



The Solari Report

MAY 17, 2012



Let's Go to the Movies
Part 2
with Jon Rappoport



Let's Go to the Movies

Part 2

May 17, 2012

C. AUSTIN FITTS: So, without much further ado, let me bring Jon in. What we wanted to do was to talk tonight about the best documentaries you could think of to help you understand your world in the 21st Century. We each were going to pick five documentaries each.

Jon did a much more disciplined job of sticking to his five. I picked five and then couldn't decide between another ten, so Jon and I ended up compromising and agreeing we'd add two and then the rest, I will post on the blog as runner ups within the different categories. So, if you go to the blog, all the runner ups will be listed, and of course, everything will be in the transcript next week.

I hope the list of movies, that we came up with, in part one, and this list of documentaries will help you get a much better understanding of what's going on in your world. I think movies and documentaries are just a great and entertaining way to understand the world around you. It's important to get to the very best ones, and that's what I'm hoping tonight will help you do.

We're going to organize our comments into a series of categories. The first is the real deal. The second is the real deal on what happens to you if you tell people about the real deal. The third is food and health and then the fourth is inspirational.

Okay. So this is a man who needs no introduction. He's more than infamous in our subscriber group, but as I've said, many times before, one of the reasons I can never get trapped by the matrix is because his intellectual fearlessness and courage is always there to remind me of what reality is. So, Mr. Rappoport, you with us?



JON RAPPOPORT: I am indeed. It's always great to be here, Catherine, thank you.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Oh, it's always great to be here. Okay. So we're going to start with the real deal. Are you ready?

JON RAPPOPORT: I am ready to go. Ready and excited. Okay. So my first documentary is actually two about the same subject. The first is called *Oklahoma City Bombing: What Really Happened*, produced and directed by Chuck Allen, 1995, and the bookend piece is a more recent film, on the same subject called the *Noble Lie* produced and directed by James Lane.

The reason I chose these, first of all, I did a lot of investigation on the Oklahoma City bombing shortly after it occurred, and it prepared me greatly for what happened on 9/11 because I could see the similarities and the patterns and so on. And not to belabor it but it soon became apparent that the government scenario about what happened in Oklahoma City was impossible, that any type of bomb, contained in the Ryder truck that was parked at the curb on that morning in April 1995, would not have caused the particular profile of damage to the building that was sustained by the building.

Certain columns, that would have stayed up, went down and vice-a-versa. It was all very, very different from any kind of scenario involved with a bomb and a truck, and this was laid out by General Ben Partin and other people that I spoke with after the bombing.

Therefore, this immediately drops you deep into the rabbit hole because so much happened on that day and so much was made of what happened on that day, and really, it saved Bill Clinton because he began to say to people, "There's a threat to the country. Come back to the government. Come back to the government."

There had been lots of rumbling and conversation in the country and action on the part of various groups that were splintering off from



government, some of which were militias. A lot was written and talked about those organizations and what were their real intentions and so forth, but, prior to the Oklahoma bombing, there was no doubt that a strong movement was taking place for radical decentralization of the country and moving away from invasive federal control

But, as soon as the bombing occurred, everything changed, and Clinton was extremely successful in being able to tell people, “Come back to the government. We’re your friend. We will help you. We will – we’re all in this together. We’ll protect you. Everything is going to be safe because we’re in charge now, and this nonsense is going to stop.” And that’s exactly what happened vis-à- vis the public and media sentiment, at least that’s how it was engineered.

“That’s exactly what happened vis-à- vis the public and media sentiment, at least that’s how it was engineered.”

The reason that I picked these two films is because the first one, *Oklahoma City Bombing: What Really Happened*, is, in production values, an amateur effort. It’s fine. I mean it’s got interviews with important people. The second, the *Noble Lie*, is much more professional job, but it shows you that people, who are not necessarily professionals in the field of either investigation or journalism, can pick up the camera and can do something that radically changes people’s idea of reality, in this case, political reality, and begins to alert people that there is a matrix, that they’re in it and that part of the reason they’re in it is because they’re accepting certain scenarios that are spelled out for them and that they can break through it, and that’s what these two films do.

And the first one, in particular, does – gives you that sense of people picking up cameras and filming other people in interviews. Also shows you – and this was a turning point, I felt, at least in my perception, you could get to official people, even though you had no connections. Charles Key, a congressman, became very much involved in the movement for Oklahoma bombing truth, and he was interviewed by endless numbers of people. And he and his own staff began to investigate, and he was available to almost anybody that walked into his



office with a camera.

Ditto for Hoppy Heidelberg, who I interviewed several times, who was a grand juror in the impaneled grand jury to investigate the bombing, and Hoppy came out of that a businessman, living in Oklahoma City, raised horses, recently died.

Hoppy was extremely forthcoming about what happened inside the grand jury, which is really – now we're talking heavy taboo to come out and say, "This whole thing is a put up job, and the people on the grand jury really didn't realize that they had an opportunity to ask questions. They were bullied around by the prosecutor. The whole thing was a prop and a front, and obviously, they wanted to float a certain scenario about McVey and his connections. And they were successful, and this was not justice."

So it also meant that citizens now had access to people who were on the inside, who knew something, and they could talk to them and interview them, put them on film and audio tape and all sorts of things would change, and this was in the very early days of the internet. So this wasn't an internet production. This was a wild cat deal, and I would recommend very much seeing these two documentaries.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: One of the things you see – and if I remember, it was in the first one you described, we've all learned, now, if something – some event like this happens, to get the early coverage by the local press. You know, get cuts of what the local press says because you get lots of honest information and pictures that later disappears, and so, you know, the back story, three days from now, is very different than what really happened. But it hasn't gotten – you know, the kaboom hasn't come down on the local media yet. If I remember, that was certainly the case in Oklahoma, and they were able to get some great footage of the first reports.

JON RAPPOPORT: I mean it was astonishing.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yeah.



JON RAPPOPORT: They got film, for example, of what certainly appeared to be people carrying missiles or bombs out of the building, after the explosion, that sort of thing, interviews with people who were – I interviewed – I mentioned this, I think, in our first chat about movies, an eyewitness to the actual collapse of the building, which was very important, because how it collapsed indicated that there were charges in the building not having anything to do with the truck bomb or whatever was in the truck.

And that eyewitness tried to tell me he didn't say what he said to a local reporter, and I went back to the reporter, and she assured me that he was lying to me and that she had him on the record as saying that the whole thing really looked like an implosion, the building falling straight down.

So you're absolutely right. Get in there early and often and you pick up things that are extremely valuable and disappear.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right. Okay. So my first pick for the real deal was an interview. It's a video of an interview. In that sense, it's not a documentary. It's Sir James Goldsmith. It's a 1994 interview with Charlie Rose. Sir James Goldsmith was a successful businessman, a billionaire. He had a – he'd been a takeover artist, and when he saw what was happening with the Uruguay Round of GATT and the plan to institute the WTO and basically globalize – compete labor globally and fundamentally shift the relationship between capital and labor, he ran for the European Parliament, tried to stop it in Europe and came here in 1994 as Congress was debating whether or not to adopt the Uruguay Round.

He came here to try to persuade people not to do it, went on Charlie Rose and gave the best description yet of the intentional and organized plan to centralize the global economy including the centralization of agriculture. Jon, if you haven't see it, it's fantastic. He describes the fact that they are literally planning to take control of the seed and the food supply and shift two to three billion self-sufficient farmers off the land into the cities or into the grave and says that this is madness.



And what was so interesting about it – one of the reasons I try to get everyone to watch it is it explains, in the most beautiful and clear way, why centralization is wealth destroying as opposed to wealth producing, number one, because you're destroying massive amounts of living equity. You're centralizing it so that people – you know, you – a few people end up with far more, but the total pie shrinks. And he describes why this is economic madness.

The other thing is it makes very clear – if you take the Sir James Goldsmith interview with Charlie Rose in 1994 and you add my story, *Dillon, Read and the Aristocracy of Stock Profits* (www.dunwalke.com), which focuses on the North America domestic piece of the same game, what it says is this was a plan. This financial coup d'état was a plan. They knew what they were doing, and it was intentional. It was clear from the beginning, and it's far from over. It's still rolling out. That clarity of understanding, oh, yes, this is a plan, is very freeing for a lot of people. You know, it's not some giant mistake. It's not because they're incompetent. It's not because people don't understand or don't have the information. It's a plan. So that would be my first pick and your –

JON RAPPOPORT: Let me ask you a question.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yes.

JON RAPPOPORT: What was Charlie's reaction to all this?

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well, you know, Charlie Rose is just the greatest deadpan. He's like, "Oh, this – yeah, this is interesting." And he couldn't like – you know, Goldsmith was a very intelligent, very clear and unbelievably charming man, so Rose clearly likes him. At the same time, he knows what Goldsmith is saying is way outside of the official plan, and so, he's – you know, he's a little bit uncomfortable, but he's – you know, Goldsmith is what I call touching the third rail, and it makes him nervous.

And what he does is he brings Laura Tyson in, the national economic advisor – who is so muddled, unclear and full of ya ya, that it's painful to



even watch her next to Goldsmith. You just can't stand it, and you know, it's pretty painful to watch. But Rose, I thought, did a good job of leading him through the issues, and he let him on. He let him say his piece, and that video is still available on the internet. I have to tell you it's one of the greatest contributions, I'm sure, that Charlie Rose has made towards freedom and the kind of world in which you and I could thrive. So, God bless him for it.

JON RAPPOPORT: Fantastic, really.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yeah.

JON RAPPOPORT: Well –

C. AUSTIN FITTS: It's tough to be a billionaire, Jon. He used to be a billionaire.

JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah, it does. It definitely does.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Okay. Your next one?

JON RAPPOPORT: Well, I'm going to follow up with another interview that is also available on the internet. You can find it at YouTube. I watched it I'm going to say three, four weeks ago, G. Edward Griffin interviewing Norman Dodd. D-O-D-D. You will easily find it. About tax exempt foundations.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: It is fabulous. Now I just have to say, Jon, if you're trolling around the internet and you're looking for something really entertaining and exciting and you see the headline, "G. Edward Griffin, of the John Birch Society, Interviewing Norman Dodd on Tax Exempt Foundations," you're not going to stop and say, "Oh, that's really fascinating. That's just what I was feeling like tonight. Let me get some popcorn and beer and watch this." Right?

JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah. You're not going to say that in the title, but once you

“It’s one of the greatest contributions, I’m sure, that Charlie Rose has made towards freedom and the kind of world in which you and I could thrive.”



flip it on –

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Oh, it's amazing.

JON RAPPOPORT: You can't get up, you know. It might have been on six parts, so you keep on going from one to the other. Come on, let's go, you know.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

JON RAPPOPORT: It just keeps picking up and continuing on with it. Essentially, Norman Dodd was part of – he was investigator for the Reese Commission which was a Congressional outgrowth of a committee investigating tax exempt foundations in America in the 1950s, '52, '53, '54, in there.

And the argument was very simple and stark and – to us, today, startling which was are these foundations doing anything un-American. That was the question that Dodd was tasked to answer. He had a lot of experience in banking, and he talks about that. And those revelations are mind-blowing in itself because they also indicate a plan, a financial plan of which he would not be a part because he was independent minded and suggested alternatives to the bank that he worked with, and they said, "Very interesting, Norman. We'd like to just put you on a salary and stick you in an office for another few years where you'll do nothing but sit there and collect a nice paycheck."

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Wasn't he at JP Morgan Chase?

JON RAPPOPORT: I don't recall if that was it or not.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: It was one of the big ones in New York.

JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah, it was a big one, for sure. So Dodd – he's a short time away from dying, first of all, when he's interviewed by Griffin, and Griffin knows this, so he wants to get him on tape because this is invisible history. This was 1982 when he interviewed him about events



in the 1950s, and Dodd is extremely convincing.

You get the sense, of listening to him, that he has really nothing to win here. He's just trying to tell the story, and it begins with the Carnegie Foundation. And just as a sort of a tease, I will tell you that Dodd decides to send one of his assistants down to the Carnegie Foundation to see what she can do there, and she says, "I don't really want to go because I'm not going to find out anything down there because it's a charity. I mean they do good things. They give money away. What could be bad?"

And he says, "That's what I want you to go. Just go." So she goes there, and the explanation that Dodd gives is this is now second generation people running the Carnegie Foundation. And so they welcome her with open arms. "Sure, no problem. We understand you won't investigate. That's fine. In fact, suppose we make available to you," get this, "The minutes of every meeting of the Carnegie Foundation since the first meeting? We'll put you in a room with the books. Two weeks. Get anything out there you want to and do what you will with it." She says, "Fine."

She goes into the room. Dodd says, when she returned, she was so shaken that she was really no longer the capable person that she was when she went, and that, subsequently, he found a job for her, in another federal agency, where she could sort wile away her years, a cushy job without having to do too much because her mind was destroyed by what she discovered.

I mean those were the days, you see, before anybody – or most people really suspected anything horrible was going on under the surface at all. Everything was exactly as it was presented. The matrix was absolutely firmly in place, and looking at the first meeting of the Carnegie Foundation, the notes, she saw that they raised this question which was, "What is the single most important thing in changing society?" They decided this was the question they wanted to ask, not a kind of question that you would assume that a charitable foundation is all that interested in, but they were very serious, and they discussed this through several



meetings, and they came up with the answer.

This was, I believe, 1908. The answer was war, and they liked that. Okay, that's the answer. That's what essentially we have to do to change society.

Flash forward, after the First World War, although now, it was, "What's the second most important thing that can change society?" And the answer was education, and they went about revolutionizing and changing the educational system of America for the purpose of, A, providing a kind of a meld, a unification, they hoped between Russia and the United States but, more importantly, to destroy and wipe out the memory of what U.S. history was really all about.

And they went about this in a very systematic way by creating scholars, historical scholars of their own, an association that became preeminent in America, so that the individual was no longer the cornerstone of American society when you went back and studied history.

That's the intro to the six part interview that will just knock you off the chair, and I know that a lot of you have probably heard about the undermining of the U.S. educational system. But when you hear the way Dodd describes it, it's chilling because it's almost like he's watching a blow-by-blow event in which this happens, engineered by a very powerful group that as a name, the Carnegie Foundation working in concert with Rockefeller Foundation, Guggenheim Foundation.

You see it. It's almost like you're watching the step-by-step operation. You know who's doing it, and I couldn't stop watching it. I mean I couldn't get up from the chair, so that's my number two.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Okay. Just as a matter of disclosure, I have to let you know that my grandfather was, after being dean at the Wharton school, was the head of social sciences at the Rockefeller Foundation, and our farm was the highest house on Iron Mountain in New Hampshire, and in fact, the Rockefeller Foundation paid for the phone line to be put up there, so they could reach him in the summer.



And, for years, my sister, who was very active in college, kept accusing him of the report for Iron Mountain being – relating to our summer home which I don't think it was.

JON RAPPOPORT: Report from Catherine's house.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well, here's the good news. He was fired from the Rockefeller Center because apparently his promotion of decentralizing ideas was upsetting up the Dulles brothers. So...

JON RAPPOPORT: What a surprise that is, huh?

C. AUSTIN FITTS: What a surprise that is. The one thing I did want to mention – I don't remember if Dodd gets into this. It's very important, when you think about the tax exempt foundations, it's such an important way, Jon, to protect intergenerational capital. So, if you're trying to husband resources to finance your corporations, you know, if you put \$100 million in an investment vehicle, you're have to pay taxes, okay, but if you put that 100 million in a tax exempt foundation, you have a very quiet way of steering it to the places you want it to go, and then instead of paying profits, you pay a much smaller amount in terms of good works, and then you use those good works to engineer society in the way you want to go including, you know, the things that make money for where you're now steering this capital into.

So it means your syndicate has a much lower cost of capital than the rest of the society, who you're competing with, and it gives you the ability – you know, it's a real juggernaut. The tax exempt foundation endowment are a real juggernaut in financing the new world order. So if you add that to what –

JON RAPPOPORT: Now, looking at one other question here, I think Dodd really gets into that. If I have a big time foundation, I can actually take a huge chunk of money and just deliver it to a corporation if I want to?

“He was fired from the Rockefeller Center because apparently his promotion of decentralizing ideas was upsetting up the Dulles brothers.”



C. AUSTIN FITTS: Oh, you have this whole system about how it has to be managed and the prudent man rule and all of this but, yes, absolutely. In other words, you can engineer a much lower cost of capital for your – the companies you want to grow. I think tax exempt foundations were one of the critical vehicles to engineer American corporations into the biggest and most successful multinational corporations.

If you look at the three parts to any business, there's the business. You know, so we make our orange juice. There's the business of the business, lobbying back office personnel, that kind of stuff, and then there's financing the business. And the rise of the big corporation has been driven by driving the capital down to zero using government and all variety of other mechanisms of which this is one, and a lot of dirty stuff is hidden.

You know, the endowments have, for many generations, been the ultimate slush funds for laundering all sorts of stuff. So that's a topic for another day.

JON RAPPOPORT: Right. Wow, that – yeah, that's a major – oh, boy. OK!

C. AUSTIN FITTS: When – sometime, you and I will – you and I have a particular favorite university endowment that we know and love.

JON RAPPOPORT: Yes.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: When you take what Dodd and Griffin, with an unbelievable interview, and you add it to sort of what the understanding of the financial model is you see the power of what these foundations have been up to.

JON RAPPOPORT: And, just to put it into historical context, you know, we're talking about, certainly, with Carnegie, I mean we're going back to the beginning of the 20th Century.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yes.



JON RAPPOPORT: So the idea, you know, that these foundations had a plan then, a very serious plan for transforming society, but they weren't fooling around. That all of this was on the planning table back then, that's one of the astonishing things to me is that is not something recent at all, even vaguely recent.

I mean this – we're going back to a time when, you know, people – the idea of questioning any of this was preposterous. You know, people, yeah, okay. What were these big foundations doing?

But I mean not really. There was no way. There was no communication system, you know, by which citizens could discuss this or even bring it to light. It was just – I mean it's like going back into an antique shop, you know, and finding a couple of guys in there talking about, in a dusty corner where you feel like you're in the 19th Century, “And then we'll do this to America and then we'll do that and then we'll do this and that,” and you're watching them talk. And they mean it, and they've got the money to back it up.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I came out of that world, and my – the first thing you did was you had a plan, and you had a plan to get a plan. And these guys are planners. They believe in 100 year plans. I mean really.

So, my next pick is Adam Curtis's *Century of Self*. *Century of Self* was made for British television, and it focuses on how Sigmund Freud, Anna Freud and Edward Bernays influenced the way corporations and governments have basically manipulated people. I laugh when I think of this, because, of course, I think of your interviews with Ellis Medavoy which, as you know, are some of my favorite of your many wonderful interviews because – and this really does dovetail, you know, through the softer, gentler version of what you and Ellis discussed.

It rolled out, in four parts, in 2002. Let me just describe the names because it will give you a sense of what it's about. The first part is called *Happiness Machines*. The second part is the *Engineering of Consent*, and then there was *There's a Policeman Inside All Our Heads*. *He Must be Destroyed* and *Eight People Sipping Wine in Kettering*.



The reason I wanted to choose this – and it's remarkably well done. It's a very, very professional and fascinating documentary, so it's very enjoyable to watch, but it shows you how, over many generations, the people governing society have figured out how to channel our actions into style choices as opposed to actions that really change things.

So I'll use the illusion, again, of the third rail. In a transit system or a train system, you have two tracks. The wheels run on the tracks, but there's a little gizmo that flips over and touches the third rail which is where the power or electricity runs. And the whole key notion is to give people a way to channel their feelings, about not liking what's going on, into something that doesn't touch the third rail, so that they can't really change anything important.

And what you see over many – over a very long period of time, is the extent to which real political power has been steadily diminished and replaced with things like consumer choice. I saw this in the '90s. It scared me to death, Jon, because, you know, I'd been busy working. I'd been busy on Wall Street then in the Bush administration and building my own company. Who was paying attention?

And I started to realize that any kind of real political influence or power was being withdrawn. People were so overwhelmed and delighted with an infinite number of consumer choices and dropping prices with all sorts of toys and digital technology that nobody seemed to notice or care that their political power was steadily diminishing in a way that would ultimately come back and bite them in the pocketbook very, very badly and deeply.

You know part of this is the choices you get between the duopolies. You know, you can have Burger King or McDonald's or the Democrats or the Republicans, but of course, there's no choice there. It's all a style choice.

Curtis does a very extraordinary job of researching, documenting and laying it all out, and you will never look at the world, let alone a political campaign, the same way again. You know, you will really see it.



So, if you want to understand how we're being manipulated, if you watch *Century of Self*, read the Ellis Medavoy interviews and the listen to the interview I did with Adam Trombly on entrainment. Boy - it will change your digestion of media forever, and it's a change I recommend. So that's my next one.

There's one more we're going to do together.

JON RAPPOPORT: I just wanted to interject something quick here because this really resonates, strikes me on top of the head here. I sort of write about this in terms of as if you wrote the word self with a small S or a big S, so it's making the big S self into the small S self.

“I sort of write about this in terms of as if you wrote the word self with a small S or a big S, so it's making the big S self into the small S self.”

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yep.

JON RAPPOPORT: It's convincing people that a diminished notion of self is really what they are, and they just had been missing it up until now, you know. They somehow had overlooked that fact that their larger ideas, their larger vision and so forth, their larger energies that could be devoted into great action, that was a mistake. That was some sort of a delusion, but now, we're really getting down to the thing which is the small S self, and now, we're showing you, this is really what you are, you see?

And what this is is you can have Chrysler. You can have Nissan. You can have Honda, and you have to really think about all of these things, and when you think about them, you have to realize how important they are because this is you. This is what you are and get used to it and fit into that sense of small self so that all your choices, as you say, will become style choices, and this is what you will think of as your identity, and that it's and then once –

C. AUSTIN FITTS: But the machinery can deliver massive attention. How do you feel? What do you want? You know, it's the grief counseling you wrote about in your interviews on Columbine, that we talked about, you



know, from your wonderful interviews in *The Matrix Revealed*.

In other words, you know, rather than talk about what is going on in the society, which is really harming you, let's talk about how you feel about your parents. And everything comes down to my little intimate world, and I never see how that connects to the power lines, and so you just – so they're delivering massive attention to you. You're becoming, if anything, self-absorbed.

JON RAPPOPORT: Completely self-absorbed. Absolutely and not only don't you find yourself any longer able to look outward at the larger picture, but you can't either look inward at the scope of what you, as an individual, really are. That's gone, too, because, now, oh, well, I've got – I don't have time for that because I've got to make up my mind whether it's going to be this wallpaper or that candy bar or that car or this because these are the choices. This is what makes me up into who I am.

And I remember an old George Carlin routine about people now becoming walking advertisements for companies and corporations. At the point where that began, all those years ago, when people started walking around with t-shirts on that were advertisements basically, and they seemed to be great with that. You know, like this is terrific. I've got a t-shirt that says, "Chrysler," on it, and they're walking – you know, they're ads walking around the street, and there's no objection to it.

It's like, "Well, this is me. This is self. This is massaged self." Right. Unbelievable.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Anyway, the – it will change your life. This afternoon, I was talking to Kimberly Gamble. She and Foster made the documentary *THRIVE* which is on our list to talk about, and you're going to laugh, Jon, because she said to me – I told her what we were going to do tonight. We're doing documentaries, and she said, "Oh, you know, I have to tell you. I just saw the most fabulous one. You have to see it. It's called *Hot Coffee*."

JON RAPPOPORT: Oh, wow.



C. AUSTIN FITTS: And, of course, *Hot Coffee* is next on our list. And so why don't you introduce *Hot Coffee*?

JON RAPPOPORT: You know, the best introduction I could give would be if I just started screaming and walking up the wall and over the ceiling because I turned on the television set one night, and it was playing on HBO. And I cut into – I don't know – maybe a third of the way through it, and I – it's a think, first of all, you have to see it a couple of times because, the first time through, you're just in shock. You know, your jaw is on the floor.

And it – what I remember of it, because I have to see it again, I mean it came through in flashes. You know, something would be revealed on the screen, and I would start thinking about it and firecrackers are going off in my head. And the next time I looked back at the screen, it's ten minutes later, and they're onto another aspect of the story, and I've lost it because it's just – it just short circuits all of the little matrix connections in there.

And they're talking – one of the things, that I remember the most, is they're talking about the Arvid – they're talking about tort reform, which you can explain much better than I can, but they're talking about arbitration contracts where people, who go to work for companies or even buy a cell phone, unknown to them, they're actually signing a contract which, in the small print, says that, if they have a problem or a perceived claim against the company for anything, that they have to submit to an arbitration panel. They can't take it to court.

And then they go onto show, in these instances that are just horrific and chilling and unbelievable, how people, who have been grievously harmed, find out, all of the sudden, that they have no recourse. There's no justice because these arbitration panels are privately owned. They're companies, you see.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

JON RAPPOPORT: That's what they do. They arbitrate. So, naturally, their



clients are corporations who need them to do the arbitration, and they can't upset these corporations by rendering verdicts against the corporations. So they're sold out right from the beginning.

So, you know, you go to work for a company, and you're working at a machine, and suddenly, you find that your torso is separated from your legs. And when you recover, six months later in the hospital, you bring in a lawyer, and he says, "Oh, sorry to tell you signed a contract saying that you're going to have to submit to an arbitration panel."

I mean it is something the Soviets could never dream of. So you pick it up from there –

C. AUSTIN FITTS: It was amazing.

JON RAPPOPORT: Because I'm still stunned by it.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: It was produced, and it just was published in 2011. We did it on *Let's Go to the Movies* earlier this year, and – or last year, and it was made my Susan Saladoff, who is a medical malpractice attorney, a very experienced medical malpractice attorney.

And I think one of the reasons it's so good is you need a very deep knowledge of a very complex subject, but it's literally about how a group of people, including Karl Rove and the Chamber of Commerce set about to change the tort law, in the country, one state at a time.

And there's some amazing stories, and one is about a state Supreme Court in Mississippi that they went after because they really went after the campaigns and state by state, target states and, you know, basically turned over the courts. And it's quite remarkable and shows you the power of this juggernaut when – you know, when they decide they want something and they start targeting people with money and campaigns and dirty tricks, you know, you see the power of what they can do. So it's very good, *Hot Coffee*.

Okay. So we have a question from a viewer that I wanted to ask, and I'll



put it to you, Jon. It's coming in from London. "On the subject of entrainment, it's almost inevitable that the documentaries should use the media formats that are now delivered in and induce a feeling of passivity and acceptance, compassion fatigue, even. Are there ways of making a documentary that can avoid this response and wake the view up rather than put them to sleep inside? Or maybe we will arrive at the view that there will always be a small percentage of people who are inclined, by nature, to act positively on revelatory material they view while most people will display their curious amnesia where such data never seems to penetrate their brain."

What do you think?

JON RAPPOPORT: What I think is that this person is reading my mind. I mean do they know me? This is the story of my life. They're asking this question, right? So, for the next six hours, I will talk about it. No.

I mean this is a story. This is it. This is the fulcrum. This is the crux. How do you actually use art to wake people up as opposed to put them to sleep?

"This is the crux. How do you actually use art to wake people up as opposed to put them to sleep?"

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

JON RAPPOPORT: Because it doesn't really matter what the message is, if the medium itself is soporific and hypnotic, then you're going to get exactly that passive effect at the end of it. People will feel like something washed over them, and they will walk out of their shaking their heads and saying, "Unbelievable," and then nothing will happen.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

JON RAPPOPORT: And the answer to that is, yes, there are ways to do this, absolutely ways to do this, and one of the reasons that I picked the Dodd interview with Ed Griffin because, in my experience, that's one of those moments where you see it's not like an interview in the usual sense. It's



like somebody took a slice out of time and just brought Dodd in and said, "Tell us what happened," and he does.

It's very hard to get away from when you're watching it, but there are many other ways, one of which we'll talk about here at the end, because I've had some recent experience with exactly this kind of thing.

But everybody can do this, first of all. Anybody can make a documentary. Anybody now can do it. So you need to ask yourself that question, "How do I do it so that the overall effect is not just to entrain people's minds and residences and rhythms so that, at the end of it, they say, 'Nice job. Wonderful,' and nothing absolutely happens. In fact, it's almost worse than if they didn't see it at all."

That's the question to ask. How do you do that? And now, you're out there with your imagination. Now you are thinking in the right away. Now you're moving into a whole atmosphere and territory that has been explored, but it's infinite. So it can continue to be explored. This is what surrealism is all about.

In the early 20th Century, artists were saying, "Yeah, yeah, yeah. We know all about the great works of art. We looked at them forever. We went to the academies. We kept looking at them and looking at them until we fell asleep even though they're the greatest works of art. Yeah, we kept looking at the Michelangelo. We kept going to the Vatican. We kept looking at Leonardo. It's fabulous. It's wonderful. Nothing like this had ever been done before, and nothing like this could ever be done again. And, therefore, this is the end, and let's go to sleep."

So we don't like that. We want to do something different. We want to juxtapose realities next to each other in ways that are going to jolt people out of the matrix, so that they're suddenly awake perceiving the information rather than asleep. This is food for much thought and much discussion which we could spend the rest of the night on this, but this is a key, key question.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yeah. It's a very key question, and also because, you know,



a lot of great documentaries have to run through a medium where that kind of technology can be overlaid. So it's –

JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah, that – such as television.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Okay. So the next – our next category is the real deal on telling the real deal, and the one we're going to discuss is *THRIVE*. Wonderful documentary, new documentary, very long documentary made by Foster and Kimberly Gamble.

THRIVE is Foster's best effort to sort of understand the world and say, "Okay, what's really going on, and what can we do about it? Why aren't humans thriving? Why aren't people thriving on this planet and then how do we end up in a world where people do thrive," which I think are, you know, just about the most important questions to ask.

And he gets deeply into the fact that we have a governance structure that's doing everything Sir James Goldsmith and Norman Dodd said they're doing. Since I've talked about *THRIVE* and we've had Foster on the Solari Report, Jon and I are not going to discuss the content of the film. It's available now for free, so if you haven't see it, I really encourage you to do so. You can stream it through the internet.

What we want to talk about is what has happened. We have a group of people, who have been interviewed in the film, who have now come out and called themselves the dissidents and are disassociating themselves from *THRIVE*. If anything, they're probably helping the marketing since it's an international marketing in ten languages. Most of the people watching *THRIVE*'s attitude is, "Who cares what they think?" It's not like they're big names in Japan.

And some of their objections – and I know because one of them tried to recruit me – their objections, some of which are written up on the internet – now, *THRIVE* has created a place on their website where they're collecting all their objections and given them a hearing.

One is they object to being in a film with G. Edward Griffin and David



Icke. The second is they object to Foster and Kimberly basically outing the top families and holding them accountable for doing what they're doing and saying, "Look, these people really do have an agenda, and here's what they're doing, and they're real."

The third is that the – from some of them, the film is light on environmental dangers, and then the fourth is that the film will be used to justify cuts in government which could lead to horrible things or anarchy.

And it's funny because I always say to Foster and Kimberly, "Welcome to my world."

JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: You never get attacked by the – you know you think you're going to be embraced by the people who are also seeking real solutions. Wrong. They see you as competitors, and this is exactly what happens to you. It's always painful when you try and engage people in a conversation about the real deal, that touches the third rail –

All these people, who you thought were also truth seekers, are attacking you. I guess there are a few things I wanted to say and then invite you to comment. You know, it's interesting to see the names that are constantly made up. You know, there are euphemisms for people who touch the third rail. So you're a terrorist or you're a communist or you're a socialist or you're a left-winger or you're a right-winger or you're a conspiracy theorist, but these are sort of euphemisms for people who touch the third rail.

In any given group, you look for the euphemism that is going to be effective because that brands you as somebody who will never be socially acceptable. It's funny because one of the things, you know, that you find out is, when you get targeted by these kinds of people at this kind of moment, suddenly, the world opens up to you because people say, "Well, I guess they're really serious. I guess they do want to deal with the third rail."



And so, suddenly, the Jon Rappaports of this world start talking to you, and you lose your credentials in one group, but the real power players sort of open up to you. So that's a little bit the process.

A second point I wanted to make is that, when you believe in promoting decentralization, it means you have to be willing to share the stage with people you don't agree with, and the notion that you will only be in a documentary when everybody else, in two hours and 15 minute documentary, are people you agree with on everything, I can't fathom it. That's a very centralized model. I

It is also a reminder that the biggest mistake you can make is to do – you know, there are two things that are absolutely unforgivable.

“It is also a reminder that the biggest mistake you can make is to do – you know, there are two things that are absolutely unforgivable.”

One is that you integrate different factions in the divide and conquer games. So, in this case you integrate right and left. The second is that you stand up for individual rights because the strongest – what Foster said when he was on the *Solari Report* is the thing that has caused the most pain is that he came out and said individual rights are non-negotiable. This whole idea of the collective is bunk. You have to start with the integrity of the individual, and that has to be sacred. And, of course, this is, as Norm Dodd would explain to you, this is – you know, this is a very dangerous idea.

Finally, the last thing I wanted to say was one of my favorite books, Jon, on real solutions, is Robert Axelrod's book, *The Evolution of Cooperation*.

What he says is, to boil it down, that markets and natural process can lead to a society where you make more money from cooperation than forceful competition. So peace makes more money than war if one condition is precedent, and that is transparency. If I can go across, to the other side of the world and kill and maim and steal and come back and still be socially acceptable in my rich suburban neighborhood, then crime pays.



But if you hold individuals accountable for what they're really doing, then crime doesn't pay because people will naturally shun, whether in society or marketplace, people who are killing and doing genocide. And so it's absolutely essential that these people not be outed if the system is going to go. When I was approached by one of these people, they said, "You know, there's nothing to be gained by being mean. If these people fail, new ones will just step up."

No, new ones will not just step up if they are constantly outed, and at the end of the day, that means they're shunned.

JON RAPPOPORT: So, to sum up what you're saying here, this is huge – another huge deal. This is –

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yeah.

JON RAPPOPORT: This is gigantic because the matrix approach to things, in terms of propaganda and Ellis Medavoy has mentioned this to me on several occasions, people have to be led to believe that the group is a fundamental unit of existence. If you can do that, then they forget they're an individual.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

JON RAPPOPORT: And, of course, you can see how this operates in multitudes of ways, if you look around and you see what's been happening over the last years here. Therefore, when this film steps out and talks about individual rights, this is a blow to the midsection of that whole trillion dollar propaganda effort, that is ongoing at every level of society, to make people believe they have to be in a group, and they group has to have a connection so that they can get special favors or they're entitled to this and that, and they're going to get it.

But they must not stand alone because there isn't any such thing as alone anymore. There's no such thing as an individual. That's a passé idea. That's what has been promoted. So, obviously, he would be attacked on that tremendously, and then as you said, the other side of that coin, same



coin is, when the individual commits a crime, it has to be transparent and there has to be justice delivered on that basis you committed a crime. Period.

And we are going to enact justice for that, and if that goes by the boards, if you don't have that anymore, then you're living in the world we're living in. You're living in this matrix. Both of those things – and I mean another six hour topic.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well, let's move on to one of our favorite topics, food and health. At the subscriber resource page, there's a document that we made about a year and a half ago called *My Favorite Food Documentaries*. So there's a huge list of food documentaries if you want to really explore food, but we've got a couple of really good ones for you tonight.

So, Jon, you take it away with the first one.

JON RAPPOPORT: Okay. So this is a shameless plug, since I'm the associate producer on it, and it's not yet released, but it's being screened right now, as we speak, at the Seattle International Film Festival several times. And it's been nominated for best documentary, and we'll see how that plays out.

It's called *American Addict*, and it's about addiction in America to prescription drugs, and the reason I'm bringing this up is because –

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Great story on this.

JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah, the – two things. One is there are two really significant interviews in the movie, extended interviews, Dr. Barbara Starfield and Dr. Peter Breggin. They're both terrific on camera to begin with. You could just stick a camera on Breggin for a couple of weeks, and you would have ten, 20, 50 films. He's endless, and he's right on the money every time. He's the psychiatrist who took apart psychiatric drugs.

And his landmark book was *Toxic Psychiatry*. So we interviewed him



about that subject starting with addiction, but this film goes way beyond that because Breggin begins to talk about the whole hoax of the psychiatric embrace between the profession of psychiatry, the journals and the pharmaceutical industry and how it's all been paid for and how the pharmaceutical industry saved psychiatry, at a time when the profession was dying, by presenting the thesis that, from now on, everything is going to be called the biological and chemically caused illness or disorder to be treated by drugs.

That was a conscious, intentional program that was foisted on the world, and it's moving right along. And so he begins to spread out and talk about this, and it goes way beyond what you think the interview is going to be about in the film because you're looking addiction, addiction, addiction, and there's Breggin, suddenly, going on about this and about the famous case called the Fentress case where he was the expert witness.

Joseph Wesbecker, fired from a job, went into his company with a gun and killed people and then committed suicide. It was the first big case against Prozac where the plaintiffs, Wesbecker's family, said that he had been driven to this by Prozac. And there were many, many, many such lawsuits waiting in the wings, and so everybody was waiting to see what would happen with this one.

And Breggin had insider knowledge because he was so intimately involved with the case. He was an expert witness, and he discovered, along with other people, that a deal had been cut by Eli Lilly, the manufacturer of Prozac, to actually, secretly, while the trial was going on, pay the plaintiffs an undisclosed sum of money, rumored to be gigantic, and the lawyer for the plaintiffs, to throw the case, so that Eli Lilly would win the case, you see, thereby, forestalling any of these other lawsuits from coming up because of precedent and everybody would see there's no chance of winning, but yet, the plaintiffs would walk away with a gigantic amount of money.

And the judge sniffed this out and called the attorneys in, and it's a whole adventure story. I mean it's an unbelievable story, and so all of the sudden, you're watching this movie and, now, we're going into



unchartered territory. Our field, on the other hand, is the public health revered, public health experts at Johns Hopkins who died last year. This is her last interview that I know of. I'm sure it's the last one. We've got her on film.

She published the landmark study, in the year 2000 in the Journal of American Medical Association, that said the medical system in America was killing 225,000 people a year like clockwork. 106,000 as a result of FDA approved pharmaceuticals.

So that's quite an explosive interview, but the story that broke yesterday is that, suddenly, I received a link to an FDA website page that is still there. To my knowledge, they haven't taken it down yet, as far as I know, but we have screenshots and everything where they admit this.

“I mean I always knew there was a smoking gun.”

I mean I always knew there was a smoking gun. For ten years, I've been tracking this story and writing about it saying, “The FDA has to know this.” That the drugs that they are saying are safe because they're the agency that has to say they're safe, before the release to the public, are killing 100,000 people a year, like one million people a decade. They have to know this.

And, now, we see, on their website, that they do know it because they cite the statistics. It's all there in a page that should have been deleted because it's kind of a dead page, but it never was, and we've got it know. And we're going – we're already making something out of it, but I mean this is gigantic because, on that page, the FDA doesn't say, “Hey and, by the way, we're the ones who released all these drugs to the public that are killing 100,000 a year.” It's totally schizophrenic. It's a come on for an educational module about adverse reactions to drugs.

And yet they're admitting all these fatalities, plus two million serious adverse reactions to drugs a year in the United States, medical drugs, and yet, they take no responsibility.



C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yeah.

JON RAPPOPORT: So.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I think those numbers qualify as genocide.

JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah, they do. Absolutely. Genocide. They are. So the film accomplishes a little bit of what the questioner was asking about can you make a documentary that doesn't put people to sleep because I think there's certain sections in this where people suddenly find themselves in deep water. They thought they were watching a film about addicts through medical drugs, and they were, but all of the sudden, the interviews go out into uncharted territory that is factual, but they never heard about. And so, they walk out of there with some sort of awakening out of the matrix.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well and I think – you know, *American Addict*, because I've seen pieces of it, I think it's like one of the ones that really got me to change – well, I wasn't eating McDonald's. But *Super Size Me* is one that I give to teenagers, and they stop eating at McDonald's. I think *American Addict*, if you're not careful about prescription drugs, you look at it, and you realize, you know, this is dangerous stuff. I've got to be unbelievably careful.

JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: So I think it does – it's – I think it's going to change behavior. Okay.

Well, mine – my next one is a series of movies on film, and we did a – on food. It's – we did a *Solari Report* with Bertram Verhaag. So I'm not going to discuss it, and I point you to that *Solari Report*.

Bertram runs Denkmal Films, his film company in Munich. He is a documentary maker who focuses on a topic and always does one – more than one. He gets into things deeply, and he really explores it, and he's got five that he did on food, three on genetically modified food and then



two on real alternatives.

He did *Killing Seeds*, *Life Running out of Control* and then, finally, *Scientists Under Attack* about scientists are being – who are warning people about genetically modified food and what is happening to them. Three amazing – I mean you will truly understand the dangers of this stuff after you watch those three movies and then he did two on sort of great heroes of our time, one *The Agro Rebel* and Sepp Holzer, a wonderful Austrian permaculturist who, in fact, I spent a lot of time when I was at the Water Symposium in Portugal. If you do a search for Sepp Holzer on the blog, you can pull up lots of good stuff including how to take courses with him, and then one – he covers a lot about Percy Schmeiser in the other, but he did one just on Percy Schmeiser called *David Versus Monsanto* which is fantastic.

So Bertram Verhaag, if you want to understand what's going on in food in this world, and then you combine it with what Sir James Goldsmith warns about agriculture, you really see the plan in agriculture. And it is a dark future, but one that will inspire you to go out and create your own fresh food, local food systems. So I really recommend it.

Okay. Your turn, Jon.

JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah. I – well, this is quick one, *We Became Silent the Last Days of Health Freedom*. You, I discovered, did a complete coverage on this. I only found that out when we spoke yesterday, and the thing that impressed me about this one is that I never heard of it before and that it hadn't gotten any significant coverage in major media despite the fact that it's narrated by Judi Dench.

And it is your basic kind of primer into here is what the bad guys are doing to restrict your access to food supplements and your freedom about choosing how to manage your own health, what practitioners you can see, what you can't, who is licensed, who isn't, all of this kind of thing.

And, with the star power of having her as the narrator, and, also, they



replay a famous commercial that Mel Gibson starred in, in the early 1990s about health freedom, you would think this would get some play in the press when it was released, which was 2005, but it absolutely did not. You can see it at WellTV.com.

And it's just to indicate, again, you know, the famous people can speak out. They can say the right thing about something, but unless it's been vetted and approved of by the matrix ears, you know, like the Disney ears, it doesn't get play in the press. This is not a subject that's viable as far as the New York Times or any of the networks are concerned. So we don't mention it. It doesn't happen. Never did. Never will and that's why I recommend seeing it because it's an example of that.

It was, also, I think, made without the full knowledge of what video would become on the internet even though it was 2005.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yeah.

JON RAPPOPORT: They didn't quite realize that they were being swept into a whole new world where they could have done something that wasn't so standard a kind of film, and it people would have gotten much bigger play.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yeah.

JON RAPPOPORT: They could have done a lot of different things. Again, this has to do with waking people up as opposed to putting them back to sleep, but Mel Gibson – and I'll close with this. You see a repeat or a rerun of the commercial that he made in about 1992, '93, at the height of the health freedom movement when the FDA was moving in on nutritional supplements and this was a wakeup thing. It was played on television in primetime. Network television. It was played in movie theaters.

It opens with a mansion at night. You're outside, and you're looking at the backs of a SWAT team fully armed, professional, very ready to raid. And the signal is given, and they rush in to the house. And ,believe me, I



mean whoever put this together, the producer, director, all that, I mean they know how to do this stuff.

And, all of the sudden, there they are, in the kitchen, and who you see – you didn't know you were going to see him. There's Mel Gibson, and he's standing there at the counter, and he looks up at these guys. And he's got a bottle in his hand, and he waves it. He kind of wiggles his hand. He says, "Hey, hey, boys. Take it easy. Take it easy. Vitamin C." That's it. Boom. Right?

And I mean this caused – I'm going to estimate – a million letters to be written in the days where people wrote letters. Stay away from our nutritional supplements.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yeah.

JON RAPPOPORT: Anyway. That's the story on that one.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Okay. So my next one is *The Rise and Fall of a Scientific Genius: The Forgotten Story of Royal Rife*. This is a remake.

It's a reedited DVD version of an original two part film by Shawn Montgomery, and it's remarkable in the pictures and the history and the document and the evidence they got to document Royal Rife, unbelievably brilliant career making the first gigantic microscope that would watch live cells and his discovery of cures that could cure people who were believed to be terminally ill, including with cancer, and the efforts made, including by the American Medical Association, to destroy him.

And it's an astonishing story, and the reason I love this documentary is it absolutely communicates the extent to which knowledge and technology has been suppressed, and our world, Jon, is boarded by these artificially created boundaries of what knowledge and technology is allowed and

“This caused – I’m going to estimate – a million letters to be written in the days where people wrote letters. Stay away from our nutritional supplements.”



what's kept out. And it's not well understood.

For example, the extent to which the stock market depends on all the suppressed technology staying suppressed. The – it's interesting. The second Wall Street Gordon Gekko movie goes into that, how no revolutionary energy technology will be allowed in, and – but you really – because of the pictures, because of the extraordinary documentation, it's very well done, and it's free.

You can get it up on the internet. We covered it on *Let's Go to the Movies*, but Royal Rife was one of the great scientific geniuses of the 20th Century, and yet, most people have never heard of him. And this documentary does a great job of documenting the true story.

JON RAPPOPORT: The thing that always bowled me over, when I studied Rife, there was an organization in L.A. – I can't remember the name of it, anymore, but they had some of these files of newspaper articles that were written at the time when Rife was doing his experiments in Los Angeles. And praise was heaped on this guy by the major media. I mean publicity was significant at the time.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yeah, yeah.

JON RAPPOPORT: And then it just – it was like the turn off the faucet. It's gone. He's a quack. He's a phony. This is ridiculous. Never happened. Nothing to see here. Move along. That's the end of the story. Amazing.

I mean the guy obviously was a real genius, and you're absolutely right about your best technology. I would definitely recommend seeing –

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well and that's just for the pharmaceutical industry.

JON RAPPOPORT: Oh, yeah. I mean right away, you know. I remember talking to a doctor, who lived next door to me, one time, and I – and we were talking cancer this and cancer that, and he said, "The war on cancer." I said "You mean the war we lost?"



And he kind of laughed, and he said, “Well, that brings up the old question. You know, what would happen if somebody really came up with the cure for cancer tomorrow?” And I said, “Well, what do you think would happen? You know, it’s going to destroy a trillion dollar industry. What do you think is going to happen,” and no answer.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right, right. Okay. Next category is inspirational. So we’re going to end with you’ve got one, and I’ve got one. And again, I just want to remind everybody we’ve got some great runner ups that will be up on the blog, and of course, you can post your favorites in the comments. So maybe we can get a real great collection going. So, Jon, an inspirational. Give us your choice.

JON RAPPOPORT: Hmm. *Children Full of Life* made by the CBC, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but it’s about a school in Japan. The teacher is – it’s about a class not a school, just once class, Toshiro Kanamori, the teacher, 2005.

You’ve got to see it because I got to say that, if somebody just told me about it, I would say, “Eh, I’m not that interested in it. You know, not my kind of film. It sounds a little touchy-feely. I don’t know. You know, aren’t the kids in the classroom to learn? They’re learning.”

Just a bare bones description, but this is all about – I was saying this to Catherine yesterday, when we were talking about these films, this is about what an individual can do who is truly independent, creative and absolutely committed. I mean absolutely committed. This is a teacher of iron will, right, and discipline.

This is not somebody, “Hey, what’s happening, man?” You know? I mean it is a guy in a suit, who walks into a class, and everybody is ready, and yet, they love him to death – the kids. These are like – I don’t know – ten, 11 year old kids, something like that.

He is like a god to them. He’s like – he’s another father, but he’s like a father that nobody ever had. I mean the guy is absolutely amazing, and it shows you a year in this classroom, as he bring his whole class through a



series of individual crisis. You know, somebody's father dies and how he handles that. He's like a relentless therapist who isn't a therapist, thank God.

I mean he goes up to a kid, and he says, "What are you thinking about?" You know, the kid's parent died. "Oh, everything is okay." "What are you thinking about?" And the teacher wants to know now, and this begins an unraveling of gigantic proportions that involves everybody in the class. And other kids being to spontaneously – and this is not rehearsed – come out with their own stories of loss and how he handles this, with ten and 11 year olds, you know, and yet, learning is taking place.

This is not, instead of learning, we're going to do this and destroy your minds by the time you're 12. I mean everything is happening at once including gigantic building projects and so on and disciplining kids for doing things, for lying, and, you know, I mean this guy embodies everything all at once, you know.

And the lesson that I took away from it was just what I said. We have no idea what an independent, highly intelligent, creative and absolutely committed individual will do, but we want to find out because it's going to be good. It's all uncharted territory for every individual.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Yeah.

JON RAPPOPORT: When they reach that point –

C. AUSTIN FITTS: The potential is amazing if we –

JON RAPPOPORT: Unbelievable.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Will support each other in being free.

JON RAPPOPORT: Exactly. So that's my final choice here.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Okay. So my choice in *The Endurance*. *The Endurance* was



made in 2000 – or came out in 2000. It was directed by another Englishman, George Butler, and it's about Ernest Shackleton's failed expedition to Antarctica in 1914. *The Endurance* was the name of the ship that Shackleton used, and the ship just – it was one of those things of a great team and great preparation, but everything goes wrong.

The ship got trapped and crushed in an ice pack, and Shackleton and his 26 man crew had to literally – and it was just miraculous. They end up in an 800 mile open boat voyage, make it out against all odds, and then Shackleton and a small group of people cross over land to try and get help and finally are able to bring help back and save the crew.

And it's one of those situations, Jon, where, you know, there are so many instances where it is completely hopeless, and yet, Shackleton never gives up. He never breaks discipline. He keeps on trying almost to a point where it's as if you're looking at spiritual miracles. And it's a reminder that excellence is its own reward because here's a group of people who conduct themselves, under the worst odds, in an excellent way, and it is unbelievably inspiring.

They were able to bring back footage, film footage. They took lots of pictures, and you know, amazingly, brought them back, and so you see that. Plus, they interviewed the surviving relatives who tell the stories that's been passed down, and it's quite remarkable that Butler went back and made this story. And I guess somebody wrote a book because Shackleton came back, and of course, the expedition was considered a failure, so no one cared.

So here's this man who accomplishes extraordinary things and saves and protects his men, great leadership, but of course, nobody cares. The other thing, of course, is the world is at war, but it is absolutely a story of triumph under the worst circumstances, and it's very inspirational, and that kind of inspiration is very useful sometimes, certainly on weeks.

“It's one of those situations, Jon, where, you know, there are so many instances where it is completely hopeless, and yet, Shackleton never gives up.”



JON RAPPOPORT: You bet. You bet. There was, as I said, a – yesterday, family and I just wandered into the Museum of Natural History in New York where there was a giant exhibition, some years ago, on the expedition and photos, film, artifacts. And when we walked out of there, it was just like, as you say, you know, this guy – it was supernatural what happened.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

JON RAPPOPORT: Absolutely supernatural.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Supernatural. Okay, before we close, I want you to just mention a little bit about what you're doing and about people are doing with Extranormal because I think this idea of all of us, you know, making our own things and sharing them and aggregating them is very, very powerful. You can make a documentary.

JON RAPPOPORT: Listen, folks, if I can make an animated video – I'm basically a typist with a computer. I – you know, I grew up on a Royal portable. So and really, you know, still probably imagine that that's when I'm doing when I sit down at the computer every day.

So goes a program – excuse me – a program called Extranormal. You can do your own animation. I got a partner in New York, who is handling the technical side of it, and I write the scripts. And he makes the animated cartoons, and he can – he's pretty good, but I mean there's a lot of people that can figure this out, and it's either free or very inexpensive. I mean it's not like you got to invest a lot in this.

And you make – he picks the characters. You know, there's a whole bunch of characters you can pick, and some of them look human, and some of them that are just totally bizarre. And you pick the characters, and the ones I've seen have a couple of characters, and they're talking.

You can pick the setting, the backgrounds. You can also pick camera angles which is wonderful. You can do close-ups. You can do from the side. You can do in front. You sort – you know, you skein this out and then you cut and paste the typed dialogue in, and mechanical voices take



over. Quite amusing, I think, mechanical voices, and they talk your script like a conversation. See?

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Wow.

JON RAPPOPORT: And that's it. So we've made two now, and you know –

C. AUSTIN FITTS: I put one today up on the blog.

JON RAPPOPORT: Oh, great. I mean, when you see the final result come out – and he's now to the point, Theo, where he's doing them, you know, looks like two or three hours, he's knocking one of these out. They're like five, six, seven minute chunks.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

JON RAPPOPORT: And you can do this endlessly on any subject.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right.

JON RAPPOPORT: You can be serious. You can be funny. You can weird. You can be surreal. This is the wake up thing that I was referring to earlier. This stuff tends to wake people up because it's so weird to look at this and listen to the voices.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Like the talking bears. The talking bears have changed the world and people's understanding of the monetary supply.

JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah, you know, and the world is saved by the talking bears. Right? Historians will write, you know, 100 years from now, "And then came the talking bears and everything changed."

It's ridiculous, but there it is. And to some degree, I would say that the matrix itself, fundamentally, is a cartoon that we're all living in, and when you see it as a cartoon, some piece of it or aspect of it, there's some sort of a link that's made instantaneously where you go, "Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. That. I want that. That."



And people don't know why, but it's like the reality that's deeper than the matrix reality is being reflecting at them, in the cartoon, where they're saying, to themselves subconsciously, "Yeah, we're living in a cartoon. We're living in a cartoon, and there's an example of it."

So check it out. Start making them. I mean let's have a million of them.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Right and I think, if you can look at the matrix in a cartoon, then you can see the crack that can become the door.

JON RAPPOPORT: Absolutely.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: And you can walk – you can open it and walk on through. Well, Jon, you are an inspiration, and I thank you.

JON RAPPOPORT: So are you. This was fabulous. We've got to figure out another reason to do this again.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Well, here's what I want to suggest – and I have to give her credit. It was our head of operations, Anais, that came up with this idea.

You know, get a group of people together, make some soup, have a potluck dinner and start watching these things and talking with each other. So one way to not end up passive is, you know, you watch together as a group and then you have a discussion about it, and the discussion is about, okay, what does this mean to us and what can we do and how can we change things to make life better for us based on what we've learned from this documentary.

And when I was up in Montana, Anais used to do it, and one day – one week, she wasn't doing anything, and I realized, oh, I'd have to go down to the movie theater and see a movie, and I'd have no one to talk to. And I said, "Oh, this is depressing."

So the list we've made of movies and the documentaries is a great fodder to start having – you know, just start having documentary parties and talk about what's going on and what you can do about it. There you go.



JON RAPPOPORT: Yeah.

C. AUSTIN FITTS: Okay. So, Jon, again, thank you so much.

JON RAPPOPORT: Thank you.

DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.