

**THE
MATRIX
REVEALED
Volume 1**

**JON RAPPOPORT
Interviews
ELLIS MEDAVOY
(Part 1 of 3)**

About ELLIS MEDAVOY

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

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

AIDS

Epidemic outbreaks

It Takes a Village

And they were all fabricated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I laughed.

"Really."

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

“Why?” I said.

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

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

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

I have.

JON RAPPOPORT

March 16, 2001

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

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

Q: Whom were you working for?

A: I can't answer that.

Q: Were you a bad guy?

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

Q: Did you work for NSA?

A: Not as an employee.

Q: For the Pentagon?

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

Q: You have worked as a reporter.

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

Q: You were in Vietnam.

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

Q: Okay. Let's talk about AIDS.

A: Why?

Q: Because it's there, okay?

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

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

A: That depends on where you're sitting.

Q: What?

A: For some people that's the reality.

Q: You're talking about belief.

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

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

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

Q: Was that a true statement?

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

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

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

Q: I'm asking you.

A: I want to hear you say it.

Q: Say what? AIDS is not a germ?

A: That's right.

Q: AIDS wasn't created in that way.

A: No.

Q: But it was an idea.

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

Q: You worked on that.

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

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

A: I made the bad seem worse.

Q: Be more specific.

A: I don't think so.

Q: Come on.

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

Q: Were you an editor?

A: No.

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

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

Q: Why should science need a person like you?

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

Q: Were you responsible for that editor being fired?

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

Q: So you got articles planted.

A: Sure.

Q: Were there lies in those articles?

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

Q: The articles you had planted—

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

Q: You dealt with medical reporters.

A: Yes.

Q: Which ones?

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

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

A: True.

Q: So?

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

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

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

Q: He WAS deranged.

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

Q: He was mind-controlled.

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

Q: And that was the op.

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

Q: And with AIDS?

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

Q: You were involved with that.

A: I was.

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

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

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

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

Q: Spot the weakness.

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

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

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

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

Q: You believe that.

A: Oh yes.

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

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

Q: Order imposed from above.

A: Where else is it going to come from?

Q: Doesn't sound like democracy.

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

Q: You prefer global dictatorship.

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

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

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

Q: Nazis?

A: Ideological or blood descendants of the German Nazis.

Q: Who are?

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

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

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

Q: Were you very active during the Cold War?

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

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

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

Q: What kind of paradigm was the Cold War?

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

Q: Is that happening now?

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

Q: In the case of AIDS—

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

Q: Just like the War on Cancer.

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

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

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

Q: But you cut them out of loop.

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

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

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

Q: Why not?

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

Q: Watergate?

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

Q: Were you personally involved?

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

Q: Which ones?

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

Q: Why was Nixon taken out?

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

Q: The newspapers...

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

Q: You were involved in psychological warfare.

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

Q: How to manipulate populations.

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

Q: As opposed to personal freedom.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A: Who cares?

Q: A lot of people do.

A: That means nothing to me.

Q: The CIA—

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

Q: How?

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

Q: What sort of disinformation?

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

Q: And you did this.

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

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

Q: Well, take the case of Bill Clinton.

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

Q: How long ago?

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

Q: Whose list?

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

Q: Then why all the scandals during his presidency?

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

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

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

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

Q: She was the dupe.

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

Q: And then Clinton was protected...

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

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

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

Q: At the same time...

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

Q: Were you involved with this Clinton operation?

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

Q: What are your feelings about UFOs?

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

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

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

Q: But what about the UFOs themselves?

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

Q: And the government cover-up?

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

Q: Overkill.

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

Q: The overkill of too many grade B movies.

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

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

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

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

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

Q: That's insanity.

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

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

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

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

A: Free?

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

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

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

A: I guess you could say that, yes.

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

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

Q: Did you ever work in that way?

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

Q: Were you ever challenged?

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

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

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

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

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

Q: Talking to editors, reporters.

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

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

Q: Grisly.

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

Q: And in real life?

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

Q: Didn't he know it?

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

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

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

Q: Did you ever work with Kissinger?

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

Q: This was one of your areas.

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

Q: In the US?

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

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

A: It’s a central key.

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

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

Q: To understand, for example, psychiatry.

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

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

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

Q: Would you want to fight that war?

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

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

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

Q: I think that's enough for now...

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

Q: Not completely inoculated.

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

Q: And what is the most sacred cow?

A: Medicine, of course.

Q: You really think so.

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

Q: Sometimes I call it Hospital Earth.

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

Q: The medical cartel itself...

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

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

Q: But there are hidden leaders.

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

Q: Who are the hidden leaders?

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

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

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

Q: We just did.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: For example?

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

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

###END###

March 23, 2001

Q: The war on drugs.

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

Q: The public—

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

Q: What are you talking about?

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

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

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

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

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

Q: You say this is going on now.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: Have to.

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

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

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

Q: Back to the war on drugs.

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

Q: What about your favorite field, the medical?

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

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

Q: Giving away secrets here.

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

Q: Moralistic people—

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

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

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

Q: —You see it after every school shooting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: Where's the moralism?

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

Q: There's a punch line here somewhere?

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

Q: It was a fake story.

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

Q: We're back to your rationalization again.

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

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

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

Q: What were those sightings about?

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

Q: Put the lid on, as you say.

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

Q: Oedipus.

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

Q: In the case of UFOs...

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

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

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

Q: The CIA gets very worked up over UFOs.

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

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

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

Q: Who's they?

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

Q: Jimmy Carter said he saw a UFO.

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

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

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

Q: To what?

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

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

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

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

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

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

A: Anything is possible.

Q: What do you think?

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

Q: You sound like a lawyer.

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

###END###

April 20, 2001

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

A: The one with mice?

Q: Yeah.

A: More balderdash. They're scrambling.

Q: Why?

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

Q: It's useless.

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

Q: What was the purpose...

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

Q: What about Foot and Mouth disease?

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

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

A: Another myth. The media perpetuate it.

Q: Why?

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

Q: How do they control the world?

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

Q: Like the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderbergers.

A: Sure.

Q: You believe that perception is changing.

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

Q: Do you agree with that?

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

Q: They could have more.

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

Q: So we get more crime.

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

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

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

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

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

Q: What about the educational shows?

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

Q: Now they have TVs in schools.

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

Q: Is all this intentional?

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

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

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

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

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

Q: What other symbols?

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

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

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

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

Q: Burn the guitars on stage.

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

Q: Why?

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

Q: Anti-heroes.

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

Q: What?

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

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

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

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

A: Count on it.

Q: You're talking about—

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

Q: The image of what?

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

Q: There are still specific issues.

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

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

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

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

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

Q: And people will—

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

Q: What about the internet?

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

Q: It needs support.

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

Q: You once did some research on alternative communities.

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

Q: What was your decision?

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

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

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

Q: You're sounding very pessimistic today.

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

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

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

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

A: Yes.

Q: We need better decentralization of power.

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

Q: What happened?

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

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

Q: I'm losing the thread.

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

Q: So?

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

Q: And the conclusion is?

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

Q: Like the internet.

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

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

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

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

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

Q: You're downplaying the power of newspapers.

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

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

Q: I ran into that.

A: I’m sure you did.

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

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

Q: Watergate.

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

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

A: I would agree.

Q: So people can wake up.

A: They can.

Q: But you have to—

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

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

MK BRIEFING #9: SHAPING SOCIETY

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

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

This map is secret.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is mind control, par excellence.

BACK TO INTERVIEW...

Q: What do you think of this?

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

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

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

Q: How is that?

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

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

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

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

###END###

July 6, 2001

HOW CITIZENS CAN MOUNT THEIR OWN PR CAMPAIGNS

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

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

Q: For example?

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

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

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

Q: So he had exposure.

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

Q: Of course what this man said is true.

A: You bet.

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

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

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

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

Q: Yes? And?

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

Q: Because?

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

Q: But they aren't.

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

Q: They aren't exposing an op.

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

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

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

Q: Okay. Therefore?

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

Q: Okay, who is the man in question?

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

Q: Why?

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

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

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

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

A: That's right.

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

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

Q: But theoretically—

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

Q: People would have believed it.

A: Of course.

Q: And you're sure that...

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

Q: And maybe it is.

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

Q: Put there.

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

Q: Give me an example.

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

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

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

Q: It plays either way.

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

Q: That's interesting.

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

Q: Bingo bango bongo.

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

Q: And this works because?

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

Q: And the images, the archetypes supply that.

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

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

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

Q: But at a higher level?

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

Q: For what purpose?

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

Q: But this is not the case.

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

Q: And in fact?

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

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

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

Q: And what was his weak point?

A: He was without portfolio.

Q: What do you mean?

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

Q: What kind of machinery?

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

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

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

Q: Was it a cult?

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

Q: I understand. Was this PR attack successful?

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

Q: Why not?

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

Q: Meaning?

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

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

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

Q: So what then?

A: A court case. A prison sentence.

Q: For what?

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

Q: Was it true?

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

Q: Not one bit.

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

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

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

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

A: They don't have to.

Q: Why not?

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

Q: That's how it starts.

A: And then you keep building the wave.

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

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

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

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

Q: Okay.

A: Lyndon LaRouche.

Q: Let's see.

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

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

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

Q: He's out of jail now.

A: Yes.

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

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

Q: Any more examples?

A: Pierre Salinger.

Q: After the TWA 800 crash.

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

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

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

Q: It all happened very quickly. The discrediting.

A: They can do that if they have to.

Q: Who else?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: What's a few?

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

Q: What do you do then?

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

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

Q: And with a federal agency?

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

Q: That can be accomplished?

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

Q: What's the overall strategy?

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

Q: Put them on the defense. How?

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

Q: So putting them on the defense would mean...

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

Q: You give them a new job.

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

Q: Do they know who you are?

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

Q: Okay. What do you do?

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

Q: And what do your attacks consist of?

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

Q: How do you define human interest?

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

Q: Tell a story.

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

Q: And then?

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

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

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

Q: So it has to be true.

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

Q: So the trick is...

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

Q: When you say the press...

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

Q: But those papers...

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

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

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

Q: To plant stories.

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

Q: Why?

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

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

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

Q: A pro like this could be expensive.

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

Q: Give me an example.

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

Q: Yes.

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

Q: You tell him it happened in his town.

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

Q: So you mail this timeline to the reporter.

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

Q: Predigested.

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

Q: The reporter'll go for that.

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

Q: And now?

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

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

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

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

Q: And you're telling the truth.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: Because...

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: People might find that depressing.

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

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

Q: But people can do something about it.

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

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

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

Q: Somehow I don't believe that.

A: Believe what you want to.

Q: I think you've gotten a conscience.

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

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

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

Q: So that's your motive.

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

###END###

August 10, 2001

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

MK BRIEFING #5: MIND CONTROL BY OPPOSITES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This contradiction is pure cartel.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AND NOW THE INTERVIEW...

Q: So what do you think about that briefing?

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

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

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

Q: You didn't choose this job.

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

Q: And then what happened?

A: I got an assignment to create a diversion.

Q: What type?

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

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

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

Q: And you were brought in?

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

Q: How many?

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

Q: What did you do?

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

Q: And you found something?

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

Q: So someone else cooked up the story.

A: Yes.

Q: And what was the fake story?

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

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

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

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

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

Q: In other words...

A: This was complex.

Q: But it wasn't true.

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

Q: Ratchet up the Cold War.

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

Q: Was Kennedy president?

A: I'm not saying when this was.

Q: What about the Soviet reaction?

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

Q: How did you feel?

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

Q: You worked it gradually.

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

Q: And the sex scandal was squelched.

A: Completely.

Q: And everybody was happy.

A: Just about.

Q: So then what happened?

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

Q: A double agent?

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

Q: Meaning?

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

Q: I see.

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

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

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

Q: So...

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

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

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

Q: You were led.

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

Q: Why?

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

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

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

Q: Spell out this "higher game."

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

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

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

Q: So the Cold War was...

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

Q: Orwell.

A: Straight out of Orwell.

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

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

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

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

Q: And what was this new area?

A: Medical.

Q: Right.

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

Q: In the sense that...

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

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

A: The prince, the king.

Q: 1984...

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

Q: So you worked on medical stories.

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

Q: In 1984 they take away freedom.

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

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

Q: So you were accepted in this new echelon.

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

Q: Why did they want you to know that?

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

Q: And if you had balked?

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

Q: Because no one would have believed you.

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

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

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

Q: Brave New World.

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

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

A: The major players are dead now.

Q: Of natural causes?

A: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: What can you tell me?

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

Q: Like modern medicine.

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

Q: More like 1 in a million.

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

Q: What do you mean?

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

Q: And in the public schools?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

###END###

September 28, 2001

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

Q: Where do we start?

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

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

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

Q: What about the attack itself?

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

Q: Do you trust the FBI?

A: Are you kidding?

Q: They often lie.

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

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

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

Q: Whereas the truth is...

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

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

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

Q: Why?

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

Q: Stopped by whom?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: But even the CIA...

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

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

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

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

Q: It's like the JFK assassination.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: So terrorism is controlled from above.

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

Q: And government leaders?

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

Q: What do you mean?

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

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

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

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

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

Q: The story about Salem is quite incredible.

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

Q: Same with the OKC bombing.

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

Q: What else?

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

Q: The disbelief factor.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: Any other formulas or equations at work here?

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

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

Q: Not reality.

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

Q: We're talking about some monsters here.

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

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

Q: Continuing...

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

Q: Why didn't you say that before?

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

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

###END###

October 12, 2001

REMARKS FROM ELLIS MEDAVOY ON 9/11:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I asked Ellis if he was satisfied with this formulation.

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

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

###END###

January 25, 2002

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

Q: Where do we start today?

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

Q: What are you talking about?

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

Q: Connecting information is the key?

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

Q: And then they think it's true.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: What does this have to do with philosophy?

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

Q: You've lost me.

A: Think. How do you build time?

Q: Build time?

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

Q: And this means?

A: There is a fundamental human hunger for TIME.

Q: What?

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

Q: I see.

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

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

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

Q: Yeah?

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

Q: And all propaganda works the same way.

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

Q: You said time and emotion.

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

Q: Proof?

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

Q: So you're saying—

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

Q: It must be true.

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

Q: What about a movie?

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

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

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

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

A: It doesn't matter.

Q: What comes next?

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

Q: And this is calculated.

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

Q: Yes.

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

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

A: Now you’re catching on.

Q: Is that what you’re saying?

A: Damn right.

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

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

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

A: I’ll let you figure that out.

Q: Oh no you don’t.

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

Q: Why isn’t it true?

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

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

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

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

Q: Okay. And?

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

Q: You tell me.

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

Q: I'd have to think about that.

A: You bet your ass you would.

Q: So you're saying—

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

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

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

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

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

A: It's too late now.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: And all the medical propaganda you did?

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

Q: We really are into philosophy here.

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

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

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

Q: Created murals.

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

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

A: I used to think so.

Q: But now?

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

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

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

Q: Go back to time and emotions.

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

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

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

A: Yes.

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

A: I disagree.

Q: Why?

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

Q: With Clinton being the other half.

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

Q: In the medical area—

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

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

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

Q: What?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: Why not?

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

Q: You knew lots of people like that.

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

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

Q: What's the party line?

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

Q: Sounds like you'd enjoy doing that.

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

Q: Did you ever try something like that?

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

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

Q: A history that goes back a long way.

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

Q: This certainly ties in to the cartels.

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

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

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

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

Q: What are you seeing?

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

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

Q: A pretty savage assessment.

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

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

A: I don't understand.

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

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

Q: Not really. I'm just digging.

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

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

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

Q: Instead.

A: Yeah.

Q: This newspaper—

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

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

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

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

Q: What is that?

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

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

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

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

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

Q: What was the drug?

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

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

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

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

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

Q: You work against what you did before.

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

Q: How do you think of it?

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

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

A: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

###END###