



The Solari Report

OCTOBER 25, 2012

Drugging Children for “Social Justice” with Jon Rappoport



Drugging Children for “Social Justice”

October 25, 2012

This is Jon Rappoport, and this is my monthly report for Catherine Austin Fitts and *Solari*. Very good to be here, as always. I'm going to take off from another article which I've just written and expand on it to make some further points. The article is going to go up on my site, no more fake news today or tomorrow. So by the time you hear this, it will be in my blog.

It's called Bombshell: *Mind-Control Engineers Now Drugging Children for "Social Justice,"* and it ties very closely into my collection called the *Matrix Revealed*, about which you can find more at <http://www.nomorefakenews.com>. There's a big banner there for *Matrix Revealed*. Just click on the details below and you will get there.

So I'm going to read, as I did last time, a section here, section there, and make comments as we go along. This is all based on an October article in the *New York Times*. It's the latest thing. Psychiatrists are now giving children in poor neighborhoods Adderall, a dangerous stimulant, by making false diagnoses of ADHD, or no diagnoses at all. Their aim: to "promote social justice, to improve academic performance in school." The rationale is the drugged kids will now be able to compete with children from wealthier families who attend better schools. This is mindboggling on so many accounts that it would tend to escape the attention of most readers – of the *New York Times*, that is.

You know, stories like this will happen. You'll read an article somewhere in a newspaper, and your mind is so blown by what you read that you can't believe it's actually true, or, conversely, you just simply glide over it because you're thinking to yourself, "It must be me." Then they've got you, you see. "The article itself must be reasonable and rational. I mean it must be me who thinks it's quite insane. There's something that I have to be missing here. It couldn't



be what I think it is, because if it were, then everyone would rise up in a mass, millions of people you know, and protest. So therefore, I must have a screw loose or it's a bad day or I'm just – I thought I was able to read English, but I'm not. There's something here in the paragraph that I'm missing, and I don't see it. It's all my fault, and everything is okay.
Nothing to see. Just move along."

This happens everyday to millions of people who encounter major media. They read stories which just rip their minds apart, but they have no reaction at all because of these excuses and so forth that they make up. And of course, the tone of these articles is almost always very even-handed. You know, you could be saying, "Well, Colorado disappeared last night." Interviewing a professor at the University of Ohio, seeking an explanation, the geologist informed this reporter that there may have been a storm that lifted the state of Colorado off the planet and took it to the moon. On the other hand, researchers at George Washington University denied that's possible, you know, and then it goes on and on and on, you see, and you're lulled to sleep by the tone, that you can't penetrate it because there's nothing to penetrate. It's just all very matter-of-fact.

“This happens everyday to millions of people who encounter major media.”

So right away we see here, in this story, a cognitive dissonance that just explodes. Psychiatrists are giving children in poor neighborhoods Adderall. Okay. So that is a drug for ADHD, along with Ritalin and several others. They're all basically in the same class, or at least most of them are. They're amphetamine type drugs, which means speed. They're stimulants. If you have heard prior programs of mine, you know that there is no such thing as ADHD. Yes, there are children with all kinds of problems, and those problems stem from many different causes. But the label itself is just that, a label, and there is no chemical or biological or any kind of lab test, diagnostic test for ADHD. It's just a collection of behaviors put together by a committee of psychiatrists. So that's the second cognitive dissonance mind-blowing fact here.

So they're giving children in poor neighborhoods Adderall, a dangerous stimulant, which it is because speed is dangerous. Over the short term, it can produce results in the sense that the person's head clears and he says, "Oh, gee, I can focus and concentrate better, yes, yes, yes." But sooner or later, a crash is



going to occur because that's what speed does, and it's dangerous because it has all sorts of other effects on blood pressure, and there is – at least according to one psychiatrist, a groundbreaking researcher, Dr. Peter Breggin – there is a very good chance that the stimulants will atrophy young brains.

Okay, so they're giving Adderall to children in poor neighborhoods, and they're not even making the diagnosis of ADHD. In other words, they're not making a false diagnosis of a false condition that doesn't exist at all, or – in other words, they're giving the drug with no diagnosis, or they're just making up a diagnosis of ADHD to justify giving Adderall because they want to promote social justice, level the playing field between children from low-income families and wealthier children who go to better schools, and they think that by giving the drug, they will improve academic performance in school of these poor children.

Wow. That is quite a lead-in. Okay, and then I go on here. Leading the way is Dr. Michael Anderson, a pediatrician in the Atlanta area. Incredibly, Anderson told the *New York Times* his diagnoses of ADHD are, quote, "made up," quote, "an excuse to hand out the drugs."

He continues, "We've decided as a society that it's too expensive to modify the kids' environment, so we have to modify the kid," Anderson said. More mindboggling. And then I write, "It would be hard to find a clearer mission statement from a psychiatrist: mind-control." He's talking about behavior modification through drugs. Now he apparently believes that this is a good modification. In other words, yes, the child will definitely now be able to get higher grades. That seems to be his approach to this. What he is ignoring, of course, is the fact that ADHD does not exist, that the drugs are toxic that are given for ADHD, that they all have deleterious effects and other things, which I'll get to in a minute.

Continuing on with my article here, a researcher at Washington University in St. Louis, Dr. Ramesh Raghavan, goes even further with this chilling comment: "We are effectively focusing local community psychiatrists to use the only tool at their disposal to level the playing field in low-income neighborhoods, which is psychotropic medicine. We are effectively forcing local community psychiatrists to use the only tool at their disposal, which is psychotropic



medicine." So this researcher is claiming that this is the only way, given the current political climate, to even things out, to make low-income families' children competitive with children whose parents come from higher economic brackets. The only way is psychotropic medicine, which, again, means Adderall, in this case, Ritalin and so on and so forth.

So these doctors are taking it into their own hands to enact social engineering to do something that they have been indoctrinated to believe is a good thing. The drugs don't matter. The side effects don't matter. They have to be aware of the side effects. I mean they are. And even the *New York Times* article comments, as you'll see, on side effects. I mean so the doctors surely know. But you see, times are desperate, and desperate measures are called for, et cetera, et cetera, blah, blah, blah. And that's why they're doing this. They see themselves as some sort of revolutionary, wreaking great positive change because this is the only thing that's going to do it.

Now, I should comment a little bit at this point on the whole idea of social justice. In the vaguest, most general terms, you could say this is a good thing. What does "social" mean? It means the interaction among people. What does "justice" mean? It means doing the right thing. So therefore, social justice, okay, sounds all right. But as we have seen in many political movements, the term is really used as a cover to somehow artificially improve the situation of children, adults to, quote, "bring them up to the level of other people," because there exists such prejudice and discrimination and so forth and such unequal a status, economically speaking, that we have to do whatever it takes in order to make this happen.

And this, of course, leads to all sorts of inequities because once it comes into play, this notion of social justice, the people who are really behind it are – well, they have other motives. They want government money. They want lots of government money, some of them, endless government money. And then when the money is presented to them as a kind of payoff to keep them quiet, they will do what they will do with the money. And as we have seen, all you have to do is look at the inner cities of America and put them up side by side with the who knows how many billions and billions of dollars have been poured into these cities over the last 40 or 50 years, and then look at the results.



So social justice has been used as a weapon to extract money, which is then diverted and is never put into programs that would truly be beneficial. So that's a kind of very encapsulated, in a nutshell history of how that works out for the poor in America, at least in terms of inner-city aid. And then you have to look at the fact that people in the inner cities have already been bamboozled and short-changed and cheated by, for example, unscrupulous mortgage lenders, who, in the very fine print, will let them know, microscopically, that the payment schedule on their homes is going to fail. It's just going to fail, and therefore they will be foreclosed on, as one example. And then we have another example in South Central Los Angeles, which I'll get to in a minute in this article, because it is a direct parallel to what these doctors are doing here with Adderall, drugs.

So to continue my article here, so pressure is being brought to bear on psychiatrists to launch a heinous behavior modification program using drugs against children in inner cities. It is important to realize that all psychotropic stimulants like Adderall and Ritalin just found a typo – can cause aggressive behavior, violent behavior, just like speed does. So that's more than very interesting because you're now adding an explosive chemical fuel to an already volatile situation in inner cities in America. It's like saying, "Yes, we know the crime rates are very high. We know the homicide rate is very high. We know the violence is very high. And now, in addition to all of that, we are going to pour over it drugs that can cause aggressive behavior, violent behavior." Does this begin to sound like an operation?

And in the next paragraph, here we go: what we're seeing here is a direct parallel to the old CIA program exposed by the late Journalist Gary Webb, who detailed the importing of crack cocaine, another kind of stimulant, into South Central Los Angeles, which went a long way toward destroying that community. You can look up articles, and I believe a book, by Gary Webb, who has since died. Some people think he was murdered. He wrote a groundbreaking series of articles for the *San Jose Mercury* about this program. CIA, crack cocaine, South Central LA. The newspaper, which is a mainstream paper, published those articles, which means that they vetted them because this was indeed explosive material.

And then, once they were published, a firestorm of counter-media went into



play, predictably. Other major, much larger newspapers around the country began to defame these articles and claimed that they were based on scanty data and evidence and that this – the *San Jose Mercury* had made a gigantic mistake in relying on Gary Webb and publishing these articles, and all sorts of attacks were leveled. These – remember, this is long before the Internet, because I think it was. If not, it was in the very early days. It was nothing like it is now. And this counter-attack against the *San Jose Mercury* eventually put on so much pressure that the publisher folded. He cracked. He caved in. And he issued retractions, at which point the whole story went dead.

“He cracked. He caved in. And he issued retractions, at which point the whole story went dead.”

So that's what happened in a case where this sort of operation was exposed. And now we're seeing the beginnings of it again, but this time with pharmaceutical drugs. That's what this is. And I'm giving you much more than I've put into the article, which leads me to believe that maybe I should add more, but it gives you kind of context in which to view this. We can also go back to the 1970s, a program that was begun at UCLA, which was to build a center for – it had a fancy name. It was basically for the study and treatment of criminality and violence. And the solution in that case was what's called "psychosurgery." In other words, instead of doing gross lobotomies, in which you cut out huge sections of the brain surgically, this was now called microsurgery because it was said researchers had discovered those very small places in the brain where violent impulses were born. And by removing those, you could turn the criminal into a – just an ordinary Joe. That was the PR.

Well, as this center moved forward, they were going to build a separate center from UCLA on the outskirts of Los Angeles at an old missile base. Protests began to gather, and Peter Breggin, again, M.D., psychiatrist, stepped into the breach and was one of the leaders in the movement to completely destroy the whole apparatus of scientific justification for this by pointing out that the research was fraudulent, that no one had discovered such a thing as to how to do this kind of surgery with this kind of result. And, of course, Breggin and others also pointed out that this was not the way to cure criminality and that, in fact, if the center was allowed to form, then what we would see would be a spreading of this doctrine so that all around the United States, suddenly the



government, law enforcement, would have the means through the passage of legislation to not only treat criminals in this way, but now you would be looking at a sort of minority report, if you've seen the movie scenario, which would be to be able to predict crime before it occurs, and then, therefore, you could pull in people who hadn't yet committed violent acts and do surgery on them. I mean this was the beginning of all of that, and it was derailed.

This is not to say that the research does not still go on, and what is the application specifically to what I am reading you here today and talking about? Well, where do we find huge statistics of violent crime? – inner cities. Some people try to deny it ridiculously and – I mean all sorts of arguments and counter-arguments are made, but the statistics are clear. So where would the first place be that this psychosurgery would be tried? Right there. Right there.

Okay. Let me continue reading here. It is widely acknowledged and admitted in the *Times* article that the effects of ADHD drugs on children's still developing brains are unknown. You can stop right there. Some of the evidence is known, but the *Times* is correct in that there have – there's been, let's call it a paucity of studies on the long-term effects of these stimulant drugs like Adderall and Ritalin. Why? – because the pharmaceutical companies don't want to do them, and who else is going to do them? I mean these are expensive studies to run, and they have to be long-term. This is not something where you can just track people for six weeks. We're talking about doing tests and follow-ups and follow-ups again and again and again over a period of, let's say, a year, then two years, then four years, then six years to see what happens to children who are taking these drugs, what's happening to their brains, their nervous systems, their metabolism, all sorts of things, which is like saying we're going to study speed and see what it does to the human body. Common sense tells us, based upon some studies and the lots of observed behavior, that it's a disaster.

So it's correct to say that the effects of ADHD drugs on children's still developing brains are unknown. That's why they're unknown. And yet, these doctors that I'm mentioning in the article and others are quite willing to go into inner cities, low-income areas, and simply start fiddling with an ADHD diagnosis, either making it falsely or not at all, and just dispensing the drugs as a social program, even though they would have to admit that they don't know, and they will admit that they don't know the long-term effects of the drugs.



So this should give you some insight into the actual people who are promoting this program. I mean if you were a doctor, and a patient came in, and you decided that the patient should have a certain drug, but at the same time you knew, (a) that the patient was going to have to take this drug for a long time and, (b) the effects, the physiological, psychological effects were unknown, and there was a good chance that they would be serious adverse effects, would you prescribe the drug? I think you would say no. I mean would you? I certainly would. And yet these people don't. They are operating from a different basis, not only from a different basis, but from a different zone of their own minds. They look at reality differently, see. They have a more cold, experimental approach, to begin with; that's number one. Number two, they see themselves, in this case, as heroic, as many researchers do, so they have to do heroic things. And then also they see the human being as basically a machine, a biologic machine that they are tinkering with, and sometimes the tinkering produces unintended effects, but by and large it's a good idea to tinker because, in the long run, what are you dealing with? – a biological machine. Sobering, hey?

Okay, to read on: therefore, the risks of the drug are great. At least one leading psychiatrist, Peter Breggin, believes there is significant evidence that these stimulants can cause atrophy of the brain. Deploying the ADHD drugs creates symptoms which may then be treated with compounds like Risperdal, a powerful antipsychotic which can cause motor brain damage. All of the antipsychotics have this capability. They're called antipsychotics like Haldol, Thorazine, Risperdal, which is a newer drug. And this is called tardive dyskinesia, a fancy name for motor brain damage. Breggin has stated and has asserted evidence for the statement in his book, *Toxic Psychiatry*, which was written some years ago, that there are at least 300,000 to 400,000 cases in America of motor brain damage from these drugs.

What I'm saying here is that, inevitably, the ADHD drugs are gateways into symptoms which are then diagnosed by psychiatrists as being other conditions requiring more powerful drugs, more toxic drugs. It just happens. I mean it – statistically, that's the way this game works.

And in the *Times* article, there is a case cited where a child eventually, because he was completely out of control after being prescribed Adderall, was put into psychiatric institution, where he received Risperdal. This also – another



scenario would be the speed type drugs for ADHD lead to depression, which is then diagnosed as clinical depression, which then you talking about the antidepressants: Prozac, Zoloft, Paxil, et cetera, et cetera. All of these drugs carry significant toxic effects. So even in the best case scenario of what these doctors for social justice are doing – and there is no best case, so I'm just talking about a fantasy here – but even in the best case, you are inevitably talking about more drugs, more diagnoses, more toxicity unleashed on the body, more unpredictable effects, more brain alterations, more chaos, more aggressive, violent behavior. And I write all this in service of, quote, "social justice for the poor."

And what about the claim that ADHD drugs can enhance school performance, because, you see, of course, that's the whole rationale here by these social justice doctors. The following pronouncement makes a number of things clear. *The 1994 Textbook of Psychiatry* published by the American Psychiatric Press contains this review. Authors are Popper and Steingard, quote: "Stimulants given for ADHD do not produce lasting improvements in aggressivity, conduct disorder, criminality, education achievement, job functioning, marital relationships or long-term adjustment." Got that?

So another mind-boggler for the readers. The American Psychiatric Press, which is part of the American Psychiatric Association, which is the association for professional psychiatrists in America, has published a textbook: *1994 Textbook of Psychiatry*. In it is a review which says that the stimulants that these social justice doctors are now prescribing does not produce lasting improvement in education achievement in school performance.

The next paragraph of my article: so the whole basis for this social justice program in low-income communities that the ADHD drugs will improve school performance of kids and, quote, "level the playing field so they can compete academically with children from wealthier families," this whole program is based on a lie to begin with. So the whole thing, it's a lie upon a lie upon a lie, et cetera. And furthermore, if we go back to that review, *Textbook of Psychiatry*, they don't – these drugs don't produce lasting improvements in aggressivity, criminality or long-term adjustment, meaning social relationships. So you're not getting any benefits there either, and, as we – or as I have mentioned a minute ago, in fact, the stimulants will produce, in the long-run,



more aggressive behavior, more violence.

Continuing here: meddling with the brains of children via these chemicals constitutes criminal assault, and it's time it was recognized for what it is. Now, I've been very harsh about these drugs, not just in this article but for you know the last 50 years or so, in calling out the people who prescribe them. In my eyes, there are two approaches one can take: the polite approach, which simply points out that there are errors in the research and that perhaps the doctors are not reading their own research and that better research needs to be done and that we are seeing over-prescription of these drugs, et cetera, et cetera, and there is pharmaceutical influence being pressed down upon political leaders, et cetera, you know. Okay, all of that is true, yes, yes, yes, yes.

But to leave it at that, in my mind, is not correct. It's not the right thing to do because – well, I'll tell you what the "because" is in a minute, but the other letting off the hook is, well, you see the doctors don't know because they've been indoctrinated. They've been put through the mill in their education and training, and they believe their own literature, and so if they see a study that says this is a good thing, this drug, and if the detail man who is coming from the pharmaceutical company assures them that the drug is wonderful, et cetera, et cetera, the doctor is going to be influenced, and so it really isn't the doctor's fault. Well, if it isn't the doctor's fault, then eventually you're going to get to say it's nobody's fault; nobody is responsible. And this, of course, is a favorite ploy in the universe of moral relativity where nothing really matters; we're just simply dealing with many points of view, okay? That's the – what you find when you take it out to the farthest extreme; it's not really anybody's fault. Nobody really knows what they're doing, and so those of us who luckily have figured out what's going on need to educate everybody else, and of course we need to do this in a very polite way, et cetera, et cetera.

And then you'll have other people chiming in and saying if you're not polite and professional, then you'll drive everybody away, and you won't achieve your own aims. I don't agree with that. In fact, my experience is the opposite. If you take an extreme position, which happens to be the truth, and you assign

“Well, if it isn't the doctor's fault, then eventually you're going to get to say it's nobody's fault; nobody is responsible.”



responsibility, then you have at least a chance of change because you awaken many people to the degree of brutality that we're talking about here. If you leave that part out, then, in my experience, nothing happens because you let everybody off the hook, because everybody can say, "Well, that was a marvelous analysis that you did, and I'm so happy to read it, and it helps and ba, ba, bup, and, yes, you've pointed out a mistake in the research, and we hope that further studies will correct that. Mm-hmm, yes, ba, ba, ba, ba, ba." See?

No. In my experience, that doesn't work. So if I say that meddling with the brains of children via these chemicals constitutes criminal assault, that's exactly what I mean because the doctor has either taken an oath, or should take an oath, to do no harm; first do no harm. That means that the doctor's education has to be broad enough to include thinking that is at least several degrees off the center of mainstream. And even as I've pointed out here a minute ago, in the mainstream of the mainstream, it's indicated that the stimulant drugs for ADHD don't work in the long term.

My philosophy is, if I can find out about it, doctors can too. If they want to, they can find out the truth. And I think this is important to point out here. When I ran for a seat in U.S. Congress in 1994 from the 29th District in Los Angeles, I was campaigning on a platform of health freedom, the right of every person to manage and deal with their own health in any way they wanted to, to make whatever choices they wanted to: go to a conventional doctor, go to an alternative practitioner, stand on their heads. It's choice. It's choice. If you eliminate choice, you have nothing. You will – now you have fascist, that's all. Well, during that political campaign, I put out several fliers that were very critical of the FDA, to say the least. They minced no words. And I think that, to the degree that I got support in that campaign – which is a whole other story I'll perhaps tell it some time here – it was because I was taking up an uncompromising position, which was it's time that we recognize what's going on here. Crimes are being committed, and they have to be prosecuted.

If you have crimes, especially ongoing RICO type crimes in the society and nobody's doing anything about it, then you have a sharp decline and decay of the whole society. People now begin to live at a different level than they were living before. If this is or ever was a society of laws, then the laws have to be followed. And, yes, there are bad laws, and we understand this is a complicated



issue. But I think in this case it's quite clear; if you give a child a drug that scrambles that child's brain, if you are toxifying the body, that's a crime, and when it goes on and on and on and on, when the evidence is available, it's a bigger crime, a far bigger crime.

So in that light, I'm going to continue reading here because you'll see what I'm talking about. In 1986, the *International Journal of the Addictions* published the most important literature review by Richard Scarnati. It was called *An Outline of Hazardous Side Effects of Ritalin*, Volume 21, Number 7, Pages 837 to 841. Adderall and other ADHD medications are all in the same basic class. They are stimulants, amphetamine type substances. Scarnati listed a large number of adverse effects of Ritalin and cited published journal articles, which reported each of these symptoms. For every one of the following, selected and quote verbatim, Ritalin effects, there is at least one confirming source in the medical literature, and here we go: paranoid delusions, paranoid psychosis, hypo manic and manic symptoms, amphetamine like psychosis, activation of psychotic symptoms, toxic psychosis, visual hallucinations, auditory hallucinations, can surpass LSD in producing bizarre experiences. Affects pathological thought processes, extreme withdrawal, terrified affect, started screaming, aggressiveness, insomnia, expect amphetamine like affects, psychic dependence, high abuse potential, DEA Schedule II drug – which means that the Drug Enforcement Agency puts Ritalin as a Schedule II drug, which means because it's highly addictive and potential for abuse. These drugs are addictive, yes.

Decreased REM sleep. When used with antidepressants, one may see dangerous reactions, including hypertension, seizures and hypothermia, convulsions. Brain damage may be seen with amphetamine abuse. And then I conclude, in what sense are the ADHD drugs social justice? The reality is, they are chemical warfare. Licensed predators are preying on the poor. And that's the article.

So I think I've clarified the situation here and elucidated it for you. I could go on here. You know, I could take the full hour for this, but I'd kind of like to leave it right here so that you can think about it and think about the implications of what I'm saying here, not the least of which is where I started, that when you get media exposure, to a degree, at least, of something like this social justice campaign in the *New York Times*, still you get no action, and one of the big reasons is because the people who read the articles can't believe what



they're reading. They can't attend to and consult their own minds to acknowledge the implications of what they're seeing on the page. They somehow gloss over it. They know what they're reading. They are shocked a little bit, quizzical, yes. But all in all, what's right there in front of their eyes manages to escape them because – because, because, because – it's such a big lie that's being exposed, you see? And as we've all heard, the bigger the lie, the easier it is to get people to believe it, okay?

So this is a little shorter than usual, but I want to make it a little bit shorter because I want you to think about it. There are many other strands here that I could draw out, and will in future episodes. But I thank you very much for your attention. This is Jon Rappoport on behalf of Catherine Austin Fitts and *Solari*, and we will 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.