

**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.”

A: The critics are complicit. No question about that. They give their seals of 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.

Q: You mean morally wake up?

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.

Q: These crimes and the propaganda campaigns are basically coming from the 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?

A: Down in the trenches, yes. But on the highest levels, this is done for a reason. 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 like I’m talking about feeding and then not

feeding an info-junky. That's what I used to think. But then I went deeper, and I 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

ignore what I'm talking about. But the truth is, the sense of time and pace is so 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

and they brought it front and center. Let me tell you what television news really is. 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.

These studies have been done for years and years. What happens when you subject 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]he 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 be 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###

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

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.

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.

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.

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###

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.

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?

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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."

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.

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###

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?

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

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---

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.

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

“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,

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###

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?

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.

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 propagand 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.

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 coronavirus 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.

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

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.

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###

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

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.

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.

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.

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###

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.

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.

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

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."

And now the interview:

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.

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.

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."

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.

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.

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.

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---

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

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.

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###

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.

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

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###

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."

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 studies revealed 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.

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,

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 letter

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.

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---

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###

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.

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?

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?

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?

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###

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.

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---

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 explicitly 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.

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###

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###

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.

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.

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

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."

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."

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.

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###

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.

Q: So the values cover story has several payoffs 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###

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.

Ooooooooooooo---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.

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

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.

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###

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.

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

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###