

BUILDING WEALTH IN CHANGING TIMES



---

# The Solari Report

---

SEPTEMBER 27, 2012

A blue stethoscope resting on a stack of US dollar bills.

**A Case Study in Invented Reality**  
with Jon Rappoport



# A Case Study in Invented Reality

September 27, 2012

---

This is Jon Rappoport and this is September 2012 for *Solari*. Again, I want to thank Katherine for the opportunity to do these special programs for you, her members. And today, I'm very pleased to be able to narrow the focus. I've been talking about the invention, the concoction of realities, specifically the kind of central consensus reality that we are all supposed stand up and salute to and believe in and so forth. And through propaganda, this is done in many ways.

It's done through many channels. But I want to talk about a specific case today. You might call this a case study in invented reality because I want to show you step-by-step how this actually works in a particular condition called Autism. And this program stems from an article that I just completed called *The Government's Demonic Strategy Against Parents of Autistic Children*. So what I'm going to do here is read this article in little sections and comment on them as I go along. And you will see – you will see how they do their shell game, how they do their sleight of hand, how they do their trick.

And you will be able to apply this to other areas, not only medical areas, but all sorts of other areas because there's certain basic principles at work here, certain strategies. There are inferences that if you think about it, you'll be able to make and import into other areas of your own perception of life, reality, and so forth. So this article begins. Let me start with this controversial statement. The worst thing parents can do is obtain a diagnosis of Autism for their vaccine-damaged child.

Okay. Now, we know that many vaccine-damaged children have been diagnosed with Autism. This is fact. The problem arises when researchers, independent researches, have tried – have succeed; that's where the problem starts in making the link between vaccine damage and Autism. Continuing. The primary fact to keep in mind is the government must deny any link between vaccines and Autism because to admit the connection would force it to pay out gigantic sums of money to parents under its vaccine injury



compensation program called VICP, which you may or may not know even exists.

It was created in 1988, and basically, just to give you a little background on it, vaccine manufacturers came to the Federal government in the 1980s and said look, we're thinking of getting out of the vaccine business altogether. We don't want to make vaccines anymore because it's too expensive an operation for us. And what they meant by that was the potential for lawsuits for vaccine damage leveled at these companies would be not only significant, but could be, from their perspective, horrendous. And so they went back and forth on this government, vaccine manufacturers, government and vaccine manufacturers.

I mean this is a completely illegitimate meeting. What is the government doing, the Federal government trying to lend some kind of support to corporations in this fashion? It's unconstitutional, but of course that doesn't stop these people, so the meetings took place a deal was struck. The deal would be that the Federal government would forestall, derail the overwhelming majority; I mean overwhelming majority of all lawsuits directed at vaccine manufacturers on the basis of damage to people who had received the vaccines, and instead, would create its own government program called the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, VICP. And parents, for example, of vaccine-damaged children would have to apply for compensation, money compensation, to the VICP.

The government would handle all of this for corporations. The government would stand in for corporations, you see. Well, this is a green light to corporations that in fact they can manufacturer dangerous vaccines. Pharmaceutical companies get – literally get away with murder because the government is going to back them up. I'll continue to read a little bit here.

VICP was created in 1988 through an agreement between the U.S. government and pharmaceutical companies to funnel all lawsuits for damage away from those companies and into a bureaucratic maze of government madness where the parents' chances of compensation are minimal where the deck is most assuredly stacked against them. Now, I have spoken with people who have entered that maze of trying to get funding from the government for their vaccine-damaged children. In many cases, what we're talking about here is life-long care just to keep kids at some sort of status quo because the damage can be



so severe, as I'm sure you understand that the kids are debilitated for life. They withdraw from life. They rarely speak.

They have sudden outbursts. They sometimes sit mute as if they are in some sort of a vacuum. They don't interact with life. All that was cut short by a vaccine. Now, the purpose unstated of the VICP is to make it as difficult as possible for parents to get any kind of financial compensation for all of this. The government has its attorney representing the VICP in proceedings, and supposedly, the government is there to protect citizens who have been damaged by vaccines. But the way it really turns out is that this is a very adversarial proceeding in which the government is really trying to punch as many holes as possible in the parents' claims of needing or deserving compensation. It's a nightmare; a nightmare.

A parent can spend years in the maze of the VICP. Okay, continuing with the article. Once parents enter the maze hoping to gain funds to care for their children, they are immediately confronted with a list of disorders and diseases. The list essentially tells them, "If your vaccine-damaged child has been diagnosed with any of the following medical conditions, you may be able to win financial support, if not, you're out of luck." Okay. So that tells us two things, two essential things. Number one, claiming vaccine damage is not alone sufficient to enter the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program and get compensation.

I mean in saying, but true. If a parent says, "Well, my kid was destroyed by a vaccine. That's why I'm here at the VICP." They say, "Well, wait a minute. Wait a minute. It's not as easy as that. We're not interested in whether or not your child was injured by a vaccine. What we're interested in is whether or not your child has been diagnosed by a doctor, an MD, with one of the following disorders or diseases which could be connected to damage from a vaccine." So we're now one layer removed, see, a significant layer of removal, which really now begins the oh, second phase I guess you could say of the nightmare. But it's very tricky; it's the shell game and it's sophisticated because on that list of

**“The way it really turns out is that this is a very adversarial proceeding in which the government is really trying to punch as many holes as possible in the parents' claims of needing or deserving compensation.”**



possible or disorders and diseases which could maybe possibly long-shot be connected to vaccine damage in such a way that the parent would get compensation from the VICP, Autism is not on the list.

If you're awake and aware, that should send your head spinning a little bit. And then I continue to write, "Can things be any clearer than that? A diagnosis of Autism is a trap." Step one, a young child receives a vaccine. Step two, he suddenly withdraws from life. Three, a doctor makes a diagnosis of Autism. Four, the parents want to sue the company that makes the vaccine, but they can't; they must apply to the VICP for funds to care for their child for the rest of his life.

Five, as soon as they enter the VICP system, they learn that the label Autism is the very thing that will keep them from the funds they desperately need. That is the long and short of it. Forget about the fact that the parents never wanted to involve themselves with a Federal government program. They wanted to sue the vaccine maker. They wanted a court award, but they were barred from suing. So you get what's happening here. The parent, in all innocence in most cases, who is just absolutely floored and devastated by the fact that his or her child is exhibiting these bizarre and horrendous symptoms and signs after having received a vaccine, the parent is – just doesn't know what to think, what to do, goes to a doctor.

The doctor talks to the parent, gets some sort of information, looks at the child; the child doesn't respond. The doctor says Autism. That's the diagnosis. The parent is relieved. The parent says oh my God, thank God. I didn't know what it was. I didn't understand. Oh yes, the doctor says, I can assure you this is Autism. It's very prevalent in society today. Well, okay, the parent says. Is there anything you can do for it? Well, there's certain palliative treatments. We don't have a cure, but we'll try our best, et cetera, and you're – it was certainly right of you to come here to my office and we will do everything we can.

Tries to assure the parents, you see. Now, the parent learns that there is potential for compensation by applying to the VICP. And so the parent says to the doctor, "But look, I need to have copies of my son, daughter's medical records so I can take them to the VICP." Of course, yes, yes, yes. Gets the records, goes in there, into the maze, starts to argue. And the attorney for the



government and the VICP says, “I see here in your son’s records that he was diagnosed with Autism.” Yes, yes, of course. He has Autism, yes, Autism, yes, yes, yes.

“Well, I’m sorry, but Autism isn’t on the list of diseases and disorders which can be connected to vaccine damage and therefore no money.” “Well, what do you mean? I thought I was coming to place where, you know, vaccine damage was recognized.” “Oh yes, it is, but we need to have a diagnosis of, you see, specific diseases and disorders which could be connected to the vaccine and Autism is not on the list. Goodbye, you’re out of luck.” “Well, wait a minute; wait a minute. Autism resulted from the vaccine.” “Well, you see now, now, I’m afraid you’re arguing medical science here, which you know nothing about, and in fact, we have shown that there’s no demonstrable connection between vaccine damage and Autism.” “Well, how can that be? How can that be? I saw what happened. My daughter was alive. She was wonderful. Everything was fine. She was three years old and then she had a vaccine, and three days later, she was destroyed. Her life was destroyed.”

“Well, I understand, as it certainly appears to you as a lay person that there was a connection, yes, between the vaccine and Autism, but in fact, that has not been demonstrated. Quite to the contrary, medical studies show there is no connection between Autism and vaccines.” Boom, pow, bam. Get what’s happening here? It gets worse. I’m going to continue to read.

“At this point, you, the reader, might say, ‘But if their child really does have Autism and it was obviously caused by a vaccine, then they should be able to find justice somehow.’” You don’t understand how deep this deception goes. You don’t understand how criminally insane it is. Because you see the label of Autism, the very label that keeps parents from getting help for their children is an arbitrary word that means nothing. That’s how it gets worse. I’ll continue to read.

“A deviously designed word that means nothing is keeping parents in a lifelong state of desperation as they go bankrupt trying to care for their vaccine-damaged child. We begin here. All 297 official mental disorders listed in the DSM Publication of the American Psychiatric Association are defined and approved by committees of psychiatrists.” I believe I covered this on the last



*Solari* program. Whether it is schizophrenia or autism or ADHD or clinical depression or bipolar disease, the definition consists wholly of described behaviors. That's all.

Psychiatrists will tell you the symptomatic behaviors are signs of underlying chemical imbalances or genetic aberrations, but they have no tests to back up this assertion. Therefore, all they are left with are the behaviors, their own menu-like clusters of those behaviors and the mental disorder label they place on each cluster. If they had more, if they had blood tests or brain scans or genetic assays, they would publish those tests and claim they are definitive for diagnoses of mental disorders. But they don't.

Here's an exchange between a respected psychiatrist and a PBS interviewer which occurred during a *Frontline Report* titled *Does ADHD Exist?* Interviewer: "Skeptics say that there's no biological marker that it, ADHD, is the one condition out there where there is no blood test and that no one knows what causes it." The response from Dr. Russell Barkley, Professor of Psychiatry and Neurology at the University of Massachusetts Medical Center, "That's tremendously naïve and it shows a great deal of illiteracy about science and about the mental health professions. A disorder doesn't have to have a blood test to be valid. If that were the case, all mental disorders would be invalid.

"There is no lab test for any mental disorder right now in our science. That doesn't make them invalid." Yes, it actually does make all those disorders invalid, unless science suddenly means, "the opinions of psychiatrists sitting in a room collecting together various human behaviors and labeling them." This is big. This is huge. This is gigantic. This is enormous.

Caught in his own words, Russell Barkley, Professor of Psychiatry and Neurology at the U. Mass Medical Center, because he is exposing the fact that even though he says to the contrary he's not, he's exposing the fact that the psychiatric profession has nothing to do with science. There are no tests, absolutely none, for any disorder. Okay, I could go into that as I did last time for another six hours, but we'll continue. I'm going to read further here in the article.

"Here is a link to the official psychiatric definition of autism disorder. It's



worth reading.” And then I give the link in my article. Notice that all the criteria for an autism diagnoses are behavioral. There is no mention of laboratory tests or test results. There is no mention of chemical imbalance or genetic factors. Despite public relations statements issued by doctors and researchers, they have no laboratory findings to establish or confirm an autism diagnosis. But people say, “This makes no sense because children do in fact withdraw from the world, stop speaking, throw sudden tantrums. Common sense dictates that these behaviors stem – these behaviors defined as autism – stem from serious neurological problems.”

**“I’m taking this a step or 2 or 12 or 100 beyond the definition, the official psychiatric definition of autism and how it’s diagnosed by asking that question; ‘What could cause the behaviors listed in the official definition of autism disorder?’”**

What could cause the behaviors listed in the official definition of autism disorder? See, now, I’m taking this a step or 2 or 12 or 100 beyond the definition, the official psychiatric definition of autism and how it’s diagnosed by asking that question; “What could cause the behaviors listed in the official definition of autism disorder?” And then I list some; vaccine injury, a toxic medical drug, a head injury, ingestion of a poison, an environmental chemical, a severe nutritional deficit, oxygen deprivation at birth, perhaps the emotional devastation accompanying the death of a parent, et cetera, et cetera.

There are a number of things that could cause the behaviors listed as definitive for a diagnosis of autism. Okay? Could be a number of things; keep that in mind as we go along. Going to read further. “There are many possible causes of the behaviors arbitrarily called autism. However, then, why bother to say autism? Why not just say vaccine injury or head injury? Why not try to find the crucial event that brought on a specific child’s sudden and unique withdrawal from the world?” Do you see?

In other words, what are we doing with this label at all? Why do we bother with it? What is it for? If there is no diagnostic test and there is only a list of behaviors in order to diagnose it, why not try to find in each specific case of each child what caused that child to exhibit these behaviors that are called autism, to withdrawal from the world, to go out of touch, to refuse to be touched, to do all of the things that are diagnosed as autism? Why not try to



find out what happened in each specific case because something has happened and autism, the label, certainly doesn't describe it?

And then I write, "Well, the answer to that question should be clear. By establishing a label like autism, medical drugs can be sold; studies can be funded; an industry can be created, and indeed it has been." Untold amounts of money going into the research to establish a single cause for autism. You have to understand, that's where the research always goes when a new disorder is announced or an old disorder suddenly seems to be accelerating in terms of the number of diagnoses. The research money pours in and it's always poured into the idea let's find the single underlying cause of all cases of autism, you see.

Well, that is completely unscientific and ridiculous from the beginning, but it does wonders for the drug industry because when eventually a cause is claimed to be found, drugs are developed to eradicate the cause. And in the meantime, as long as the label sticks, autism, and many diagnoses are being made, then palliative drugs can be developed and sold. This is an industry, you see, and if you were to eradicate the label autism and say, "Guess what, we were – you know, we went crazy for a little while, we medical experts.

"We just went nuts and we invented this label called autism when actually it's a misnomer and a mis-director and it just confuses everybody because as it turns out, this list of behaviors that we've kind of put together and claim that if you take one from column A and three from column B and two from column C of behaviors, this gives you autism. That was just arbitrary. Really what we're looking at here is a number of causes for this range of behaviors. It isn't autism. It isn't anything.

"We have to identify in each child what caused it, whether it was vaccine damage or a car accident with a head injury or whatever it was, you see, that's how we get to the root, by diagnosing each unique case." Yeah, that's going to happen tomorrow like an ant is going to fly off the surface of the planet to the moon, take it out of its orbit and deposit it on Mars. You're now probing into the very core of the way that the medical cartel operates in promoting and inventing diseases. They are not going to turn around no matter how much exposure, negative exposure, they would get.



The answer should be clear why bother to say autism. By establishing a label like autism, medical drugs can be sold. Studies can be funded. An industry can be created. “Something more can be done too” I’m reading again. “The government can reject vaccine injury as a defining event in a child’s life and reject the need to pay out compensation for it. The government can say, ‘Since we know that some children who are diagnosed with autism have not received vaccines or have not received vaccines containing a neurological poison like mercury, we do not compensate whose children are vaccine-injured on the basis that they have autism.’”

Do you see? This is a continuation of this method of looking for the one cause of – for the one arbitrary really, you see. In other words, the government’s saying, “Yeah, we’ve done studies, you see, because we are looking for the single and underlying cause for all cases of autism, and we thought it might be vaccines. And so we went around and we checked on thousands of cases of children who’ve been diagnosed as autistic, and guess what? We’ve discovered there is some cases of children who are autistic or have been diagnosed who never received a vaccine at all or have never received a vaccine containing mercury, which is the charge frequently brought up that mercury-containing vaccines are the cause of autism.

“And so we have proved that vaccines are not the cause of autism, and therefore, vaccine damage is not related to autism.” Another phase of the shell game because an intelligent parent could reply to that, “Well, wait a minute. Wait. You say that this label caused autism is a single disorder that has a single cause. I never said that. To me, it’s just a word that you people use. To me, what’s really happening here is that different children are exhibiting different behaviors based on things that have happened to them, serious things like vaccine damage, head injuries, poisonings and so forth.

“In the case of my child, the evidence is clear that it was a vaccine. So I don’t care whether you say that vaccines are not the single cause of what you’re calling autism and therefore vaccine damage is irrelevant; you can say that all you want to. But that has nothing to do with reality. That has to do with your game, the shell game that you’re playing. And I know that game. I see it. And other people are beginning to see it.



“So don’t come back at me with this nonsense about oh, we found, you know, there were children diagnosed with autism who never got vaccines. Of course. Number one, the label autism means nothing. Number two, the way that you define it with this menu of behaviors is a wide net to include all kinds of children that have been damaged by various different things. You don’t need to find a single cause.

“All you have to do is stop saying autism.” Yeah, but that’s not going to happen. And then I write, “Poof. It all goes away. Did you catch the sleight of hand trick? Let me expose it. A child is given a vaccine. The child goes into a massive withdrawal from life and communication. A doctor assessing the child’s behaviors connects them with the official menu of behaviors labeled autism. The doctor then says this child has autism.

“Then the parents try to obtain government compensation through the VICP, the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program. The parents who have alarmingly high expenses for ongoing care of their vaccine-damaged child go to the VICP and say, ‘Our child has been diagnosed with autism and we want to collect funds for the vaccine injury he sustained.’ The government replies, ‘This is impossible. You see, we know that autism isn’t caused by vaccine injury. We know it because many children who are diagnosed with autism have never been injured by vaccines.

‘Some autism – autistic children have never had vaccines.’” And then I continue, “Do you see what is going on here? The parents stepped into a fatal trap. They said autism and the government said vaccine injury does not cause autism.” You might think the parents could back up and regroup. They could say, “We don’t care what you call it. We just know our child was severely damaged by a vaccine and we need funds.” But it’s not as easy as that.

In others, by the parents backing up and regrouping, I mean they could go back to the doctor and they say, “Hey, look, doctor. Whether you know it or not, you just destroyed our chances of getting any funding from the government when you wrote autism on the chart of our child. We want a different diagnosis. We don’t care what it is, as long as it will be recognized by the VICP as a diagnosis that could gain us financial compensation to take care of our child.” Well, but it’s not as easy as that.



Is the doctor really going to retrench and do that? I continue, “The government has no category called vaccine damage. The government demands some disease or disorder that is diagnosed and officially attributed to a vaccine injury, as I established earlier. The government has a specific list of diseases or disorders that it will allow to even begin thinking about financial compensation.” But you say, “This is an evil word game.” Of course, it’s a word game. The whole notion of autism based on no definitive test was a word game to begin with.

What is called autism, merely a label, is not one condition caused by one factor. It is a loose collection of behaviors that can be caused by various traumas, including vaccine damage. Parents say, “My child’s life was stolen away from him. He must have autism.” All right. This is a way parents enter the brainwashing venue. They’re so relieved by what the doctor did, diagnosed; oh, you got a label here. Oh, great. Fantastic.

**“This is a way parents enter the brainwashing venue. They’re so relieved by what the doctor did, diagnosed; oh, you got a label here. Oh, great. Fantastic.”**

Parents are so relieved that they live with that word. They don’t want to give it up either. It’s not just the doctor, you see. The parents cling to the word *autism* too. And so you try to take it away from them; oh, no, no, no. “My child has autism. He has autism. I know it’s autism” because what would the parent be facing if that label were ripped away and no other kind of catchall label was applied to substitute for it? If there was no label at all, the parent would be panic-stricken.

“Well, then, what’s going on with my child? What’s happening? I don’t understand.” Yeah, well what happened is something that can be discovered. This doesn’t happen just out of nowhere, you see, the sudden change like this that we’re describing in a child’s life. “The child have a vaccine?” “Oh, yes, had the hepatitis B vaccine, and you know, come to think of it, three days later, that’s when it all happened; withdrew from life completely.”

“I see, uh-huh.” So suppose we call this a vaccine damage syndrome. The parent says, “Well, is that official?” “Well, let’s say it’s official.” “Well, I want to know if it really is official.” Is this official consensus reality, in other words. The parent is not saying that, but that’s the idea. I mean is this recognized? Is there



an authority that stands behind this thing called vaccine damage syndrome?

Am I allowed to say that to my friends? When they ask what's wrong with your child, am I allowed to say vaccine damage syndrome? Can I say it with full confidence? You see, putting together, concocting reality, concocting reality. And then the doctor says, "No, you can't say that. No, no, no, no, you can't say that. You can say autism. That's okay.

"That's a reality" even though it isn't. But the doctor says it is, you see, inventing reality. The parent says, "Oh, good. Okay. So I can say autism?" Yes, you can. You can say it as many times as you want to and everyone will understand and they will agree. They will consent; this is what consensus means. Everybody consents. You can say it, yes.

But they can't say vaccine damage syndrome. No, no, no, no, you can't say that, no. Okay. Parent knows now, "Okay, this is reality. Autism is reality. Vaccine damage syndrome is not reality, okay." You see, unbelievable, right? So I continue to write, "A label provides some measure of relief for the parents. It doesn't prove that the label actually means something. In fact, the label can be a diversion from knowledge that would actually help the child."

Suppose, for example, after receiving the DPT vaccine, the child went into a screaming fit and then withdrew from the world. Calling that autism tends to put the parents and the child in the medical system where there is no definitive effective treatment. Outside that system, there might be some hope with say hyperbaric oxygen or other strategies. "If this all creates a sense of outrage in you, you are not alone" I write.

If 100,000 parents of children who have been devastated by vaccines traveled to the headquarters of the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program at the Parklawn Building 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland, and if they stayed there and occupied the area, and if they had a unified position that cut through the word game and the purposeful, official delusion, perhaps this criminal insanity would end. A doctor's diagnosis of autism most assuredly does not end the insanity. It adds to it.

Okay. There's a little bit more of the article, but you see, I originally was going



to title this article *Why Autism Doesn't Exist*. And I decided that although that would be very provocative, that it would drive some people away from reading the article or posting it on the Web because it – that would be too heavy a shot to the bow right off at the beginning without some explanation. But that really is the title of the article,

*Why Autism Doesn't Exist*, because it doesn't.

The whole thing, the fabric of the whole concocted reality falls apart and I hope by this point in the program here that you realize that. It's totally in shreds and tatters. It does not exist. Autism does not exist. Autism is a word. That's all.

It's a word. It's a word that is applied to a loose collection of behaviors, as I read, and there are no definitive tests for it. It is not a single condition. How could it have a single cause if it is not a single condition? And therefore, billions of dollars are being spent on trying to find a single cause for autism when it is not a single condition to begin with, and so therefore, they will never find a single cause. Even if they were to find some interesting things, you see, and I'm not banking on it, they would ultimately reject those interesting potential causes because they would be able to find children who have been diagnosed with autism for whom those causes are irrelevant.

They don't fit. They never happened, you see, because, "Autism was never a single condition to begin with." Please understand that. It was never a single condition. Autism is just a word. Autism doesn't exist. There is no such thing as autism. There is a concocted reality emanating from the medical tower of authority aided by the press, by pharmaceutical companies, by other elements of the medical cartel, by textbooks such as the psychiatric Bible called the *DSM* which lists it as a psychiatric disorder.

This is how it's built, you see. You build something this way from scratch by finding, encouraging, when necessary coercing consensus from "important sources". And that's how you create reality, and this is the reality called autism, which is nothing more than a consensus. When the consensus is removed, it falls apart, so it's a fake. It's a fake. And some people find this difficult to grasp or accept. Some people who would say, "I see exactly what you mean by



autism, no question about it, it's totally a fake, it doesn't exist. I really get it. It's fantastic. Well done and all that."

But then someplace else in their life they will be accepting another autism if you know what I mean. Whatever it'll be called, they will swear to that and say, "Oh, but this exists." And I'm not just talking about medical diseases or disorders. I'm talking about in other venues of life. "Oh, but X, Y, Z, that's not just a concoction done by enlisting consensus from various authoritarian sources. Hell no. This is real.

"This is real, real, real, real stuff, yeah. Uh-huh." And it isn't. It's a total fake. It doesn't exist. It falls apart once one perceives that it was only built up by consensus, and of course lied about along the way and so on and so forth because doctors will do that all the time. "Oh, we know it's a genetic disorder." They'll say that about autism flat-out to their patients. "Oh, well, we know, we just haven't identified the particular genes yet. Or we know it's a chemical imbalance in the brain, but we – we're still finding out more about that every day as we do more tests and so on."

"We've got – beginning to get a handle on it, and with more money, we will definitely arrive, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes." They'll say that. They'll say that. But when it comes to the official approved definition as in the case of autism in the *DSM* Bible of the psychiatric profession, there are no tests listed. There are no tests. There are no – as Russell Barkley said at the beginning of this article, "There are no tests for any psychiatric disorder, any of the 297, from the oldest venerated ones, you know, like schizophrenia, to the flashy hip ones like bipolar." No tests, no tests, no tests.

Okay, continuing. I once had a conversation with a parent whose child was vaccine-injured and then diagnosed with autism. She spent years trying to obtain compensation from the VICP and failed. Here is a paraphrase of how our conversation went: "I found out my child wasn't the point of a VIC proceeding at all. The government's attorney was doing everything possible to deny us compensation. I felt I was up against a monster."

"They denied you benefits your son had been diagnosed with autism?" "Yes, they said there was no established connection between the vaccine damage and



autism, so they rejected my claim.” “So you see that the label autism was the very thing they used to reject your claim.” “I know it now; I didn’t know it then.” “You also know there is no reason to use the autism label. It is an arbitrary word.

“It’s a word that’s ruining us. Do you realize that if your doctor had diagnosed your son with a different catchall label, you would’ve stood a better chance of gaining compensation?” “What label?” “Encephalopathy, for example.” “So you’re telling me it was all a game and if I could’ve gotten the doctor to understand that, he might’ve written a different diagnosis in my son’s chart and my chances of compensation might’ve improved?”

“That’s right, a different word. A different word in the chart.” In a just world, a parent whose child is damaged by a vaccine would be permitted to sue the vaccine maker. In a less just world, the parent would be able to enter the VICP system and claim a right to compensation based on the simple standalone fact that her child was damaged by a vaccine. In the world we live in, that parent has to prove her child was diagnosed with a condition that the government admits could be caused by a vaccine.

**“In a just world, a parent whose child is damaged by a vaccine would be permitted to sue the vaccine maker.”**

And if the doctor wrote down the word *autism*, the chances of compensation are suddenly very, very remote. They’re zero unless the parent was able to obtain an accompanying word like *encephalopathy*. Finally, people will insist that researchers are getting closer to discovering the true and basic cause of autism. This is just more arbitrary verbiage.

The symptoms listed as definitive for autism are just a collection of behaviors. I could put together a list and so could you. Fatigue, eye flutters, sadness, lack of desire to participate in school, loss of appetite, halting communication. I could give these behaviors a name; remoteness syndrome, and call it a disorder and then I could raise a few billion dollars to search for the underlying cause. But there would be no underlying single cause because the list of behaviors was a non-starter.

It was just an arbitrary collection of behaviors. Autism is nothing more than a



catchall phrase that indicates a variety of possible unconnected neurological insults. Each patient should be examined by a health practitioner who can really find a cause in that case, then perhaps a treatment plan can be devised for that child. Meanwhile, the government and its VIC Program embroils parents and works them over and then tortures them for years and dumps most of them out on the street with no compensation. That's the article.

You can find it at my site, [www.nomorefakenews.com](http://www.nomorefakenews.com). If it's not currently posted, you can find it in my blog, which you can enter through the site. It's really something. I'll toot my horn a little bit here and say the overwhelming number of medical journalists, I don't care mainstream or alternative, they don't get down to this, what I'm talking about here. They just don't get down to it. Some of them don't get down to it, although they glimpse it because they don't want to get down to it because they feel that no one would want to read what they have to say.

They would lose their audience. Huge numbers of people would suddenly; you know, it's all right to say, okay, a drug was removed from the marketplace today, scandal, the company has to admit to certain faults and pay a \$2 billion fine, and studies have been uncovered that show that actually there were many heart attacks and strokes from the joke, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Yes, of course, absolutely. Let's see the exposure of that. Let's get it out there in the public view.

But what we're talking about here goes to the root of how all of the insanity begins and what insanity it is. And it's absolutely necessary if one wants to begin to grasp how reality is put together. So to give my 15-second pitch, that's what I do in my collection called *The Matrix Revealed*, which you can see the banner for at [nomorefakenews.com](http://nomorefakenews.com).

Click on the banner. You'll get a complete description of what that collection is all about. It's not only about medical, it's about all sectors of society and how in fact insiders who have been working absolutely along the line of building reality, building, concocting, inventing reality along all fronts of society talk to me off the record and tell me how it's done.

And I've given you a case history so to speak or case study here of one disorder



called autism. Could be called [*mumbles*]. It makes as much sense. One of the things, and this is just one, that keeps people glued and welded to this notion of the arbitrary label being applied to the person who has obviously something terribly wrong with them, that keeps one glued to the other is the condition of the person, you know, the child with autism. They make that equation; the label equals what my child is suffering.

Well, what my child is suffering equals the label. No, has nothing to do with the label. And in the last 55 minutes, I'm quite confident that I proved that. It's a crime. It's an ongoing gigantic crime. It's a tragedy, and it's also an example of how reality is built and constructed.

That PBS reporter that was interviewing Russell Barkley, see, he admitted there are no tests. No tests for any disorder. But of course, that does – that's not a problem. No. "People who think it's a problem just don't understand science. Hey, in science, we don't need to test for anything. Didn't you get the memo?"

"We just say what we want to say and everybody salutes." That's essentially what the guy's saying the PBS interview. But the reporter doesn't pick up on it, nor does PBS want the reporter to pick up on it because if the reporter did pick up on it, suppose somebody – I mean they let me into the room and they didn't know what they were doing, I would say, "Well, Dr. Barkley, this is wonderful. Somebody lock the door there, keep the cameras rolling. We're going to go on for a little bit here."

"You see, Dr. Barkley, you are utterly and completely full of bleep because you just admitted, despite what you're saying down your nose at me, that your profession has nothing to do with science. There are no tests. There are no defining tests for any mental disorder. And let's talk about it, okay?"

"Let's talk about it. Let's talk about autism, for example. How are they going to find a cause for autism when it isn't one thing to begin with?" "Oh, it is one thing. We certainly know that. It's defined. It's well defined. We found..." "No, it isn't well defined, doctor. It's just a collection of behaviors, you see."

"You have no test, no test to prove that it's defined. You've already admitted that, so it's only one step from there to realizing that the definition is arbitrary."



I could take any menu of behaviors I want to and I could find people who display those and I could call it whatever I wanted to. But if I were to give billions of dollars into researching for the cause of it, the single cause, I would never find it because it wasn't a single thing to begin with. That's what you're dealing with here, doctor.

"Why don't you come out and admit it"? Let's see what kind of conversation we could spawn from that. I'm sure it would be far more interesting to PBS viewers in the long run than whatever they were listening to or watching on that show. That's the point, you see. When you really begin to uncover how this all works, the concoction of reality, the arbitrariness of it, the consensus building and all of that, if you go on long enough with your exposé, and this has been like 20 years for me, so yeah, I've been going on long enough, people begin to sit up and get interested.

They actually do. You could get ratings on this on television. Believe me. You could get monster ratings, monster ratings. But you just have to go on long enough until people begin to catch on. "Hey, do you hear what this guy's saying here? Do you see what he's doing in this interview? He's just exposing this guy here as a complete fraud. You see? He just nailed – did you get that? Wait a minute, let's run that back.

"Yeah, you see. The guy said there are no tests." I mean it's like suppose you went to the doctor and you had – you know, and you say, "Doc, I think I've got arthritis" and he says, "Hold it, wait a minute." And he opens a door and six other doctors walk into the room and they look at you and then they begin to argue about whether you have arthritis or not and then they take a vote. And if the majority says you do, you do. That's what this guy is admitting.

"This is like a big-time – you see this, honey. Come here. Look at this." That's what you'd get if you persisted with this long enough. Believe me. People want to know about this. The only reason they don't seem to show any overt interest right away is because every time they've come to the cusp of somebody revealing it, blowing the cover, it stops. Somebody backs away.

"Oh, we don't want to go any further than that." But when you do go further than that and you go a lot further than that, people begin to really get



interested because they know it down deep, you see. You know, they've been suspicious of this whole idea of the matrix as consensus reality for a long, long, long, long, long time. And when they finally – it dawns on them that that's what's being discussed here, they wake up real fast.

This is Jon Rappoport for *Solari*. Thank you very much for listening. We'll see you next month.

#### **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.