

**THE
MATRIX
REVEALED
Volume 1**

**JON RAPPOPORT
Interviews
ELLIS MEDAVOY
(Part 3 of 3)**

December 22, 2005

TAMIFLU DEATHS AND THE TAP-DANCE

Below you will find an excerpt from the Sydney Morning Herald, reporting two cases of "death from bird flu," despite treatment with Tamiflu, the drug that is being stockpiled all over the world against the hoax-pandemic.

I was reminded of an interview I did some years ago with Ellis.

Here is a piece from that Medavoy interview:

Q: (Jon Rappoport) So you're saying that when people die after a drug is given, there is a standard spin that is published.

A: (Ellis Medavoy) Of course. The words "resistance" and "mutation" are hauled out and used. They are painted on the story.

Q: And how are these words employed?

A: "The germ has developed resistance to the drug." "The germ mutated rapidly, so the effective drug was no longer effective."

Q: Which means the drug can't be blamed for not working.

A: Not only that, but the drug can't be blamed for killing the patient. "It was the germ."

Q: What about proof that the germ really did mutate?

A: Try and find it. Normally, the mutation cover story is announced to the press with no proof at all. It's just a tale. They simply assume the germ must have evolved into a new form---overnight---and that's why the drug didn't work.

Q: There is another question, too. Did they ever really find the germ in question in the ill patient?

A: Right. Or did they find antibodies to the germ---

Q: Which are a sign of health.

A: Yes. In most cases, they don't isolate the actual germ at all. And when they do, they don't show that the germ existed in sufficient numbers in the body to cause any harm. It's all nonsense and obfuscation.

Q: So you could get a patient who is mildly ill, no real problem. Then he is given a drug and he dies. The story is spun so that the patient is said to have died from some germ, whereas the only logical explanation of death is that the drug killed him.

A: Absolutely. See, the drug makers always have a theory about how a drug works to cure a disease. They have a technical step-by-step story about the mechanism of

cure. This happens, then that happens, then that happens over there, and then you have a cure. But they don't have a step-by-step story about how the drug can kill someone, because they don't want to know about THAT. So when a patient does die after being given a drug, the manufacturer always says, "There is no step-by-step chain of evidence that the drug actually led to the patient's death. There could have been other factors involved. Therefore, we're exempt from blame." It's a tap dance.

End of interview excerpt.

In the case of Tamiflu, it's interesting to note that even conventional assessments of the effectiveness of the drug admit that it only shortens the length of the flu by 1.5 to 2.5 days, if it is given after the person already has the flu.

However, the proponents of the drug don't want to bring this up as a reason for a flu death after treatment with Tamiflu. "Hey, it only shortens the length of the illness by a little bit, so yes, people can die anyway." No, instead they want to say the germ mutated and developed resistance to the drug. That suits them better. Otherwise, people might begin to say, "Why are we bothering with this drug at all? It does almost nothing."

Yeah. Almost nothing. Except it can have dire negative effects.

Here is an excerpt from the Sydney Morning Herald article. Notice how closely it follows the pattern Medavoy laid down:

Deaths of treated patients alarm bird flu experts

By Mark Metherell

December 23, 2005

The deaths of two bird flu patients in Vietnam who had been treated with Tamiflu has raised questions about the drug Australia has stockpiled as a front-line medicine to combat an influenza pandemic.

To the dismay of medical experts and those responsible for the worldwide efforts to fight a pandemic occurring, the H5N1 bird flu virus in the bloodstream of the two patients in Vietnam rapidly developed resistance to the drug.

Concerns about resistance problems with Tamiflu suggested by an earlier case in Vietnam had already prompted the Australian Government to acquire more stocks of a rival antiviral drug, Relenza, a Health Department official revealed yesterday.

In one of the latest cases, a 13-year-old girl appeared to be stable but then rapidly worsened as the virus mutated, became more aggressive and eventually killed her.

Reports of the deaths are published in the New England Journal of Medicine by doctors funded by the British Wellcome Trust working in Vietnam. They urge changes to the global plans for fighting a flu pandemic. Other antiviral drugs are

needed alongside Tamiflu, they say. [NOTE: THE WELLCOME TRUST IS VERY CLOSELY TIED TO GLAXO. GLAXO WAS GLAXO WELLCOME, UNTIL 2000, WHEN IT MERGED WITH SMITH KLINE BEECHAM TO BECOME GLAXO SMITH KLINE BEECHAM. WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT? BECAUSE GLAXO MANUFACTURES RELENZA, ANOTHER "ANTI-FLU DRUG," WHICH IS IN COMPETITION WITH TAMIFLU. SO WE HAVE A SITUATION WHERE THE WELLCOME TRUST TRASHES TAMIFLU AND CALLS FOR OTHER FLU DRUGS TO BE USED. SUCH AS RELENZA, WHICH HAD FALLEN ON HARD ECONOMIC TIMES. IT HELPS GLAXO TO TRASH TAMIFLU.---JR]

An Australian authority on influenza, Graeme Laver, said: "What is so worrying is that it looks as though it [the mutation] happened very quickly."

Dr Laver, whose research contributed to the development of the antiviral drugs, said while it was not surprising that a flu strain should develop resistance to the drug, the speed of the mutation was surprising as it was very difficult to develop resistant strains, even in the laboratory.

He said one possible comfort was that any future flu pandemic may not be the same as the current H5N1 strain, meaning it might not have the same potential to develop resistance rapidly.

The H5N1 strain has so far killed 71 people in South-East Asia, most of whom have been in close contact with infected birds. Scientists say the risk of a pandemic of the lethal disease would arise if the strain were to develop the ability to spread easily from human to human.

The Health Department's spokeswoman, Kay McNiece, said officials had been told of an earlier case of apparent resistance to Tamiflu and that was one of the reasons for the recent decision to order 1.81 million courses of the alternative antiviral, Relenza.

Australia has 3.95 million courses of antivirals held in secret stockpiles, most of them Tamiflu, as part of the \$555 million anti-pandemic measures...

End Sydney Morning Herald excerpt

###END###

February 13, 2006

AN EXPLOSIVE INTERVIEW WITH ELLIS MEDAVOY: "MIND CONTROL, MIND FREEDOM"

Media mind control was his specialty.

Eventually, when he realized the extent of depopulation agendas in the Third World, he quit the scene.

Over the years, he has changed his outlook on ethics.

More than anyone I've ever encountered, he knows the nuts and bolts of influencing the media, and he also knows the big picture, when it comes to floating false cover stories.

When I told him about my upcoming tele-workshop, "MIND CONTROL, MIND FREEDOM", he said he wanted to do a background interview. However, I wasn't prepared for the direction this conversation would take. In his usual frank and no-holds-barred fashion, he reveals a number of things about himself, mind control, creativity, imagination, and the psychology of destruction. You may need to buckle up for this one.

Here it is.

Q: First of all, as you've told me before, you were involved in spreading the lie that AIDS is basically one condition caused by HIV.

A: That's right. There was a group that knew this was all a lie, and they wanted "traction" in the press. They wanted the world to accept HIV as the cause of AIDS. They wanted plenty of stories planted in the media. So I accepted that assignment. I was, of course, not the only person doing this. This was a very big operation.

Q: What was the purpose of the lie?

A: As with any major op, there were several purposes. I've explained most of it to you before. But, as you can see, the world has seen, in recent years, an explosion in PR and propaganda about so-called epidemics. West Nile, SARS, bird flu. Besides scaring people and getting them to accept any and all medical and political edicts, the idea is to bring nations of the world into a tighter connection---because when you have an international agency like the World Health Organization at the helm, telling governments what they have to do and can't do, the "community of nations" draws closer and closer together.

Q: Basically, you're talking about the move toward globalism, the rule of the many by the few.

A: Yes, I'm talking about the eventual erasure of all significant national borders.

Q: What's called the New World Order.

A: Right. Only that phrase has been somewhat discredited. I try not to use it.

Q: What do you mean, discredited?

A: It's been interpreted to mean: "a bunch of right-wing wackos are spinning a conspiracy theory about evil men who want to take over the planet." That is how you do propaganda. You see? When some people become aware that globalism is on the march and they call it a New World Order, the phrase itself is attacked and made to seem bizarre.

Q: Yeah. I want to establish for my readers that you've been retired for some years.

A: That's right.

Q: What happened after you retired and gave up lying for money?

A: I would use two words to describe my state of mind: DEMORALIZED and DESPONDENT.

Q: Really.

A: Yeah. For several years, I was in bad shape.

Q: Because you regretted what you'd been involved with as a professional propaganda man?

A: That was part of it. But there was something else, too. Doing propaganda is creative. I was, you could say, an artist. And then I stopped. When you stop creating, after you've been doing it, you get very down. That's what happened.

Q: But your creative bent had been directed in the area of mind control.

A: Doesn't matter. Do you know why I contacted you the very first time we met?

Q: Well, I thought I did, but apparently you have something else to say on the subject.

A: I found out you were an artist, and I also found out you had a great deal to say about the healing power of imagination. That sparked my interest. Because I was very down. I was a "painter who no longer had a canvas." And I'd say the last few years of my work in PR and propaganda, I realized I was going into a very negative mental direction, in terms of having no more interest in doing my "art." I was lost.

Q: I see. So you---

A: I wanted to hear more of what you had to say about imagination. I had a feeling it held a key for me.

Q: And did it?

A: Yes.

Q: I didn't know that.

A: That's why I'm telling you.

Q: So a shrink might have---

A: Diagnosed me as manic-depressive. But it was really all about creating and then not creating. The up and then the down. Rise and fall.

Q: You were getting what you deserved.

A: True. But regardless of that, there were other factors at work. You see, when a person is going in a very creative direction, no matter how he's doing it, he doesn't want to stop. Because he's doing art. It may be destructive art, as in my case, but that doesn't matter. He doesn't want to stop creating. Most evil people who create and know they're doing it don't want to stop because they like being an artist. They don't see any other outlet for their creativity. And they think about not creating as a form of personal suicide. I have to say, though, this whole process for them is pretty much happening on a subconscious level.

Q: Were you suicidal?

A: After I retired, I strongly considered ending my life.

Q: What made you not kill yourself?

A: The possibility that I could harness my imagination in new directions.

Q: Really.

A: That was the only thing that stood between me and a bullet in the brain.

Q: To clarify this for my readers---

A: Look, let me boil it down. Suppose there is a guy who has spent his whole life working for a company. He's some sort of midlevel executive. He doesn't really have a very interesting job. But he has one. He shows up every day at the office, year after year. And then, all of a sudden, he hears a rumor that his job and other similar jobs are going to be cut. Now, everybody assumes that the only thing at stake is the money, the way to support himself and his family. But even in that situation, this guy is creating a little bit. Every day, on the job, he's a creating in a minor way. He may not know it, but it's happening. And when the threat of getting fired looms up, on an unconscious level he's in a panic. How is he going to keep creating his "art?" Where is he going to do it? It doesn't matter how small the creating has been. He's upset. He's feeling that incoming cloud of demoralization and despondence. He's going down.

Q: He's---

A: He's getting closer to being nothing more than a robot. That little edge of creativity---that's his ace in the hole. That's what really keeps him afloat.

Q: So you're saying creativity is everywhere.

A: Well, you know that. We're all floating in a sea of our creativity. We may not know it, we may not admit it, but that's the basic situation. If we get cut off from that, we go down. Here is a principle of propaganda I don't think I've ever articulated in quite this way before: TO THE DEGREE THAT A PERSON IS CREATING LESS AND LESS, HE BECOMES A MORE RIPE SUBJECT FOR PROPAGANDA AND EXTERNALLY IMPOSED MIND CONTROL.

Q: And the converse would apply as well.

A: You bet. The more a person is creating, the less likely it is that he'll be ripe for mind control.

Q: When did you see this?

A: About three years after I retired. It blew me away. It's a simple idea. But it hit me like a ton of bricks.

Q: Did this come to you all on your own?

A: No. It came in part from you, and from a few talks I had with your friend, the hypnotherapist, Jack True.

Q: I see.

A: So, in terms of the propaganda effect, the media mind control effect, I want your readers to know all this. What you're doing in your work is pointing the way to far less mind control. If people take the clue. If they begin to consciously use their imaginations more and more.

Q: In your work as a propaganda specialist---

A: I was creating a world, an island of false information. I was creating it and selling it. And now, looking back on that time, I can see that people were buying what I was selling to the degree that, in their own lives, they were creating not very much. It was a very strong and very precise equation. At the time I wasn't aware of that. But now I am.

Q: Which means that there must be, in our culture, a whole lot of ops aimed at reducing people's creative power, in order to make them more ripe for informational mind control.

A: Absolutely. But as you've pointed out, when you get to that profound a level, you are mostly talking about ops that are launched and run without much consciousness. The people who, for example, sell tons of toxic medical drugs---drugs that tend to make creativity harder to do---aren't really thinking on this level.

They don't consciously know much about imagination and creativity, when it comes to the core of life itself. They knew a few things, but they don't see the biggest picture. In the same way, when you see all the budget cuts in education for the arts, that's being done more or less as a reflex. The people that run societies have what you could call an instinctive fear of individual creativity---but they haven't added the whole thing up. They can't.

Q: Why not?

A: Because, when a person really begins to see what creativity is all about, he doesn't want to push people down and grind their noses in the mud anymore.

Q: Is that what happened to you?

A: By degrees, yes. It was like coming out of a fog. The full force of it didn't hit me until after I retired. But in those last few years of work, I was beginning to break through. I was beginning to get some very strong glimpses of the biggest picture.

Q: And then you didn't want to sell lies anymore.

A: I wasn't so keen on it, no.

Q: That's important.

A: Yes it is. I want people to know something. I'm sort of repeating myself, but so what? When you realize, consciously, that you are creating more and more in your life, in your work, in your "art," whatever it is---as you see this more and more and more---and you can't deny it because it's so obvious---you also see that using that creativity for destructive purposes is a very bad and stupid thing. That's the ethical force kicking in. That's when the destructive artist hits the wall. Take a person like Hitler, who was a painter in his early days. When he became the big guy in power in Germany, he put all that conscious painting---and his ambition to BE a painter---aside. Notice this. It's very important. He began to rely on a whole bunch of bullshit ideas about the "true origin" of the German race. The Aryan business. The gods from their secret caves. All that nonsense. He began to sacrifice his own straight-out creativity on the chopping block of this "external" metaphysical baloney. Do you see? He "appealed to a higher power." That's where he put all the eggs in his basket. And that's why he was able to continue his destructive and inhuman course of action. If he had stayed a painter, he might have come out of the fog. With enough straight-out imagination and creativity---

Q: You don't need to appeal to a higher power. You'll eventually get everything you want, in the highest possible sense. In every sense.

A: That's right. Look at the Roman Church. They did the same thing. Those leaders, early on, did the same thing. They cooked up some very creative myths, but then they used them to appeal to a higher power, and with that pretended higher power in their hands, they pushed people right into the mud. There is nothing very

creative happening in that organization now. There hasn't been for a long time. They abandoned the creative spark and they went into the business of selling lies. Their creativity dwindled and dwindled. Now they're just like robots selling the same lies they sold hundreds of years ago, but with a "softer" touch. You can find the same formula in Satanic groups. They invoke this "higher power" and hitch their creative wagon up to that, and then the creativity dwindles and becomes a very sick and painful joke for a lot of people. It's all about coercion and delusion.

Q: Coerced mind control.

A: Which is exactly---

Q: The opposite of conscious creative power exercised by the individual.

A: Right.

###END###

May 17, 2006

Q: What did you want to talk about today?

A: In the past, we've touched on the reasons why I quit my profession. But there is something I've left out.

Q: What's that?

A: I was in New York. I was working with a guy who was one of the early graphics people. He had come over into propaganda from advertising, and he was hot on the idea that graphic presentation could be very convincing, and I should learn about it.

Q: Were you interested?

A: No. But then he started talking about the uses of color and people's responses to different colors, and I perked up a little.

Q: Why?

A: To this day, I really don't know. For him, color was all about covert persuasion. He had his theories. They were complicated. After a while, I was bored stiff. You know, blue means this in these situations and green means that. All that stuff.

Q: So you didn't pick up on his ideas.

A: No. I just listened. It was cold outside, and he had a nice office and the heat felt good. I almost dozed off.

Q: Who was he working for?

A: No comment.

Q: What does this have to do with you quitting the propaganda trade?

A: I'm getting to that. After I left his office, I tried to catch a cab, but I couldn't find one. So I walked to the Museum of Modern Art and went in. I almost never go to museums. I wandered around for half an hour or so, and I came across a Corot painting, I think. My memory is a little hazy on it. I didn't like the painting much. I remember that. It was gloomy. But there was a purple in it. A sort of gray-purple. And I fixated on it. I couldn't stop looking at it. It seemed like the greatest thing in the world at that moment. I don't know why. It was so beautiful. If it was on a dish, I would have eaten it.

Q: So this advertising guy had talked to you about color, and then you were looking at it, in a painting.

A: Yeah. Only propaganda or PR or bullshit was the furthest thing from my mind. That was the point. I was just looking at color.

Q: And what happened?

A: I was transported. You could say that. I went into a different kind of reality. It felt very good. There was no deception in that world. It was exactly what it was. I had never come across an experience where everything was exactly what it was and was so damn good, so beautiful. It lacked all artifice. It wasn't coming at me around the corner with an agenda. It was itself. That's all it meant to be. It was like a voice talking to me, saying, "Here I am. Relax. It's all good."

Q: And that had---

A: That had a huge effect on me. I said to myself, "What am I doing? Why am I trying to fake people out and fool them and bamboozle them IF THIS EXISTS, this color?" Weird, eh?

Q: Not to me.

A: That's why I'm telling you. In that moment, my whole life, such as it was, fell apart like a plate sliding off a table and breaking on the floor.

Q: Just like that.

A: Just like that.

Q: And that's how you got interested in painting?

A: Yeah. That was the moment. Everything turned upside down. I was knocked out by a punch. That purple. (laughs)

Q: What did you see? I mean, can you say anything else about looking at that color?

A: I saw what I wanted. Not what I thought I wanted. I wanted that color. I was like a guy in the water off a boat, and I was clinging to a life preserver. That color. Only I wasn't scared. I was happy. Happy in a different way than I had ever felt in my life.

Q: You knew what you wanted. Not what you thought you wanted.

A: Right. And I saw the difference, the distinction.

Q: And you decided to get out of the propaganda business.

A: Yeah. Because for the first time, I saw something and felt something---that damn color---that was so much itself, so much what it was, there was no pretense. And I wanted it right down to my core. In terms of what you've been writing about and teaching these days, I saw my desire and I manifested it on the spot---all in a few seconds.

Q: And it changed everything.

A: Yeah.

###END###

May 25, 2006

Here, Ellis gets into some very sophisticated and important material about desire and manifestation.

Q: After our recent interview, you wanted to say more about painting?

A: Yes. I haven't talked much about it in the past, but I do paint almost every day now.

Q: That often.

A: Yes.

Q: What are you---

A: Let me put it this way. From painting, I've learned that you can choose what you desire.

Q: What do you mean?

A: Let's say I'm feeling a fascination for the color red. I'm taken with it completely for the moment. So I paint red pictures. But as I'm doing this, I feel a sinking sensation.

Q: Why?

A: Because although it's what I desire, I'm overdoing it.

Q: I'm not sure I understand.

A: I'm all about red. I keep pushing red. As I do, I feel unhappy.

Q: But why do you feel unhappy?

A: I'm going too far with it. I'm following like a dog, an obedient dog, what I desire. I desire red, so I keep sniffing it and painting it, and I begin to feel uncomfortable. I want red, but I'm limiting myself. I'm focusing too much on it.

Q: But you want red.

A: Yes, it feels very natural for me to want red at that moment. It feels so natural I think I've got my hands on what I want. And yet...it's not completely satisfying.

Q: Again, why not?

A: Because a connection with myself has been broken.

Q: This is fascinating, but I don't understand.

A: I can see that.

Q: So explain it.

A: Desire is certainly a key. You go ahead and you manifest what you desire, but there is a further possibility: you decide what you want.

Q: You don't just discover what you want. You invent what you want?

A: Exactly.

Q: Well, I can certainly see that a person can decide or invent what he wants, but why is that so important?

A: Because it vaults you into new territory. You haven't been there before.

Q: And if you don't do that?

A: You develop a keen sense for what you want, but you keep following it like a dog and you let it lead you around by the nose, and after a period of time, you are finding out nothing new, and that becomes boring.

Q: This is getting a little clearer.

A: Good. You see, there are several territories, you might say, where desire enters in. Several different territories. For example, advertising people are plugged into one area. They are getting consumers to want what they the consumers already want: the superficial stuff. But if a person keeps going after that kind of stuff, he gets bored and irritable and peeved. He doesn't know why, but he gets fed up. He's fulfilling desire, but at a level where it doesn't matter after a while.

Q: And you're saying it's the same thing with red.

A: Exactly! You keep going after red and getting red, and you're painting red, and you like red and you desire red, but you're following the track of desire too closely. You're turning into a robot of getting what you desire, because you're only consulting your desires in one type of area.

Q: I could make an analogy to food.

A: That's good. You love steak. You desire steak and potatoes, and so you eat it every night. After two weeks, you're bloated and bored. So you go to the next thing that pops up as something you desire: cheese. You eat it every day for a week, and again you feel bloated. The next thing is chocolate...and so on. At each step you're manifesting what you desire, but it's all on the same level.

Q: The whole idea of manifestation, though, is to discover deeper levels of what you desire.

A: Yes. And that's very important. I'm suggesting you can help that process along by looking for something NEW.

Q: Something new to desire.

A: Yes. I go to the museum and I see a painting by Matta, the surrealist, and I don't really like it but it gives me a few ideas I never had before. I ponder that, and I come up with a vague idea for a painting I've never tried before, and THAT peaks my interest. I desire THAT, even though I can't define it exactly. But I go for it in my next painting, and as a result, I'm painting something new, something I never dreamed of before. Now my desire is expanding into new territory. It's different. I'm into a whole new RANGE of desire. That's how people get out of a rut in their work and in their lives. That's how they escape from ads and advertising people and those hidden persuaders. You go to a new LEVEL of desire, where innovation and invention of the NEW are paramount.

Q: That's very, very good.

A: Yes. You see, you don't get out of the Pavlovian rut of consumerism by shifting from buying a Ford to buying a Lincoln. That's all on the same level. You get out of the rut by moving into something quite different. Only you can decide what that would be, but you take the leap and desire something quite different and then you manifest THAT. Now, you're really off and running.

Q: Yes.

A: That's how each individual really changes his life, and that's how society as a whole changes into something meaningful. You walk away from a whole LEVEL of desire, and you enter into another level. In order to do that, you need to invent new desire. You need to dream it up as you go along. You need to have some courage. You need to take a leap. I don't care whether it's buying habits or a business model or a new type of very local government or a solution to a problem---you look for something that's very different. Why? Because you can. And then you discover something very profound. You really DO desire something that exists at a whole new level. You change the rules of the game. A man like Tesla could have gone along inventing machines that all operated in more or less the same way. But instead he went for different TYPES of energy. He took the plunge. And he arrived. He entered new territory. He left---

Q: He left the cultural consensus. He left the consensus of science.

A: Yes. People can do this in a lot of different ways. They just have to be alert for it. They have to push it. They have to INVENT.

Q: There is no blueprint for that.

A: Right. People keep looking for blueprints. But here that doesn't work. You have to do some "alchemy." You have to gamble. You have to dream up something different and then explore it. Even if you ultimately reject it, you've gotten a few new ideas, and you can apply those ideas to your future. You can improvise. You can change your basis of operation. I've seen this happen so often in life. A person finds

out what he wants, and then goes after it. It's good. It's natural. But then, a few months or years later, he doesn't want it anymore. He knows all about it. It doesn't have any energy left in it. And then he's stuck. He's all washed up. He doesn't know what to do. He's run out of options. He needs a shift. He needs to invent something new that he might want, and he has to pursue it. So he does. And then the light dawns. He's into a whole new area of desire, and he feels a lot better. He's motivated in a different way. He's branching out. He's---

Q: More alive.

A: Definitely more alive.

###END###

July 19, 2006

SCIENTIFIC HOAX AND THE MAGICAL PLANE

An interview with Ellis follows after this article.

This article takes up the whole connection between the "art" that is manifested for us and the much more powerful manifestations that we do for ourselves. It uses, as an example of what is created for us, the whole system of HIV testing---in other words, a scientific hoax. Basically, the article shows people that AFTER you expose a hoax in all its details, there is still much ground to cover. That ground is all about manifesting something better and unique and different and powerful. I could have called this article: WHAT DO YOU DO AFTER YOU'VE TAKEN APART CONSPIRACIES?)

This article is about two sides of a coin: what has been created for us, and what we decide on our own to create. It is not only a statement of fact; it is a statement of personal position on the way the world works and what we can do about it. It is a thesis on the interaction between physical cause-and-effect and magical causation.

For the past 25 years, I have been pursuing two major areas of research. The first stems from my work as a reporter specializing in investigations of medical fraud. The second area is the creation of alternative realities by the paranormal power of imagination.

It would seem that these two subjects are light years apart. I will show in this article that they are connected in important and profound ways.

First, I want to take up, in detail, HIV testing as an illustration of the complex nature of medical hoaxes. (I could have chosen any number of other medical examples.) It's vital to present the details, because only then can we see the structure of the hoax, in the same way that a person might notice, after repeated viewings, various aspects of a major painting by, say, Dali or Gauguin. And only after seeing into the dimensions of such a hoax can we make the connection between fraud and the true power of imagination. Much more on that later.

First: HIV testing. Accurate? Misleading? Worthwhile? Absurd? Helpful? Harmful?

On July 12, 2006, ABC News ran a story about testing all adults in America for HIV:

"Along with Washington's new screening program, the national Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC] is expected to release similar guidelines this summer that would expand HIV screening to all adults in the United States.

"If this happens, it means that just about anybody over the age of 13 could be asked by their doctor, 'Would you like an HIV test?'"

Although this would not be a compulsory program, it would be another step in that direction. And of course, in a doctor's office or in a hospital, many patients simply go along with doctors' recommendations.

If a doctor says, "Would you like to get tested for AIDS? It's very important, it could save your life," the patient will often give his/her consent.

The CDC is also claiming that today's HIV tests are much more accurate than the tests done in the early years of AIDS. However, in the early years, US health authorities asserted that standard HIV tests were 99.78% accurate, which is to say they very, very rarely called a patient HIV positive when he/she wasn't. Were US health authorities lying then, or are they lying now—or both?

In 1988, my book, AIDS INC., was published. It was the first book that challenged the assumption that HIV causes AIDS.

I also devoted an entire chapter to proving that routine HIV tests were unscientific, useless, misleading, and produced devastating results, since those tests were (and are) the gateway into highly toxic drugs---to say nothing of the horrendous consequences of telling a person he has contracted an ultimately fatal disease.

In the years since 1988, a great deal of information has come to light regarding HIV tests.

For example, last year (2005), the following explosive lead paragraph appeared in a KTVU/Associated Press story:

Anxiety Triggered By AIDS Test/ False Positive Results

POSTED: 8:01 am PST December 9, 2005

UPDATED: 8:23 am PST December 9, 2005

SAN FRANCISCO – "A promising new oral HIV test that uses fluid swabbed from the mouth to quickly and easily detect the virus that causes AIDS incorrectly diagnosed a quarter of the people who tested positive in San Francisco, city health officials found."

People were tested for HIV, told they were positive, when in fact this was false.

The article continues:

"Forty-seven people who tested positive after using the OraQuick Advance HIV test in city clinics were not infected at all, the San Francisco Department of Public Health said this week."

So apparently, not all HIV tests are "much more accurate today."

At the end of the article, a scientist at the California Office of AIDS made a telling admission:

"One explanation for the spate of false positives might be that there is something unique about the San Francisco group, such as a high number of people with hepatitis, that may unexpectedly interfere with the test results, said Deanne Sykes, a research scientist for the California Office of AIDS.

"We will watch it,' she said. 'We will monitor it to see if there is something consistent we can pinpoint.'"

Sykes was stating that hepatitis might cause the HIV blood test to register positive when it was really negative. This is called a cross-reaction.

Actually, blood products given to treat hepatitis, as well as the hepatitis B vaccine, can both cause a false-positive HIV test. This has been known for a long time.

See, for example, Lee, D, Eby W, Molinaro, G. 1992. HIV false positivity after Hepatitis B vaccination. *Lancet* 339: 1060.

There is a great deal of useful information you can find on HIV tests, if you go to Christine Maggiore's excellent site, www.aliveandwell.com

Here are some citations assembled at Alive and Well:

"The only way to distinguish between real reactions and cross-reactions is to use HIV isolation. All claims of HIV isolation are based on a set of phenomena detected in tissue culture, none of which are isolation and none of which are even specific for retroviruses...We don't know how many positive tests occur in the absence of HIV infection. There is no specificity of the HIV antibody tests for HIV infection."

Bio/Technology Journal, 11:696-707, 1993

"The HIV antibody tests do not detect a virus. They test for any antibodies that react with an assortment of proteins experts claim are specific to HIV. The fact is that an antibody test, even if repeated and found positive a thousand times, does not prove the presence of viral infection."

Val Turner, MD, *Continuum magazine*, Vol 3 No 5, 1996

"HIV tests are notoriously unreliable in Africa. A 1994 study published in the *Journal of Infectious Diseases* concluded that HIV tests were useless in central Africa, where the microbes responsible for tuberculosis, malaria and leprosy were so prevalent that they [cross reacted] and registered over 70% false positive [for HIV]."

Sacramento Bee, October 30, 1994

"With public health officials and politicians thrashing out who should be tested for HIV, the accuracy of the test itself has been nearly ignored. A study last month by Congress' Office of Technology Assessment found that HIV tests can be very inaccurate indeed. For groups at very low risk -- people who don't use IV drugs or

have sex with gay or bisexual men -- 9 in 10 positive findings are called false positives, indicating infection where none exists."

US News & World Report, November 23, 1987

"People who receive gamma globulin shots for chicken pox, measles and hepatitis could test positive for HIV even if they've never been infected [with HIV]. The Food and Drug Administration says that a positive test could be caused by antibodies found in most of America's supply of gamma globulin. Gamma globulin is made from blood collected from thousands of donors and is routinely given to millions of people each year as temporary protection against many infectious diseases. Dr. Thomas Zuck of the FDA's Blood and Blood Products Division says the government didn't release the information because 'we thought it would do more harm than good.'"

USA Today, October 2, 1987

"Two weeks ago, a 3-year-old child in Winston Salem, North Carolina, was struck by a car and rushed to a nearby hospital. Because the child's skull had been broken and there was a blood spill, the hospital performed an HIV test. As the traumatized mother was sitting at her child's bedside, a doctor came in and told her the child was HIV-positive. Both parents are negative. The doctor told the mother that she needed to launch an investigation into her entire family and circle of friends because this child had been sexually abused. There was no other way, the doctor said, that the child could be positive. A few days later, the mother demanded a second test. It came back negative. The hospital held a press conference where a remarkable admission was made. In her effort to clear the hospital of any wrongdoing, a hospital spokesperson announced that 'these HIV tests are not reliable; a lot of factors can skew the tests, like fever or pregnancy. Everybody knows that.'"

Celia Farber, Impression Magazine, June 21, 1999

"A Vancouver woman is suing St. Paul's Hospital and several doctors because she was diagnosed as carrying the AIDS virus, when in fact she wasn't. In a BC Supreme Court writ, Lisa Lebed claims when she was admitted to the hospital in late 1995 to give birth to a daughter, a blood sample was taken without her consent. It revealed she was HIV positive, so she gave up the baby girl for adoption and decided to have a tubal ligation. A year and a half later, while undergoing AIDS treatment, she found out she was not HIV positive. The explanation she was given was a lab error. She says because of the negligence of the hospital, she's now sterile and has lost a daughter."

Woman Sues St. Paul's, CKNW Radio 98, June 10, 1999.

While writing AIDS INC., I was told by an employee of the FDA that the universally used Elisa blood test for HIV was, in fact, designed to cast a very wide net and catch possible HIV contamination in the overall stored blood supply. The tests were not designed for individuals. The tests were too broad and too unreliable for individuals.

The FDA is the federal licensing agency for all US AIDS testing. In 1987, a person from their Washington office sent me a rather stunning document simply titled "Summary and Explanation of the Test," dated July 23, 1987 (and not on Agency letterhead): "In order to afford maximum protection of the blood supply, the EIA [Elisa] test was designed to be extremely sensitive. As a result, non-specific [falsely positive] reactions may be seen in samples from some people...due to prior pregnancy, blood transfusions, or other exposure..."

Remember, in those days, US medical authorities were touting the Elisa test as extremely accurate for individuals---99.78% accurate in being able to find true HIV-negative people.

I recently made several phone calls to the FDA. On July 17, 2006, the FDA press office connected me to Paul Richards. He consulted an FDA spreadsheet. He found that the FDA had approved and licensed a blood test for HIV in 1985 (shortly after the test was developed). But that license was for screening donors who were giving blood at clinics. It wasn't for diagnosing HIV in a patient. The earliest approval license Richards could find for diagnostic purposes was 1990---a full six years after the Elisa test was developed. As far as I can determine, the Elisa test was in use for diagnostic purposes roughly five years before FDA approved it. This certainly raises red flags.

The Elisa test is, by far, the most widely used instrument for determining whether an individual is HIV positive or negative. Conventional wisdom has it that the ultimate backup for the Elisa is the Western Blot test, which has been called the gold standard. In other words, to verify (or negate) a positive Elisa, a person should get a confirmatory Western Blot.

However, while writing AIDS INC. and searching the medical literature, I found a paper published in the March 1987 issue of the Journal of Clinical Microbiology. The author, James Carlson, of the University of California at Davis School of Pathology, dropped a bombshell. He stated that in low-risk groups, the false-positive rate in Elisa tests was an overwhelming "84.2% in our study and 77.1% recently reported by the American Red Cross..."

In plain English, this means that, of all the individuals from low-risk groups who are Elisa tested for HIV, the overwhelming number of those who test positive are not really positive at all.

Carlson continues: "It must be noted that even though we feel the Western Blot technique is presently the most acceptable method...Western Blot analysis is a subjective method with quality control limitations; the possibility of false-positive results still exists..."

The January 9, 1986, issue of the New England Journal of Medicine contained a report on a 34-year-old woman from rural Alabama who tested positive for HIV on an Elisa test. The woman had four more Elisa tests. They, too, came up positive.

Next, a Western Blot test was done. It was strongly positive. What else could one ask for?

But then new blood was drawn from the woman and sent to a handful of prestigious labs for analysis. Now all the Elisa and Western Blot tests were NEGATIVE.

Then the Elisa tests were repeated at two of these labs. They were both POSITIVE.

“Western Blot tests,” the authors conclude, “have been used as the gold standard by which other tests [the Elisias] are judged to be falsely positive [or truly positive]...the need for improved confirmatory tests...is evident.” This is a polite way of saying Western Blot is unreliable.

British researcher LJ Oldham, writing in the *Journal of Medical Virology* (January, 1987), concludes: “Our findings suggest that Western Blot cannot be depended upon as the sole confirmatory test for [HIV].”

In the same paper, Oldham states: “As has been shown, Western Blot lacks full sensitivity and specificity.” Sensitivity would enable the test to discover people who were HIV positive, and specificity would keep the tests from calling people HIV positive who weren’t.

Evelyn Lennette, writing in the February 1987 *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, indicates that “both of these assays [Elisa and Western Blot] have drawbacks...[there are] reports of both false-positive and false-negative results with the Elisa, necessitating the use of a second confirmatory test...The immunoblot [Western Blot] is also not free from false results.”

Perhaps the most devastating analysis of HIV testing was offered by Dr. Harvey Fineberg. When I interviewed Fineberg in 1988, he was Dean of the Harvard School of Public Health. Later, he went on to become Provost of Harvard University, and then was appointed the president of the very prestigious Institute of Medicine. A man with impeccable conventional credentials, Fineberg had, in the spring of 1987, published a statistical analysis of HIV testing in *Law, Medicine, and Healthcare*.

“To begin with,” Fineberg told me on the phone, “in the study, we accepted the advertised accuracy ratings of the Elisa test. It’s reportedly able to find true [HIV] positives at a rate of 93.4 percent, and it supposedly can detect true [HIV] negatives correctly 99.78 percent of the time.

“So let’s say that three out of 10,000 people in the US are really infected with the HIV virus. If we consider a sample of 100,000 people, that means 30 will actually be infected with HIV. The Elisa test will be able to pinpoint 93.4 percent, or 28 of those people.

“On the other side of the ledger, that leaves 99,970 out of 100,000 who are truly not infected with the AIDS virus.

"If the Elisa test is 99.78 percent capable of finding these real [HIV] negatives, it will locate 99,750 of these people without fail. That leaves 220 [HIV] negatives it missed." How did it miss? By calling those 220 people [HIV] positive.

Fineberg stated, "So now you have, out of every 100,000 people, 28 truly [HIV] positive and 220 falsely positive test results. That means the statistical chances are about 90 percent that [an HIV] positive-reading Elisa is wrongly positive [false-positive]."

Fineberg continued: "A second Elisa won't change that either. If you do a Western Blot, the odds might, at best, be lowered to 25 percent. In other words, a fourth of the time, a positive AIDS test would be false-positive."

Fineberg's analysis was largely ignored by the mainstream press, medical researchers, and of course the US government, which was funding most of the major research on AIDS.

In fact, as you can see from reading what I've presented so far in this article, a great deal of CONVENTIONAL medical assessment of the crippling problems associated with AIDS testing was ignored.

The reason for this avoidance was obvious. There existed (and continues to exist) a network of government funders, government labs, private AIDS fund-raising agencies, PR groups, "star researchers," medical journals, compliant and superficial medical reporters, and drug companies---to say nothing of the FDA and the World Health Organization---devoted to presenting HIV testing as an entirely reliable instrument.

An admission that this whole testing system was (and is) scientifically bankrupt and dangerous would collapse the whole AIDS structure of certainty.

And this is just the beginning of the problem with AIDS tests.

So far, I have been discussing what is called antibody testing. In both the Elisa and Western blot techniques, the patient's blood is analyzed to discover whether he has been producing antibodies, which are part of the overall immune response against a given germ.

What does the presence of these antibodies mean?

Perhaps we can glean a clue from a rather astonishing mainstream comment on the current bird-flu hysteria. Near the end of a NY Times article ("Hazards in the hunt for flu bug") by medical reporter Gina Kolata (November 9, 2005), we find the following reference to Dr. Peter Palese, of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York:

"Some experts like Peter Palese of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York said the H5N1 viruses are a false alarm. He notes that studies of serum collected in 1992 from people in rural China indicated that millions there had antibodies to the

H5N1 strain. That means they had been infected with an H5N1 bird virus and recovered, apparently without incident."

Until AIDS testing took off in earnest in the mid-1980s, it was generally assumed that the presence of antibodies in a patient signified good health. The patient had contacted a germ, mounted an immune response, and the germ was neutralized. There was certainly no consensus that antibodies meant present or future disease across the board.

In other words, if millions of people in China had encountered H5N1 (bird flu) viruses and showed antibodies to these viruses, it would be expected that they would remain healthy.

Except that with the onset of AIDS research, everything was stood on its head. People who were tested and called HIV-positive---meaning they had antibodies to the virus---were said to be sick or on a sure road to becoming sick.

So now we have another level of the AIDS testing hoax. Why were people being tested for antibodies to HIV? Why was that method presumed to be significant at all? Why wasn't the presence of antibodies to HIV taken as a sign of health?

Millions of people all over the world have been subjected to the Elisa and Western Blot HIV tests---both of which have the sole objective of finding antibodies to HIV. Why have these tests been elevated to the status of present or future disease detectives?

While writing AIDS INC. in 1988, I had a very interesting conversation with a doctor at the US National Institutes of Health. He told me that when an HIV vaccine eventually went into testing (and when it was later released for use on the public), every person who got the vaccine would be given a special letter.

The letter would say that the person had received the vaccine. The letter would say that if, at any time, the person was subsequently tested for HIV and came up positive---meaning he had antibodies to HIV---this should NOT be taken as a sign of present or future illness. In this case, the person was actually immune to HIV, because he had "received" his antibodies from the vaccine.

I almost fell off my chair. I said, "Let me get this straight. If a person develops antibodies naturally to HIV, he is told he is either sick now or will get sick. But if gets his antibodies---the same antibodies---to HIV from a vaccine, he is told he is immune to the virus."

The doctor gave me no clear response.

This explosive contradiction has been studiously ignored by the mainstream press and by the entire AIDS establishment network.

By conventional standards (not mine), the whole point of a vaccine is to confer immunity to a germ by producing antibodies to that germ in the body. That is the essence and the standard of a “good vaccine.”

And yet, in the case of AIDS research, all this was turned upside down. Suddenly, HIV positive meant: the patient has antibodies to HIV and this is a sign that he will become very ill and most likely die.

To sum up: not only are both HIV antibody tests (Elisa and Western Blot) unreliable in finding true positives, as opposed to false positives, the WHOLE IDEA of using the presence of antibodies as an unmistakable sign of present or future illness is without merit.

Two levels of madness.

Add to this the question of whether a germ called HIV has anything to do with what has been called AIDS, and you have yet a third level. For reasons of space, I’m not taking up that question in this article. But in my book, AIDS INC., I have offered much evidence that HIV has nothing to do with the various immune deficiencies that have been lumped together and called AIDS.

To bolster the assumption that a positive HIV test does lead to grave illness, studies have been done to track healthy people who test positive. This method, it is thought, would establish that being HIV positive is, in fact, a predictor of illness and death.

The most comprehensive such study, taking in several thousand gay men, the San Francisco Men’s Study, is often cited to prove that being HIV positive leads to full-blown AIDS. However, the study has many flaws. Perhaps most importantly, it has failed to track accurately a group of men who started off as HIV negative. In other words, if enough men from that HIV-negative group also developed severe immune deficiency (the hallmark of what is called AIDS), then a positive HIV test would not be a predictor of illness.

It turned out that there was a group of men in the San Francisco Men’s Study who were HIV positive, who had declined the (highly toxic) AIDS drugs like AZT, or had gone off them. As reported in the press, these men had remained healthy for eight years or longer and were still going strong.

I queried one of the researchers in the San Francisco Study. I asked her why she and her colleagues hadn’t trumpeted these findings as highly significant. She said they just didn’t think it was all that important.

In conventional terms, under the most rigorous of conditions, if you want to do a tracking study that proves HIV-positive status leads to full-blown disease and death, you must have a control group: a group of people who are HIV negative to begin with. And most importantly, you must choose both groups according to the same relevant factors. For example, all the people in the study, from both groups, must have a very similar nutritional status. They must be taking similar recreational

drugs in similar quantities (or not taking them at all). They must have similar medical histories. They must be having sex with a similar number of partners. They must show a similar profile of, for example, intestinal parasites. They must reveal a similar level of exposure to environmental chemicals. And so on and so forth.

Why? Because all of the above factors and more (for instance, aspartame ingestion, and number and type of vaccines received) can be implicated in immune-system compromise. And at the heart of it, what is being called AIDS, from Uganda to New York, is nothing more and nothing less than immune-system deterioration.

No tracking study which adheres to these rigorous standards has ever been done.

There is one other point to be made. The very act of diagnosing a person as HIV positive carries with it a kind of hypnotic power. This effect, of course, is downplayed by mainstream researchers. But it certainly can produce a thorough expectation of future illness and/or death. It does induce great fear and disorientation. And these factors, acting within what could be called the mind-body complex, have sharply negative consequences, to say the least.

When analyzing how this whole HIV testing hoax came into being, and why it is being sustained, I have, at different times, cut into the stratified layers of motive at different levels.

Here are some of those motives: to profit from selling drugs and HIV test kits; to gain and upgrade individual status as a researcher; to protect an employment position; to go along with the herd; to cover up past mistakes; to avoid criminal charges; to use a cover story (HIV) to obscure the actual and simple reasons for widespread death in the so-called Third World---systematic starvation, water contamination, overcrowding, poverty, stolen land, and toxic vaccines: an entire system that has been installed, for a very long time, in order to kill (via a depopulation agenda) large numbers of people and keep the rest in a weakened state...

There are a whole host of motives for supporting the past and current HIV testing apparatus.

In addition to antibody testing for HIV, there is another method, less popular, that relies on what is called PCR. PCR stands for Polymerase Chain Reaction. Some proponents of HIV testing point to PCR as the new gold standard, the final backup, the ultimate tool.

PCR takes, from a patient's blood, a very tiny amount of genetic material that is suspected of being a component of a virus, and "amplifies it," "blows it up" to a size where it can be identified and studied.

Much can be said about PCR, but here is the crux: if technicians can only find a miniscule amount of material (in a patient) that may be HIV, no matter how much “amplification” is applied to that sample, there is no reliable way of inferring that the patient is carrying a large number (millions and millions) of HIVs.

And why is that important? Because, in order for some germ to be called a cause of illness, millions of those germs must be in the body, and they must be doing some real damage to cells. Otherwise, the inference drawn is meaningless.

Our bodies contain who knows how many germs? Mostly, they have no negative effect on health. The presence of a tiny, tiny amount of what may be viral material is irrelevant.

Now that I have presented a good deal of specific material about HIV testing, I want to offer excerpts from three interviews I did about two years ago with Ellis Medavoy.

As you know, Ellis is a retired PR man. He is an expert on the uses of propaganda.

For several years, Medavoy was part of an effort to foist on the world the conventional hypothesis about HIV and AIDS.

In my 25 years as a reporter, I have met no one who approaches Medavoy’s deep understanding of propaganda.

It is clear from conversations I’ve had with him that Ellis once worked for a small core of people who were in turn connected to two or three members of the Council on Foreign Relations. In the case of AIDS, however, I can’t say with certainty that Ellis’ assignments were given from that source. But Ellis was working on assignment and he had a job to do: make key conventional concepts about AIDS “as real as cars and clocks and planes and supermarkets,” as he puts it.

You’ll glean the rest from these excerpts from our conversations:

Q (Rappoport): How did you do your job?

A (Medavoy): I’ve told you all this before.

Q: Do it again.

A: Basically, I was the fountainhead for what reporters call their “reliable sources.” I fed information to these reliable sources, and they then spoke with reporters, who wrote stories.

Q: So you were two levels removed from the public.

A: Right. It’s comfortable that way.

Q: So you had to convince these reliable sources that you yourself were reliable.

A: As a PR man, you build up that confidence in your people over years of work. You feed them stories that aren't stories yet, and then they see the stories happen. They believe.

Q: In the case of AIDS, what was your mission?

A: I had several jobs. I needed to cement in the concepts that HIV caused AIDS, that HIV testing was valid, and that AIDS was, in fact, one condition at its root, stemming from the destructive action of HIV.

Q: Did you believe any of this yourself?

A: (laughs) You know I didn't. I knew these were outright lies. But as a PR operative, that wasn't my business.

Q: So you told these reliable sources what?

A: I told them I had inside information from the labs that were doing the key research on AIDS. It was more complex than that, but that was it, essentially. I told them, for example, in the early days---1982---that AIDS would definitely spread across the globe, that researchers were saying this was "the big one," and so on.

Q: You knew this was a lie?

A: I knew that AIDS was nothing more than a label, that it joined together all sorts of immune-system destruction that emanated from different causes, none of which had anything to do with a virus called HIV.

Q: ...What about HIV testing?

A: It was a dud. It made no sense, if you really looked at the science.

Q: You mean it was unreliable.

A: Of course. Antibodies have nothing to do with becoming sick and dying. I and others had to sell the false connection. I used the false pronouncements by researchers, and I relied on the basic ignorance of reporters. I was painting a picture.

Q: Painting a picture?

A: Sure. Look, science can be seen in different ways. You can break it down into a series of statements and the evidence for those statements, or you can see it as an impressionist painting. A whole landscape. I was a painter. I was a story-teller. I sold stories and images. I sprinkled those images with so-called "facts" and that made the painting seem real.

Q: This is important.

A: No kidding. It's everything. You get someone who is already slightly disposed to seeing things in a certain way, and you feed them the rest. You fill in their picture. You confirm what they already suspect. For instance, I knew a man who often was a "reliable source" for a major reporter in New York. I knew this reliable source pretty well. I knew he was a "pandemic man."

Q: Meaning?

A: He loved the idea of pandemics. He was into that crap. So I painted him a picture of the pandemic called AIDS. Caused by HIV. I kept using words like "plague" and "latent virus." He ate it up like candy. I could see his mind working on it. The virus that hides in the body for ten years and suddenly activates. It was, in a real sense, his picture, but he didn't fully know it. So I provided the pieces of the painting that were missing for him.

Q: And then he talked to his reporter friend.

A: Yeah.

Q: You considered yourself an artist.

A: No. I WAS an artist. I made certain "worlds" come alive for people.

Q: You painted; they looked at what you painted with---

A: Awe. Reverence. Gratitude. Satisfaction.

Q: This is what propaganda is?

A: Of course. I brought these paintings, these "other worlds" into the "real world" for people. I wove them together. I made the world and they looked at it.

Q: You made the world.

A: Take planet Earth. What is it, really? Trees, earth, sand, ocean, sky, animals, rivers? Look at the bare essentials of this planet, and then think about what everybody believes and accepts. They believe much more than the bare essentials, but **THEY THINK THEY ARE LOOKING AT THE REAL WORLD**. Get it? I'm creating the world for them. That's propaganda. That's the art of propaganda.

Q: Like all those painters who did murals for the Roman Church.

A: Just like that. People saw the Church cosmology---the Church propaganda---as woven into the real world. There was no distinction, for many people. Or take some goofy theory about the mystical nature of certain symbols or objects. People---artists---spend their lives building up the "meaning" of those symbols. And then other people buy it and add it to the real world and say it is an "added dimension" to the real world. It's the same way with royal titles. What the hell is a royal title? Nothing, unless you have a good PR man or group working for you.

Q: So in the case of AIDS---

A: Look. It all comes down to the tests. That's where the so-called science makes its stand: "We have a test. It tells whether or not you are 'infected.' If you are, you'll get sick. So we have to give you drugs. The drugs are toxic, but so what? You're going to die anyway. This is a heroic measure." It all starts with the tests. People have to believe the tests are accurate, and they have to believe the tests mean something. So people like me are brought in to sell that. Sell it hard. "99 percent accurate. Works every time. Everybody should get tested." Just think about the idea of a test. It's a great word, isn't it? You take a test. You either pass or fail. You get a certain score on a test. It's real. And you don't get to say what your test score is. Somebody else, a priest in a white coat, gives you your test score. He knows. You don't know. He's the king of kings when it comes to tests.

Q: We've covered this before, but you DO have regrets about your former occupation, now that you're retired.

A: Of COURSE I have regrets. Why do you think I talk to you? Why do you think I want people to open their eyes to the simplest of things?

Q: From what you've been saying, you view your work with, say, the HIV tests as far more sophisticated than just passing on lies.

A: Come on. Of COURSE it's more sophisticated. It's easy to tell lies, and then people don't believe you and you're all washed up. You have to dress up the lies. You have to---by word and gesture and image---sell the lie by painting a picture. Just like a stage designer does. You want the stage set to convey a certain mood and a certain space and a certain urgency. You want to draw the audience into the play. You want them to FEEL that the "real world" and the stage world are connected in some important way. Except that as a propagandist, the house lights never come up. The author never takes a bow. The actors never leave the stage. You go on and on with your play. You keep painting, over and over. And you know what happens when you do THAT?

Q: What happens?

A: Eventually the play becomes totally integrated into the real world. There is no distinction.

Q: As an artist---

A: As an artist, you've made the world. You've invented it. And people accept that.

Q: That takes imagination. Inventing the world.

A: You better believe it.

Q: "I give you the world. The longest running play in existence. Buy it."

A: Exactly.

Q: You felt---

A: I felt and I knew I was creating the world, so to speak, for millions of people. I wasn't doing it alone, of course. But I was an individual artist working my black magic.

Q:...Why are you so insistent on making this point?

A: Because it's rather profound. It involves space.

Q: How?

A: When a painter looks at his canvas, he doesn't just see white surface. He sees potential spaces. To a civilian, this may sound like nonsense. But if the painter didn't see those spaces---

Q: He wouldn't be able to create the illusion of spaces, illusions that the viewer accepts.

A: Yeah. You're a painter. You understand that. I was doing that. I had newspapers and television indirectly at my disposal. And I knew how my "spaces" would be inserted into the media. I knew how. I was creating the world. To the average Joe, this is crazy talk. But the proof is in the pudding. I succeeded. I made people believe. Accept. Respond. I knew how my paintings would be received and used. I was operating on several levels. In some ways, it was really psychic. I was already living in the future and seeing how it would all play. I was the director. "Here are some stage flats and some lights. I'm creating a whole drama here, and you, Joe Public, are entranced. You don't see me doing what I'm doing. You don't want to. You just want to be entertained and scared and uplifted and moved. I'm giving you that. I'm inventing a world right here, and you're moving into it and living in it." THAT'S propaganda at its best. THAT'S what it's all about. If you're a real pro. If you're an artist...

Q: What's the ultimate, ultimate solution to this situation? What's the ultimate long-term solution?

A: That should be obvious. In the long run, there is one answer for the individual. He becomes the complete, intense, no-holds-barred, balls-to-the-wall artist of his own futures. He CREATES THAT.

And now we are on the plane of magic.

We are not victims buying into the magic, we are looking at how it works.

And what do we see?

Systems and programs and apparatuses and events and ideas and lies and gorgeous paintings and inspiring music and destructive projects and symbols are CREATED. They are, in a real sense, spontaneously created, on and on and on through time.

Outcomes stemming from these creations are much more than the result of chains of tight physical cause and effect.

From Ellis Medavoy's description, it is as if the whole HIV testing program and paradigm has been put up like pillars and girders and framing and board by workers (like Medavoy) in the middle of the night. There it is; we see it standing in all its wretched dimensions.

It is one network of crass and venal thought-forms.

It is A PERVERSE WORK OF ART.

It is created. Created and then foisted.

(An articulate research colleague of mine once wrote that for her personally, this vista of the whole structure of HIV testing was "floating in mid-air, paragraphs of scribbled gray lies on rusted iron slabs, attached to poles, surrounded by researchers announcing, ex-cathedra, their false discoveries. Horses pull this entire contraption by chains. The horses move sluggishly, as if in a (bad) dream, dragging the iron slabs through dirty clouds. Shepherding the parade are troops with bright weapons wearing white uniforms...")

In other words, she saw "HIV testing" as a series of created thought-forms.

There are people who are inventing dramas and paintings that capture our consent. We go on to act as if these inventions are as real as the reality we ascribe to chairs and tables and houses and grass and trees.

When we expand Medavoy's insights, we can say: our world is created for us. We can accept it as is, and adjust our actions on that basis, or we can refuse to function as audience.

On what should this refusal be based?

First, freedom from group consciousness.

Second, the realization that each one of us has the capacity to create his/her own realities.

And finally, the experiential knowledge that each one of us has the CREATIVE POWER to invent realities WHOSE SCOPE IS WITHOUT LIMIT.

I have given chapter and verse of the HIV testing hoax to make it clear that, on the magical plane---if one takes that point of view---much is happening that intends to bind us within pre-set parameters.

There are artists at work who want us to live inside their stage play, regardless of the harmful consequences to us. They design the sets. They turn on the lights. They cast the characters. They write the lines. They shape the plots. They concoct the endings.

To respond with anything less than our own individual art is absurd.

And here is the whole crux of the situation. If we indeed---each one of us---really does have the power to create realities of any scope without limit, then our whole world and universe and future become something potentially ecstatic.

In fact, we can do far more than respond to perverse art. We can take on a whole different view and position. We can recognize that creation is everywhere. Most importantly, it is the core of what each one of us IS.

If propagandists can create worlds for us, each one of us can ignore the reflex reaction to believe and accept---and instead, create our own worlds.

For 20-plus years as a reporter, I worked to uncover hoaxes and conspiracies and frauds and crimes of magnitude. I finally came to the place where that would no longer suffice. I had also been working as a painter since 1961. I knew that imagination was at the heart of what we are. I could see as clearly as my own hand that “they” were constructing a stage set (the world) for us. I could see where that was heading. And I also knew that, within each of us, there was a much greater creative power that owed allegiance and obedience to no propped up authority.

For the past year, I have been teaching seminars in the art and skill of manifestation: creating what you truly and deeply desire. This approach rests on the knowledge that every individual soul, every YOU, is naturally equipped to invent greater futures than all the planetary Elites put together. I am seeing that proving out.

My recent full-bore focus on the art and skill of positive manifestation does not exclude social or political action. Over the years, I have often taken part in such action. But something else is needed, too. That something else depends on awakening to a new view of life. A view that begins with the notion of powerful creation by each individual.

Here is a story that illustrates what I mean. In 1994, I met an artist in Los Angeles who had been diagnosed, three years earlier, as HIV positive. After reading AIDS INC. and talking with a few friends who were part of an alternative healing group, this woman came to a conclusion. As she put it to me, “I realized that I had been conned.”

She said, “The medical bosses and their henchmen gave me a death sentence based on fake tests. I was healthy when I was tested. After taking AZT for a few months, I could hardly get out of bed in the morning.

“I stopped taking AZT and decided to rebuild my health. I began exercising every day. I found a legitimate detox program and began it. I forced myself to paint every day, even though I was feeling terrible.

“The most important thing I did was paint. It brought me up out of a very deep depression caused by my [AZT] deteriorated physical state. I found myself again.

“I offloaded any prior ideas I had about ‘having a deadly virus.’ I just kept painting. Eventually I saw that I had been dealing with an invisible group of medical people who were trying to produce reality for me. They were painting me sick and dead. I was painting myself alive. I won.

“After a year or so, I arrived at some very deep understandings about my power. Whatever reality I was living in, I could create beyond it. Taking that position, I saw the way up and out.

“I also saw that this power I had went far beyond escaping a cul de sac I had found myself in after my HIV test. This power applied to everything in my life. Most of all, it applied to what I hadn’t created yet: my future.

“I tried a number of methods of meditation, and I learned from that. But I wanted something more. I kept coming back to the most obvious factor, the one I was already using to change my life: my own power.

“I finally took that power completely into my own hands. It’s pure magic. It enables me to build tomorrow and the next day, and next month and next year. It has paranormal facets, as well. I now know that my ‘ordinary self’ is just a limitation and a description of me in a compliant state of mind.

“I’m not compliant at all. I’m a rebel. I always have been. The root of that rebellion, as I see it now, comes from my insistence on creating as an artist---and I use the term ‘artist’ with its widest meaning.”

Today, this woman lives in a state of electric health.

What I not so fondly like to call Earth Culture insists on us viewing ourselves as limited in power and limited in choice. It states that if there is any magic to be had in our lives, it can only come as a result of attaching ourselves to higher powers who carry suitcases full of rules and requirements and pre-set cosmologies.

Magic, according to Earth Culture, means we must travel dim corridors and engage in ceremonies and rituals and take our strength from narrowly defined symbols and images. We must hope and plead and ask for things to be given.

But the unlimited creative power at our disposal---the power to create better and more adventurous lives and more positive and ecstatic futures---does not bow down to myths about material or spiritual dictators who want to lead us into swamps of despair-hope and misery-relief. These are wicked children’s games for puerile minds.

When we contemplate and taste the sensation of our own power, we can look back on the pieces of bad dreams others create for us, and see them as nothing more or less than perverse art, designed to build prison bars inside which we suffer and are swept back and forth between abject sadness and glimmers of relief. That is the wildly popular game: from pillar to post.

Using what is finally authentic---our own vast creative power---we invent what is to come. We do not submit.

What I have detailed in the first part of this article is simply a fragment of miserable Earth Culture in action, on parade. That it operates under the rubric of science---the most modern of religions---makes it all the more vicious and venal.

Some day, when millions of people are operating from their own true power, they will look back on such blatant absurdity and see it in the light of how far they have come.

We will say: "We were able to stop believing in the consensus stage play for one reason, and one reason only: each of us created and manifested something far, far better." That, whatever name you give it, IS magic."

###END##

August 17, 2006

Ellis Medavoy with insights on "THE END TIMES".

Q: What prompts you to speak about this subject?

A: One, I'm sick of it, and two, I've been doing your manifestation exercises.

Q: Okay, so what are the end-times?

A: Basic PR about the end of the world, and the triumph of the Good...

Q: PR.

A: Obviously. From time to time, there are disasters or wars or "crumblings," and civilizations go down. So if you predict The End, you'll be right eventually if you keep pushing the goalposts back further and further and wait for a hundred or five hundred or a thousand or five thousand years.

Q: You can't be wrong.

A: As long as you make the date vague, and bring in all sorts of nonsense about signs and symbols and the "fact" that the End is out of our hands.

Q: Higher power.

A: Higher power.

Q: And that's all there is to it?

A: Well, there is another thing. Process. Big process.

Q: What do you mean?

A: People want to connect to Big Process.

Q: I'm still not sure---

A: Think about it. People want to feel power. However they can. But most people don't actually want to exercise it. They just want to "enter the power zone" and feel the energy.

Q: And that's Big Process?

A: Sure. When you look at the end of the world stories, they all resonate with big shapes and destinies....Process....energy....the final turn of the clock hands....and people like that. They can be part of that energy....in their minds and imaginations....it's like fantasizing about joining the French Foreign Legion.....the adventure....it's like watching Star Trek.....

Q: Feeling power without having to actually use power.

A: Exactly. Let God manifest, but the person doesn't have to manifest anything. Ride the storm. Don't create one yourself. You know, when you join the army, you fight for a cause. Under that banner, you can kill people. You can do anything. But you always have an out. You can say you're acting on behalf of someone or something else. You aren't manifesting on a straight line. You're creating crooked. That's really why the whole end-times thing is a phony deal. It's the epitome of hitching your wagon to someone else's juice. It's a giant cop-out. It's passing the buck.

Q: Sounds like a pretty good description of Earth Culture.

A: It is. Believe me, it is.

###END###

September 15, 2006

Here is an article I wrote plus a brief interview with Ellis Medavoy.

It's all about money. It's about you having money, a lot of it. Perhaps a very great deal of money.

Is there something wrong with that?

A few years ago, I dealt with this question. It all comes back to the trust factor. In other words, I believe my readers having a lot of money would be a good thing, and I believe they would do good things with that money.

I'd rather my readers had a few billion dollars than people like Bill Gates and Warren Buffet.

In this economy, somebody is going have billions.

But money itself is not a bad thing.

Some people think it is, but that's their opinion.

Of course, there are lots of people in this world who sell stuff that is silly and even dangerous (arms dealers)...and they make a lot of \$\$\$ from that, but that doesn't make money bad.

Much of the world exists in poverty, but that doesn't make money itself bad.

I know as well as anyone that we, the human race, have the ability to ensure that no human on the face of the Earth goes hungry or goes without clothes or a place to live, and we can eliminate pollution and water contamination and lack of basic sanitation and all sorts of other heinous conditions....but where is that going to start? Are governments really going to do it? And if they did, wouldn't they take the money for it from you and everybody else in the form of taxes...and so, if you had the ideal of wiping out poverty from the face of the Earth, you'd have to start from individuals who have money and who want to do it. Because, let's face it, if governments did the job, they'd do it in some Soviet style, and they'd make the whole operation into something oppressive and gray and horrendous and enslaving. Governments don't spread freedom, they spread control.

Of course, a person could just dream about doing this good thing (eliminating poverty) and then blame governments or others for not doing it...but that wouldn't get the job done.

My point here is simply that money itself is not a bad thing.

Money invented out of thin air by men who pretend to be government banks when they are really private banks, men who take HUGE amounts of money off the top for themselves....that system is bad....but even that does not make the basic concept of money a bad thing.

Once in awhile, I get a wacky email from someone who says no one should have money...that's the gist of the email...but at the same time that person is doing nothing to launch a new system of money or whatever it is you would call it. And furthermore, that person already has some money, and gets it by working for a company whose aim is profit...so the whole deal is wacky....it doesn't add up.

Here is what does add up. If a person is operating from an idea about scarcity, if a person embraces scarcity in his own life, then that would be problem to that person. That person would not be able to embrace a notion of abundance for himself or anyone else.

On the subject of abundance and "what a person wants," here is my position, and it's reflected in every workshop I do. Manifestation is the process of creating what a person wants, by his own definition of what's good. When he/she walks that road, sooner or later, his concept of what he desires changes and opens up and he gets to wider and deeper desires, and this is happily transformative for the person. This is what changes lives for the better. If someone else steps in right at the beginning and tries to tell the person what he should want, the whole process breaks down right away. It doesn't work. That's a fact.

Here is a brief conversation with Ellis Medavoy:

Q: So what about having lots of money, Ellis?

A: You have to back up and start from a prior point.

Q: What point?

A: People are conditioned and taught that having money, lots of it, is a bad thing. It's the start of a lot of trouble.

Q: What trouble?

A: The whole consumer society, where people are always shopping and buying stuff...at this point in time, it's all reversed, it's coming from a sense that money is bad.

Q: What?

A: Yeah, that's right. You see, when you have a person who has a healthy idea about money, who really likes money...and isn't brainwashed, you get a whole different approach.

Q: What approach is that?

A: That person is going to buy a certain number of things, but mostly he's going to fulfill his desires that have to do with things other than money. The FIXATION on money comes from believing money is bad. That's where you get "the mad shopper" mentality.

Q: Perhaps you should explain "fixation."

A: Fixation is different from wanting money. You can want money very much and manifest it and so on, but when you're fixated on it and nothing else, you are reflecting a basic sense of scarcity. That's what that game is all about.

Q: So if a reader of mine manifested a billion dollars---

A: That would be a good thing. He'd use it to good ends. For himself and other people. We're trained, however, to believe that money itself is bad and that it automatically corrupts people. Money doesn't corrupt people, people corrupt themselves. It starts much earlier. The absolute fixation on money means a person can't really see anything else. His horizon is flat. He has no other desires he knows about, which of course is a fiction. He really does desire all sorts of other things, but he can't see that. He's "a robot for money." I'm sick and tired of the idea that money is already a corruption. It's like saying a stone is corrupt. No, a person who picks up the stone and hits another person over the head with it just to do it----we can all see where the badness is coming from. The stone didn't do it. We all nod our heads and say, "Well of course, we know that," but at the same time we tend to think that having a lot of money is bad. We have to get rid of that notion. We have to get past that. Certain religions like to say, "As long as one person in the world is poor, we are all guilty." Baloney. Why do religions say that? Because they are setting themselves up as fund-raising entities, and they need a reason to raise money from their congregations. Guilt does the trick. Guilt is a great fund raiser. Guilt is using an image of the poor masses of people to hold everyone else down. For example, you could use this trick: "no one should have power until and unless everyone has the same amount of power." In which case, individuals would go nowhere. Individuals are all about power. They have it. They can increase it. They can use it. And they don't have to gear themselves by how other people are doing. Take your power. Create it. Make it happen. Become as powerful as you really are. The destruction of the individual and the very concept of the individual is what planet Earth is all about now....which means that the few who rule the many will become more powerful. They have no problem with having power. They just want to use propaganda to keep everybody else down. Screw them. Rise up. Be as powerful as you are and can be...

###END###

October 8, 2006

AN INTERVIEW WITH ELLIS MEDAVOY ABOUT POWER

Ellis comments on this vital subject...

Q: What is power?

A: The ability to get things done.

Q: That's it? That's all?

A: No, that's not all. But it's a start. You have to start from somewhere. And in this society, the ability to get things done is viewed as a negative by lots of people.

Q: Why?

A: Because they live off not getting things done. They live off failing or not trying.

Q: That sounds like a sour note.

A: It is. I'm just telling you the facts. Along with failure comes excuses. So many we could never count them.

Q: For example?

A: "Bad things have happened to me, so I'm not going to try anymore. The people who did bad things to me exerted power, so power must be a bad thing in general..."

Q: Lunacy.

A: To be sure. If you cut power off at the knees right at the beginning, there is no success except failure and apathy.

Q: Everything is turned upside down.

A: That's right.

Q: Where did this come from?

A: From people themselves. They have bought into failure. They have re-shaped their own conception of themselves.

Q: It's almost like a perverse form of magic.

A: Right. It's magic turned to failure. Magic is used to create failure. It's crazy. Power to succeed is looked at as a crime.

Q: Do you see a way out of this?

A: Yes. One individual at a time. You pick up individuals who haven't succumbed to the bullshit.

Q: No other way?

A: None.

Q: Why not?

A: Because otherwise you're working with The Group, and in these times, most groups are bent on a collective mindset.

Q: How would you define "collective mindset?"

A: A thought is shared by every member of the group, but the responsibility for that thought is passed from one member to another. No one stands up and takes credit for the thought. It's all a mush. A stupid mush.

Q: And what if one member of the group does stand up and take credit for the thought?

A: He is lambasted. He is looked at as a traitor to the group concept. He takes the blows.

Q: I feel a religious kind of insanity there.

A: Yes. The religion is The Group. That's what the group stands for. Itself. It's a self-imposed weakness. "If we all become powerless as individuals, then we can form a group and find strength in that. We deny ourselves as individuals and go from there..."

Q: Kindness is worked in there.

A: It's looked at as a kindness to sacrifice self on the altar of the group. It's looked at as a form of generosity.

Q: But it isn't.

A: It's personal suicide.

Q: So that's the underlying theme.

A: Yes.

Q: Disgusting, don't you think?

A: I do. It's all about a lack of courage and about weakness. Those concepts are now raised as flags of triumph.

Q: Individual weakness morphs into the group.

A: It's a rather smooth transition. That's the whole point. To make the transition seem as smooth as possible. So no one really notices or talks about what's really happening. Every individual is already looking for a group, is already looking to give

up on himself. With that predisposition, it's going to be easy to make the morph happen.

Q: Of course, from another angle, there is all sorts of propaganda backing up the idea of the group as All.

A: Yes, but I don't want to let the individual off the hook. I don't want to make it seem that the individual is powerless to stop himself from melting into the group. That would just be another excuse. A nonsense excuse.

Q: Do you think America, at the beginning, in 1776, was really about individual power?

A: For the most part, no. It depends on who you read. Thomas Paine knew the score. But did anyone else? To an extent, Jefferson did. But not nearly as well as Paine.

###END###

Ellis Medavoy, 2011, Interview #1

Before I spoke with Ellis, once again, in 2011, I knew he had held back from me, even after persistent attempts on my part, several major stories he helped sell the public.

And now he talks about one of them.

Q: So my good man, have you repented all your sins yet?

A: I told a priest I would only speak to the Pope. That didn't work out.

Q: Because you know too much?

A: Something like that.

Q: What are you selling these days?

A: Apples, at a little farmer's market. For you, I tell the truth.

Q: I suppose I should feel honored, but I don't.

A: I'm not requiring that from you, as you well know. Reflected in all the conversations we've had, I've seen enough of myself to know I would never go back into my old world again. That's more than enough of a reward.

Q: Do people have to believe lies?

A: An interesting question. Most of them WANT to believe lies.

Q: Why?

A: Because it puts them into an oppositional game. They REALLY want that. A lie creates a counter. A truth stands alone. With most people, it creates boredom.

Q: So boredom is a factor.

A: It's vastly underrated as a motive for action. I mean, in the sense that people will do almost anything to escape a zero point.

Q: What?

A: Psychologically, people avoid silence. Truth is silence. When you have it, you have it. It's over. Game, set, match. A lie provokes a new game. Action. Boredom is what you feel when a game ends. If I tell you that a new epidemic is breaking out, and it's already in America, you have a lie. You can work with it. You can talk to your friends about it. You can argue. But if I say, "There is no epidemic," and that's the headline, people will jump out of windows. Right? They feel that silence, that boredom, that zero, and they don't like it. It makes them feel terrible. That's an element of human psychology. By the way, that's why you've had a few problems over the years.

Q: What are you talking about?

A: Come on. Get the cotton out of your ears.

Q: In other words--

A: In other words, some guy comes along and says, "Well, this isn't just an epidemic, this is biowarfare. They made it in a lab. They sent it out from a lab and it's infecting everybody, and you have to duck, because it may kill you." That story sells, my friend. Your story, which is THERE IS NOTHING, doesn't sell. It's that simple. You told the truth. He lied. He wins in the marketplace. And the reason he wins is because his lie allows people to escape boredom. Their adrenaline pumps.

Q: This has something to do with the Matrix?

A: Of course. But we'll get to that a little later. The point is, a man like myself could make a very good living selling lies because that's what people want. They can't see past their noses.

Q: Explain.

A: They don't know how to maintain excitement about life without those lies. They want the thrill.

Q: Is this just theory?

A: What? What's wrong with you? EVERYTHING I tell you has been tested in the trenches. It works. I'm giving you the fundamentals on which you can build a career in PR. I did. The world IS PR now, and very little else.

Q: Let's look at Swine Flu. You disappeared off the radar before I could quiz you on that one.

A: Ah yes, the pig nonsense. It was sold by the World Health Organization and the CDC. They're doing the lying in-house these days. They've got their own PR people, so if I had been in the game, they wouldn't have needed me to sell the story to the press. But other thing is, we have the internet now. So they didn't quite realize the power that would have to neutralize their scare tactic. You led the way on that.

Q: A lot of people did.

A: You don't realize the power you have. People look to you for medical truth. You said, there is nothing here. But with the internet, that's not the end of the story. It becomes a tug of war, which is good, because that way people can avoid boredom. The enemy became WHO and CDC. That was the shape of it. The people against WHO and CDC. That works. You called the shot early on. You said there's no reason to be afraid, they haven't proved anything, they're lying, this is a con. And you won. This was a real defeat for the bad guys. Huge stocks of unused vaccines left over, because people didn't get the jabs.

Q: But they'll try again.

A: Sure. This is a step-operation.

Q: Explain that.

A: A step-op is one in which the bad guys keep going, one intrusion after another. It isn't just West Nile, it's West Nile, then SARS, then Bird Flu, then Swine Flu. It's all one package, with the idea, in this case, that they'll slowly wear down the resistance and people will buy in, will buy the story, the lie. They want to people to OBEY. That's the whole essence of this op. OBEY. It isn't only about fake epidemics and getting vaccines. It's about operant training in OBEYING. Get it? In general. Obey us. We command, you go along.

Q: What I did with my first book, AIDS INC, was expose the lie you were selling.

A: That's why I liked you. You didn't expose me, of course, because you had no idea who I was or what I was doing. But you saw through the whole lie.

Q: And what was that lie?

A: That HIV was causing the destruction of the immune system, and there was a global epidemic underway. As you pointed out in your book, all you need for that kind of lie is people dying, and people are dying all the time. The lie is: pretend you know why they're dying, and say it's from one cause.

Q: In retrospect, what was the top reason you were assigned to invent that lie and get reporters to buy into it?

A: To create a class of victims.

Q: Really?

A: Yeah. It took me awhile to realize that, and it's politically incorrect to even mention it, but in fact this has nothing to do with gay men per se. Nothing at all. It has to do with creating the perception of victims on a broad scale. That's the top agenda of the AIDS story, from the point of view of social control.

Q: Because the people who gave you the assignment want a world full of victims.

A: If you were an elite controller, wouldn't you? Wouldn't that suit your purposes? Look what's happened in the world since I floated the story of AIDS. You have all sorts of groups who are now official victims. It's ballooned into amazing proportions. Who is able to take care of victims? Governments. And there you have the bottom line. Victims, victims, victims. The chant. It drowns out everything else. It's the megaphone in the crowd. You create more powerful government by having more victims. And you have more victims by assigning that status to everyone you can. AIDS was the kickoff for that campaign. That was its real purpose.

Q: Because if you have lots of strong free individuals--

A: The controllers lose. They have nothing to do. They wither and die. So you have to eradicate even the PERCEPTION that strong free individuals exist. They're not strong and free. They're greedheads. They're all corrupt.

Q: And this story is being consciously sold to the press.

A: All the time. By people like me. People who cultivate reporters and feed them stories and leads and rumors and tips and clues. It's an art. But you know that. I've explained it to you before. Reporters are always looking to figure out "the prevailing mood." Which way the wind is blowing. I gave them that. Cleverly. Not like some schmuck blowing a horn. Gradually, piece by piece.

Q: Creating reality.

A: Inventing it. How often do you see a story in the press or on TV about a strong free individual? I'll tell you. NEVER. If you see one, it's always got an appendage. The tale of how this man overcame great hardship and turned into a good guy from being a bad guy. Something like that. It's never HERE HE IS. HE'S FREE AND STRONG. LET'S HEAR IT FOR THE FREE AND STRONG GUY. You never hear that. You think that's an accident? There are no accidents like that. INFORMATION IS MANAGED. IT'S MANAGED TO THE POINT WHERE IT DOESN'T NEED TO BE MANAGED ANYMORE. THEN IT JUST ROLLS ALONG ON ITS OWN.

Q: In the days when you were working, how did you get your assignments?

A: Well, it was rather sly. I wasn't sitting in a room listening to someone tell me YOU'RE GOING TO SELL A BIG LIE ABOUT SOMETHING WE'RE CALLING AIDS, WHICH IS REALLY JUST A WHOLE LOT OF DIFFERENT WAYS IMMUNE SYSTEMS CAN BE SUPPRESSED. That's not how it's done.

Q: How is it done?

A: There were a number of conversations with cutouts. Front men. People who sounded me out about my career, my fees, that sort of thing. All very casual. Bit by bit, I would put together what they wanted me to do. Just like you do when you interview people. You see where they're going and what they really have to say. It's similar.

Q: You eventually realized they wanted you to promote a big lie about AIDS.

A: It wasn't a light bulb going off in my mind. I was dancing with these cutouts. Back and forth, back and forth. Over a period of a few months. Drinks, lunch, parties. They were qualifying me. I was sniffing at them, trying to figure out how high on the food chain they were.

Q: Why did you care?

A: Are you crazy? I wanted to know whether I'd get paid. Whether my fee would be covered. I wanted to know how extensive this job would be, how long it would

take; when they, my bosses, would be satisfied. I knew there were other people working on this, doing the same thing I was going to do. I wanted to get a picture of how my work would be understood separately from their work. I was performance oriented. I wanted my results to be clear.

Q: But your assignment WAS clear.

A: Eventually. Finally, I sat down with a man who was a much higher level cutout. I knew him. He was reliable. As soon as I saw him, I knew things would be okay. He was a pro. We sat down in a conference room at a hotel, and he sat back and spread his hands and looked at me. He wanted me to tell him what I was going to do. And so I did. I proved to him I had figured out what my assignment was. And he told me it was long term. He said this was a big op. He said this was the biggest op of my life. Well, maybe. I had another one I thought was just as big, but okay.

Q: Did you know who this man was representing?

A: Three Nazis.

Q: What?

A: That's what I called them. Two were Americans. One was European. They were inside the inside of a group. I won't say which one. And don't even think of asking, because I won't fall for that. I won't give you a "no comment" or a non-denial denial. But the three men he was representing were big players. Not Council on Foreign Relations or Bilderberg. But players inside one of those two groups who had their own agenda. Not official. It was high up. The pharmaceutical game goes very high.

Q: So you felt--

A: This was legit. It was real. I would make a good chunk of cash.

Q: Were you surprised when you saw what your assignment was?

A: My boy, nothing surprises me. What most people see and accept as the world is PR. Pure propaganda. That's the Matrix.

Q: Why is the medical agenda so important to major players?

A: Hell, asked and answered. You got all that when you wrote AIDS INC. I don't how, but you did.

Q: Medical dictatorship.

A: The medical angle appears neutral. That was your statement. It appears to have no partisan political banner. Your words. It's therefore an ideal way to control people. Your words. Cradle to grave medical treatment. With toxic debilitating drugs. Your words. All true.

Q: Once you had your assignment to sell the big AIDS lie, what did you do?

A: This was before, just before HIV was announced as the cause of AIDS. I knew they were going to call it [the cause] a retrovirus. I already knew that. So it was my job to prepare the ground. To talk to reporters casually and spread that around. "You know, they're saying it's a retrovirus, a slow-acting virus, this is unique, this is interesting because a couple of retroviruses have already been found as the cause of cancers."

Q: That's a lie.

A: Of course it's a lie, dummy. That's my work. Robert Gallo SAID he had found a couple of these viruses were causes of cancer, but the connection was slippery at best.

Q: So you softened up reporters.

A: Yeah. That was a major part of my work. Then once HIV was announced as the cause, it got more complicated. Because there were going to be obvious objections. There were holes in that story. I had to gloss that over. I had to plug the holes. I didn't talk to reporters much. I talked to their sources. I knew who their sources were. I worked on the sources, who in turn talked to the reporters. Actually, I had people talk to the sources. I was removed.

Q: These reporters' sources were scientists?

A: Some of them. Scientists are idiots when it comes to PR. They either ignore it altogether, or they do it badly. Part of my work, also, was making sure the idea of a global epidemic was bought and sold. Haiti, New York, San Francisco, LA, Uganda. All the same epidemic caused by the same virus. A complete lie.

Q: Did you work directly with anyone at the CDC?

A: Hell no. I wouldn't approach those guys with a ten-foot pole. It risks exposure for me, and besides, they make mistakes all the time. They're arrogant and stupid. But you see, I was acting for them, invisibly. I was doing part of their job. They didn't know that, of course. These days, they're pretty much on their own. They don't have the kind of help I gave them. They need it, but they don't have it.

Q: You build a world with propaganda.

A: The news becomes the world. If you can guide and steer the news, you create the world for people to see.

Q: With AIDS, there were dissident scientists who didn't believe the lie.

A: Yes, but there was only one I paid attention to, Peter Duesberg at UC Berkeley. The rest were unimportant. Duesberg was very bright, and he had an excellent reputation. He was a star. Fortunately, he was already out of the club of retrovirologists. He had left the fold on his own, because he saw that trying to connect these lazy viruses to cancer was a failure. So that pissed off some of his

colleagues, and later they were quite happy to trash the hell out of him when he said there was no reason to believe HIV caused AIDS. I made sure Duesberg was made into a pariah. I made sure he wasn't given his due. He was your main source for your book, AIDS INC.

Q: Yes.

A: But by that time, 1988, he was discredited.

Q: If I had known then that you were doing what you were doing...

A: Sonny boy, you had no chance to expose me. You would have been discredited, too, if you tried. People would have said you were crazy. People don't want to admit that their world is being created for them by PR, that their world is all a joke. They're afraid they'd be left with nothing, a big fat zero. You know. The VOID.

Q: What?

A: I've studied Tibet, pal. I know the score.

Q: You're going to have to explain that.

A: The void. The place where, to put it bluntly, there is no action. Where all information dies. Where there is nothing. For a person, this is either paradise or hell, depending on whether he can ...

Q: Yes?

A: You see, if you want understand human psychology, the real stuff, not the crap these therapists peddle, you have to go back to that. The boredom factor. The emptiness. The silence. People who live in the Matrix are trapped because they can't stand the big silence. That's the bottom line. They need the action and the frenzy. That's my territory. Or it was, before I got morality. I flourished in the land of lies. And I made my contribution. "You want lies. I'll give you whoppers."

Q: You don't regret your career.

A: I do and I don't. What I don't regret is seeing how much people want to be deluded. How much they'll delude themselves. I got to see that up close and personal. In a way few people do. Understand? And I'll tell you another unpleasant truth. Every great spiritual leader has seen the same thing. He's seen how much delusion people want and how much they want it. My path was to pile on the delusions. But I'll never regret seeing how people want a world made for them that they can believe in. And it all goes back to the void and Tibet, where a long time ago, their sages said, "If you can't stand the silence, the nothing, you're a chump." They knew the score. Now, that's all translated into: people have their own belief systems. That's a joke. That's a very pale representation of the truth. That's a slogan for chumps. The real psychology is all about void and non-void, being able to sit in the big silence and enjoy it. And lucky for me, 99.999 percent of the people

can't do it. They wouldn't want to try. They're scared of that. They think something bad will happen to them. And here's another very unpleasant truth. People know, unconsciously, they KNOW...that the best way to escape being in the void is to accept a delusion, to live with delusions and get all wrapped up in them. People will never admit it to themselves, but that's the way they are. And in that sense, truth is for suckers.

Q: You're having fun with this, aren't you?

A: Damn right. I like tweaking the fools. It's my nature. I never said I was a nice guy.

Q: I never said you were, either.

A: If you had, I'd have dropped you in a second.

Q: Delusion.

A: Coin of the realm. Maker of worlds.

Q: The Matrix.

A: This, my friend is what bores me about conspiracy buffs. They never get to the other side.

Q: Which is?

A: People want to buy the cover-ups. It takes two to tango. It isn't just people like me who screw up the world. I'm the seller. There have to be buyers. Buyers aren't victims. They're willing participants. It may be happening on a subconscious level, the buying, but whose subconscious is it? Mine? Hell no.

Q: So now you have a theory about the subconscious.

A: Don't mess with me. You know what I'm talking about. The subconscious is another term for "I'm buying delusions, leave me alone, I'm busy." (laughs)

Q: You've dropped hints, here and there, over the years, that you were involved in selling psychiatry as the authority on human behavior.

A: Yeah. Well. That was and is a major op. Bigger than AIDS. Much, much bigger. It's the lid on the Matrix, if you look at it in the widest terms possible. And I do.

Q: Let's get into that.

A: Do you have a week or two?

Q: If necessary.

A: Start with the delusion concept. It always comes back to that anyway. SOMEBODY has to be in charge of the mind, right?

Q: Why?

A: Because that's the key to the Matrix. If you let the mind run free, eventually things are going to unravel. Who knows how long it'll take? But the mind will figure itself out. It'll see how deep the delusion-buying goes. How pervasive it is.

Q: So an authority on the mind can put the lid on.

A: With a whole series of delusions ABOUT THE MIND ITSELF. That's important to know. If you know that, you know a lot.

Q: You're telling me you sold delusions ABOUT the mind TO the mind.

A: Very good. (laughs)

Q: And there were willing buyers.

A: There are ALWAYS willing buyers.

Q: Okay. I'm listening. Give me the background on it. And don't pat yourself on the back too much.

A: Don't worry. I have an objective view of my work. Otherwise, I'd never have been able to do it.

Q: Where do we begin?

A: With Freud. He was the one who said there were secrets to be learned inside the mind. He was different from the Pavlov types. He wasn't merely trying to stimulate conditioned reflexes. He was a pioneer. But he was also crazy. All boxed up with Oedipal this and that. Nonsense. He did point the way, though. And others picked up the ball. Notably, Wilhelm Reich and JL Moreno. Reich was all about liberating human energy, and Moreno saw that human psychology was drama, and if you could play out those dramas in real time, you would go farther than therapy. You would get freedom from closed-in roles in life. So these guys had to be stopped. Reich was busted by the feds for selling his devices and he died in jail. Moreno was simply sidelined and ignored by the mainstream. He was copied by therapists who couldn't see the depth of his work. Moreno was a genius. Eventually, the medical boys won the war. They established psychiatry as a medical discipline. That was a stroke. That was a major victory for the delusion sellers.

Q: If you're medical, you can plug into the monopoly. The cartel.

A: Sure. That was the idea. The medical system is supported by government. That's the key. You're official. You can spin fairy tales until the cows come home and you sell those tales. And if you're challenged, you have clout on your side. Real power. So with psychiatry, you now have medical doctors who go on to get those degrees and certifications and licenses as psychiatrists.

Q: But these shrinks were still doing therapy. Talk therapy.

A: Yeah, until they went broke. Because they're not good at it, and they're doing some sort of hybrid activity. It's the brain, you need drugs, it's your mommy and daddy, you need to talk about it, it's your non-conformity, you need to get back on the straight and narrow. It's a mess. And they're medical doctors—most doctors aren't great communicators.

Q: So what happened?

A: The profession of psychiatry makes a bargain with the pharmaceutical industry. About 35 years ago. It's now all about brain disorders. Everything is the brain. Chemical imbalance. That's the main delusion they're selling.

Q: They don't have the science, so they're going to fake it.

A: Right. And for every disorder they name, there is a drug. It's a machine all of a sudden. Disorder A gets drug B. And everybody makes money. The shrinks are back on top. Their business is being bankrolled by the drug industry.

Q: So what was your work in this area?

A: First of all, I was one man in an army of PR people. This was a major assault. This was big-time. My work was coordination, to a degree, and also pushing what I call the MAYBE fairy tales.

Q: What is that?

A: All those stories you read in the press and watch on TV? Researchers may be on the verge of a breakthrough in the treatment of depression. All that maybe could-be stuff? That's the sell-job. That was me. That's the WE THINK IT'S GENES. Genes cause depression. Genes cause schizophrenia. Chemical imbalance is now understood more clearly, and scientists say in the next five years....all that crap. And it is crap. Believe me. It's sheer PR. I was involved in priming and prepping the sources reporters rely on. It was a very big job. Behind the scenes. I always operated behind the scenes. Like a lot of people.

Q: Putting a lid on the Matrix.

A: Sure. Because if the mind is understood purely in delusional terms, then the mind is a puzzle that won't be cracked. Instead, the mind will be stunted by drugs. These drugs are bad ones. Toxic.

Q: And that was the agenda.

A: It wasn't just a psychiatric agenda. It's a Matrix agenda.

Q: What about all the so-called mental disorders?

A: After 1975, the numbers of these things escalated. They were devised, as you know, by committees. You know the story. No clear diagnostic tests. No causes

named. Just labels placed on sets of behaviors. But the job was to convince everyone that these disorders were precise and real.

Q: Right now, there are 297 official mental disorders.

A: Yeah. It's in the book. So my job [and the job of a lot of other propaganda operatives] was to make all this believable. To make it sound medical. The mind is a territory for doctors. Doctors only.

Q: What about the campaign "to remove the stigma attached to mental illness?"

A: Those were different people working that angle. I knew what was going on, but I wasn't part of it. They enlisted politicians and celebrities. Selling more delusions.

Q: I want to make this clear. You were selling fake science.

A: That was my specialty. That was my piece of the pie.

Q: Because there are a lot of people who fervently believe these 297 mental disorders are real.

A: Suffering confusion, pain, struggle are real. The disorders are a grid laid over that. A fake grid. A series of crafted delusions. You can take that to the bank. I did.

Q: You worked this territory a long time?

A: Yeah. It was an ongoing job. It had many branches. You have to understand something about my operations, all of them. A lot of the time I used cutouts.

Q: How?

A: I had people working for me who contacted the sources for reporters. I influenced the press at a distance. Two layers, three layers removed. I wasn't right there having cocktails with a reporter. I was higher on the food chain. I was invisible. If a major reporter ever heard my name, chances are he had no idea who I was. I stayed in the shadows. I wasn't some low-level hustler of stories.

Q: Was selling all these mental disorders easy?

A: It was work. Labor. But it wasn't a battle to sell it. It was cumulative selling. One fake story after another. In time, it got easier, because we had built up a backlog of acceptance. Once you get the press to buy in, they aren't going to turn around and say they were bamboozled. Understand?

Q: You were selling a pattern.

A: You bet. That's the essence. Problem equals mental disorder equals diagnosis equals drugs. The psychiatrist becomes a drug dispensing machine. An ATM for drugs. The PR job is to dress that up and give it scientific sounding context and you throw in all sorts of stuff about "the research"--and you have an industry. But in the

larger frame, you have a priesthood of the mind. An official priesthood. Licensed. And you sell that, too, using other words. You REALLY sell that. “No one else knows anything about the mind. Only the psychiatrists have the knowledge.” You sell “needs professional help” and “is going in for treatment” and “new breakthroughs” and all that crap. You sell it six ways from Sunday.

Q: People are really mired in this.

A: Oh, sure. That's the idea. They deny any attacks on their precious mental disorders. “I have clinical depression.” I love this one: “My depression.” See? They own it. It's their special disorder. It's PROPERTY. They own something. Finally.

Q: They wear it like a badge. They talk about it. They expect psychiatric help from now to the end of their lives.

A: And they'll get it. “A mental disorder is no different from any disease. Like diabetes.” Total balderdash.

Q: Inventing reality.

A: In the form of a delusion. The whole profession of psychiatry is an invented delusion ABOUT the mind. That's what makes it so powerful.

Q: If “everybody in the world” is eventually diagnosed with a mental disorder...

A: That's not just an aimless fantasy, my friend. That's the objective! Include everybody under that canopy of diagnosis. When that happens, there will be a kind of control Stalin never dreamed of. Because DISEASE will be the overall background context of the world. That's the goal. That's the plan.

Q: The Matrix is delusion.

A: Delusion SOLD.

Q: Your specialty was selling stories.

A: And as you've noted, people are addicted to stories. It's a heavy addiction. Actually, I sold story fragments. The idea there is that people will fill in the blanks themselves. It's stronger that way.

Q: People want to believe in science.

A: Science sells, yes. Anything you can connect to “science” gives you a leg up. That's a big storyline—“the march of science.” If I had been living in the twelfth century, I would have been selling the Roman Church. I would have been selling the idea that the only road to heaven was through a priest. There is another aspect to psychiatry. It gets into popular language. So even if you're not “in treatment,” you're using those psychiatric words. “Clinical depression.” “Chemical imbalance.” “Bipolar.” “Fantasy world.” You're in the soup. You're in that context. People pretend they are professionals. They spread these words around, it becomes...

Q: A weave in the Matrix.

A: Yeah. And of course in the legal system, it's already embedded. You have lawyers arguing the most preposterous things, to get their clients into mental wards and away from long sentences. Context again—a person is the result of his past. That's a BIG one. Everybody's an expert on that now. How the past history shapes a person. Everybody weighs in on that. It's a joke. Another joke. People actually equate empathy with “understanding how the past made the person into what he is now.” It's a self-defeating paradigm, and it's part of the sell-job, because self-defeat is what you covertly sell if CONTROL is your agenda.

Q: I want to talk a little history. As you know, I've done some checking on you.

A: It wasn't my favorite thing.

Q: And I was careful, and it wasn't easy. But I did satisfy myself that you were who you said you were.

A: So?

Q: What is it about you that got you into this black art of propaganda?

A: It was a choice. Motivated by my interest in what makes people so sure they're DIFFERENT.

Q: Explain.

A: People say, “Sure, I understand everybody else is stupid, but I'm one of the chosen ones. I've extricated myself from the delusions.” Well, looking at them I could see they were surrounded by, and embedded in, delusions. It interested me. I wanted to know what was going on. And that was the beginning of my work. That was the thing that got me started.

Q: But people ARE different. Every person is unique.

A: Depends on what you mean by that. If a person can actually get free of the delusions he loves so much, then yes. He's unique. He's creative. But short of that, he's a cipher.

Q: And he deserves all the crap you can feed him.

A: At one time, I thought that, yes. But don't expect an abject confession of guilt from me. I learned my lesson. I'm retired. Doesn't mean I'm a goody two shoes.

Q: I don't think anyone is going to confuse you with that.

A: The Matrix is a fascinating study, mainly because it's a question of how deep the delusions go. Most people don't understand that. They're pretending they're comfortable where they are. I basically object to that pretension. I don't like it. Never have.

Q: Give me an example.

A: When I was a young boy, I studied early American history. The founding of the Republic. The heroes. There was something about it I didn't like. I couldn't put my finger on it. It took some maturity before I understood it.

Q: What was your conclusion?

A: Rights.

Q: What?

A: There was this eerie implication in the Constitution that the people were being granted certain rights. GRANTED being the operative word. Well, that's baloney. That's reversing the whole thing.

Q: In what sense?

A: If I say, "I grant that you're intelligent, Rappoport," I'm setting myself up as the arbiter of that. Understand? I'm on a perch.

Q: Yeah. Okay.

A: There was a basic delusion in the implication of the Constitution. The government was granting rights to the people. Or the people who were setting up the government were granting the rights. But the rights already existed. The rights were not rights at all. They were INHERENT IN THE INDIVIDUAL.

Q: And if you can--

A: And if I can grant you rights, I can take them away. I can erode them slowly over time. I can change my mind. I can re-interpret those rights. I can do whatever the hell I want to. Look at the history. That's exactly what happened. One delusion gave rise to another and another. That was the flaw from the beginning.

Q: How would you have written the Constitution?

A: WE WHO ARE FREE, EACH ONE OF US, RELUCTANTLY BUILD THIS GOVERNMENT TO SERVE SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS. WE HAVE THE POWER. WE CAN DESTROY WHAT WE CREATE. THE GOVERNMENT IS OUR SLAVE. Something like that.

Q: To make things clear, you would have written it that way.

A: To leave no room for doubt.

Q: Is individual freedom a delusion?

A: IT'S THE ONE FACT THAT BY COMPARISON TELLS YOU WHAT THE DELUSIONS ARE. Unless the word FREEDOM has been corrupted and turned into something else.

Q: Let's go deeper into what the Matrix is.

A: Not quite yet. First, I want to give you a quote. It's a statement I've given to you in the past, and I don't think you've ever presented it, at least not in this form.

Q: Okay. Go ahead.

A: "You need to prepare a population for propaganda. You do that through REDUCTION. You get people to want only the simplest ideas. Then you can sell them anything. ADD and ADHD are self-fulfilling prophecies."

Q: Interesting. You want to expand on that?

A: If you look up the list of behaviors that are used to diagnose ADHD, you see that almost any child, at the right moment, can be diagnosed. We know that's true because we already have several million kids in America who are called ADHD. And they get the drugs. Ritalin, which is an upper. It's speed. Well, eventually, speed is going to cause what I would call "a shortening of the perspective of the mind." I was there for part of the propaganda campaign on ADHD. I know what went on, how it was sold. It was basically an appeal "on behalf of parents" who couldn't deal with their kids. It was sold as a deficit—your kid can't concentrate. So after he gets the drug for a while, under the surface, the DIMENSIONALITY of his mind is reduced. He wants simpler ideas. He wants bottom lines. It's a self-fulfilling scam. Under the influence of the drug, his attention moves into deficit territory. You see, this is preparation for propaganda. A simpler mind takes in delusions more easily. Delusions presented as little packages. You wanted to go deeper into the Matrix. Well, here we are. REDUCE THE DIMENSIONALITY OF THE MIND. It's hard to detect. How are you going to quantify that?

Q: It's like pre-op for surgery.

A: Yes. You make minds simpler, and then they are fertile ground for any idea that is clever and simple.

Q: Ritalin isn't the only drug that does that.

A: Of course not.

Q: You knew my late friend and colleague, Jack True.

A: We had several conversations. His work and mine fit nicely together. He gave me some ideas. The Matrix is a meld between externally applied propaganda/delusions and the tendencies of the mind to buy delusion. That's boiling it down. The mind likes complexity, which is what lies produce. Lies lead to other lies. Lies are a compounding substance. Of course, the mind doesn't label

these as lies. They are “adventures.” Explorations. You have to understand layers here, or you'll get lost.

Q: Yes. Because you are now saying two separate things. The mind is reduced, and then accepts little bottom lines, little packages of propaganda. And then you're saying the mind likes and wants complexity.

A: Right. Let me explain. The mind has two sensors. That's a useful image. One sensor reaches out for simplicity. Complex issues boiled down to bottom lines. Which are often lies. Okay? The other sensor reaches out for complexity, which is exploration and interesting involvement. But underneath both of those sensors is this fear. This fear of NOTHING. The VOID. Silence. Empty space. This is the place where, actually, very clear thinking can take place. It's thinking surrounded by silence. But most people never experience that. They don't know about that. They only know that the place of VOID is a place they don't want to visit. They would rather have ceaseless activity and buzz and noise. Subconsciously, they sense the potential presence of VOID. They shy away from it. They don't want it. They don't understand it. VOID IS outside the Matrix. That's the key. VOID is outside this reality. If you know all this—and I do—you know you can feed lies right into the mind like a hopper, because those lies will keep the mind away from brushing up against the VOID. And the mind recoils at the thought of visiting the VOID. I don't want to make this sound esoteric. IT ISN'T. It only seems that way because “nothing” is a foreign concept to people. If there is a “nothing,” they'll swear they don't know anything about it. Anyway, I can feed simple lies and complex lies right into the mind. Either way, the mind likes them.

Q: The mind likes simple lies because--

A: Because they're like concrete. Cement. The simple lies say, “Now you know something. You really know something.” And the person likes that. Gives him a sense of surety. The complex lies are good because they give rise to lots of thinking and conversation and argument and opposition and polarity—the buzz and noise. But if I tell the truth, if I say, “Ritalin is a poison, it's speed, and it's hurting people,” well, what do you do with that if you're Joe Average? What the hell do you do? You're not equipped to handle all the implications. You deny the truth. And also, the truth tends to make you stop thinking. You see? All of a sudden, lots of extraneous thinking you've done becomes irrelevant and you can throw it away. Well, if I unload four or five of these truth-blockbusters on a person and he offloads a whole lot of extraneous thinking, he feels the VOID drawing closer. And the crazy thing about all this is--

Q: The Void is peace.

A: Yes. That's it exactly. The Void is peace. It's a great place.

Q: So Matrix has a lot to do with avoidance of peace.

A: It has a lot to do with avoidance of profound peace. Very, very deep peace.

Q: Which seems counter-intuitive. Why would anyone want to avoid profound peace?

A: Or to put it another way, why would anyone want to traffic in blizzards of lies for a whole lifetime?

Q: So in here somewhere is a key to the Matrix.

A: In one of my important conversations with Jack [True], what emerged was this. A person associates peace with death.

Q: Why the hell would that be?

A: I can think of a lot of reasons. But one of them is the biological imperative.

Q: Which is?

A: Stay alive. Keep moving. It's this motion that is the opposite of Void.

Q: So a confusion arises.

A: Yes. And subconsciously—I'm repeating myself—the person has learned that lies will keep his mind moving. SUBCONSCIOUSLY LEARNED THAT. Lies are good for continued motion. Lies work. They have legs. They generate activity. They stimulate adrenaline. So he buys lies. And if you're a seller, you make out well.

Q: Well now, we're getting into my cardinal area. Imagination.

A: You see, that's entirely different.

Q: How?

A: Hell, I'll leave that to you to explain. You write about it all the time.

Q: I'll say this from my experience. If you're living intensely by and through your imagination, you dip in and out of Void. You become accustomed to it, because Void is really all about not creating. It's a state in which you aren't creating. That's the deeper message of the Tibetan philosophy. The original philosophy, before it was trampled by the priests. With CREATING and the VOID, you're drawing a straight line between two stars. Everything lines up. The more you're creating, and the more you're creating what you imagine, instead of relying on what others do and say, the more you experience the Void. You go back and forth between those two stars, between CREATING AND NOT CREATING, BETWEEN VOID AND NOT-VOID, and you become familiar with them. You don't see peace as death, which is a ridiculous Matrix computation. You get out of all that.

A: Yes. You don't hunger for lies anymore. You don't have that need to buy lies.

Q: When you were working in the fields of propaganda, did you see any of this?

A: Some of it, yes. But I was “a career man.”

Q: Did you work on warfare propaganda?

A: A little. By the time I was in the game, World War Two was over. That form of PR had already been shifted over into what was called communication research. It was funded by the government, and grants were readily available. Communication research is based on stereotypes. How you want people to see other people they've never met. It's alive and well today. [See Science of Coercion, Christopher Simpson]. Communication research tends to be about how to form images of people for other people. I mean, that's not the stated goal, but that's going on under the surface. It's a big field. How can you influence and dominate foreign cultures? How can you use stereotypes to dismiss strangers in other lands. That kind of thing. It's elementary school stuff. Kindergarten. But there is an interesting twist on it now. A reverse. And this is pure propaganda. It's this: Americans are horrible people. Everybody else is okay, but Americans are horrible. You see? A reverse. And it's entirely engineered in the press. This is an op. Pure and simple. It's propaganda, using the same stereotype images to go the other way. Here is an example, on a slightly more sophisticated level. Israel and the Palestinians. Ten, fifteen years ago, the official line was Palestinians were terrorists, and Israel was fighting for its life, and the US was on the side of Israel. And you had very powerful lobbies supporting Israel in the US. All of a sudden, overnight, the whole thing flipped. Did you notice that? Suddenly, the Left came out for the Palestinians and every college campus was anti-Israel? That's quite an op. That was a blitz.

Q: And this sort of thing started during WW2?

A: Didn't start then, but it was raised to an art form. In order to make all Germans and Japanese seem like sub-humans. Stereotypes.

Q: Did you ever work out of an office?

A: Hell no. I got my best ideas in big cities walking down the streets, looking at people.

Q: How so?

A: I'd look at them and wonder, “What lie do they want to hear?” Better yet, “What lie can I float that will attract them?” That was my inspiration.

Q: You're quite a piece of work.

A: Never denied that, chum. But you see, I could have asked, “What can I do to help them?” And you know what?

Q: What?

A: No answer would have come back. Because they don't want help, not really. My perception was, they want a story. And they won't accept the truth. So I'm not going to be victimized by that. I'm not going to be silenced by that. What's the alternative? Tell them stories.

Q: And this is your--

A: It was my game.

Q: You could have written novels or made movies.

A: Yes. And in retrospect, with what I know now, I probably would have done exactly that. But I had a nasty edge then.

Q: You have a lot to answer for.

A: I don't need you to tell me that.

Q: Did you ever work for an intelligence agency?

A: Not consciously. You never know who's hiring who. But I knew a few of those types. They're always looking for ways to employ mind control. It's their dream of a perfect world. Every robot turned into their kind of robot. That's what they see. Robots.

Q: What about vaccines?

A: What about them?

Q: Did you ever do propaganda in that area?

A: No, but I knew people who did. Their little specialty was calling in the troops.

Q: I have no idea what that means.

A: Well, take the swine Flu fiasco. As you know, it all started in a place called La Gloria. Mexico. A big pig farm. People, workers were getting sick there. How could they not be getting sick?

Q: They had lagoons of pig feces right out in the open. And workers came in and sprayed pesticide all over the place.

A: Yeah. So any normal person would conclude the workers getting sick was a natural consequence of those things. The place was a pustule to begin with.

Q: But the CDC sent doctors and researchers down there to investigate.

A: You have to ask why, don't you?

Q: The doctors were the troops?

A: (laughs) Yeah. They were called in to make an epidemic happen. Not a real one. A fake one. A PR fabrication. I mean, there is this place out in the middle of nowhere, and some workers get sick. Why on Earth should this interest the CDC?

Q: They have scouts?

A: Wouldn't you? It was time for the next fake epidemic. So they called in the troops. Those scouts. They're like PR men, but they have a peculiar function. Like the old advance men for show acts. They go down there, look around, spread a few rumors and then say, "Yeah, this a good spot for the beginning of an epidemic." A fake one. So they call home, and then the doctors are called in to examine the sick workers.

Q: They draw blood.

A: They take samples and then they leave.

Q: The blood goes to a lab.

A: And then the researchers mess around with it and come up with a virus. A virus no one has identified before. Which isn't that hard, since there are millions of germs in the body. But they find one and they settle on it "as the cause of the outbreak."

Q: Of course, there isn't an outbreak.

A: No. But there is a story.

Q: And that's how it starts.

A: Sure. How else could it start?

Q: In the old days, would a guy like you have told that story?

A: Maybe. But now, the CDC and WHO have their own people. They know the drill. They've been through it before.

Q: I'll tell you a little secret. A couple of times, with SARS and with Swine Flu, when I said, early on, that they were fake epidemics...and then at the end, I was proven right, very few people contacted me. I'm not complaining. I don't care. But it's interesting in light of what you've been saying.

A: Of course. I know all about it. When you were proven right, there was very little attention to that. Because the truth stands alone. It signals the end of an episode. The people who could have and might have contacted you to say, "You were right, great going," they were off and running on believing the next lie coming down the road on a horse with banner waving in the wind.

Q: Yes, I've seen that happen.

A: (laughs) I'm not theorizing in this conversation, kiddo. I'm telling you the way it works. People can't stand the silence of truth. They've got to have the next big lie and eat it up, even though they've just seen how the last lie they bought was, in fact, a lie. It's beautiful really, if you have to the guts to understand it.

Q: I once gave a talk to a large audience about AIDS, about my book, and I went through the whole thing, and I could tell they were following me all the way, and they saw that AIDS was just a label that had been invented to describe many different types of immune suppression caused by different factors—the label AIDS was just word that functioned as an umbrella to sell drugs and so on—and they got it. They understood. They were very enthusiastic, as if I'd ripped the roof off the building. They saw how the medical boys concoct these labels for all sorts of things that don't really exist as actual disease entities....and then when I was through, and I was standing in the lobby, people came up to me and said, "So what really does cause AIDS then?" The first time that happened, I actually laughed. I had a hard time stopping laughing. It was completely insane.

A: Yeah. They were anxious to get up on their horse and find the next lie. And they thought you might help them.

Q: I saw that very clearly.

A: I bet you were tempted to feed them a lie.

Q: I thought about it. Well, AIDS is really a virus from Andromeda, and there is a secret lab in Detroit where they modify it so it's infectious.

A: They would have loved you.

Q: You're right.

A: Damn right I'm right.

Q: People reading this might tend to back away from this whole VOID business.

A: OF COURSE they'll back off. It's the thing they want to avoid. They want to avoid going there, and they want to avoid thinking about going there, and they want to avoid thinking about VOID at all. It seems alien to them, because they've blocked themselves off from the concept of it. So it seems eerie. But it isn't. The urge to explain and categorize everything down to a gnat's ass is the reaction against going to the VOID. At one time, in a few places on Earth, this was well understood. It was understood as well as you understand going to the supermarket to buy paper towels. You see, if you're really going to investigate the Matrix, you have to be prepared to encounter some things that aren't familiar. If they were familiar, you'd already understand them, and you wouldn't be enmeshed in the Matrix. This isn't like going to the hardware store and buying a key and going to a storage locker and opening the door and finding all the secrets of the Matrix. You may WANT it to be

like that, but it isn't. The Matrix is the cosmic joke. You have to work to get the punchline.

Q: Okay.

A: I've given you more than I intended to.

Q: More truth.

A: Yeah. Given that people are so desperate to wrap their arms around lies, I don't know how they'll take this [interview]. But that's your problem.

Q: I don't have a problem.

A: Good.

###END###

Ellis Medavoy, 2011, Interview #2

In this conversation, Ellis comments on what he calls “the basics behind social agendas.”

Q: What is “the social agenda?”

A: It's whatever elite groups want it to be at any given time. You have to understand it's all based on the idea that the human being is a very flexible entity.

Q: Flexible in what sense?

A: He can be stimulated to tap into different attitudes—much like an actor can be guided in roles in plays by directors. The director says, “give me a little more of this,” and the actor responds. So a social agenda—which is really about behavior—is a flex operation. You can get human beings to change behavior, AND THEY WILL THINK THAT CHANGE IS A GOOD IDEA. Let me give you several images here, or cues, or templates, or, if you will, stereotypes. You have “the isolated male,” “the strong tough guy,” “the soft sensitive man,” the “helpful service-oriented person,” “the assertive female,” “the nurturing mother,” “the communicative, sharing person,” “the emotionally available person,” “the can-do guy,” “the incurable spiritual optimist,” “the New Age person,” “the sexually liberated woman,” “the egalitarian humanist,”...

Q: You're saying all these are INDUCED as attitudes in people through PR and propaganda??

A: Of course. I'm not saying people are just blank slates. But they can be influenced—and they are, especially when they sense a trend is taking place and they want to be on board, instead of left behind. The trend is created by PR campaigns. Conscious directed campaigns.

Q: So for example--

A: A man changes from being “a tough guy” to a “warm, caring, sensitive human being.” He does this because he senses a shift in the way the cultural wind is blowing. And that shift IS created by PR.

Q: But is he really changing?

A: You want statistics? (laughs) He's an actor in a play. And he's taking direction from “the director.” Mostly, that's what's happening. Not all the time, but most of the time.

Q: Why haven't you ever mentioned this before in our conversations?

A: I have, but not in such a succinct way. I think about things, kiddo. I'm not stagnant. I distill my ideas.

Q: I want to get this straight. You're saying a great deal of human behavior is stimulated by social propaganda. That people will shift their attitudes and behavior like chameleons.

A: That's right. They give themselves reasons for changing, but they change. And the long-term propaganda goal is in the direction of softening up the population, so they'll think in terms of WHAT OTHER PEOPLE WILL THINK OF THEM...and it's all "in the service of the greater community." It's a con.

Q: "The greater community" is a con?

A: Well, let me put it to you this way. If you're changing your behavior based on a stimulus-response model of "the greater community," is that profound? Is that deep? Or is that the dog drooling when he hears the bell and knows he's about to get ground meat? Let's get real about this. ANY ideal which is internalized based on a Pavlovian response is a con. The whole purpose of social propaganda is: THE DIRECTOR TELLS THE ACTOR TO MODIFY HIS ROLE. That's it.

Q: And if the actor doesn't know he's in a play...

A: To use a technical term, he's screwed.

Q: But you'll admit that ideals like community and individualism and achievement and power and so on...these can be quite real. They don't have to be mere artifacts created by propaganda.

A: Of course. It's the difference between a counterfeit gold coin and the real thing. But social propaganda has one basic goal—softening up the population so that it seeks to be a single enmeshed organism.

Q: So it can be controlled from an exterior platform.

A: Yes.

Q: On radio shows, I've been talking about activism on behalf of health freedom and how that's changed over the past 15 years, from aggressive energy to what I call The Church of Nice.

A: (laughs) Yeah, that's a good example. NICE is all about prizing the acceptance of others, even those who want to take away your freedom. And that shift you've noticed—that's no accident. That has been the result of sustained PR. Of course, when PR rolls like a tank for a while, people then carry on, on their own. They don't need the stimulus anymore. They drool all by themselves.

Q: One of my favorites is: "If it didn't happen, it wasn't meant to be."

A: Sure, that's an example of the softening-up process. Former generations of Americans didn't create all the comforts we now take for granted and cherish by

pasting a smile on their faces and saying, "It wasn't meant to be." That's not our natural tradition.

Q: The social engineering of attitudes.

A: That's what I'm talking about.

Q: There's a difference between a person reflecting on his highest and deepest desires and then creating them, as fact, in the world...there's a difference between that and accepting roles in plays that were designed by propagandists.

A: Night and day, lad. Night and day.

Q: This type of social propaganda you're talking about...where did it come from?

A: It's as old as the hills. But more recently, coming out of World War Two, the prevalent theme was American domination—so that meant templates like "strong" and "forceful" were for us, and "backward" and "corrupt" and "animalistic" were for them, the nations and people we were determined to dominate. But then that all changed, because the theme changed. It became globalism. One world community. So all the templates became softer. That was the newer propaganda. Again, these shifts are no accident.

Q: Suppose a person says, "But I really AM for a global community and a peaceful world."

A: That person better do several things. Define and understand what he really means and what that community would look like and what the individual would look like in that world of the future. He'd better look at this closely and then ACT on it. He'd better have his head on straight, to make sure he isn't just swallowing some Disneyesque PR about "world community." With any ideal, there is the real and the fake. The fake is the social agenda of the propagandists, and the elites they serve. And for them, "community" is a code word for "duped actors" controlled by a director. As a final tidbit...this whole business of political correctness and never saying anything that might possibly offend someone else? You notice how it's becoming more and more pervasive? Well, whatever you think about it, I can tell you that, at the highest levels of control, it has absolutely nothing to do with the evolution of human beings toward a more tolerant state of mind. Nothing. It's entirely about enmeshing people in a social framework of sticky interconnectedness. Easier to control and rule them that way. Globally rule them. It IS A PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN, a sustained campaign. It has that goal. It isn't anything else. The elites have nothing but contempt for everyone else, and they express that contempt in decidedly politically incorrect ways.

###END###