.

A: They didn't actually parade him out in front of the press, did they? They didn't take live questions, did they? Saddam wasn't allowed to speak, was he?

Q: So you're saying---

A: What do we really know and what don't we really know?

Q: We know---

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: We know we have video of a man who looks like Saddam. We don't know when that video was shot. We don't know who was in that hole.

Q: So the man in the video---

A: Could have been a double. The whole thing could have been staged to grab some good press for Bush at a moment when he needed it. Think time-table.

Q: So in the case of bin Laden---

A: They say they're going to arrest him in the next few months and they're not worried that this news would make bin Laden fly to the Arctic and hide in a forest or go to a little island in the South Pacific. This does not worry them.

Q: Because---

A: They already have him---or more likely, they have a double who is going to stand in for bin Laden at the right time, and they've already made video of him, the double, and they'll release that at the right time, and they want the Saudi royal house to know all this now.

Q: They want the Saudi royal house to know that---

A: The real bin Laden no longer poses a threat, will not reveal the secrets of his ties to the royal house---

Q: Because the real bin Laden is dead.

A: Yeah. Could very well be. But in the election cycle, it pays better to wait awhile, probably until after the Democrats choose their candidate.

Q: The October surprise.

A: Reagan's handlers worked it so that the US hostages in Iran were never gotten out by Carter (until after the election, when Reagan did it), because if Carter had gotten it done during the campaign, he might have defeated Reagan. This is a similar strategy. I'm just showing you the way it could happen, the way it has happened in the past.

Q: If bin Laden had been announced as dead during the Afghanistan war---

A: Bush would have lost his reason to continue on. The war against Iraq would have had much less support---bin Laden was the subconscious image in the public consciousness after 9/11---even though the war against Iraq was not explicity fought to get bin Laden. Destroying Iraq was subliminal revenge for 9/11 and revenge against the mystery man, bin Laden---the war was part of "solving the bin Laden mystery"---not in conscious rational terms certainly, but on a subconscious level.

Q: In the public mind, bin Laden still needed to be alive.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Right. But now, it well may be that, from a psychological point of view, there is no further reason for him "to be alive." To put it another way, the currency that a living bin Laden gives the Bush crowd after he wins the White House again is less than the currency needed soon to sew up that election.

Q: Of course, if after the Democrats nominate a candidate, the polls all show that Bush is going to sweep into the White House for a second term, they may not announce the capture or killing of bin Laden. They may let it ride and use The Mystery Man to fuel Bush's second term.

A: Exactly.

Q: The Bush crowd wants to maintain ties to the Saudi royal house and the heavy business hitters in Saudi Arabia.

A: As Greg Palast revealed, James Baker has been chosen by Bush to handle all the Iraqi finances for the time being, so he can repay the Saudis a few billion dollars from the Iraqi treasury the Saudis claim they are owed. A gift from heaven. Money binds.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

June 7, 2004

Here is a quote from Ellis Medavoy of propaganda.

"Propaganda is lying. Face it. That's what it is. And if someone is lying, someone knows the truth. It's simple logic. You can't get around it. Someone knows the truth. You can't plan a campaign of lies unless you know the truth. You have to be lying about something, and that something is the truth. But people at large don't want to deal with this. They understand lying, but they shy away from the truth part, because the truth is too grim. See? If you want to say so and so isn't murdering 10,000 people, and that's your campaign, then you already know he is murdering all those people. What comes out in court, if anything does, is the lies. But seldom do we get the full truth, which is that the people behind the propaganda know that the murders are occurring and they don't care. In fact, they want those people to be murdered. One reason why Hitler and the mob continue to be objects of fascination is, they wanted people to be murdered and they admitted it. It's a kind of relief to see the truth spelled out, after there are so many lies. Underneath it all, we're sick and tired of all the lies, and we want the truth. We do and we don't. We dance around it. We stick a toe in the water and then we take it out. It's a dance…"

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

June 16, 2004

THE SCRAMBLED 9/11 JETS: A PR CASE STUDY

"CONFUSION" AS A KEY PROPAGANDA TERM

ELLIS MEDAVOY's WORD ANALYSIS

On the eve of the 9/11 commission hearings into the failure of US fighters planes to scramble and intercept the hijacked airliners, the NY Times (see article below) is preparing us with a very limited hangout (and a few outright lies) for the dog and pony show, as witnesses are trotted out.

Perhaps the most amazing contention will be: Dick Cheney was supposed to issue the order for the fighter jets to get into the air and intercept.

Excuse me, but the vice-president is supposed to go to funerals and rubber-chicken lunches and discover that Army contractors are charging $500 for a toenail clipper.

NORAD and the FAA and other segments of the air-control monopoly have ironclad procedures in place for hijacked aircraft.

These procedures involve, at the very least, fighter jets going up and moving alongside the stolen planes and peering into the cockpits to see what's going on. At the extreme, these fighters shoot down the planes.

As I've written before, on the morning of 9/11 there were AF dry-run mock exercises taking place that, yes, involved hijacked planes---and this boggling "coincidence" supposedly added to the confusion.

In truth, the mock exercises were run to provide a later cover story for failure to shoot down the jetliners; and to confuse traffic controllers on the day of 9/11 who were looking at their radar screens. As in, were they looking at blips of exercises or real hijackings?

But now it appears there is no need to invoke this cover story. The 9/11 commission is going completely Lite. Blame will be spread around, and people will say we must overhaul the whole military-civilian preparedness structure. The usual. "Fix the problem; reorganize; give more money to the agencies."

You see, FAILURE is a good thing and a good excuse, when you are dealing with government. That word covers it. "We must do better, and we will."

FAILURE never implies intent. It's just, well, failure. It's a word that all government hearings are supposed to use. No criminal liability.

CONFUSION is another good word. "We were confused. That's why we failed."

When there is confusion, there can be no criminal liability.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

You will soon be hearing these words. Watch the hearings and see.

FAILURE. CONFUSION.

The witnesses are prepared, believe me. They know how to spin it. They don't go up there and testify without being coached by their PR people. They are told what key words to use. Yes, it gets very specific.

It's like a political campaign. For each issue, there is a word or phrase to cover it. A word that will resonate with the suckers. A word that will keep the sleeping ones asleep.

"WE ALL MUST, TO A DEGREE, ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FAILURE AND THE CONFUSION."

"WE MUST GET A HANDLE ON THIS. WE MUST REORGANIZE. WE NEED MORE MONEY."

It's a combination of pass the buck, musical chairs, and a "sharing of responsibility." PROCEDURES. That's another word you'll be hearing. "We need better procedures."

Don't be surprised if someone says a NEW ORGANIZATION must be created to ensure that PROCEDURES are in place.

These are all well-tested cover words.

After all, what happened in the wake of 9/11? The creation of HOMELAND SECURITY, which has not done one thing that existing agencies could not do.

All these cover words conceal: CRIMINAL LIABILITY and, more important, INTENT.

Intent to let 9/11 happen.

No one will bring that up. Of course not.

So it's all a charade, and in order to carry it off, you have to use certain words. You also need the Opposition Party to try to punch holes in the cover words, because this gives the impression of a real probe, a real investigation.

But I assure you, the net result will be a DEBATE about blame and responsibility and failure and confusion. That debate will settle into mud, as it almost always does. Both sides chattering. As if they represent the totality of perception of the issue at hand. That's of extreme importance, if you want a good cover-up.

And then, at another useless level, you'll get certain pundits who, in the aftermath, say that PARTISAN BICKERING impeded the investigation---as if this crowning insight really covers the waterfront.

All these levels of the charade are predicted and prepared for and invoked, both on an unconscious and conscious basis.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

First, the crime. Then the hearings. Then the key words and phrases. Then the Opposition pushing at the key words. Then the debate. Then the pundits. These people may be criminals, but they're not so stupid they don't know how to run a cover-up.

New York Times Wednesday 16 June 2004

Panel Investigating 9/11 Attacks Cites Confusion in Air Defense

By Philip Shenon

Washington - The independent commission investigating the Sept. 11 attacks has found that the Pentagon's domestic air-defense command was disastrously unprepared for a major terrorist strike on American soil and was slow and confused in its response to the hijackings that morning, according to officials who have read a draft report of the commission's findings.

The officials said the draft had been circulated in recent days among commission members and at the Pentagon in preparation for public release of the report at a hearing on Thursday.

The 9/11 commission draft summarized the response of the military, the Federal Aviation Administration and other agencies with this passage:

"On the morning of 9/11, the existing protocol was unsuited in every respect for what was about to happen. What ensued was a hurried attempt to create an improvised defense by officials who had never encountered or trained against the situation they faced."

The report, they said, suggests - though it does not say explicitly - that a more organized response by the North American Aerospace Defense Command, or Norad, might have allowed fighter pilots to reach one jetliner and shoot it down before it flew into the Pentagon, more than 50 minutes after the first of the hijacked planes crashed into the World Trade Center in New York.

Instead, the report finds, an emergency order from Vice President Dick Cheney authorizing the hijacked planes to be shot down did not reach pilots until the last of the four commandeered jetliners had crashed into a field in western Pennsylvania, after a struggle between terrorists and passengers aboard that plane.

A spokesman for Norad, which is based in Colorado, had no immediate comment on accounts of the report. Norad's commander, Gen. Ralph E. Eberhart, and Gen. Richard B. Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are to testify before the commission at the Thursday hearing, along with former officials of the F.A.A., which has been harshly criticized by the commission in the past.

Commission officials said that Norad and the F.A.A. believed that elements of the criticism in the draft report were wrong or exaggerated, and that they were pressing for last-minute corrections. The 10-member bipartisan commission, which is in the

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

final weeks of its investigation, has repeatedly tangled with the air-defense command and the aviation agency, and issued subpoenas to both last year in trying to gather documents and testimony.

The commission's public hearings this week - Wednesday on Al Qaeda and the development of the Sept. 11 plot, Thursday on the chronology of that morning and how Norad, the F.A.A. and other agencies responded to the attacks - are the last the panel is scheduled to hold before it delivers a final, all-encompassing report late next month.

Thomas H. Kean, the commission's chairman and a former Republican governor of New Jersey, said in an interview Tuesday that the hearings this week would "close the circle" on the inquiry and alter the public's understanding of exactly what happened on Sept. 11 and of the plotting of Qaeda terrorists in the months before.

While Mr. Kean said he could not disclose in advance what exactly the commission had learned, other panel officials said the hearings this week would depict widespread chaos within the federal government on the day of the attacks, offering extensive new evidence of how the White House, the Pentagon and federal emergency response agencies were slow to react.

Members of the commission, they said, are expected to question witnesses about hesitation among White House aides on the morning of the attacks, why President Bush was allowed to remain in a meeting with Florida schoolchildren for several minutes after it became clear that a terrorist attack was under way and why he was then taken on a perplexing, hopscotch series of flights on Air Force One that created the appearance of chaos among the nation's leaders.

"There was a lot of chaos," Mr. Kean said. "We'll go over what the president did, what the vice president did, what was going on in the PEOC - the whole story." PEOC is the acronym for the Presidential Emergency Operations Center, a White House bunker where Mr. Cheney and senior aides were sheltered in the hours after the attacks.

Mr. Kean said that in a closed meeting on Tuesday, the panel began to debate the report's final recommendations in earnest, including proposals for a sweeping overhaul of the nation's intelligence agencies. He said he remained optimistic that the commission could produce a unanimous report.

Commission officials have made clear in the past that the report will offer blistering criticism of the C.I.A., the F.B.I. and other intelligence and counterterrorism agencies for failures before Sept. 11. Some members have suggested that the commission may want to recommend the creation of domestic intelligence-gathering agencies separate from the F.B.I., similar to Britain's MI-5.

The intelligence overhaul "is probably the most complex and the most difficult" of the issues under consideration by the panel, Mr. Kean said. "But yes, I'm optimistic. Even with 10 very independent-minded people, this is not impossible."

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

End of Times article

Update #1. June 17, 2004

Bingo!

Just as I predicted yesterday, they are leading with CONFUSION.

That's the word that's been chosen by both witnesses AND the 9/11 panel itself to headline what happened and didn't happen to US air response on 9/11.

I consulted Google. Reading from its major posts on the subject.

Today, the AP headline all over the world is CONFUSION HINDERED RESPONSE.

The NY Times has PANEL INVESTIGATING 9/11 ATTACKS CITES CONFUSION IN AIR DEFENSE.

The LA Times goes with CONFUSION PREVENTED RESPONSE.

This got me very interested so I decided to apply the word confusion to the whole subject of 9/11. On Google, I punched in "9/11 confusion." How many listings came up? A whopping 263,000.

I changed the entry to "September 11 confusion." 960,000 listings! To get the full impact of these findings, be sure you've read my last few posts in this newsletter section.

It's all about key words and phrases, how they are sculpted and used by the propaganda and PR boys to cover a situation in a blanket of non-blame.

Ellis Medavoy weighs in and offers this: "I can sort of give you a sliding scale of words used in these situations. I've actually put together cards of these words, to use in certain situations. I'm working here off the top of my head, but it's something like this---CONFUSION, NO WARNING, MISCOMMUNICATION, CHAOS, COULDN'T TELL, DATA FAILURE, UNDERMANNED...notice that MISTAKE is not on the list. You would use that if you really were in toilet looking up and had nowhere else to go."

Update #2. June 17, 2004

Ellis Medavoy weighs in with his Google search results...

Ellis: "To get a rough idea of how pervasively the words FAILURE and CONFUSION are used in connection with government, I did a Google assessment. Why? Because those two key words are often floated BY THE GOVERNMENTS THEMSELVES, AS COVER STORIES TO ESCAPE LEGAL LIABILITY. Then the words are picked up by the press---the press, after all, is taking many of its cues from government PR people. Even when the press isn't, it apes the behavior of government in its use of language. That language flows easily back and forth between press and government. It's a common language."

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

As I pointed out in yesterday's post in this newsletter section, FAILURE and CONFUSION are sculpted to avoid criminal liability and to avoid the revelation of intention to commit a crime. These words have become acceptable "admissions of guilt" where NO real consequences follow. What could be better? When the government is on the hot seat, it can fall back to CONFUSION and FAILURE and then invoke all sorts of peripheral nonsense to worm out of its mess and its crimes and its intent to commit crimes.

Ellis: "Here is what I found on Google. If I enter GOVERNMENT, CONFUSION, I get 1,310,000 entries. That's a big number for such a pairing. A very big number. Now, here's even more of a surprise. If I enter GOVERNMENT, FAILURE, I get 4,540,000 entries! That's huge for such a pairing. By comparison, SATAN comes up with 3,100,000. UFO gives me 4,440,000. ELVIS? 5,390,000. At first glance, people want to say, "Government and failure, paired together, come up so many times because there are so many failures and the press is reporting them." No, no, no, no! You have to understand this is all PR, intentional PR, the invention of language, if you will, to present government in a way that allows them to avoid liability---and failure is the perfect word for doing that. I ought to know. I was in on inventing words and phrases like that. You give them to reporters in statements and they are printed, and pretty soon they become the conditioned reflex and everybody in government and in the press uses them."

So here is the structure. It's loose, but it is a structure. You've got PR pros who work in black ops as outside contractors for governments and secret groups like the CFR and the Bilderbergers and so on. You've got government and their own in-house PR spinners. And you've got the press. The black ops PR people invent phrases and pass them on to reporters and government PR spinners. Pretty soon these words are appearing all over the place. Handed back and forth, back and forth. They become part of the language, and as Ellis put it, "Their meanings become clear. THIS word implies no liability. THAT word does imply liability. THIS OTHER WORD is a real slam. THAT OTHER WORD seems like a real slam but it isn't. It's just a limited hangout and lets the guilty party off the hook with a slap on the wrist. The public catches on, but only on an unconscious level. It catches on to the invented meaning, but not the deception. That's the game."

I tell you, this is a gold mine.

Update #3. June 18, 2004

"9/11 CONFUSION" WORKED

I predicted that the CONFUSION angle would be worked at the 9//11 commission hearings to explain why US fighter jets did not intercept the hijacked planes.

And so it was. And the press picked up on it, of course, and spread it like thick mustard.

So look at the aftermath in the press now.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A great big zero. No huge outcries. Mostly, silence.

Yesterday's final public 9/11 hearing is already old news.

A very successful OP.

All done according to solid PR principles: find a key word that implies no blame, no criminal liability, no intent, and use it to the hilt, get it featured in press headlines---and move on.

Even many of the alternative news sites were silent on the whole deal.

You've got one of the key visible pieces of outrageous evidence re 9/11---the failure of fighter jets to scramble in time---and it's whitewashed to the point of invisibility.

"Oh, well, it was a screw-up. There was confusion. They were too late. They were undermanned. Things were happening too fast..."

Yeah. Sure.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

November 15, 2004

Ellis talks about the presidential election

Q: Where have you been? It's been a long time.

A: I've been pissed off, as usual.

Q: What about this election?

A: You need a starting point. After you get that, other things fall into place.

Q: So what's the starting point?

A: The election was won through vote fraud. That was the plan from the beginning.

Q: Yeah, there is much evidence for that.

A: So once you realize it, then, for example, you can interpret the idea that Bush won because so many people came out and voted for "values."

Q: Not true?

A: It's a cover story. It is used as a smokescreen to obscure the fact of vote fraud.

Q: But why "values?" Any number of false explanations for Bush's cheating victory could have been put forward.

A: Exactly. So why did they choose "values?" Because they wanted to take attention away from another op that was ongoing.

Q: What other op?

A: Pumping up fear about security, terrorism. They didn't want to say Bush won as a result of people being afraid about terrorism. They could have said that, but they didn't want to.

Q: Because fear about terrorism is a bigger op than the election.

A: Yes. That's the bigger deal. The recent Osama tape, the tale about Al Qaeda coming through Mexico into the US with nukes...it goes on and on. If they said Bush won because of this fear, people would begin to make parallels between propaganda about fear and Bush winning. They preferred what was for them safer ground: values.

Q: So it was all about choice of cover story to explain why Bush won?

A: Yeah. And look what else the values cover story does. It bolsters Bush as a man who has a moral mandate from moral people out in the hinterlands. It sets up his second term perfectly: appointments of judges, slamming gay marriage, going after abortion. Now it looks like he has a mandate from his voters to do just that.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: So the values cover story has several payofs for Bush.

A: It's what a good cover story is supposed to do. Give more than one advantage to the people floating the cover story.

Q: What about Kerry?

A: Of course, everybody knows he ran a weak campaign. But if he had any leverage at all, it was because his supporters thought he was taking the moral high ground. But you see, the Bush people using the values issue...that trumps Kerry along that vector as well.

Q: And with millions of people watching the red states swell on election night...

A: A lot of vote fraud. But the Bush people explained that through values. The red-state people are "old fashioned" folks who hold to "traditional values." The blue-state people can buy that. They fear the red-state people. They're willing to believe, in a New York minute, that all the red-state people are "Neanderthals." It fits their myth and their nightmare about the "American heartland."

Q: Values. Good cover story.

A: Perfect.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

March 3, 2005

FBI FAKING IT---WHY?

TERRORISM INTERVIEW WITH ELLIS

Below is a snip from an ABC News article about a secret FBI report that was leaked to ABC. The FBI report states that, to date, no al Qaida sleeper cells have been found in the US.

This is startling. You mean, after all the investigations since 9/11, and since all the official warnings about sleeper cells, NOTHING has been found?

Pretty much.

This was the nightmare, wasn't it? Sleeper cells, embedded deep within American society, waiting to be activated.

Something smells fishy, doesn't it?

Instead of a fish, maybe it's a goose. A wild one.

What could have set the FBI off on a very long wild goose chase?

PR.

Propaganda launched after 9/11.

About what?

Sleeper cells.

It was a fear op. It was agitprop designed to speed up the passage of the Patriot Act and bring more government and popular support to the war on terrorism and the war against Iraq---and scoop up more funding from Congress.

Ooooooooooo---sleeper cells. Watch out. It's like a virus that hides deep within the body and activates ten years later.

So the FBI has been obliged to look for these cells---and they haven't found any.

Well, let's look at this thing straight-on. The head of the FBI, at first, warned America that sleeper cells inside the US were the greatest terrorist threat to us. The greatest threat. The greatest threat.

And everyone bought that idea because it seemed, as an image, the most frightening thing. Most frightening image=greatest threat.

Always good PR. Always works. Always an effective equation.

FBI investigation units are detailed to find the cells. And they come up with nada.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

But... if the blowing up of buildings is the MO of terrorists... why do they need a carefully embedded cell to do that? Why?

Hmmm. When you look at it, it doesn't make sense. All "they" would need to do is sneak a few people into the US with explosives, through the porous Mexican border. No need to embed a sleeper cell in the US for five years.

The whole thing is a con.

I can think of a very trivial analogy. Your boss at work, who is given to overblown ideas and projects, launches a new plan to find a market for his product in...Bali. So this boss details a few employees to scout that market. They try and try and try, but it doesn't fit. The product will never sell in Bali.

That about sums up what happened at the FBI.

Here is the article...

March 9, 2005: ABC NEWS

A secret FBI report obtained by ABC News concludes that while there is no doubt al Qaeda wants to hit the United States, its capability to do so is unclear.

"Al-Qa'ida leadership's intention to attack the United States is not in question," the report reads. (All spellings are as rendered in the original report.) "However, their capability to do so is unclear, particularly in regard to 'spectacular' operations. We believe al-Qa'ida's capability to launch attacks within the United States is dependent on its ability to infiltrate and maintain operatives in the United States."

And for all the worry about Osama bin Laden's sleeper cells or agents in the United States, a secret FBI assessment concludes it knows of none.

The 32-page assessment says flatly, "To date, we have not identified any true 'sleeper' agents in the US," seemingly contradicting the "sleeper cell" description prosecutors assigned to seven men in Lackawanna, N.Y., in 2002.

Overblown Sleeper Cell Threat?

"Limited reporting since March indicates al-Qa'ida has sought to recruit and train individuals to conduct attacks in the United States, but is inconclusive as to whether they have succeeded in placing operatives in this country," the report reads. "US Government efforts to date also have not revealed evidence of concealed cells or networks acting in the homeland as sleepers."

It also differs from testimony given by FBI Director Robert Mueller, who warned in the past that several sleeper cells were probably in place.

"Our greatest threat is from al Qaeda cells in the United States that we have not yet been able to identify," Mueller said at a Senate Select Intelligence Committee hearing in February 2003. "Finding and rooting out al Qaeda members once they have

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

entered the United States and have had time to establish themselves is our most serious intelligence and law enforcement challenge."

When the secret report was issued last month, on Feb. 16, Mueller testified at a hearing before the same committee that the lack of evidence concerned him. "I am concerned about what we are not seeing," he said.

End ABC snip

Now, here is the short interview with a colleague of Ellis.

Q: You've read the ABC piece on the FBI failure to locate sleeper cells of terrorists in the US?

A: Right. I have.

Q: What do you make of it?

A: Let's back up. If you are fighting a war, a real one, on the ground, and you know the enemy can penetrate your forces in 100 different ways---but it's not happening---what do you conclude?

Q: The enemy does not want to.

A: And therefore it's not a real war. Something else is going on.

Q: What would that be?

A: Someone is controlling the movements of your enemy. And that person or group is holding your enemy off. He's doing you a favor. It looks like a real war---it's meant to---but it's not a real war.

Q: It's a fake operation.

A: Yeah.

Q: So you're saying---

A: There are 10,000 ways to get weapons or explosives inside the US. Move them in, buy them here. There are 10,000 ways to get operatives into the US through borders.

Q: Therefore, if "al Qaida" is so intent on wreaking havoc inside the US, why haven't we seen it since 9/11?

A: Exactly. We could do a lot of fancy speculating, but that's what the issue comes down to. I could sit here from now until next month and grind out possible terror-attack scenarios. Of course, I would never do that because I don't want to float ideas on that. But anybody could dream up these scenarios. Anybody. You can see them on TV crime dramas and in movies.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: What conclusions do you draw from all this?

A: Someone is controlling the degree of terrorism. That someone is not a fanatical person bent on launching attack after attack, day after day. That someone wants to proceed by steps. To obtain political realities.

Q: Such as the war in Iraq.

A: Right.

Q: Such as the Patriot Act and all that that implies.

A: Yeah.

Q: Such as higher prices for oil.

A: Yeah.

Q: Such as support for the objectives of the government of Israel.

A: Correct.

Q: Anything else?

A: One other thing. If you and I can see these things, why haven't there been a flood of comments in the mainstream press about it? Well, the press is controlled. The press is stupid. But beyond that, someone is keeping the obvious from surfacing. Someone is keeping the nature of the op from being understood. And that someone would be the controller of the op itself. Makes sense, doesn't it?

Q: Yes.

A: Osama is not controlling the US press.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

July 9, 2005

THE PSY OP CALLED TERRORISM

Ellis offered to talk about terrorism in the wake of the London bombings.

Q: I'd like to talk about the psy-op surrounding terrorism.

A: Well, to begin with, you have to realize that it's essential, in doing propaganda, to find an enemy as soon as possible. When bombs go off, people are conditioned to want to know who did it. In fact, if you don't feed them that morsel soon, they turn on YOU.

Q: So the liars have a head start.

A: You bet. They are plugging into the public demand to know who was responsible. The liars are all too eager to pin the tail on the donkey. They select that donkey to align with their goals.

Q: It seems to me this is vital to understand.

A: Of course. It is the public that has been conditioned to expect answers right away. Who did it? What was the name of the group?

Q: Why is that? Why is that demand to know so strong?

A: Because the public, after a terrorist incident, is dangling like a worm on the hook. It needs to get off the hook. It needs to become something other than a worm. It needs to go on the attack, even if that attack is only in its own mind.

Q: In that case, the public will accept the name of any enemy, even if that name is invented out of thin air.

A: Right. However, it helps if the name of the perpetrator---for example, al Qaeda---is familiar. It feels better. Hence the need for a legend.

Q: What do you mean?

A: It's right out of Orwell. You invent an enemy and then you keep describing the enemy throughout a whole series of incidents the enemy has supposedly committed. The public comes to believe that if enemy X did Y, then he did Z as well. It's all building a legend.

Q: Satan did A, so he did B, too.

A: Yes. You keep the name of the enemy in full sight, and you keep adding to the legend. After awhile, he becomes embedded in the subconscious.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: I once did an interview with you in which you spoke about the disruption of the flow of time as essential to staging a terror event. A lot of people didn't get that. They thought your analysis was too esoteric.

A: Well, a lot of people don't have a clue. Not my fault. Essentially, any terror incident intrudes with great shock into the normal every-day flow of events. That's what makes it terror. The public is shocked out of its daily trance. A bomb goes off. Objects and people blow up. Everything you have come to accept about what is normal is suddenly torn apart. You see? You are walking down a street. You know that street. You know what generally happens on that street. You know the flow of events and time on that street. It's all very familiar. The grocer, the baker, the cars, the newspaper vendor. Then in one second, it all blows up.

Q: How does this tie in with the invention of an enemy?

A: You are essentially offering the public a rational-sounding reason to explain why the flow of events and time has suddenly been blasted. You are explaining dead bodies on a sidewalk where only pleasant things happen.

Q: "It was al Qaeda."

A: Yeah.

Q: So now it makes sense to people.

A: If the public is prepared to believe the legend of al Qaeda. You know, "the most evil force on the planet." Then it makes perfect sense.

Q: And then it makes sense to go after al Qaeda and anything associated with it.

A: Sure. Absolutely. And going after after al Qaeda, whatever the hell that means, galvanizes people and gives them an avenue along which they can escape from the moments of terror. This is basic psychology at a very primitive level.

Q: Of course, the press and pundits and politicians all go along with this, too.

A: Mostly, these people are subject to the same psychology. They don't want to dig deeper. They want to stay in the pocket of their own primitive responses.

Q: But they play on the public's conditioned response.

A: Of course. Their genius, if you could call it that, is being like everybody else.

Q: Isn't there a taboo against digging deeper?

A: Yes. Among the majority of people, it's considered very uncool to look for cover stories and lies and fake-outs and staged events. That would be like telling a wild animal that the meat he is finding along a trail is being put there to lead him toward a cage and men with guns who are waiting a mile away. The animal gets very pissed off at such analysis. All he wants is the meat and the taste of blood. If you try to

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

distract him from that, he might eat you. Have you seen that Carl's Jr. TV ad where the kid is slurping up a burger? What does he say? "Don't bother me, I'm eating." Well, that's the slogan for this, too. Don't bother me, I'm getting revenge against al Qaeda.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

THE MATRIX REVEALED Volume 1

JON RAPPOPORT Interviews ELLIS MEDAVOY (Part 3 of 3)

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

December 22, 2005

TAMIFLU DEATHS AND THE TAP-DANCE

Below you will find an excerpt from the Sydney Morning Herald, reporting two cases of "death from bird flu," despite treatment with Tamiflu, the drug that is being stockpiled all over the world against the hoax-pandemic.

I was reminded of an interview I did some years ago with Ellis.

Here is a piece from that Medavoy interview:

Q: (Jon Rappoport) So you're saying that when people die after a drug is given, there is a standard spin that is published.

A: (Ellis Medavoy) Of course. The words "resistance" and "mutation" are hauled out and used. They are painted on the story.

Q: And how are these words employed?

A: "The germ has developed resistance to the drug." "The germ mutated rapidly, so the effective drug was no longer effective."

Q: Which means the drug can't be blamed for not working.

A: Not only that, but the drug can't be blamed for killing the patient. "It was the germ."

Q: What about proof that the germ really did mutate?

A: Try and find it. Normally, the mutation cover story is announced to the press with no proof at all. It's just a tale. They simply assume the germ must have evolved into a new form---overnight---and that's why the drug didn't work.

Q: There is another question, too. Did they ever really find the germ in question in the ill patient?

A: Right. Or did they find antibodies to the germ---

Q: Which are a sign of health.

A: Yes. In most cases, they don't isolate the actual germ at all. And when they do, they don't show that the germ existed in sufficient numbers in the body to cause any harm. It's all nonsense and obfuscation.

Q: So you could get a patient who is mildly ill, no real problem. Then he is given a drug and he dies. The story is spun so that the patient is said to have died from some germ, whereas the only logical explanation of death is that the drug killed him.

A: Absolutely. See, the drug makers always have a theory about how a drug works to cure a disease. They have a technical step-by-step story about the mechanism of

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

cure. This happens, then that happens, then that happens over there, and then you have a cure. But they don't have a step-by-step story about how the drug can kill someone, because they don't want to know about THAT. So when a patient does die after being given a drug, the manufacturer always says, "There is no step-by-step chain of evidence that the drug actually led to the patient's death. There could have been other factors involved. Therefore, we're exempt from blame." It's a tap dance.

End of interview excerpt.

In the case of Tamiflu, it's interesting to note that even conventional assessments of the effeciveness of the drug admit that it only shortens the length of the flu by 1.5 to 2.5 days, if it is given after the person already has the flu.

However, the proponents of the drug don't want to bring this up as a reason for a flu death after treatment with Tamiflu. "Hey, it only shortens the length of the illness by a little bit, so yes, people can die anyway." No, instead they want to say the germ mutated and developed resistance to the drug. That suits them better. Otherwise, people might begin to say, "Why are we bothering with this drug at all? It does almost nothing."

Yeah. Almost nothing. Except it can have dire negative effects.

Here is an excerpt from the Sydeny Morning Herald article. Notice how closely it follows the pattern Medavoy laid down:

Deaths of treated patients alarm bird flu experts

By Mark Metherell

December 23, 2005

The deaths of two bird flu patients in Vietnam who had been treated with Tamiflu has raised questions about the drug Australia has stockpiled as a front-line medicine to combat an influenza pandemic.

To the dismay of medical experts and those responsible for the worldwide efforts to fight a pandemic occurring, the H5N1 bird flu virus in the bloodstream of the two patients in Vietnam rapidly developed resistance to the drug.

Concerns about resistance problems with Tamiflu suggested by an earlier case in Vietnam had already prompted the Australian Government to acquire more stocks of a rival antiviral drug, Relenza, a Health Department official revealed yesterday.

In one of the latest cases, a 13-year-old girl appeared to be stable but then rapidly worsened as the virus mutated, became more aggressive and eventually killed her.

Reports of the deaths are published in the New England Journal of Medicine by doctors funded by the British Wellcome Trust working in Vietnam. They urge changes to the global plans for fighting a flu pandemic. Other antiviral drugs are

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

needed alongside Tamiflu, they say. [NOTE: THE WELLCOME TRUST IS VERY CLOSELY TIED TO GLAXO. GLAXO WAS GLAXO WELLCOME, UNTIL 2000, WHEN IT MERGED WITH SMITH KLINE BEECHAM TO BECOME GLAXO SMITH KLINE BEECHAM. WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT? BECAUSE GLAXO MANUFACTURES RELENZA, ANOTHER "ANTI-FLU DRUG," WHICH IS IN COMPETITION WITH TAMIFLU. SO WE HAVE A SITUATION WHERE THE WELLCOME TRUST TRASHES TAMIFLU AND CALLS FOR OTHER FLU DRUGS TO BE USED. SUCH AS RELENZA, WHICH HAD FALLEN ON HARD ECONOMIC TIMES. IT HELPS GLAXO TO TRASH TAMIFLU.---JR]

An Australian authority on influenza, Graeme Laver, said: "What is so worrying is that it looks as though it [the mutation] happened very quickly."

Dr Laver, whose research contributed to the development of the antiviral drugs, said while it was not surprising that a flu strain should develop resistance to the drug, the speed of the mutation was surprising as it was very difficult to develop resistant strains, even in the laboratory.

He said one possible comfort was that any future flu pandemic may not be the same as the current H5N1 strain, meaning it might not have the same potential to develop resistance rapidly.

The H5N1 strain has so far killed 71 people in South-East Asia, most of whom have been in close contact with infected birds. Scientists say the risk of a pandemic of the lethal disease would arise if the strain were to develop the ability to spread easily from human to human.

The Health Department's spokeswoman, Kay McNiece, said officials had been told of an earlier case of apparent resistance to Tamiflu and that was one of the reasons for the recent decision to order 1.81 million courses of the alternative antiviral, Relenza.

Australia has 3.95 million courses of antivirals held in secret stockpiles, most of them Tamiflu, as part of the $555 million anti-pandemic measures...

End Sydney Morning Herald excerpt

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

February 13, 2006

AN EXPLOSIVE INTERVIEW WITH ELLIS MEDAVOY: "MIND CONTROL, MIND FREEDOM"

Media mind control was his specialty.

Eventually, when he realized the extent of depopulation agendas in the Third World, he quit the scene.

Over the years, he has changed his outlook on ethics.

More than anyone I've ever encountered, he knows the nuts and bolts of influencing the media, and he also knows the big picture, when it comes to floating false cover stories.

When I told him about my upcoming tele-workshop, "MIND CONTROL, MIND FREEDOM", he said he wanted to do a background interview. However, I wasn't prepared for the direction this conversation would take. In his usual frank and no-holds-barred fashion, he reveals a number of things about himself, mind control, creativity, imagination, and the psychology of destruction. You may need to buckle up for this one.

Here it is.

Q: First of all, as you've told me before, you were involved in spreading the lie that AIDS is basically one condition caused by HIV.

A: That's right. There was a group that knew this was all a lie, and they wanted "traction" in the press. They wanted the world to accept HIV as the cause of AIDS. They wanted plenty of stories planted in the media. So I accepted that assignment. I was, of course, not the only person doing this. This was a very big operation.

Q: What was the purpose of the lie?

A: As with any major op, there were several purposes. I've explained most of it to you before. But, as you can see, the world has seen, in recent years, an explosion in PR and propaganda about so-called epidemics. West Nile, SARS, bird flu. Besides scaring people and getting them to accept any and all medical and political edicts, the idea is to bring nations of the world into a tighter connection---because when you have an international agency like the World Health Organization at the helm, telling governments what they have to do and can't do, the "community of nations" draws closer and closer together.

Q: Basically, you're talking about the move toward globalism, the rule of the many by the few.

A: Yes, I'm talking about the eventual erasure of all significant national borders.

Q: What's called the New World Order.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Right. Only that phrase has been somewhat discredited. I try not to use it.

Q: What do you mean, discredited?

A: It's been interpreted to mean: "a bunch of right-wing wackos are spinning a conspiracy theory about evil men who want to take over the planet." That is how you do propaganda. You see? When some people become aware that globalism is on the march and they call it a New World Order, the phrase itself is attacked and made to seem bizarre.

Q: Yeah. I want to establish for my readers that you've been retired for some years.

A: That's right.

Q: What happened after you retired and gave up lying for money?

A: I would use two words to describe my state of mind: DEMORALIZED and DESPONDENT.

Q: Really.

A: Yeah. For several years, I was in bad shape.

Q: Because you regretted what you'd been involved with as a professional propaganda man?

A: That was part of it. But there was something else, too. Doing propaganda is creative. I was, you could say, an artist. And then I stopped. When you stop creating, after you've been doing it, you get very down. That's what happened.

Q: But your creative bent had been directed in the area of mind control.

A: Doesn't matter. Do you know why I contacted you the very first time we met?

Q: Well, I thought I did, but apparently you have something else to say on the subject.

A: I found out you were an artist, and I also found out you had a great deal to say about the healing power of imagination. That sparked my interest. Because I was very down. I was a "painter who no longer had a canvas." And I'd say the last few years of my work in PR and propaganda, I realized I was going into a very negative mental direction, in terms of having no more interest in doing my "art." I was lost.

Q: I see. So you---

A: I wanted to hear more of what you had to say about imagination. I had a feeling it held a key for me.

Q: And did it?

A: Yes.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: I didn't know that.

A: That's why I'm telling you.

Q: So a shrink might have---

A: Diagnosed me as manic-depressive. But it was really all about creating and then not creating. The up and then the down. Rise and fall.

Q: You were getting what you deserved.

A: True. But regardless of that, there were other factors at work. You see, when a person is going in a very creative direction, no matter how he's doing it, he doesn't want to stop. Because he's doing art. It may be destructive art, as in my case, but that doesn't matter. He doesn't want to stop creating. Most evil people who create and know they're doing it don't want to stop because they like being an artist. They don't see any other outlet for their creativity. And they think about not creating as a form of personal suicide. I have to say, though, this whole process for them is pretty much happening on a subconscious level.

Q: Were you suicidal?

A: After I retired, I strongly considered ending my life.

Q: What made you not kill yourself?

A: The possibility that I could harness my imagination in new directions.

Q: Really.

A: That was the only thing that stood between me and a bullet in the brain.

Q: To clarify this for my readers---

A: Look, let me boil it down. Suppose there is a guy who has spent his whole life working for a company. He's some sort of midlevel executive. He doesn't really have a very interesting job. But he has one. He shows up every day at the office, year after year. And then, all of a sudden, he hears a rumor that his job and other similar jobs are going to be cut. Now, everybody assumes that the only thing at stake is the money, the way to support himself and his family. But even in that situation, this guy is creating a little bit. Every day, on the job, he's a creating in a minor way. He may not know it, but it's happening. And when the threat of getting fired looms up, on an unconscious level he's in a panic. How is he going to keep creating his "art?" Where is he going to do it? It doesn't matter how small the creating has been. He's upset. He's feeling that incoming cloud of demoralization and despondence. He's going down.

Q: He's---

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: He's getting closer to being nothing more than a robot. That little edge of creativity---that's his ace in the hole. That's what really keeps him afloat.

Q: So you're saying creativity is everywhere.

A: Well, you know that. We're all floating in a sea of our creativity. We may not know it, we may not admit it, but that's the basic situation. If we get cut off from that, we go down. Here is a principle of propaganda I don't think I've ever articulated in quite this way before: TO THE DEGREE THAT A PERSON IS CREATING LESS AND LESS, HE BECOMES A MORE RIPE SUBJECT FOR PROPAGANDA AND EXTERNALLY IMPOSED MIND CONTROL.

Q: And the converse would apply as well.

A: You bet. The more a person is creating, the less likely it is that he'll be ripe for mind control.

Q: When did you see this?

A: About three years after I retired. It blew me away. It's a simple idea. But it hit me like a ton of bricks.

Q: Did this come to you all on your own?

A: No. It came in part from you, and from a few talks I had with your friend, the hypnotherapist, Jack True.

Q: I see.

A: So, in terms of the propaganda effect, the media mind control effect, I want your readers to know all this. What you're doing in your work is pointing the way to far less mind control. If people take the clue. If they begin to consciously use their imaginations more and more.

Q: In your work as a propaganda specialist---

A: I was creating a world, an island of false information. I was creating it and selling it. And now, looking back on that time, I can see that people were buying what I was selling to the degree that, in their own lives, they were creating not very much. It was a very strong and very precise equation. At the time I wasn't aware of that. But now I am.

Q: Which means that there must be, in our culture, a whole lot of ops aimed at reducing people's creative power, in order to make them more ripe for informational mind control.

A: Absolutely. But as you've pointed out, when you get to that profound a level, you are mostly talking about ops that are launched and run without much consciousness. The people who, for example, sell tons of toxic medical drugs---drugs that tend to make creativity harder to do---aren't really thinking on this level.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

They don't consciously know much about imagination and creativity, when it comes to the core of life itself. They knew a few things, but they don't see the biggest picture. In the same way, when you see all the budget cuts in education for the arts, that's being done more or less as a reflex. The people that run societies have what you could call an instinctive fear of individual creativity---but they haven't added the whole thing up. They can't.

Q: Why not?

A: Because, when a person really begins to see what creativity is all about, he doesn't want to push people down and grind their noses in the mud anymore.

Q: Is that what happened to you?

A: By degrees, yes. It was like coming out of a fog. The full force of it didn't hit me until after I retired. But in those last few years of work, I was beginning to break through. I was beginning to get some very strong glimpses of the biggest picture.

Q: And then you didn't want to sell lies anymore.

A: I wasn't so keen on it, no.

Q: That's important.

A: Yes it is. I want people to know something. I'm sort of repeating myself, but so what? When you realize, consciously, that you are creating more and more in your life, in your work, in your "art," whatever it is---as you see this more and more and more---and you can't deny it because it's so obvious---you also see that using that creativity for destructive purposes is a very bad and stupid thing. That's the ethical force kicking in. That's when the destructive artist hits the wall. Take a person like Hitler, who was a painter in his early days. When he became the big guy in power in Germany, he put all that conscious painting---and his ambition to BE a painter---aside. Notice this. It's very important. He began to rely on a whole bunch of bullshit ideas about the "true origin" of the German race. The Aryan business. The gods from their secret caves. All that nonsense. He began to sacrifice his own straight-out creativity on the chopping block of this "external" metaphysical baloney. Do you see? He "appealed to a higher power." That's where he put all the eggs in his basket. And that's why he was able to continue his destructive and inhuman course of action. If he had stayed a painter, he might have come out of the fog. With enough straight-out imagination and creativity---

Q: You don't need to appeal to a higher power. You'll eventually get everything you want, in the highest possible sense. In every sense.

A: That's right. Look at the Roman Church. They did the same thing. Those leaders, early on, did the same thing. They cooked up some very creative myths, but then they used them to appeal to a higher power, and with that pretended higher power in their hands, they pushed people right into the mud. There is nothing very

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

creative happening in that organization now. There hasn't been for a long time. They abandoned the creative spark and they went into the business of selling lies. Their creativity dwindled and dwindled. Now they're just like robots selling the same lies they sold hundreds of years ago, but with a "softer" touch. You can find the same formula in Satanic groups. They invoke this "higher power" and hitch their creative wagon up to that, and then the creativity dwindles and becomes a very sick and painful joke for a lot of people. It's all about coercion and delusion.

Q: Coerced mind control.

A: Which is exactly---

Q: The opposite of conscious creative power exercised by the individual.

A: Right.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

May 17, 2006

Q: What did you want to talk about today?

A: In the past, we've touched on the reasons why I quit my profession. But there is something I've left out.

Q: What's that?

A: I was in New York. I was working with a guy who was one of the early graphics people. He had come over into propaganda from advertising, and he was hot on the idea that graphic presentation could be very convincing, and I should learn about it.

Q: Were you interested?

A: No. But then he started talking about the uses of color and people's responses to different colors, and I perked up a little.

Q: Why?

A: To this day, I really don't know. For him, color was all about covert persuasion. He had his theories. They were complicated. After a while, I was bored stiff. You know, blue means this in these situations and green means that. All that stuff.

Q: So you didn't pick up on his ideas.

A: No. I just listened. It was cold outside, and he had a nice office and the heat felt good. I almost dozed off.

Q: Who was he working for?

A: No comment.

Q: What does this have to do with you quitting the propaganda trade?

A: I'm getting to that. After I left his office, I tried to catch a cab, but I couldn't find one. So I walked to the Museum of Modern Art and went in. I almost never go to museums. I wandered around for half an hour or so, and I came across a Corot painting, I think. My memory is a little hazy on it. I didn't like the painting much. I remember that. It was gloomy. But there was a purple in it. A sort of gray-purple. And I fixated on it. I couldn't stop looking at it. It seemed like the greatest thing in the world at that moment. I don't know why. It was so beautiful. If it was on a dish, I would have eaten it.

Q: So this advertising guy had talked to you about color, and then you were looking at it, in a painting.

A: Yeah. Only propaganda or PR or bullshit was the furthest thing from my mind. That was the point. I was just looking at color.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: And what happened?

A: I was transported. You could say that. I went into a different kind of reality. It felt very good. There was no deception in that world. It was exactly what it was. I had never come across an experience where everything was exactly what it was and was so damn good, so beautiful. It lacked all artifice. It wasn't coming at me around the corner with an agenda. It was itself. That's all it meant to be. It was like a voice talking to me, saying, "Here I am. Relax. It's all good."

Q: And that had---

A: That had a huge effect on me. I said to myself, "What am I doing? Why am I trying to fake people out and fool them and bamboozle them IF THIS EXISTS, this color?" Weird, eh?

Q: Not to me.

A: That's why I'm telling you. In that moment, my whole life, such as it was, fell apart like a plate sliding off a table and breaking on the floor.

Q: Just like that.

A: Just like that.

Q: And that's how you got interested in painting?

A: Yeah. That was the moment. Everything turned upside down. I was knocked out by a punch. That purple. (laughs)

Q: What did you see? I mean, can you say anything else about looking at that color?

A: I saw what I wanted. Not what I thought I wanted. I wanted that color. I was like a guy in the water off a boat, and I was clinging to a life preserver. That color. Only I wasn't scared. i was happy. Happy in a different way than I had ever felt in my life.

Q: You knew what you wanted. Not what you thought you wanted.

A: Right. And I saw the difference, the distinction.

Q: And you decided to get out of the propaganda business.

A: Yeah. Because for the first time, I saw something and felt something---that damn color---that was so much itself, so much what it was, there was no pretense. And I wanted it right down to my core. In terms of what you've been writing about and teaching these days, I saw my desire and I manifested it on the spot---all in a few seconds.

Q: And it changed everything.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Yeah.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

May 25, 2006

Here, Ellis gets into some very sophisticated and important material about desire and manifestation.

Q: After our recent interview, you wanted to say more about painting?

A: Yes. I haven't talked much about it in the past, but I do paint almost every day now.

Q: That often.

A: Yes.

Q: What are you---

A: Let me put it this way. From painting, I've learned that you can choose what you desire.

Q: What do you mean?

A: Let's say I'm feeling a fascination for the color red. I'm taken with it completely for the moment. So I paint red pictures. But as I'm doing this, I feel a sinking sensation.

Q: Why?

A: Because although it's what I desire, I'm overdoing it.

Q: I'm not sure I understand.

A: I'm all about red. I keep pushing red. As I do, I feel unhappy.

Q: But why do you feel unhappy?

A: I'm going too far with it. I'm following like a dog, an obedient dog, what I desire. I desire red, so I keep sniffing it and painting it, and I begin to feel uncomfortable. I want red, but I'm limiting myself. I'm focusing too much on it.

Q: But you want red.

A: Yes, it feels very natural for me to want red at that moment. It feels so natural I think I've got my hands on what I want. And yet...it's not completely satisfying.

Q: Again, why not?

A: Because a connection with myself has been broken.

Q: This is fascinating, but I don't understand.

A: I can see that.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: So explain it.

A: Desire is certainly a key. You go ahead and you manifest what you desire, but there is a further possibility: you decide what you want.

Q: You don't just discover what you want. You invent what you want?

A: Exactly.

Q: Well, I can certainly see that a person can decide or invent what he wants, but why is that so important?

A: Because it vaults you into new territory. You haven't been there before.

Q: And if you don't do that?

A: You develop a keen sense for what you want, but you keep following it like a dog and you let it lead you around by the nose, and after a period of time, you are finding out nothing new, and that becomes boring.

Q: This is getting a little clearer.

A: Good. You see, there are several territories, you might say, where desire enters in. Several different territories. For example, advertising people are plugged into one area. They are getting consumers to want what they the consumers already want: the superficial stuff. But if a person keeps going after that kind of stuff, he gets bored and irritable and peeved. He doesn't know why, but he gets fed up. He's fulfilling desire, but at a level where it doesn't matter after a while.

Q: And you're saying it's the same thing with red.

A: Exactly! You keep going after red and getting red, and you're painting red, and you like red and you desire red, but you're following the track of desire too closely. You're turning into a robot of getting what you desire, because you're only consulting your desires in one type of area.

Q: I could make an analogy to food.

A: That's good. You love steak. You desire steak and potatoes, and so you eat it every night. After two weeks, you're bloated and bored. So you go to the next thing that pops up as something you desire: cheese. You eat it every day for a week, and again you feel bloated. The next thing is chocolate...and so on. At each step you're manifesting what you desire, but it's all on the same level.

Q: The whole idea of manifestation, though, is to discover deeper levels of what you desire.

A: Yes. And that's very important. I'm suggesting you can help that process along by looking for something NEW.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Something new to desire.

A: Yes. I go to the museum and I see a painting by Matta, the surrealist, and I don't really like it but it gives me a few ideas I never had before. I ponder that, and I come up with a vague idea for a painting I've never tried before, and THAT peaks my interest. I desire THAT, even though I can't define it exactly. But I go for it in my next painting, and as a result, I'm painting something new, something I never dreamed of before. Now my desire is expanding into new territory. It's different. I'm into a whole new RANGE of desire. That's how people get out of a rut in their work and in their lives. That's how they escape from ads and advertising people and those hidden persuaders. You go to a new LEVEL of desire, where innovation and invention of the NEW are paramount.

Q: That's very, very good.

A: Yes. You see, you don't get out of the Pavlovian rut of consumerism by shifting from buying a Ford to buying a Lincoln. That's all on the same level. You get out of the rut by moving into something quite different. Only you can decide what that would be, but you take the leap and desire something quite different and then you manifest THAT. Now, you're really off and running.

Q: Yes.

A: That's how each individual really changes his life, and that's how society as a whole changes into something meaningful. You walk away from a whole LEVEL of desire, and you enter into another level. In order to do that, you need to invent new desire. You need to dream it up as you go along. You need to have some courage. You need to take a leap. I don't care whether it's buying habits or a business model or a new type of very local government or a solution to a problem---you look for something that's very different. Why? Because you can. And then you discover something very profound. You really DO desire something that exists at a whole new level. You change the rules of the game. A man like Tesla could have gone along inventing machines that all operated in more or less the same way. But instead he went for different TYPES of energy. He took the plunge. And he arrived. He entered new territory. He left---

Q: He left the cultural consensus. He left the consensus of science.

A: Yes. People can do this in a lot of different ways. They just have to be alert for it. They have to push it. They have to INVENT.

Q: There is no blueprint for that.

A: Right. People keep looking for blueprints. But here that doesn't work. You have to do some "alchemy." You have to gamble. You have to dream up something different and then explore it. Even if you ultimately reject it, you've gotten a few new ideas, and you can apply those ideas to your future. You can improvise. You can change your basis of operation. I've seen this happen so often in life. A person finds

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

out what he wants, and then goes after it. It's good. It's natural. But then, a few months or years later, he doesn't want it anymore. He knows all about it. It doesn't have any energy left in it. And then he's stuck. He's all washed up. He doesn't know what to do. He's run out of options. He needs a shift. He needs to invent something new that he might want, and he has to pursue it. So he does. And then the light dawns. He's into a whole new area of desire, and he feels a lot better. He's motivated in a different way. He's branching out. He's---

Q: More alive.

A: Definitely more alive.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

July 19, 2006

SCIENTIFIC HOAX AND THE MAGICAL PLANE

An interview with Ellis follows after this article.

This article takes up the whole connection between the "art" that is manifested for us and the much more powerful manifestations that we do for ourselves. It uses, as an example of what is created for us, the whole system of HIV testing---in other words, a scientific hoax. Basically, the article shows people that AFTER you expose a hoax in all its details, there is still much ground to cover. That ground is all about manifesting something better and unique and different and powerful. I could have called this article: WHAT DO YOU DO AFTER YOU'VE TAKEN APART CONSPIRACIES?)

This article is about two sides of a coin: what has been created for us, and what we decide on our own to create. It is not only a statement of fact; it is a statement of personal position on the way the world works and what we can do about it. It is a thesis on the interaction between physical cause-and-effect and magical causation.

For the past 25 years, I have been pursuing two major areas of research. The first stems from my work as a reporter specializing in investigations of medical fraud. The second area is the creation of alternative realities by the paranormal power of imagination.

It would seem that these two subjects are light years apart. I will show in this article that they are connected in important and profound ways.

First, I want to take up, in detail, HIV testing as an illustration of the complex nature of medical hoaxes. (I could have chosen any number of other medical examples.) It's vital to present the details, because only then can we see the structure of the hoax, in the same way that a person might notice, after repeated viewings, various aspects of a major painting by, say, Dali or Gauguin. And only after seeing into the dimensions of such a hoax can we make the connection between fraud and the true power of imagination. Much more on that later.

First: HIV testing. Accurate? Misleading? Worthwhile? Absurd? Helpful? Harmful?

On July 12, 2006, ABC News ran a story about testing all adults in America for HIV:

"Along with Washington's new screening program, the national Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] is expected to release similar guidelines this summer that would expand HIV screening to all adults in the United States.

"If this happens, it means that just about anybody over the age of 13 could be asked by their doctor, 'Would you like an HIV test?'"

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Although this would not be a compulsory program, it would be another step in that direction. And of course, in a doctor's office or in a hospital, many patients simply go along with doctors' recommendations.

If a doctor says, "Would you like to get tested for AIDS? It's very important, it could save your life," the patient will often give his/her consent.

The CDC is also claiming that today's HIV tests are much more accurate than the tests done in the early years of AIDS. However, in the early years, US health authorities asserted that standard HIV tests were 99.78% accurate, which is to say they very, very rarely called a patient HIV positive when he/she wasn't. Were US health authorities lying then, or are they lying now—or both?

In 1988, my book, AIDS INC., was published. It was the first book that challenged the assumption that HIV causes AIDS.

I also devoted an entire chapter to proving that routine HIV tests were unscientific, useless, misleading, and produced devastating results, since those tests were (and are) the gateway into highly toxic drugs---to say nothing of the horrendous consequences of telling a person he has contracted an ultimately fatal disease.

In the years since 1988, a great deal of information has come to light regarding HIV tests.

For example, last year (2005), the following explosive lead paragraph appeared in a KTVU/Associated Press story:

Anxiety Triggered By AIDS Test/ False Positive Results

POSTED: 8:01 am PST December 9, 2005

UPDATED: 8:23 am PST December 9, 2005

SAN FRANCISCO – "A promising new oral HIV test that uses fluid swabbed from the mouth to quickly and easily detect the virus that causes AIDS incorrectly diagnosed a quarter of the people who tested positive in San Francisco, city health officials found."

People were tested for HIV, told they were positive, when in fact this was false.

The article continues:

"Forty-seven people who tested positive after using the OraQuick Advance HIV test in city clinics were not infected at all, the San Francisco Department of Public Health said this week."

So apparently, not all HIV tests are "much more accurate today."

At the end of the article, a scientist at the California Office of AIDS made a telling admission:

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

“One explanation for the spate of false positives might be that there is something unique about the San Francisco group, such as a high number of people with hepatitis, that may unexpectedly interfere with the test results, said Deanne Sykes, a research scientist for the California Office of AIDS.

"’We will watch it,’ she said. ‘We will monitor it to see if there is something consistent we can pinpoint.’"

Sykes was stating that hepatitis might cause the HIV blood test to register positive when it was really negative. This is called a cross-reaction.

Actually, blood products given to treat hepatitis, as well as the hepatitis B vaccine, can both cause a false-positive HIV test. This has been known for a long time.

See, for example, Lee, D, Eby W, Molinaro, G. 1992. HIV false positivity after Hepatitis B vaccination. Lancet 339: 1060.

There is a great deal of useful information you can find on HIV tests, if you go to Christine Maggiore's excellent site, www.aliveandwell.com

Here are some citations assembled at Alive and Well:

"The only way to distinguish between real reactions and cross-reactions is to use HIV isolation. All claims of HIV isolation are based on a set of phenomena detected in tissue culture, none of which are isolation and none of which are even specific for retroviruses...We don't know how many positive tests occur in the absence of HIV infection. There is no specificity of the HIV antibody tests for HIV infection."

Bio/Technology Journal, 11:696-707, 1993

"The HIV antibody tests do not detect a virus. They test for any antibodies that react with an assortment of proteins experts claim are specific to HIV. The fact is that an antibody test, even if repeated and found positive a thousand times, does not prove the presence of viral infection."

Val Turner, MD, Continuum magazine, Vol 3 No 5, 1996

"HIV tests are notoriously unreliable in Africa. A 1994 study published in the Journal of Infectious Diseases concluded that HIV tests were useless in central Africa, where the microbes responsible for tuberculosis, malaria and leprosy were so prevalent that they [cross reacted] and registered over 70% false positive [for HIV]."

Sacramento Bee, October 30, 1994

"With public health officials and politicians thrashing out who should be tested for HIV, the accuracy of the test itself has been nearly ignored. A study last month by Congress' Office of Technology Assessment found that HIV tests can be very inaccurate indeed. For groups at very low risk -- people who don't use IV drugs or

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

have sex with gay or bisexual men -- 9 in 10 positive findings are called false positives, indicating infection where none exists."

US News & World Report, November 23, 1987

"People who receive gamma globulin shots for chicken pox, measles and hepatitis could test positive for HIV even if they've never been infected [with HIV]. The Food and Drug Administration says that a positive test could be caused by antibodies found in most of America's supply of gamma globulin. Gamma globulin is made from blood collected from thousands of donors and is routinely given to millions of people each year as temporary protection against many infectious diseases. Dr. Thomas Zuck of the FDA's Blood and Blood Products Division says the government didn't release the information because 'we thought it would do more harm than good.'"

USA Today, October 2, 1987

"Two weeks ago, a 3-year-old child in Winston Salem, North Carolina, was struck by a car and rushed to a nearby hospital. Because the child's skull had been broken and there was a blood spill, the hospital performed an HIV test. As the traumatized mother was sitting at her child's bedside, a doctor came in and told her the child was HIV-positive. Both parents are negative. The doctor told the mother that she needed to launch an investigation into her entire family and circle of friends because this child had been sexually abused. There was no other way, the doctor said, that the child could be positive. A few days later, the mother demanded a second test. It came back negative. The hospital held a press conference where a remarkable admission was made. In her effort to clear the hospital of any wrongdoing, a hospital spokesperson announced that 'these HIV tests are not reliable; a lot of factors can skew the tests, like fever or pregnancy. Everybody knows that.'"

Celia Farber, Impression Magazine, June 21, 1999

"A Vancouver woman is suing St. Paul's Hospital and several doctors because she was diagnosed as carrying the AIDS virus, when in fact she wasn't. In a BC Supreme Court writ, Lisa Lebed claims when she was admitted to the hospital in late 1995 to give birth to a daughter, a blood sample was taken without her consent. It revealed she was HIV positive, so she gave up the baby girl for adoption and decided to have a tubal ligation. A year and a half later, while undergoing AIDS treatment, she found out she was not HIV positive. The explanation she was given was a lab error. She says because of the negligence of the hospital, she's now sterile and has lost a daughter."

Woman Sues St. Paul's, CKNW Radio 98, June 10, 1999.

While writing AIDS INC., I was told by an employee of the FDA that the universally used Elisa blood test for HIV was, in fact, designed to cast a very wide net and catch possible HIV contamination in the overall stored blood supply. The tests were not designed for individuals. The tests were too broad and too unreliable for individuals.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

The FDA is the federal licensing agency for all US AIDS testing. In 1987, a person from their Washington office sent me a rather stunning document simply titled "Summary and Explanation of the Test," dated July 23, 1987 (and not on Agency letterhead): "In order to afford maximum protection of the blood supply, the EIA [Elisa] test was designed to be extremely sensitive. As a result, non-specific [falsely positive] reactions may be seen in samples from some people…due to prior pregnancy, blood transfusions, or other exposure…"

Remember, in those days, US medical authorities were touting the Elisa test as extremely accurate for individuals---99.78% accurate in being able to find true HIV-negative people.

I recently made several phone calls to the FDA. On July 17, 2006, the FDA press office connected me to Paul Richards. He consulted an FDA spreadsheet. He found that the FDA had approved and licensed a blood test for HIV in 1985 (shortly after the test was developed). But that license was for screening donors who were giving blood at clinics. It wasn't for diagnosing HIV in a patient. The earliest approval license Richards could find for diagnostic purposes was 1990---a full six years after the Elisa test was developed. As far as I can determine, the Elisa test was in use for diagnostic purposes roughly five years before FDA approved it. This certainly raises red flags.

The Elisa test is, by far, the most widely used instrument for determining whether an individual is HIV positive or negative. Conventional wisdom has it that the ultimate backup for the Elisa is the Western Blot test, which has been called the gold standard. In other words, to verify (or negate) a positive Elisa, a person should get a confirmatory Western Blot.

However, while writing AIDS INC. and searching the medical literature, I found a paper published in the March 1987 issue of the Journal of Clinical Microbiology. The author, James Carlson, of the University of California at Davis School of Pathology, dropped a bombshell. He stated that in low-risk groups, the false-positive rate in Elisa tests was an overwhelming "84.2% in our study and 77.1% recently reported by the American Red Cross…"

In plain English, this means that, of all the individuals from low-risk groups who are Elisa tested for HIV, the overwhelming number of those who test positive are not really positive at all.

Carlson continues: "It must be noted that even though we feel the Western Blot technique is presently the most acceptable method…Western Blot analysis is a subjective method with quality control limitations; the possibility of false-positive results still exists…"

The January 9, 1986, issue of the New England Journal of Medicine contained a report on a 34-year-old woman from rural Alabama who tested positive for HIV on an Elisa test. The woman had four more Elisa tests. They, too, came up positive.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Next, a Western Blot test was done. It was strongly positive. What else could one ask for?

But then new blood was drawn from the woman and sent to a handful of prestigious labs for analysis. Now all the Elisa and Western Blot tests were NEGATIVE.

Then the Elisa tests were repeated at two of these labs. They were both POSITIVE.

"Western Blot tests," the authors conclude, "have been used as the gold standard by which other tests [the Elisas] are judged to be falsely positive [or truly positive]…the need for improved confirmatory tests…is evident." This is a polite way of saying Western Blot is unreliable.

British researcher LJ Oldham, writing in the Journal of Medical Virology (January, 1987), concludes: "Our findings suggest that Western Blot cannot be depended upon as the sole confirmatory test for [HIV]."

In the same paper, Oldham states: "As has been shown, Western Blot lacks full sensitivity and specificity." Sensitivity would enable the test to discover people who were HIV positive, and specificity would keep the tests from calling people HIV positive who weren't.

Evelyn Lennette, writing in the February 1987 Journal of Clinical Microbiology, indicates that "both of these assays [Elisa and Western Blot] have drawbacks…[there are] reports of both false-positive and false-negative results with the Elisa, necessitating the use of a second confirmatory test…The immunoblot [Western Blot] is also not free from false results."

Perhaps the most devastating analysis of HIV testing was offered by Dr. Harvey Fineberg. When I interviewed Fineberg in 1988, he was Dean of the Harvard School of Public Health. Later, he went on to become Provost of Harvard University, and then was appointed the president of the very prestigious Institute of Medicine. A man with impeccable conventional credentials, Fineberg had, in the spring of 1987, published a statistical analysis of HIV testing in Law, Medicine, and Healthcare.

"To begin with," Fineberg told me on the phone, "in the study, we accepted the advertised accuracy ratings of the Elisa test. It's reportedly able to find true [HIV] positives at a rate of 93.4 percent, and it supposedly can detect true [HIV] negatives correctly 99.78 percent of the time.

"So let's say that three out of 10,000 people in the US are really infected with the HIV virus. If we consider a sample of 100,000 people, that means 30 will actually be infected with HIV. The Elisa test will be able to pinpoint 93.4 percent, or 28 of those people.

"On the other side of the ledger, that leaves 99,970 out of 100,000 who are truly not infected with the AIDS virus.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

"If the Elisa test is 99.78 percent capable of finding these real [HIV] negatives, it will locate 99,750 of these people without fail. That leaves 220 [HIV] negatives it missed." How did it miss? By calling those 220 people [HIV] positive.

Fineberg stated, "So now you have, out of every 100,000 people, 28 truly [HIV] positive and 220 falsely positive test results. That means the statistical chances are about 90 percent that [an HIV] positive-reading Elisa is wrongly positive [false-positive]."

Fineberg continued: "A second Elisa won't change that either. If you do a Western Blot, the odds might, at best, be lowered to 25 percent. In other words, a fourth of the time, a positive AIDS test would be false-positive."

Fineberg's analysis was largely ignored by the mainstream press, medical researchers, and of course the US government, which was funding most of the major research on AIDS.

In fact, as you can see from reading what I've presented so far in this article, a great deal of CONVENTIONAL medical assessment of the crippling problems associated with AIDS testing was ignored.

The reason for this avoidance was obvious. There existed (and continues to exist) a network of government funders, government labs, private AIDS fund-raising agencies, PR groups, "star researchers," medical journals, compliant and superficial medical reporters, and drug companies---to say nothing of the FDA and the World Health Organization---devoted to presenting HIV testing as an entirely reliable instrument.

An admission that this whole testing system was (and is) scientifically bankrupt and dangerous would collapse the whole AIDS structure of certainty.

And this is just the beginning of the problem with AIDS tests.

So far, I have been discussing what is called antibody testing. In both the Elisa and Western blot techniques, the patient's blood is analyzed to discover whether he has been producing antibodies, which are part of the overall immune response against a given germ.

What does the presence of these antibodies mean?

Perhaps we can glean a clue from a rather astonishing mainstream comment on the current bird-flu hysteria. Near the end of a NY Times article ("Hazards in the hunt for flu bug") by medical reporter Gina Kolata (November 9, 2005), we find the following reference to Dr. Peter Palese, of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York:

"Some experts like Peter Palese of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York said the H5N1 viruses are a false alarm. He notes that studies of serum collected in 1992 from people in rural China indicated that millions there had antibodies to the

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

H5N1 strain. That means they had been infected with an H5N1 bird virus and recovered, apparently without incident."

Until AIDS testing took off in earnest in the mid-1980s, it was generally assumed that the presence of antibodies in a patient signified good health. The patient had contacted a germ, mounted an immune response, and the germ was neutralized. There was certainly no consensus that antibodies meant present or future disease across the board.

In other words, if millions of people in China had encountered H5N1 (bird flu) viruses and showed antibodies to these viruses, it would be expected that they would remain healthy.

Except that with the onset of AIDS research, everything was stood on its head. People who were tested and called HIV-positive---meaning they had antibodies to the virus---were said to be sick or on a sure road to becoming sick.

So now we have another level of the AIDS testing hoax. Why were people being tested for antibodies to HIV? Why was that method presumed to be significant at all? Why wasn't the presence of antibodies to HIV taken as a sign of health?

Millions of people all over the world have been subjected to the Elisa and Western Blot HIV tests---both of which have the sole objective of finding antibodies to HIV. Why have these tests been elevated to the status of present or future disease detectives?

While writing AIDS INC. in 1988, I had a very interesting conversation with a doctor at the US National Institutes of Health. He told me that when an HIV vaccine eventually went into testing (and when it was later released for use on the public), every person who got the vaccine would be given a special letter.

The letter would say that the person had received the vaccine. The letter would say that if, at any time, the person was subsequently tested for HIV and came up positive---meaning he had antibodies to HIV---this should NOT be taken as a sign of present or future illness. In this case, the person was actually immune to HIV, because he had "received" his antibodies from the vaccine.

I almost fell off my chair. I said, "Let me get this straight. If a person develops antibodies naturally to HIV, he is told he is either sick now or will get sick. But if gets his antibodies---the same antibodies---to HIV from a vaccine, he is told he is immune to the virus."

The doctor gave me no clear response.

This explosive contradiction has been studiously ignored by the mainstream press and by the entire AIDS establishment network.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

By conventional standards (not mine), the whole point of a vaccine is to confer immunity to a germ by producing antibodies to that germ in the body. That is the essence and the standard of a "good vaccine."

And yet, in the case of AIDS research, all this was turned upside down. Suddenly, HIV positive meant: the patient has antibodies to HIV and this is a sign that he will become very ill and most likely die.

To sum up: not only are both HIV antibody tests (Elisa and Western Blot) unreliable in finding true positives, as opposed to false positives, the WHOLE IDEA of using the presence of antibodies as an unmistakable sign of present or future illness is without merit.

Two levels of madness.

Add to this the question of whether a germ called HIV has anything to do with what has been called AIDS, and you have yet a third level. For reasons of space, I'm not taking up that question in this article. But in my book, AIDS INC., I have offered much evidence that HIV has nothing to do with the various immune deficiencies that have been lumped together and called AIDS.

To bolster the assumption that a positive HIV test does lead to grave illness, studies have been done to track healthy people who test positive. This method, it is thought, would establish that being HIV positive is, in fact, a predictor of illness and death.

The most comprehensive such study, taking in several thousand gay men, the San Francisco Men's Study, is often cited to prove that being HIV positive leads to full-blown AIDS. However, the study has many flaws. Perhaps most importantly, it has failed to track accurately a group of men who started off as HIV negative. In other words, if enough men from that HIV-negative group also developed severe immune deficiency (the hallmark of what is called AIDS), then a positive HIV test would not be a predictor of illness.

It turned out that there was a group of men in the San Francisco Men's Study who were HIV positive, who had declined the (highly toxic) AIDS drugs like AZT, or had gone off them. As reported in the press, these men had remained healthy for eight years or longer and were still going strong.

I queried one of the researchers in the San Francisco Study. I asked her why she and her colleagues hadn't trumpeted these findings as highly significant. She said they just didn't think it was all that important.

In conventional terms, under the most rigorous of conditions, if you want to do a tracking study that proves HIV-positive status leads to full-blown disease and death, you must have a control group: a group of people who are HIV negative to begin with. And most importantly, you must choose both groups according to the same relevant factors. For example, all the people in the study, from both groups, must have a very similar nutritional status. They must be taking similar recreational

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

drugs in similar quantities (or not taking them at all). They must have similar medical histories. They must be having sex with a similar number of partners. They must show a similar profile of, for example, intestinal parasites. They must reveal a similar level of exposure to environmental chemicals. And so on and so forth.

Why? Because all of the above factors and more (for instance, aspartame ingestion, and number and type of vaccines received) can be implicated in immune-system compromise. And at the heart of it, what is being called AIDS, from Uganda to New York, is nothing more and nothing less than immune-system deterioration.

No tracking study which adheres to these rigorous standards has ever been done.

There is one other point to be made. The very act of diagnosing a person as HIV positive carries with it a kind of hypnotic power. This effect, of course, is downplayed by mainstream researchers. But it certainly can produce a thorough expectation of future illness and/or death. It does induce great fear and disorientation. And these factors, acting within what could be called the mind-body complex, have sharply negative consequences, to say the least.

When analyzing how this whole HIV testing hoax came into being, and why it is being sustained, I have, at different times, cut into the stratified layers of motive at different levels.

Here are some of those motives: to profit from selling drugs and HIV test kits; to gain and upgrade individual status as a researcher; to protect an employment position; to go along with the herd; to cover up past mistakes; to avoid criminal charges; to use a cover story (HIV) to obscure the actual and simple reasons for widespread death in the so-called Third World---systematic starvation, water contamination, overcrowding, poverty, stolen land, and toxic vaccines: an entire system that has been installed, for a very long time, in order to kill (via a depopulation agenda) large numbers of people and keep the rest in a weakened state…

There are a whole host of motives for supporting the past and current HIV testing apparatus.

In addition to antibody testing for HIV, there is another method, less popular, that relies on what is called PCR. PCR stands for Polymerase Chain Reaction. Some proponents of HIV testing point to PCR as the new gold standard, the final backup, the ultimate tool.

PCR takes, from a patient's blood, a very tiny amount of genetic material that is suspected of being a component of a virus, and "amplifies it," "blows it up" to a size where it can be identified and studied.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Much can be said about PCR, but here is the crux: if technicians can only find a miniscule amount of material (in a patient) that may be HIV, no matter how much "amplification" is applied to that sample, there is no reliable way of inferring that the patient is carrying a large number (millions and millions) of HIVs.

And why is that important? Because, in order for some germ to be called a cause of illness, millions of those germs must be in the body, and they must be doing some real damage to cells. Otherwise, the inference drawn is meaningless.

Our bodies contain who knows how many germs? Mostly, they have no negative effect on health. The presence of a tiny, tiny amount of what may be viral material is irrelevant.

Now that I have presented a good deal of specific material about HIV testing, I want to offer excerpts from three interviews I did about two years ago with Ellis Medavoy.

As you know, Ellis is a retired PR man. He is an expert on the uses of propaganda.

For several years, Medavoy was part of an effort to foist on the world the conventional hypothesis about HIV and AIDS.

In my 25 years as a reporter, I have met no one who approaches Medavoy's deep understanding of propaganda.

It is clear from conversations I've had with him that Ellis once worked for a small core of people who were in turn connected to two or three members of the Council on Foreign Relations. In the case of AIDS, however, I can't say with certainty that Ellis' assignments were given from that source. But Ellis was working on assignment and he had a job to do: make key conventional concepts about AIDS "as real as cars and clocks and planes and supermarkets," as he puts it.

You'll glean the rest from these excerpts from our conversations:

Q (Rappoport): How did you do your job?

A (Medavoy): I've told you all this before.

Q: Do it again.

A: Basically, I was the fountainhead for what reporters call their "reliable sources." I fed information to these reliable sources, and they then spoke with reporters, who wrote stories.

Q: So you were two levels removed from the public.

A: Right. It's comfortable that way.

Q: So you had to convince these reliable sources that you yourself were reliable.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: As a PR man, you build up that confidence in your people over years of work. You feed them stories that aren't stories yet, and then they see the stories happen. They believe.

Q: In the case of AIDS, what was your mission?

A: I had several jobs. I needed to cement in the concepts that HIV caused AIDS, that HIV testing was valid, and that AIDS was, in fact, one condition at its root, stemming from the destructive action of HIV.

Q: Did you believe any of this yourself?

A: (laughs) You know I didn't. I knew these were outright lies. But as a PR operative, that wasn't my business.

Q: So you told these reliable sources what?

A: I told them I had inside information from the labs that were doing the key research on AIDS. It was more complex than that, but that was it, essentially. I told them, for example, in the early days---1982---that AIDS would definitely spread across the globe, that researchers were saying this was "the big one," and so on.

Q: You knew this was a lie?

A: I knew that AIDS was nothing more than a label, that it joined together all sorts of immune-system destruction that emanated from different causes, none of which had anything to do with a virus called HIV.

Q: …What about HIV testing?

A: It was a dud. It made no sense, if you really looked at the science.

Q: You mean it was unreliable.

A: Of course. Antibodies have nothing to do with becoming sick and dying. I and others had to sell the false connection. I used the false pronouncements by researchers, and I relied on the basic ignorance of reporters. I was painting a picture.

Q: Painting a picture?

A: Sure. Look, science can be seen in different ways. You can break it down into a series of statements and the evidence for those statements, or you can see it as an impressionist painting. A whole landscape. I was a painter. I was a story-teller. I sold stories and images. I sprinkled those images with so-called "facts" and that made the painting seem real.

Q: This is important.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: No kidding. It's everything. You get someone who is already slightly disposed to seeing things in a certain way, and you feed them the rest. You fill in their picture. You confirm what they already suspect. For instance, I knew a man who often was a "reliable source" for a major reporter in New York. I knew this reliable source pretty well. I knew he was a "pandemic man."

Q: Meaning?

A: He loved the idea of pandemics. He was into that crap. So I painted him a picture of the pandemic called AIDS. Caused by HIV. I kept using words like "plague" and "latent virus." He ate it up like candy. I could see his mind working on it. The virus that hides in the body for ten years and suddenly activates. It was, in a real sense, his picture, but he didn't fully know it. So I provided the pieces of the painting that were missing for him.

Q: And then he talked to his reporter friend.

A: Yeah.

Q: You considered yourself an artist.

A: No. I WAS an artist. I made certain "worlds" come alive for people.

Q: You painted; they looked at what you painted with---

A: Awe. Reverence. Gratitude. Satisfaction.

Q: This is what propaganda is?

A: Of course. I brought these paintings, these "other worlds" into the "real world" for people. I wove them together. I made the world and they looked at it.

Q: You made the world.

A: Take planet Earth. What is it, really? Trees, earth, sand, ocean, sky, animals, rivers? Look at the bare essentials of this planet, and then think about what everybody believes and accepts. They believe much more than the bare essentials, but THEY THINK THEY ARE LOOKING AT THE REAL WORLD. Get it? I'm creating the world for them. That's propaganda. That's the art of propaganda.

Q: Like all those painters who did murals for the Roman Church.

A: Just like that. People saw the Church cosmology---the Church propaganda---as woven into the real world. There was no distinction, for many people. Or take some goofy theory about the mystical nature of certain symbols or objects. People---artists---spend their lives building up the "meaning" of those symbols. And then other people buy it and add it to the real world and say it is an "added dimension" to the real world. It's the same way with royal titles. What the hell is a royal title? Nothing, unless you have a good PR man or group working for you.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: So in the case of AIDS---

A: Look. It all comes down to the tests. That's where the so-called science makes its stand: "We have a test. It tells whether or not you are 'infected.' If you are, you'll get sick. So we have to give you drugs. The drugs are toxic, but so what? You're going to die anyway. This is a heroic measure." It all starts with the tests. People have to believe the tests are accurate, and they have to believe the tests mean something. So people like me are brought in to sell that. Sell it hard. "99 percent accurate. Works every time. Everybody should get tested." Just think about the idea of a test. It's a great word, isn't it? You take a test. You either pass or fail. You get a certain score on a test. It's real. And you don't get to say what your test score is. Somebody else, a priest in a white coat, gives you your test score. He knows. You don't know. He's the king of kings when it comes to tests.

Q: We've covered this before, but you DO have regrets about your former occupation, now that you're retired.

A: Of COURSE I have regrets. Why do you think I talk to you? Why do you think I want people to open their eyes to the simplest of things?

Q: From what you've been saying, you view your work with, say, the HIV tests as far more sophisticated than just passing on lies.

A: Come on. Of COURSE it's more sophisticated. It's easy to tell lies, and then people don't believe you and you're all washed up. You have to dress up the lies. You have to---by word and gesture and image---sell the lie by painting a picture. Just like a stage designer does. You want the stage set to convey a certain mood and a certain space and a certain urgency. You want to draw the audience into the play. You want them to FEEL that the "real world" and the stage world are connected in some important way. Except that as a propagandist, the house lights never come up. The author never takes a bow. The actors never leave the stage. You go on and on with your play. You keep painting, over and over. And you know what happens when you do THAT?

Q: What happens?

A: Eventually the play becomes totally integrated into the real world. There is no distinction.

Q: As an artist---

A: As an artist, you've made the world. You've invented it. And people accept that.

Q: That takes imagination. Inventing the world.

A: You better believe it.

Q: "I give you the world. The longest running play in existence. Buy it."

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Exactly.

Q: You felt---

A: I felt and I knew I was creating the world, so to speak, for millions of people. I wasn't doing it alone, of course. But I was an individual artist working my black magic.

Q:…Why are you so insistent on making this point?

A: Because it's rather profound. It involves space.

Q: How?

A: When a painter looks at his canvas, he doesn't just see white surface. He sees potential spaces. To a civilian, this may sound like nonsense. But if the painter didn't see those spaces---

Q: He wouldn't be able to create the illusion of spaces, illusions that the viewer accepts.

A: Yeah. You're a painter. You understand that. I was doing that. I had newspapers and television indirectly at my disposal. And I knew how my "spaces" would be inserted into the media. I knew how. I was creating the world. To the average Joe, this is crazy talk. But the proof is in the pudding. I succeeded. I made people believe. Accept. Respond. I knew how my paintings would be received and used. I was operating on several levels. In some ways, it was really psychic. I was already living in the future and seeing how it would all play. I was the director. "Here are some stage flats and some lights. I'm creating a whole drama here, and you, Joe Public, are entranced. You don't see me doing what I'm doing. You don't want to. You just want to be entertained and scared and uplifted and moved. I'm giving you that. I'm inventing a world right here, and you're moving into it and living in it." THAT'S propaganda at its best. THAT'S what it's all about. If you're a real pro. If you're an artist…

Q: What's the ultimate, ultimate solution to this situation? What's the ultimate long-term solution?

A: That should be obvious. In the long run, there is one answer for the individual. He becomes the complete, intense, no-holds-barred, balls-to-the-wall artist of his own futures. He CREATES THAT.

****

And now we are on the plane of magic.

We are not victims buying into the magic, we are looking at how it works.

And what do we see?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Systems and programs and apparatuses and events and ideas and lies and gorgeous paintings and inspiring music and destructive projects and symbols are CREATED. They are, in a real sense, spontaneously created, on and on and on through time.

Outcomes stemming from these creations are much more than the result of chains of tight physical cause and effect.

From Ellis Medavoy's description, it is as if the whole HIV testing program and paradigm has been put up like pillars and girders and framing and board by workers (like Medavoy) in the middle of the night. There it is; we see it standing in all its wretched dimensions.

It is one network of crass and venal thought-forms.

It is A PERVERSE WORK OF ART.

It is created. Created and then foisted.

(An articulate research colleague of mine once wrote that for her personally, this vista of the whole structure of HIV testing was "floating in mid-air, paragraphs of scribbled gray lies on rusted iron slabs, attached to poles, surrounded by researchers announcing, ex-cathedra, their false discoveries. Horses pull this entire contraption by chains. The horses move sluggishly, as if in a (bad) dream, dragging the iron slabs through dirty clouds. Shepherding the parade are troops with bright weapons wearing white uniforms…")

In other words, she saw "HIV testing" as a series of created thought-forms.

There are people who are inventing dramas and paintings that capture our consent. We go on to act as if these inventions are as real as the reality we ascribe to chairs and tables and houses and grass and trees.

When we expand Medavoy's insights, we can say: our world is created for us. We can accept it as is, and adjust our actions on that basis, or we can refuse to function as audience.

On what should this refusal be based?

First, freedom from group consciousness.

Second, the realization that each one of us has the capacity to create his/her own realities.

And finally, the experiential knowledge that each one of us has the CREATIVE POWER to invent realities WHOSE SCOPE IS WITHOUT LIMIT.

I have given chapter and verse of the HIV testing hoax to make it clear that, on the magical plane---if one takes that point of view---much is happening that intends to bind us within pre-set parameters.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

There are artists at work who want us to live inside their stage play, regardless of the harmful consequences to us. They design the sets. They turn on the lights. They cast the characters. They write the lines. They shape the plots. They concoct the endings.

To respond with anything less than our own individual art is absurd.

And here is the whole crux of the situation. If we indeed---each one of us---really does have the power to create realities of any scope without limit, then our whole world and universe and future become something potentially ecstatic.

In fact, we can do far more than respond to perverse art. We can take on a whole different view and position. We can recognize that creation is everywhere. Most importantly, it is the core of what each one of us IS.

If propagandists can create worlds for us, each one of us can ignore the reflex reaction to believe and accept---and instead, create our own worlds.

For 20-plus years as a reporter, I worked to uncover hoaxes and conspiracies and frauds and crimes of magnitude. I finally came to the place where that would no longer suffice. I had also been working as a painter since 1961. I knew that imagination was at the heart of what we are. I could see as clearly as my own hand that "they" were constructing a stage set (the world) for us. I could see where that was heading. And I also knew that, within each of us, there was a much greater creative power that owed allegiance and obedience to no propped up authority.

For the past year, I have been teaching seminars in the art and skill of manifestation: creating what you truly and deeply desire. This approach rests on the knowledge that every individual soul, every YOU, is naturally equipped to invent greater futures than all the planetary Elites put together. I am seeing that proving out.

My recent full-bore focus on the art and skill of positive manifestation does not exclude social or political action. Over the years, I have often taken part in such action. But something else is needed, too. That something else depends on awakening to a new view of life. A view that begins with the notion of powerful creation by each individual.

Here is a story that illustrates what I mean. In 1994, I met an artist in Los Angeles who had been diagnosed, three years earlier, as HIV positive. After reading AIDS INC. and talking with a few friends who were part of an alternative healing group, this woman came to a conclusion. As she put it to me, "I realized that I had been conned."

She said, "The medical bosses and their henchmen gave me a death sentence based on fake tests. I was healthy when I was tested. After taking AZT for a few months, I could hardly get out of bed in the morning.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

"I stopped taking AZT and decided to rebuild my health. I began exercising every day. I found a legitimate detox program and began it. I forced myself to paint every day, even though I was feeling terrible.

"The most important thing I did was paint. It brought me up out of a very deep depression caused by my [AZT] deteriorated physical state. I found myself again.

"I offloaded any prior ideas I had about 'having a deadly virus.' I just kept painting. Eventually I saw that I had been dealing with an invisible group of medical people who were trying to produce reality for me. They were painting me sick and dead. I was painting myself alive. I won.

"After a year or so, I arrived at some very deep understandings about my power. Whatever reality I was living in, I could create beyond it. Taking that position, I saw the way up and out.

"I also saw that this power I had went far beyond escaping a cul de sac I had found myself in after my HIV test. This power applied to everything in my life. Most of all, it applied to what I hadn't created yet: my future.

"I tried a number of methods of meditation, and I learned from that. But I wanted something more. I kept coming back to the most obvious factor, the one I was already using to change my life: my own power.

"I finally took that power completely into my own hands. It's pure magic. It enables me to build tomorrow and the next day, and next month and next year. It has paranormal facets, as well. I now know that my 'ordinary self' is just a limitation and a description of me in a compliant state of mind.

"I'm not compliant at all. I'm a rebel. I always have been. The root of that rebellion, as I see it now, comes from my insistence on creating as an artist---and I use the term 'artist' with its widest meaning."

Today, this woman lives in a state of electric health.

What I not so fondly like to call Earth Culture insists on us viewing ourselves as limited in power and limited in choice. It states that if there is any magic to be had in our lives, it can only come as a result of attaching ourselves to higher powers who carry suitcases full of rules and requirements and pre-set cosmologies.

Magic, according to Earth Culture, means we must travel dim corridors and engage in ceremonies and rituals and take our strength from narrowly defined symbols and images. We must hope and plead and ask for things to be given.

But the unlimited creative power at our disposal---the power to create better and more adventurous lives and more positive and ecstatic futures---does not bow down to myths about material or spiritual dictators who want to lead us into swamps of despair-hope and misery-relief. These are wicked children's games for puerile minds.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

When we contemplate and taste the sensation of our own power, we can look back on the pieces of bad dreams others create for us, and see them as nothing more or less than perverse art, designed to build prison bars inside which we suffer and are swept back and forth between abject sadness and glimmers of relief. That is the wildly popular game: from pillar to post.

Using what is finally authentic---our own vast creative power---we invent what is to come. We do not submit.

What I have detailed in the first part of this article is simply a fragment of miserable Earth Culture in action, on parade. That it operates under the rubric of science---the most modern of religions---makes it all the more vicious and venal.

Some day, when millions of people are operating from their own true power, they will look back on such blatant absurdity and see it in the light of how far they have come.

We will say: "We were able to stop believing in the consensus stage play for one reason, and one reason only: each of us created and manifested something far, far better." That, whatever name you give it, IS magic."

###END##

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

August 17, 2006

Ellis Medavoy with insights on "THE END TIMES".

Q: What prompts you to speak about this subject?

A: One, I'm sick of it, and two, I've been doing your manifestation exercises.

Q: Okay, so what are the end-times?

A: Basic PR about the end of the world, and the triumph of the Good...

Q: PR.

A: Obviously. From time to time, there are disasters or wars or "crumblings," and civilizations go down. So if you predict The End, you'll be right eventually if you keep pushing the goalposts back further and further and wait for a hundred or five hundred or a thousand or five thousand years.

Q: You can't be wrong.

A: As long as you make the date vague, and bring in all sorts of nonsense about signs and symbols and the "fact" that the End is out of our hands.

Q: Higher power.

A: Higher power.

Q: And that's all there is to it?

A: Well, there is another thing. Process. Big process.

Q: What do you mean?

A: People want to connect to Big Process.

Q: I'm still not sure---

A: Think about it. People want to feel power. However they can. But most people don't actually want to exercise it. They just want to "enter the power zone" and feel the energy.

Q: And that's Big Process?

A: Sure. When you look at the end of the world stories, they all resonate with big shapes and destinies....Process....energy....the final turn of the clock hands....and people like that. They can be part of that energy....in their minds and imaginations....it's like fantasizing about joining the French Foreign Legion.....the adventure....it's like watching Star Trek.....

Q: Feeling power without having to actually use power.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Exactly. Let God manifest, but the person doesn't have to manifest anything. Ride the storm. Don't create one yourself. You know, when you join the army, you fight for a cause. Under that banner, you can kill people. You can do anything. But you always have an out. You can say you're acting on behalf of someone or something else. You aren't manifesting on a straight line. You're creating crooked. That's really why the whole end-times thing is a phony deal. It's the epitome of hitching your wagon to someone else's juice. It's a giant cop-out. It's passing the buck.

Q: Sounds like a pretty good description of Earth Culture.

A: It is. Believe me, it is.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

September 15, 2006

Here is an article I wrote plus a brief interview with Ellis Medavoy.

It's all about money. It's about you having money, a lot of it. Perhaps a very great deal of money.

Is there something wrong with that?

A few years ago, I dealt with this question. It all comes back to the trust factor. In other words, I believe my readers having a lot of money would be a good thing, and I believe they would do good things with that money.

I'd rather my readers had a few billion dollars than people like Bill Gates and Warren Buffet.

In this economy, somebody is going have billions.

But money itself is not a bad thing.

Some people think it is, but that's their opinion.

Of course, there are lots of people in this world who sell stuff that is silly and even dangerous (arms dealers)....and they make a lot of $$$ from that, but that doesn't make money bad.

Much of the world exists in poverty, but that doesn't make money itself bad.

I know as well as anyone that we, the human race, have the ability to ensure that no human on the face of the Earth goes hungry or goes without clothes or a place to live, and we can eliminate pollution and water contamination and lack of basic sanitation and all sorts of other heinous conditions....but where is that going to start? Are governments really going to do it? And if they did, wouldn't they take the money for it from you and everybody else in the form of taxes...and so, if you had the ideal of wiping out poverty from the face of the Earth, you'd have to start from individuals who have money and who want to do it. Because, let's face it, if governments did the job, they'd do it in some Soviet style, and they'd make the whole operation into something oppressive and gray and horrendous and enslaving. Governments don't spread freedom, they spread control.

Of course, a person could just dream about doing this good thing (eliminating poverty) and then blame governments or others for not doing it....but that wouldn't get the job done.

My point here is simply that money itself is not a bad thing.

Money invented out of thin air by men who pretend to be government banks when they are really private banks, men who take HUGE amounts of money off the top for themselves....that system is bad....but even that does not make the basic concept of money a bad thing.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Once in awhile, I get a wacky email from someone who says no one should have money...that's the gist of the email...but at the same time that person is doing nothing to launch a new system of money or whatever it is you would call it. And furthermore, that person already has some money, and gets it by working for a company whose aim is profit...so the whole deal is wacky....it doesn't add up.

Here is what does add up. If a person is operating from an idea about scarcity, if a person embraces scarcity in his own life, then that would be problem to that person. That person would not be able to embrace a notion of abundance for himself or anyone else.

On the subject of abundance and "what a person wants," here is my position, and it's reflected in every workshop I do. Manifestation is the process of creating what a person wants, by his own definition of what's good. When he/she walks that road, sooner or later, his concept of what he desires changes and opens up and he gets to wider and deeper desires, and this is happily transformative for the person. This is what changes lives for the better. If someone else steps in right at the beginning and tries to tell the person what he should want, the whole process breaks down right away. It doesn't work. That's a fact.

Here is a brief conversation with Ellis Medavoy:

Q: So what about having lots of money, Ellis?

A: You have to back up and start from a prior point.

Q: What point?

A: People are conditioned and taught that having money, lots of it, is a bad thing. It's the start of a lot of trouble.

Q: What trouble?

A: The whole consumer society, where people are always shopping and buying stuff....at this point in time, it's all reversed, it's coming from a sense that money is bad.

Q: What?

A: Yeah, that's right. You see, when you have a person who has a healthy idea about money, who really likes money...and isn't brainwashed, you get a whole different approach.

Q: What approach is that?

A: That person is going to buy a certain number of things, but mostly he's going to fulfill his desires that have to do with things other than money. The FIXATION on money comes from believing money is bad. That's where you get "the mad shopper" mentality.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Perhaps you should explain "fixation."

A: Fixation is different from wanting money. You can want money very much and manifest it and so on, but when you're fixated on it and nothing else, you are reflecting a basic sense of scarcity. That's what that game is all about.

Q: So if a reader of mine manifested a billion dollars---

A: That would be a good thing. He'd use it to good ends. For himself and other people. We're trained, however, to believe that money itself is bad and that it automatically corrupts people. Money doesn't corrupt people, people corrupt themselves. It starts much earlier. The absolute fixation on money means a person can't really see anything else. His horizon is flat. He has no other desires he knows about, which of course is a fiction. He really does desire all sorts of other things, but he can't see that. He's "a robot for money." I'm sick and tired of the idea that money is already a corruption. It's like saying a stone is corrupt. No, a person who picks up the stone and hits another person over the head with it just to do it----we can all see where the badness is coming from. The stone didn't do it. We all nod our heads and say, "Well of course, we know that," but at the same time we tend to think that having a lot of money is bad. We have to get rid of that notion. We have to get past that. Certain religions like to say, "As long as one person in the world is poor, we are all guilty." Baloney. Why do religions say that? Because they are setting themselves up as fund-raising entities, and they need a reason to raise money from their congregations. Guilt does the trick. Guilt is a great fund raiser. Guilt is using an image of the poor masses of people to hold everyone else down. For example, you could use this trick: "no one should have power until and unless everyone has the same amount of power." In which case, individuals would go nowhere. Individuals are all about power. They have it. They can increase it. They can use it. And they don't have to gear themselves by how other people are doing. Take your power. Create it. Make it happen. Become as powerful as you really are. The destruction of the individual and the very concept of the individual is what planet Earth is all about now....which means that the few who rule the many will become more powerful. They have no problem with having power. They just want to use propaganda to keep everybody else down. Screw them. Rise up. Be as powerful as you are and can be...

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

October 8, 2006

AN INTERVIEW WITH ELLIS MEDAVOY ABOUT POWER

Ellis comments on this vital subject…

Q: What is power?

A: The ability to get things done.

Q: That's it? That's all?

A: No, that's not all. But it's a start. You have to start from somewhere. And in this society, the ability to get things done is viewed as a negative by lots of people.

Q: Why?

A: Because they live off not getting things done. They live off failing or not trying.

Q: That sounds like a sour note.

A: It is. I'm just telling you the facts. Along with failure comes excuses. So many we could never count them.

Q: For example?

A: "Bad things have happened to me, so I'm not going to try anymore. The people who did bad things to me exerted power, so power must be a bad thing in general…"

Q: Lunacy.

A: To be sure. If you cut power off at the knees right at the beginning, there is no success except failure and apathy.

Q: Everything is turned upside down.

A: That's right.

Q: Where did this come from?

A: From people themselves. They have bought into failure. They have re-shaped their own conception of themselves.

Q: It's almost like a perverse form of magic.

A: Right. It's magic turned to failure. Magic is used to create failure. It's crazy. Power to succeed is looked at as a crime.

Q: Do you see a way out of this?

A: Yes. One individual at a time. You pick up individuals who haven't succumbed to the bullshit.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: No other way?

A: None.

Q: Why not?

A: Because otherwise you're working with The Group, and in these times, most groups are bent on a collective mindset.

Q: How would you define "collective mindset?"

A: A thought is shared by every member of the group, but the responsibility for that thought is passed from one member to another. No one stands up and takes credit for the thought. It's all a mush. A stupid mush.

Q: And what if one member of the group does stand up and take credit for the thought?

A: He is lambasted. He is looked at as a traitor to the group concept. He takes the blows.

Q: I feel a religious kind of insanity there.

A: Yes. The religion is The Group. That's what the group stands for. Itself. It's a self-imposed weakness. "If we all become powerless as individuals, then we can form a group and find strength in that. We deny ourselves as individuals and go from there…"

Q: Kindness is worked in there.

A: It's looked at as a kindness to sacrifice self on the altar of the group. It's looked at as a form of generosity.

Q: But it isn't.

A: It's personal suicide.

Q: So that's the underlying theme.

A: Yes.

Q: Disgusting, don't you think?

A: I do. It's all about a lack of courage and about weakness. Those concepts are now raised as flags of triumph.

Q: Individual weakness morphs into the group.

A: It's a rather smooth transition. That's the whole point. To make the transition seem as smooth as possible. So no one really notices or talks about what's really happening. Every individual is already looking for a group, is already looking to give

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

up on himself. With that predisposition, it's going to be easy to make the morph happen.

Q: Of course, from another angle, there is all sorts of propaganda backing up the idea of the group as All.

A: Yes, but I don't want to let the individual off the hook. I don't want to make it seem that the individual is powerless to stop himself from melting into the group. That would just be another excuse. A nonsense excuse.

Q: Do you think America, at the beginning, in 1776, was really about individual power?

A: For the most part, no. It depends on who you read. Thomas Paine knew the score. But did anyone else? To an extent, Jefferson did. But not nearly as well as Paine.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Ellis Medavoy, 2011, Interview #1

Before I spoke with Ellis, once again, in 2011, I knew he had held back from me, even after persistent attempts on my part, several major stories he helped sell the public.

And now he talks about one of them.

Q: So my good man, have you repented all your sins yet?

A: I told a priest I would only speak to the Pope. That didn't work out.

Q: Because you know too much?

A: Something like that.

Q: What are you selling these days?

A: Apples, at a little farmer's market. For you, I tell the truth.

Q: I suppose I should feel honored, but I don't.

A: I'm not requiring that from you, as you well know. Reflected in all the conversations we've had, I've seen enough of myself to know I would never go back into my old world again. That's more than enough of a reward.

Q: Do people have to believe lies?

A: An interesting question. Most of them WANT to believe lies.

Q: Why?

A: Because it puts them into an oppositional game. They REALLY want that. A lie creates a counter. A truth stands alone. With most people, it creates boredom.

Q: So boredom is a factor.

A: It's vastly underrated as a motive for action. I mean, in the sense that people will do almost anything to escape a zero point.

Q: What?

A: Psychologically, people avoid silence. Truth is silence. When you have it, you have it. It's over. Game, set, match. A lie provokes a new game. Action. Boredom is what you feel when a game ends. If I tell you that a new epidemic is breaking out, and it's already in America, you have a lie. You can work with it. You can talk to your friends about it. You can argue. But if I say, “There is no epidemic,” and that's the headline, people will jump out of windows. Right? They feel that silence, that boredom, that zero, and they don't like it. It makes them feel terrible. That's an element of human psychology. By the way, that's why you've had a few problems over the years.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: What are you talking about?

A: Come on. Get the cotton out of your ears.

Q: In other words--

A: In other words, some guy comes along and says, "Well, this isn't just an epidemic, this is biowarfare. They made it in a lab. They sent it out from a lab and it's infecting everybody, and you have to duck, because it may kill you." That story sells, my friend. Your story, which is THERE IS NOTHING, doesn't sell. It's that simple. You told the truth. He lied. He wins in the marketplace. And the reason he wins is because his lie allows people to escape boredom. Their adrenaline pumps.

Q: This has something to do with the Matrix?

A: Of course. But we'll get to that a little later. The point is, a man like myself could make a very good living selling lies because that's what people want. They can't see past their noses.

Q: Explain.

A: They don't know how to maintain excitement about life without those lies. They want the thrill.

Q: Is this just theory?

A: What? What's wrong with you? EVERYTHING I tell you has been tested in the trenches. It works. I'm giving you the fundamentals on which you can build a career in PR. I did. The world IS PR now, and very little else.

Q: Let's look at Swine Flu. You disappeared off the radar before I could quiz you on that one.

A: Ah yes, the pig nonsense. It was sold by the World Health Organization and the CDC. They're doing the lying in-house these days. They've got their own PR people, so if I had been in the game, they wouldn't have needed me to sell the story to the press. But other thing is, we have the internet now. So they didn't quite realize the power that would have to neutralize their scare tactic. You led the way on that.

Q: A lot of people did.

A: You don't realize the power you have. People look to you for medical truth. You said, there is nothing here. But with the internet, that's not the end of the story. It becomes a tug of war, which is good, because that way people can avoid boredom. The enemy became WHO and CDC. That was the shape of it. The people against WHO and CDC. That works. You called the shot early on. You said there's no reason to be afraid, they haven't proved anything, they're lying, this is a con. And you won. This was a real defeat for the bad guys. Huge stocks of unused vaccines left over, because people didn't get the jabs.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: But they'll try again.

A: Sure. This is a step-operation.

Q: Explain that.

A: A step-op is one in which the bad guys keep going, one intrusion after another. It isn't just West Nile, it's West Nile, then SARS, then Bird Flu, then Swine Flu. It's all one package, with the idea, in this case, that they'll slowly wear down the resistance and people will buy in, will buy the story, the lie. They want to people to OBEY. That's the whole essence of this op. OBEY. It isn't only about fake epidemics and getting vaccines. It's about operant training in OBEYING. Get it? In general. Obey us. We command, you go along.

Q: What I did with my first book, AIDS INC, was expose the lie you were selling.

A: That's why I liked you. You didn't expose me, of course, because you had no idea who I was or what I was doing. But you saw through the whole lie.

Q: And what was that lie?

A: That HIV was causing the destruction of the immune system, and there was a global epidemic underway. As you pointed out in your book, all you need for that kind of lie is people dying, and people are dying all the time. The lie is: pretend you know why they're dying, and say it's from one cause.

Q: In retrospect, what was the top reason you were assigned to invent that lie and get reporters to buy into it?

A: To create a class of victims.

Q: Really?

A: Yeah. It took me awhile to realize that, and it's politically incorrect to even mention it, but in fact this has nothing to do with gay men per se. Nothing at all. It has to do with creating the perception of victims on a broad scale. That's the top agenda of the AIDS story, from the point of view of social control.

Q: Because the people who gave you the assignment want a world full of victims.

A: If you were an elite controller, wouldn't you? Wouldn't that suit your purposes? Look what's happened in the world since I floated the story of AIDS. You have all sorts of groups who are now official victims. It's ballooned into amazing proportions. Who is able to take care of victims? Governments. And there you have the bottom line. Victims, victims, victims. The chant. It drowns out everything else. It's the megaphone in the crowd. You create more powerful government by having more victims. And you have more victims by assigning that status to everyone you can. AIDS was the kickoff for that campaign. That was its real purpose.

Q: Because if you have lots of strong free individuals--

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: The controllers lose. They have nothing to do. They wither and die. So you have to eradicate even the PERCEPTION that strong free individuals exist. They're not strong and free. They're greedheads. They're all corrupt.

Q: And this story is being consciously sold to the press.

A: All the time. By people like me. People who cultivate reporters and feed them stories and leads and rumors and tips and clues. It's an art. But you know that. I've explained it to you before. Reporters are always looking to figure out "the prevailing mood." Which way the wind is blowing. I gave them that. Cleverly. Not like some schmuck blowing a horn. Gradually, piece by piece.

Q: Creating reality.

A: Inventing it. How often do you see a story in the press or on TV about a strong free individual? I'll tell you. NEVER. If you see one, it's always got an appendage. The tale of how this man overcame great hardship and turned into a good guy from being a bad guy. Something like that. It's never HERE HE IS. HE'S FREE AND STRONG. LET'S HEAR IT FOR THE FREE AND STRONG GUY. You never hear that. You think that's an accident? There are no accidents like that. INFORMATION IS MANAGED. IT'S MANAGED TO THE POINT WHERE IT DOESN'T NEED TO BE MANAGED ANYMORE. THEN IT JUST ROLLS ALONG ON ITS OWN.

Q: In the days when you were working, how did you get your assignments?

A: Well, it was rather sly. I wasn't sitting in a room listening to someone tell me YOU'RE GOING TO SELL A BIG LIE ABOUT SOMETHING WE'RE CALLING AIDS, WHICH IS REALLY JUST A WHOLE LOT OF DIFFERENT WAYS IMMUNE SYSTEMS CAN BE SUPPRESSED. That's not how it's done.

Q: How is it done?

A: There were a number of conversations with cutouts. Front men. People who sounded me out about my career, my fees, that sort of thing. All very casual. Bit by bit, I would put together what they wanted me to do. Just like you do when you interview people. You see where they're going and what they really have to say. It's similar.

Q: You eventually realized they wanted you to promote a big lie about AIDS.

A: It wasn't a light bulb going off in my mind. I was dancing with these cutouts. Back and forth, back and forth. Over a period of a few months. Drinks, lunch, parties. They were qualifying me. I was sniffing at them, trying to figure out how high on the food chain they were.

Q: Why did you care?

A: Are you crazy? I wanted to know whether I'd get paid. Whether my fee would be covered. I wanted to know how extensive this job would be, how long it would

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

take; when they, my bosses, would be satisfied. I knew there were other people working on this, doing the same thing I was going to do. I wanted to get a picture of how my work would be understood separately from their work. I was performance oriented. I wanted my results to be clear.

Q: But your assignment WAS clear.

A: Eventually. Finally, I sat down with a man who was a much higher level cutout. I knew him. He was reliable. As soon as I saw him, I knew things would be okay. He was a pro. We sat down in a conference room at a hotel, and he sat back and spread his hands and looked at me. He wanted me to tell him what I was going to do. And so I did. I proved to him I had figured out what my assignment was. And he told me it was long term. He said this was a big op. He said this was the biggest op of my life. Well, maybe. I had another one I thought was just as big, but okay.

Q: Did you know who this man was representing?

A: Three Nazis.

Q: What?

A: That's what I called them. Two were Americans. One was European. They were inside the inside of a group. I won't say which one. And don't even think of asking, because I won't fall for that. I won't give you a "no comment" or a non-denial denial. But the three men he was representing were big players. Not Council on Foreign Relations or Bilderberg. But players inside one of those two groups who had their own agenda. Not official. It was high up. The pharmaceutical game goes very high.

Q: So you felt--

A: This was legit. It was real. I would make a good chunk of cash.

Q: Were you surprised when you saw what your assignment was?

A: My boy, nothing surprises me. What most people see and accept as the world is PR. Pure propaganda. That's the Matrix.

Q: Why is the medical agenda so important to major players?

A: Hell, asked and answered. You got all that when you wrote AIDS INC. I don't how, but you did.

Q: Medical dictatorship.

A: The medical angle appears neutral. That was your statement. It appears to have no partisan political banner. Your words. It's therefore an ideal way to control people. Your words. Cradle to grave medical treatment. With toxic debilitating drugs. Your words. All true.

Q: Once you had your assignment to sell the big AIDS lie, what did you do?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: This was before, just before HIV was announced as the cause of AIDS. I knew they were going to call it [the cause] a retrovirus. I already knew that. So it was my job to prepare the ground. To talk to reporters casually and spread that around. "You know, they're saying it's a retrovirus, a slow-acting virus, this is unique, this is interesting because a couple of retroviruses have already been found as the cause of cancers."

Q: That's a lie.

A: Of course it's a lie, dummy. That's my work. Robert Gallo SAID he had found a couple of these viruses were causes of cancer, but the connection was slippery at best.

Q: So you softened up reporters.

A: Yeah. That was a major part of my work. Then once HIV was announced as the cause, it got more complicated. Because there were going to be obvious objections. There were holes in that story. I had to gloss that over. I had to plug the holes. I didn't talk to reporters much. I talked to their sources. I knew who their sources were. I worked on the sources, who in turn talked to the reporters. Actually, I had people talk to the sources. I was removed.

Q: These reporters' sources were scientists?

A: Some of them. Scientists are idiots when it comes to PR. They either ignore it altogether, or they do it badly. Part of my work, also, was making sure the idea of a global epidemic was bought and sold. Haiti, New York, San Francisco, LA, Uganda. All the same epidemic caused by the same virus. A complete lie.

Q: Did you work directly with anyone at the CDC?

A: Hell no. I wouldn't approach those guys with a ten-foot pole. It risks exposure for me, and besides, they make mistakes all the time. They're arrogant and stupid. But you see, I was acting for them, invisibly. I was doing part of their job. They didn't know that, of course. These days, they're pretty much on their own. They don't have the kind of help I gave them. They need it, but they don't have it.

Q: You build a world with propaganda.

A: The news becomes the world. If you can guide and steer the news, you create the world for people to see.

Q: With AIDS, there were dissident scientists who didn't believe the lie.

A: Yes, but there was only one I paid attention to, Peter Duesberg at UC Berkeley. The rest were unimportant. Duesberg was very bright, and he had an excellent reputation. He was a star. Fortunately, he was already out of the club of retrovirologists. He had left the fold on his own, because he saw that trying to connect these lazy viruses to cancer was a failure. So that pissed off some of his

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

colleagues, and later they were quite happy to trash the hell out of him when he said there was no reason to believe HIV caused AIDS. I made sure Duesberg was made into a pariah. I made sure he wasn't given his due. He was your main source for your book, AIDS INC.

Q: Yes.

A: But by that time, 1988, he was discredited.

Q: If I had known then that you were doing what you were doing...

A: Sonny boy, you had no chance to expose me. You would have been discredited, too, if you tried. People would have said you were crazy. People don't want to admit that their world is being created for them by PR, that their world is all a joke. They're afraid they'd be left with nothing, a big fat zero. You know. The VOID.

Q: What?

A: I've studied Tibet, pal. I know the score.

Q: You're going to have to explain that.

A: The void. The place where, to put it bluntly, there is no action. Where all information dies. Where there is nothing. For a person, this is either paradise or hell, depending on whether he can ...

Q: Yes?

A: You see, if you want understand human psychology, the real stuff, not the crap these therapists peddle, you have to go back to that. The boredom factor. The emptiness. The silence. People who live in the Matrix are trapped because they can't stand the big silence. That's the bottom line. They need the action and the frenzy. That's my territory. Or it was, before I got morality. I flourished in the land of lies. And I made my contribution. "You want lies. I'll give you whoppers."

Q: You don't regret your career.

A: I do and I don't. What I don't regret is seeing how much people want to be deluded. How much they'll delude themselves. I got to see that up close and personal. In a way few people do. Understand? And I'll tell you another unpleasant truth. Every great spiritual leader has seen the same thing. He's seen how much delusion people want and how much they want it. My path was to pile on the delusions. But I'll never regret seeing how people want a world made for them that they can believe in. And it all goes back to the void and Tibet, where a long time ago, their sages said, "If you can't stand the silence, the nothing, you're a chump." They knew the score. Now, that's all translated into: people have their own belief systems. That's a joke. That's a very pale representation of the truth. That's a slogan for chumps. The real psychology is all about void and non-void, being able to sit in the big silence and enjoy it. And lucky for me, 99.999 percent of the people

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

can't do it. They wouldn't want to try. They're scared of that. They think something bad will happen to them. And here's another very unpleasant truth. People know, unconsciously, they KNOW...that the best way to escape being in the void is to accept a delusion, to live with delusions and get all wrapped up in them. People will never admit it to themselves, but that's the way they are. And in that sense, truth is for suckers.

Q: You're having fun with this, aren't you?

A: Damn right. I like tweaking the fools. It's my nature. I never said I was a nice guy.

Q: I never said you were, either.

A: If you had, I'd have dropped you in a second.

Q: Delusion.

A: Coin of the realm. Maker of worlds.

Q: The Matrix.

A: This, my friend is what bores me about conspiracy buffs. They never get to the other side.

Q: Which is?

A: People want to buy the cover-ups. It takes two to tango. It isn't just people like me who screw up the world. I'm the seller. There have to be buyers. Buyers aren't victims. They're willing participants. It may be happening on a subconscious level, the buying, but whose subconscious is it? Mine? Hell no.

Q: So now you have a theory about the subconscious.

A: Don't mess with me. You know what I'm talking about. The subconscious is another term for "I'm buying delusions, leave me alone, I'm busy." (laughs)

Q: You've dropped hints, here and there, over the years, that you were involved in selling psychiatry as the authority on human behavior.

A: Yeah. Well. That was and is a major op. Bigger than AIDS. Much, much bigger. It's the lid on the Matrix, if you look at it in the widest terms possible. And I do.

Q: Let's get into that.

A: Do you have a week or two?

Q: If necessary.

A: Start with the delusion concept. It always comes back to that anyway. SOMEBODY has to be in charge of the mind, right?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Why?

A: Because that's the key to the Matrix. If you let the mind run free, eventually things are going to unravel. Who knows how long it'll take? But the mind will figure itself out. It'll see how deep the delusion-buying goes. How pervasive it is.

Q: So an authority on the mind can put the lid on.

A: With a whole series of delusions ABOUT THE MIND ITSELF. That's important to know. If you know that, you know a lot.

Q: You're telling me you sold delusions ABOUT the mind TO the mind.

A: Very good. (laughs)

Q: And there were willing buyers.

A: There are ALWAYS willing buyers.

Q: Okay. I'm listening. Give me the background on it. And don't pat yourself on the back too much.

A: Don't worry. I have an objective view of my work. Otherwise, I'd never have been able to do it.

Q: Where do we begin?

A: With Freud. He was the one who said there were secrets to be learned inside the mind. He was different from the Pavlov types. He wasn't merely trying to stimulate conditioned reflexes. He was a pioneer. But he was also crazy. All boxed up with Oedipal this and that. Nonsense. He did point the way, though. And others picked up the ball. Notably, Wilhelm Reich and JL Moreno. Reich was all about liberating human energy, and Moreno saw that human psychology was drama, and if you could play out those dramas in real time, you would go farther than therapy. You would get freedom from closed-in roles in life. So these guys had to be stopped. Reich was busted by the feds for selling his devices and he died in jail. Moreno was simply sidelined and ignored by the mainstream. He was copied by therapists who couldn't see the depth of his work. Moreno was a genius. Eventually, the medical boys won the war. They established psychiatry as a medical discipline. That was a stroke. That was a major victory for the delusion sellers.

Q: If you're medical, you can plug into the monopoly. The cartel.

A: Sure. That was the idea. The medical system is supported by government. That's the key. You're official. You can spin fairy tales until the cows come home and you sell those tales. And if you're challenged, you have clout on your side. Real power. So with psychiatry, you now have medical doctors who go on to get those degrees and certifications and licenses as psychiatrists.

Q: But these shrinks were still doing therapy. Talk therapy.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: Yeah, until they went broke. Because they're not good at it, and they're doing some sort of hybrid activity. It's the brain, you need drugs, it's your mommy and daddy, you need to talk about it, it's your non-conformity, you need to get back on the straight and narrow. It's a mess. And they're medical doctors—most doctors aren't great communicators.

Q: So what happened?

A: The profession of psychiatry makes a bargain with the pharmaceutical industry. About 35 years ago. It's now all about brain disorders. Everything is the brain. Chemical imbalance. That's the main delusion they're selling.

Q: They don't have the science, so they're going to fake it.

A: Right. And for every disorder they name, there is a drug. It's a machine all of a sudden. Disorder A gets drug B. And everybody makes money. The shrinks are back on top. Their business is being bankrolled by the drug industry.

Q: So what was your work in this area?

A: First of all, I was one man in an army of PR people. This was a major assault. This was big-time. My work was coordination, to a degree, and also pushing what I call the MAYBE fairy tales.

Q: What is that?

A: All those stories you read in the press and watch on TV? Researchers may be on the verge of a breakthrough in the treatment of depression. All that maybe could-be stuff? That's the sell-job. That was me. That's the WE THINK IT'S GENES. Genes cause depression. Genes cause schizophrenia. Chemical imbalance is now understood more clearly, and scientists say in the next five years....all that crap. And it is crap. Believe me. It's sheer PR. I was involved in priming and prepping the sources reporters rely on. It was a very big job. Behind the scenes. I always operated behind the scenes. Like a lot of people.

Q: Putting a lid on the Matrix.

A: Sure. Because if the mind is understood purely in delusional terms, then the mind is a puzzle that won't be cracked. Instead, the mind will be stunted by drugs. These drugs are bad ones. Toxic.

Q: And that was the agenda.

A: It wasn't just a psychiatric agenda. It's a Matrix agenda.

Q: What about all the so-called mental disorders?

A: After 1975, the numbers of these things escalated. They were devised, as you know, by committees. You know the story. No clear diagnostic tests. No causes

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

named. Just labels placed on sets of behaviors. But the job was to convince everyone that these disorders were precise and real.

Q: Right now, there are 297 official mental disorders.

A: Yeah. It's in the book. So my job [and the job of a lot of other propaganda operatives] was to make all this believable. To make it sound medical. The mind is a territory for doctors. Doctors only.

Q: What about the campaign "to remove the stigma attached to mental illness?"

A: Those were different people working that angle. I knew what was going on, but I wasn't part of it. They enlisted politicians and celebrities. Selling more delusions.

Q: I want to make this clear. You were selling fake science.

A: That was my specialty. That was my piece of the pie.

Q: Because there are a lot of people who fervently believe these 297 mental disorders are real.

A: Suffering confusion, pain, struggle are real. The disorders are a grid laid over that. A fake grid. A series of crafted delusions. You can take that to the bank. I did.

Q: You worked this territory a long time?

A: Yeah. It was an ongoing job. It had many branches. You have to understand something about my operations, all of them. A lot of the time I used cutouts.

Q: How?

A: I had people working for me who contacted the sources for reporters. I influenced the press at a distance. Two layers, three layers removed. I wasn't right there having cocktails with a reporter. I was higher on the food chain. I was invisible. If a major reporter ever heard my name, chances are he had no idea who I was. I stayed in the shadows. I wasn't some low-level hustler of stories.

Q: Was selling all these mental disorders easy?

A: It was work. Labor. But it wasn't a battle to sell it. It was cumulative selling. One fake story after another. In time, it got easier, because we had built up a backlog of acceptance. Once you get the press to buy in, they aren't going to turn around and say they were bamboozled. Understand?

Q: You were selling a pattern.

A: You bet. That's the essence. Problem equals mental disorder equals diagnosis equals drugs. The psychiatrist becomes a drug dispensing machine. An ATM for drugs. The PR job is to dress that up and give it scientific sounding context and you throw in all sorts of stuff about "the research"--and you have an industry. But in the

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

larger frame, you have a priesthood of the mind. An official priesthood. Licensed. And you sell that, too, using other words. You REALLY sell that. "No one else knows anything about the mind. Only the psychiatrists have the knowledge." You sell "needs professional help" and "is going in for treatment" and "new breakthroughs" and all that crap. You sell it six ways from Sunday.

Q: People are really mired in this.

A: Oh, sure. That's the idea. They deny any attacks on their precious mental disorders. "I have clinical depression." I love this one: "My depression." See? They own it. It's their special disorder. It's PROPERTY. They own something. Finally.

Q: They wear it like a badge. They talk about it. They expect psychiatric help from now to the end of their lives.

A: And they'll get it. "A mental disorder is no different from any disease. Like diabetes." Total balderdash.

Q: Inventing reality.

A: In the form of a delusion. The whole profession of psychiatry is an invented delusion ABOUT the mind. That's what makes it so powerful.

Q: If "everybody in the world" is eventually diagnosed with a mental disorder...

A: That's not just an aimless fantasy, my friend. That's the objective! Include everybody under that canopy of diagnosis. When that happens, there will be a kind of control Stalin never dreamed of. Because DISEASE will be the overall background context of the world. That's the goal. That's the plan.

Q: The Matrix is delusion.

A: Delusion SOLD.

Q: Your specialty was selling stories.

A: And as you've noted, people are addicted to stories. It's a heavy addiction. Actually, I sold story fragments. The idea there is that people will fill in the blanks themselves. It's stronger that way.

Q: People want to believe in science.

A: Science sells, yes. Anything you can connect to "science" gives you a leg up. That's a big storyline—"the march of science." If I had been living in the twelfth century, I would have been selling the Roman Church. I would have been selling the idea that the only road to heaven was through a priest. There is another aspect to psychiatry. It gets into popular language. So even if you're not "in treatment," you're using those psychiatric words. "Clinical depression." "Chemical imbalance." "Bipolar." "Fantasy world." You're in the soup. You're in that context. People pretend they are professionals. They spread these words around, it becomes...

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: A weave in the Matrix.

A: Yeah. And of course in the legal system, it's already embedded. You have lawyers arguing the most preposterous things, to get their clients into mental wards and away from long sentences. Context again—a person is the result of his past. That's a BIG one. Everybody's an expert on that now. How the past history shapes a person. Everybody weighs in on that. It's a joke. Another joke. People actually equate empathy with "understanding how the past made the person into what he is now." It's a self-defeating paradigm, and it's part of the sell-job, because self-defeat is what you covertly sell if CONTROL is your agenda.

Q: I want to talk a little history. As you know, I've done some checking on you.

A: It wasn't my favorite thing.

Q: And I was careful, and it wasn't easy. But I did satisfy myself that you were who you said you were.

A: So?

Q: What is it about you that got you into this black art of propaganda?

A: It was a choice. Motivated by my interest in what makes people so sure they're DIFFERENT.

Q: Explain.

A: People say, "Sure, I understand everybody else is stupid, but I'm one of the chosen ones. I've extricated myself from the delusions." Well, looking at them I could see they were surrounded by, and embedded in, delusions. It interested me. I wanted to know what was going on. And that was the beginning of my work. That was the thing that got me started.

Q: But people ARE different. Every person is unique.

A: Depends on what you mean by that. If a person can actually get free of the delusions he loves so much, then yes. He's unique. He's creative. But short of that, he's a cipher.

Q: And he deserves all the crap you can feed him.

A: At one time, I thought that, yes. But don't expect an abject confession of guilt from me. I learned my lesson. I'm retired. Doesn't mean I'm a goody two shoes.

Q: I don't think anyone is going to confuse you with that.

A: The Matrix is a fascinating study, mainly because it's a question of how deep the delusions go. Most people don't understand that. They're pretending they're comfortable where they are. I basically object to that pretension. I don't like it. Never have.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Give me an example.

A: When I was a young boy, I studied early American history. The founding of the Republic. The heroes. There was something about it I didn't like. I couldn't put my finger on it. It took some maturity before I understood it.

Q: What was your conclusion?

A: Rights.

Q: What?

A: There was this eerie implication in the Constitution that the people were being granted certain rights. GRANTED being the operative word. Well, that's baloney. That's reversing the whole thing.

Q: In what sense?

A: If I say, "I grant that you're intelligent, Rappoport," I'm setting myself up as the arbiter of that. Understand? I'm on a perch.

Q: Yeah. Okay.

A: There was a basic delusion in the implication of the Constitution. The government was granting rights to the people. Or the people who were setting up the government were granting the rights. But the rights already existed. The rights were not rights at all. They were INHERENT IN THE INDIVIDUAL.

Q: And if you can--

A: And if I can grant you rights, I can take them away. I can erode them slowly over time. I can change my mind. I can re-interpret those rights. I can do whatever the hell I want to. Look at the history. That's exactly what happened. One delusion gave rise to another and another. That was the flaw from the beginning.

Q: How would you have written the Constitution?

A: WE WHO ARE FREE, EACH ONE OF US, RELUCTANTLY BUILD THIS GOVERNMENT TO SERVE SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS. WE HAVE THE POWER. WE CAN DESTROY WHAT WE CREATE. THE GOVERNMENT IS OUR SLAVE. Something like that.

Q: To make things clear, you would have written it that way.

A: To leave no room for doubt.

Q: Is individual freedom a delusion?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: IT'S THE ONE FACT THAT BY COMPARISON TELLS YOU WHAT THE DELUSIONS ARE. Unless the word FREEDOM has been corrupted and turned into something else.

Q: Let's go deeper into what the Matrix is.

A: Not quite yet. First, I want to give you a quote. It's a statement I've given to you in the past, and I don't think you've ever presented it, at least not in this form.

Q: Okay. Go ahead.

A: "You need to prepare a population for propaganda. You do that through REDUCTION. You get people to want only the simplest ideas. Then you can sell them anything. ADD and ADHD are self-fulfilling prophecies."

Q: Interesting. You want to expand on that?

A: If you look up the list of behaviors that are used to diagnose ADHD, you see that almost any child, at the right moment, can be diagnosed. We know that's true because we already have several million kids in America who are called ADHD. And they get the drugs. Ritalin, which is an upper. It's speed. Well, eventually, speed is going to cause what I would call "a shortening of the perspective of the mind." I was there for part of the propaganda campaign on ADHD. I know what went on, how it was sold. It was basically an appeal "on behalf of parents" who couldn't deal with their kids. It was sold as a deficit—your kid can't concentrate. So after he gets the drug for a while, under the surface, the DIMENSIONALITY of his mind is reduced. He wants simpler ideas. He wants bottom lines. It's a self-fulfilling scam. Under the influence of the drug, his attention moves into deficit territory. You see, this is preparation for propaganda. A simpler mind takes in delusions more easily. Delusions presented as little packages. You wanted to go deeper into the Matrix. Well, here we are. REDUCE THE DIMENSIONALITY OF THE MIND. It's hard to detect. How are you going to quantify that?

Q: It's like pre-op for surgery.

A: Yes. You make minds simpler, and then they are fertile ground for any idea that is clever and simple.

Q: Ritalin isn't the only drug that does that.

A: Of course not.

Q: You knew my late friend and colleague, Jack True.

A: We had several conversations. His work and mine fit nicely together. He gave me some ideas. The Matrix is a meld between externally applied propaganda/delusions and the tendencies of the mind to buy delusion. That's boiling it down. The mind likes complexity, which is what lies produce. Lies lead to other lies. Lies are a compounding substance. Of course, the mind doesn't label

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

these as lies. They are "adventures." Explorations. You have to understand layers here, or you'll get lost.

Q: Yes. Because you are now saying two separate things. The mind is reduced, and then accepts little bottom lines, little packages of propaganda. And then you're saying the mind likes and wants complexity.

A: Right. Let me explain. The mind has two sensors. That's a useful image. One sensor reaches out for simplicity. Complex issues boiled down to bottom lines. Which are often lies. Okay? The other sensor reaches out for complexity, which is exploration and interesting involvement. But underneath both of those sensors is this fear. This fear of NOTHING. The VOID. Silence. Empty space. This is the place where, actually, very clear thinking can take place. It's thinking surrounded by silence. But most people never experience that. They don't know about that. They only know that the place of VOID is a place they don't want to visit. They would rather have ceaseless activity and buzz and noise. Subconsciously, they sense the potential presence of VOID. They shy away from it. They don't want it. They don't understand it. VOID IS outside the Matrix. That's the key. VOID is outside this reality. If you know all this—and I do—you know you can feed lies right into the mind like a hopper, because those lies will keep the mind away from brushing up against the VOID. And the mind recoils at the thought of visiting the VOID. I don't want to make this sound esoteric. IT ISN'T. It only seems that way because "nothing" is a foreign concept to people. If there is a "nothing," they'll swear they don't know anything about it. Anyway, I can feed simple lies and complex lies right into the mind. Either way, the mind likes them.

Q: The mind likes simple lies because--

A: Because they're like concrete. Cement. The simple lies say, "Now you know something. You really know something." And the person likes that. Gives him a sense of surety. The complex lies are good because they give rise to lots of thinking and conversation and argument and opposition and polarity—the buzz and noise. But if I tell the truth, if I say, "Ritalin is a poison, it's speed, and it's hurting people," well, what do you do with that if you're Joe Average? What the hell do you do? You're not equipped to handle all the implications. You deny the truth. And also, the truth tends to make you stop thinking. You see? All of a sudden, lots of extraneous thinking you've done becomes irrelevant and you can throw it away. Well, if I unload four or five of these truth-blockbusters on a person and he offloads a whole lot of extraneous thinking, he feels the VOID drawing closer. And the crazy thing about all this is--

Q: The Void is peace.

A: Yes. That's it exactly. The Void is peace. It's a great place.

Q: So Matrix has a lot to do with avoidance of peace.

A: It has a lot to do with avoidance of profound peace. Very, very deep peace.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: Which seems counter-intuitive. Why would anyone want to avoid profound peace?

A: Or to put it another way, why would anyone want to traffic in blizzards of lies for a whole lifetime?

Q: So in here somewhere is a key to the Matrix.

A: In one of my important conversations with Jack [True], what emerged was this. A person associates peace with death.

Q: Why the hell would that be?

A: I can think of a lot of reasons. But one of them is the biological imperative.

Q: Which is?

A: Stay alive. Keep moving. It's this motion that is the opposite of Void.

Q: So a confusion arises.

A: Yes. And subconsciously—I'm repeating myself—the person has learned that lies will keep his mind moving. SUBCONSCIOUSLY LEARNED THAT. Lies are good for continued motion. Lies work. They have legs. They generate activity. They stimulate adrenaline. So he buys lies. And if you're a seller, you make out well.

Q: Well now, we're getting into my cardinal area. Imagination.

A: You see, that's entirely different.

Q: How?

A: Hell, I'll leave that to you to explain. You write about it all the time.

Q: I'll say this from my experience. If you're living intensely by and through your imagination, you dip in and out of Void. You become accustomed to it, because Void is really all about not creating. It's a state in which you aren't creating. That's the deeper message of the Tibetan philosophy. The original philosophy, before it was trampled by the priests. With CREATING and the VOID, you're drawing a straight line between two stars. Everything lines up. The more you're creating, and the more you're creating what you imagine, instead of relying on what others do and say, the more you experience the Void. You go back and forth between those two stars, between CREATING AND NOT CREATING, BETWEEN VOID AND NOT-VOID, and you become familiar with them. You don't see peace as death, which is a ridiculous Matrix computation. You get out of all that.

A: Yes. You don't hunger for lies anymore. You don't have that need to buy lies.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: When you were working in the fields of propaganda, did you see any of this?

A: Some of it, yes. But I was "a career man."

Q: Did you work on warfare propaganda?

A: A little. By the time I was in the game, World War Two was over. That form of PR had already been shifted over into what was called communication research. It was funded by the government, and grants were readily available. Communication research is based on stereotypes. How you want people to see other people they've never met. It's alive and well today. [See Science of Coercion, Christopher Simpson]. Communication research tends to be about how to form images of people for other people. I mean, that's not the stated goal, but that's going on under the surface. It's a big field. How can you influence and dominate foreign cultures? How can you use stereotypes to dismiss strangers in other lands. That kind of thing. It's elementary school stuff. Kindergarten. But there is an interesting twist on it now. A reverse. And this is pure propaganda. It's this: Americans are horrible people. Everybody else is okay, but Americans are horrible. You see? A reverse. And it's entirely engineered in the press. This is an op. Pure and simple. It's propaganda, using the same stereotype images to go the other way. Here is an example, on a slightly more sophisticated level. Israel and the Palestinians. Ten, fifteen years ago, the official line was Palestinians were terrorists, and Israel was fighting for its life, and the US was on the side of Israel. And you had very powerful lobbies supporting Israel in the US. All of a sudden, overnight, the whole thing flipped. Did you notice that? Suddenly, the Left came out for the Palestinians and every college campus was anti-Israel? That's quite an op. That was a bltiz.

Q: And this sort of thing started during WW2?

A: Didn't start then, but it was raised to an art form. In order to make all Germans and Japanese seem like sub-humans. Stereotypes.

Q: Did you ever work out of an office?

A: Hell no. I got my best ideas in big cities walking down the streets, looking at people.

Q: How so?

A: I'd look at them and wonder, "What lie do they want to hear?" Better yet, "What lie can I float that will attract them?" That was my inspiration.

Q: You're quite a piece of work.

A: Never denied that, chum. But you see, I could have asked, "What can I do to help them?" And you know what?

Q: What?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: No answer would have come back. Because they don't want help, not really. My perception was, they want a story. And they won't accept the truth. So I'm not going to be victimized by that. I'm not going to be silenced by that. What's the alternative? Tell them stories.

Q: And this is your--

A: It was my game.

Q: You could have written novels or made movies.

A: Yes. And in retrospect, with what I know how, I probably would have done exactly that. But I had a nasty edge then.

Q: You have a lot to answer for.

A: I don't need you to tell me that.

Q: Did you ever work for an intelligence agency?

A: Not consciously. You never know who's hiring who. But I knew a few of those types. They're always looking for ways to employ mind control. It's their dream of a perfect world. Every robot turned into their kind of robot. That's what they see. Robots.

Q: What about vaccines?

A: What about them?

Q: Did you ever do propaganda in that area?

A: No, but I knew people who did. Their little specialty was calling in the troops.

Q: I have no idea what that means.

A: Well, take the swine Flu fiasco. As you know, it all started in a place called La Gloria. Mexico. A big pig farm. People, workers were getting sick there. How could they not be getting sick?

Q: They had lagoons of pig feces right out in the open. And workers came in and sprayed pesticide all over the place.

A: Yeah. So any normal person would conclude the workers getting sick was a natural consequence of those things. The place was a pustule to begin with.

Q: But the CDC sent doctors and researchers down there to investigate.

A: You have to ask why, don't you?

Q: The doctors were the troops?

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: (laughs) Yeah. They were called in to make an epidemic happen. Not a real one. A fake one. A PR fabrication. I mean, there is this place out in the middle of nowhere, and some workers get sick. Why on Earth should this interest the CDC?

Q: They have scouts?

A: Wouldn't you? It was time for the next fake epidemic. So they called in the troops. Those scouts. They're like PR men, but they have a peculiar function. Like the old advance men for show acts. They go down there, look around, spread a few rumors and then say, "Yeah, this a good spot for the beginning of an epidemic." A fake one. So they call home, and then the doctors are called in to examine the sick workers.

Q: They draw blood.

A: They take samples and then they leave.

Q: The blood goes to a lab.

A: And then the researchers mess around with it and come up with a virus. A virus no one has identified before. Which isn't that hard, since there are millions of germs in the body. But they find one and they settle on it "as the cause of the outbreak."

Q: Of course, there isn't an outbreak.

A: No. But there is a story.

Q: And that's how it starts.

A: Sure. How else could it start?

Q: In the old days, would a guy like you have told that story?

A: Maybe. But now, the CDC and WHO have their own people. They know the drill. They've been through it before.

Q: I'll tell you a little secret. A couple of times, with SARS and with Swine Flu, when I said, early on, that they were fake epidemics...and then at the end, I was proven right, very few people contacted me. I'm not complaining. I don't care. But it's interesting in light of what you've been saying.

A: Of course. I know all about it. When you were proven right, there was very little attention to that. Because the truth stands alone. It signals the end of an episode. The people who could have and might have contacted you to say, "You were right, great going," they were off and running on believing the next lie coming down the road on a horse with banner waving in the wind.

Q: Yes, I've seen that happen.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

A: (laughs) I'm not theorizing in this conversation, kiddo. I'm telling you the way it works. People can't stand the silence of truth. They've got to have the next big lie and eat it up, even though they've just seen how the last lie they bought was, in fact, a lie. It's beautiful really, if you have to the guts to understand it.

Q: I once gave a talk to a large audience about AIDS, about my book, and I went through the whole thing, and I could tell they were following me all the way, and they saw that AIDS was just a label that had been invented to describe many different types of immune suppression caused by different factors—the label AIDS was just word that functioned as an umbrella to sell drugs and so on—and they got it. They understood. They were very enthusiastic, as if I'd ripped the roof off the building. They saw how the medical boys concoct these labels for all sorts of things that don't really exist as actual disease entities....and then when I was through, and I was standing in the lobby, people came up to me and said, "So what really does cause AIDS then?" The first time that happened, I actually laughed. I had a hard time stopping laughing. It was completely insane.

A: Yeah. They were anxious to get up on their horse and find the next lie. And they thought you might help them.

Q: I saw that very clearly.

A: I bet you were tempted to feed them a lie.

Q: I thought about it. Well, AIDS is really a virus from Andromeda, and there is a secret lab in Detroit where they modify it so it's infectious.

A: They would have loved you.

Q: You're right.

A: Damn right I'm right.

Q: People reading this might tend to back away from this whole VOID business.

A: OF COURSE they'll back off. It's the thing they want to avoid. They want to avoid going there, and they want to avoid thinking about going there, and they want to avoid thinking about VOID at all. It seems alien to them, because they've blocked themselves off from the concept of it. So it seems eerie. But it isn't. The urge to explain and categorize everything down to a gnat's ass is the reaction against going to the VOID. At one time, in a few places on Earth, this was well understood. It was understood as well as you understand going to the supermarket to buy paper towels. You see, if you're really going to investigate the Matrix, you have to be prepared to encounter some things that aren't familiar. If they were familiar, you'd already understand them, and you wouldn't be enmeshed in the Matrix. This isn't like going to the hardware store and buying a key and going to a storage locker and opening the door and finding all the secrets of the Matrix. You may WANT it to be

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

like that, but it isn't. The Matrix is the cosmic joke. You have to work to get the punchline.

Q: Okay.

A: I've given you more than I intended to.

Q: More truth.

A: Yeah. Given that people are so desperate to wrap their arms around lies, I don't know how they'll take this [interview]. But that's your problem.

Q: I don't have a problem.

A: Good.

###END###

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Ellis Medavoy, 2011, Interview #2

In this conversation, Ellis comments on what he calls "the basics behind social agendas."

Q: What is "the social agenda?"

A: It's whatever elite groups want it to be at any given time. You have to understand it's all based on the idea that the human being is a very flexible entity.

Q: Flexible in what sense?

A: He can be stimulated to tap into different attitudes—much like an actor can be guided in roles in plays by directors. The director says, "give me a little more of this," and the actor responds. So a social agenda—which is really about behavior—is a flex operation. You can get human beings to change behavior, AND THEY WILL THINK THAT CHANGE IS A GOOD IDEA. Let me give you several images here, or cues, or templates, or, if you will, stereotypes. You have "the isolated male," "the strong tough guy," "the soft sensitive man," the "helpful service-oriented person," "the assertive female," "the nurturing mother," "the communicative, sharing person," "the emotionally available person," "the can-do guy," "the incurable spiritual optimist," "the New Age person," "the sexually liberated woman," "the egalitarian humanist,"...

Q: You're saying all these are INDUCED as attitudes in people through PR and propaganda??

A: Of course. I'm not saying people are just blank slates. But they can be influenced—and they are, especially when they sense a trend is taking place and they want to be on board, instead of left behind. The trend is created by PR campaigns. Conscious directed campaigns.

Q: So for example--

A: A man changes from being "a tough guy" to a "warm, caring, sensitive human being." He does this because he senses a shift in the way the cultural wind is blowing. And that shift IS created by PR.

Q: But is he really changing?

A: You want statistics? (laughs) He's an actor in a play. And he's taking direction from "the director." Mostly, that's what's happening. Not all the time, but most of the time.

Q: Why haven't you ever mentioned this before in our conversations?

A: I have, but not in such a succinct way. I think about things, kiddo. I'm not stagnant. I distill my ideas.

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

Q: I want to get this straight. You're saying a great deal of human behavior is stimulated by social propaganda. That people will shift their attitudes and behavior like chameleons.

A: That's right. They give themselves reasons for changing, but they change. And the long-term propaganda goal is in the direction of softening up the population, so they'll think in terms of WHAT OTHER PEOPLE WILL THINK OF THEM...and it's all "in the service of the greater community." It's a con.

Q: "The greater community" is a con?

A: Well, let me put it to you this way. If you're changing your behavior based on a stimulus-response model of "the greater community," is that profound? Is that deep? Or is that the dog drooling when he hears the bell and knows he's about to get ground meat? Let's get real about this. ANY ideal which is internalized based on a Pavlovian response is a con. The whole purpose of social propaganda is: THE DIRECTOR TELLS THE ACTOR TO MODIFY HIS ROLE. That's it.

Q: And if the actor doesn't know he's in a play...

A: To use a technical term, he's screwed.

Q: But you'll admit that ideals like community and individualism and achievement and power and so on...these can be quite real. They don't have to be mere artifacts created by propaganda.

A: Of course. It's the difference between a counterfeit gold coin and the real thing. But social propaganda has one basic goal—softening up the population so that it seeks to be a single enmeshed organism.

Q: So it can be controlled from an exterior platform.

A: Yes.

Q: On radio shows, I've been talking about activism on behalf of health freedom and how that's changed over the past 15 years, from aggressive energy to what I call The Church of Nice.

A: (laughs) Yeah, that's a good example. NICE is all about prizing the acceptance of others, even those who want to take away your freedom. And that shift you've noticed—that's no accident. That has been the result of sustained PR. Of course, when PR rolls like a tank for a while, people then carry on, on their own. They don't need the stimulus anymore. They drool all by themselves.

Q: One of my favorites is: "If it didn't happen, it wasn't meant to be."

A: Sure, that's an example of the softening-up process. Former generations of Americans didn't create all the comforts we now take for granted and cherish by

Copyright © 2011 by Jon Rappoport

pasting a smile on their faces and saying, "It wasn't meant to be." That's not our natural tradition.

Q: The social engineering of attitudes.

A: That's what I'm talking about.

Q: There's a difference between a person reflecting on his highest and deepest desires and then creating them, as fact, in the world...there's a difference between that and accepting roles in plays that were designed by propagandists.

A: Night and day, lad. Night and day.

Q: This type of social propaganda you're talking about...where did it come from?

A: It's as old as the hills. But more recently, coming out of World War Two, the prevalent theme was American domination—so that meant templates like "strong" and "forceful" were for us, and "backward" and "corrupt" and "animalistic" were for them, the nations and people we were determined to dominate. But then that all changed, because the theme changed. It became globalism. One world community. So all the templates became softer. That was the newer propaganda. Again, these shifts are no accident.

Q: Suppose a person says, "But I really AM for a global community and a peaceful world."

A: That person better do several things. Define and understand what he really means and what that community would look like and what the individual would look like in that world of the future. He'd better look at this closely and then ACT on it. He'd better have his head on straight, to make sure he isn't just swallowing some Disneyesque PR about "world community." With any ideal, there is the real and the fake. The fake is the social agenda of the propagandists, and the elites they serve. And for them, "community" is a code word for "duped actors" controlled by a director. As a final tidbit...this whole business of political correctness and never saying anything that might possibly offend someone else? You notice how it's becoming more and more pervasive? Well, whatever you think about it, I can tell you that, at the highest levels of control, it has absolutely nothing to do with the evolution of human beings toward a more tolerant state of mind. Nothing. It's entirely about enmeshing people in a social framework of sticky interconnectedness. Easier to control and rule them that way. Globally rule them. It IS A PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN, a sustained campaign. It has that goal. It isn't anything else. The elites have nothing but contempt for everyone else, and they express that contempt in decidedly politically incorrect ways.

###END###