



---

# The Solari Report

---

DECEMBER 27, 2012

**Covert Engineering  
of Information  
with Jon Rappoport**





# Covert Engineering of Information

December 27, 2012

---

This is John Rappoport for the *Solari Report* and for Catherine Austin Fitts. Again, great pleasure to be able to be here with you and discuss issues that certainly fly under the radar. So for this month, the title of this episode is the *Covert Engineering of Information*, and I'm going to use two concrete illustrations. I was going to break these up and do an hour a piece on these, but I decided it was too important to wait on it. So I'm going to split this.

Let's see. We want to look at it this way: what I'm giving you here is real-life examples that could and should lead you to a deeper examination and analysis of the way that reality is put together, okay? If you follow the bouncing ball, you will certainly see connections to deeper issues of the creation of reality for us by them because that's what's going on. Portraits and pictures and murals and movies of reality are being created for us so that we can, so to speak, go to the museum, look at the painting, walk into the painting and live there forever. And information is certainly a prime route along which we travel to live inside the painting. It leads us there. And all of this information is concocted. It's cooked up. It's slanted. It contains half-truths.

It's perverted works of art that are assembled to lead the sniffing dog along the track right into the painting of reality, where he takes up residence and looks around and says, "Well, I guess this is it." All right, so with that brief into, one is a press conference that I sat in on last week, a phone press conference. And I had no idea what to expect. At the last minute I got the phone number and the code. It was a press conference being put on by the Yes on 37 forces in California, who are trying to get a ballot measure passed on election day so that all genetically engineered food in California would have to contain a label saying that it was GMO, genetically modified, genetically engineered. And as you probably know, that ballot measure lost on election night.



But the people who were proposing it were holding kind of a last-minute press conference before the election, and they were trying to make a case for the fact that the No on 37 forces, supported by big pesticides, big genetic engineering companies such as Monsanto, that had poured millions into the campaign, were guilty of serious fraud and crimes. So this would be the kind of story, certainly, that major media would pick up on, you would imagine. And the intro to the press conference was: "FBI Opens Investigation into No on 37." So, uh, a few people from Yes on 37, a couple of lawyers, Andy Kimbrell, uh, Joe Sandler, I believe his name is, spoke, and they laid out a case for the fraud that was being perpetrated by No on 37 forces. And among these frauds was a statement in ads taken out by No on 37 claiming that there was no need to label the genetically modified food and attributing that statement to the FDA, and then under that statement the seal of the agency, the FDA. This was in a print ad.

And as the Yes on 37 people pointed out, the FDA came back and said, "We never made that statement," and also there is the matter of the seal, because it's a federal crime punishable by years in jail and a large amount of money, uh, to misappropriate or fraudulently use the seal of a federal agency. An FBI agent named Jason Jones had called up Joe Sandler after a complaint had been lodged with the Department of Justice, the FBI, and said, "Okay, got the complaint here. We're looking into it," words to that effect. In fact, the matter was being referred to the FDA to get their opinion.

So that was one of the accusations made against No on 37 people. Then there were various statements also in No on 37 as attributed to very sensitive institutions like Stanford University, National Academy of Sciences. These organizations – World Health Organization – which these organizations then repudiated in print, said, "We never said that. Never said that." Certainly raised red flags there. And then there was also a charge level during the press conference by the Yes on 37 forces against the No on 37 people that, in the California Voters Guide, which is a lot of text given to voters to give them information about these ballot measures and so forth, pro and con. Again, the No on 37 people had lied, had made false statements intentionally knowing you know they were lies, which is another felony.

So this went on for 20 minutes, half-an-hour, whatever, you know presenting



the case. And I had no idea, you know, who's on the call. I assumed a few reporters might be, but lo and behold, when they opened up the question-and-answer period, *New York Times* was there, *L.A. Times* was there, other major media outlets, and one by one, they all asked the same question: is this a real investigation that the FBI is doing into No on 37? Has the FBI really opened an investigation into No on 37? One reporter, "I called the Department of Justice, and they said there is no investigation. And I called the U.S. Attorney in Sacramento, and he said there is no investigation." This became the entire subject of the press conference.

Is it an expression of interest on the part of the FBI? I mean what difference does it make? The issue here, essentially, is fraud crimes. But you see, that's not why the reporters were on the phone. On one level, they were on the phone because they thought they might have a story, and every story in the press needs a hook, and the hook for this story would be "FBI Opens Investigation into No on 37 Fraud." Now, as they saw that hook dissolving in front of their eyes because by some standards there was no official full-blown investigation – you know, semantics, semantics, semantics – they felt they had no story.

**“The issue here, essentially, is fraud crimes. But you see, that's not why the reporters were on the phone.”**

This is androidal behavior, you see. This is the way the game is played in mainstream press; no story. "Man killed on sidewalk, but we were sent out to see whether man was wearing red suit. Man is not apparently wearing red suit; he's wearing a kind of pinkish suit with maroon in it, which we don't think is red, and therefore we have no hook, therefore we have no story, therefore the story of the man being killed on the sidewalk, that is not a story." The murder on the sidewalk is not a story. This is robot, android, Pavlovian behavior.

On another level, that is not confined to that press conference. The point was obviously to deride and defame and derail the Yes on 37 forces by not giving them adequate coverage for what they had legitimately uncovered in the way of fraud about the opposition, and therefore not to give 37 Yes a helping hand at the last minute by telling the truth as the election was coming up and the ballot measure you know was going to be voted on because the forces that be are all about allowing genetically engineered food to proliferate everywhere and to not



give consumers the right to know whether it is genetically engineered because they are definitely afraid that people finding out that the stuff they're eating has been modified genetically, they won't buy it anymore and they won't eat it. Profit motive, of course, yes, but also the long-range goal of controlling the food supply on the planet, by controlling the patents on the seeds that contain the genes that have been inserted, because that's the way that agriculture can be, quote, "legitimately and scientifically owned" if all the seeds are patented, because they're genetically engineered. Then we're talking about commercial interests, corporate interests, who holds the patents, and therefore who holds control of the food supply.

So as we go up the ladder of power, the objectives, the purposes, and the goals become much bigger. But at the ground level, it's all about the twisting of information. And then, indeed, in the next day or two or three after that disastrous press conference, stories began appearing in *Christian Science Monitor*, other newspapers; the investigation that was no investigation. Could have been an investigation but wasn't an investigation. You know, whatever, however the headlines were put together. The gist of the stories was: false alarm. Yes on 37 is now backed up against the wall because they said there was a full-blown investigation when there really wasn't a full-blown investigation, and therefore the tables are turned, and they're really the guilty parties. I mean this is the kind of bad publicity that you really do want to avoid.

But that's how everything in the press conference was twisted. That's how the information was twisted. That's how the information would lead the public to accept the covert premise that there's something wrong with the Yes on 37. There's something wrong, in fact, with all people who want to have food genetically labeled. There's something wrong with the whole idea that there's anything wrong with genetically engineered food. And that was the smash-and-grab tactic of the reporters who got into that press conference and completely turned the whole thing upside down. Quite incredible.

And then, of course, we had the vote on 37, and it failed. I have my suspicions about the possibility that the vote count itself was rigged because only several weeks earlier, it seemed clear that Yes on 37 was going to win, and then in the ensuing weeks – and I live in California – the kinds of ads that I saw on television did nothing to convince me or I think any reasonably intelligent



person that they should vote No on 37. So why on suddenly was there a complete turnaround, and why, on election day, was Yes on 37 not only defeated, but defeated big time, soundly by a huge margin? I don't buy it. I think maybe something happened there. Something was rigged. To get those numbers to reverse so quickly is not what you normally see, unless there was some gigantic kind of scandal.

However, these reporters did play a role in changing people's minds from yes to no because of the way they manipulated the press conference, the way they reported on the press conference, the way they omitted the vital facts of the crimes that were committed by the No on 37 people. They had them on the record. I mean, "This organization said this," you know they put in an ad. "No, we didn't." Well, that organization said that. "No, we didn't." National Academy of Sciences said, "No, we didn't." FDA said this. "No, we didn't." World Health Organization said this. "No, we didn't." Stanford University said this. "No, we didn't." All purported statements to support No on 37, all completely countered and contradicted by the organizations to whom they had been attributed, plus the use of the FBI's seal, plus spreading intentionally false information through the California Voters Guide.

Manipulation of information, and for John Q. Public, just picking up a copy of the *Christian Science Monitor*, or a number of other newspapers, would never have known what happened. Reads the article, "Okay, it looks like the Yes on 37 people sort of cheated or they don't know what they're doing, they're bumlbers. They claim..." You see, it's a total turning of the tables because now the story becomes, "Well, Yes on 37 people said the FBI was investigating, but the FBI says they weren't investigating." Well, what were the Yes On people actually charging? They were saying the No on 37 people made statements that were later contradicted by the organizations to which they had been attributed. Well, now the reporters are not only turning the spotlight away from the No on 37 to the Yes on 37 people, but they're accusing them of exactly the same kind of distortion that the Yes on 37 people had caught the No on 37 people doing.

It is quite interesting to see it play out, to be there on the call, to watch the whole thing unravel and then to see the stories that appeared in the press in the next several days, and to realize that most people reading those stories would



never in a million years have a clue as to how that story really came about, how that story really happened. These are pictures of reality being painted for us.

So now I want to tell a story, a personal story, that I've told really only a few times before. It was how I ran in a rigged election in 1994 in California. In this case, the manipulation of information that we're talking about is the actual vote count, the actual vote count. Around Christmas of 1993, I was deeply involved in the Health Freedom Movement, which, at that time, was trying to stop the FDA from making incursions on nutritional supplements and narrowing the choice of consumers. Lots of people were involved in this, nutritional companies, celebrities, mad letter writing campaign to Congress and the White House. More letters had been received on that issue, and we're talking about snail mail, than any other issue in the history of the Congress.

There had been a raid in 1992, I'm going to call it, at the Jonathan Wright Clinic in Tahoma, Washington. He's an alternative doctor. FDA, with armed marshals, came in while people were on IVs and being treated and so forth, and it was like a SWAT team Gestapo raid. They confiscated all kinds of products and records and upset, greatly upset patients. I think somebody may have even suffered a heart attack in the office. This became a national story all of a sudden. And that fueled, as well, the Health Freedom Movement, the right of people to seek health – management of their own health through any practitioner they wished to visit.

There was a bill riding in Congress that became known as the Dee-Shay Bill, the Hatch Bill that was going to at least partially put the FDA back in its place if it passed. So these were some of the threads of events going on at the time, and then I lived in the 29th District, California, where Henry Waxman was the 20-year incumbent congressman, and he was a tremendous supporter of pharmaceutical interests and derided the whole Health Freedom Movement. And so I thought to myself, "I'm going to run for Congress against this guy." And I talked to a couple of friends, and I made up my mind on New Years Eve in 1994, this is it, bang, here we go. And I assembled a small team of people, none of whom were professional in the political sense, and we began to try to raise money and decided, okay, here we go. And I said, "All right, look, in the 29th District, no Republican ever wins anything, you know, except the booby prize." So the only way to defeat Waxman, who was a Democrat, is to run



against him in the primary in June on the Democratic ticket. That's the only way.

So I made that error. These days I know a lot better. If you're an independent, you run as an independent. You run as an independently independent, independent person. That's what you do. You don't make compromises right at the beginning with the two parties, or the one party that has two heads, the Demo and the Repub heads. This is where Ron Paul ran off the rails. Ron Paul, God knows how many votes he could have gotten on that Tuesday night if he had run as an independent. It would have been phenomenal, and it really would have put a dagger into the bland confidence that people have in the two-party system in America, or even if they don't have confidence, the apathy through which they view it. That's a whole other story, and that's a big, big story.

Anyway, I won't go through all the myriad of contortions of the campaign except to say that every time that I appeared at a Democratic club or sort of conference – that's a little too big a word – in Los Angeles, the events that the Democratic Party hosts, where candidates who are running in the primary in the Democratic sphere have a chance to say a few words and so on. Every time I showed up to one of these, it was like going to a morgue. I mean there were 3, 4 people, 10, 20, 30 people at the most. There seemed to be a lot more interest in the donuts than in anything that anybody had to say. I mean it was just nothing going on. Century Cable, which was the big cable provider in the 29th District at the time, there was a guy over there who ran the show who liked me a lot, and he wanted to get Waxman to debate me on Century Cable's own political show, which was a very popular show. And I said, "Yeah, that's what I want. Bring the man here."

All attempts at that failed. In fact, as far as I could tell, Waxman never showed up into the district at all during the entire six months between the time that I announced and the primary was held in June. Did no campaigning. I saw no signs for him, no flyers, no anything, no ads at all. This, as far as I could tell,

**“It would have been phenomenal, and it really would have put a dagger into the bland confidence that people have in the two-party system in America, or even if they don't have confidence, the apathy through which they view it.”**



was a complete machine election. He had the machinery in place. It was there. It had been there for all these years, and it was just going to grind him out another victory on primary night, which made me a little suspicious right away. What am I dealing with here? What is the machine? How big is the machine and what does the machine do exactly? What are all the things the machine can do? Well, I was about to find out.

So we gathered our small team and some supporters – and by the way, we had posters up everywhere all over town, paid a fair sum of money for one of these companies to print up "Rappoport for Congress" signs, and they were all over the place in the 29th District. So people knew who I was. We took out television spots, which are very cheap for local political campaigns and flooded the airwaves and so on. So here we are at this bookstore, the Phoenix Bookstore, the night, election night, primary night, and we get a report from one of our guys, said he did an informal exit poll in Santa Monica that afternoon and discovered that I came out very well, in fact, ahead of Waxman. So that's the information, the only information we had. Eight o'clock, the polls close, and as they're beginning to announce results, the first thing out of the box in my election was the bundle of absentee ballots that had already been counted and were ready to go as soon as the polls closed. This is very important. And they announced these, and the figures showed that Waxman won 80 percent of these and I won 20 percent.

Okay. So we hung around a while longer, and we didn't see anymore updates on the vote count, and we didn't think we were going to get any. So somebody said, "Well, why don't we drive down to Norwalk," which is south of Los Angeles, "to the county registrar's building, where they count the votes, and let's see what's going on down there." So we all piled into cars, and we drove down there. Completely surreal scene; the city of Norwalk is totally dark except for this one building, the county registrar's office – it's the big building – blazing with lights. Helicopters are landing, helicopters carrying sealed and locked boxes of punch cards from the voting precincts. At that time, it was all punch cards. I don't know if there were any paper ballots where you would actually write in the name of the candidates. Pretty sure it was all punch cards all throughout the district.

And cars were driving up with boxes locked, delivering all this to the building



for the county in my race and a number of other races, all kinds of stuff. Okay. We walk in the building, and suddenly a young woman appears who looks like a flight attendant. I feel like I'm on a gigantic plane and we're taking the Red Eye to New York, "Hi. How are you?" You know, it's like, I don't know, at this point 10:00 at night. There's about seven or eight of us. "Hi. What can I do for you?" So, "Well, we're from the Rappoport for Congress Campaign, and we'd like to see what's happening." "Well, sure. Fine. We can take you on a tour." "Okay, great." So they take us into a very large room where there are a lot of people sitting at desks fiddling with punch cards. They're opening the boxes and whatever they're doing with the punch cards. I'm not really sure what they were doing with them, feeding them into machines. That memory is a little vague. But that's the first shot out of the box. We see this huge room and, okay, here's where the boxes come in, and they're unpacked, and so forth, and then we move along to another space where we're looking at several computers.

Again, it's 1994. We're looking at machines. There's nobody there. And the tour guide says, "Well, these are Compaq computers that have been modified to become vote-counting machines." Okay. And what are they doing? "They're counting votes." Okay. And what happens next? "Well, the results are sent upstairs to another computer." Okay. "Can we go to that room?" "Yes, you can't go into that room, but you can peek inside." Okay. So we all get into an elevator with our tour guide, and we go up to the next floor, and sure enough, there is this little tiny room, had a couple of windows, and there's a computer. It looks – it's like a console. It's standing on the floor.

"Okay, so the Compaq computers deliver the ground count, the running count, to this computer. Is that right?" "Yes." Okay. And there's this kind of sinking feeling of we're not seeing anything. We don't know anything. We're more stupid than when we arrived. You want to take a hammer and a screw driver or something or a pair of pliers and open up and see what's inside, as if that was going to help you. But that's the feeling you had. Machines are counting and tabulating. This is information. It's all being processed, and we're getting – oh, boy, this is up close and personal, but we don't know anything. So I said, "Well, what happens?" We're looking in the little room and we can see the big computer. "So what goes on next?"

And she says, "Well, at this point, all the information gets sent to a mainframe



computer eight miles away." Oh, man. Eight miles away? What are we doing here? "Can we go eight miles away and see the other computer?" And the answer is, "Maybe. Maybe. You'd have to get special permission." And so we look at each other like, "What good is that going to do? We're going to get in our cars now. We're going to drive eight miles away. We're going to look at another computer." You know? I mean what are we going to know? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

Okay, so we're kind of tired. It's been a long six months. Here we are. All right, is there anything more we can learn? "Well, yes," she says, "yes, you can. There's a room downstairs with computers and people sitting in front of them, and every 20 minutes to a half-hour there are updates as the vote count is done, and you can look at those." "Oh, fantastic. Okay." So we all go back down the elevator, and now we're in a different room, and sure enough, there are a couple of computers in there, screens, and guys sitting in chairs in front of the computers looking at the screens. So we grab some chairs and we sit behind that guy, and we wait, and pretty soon, ding, here comes an update. And the numbers for my election flash on the screen, and below the numbers are the percentage breakouts, 80/20, the same breakdown as in the first total batch of absentee ballots several hours prior that we saw on television in the bookstore in Santa Monica. Hmm. How is this possible? You mean that somehow in the intervening few hours magically a billion to one odds? The vote count at this moment is precisely the same 80/20 breakdown as it was? And we look at each other, "What? What's happening here?" But, okay. All right. Let's see.

We sit there and blab and drink coffee for another 20 minutes, half-hour, and boom, here comes new numbers up on the screen, and lo and behold, the breakdown is 80 percent-20 percent, 80 percent Waxman, 20 percent me. Same deal. Holy moly. No, no, no. This is impossible. Well, for the next, I don't know, couple of hours, we sat there and we saw update after update at 20-minute, half-hour intervals with new numbers and yet the same percentage breakdown. One time I saw a variance, and I believe it was 79/21. That's as far off as it ever got. And at the bitter end, it was 80/20. And that's the way it is recorded and would still be, I presume, available for inspection at the county registrar's office, if they even keep those records now.

It may be – outside chance, in my memory, that the final was 79/21, but I



believe it was 80/20. I mean nothing really changed all night long, and no matter what interval you wanted to plug into the update on the count, same percentages, same percentages. Are you kidding me? I mean this was prima facie evidence of manipulation. There's no other way to account for it. But you know there is this tendency in the mind to reject that, "Well, it couldn't be. There must be some other explanation. Blah, blah, blah, blah." And people have offered me, of course, you know multitudes of explanations over the years, but I keep coming back to the raw reality. Part of your mind doesn't want to think that this was a rigged job when you're up close and personal to it. Hard to explain why in the heat of the moment you don't want to accept that, because another part of your mind is saying, "Ah-ha, just as I suspected all along," because I had already been working as a reporter for about 12 years, and so it wasn't as if I was some sort of a naïve neophyte just sort of wet behind the ears coming into a political race; far from it. But still, there was that divided sense of, "Ah-ha," over here, and then on the other side, "No, this couldn't be. Could not be because if it is, what it certainly is, then reality is absolutely not what I thought it was or what I thought it was in one part of my mind," because the mind still wants to maintain that reality as we assume it is, is, in fact, reality.

And it's one thing to read a newspaper article and to punch holes in it and say, "Therefore, the reality presented in that article is bogus, and the real truth, real reality is hidden somewhere underneath." It's quite another thing to be in the building where they're counting the votes, in the election in which you have busted your butt for six months night and day trying to make inroads on a 20-year incumbent when the issue is as vital as do you have control over your own body to manage your health and well-being in any way that you want to or not. You're in the building. They are counting the votes. You can see it is fraud. There is no other explanation, and there you are, and there it is. And reality is most definitely not what you supposed it was.

**“It's quite another thing to be in the building where they're counting the votes, in the election in which you have busted your butt for six months night and day trying to make inroads on a 20-year incumbent when the issue is as vital as do you have control over your own body to manage your health and well-being in any way that you want to or not.”**



That's a heavy dose, and it was a heavy dose. And in one small and shrinking part of my mind, I continued to believe that there must have been some other explanation. But that part of my mind in which I kept on insisting shrank and shrank and shrank and shrank until finally I had to face the fact that, yes, this was the fix, the rig, the phony, the fraud. And I was sitting right in the middle of it. There I was. And I have to tell you that even now as I'm telling the story and as I have told the story on a radio show yesterday, in almost as much detail as I'm giving it to you now, but not presenting this in terms of the matrix and reality the way I'm putting it into context here. Right now it still is – the ah-ha's are still coming. It's not a static situation. It's a progressive situation, a realization that, in fact, I was sitting in the middle of a major fraud.

I think that's the way it goes in our education – I'm talking now about our real education – progressively realizing the existence of the fraud. It isn't the simple one or zero. It isn't a simple yes or a no or black or white. Progressive realization. So we went home. We were told because we inquired, and I said, "Well, what about a recount?" "Yes, you can do that tomorrow. We could do a hand recount of all the punch cards, but you have to pay for that." "How much?" "Six grand." Didn't have the six grand. Friend of mine leans over to me and says, "Look, if they could fake this, do you think they're really going to let you see that the recount shows that the entire computer system here was a fraud? If they can rig this, they can rig the hand count on the punch cards. They could just print up a whole new set of punch cards and have them ready to go, and when they're hand recounted, it'll show the same 80/20 split."

Okay. In the following week or so, I consulted with a couple of bright computer people of the period, 1994. And finally, one of them said to me, "Look, here's the bottom line. A guy with a laptop and a password or passwords and a pay phone could get into the software that enables the vote count, could change a few lines of code or whatever has to be changed, to achieve the desired results, could then get out and nobody would know he was there. You don't have a chance. You're not going to be able to find it. If it's there, it's buried," and I was told – and this was presented to me as unusual but true – the software for that vote count had a lot of code. It wasn't just simple stuff. There were a lot of lines of code. Why I don't know. So that was the end of it.



The next night, six or seven of us got on a popular late-night radio show in Los Angeles on KPFK and spilled the beans and talked about the whole thing for an hour-and-a-half. The host – I won't say he was skeptical. I think he was a little bit nonplussed, but he had agreed to have us on, and he did, and we laid out the whole case. And then we had a source, I think his name was Jim Collier, the Collier Brothers. They had a very well known book at the time. I think it was called *Votescam*, where they went through all sorts of ways in which elections could be rigged. And of course you know, if you know black box voting now, that Harris and all sorts of other people, there was a Pew Center study recently done that said that about 2 million, I think it was, American voters are registered in two or more states. That 1.8 million registered voters in America are dead, and then you get to you know the hacking. You get to the fact that the company called Scytl, which is responsible for reporting a fraction of the vote, American vote, from overseas, and that's been poo-pooed and downplayed because they only report a small percentage of absentee ballots sent in from overseas. Well, you know that's a lot of votes.

And there are numerous other factors: voting machines that flip. You enter one name, another name shows up. And I'm talking about both sides here. I'm not talking about Democrats or Republicans; I'm talking about everybody. So it's different, though, as I say, if you're actually there, and I was there. I was in the middle of it. I sat there, and I can still see the rooms. I can still see people. I can still trace the route that we took through the building as we discovered that we knew nothing. I can see that room where the computers were that gave us the updates and the percentage breakouts and the sense of, at the end of it, what are you going to do? And I would say that that event was significant in my eventual decision: first of all, that two-party politics in America was absolutely ridiculous, and furthermore, that decentralization of power is the answer. In other words, if you're going to go up against that machine, what are your chances if you want to take over the machine and reform it, you see? You said, well, there's the monolith. It's this gigantic thing. It's about 5 billion stories high, and it's corrupt, completely corrupt.

Now, what I want to do is I want to get into that monolith, and I want to take it over, and then I want to fix it as opposed to the monolith grew in the first place because the idea that individuals control their own destiny was deemed to be an unsettling prospect, an unhappy idea. And there were psychopaths bent



on controlling individuals who decided to build the monolith. So the sane answer would be: decentralize. Decentralize power wherever you possibly can. Take it down to a visible spectrum so that you can see the power, first of all because we think we see the power now. Obama says this, Obama does that, Bush does this, Bush does that. And yes, we're seeing, in a sense, but we're – in another sense, we're not seeing it at all. We're not seeing it in a way that would lead us to realize that we can participate directly in it, that's for sure.

You see, it's not as if, well, Obama's about to sign this executive order, and lo and behold, I'm in the room, and he looks at me, and he kind of raises his eyebrows. And I walk over, and I say, "Tarry, tarry, baby, tarry. Don't sign the executive order." And he says, "Oh, really? Why not?" "Because don't you see what it says here in the second paragraph? Read that again. You're going to – you could put people on a kill list." "Yeah," he says, "yeah, I was wondering about that. Hold on, guys. I want to talk to you. I want to talk to John about this." That's what I mean by seeing power. You see it and you realize that you have a role to play in it. You decentralize and decentralize and decentralize until you've reached a scale on which you can see the power, and you can see that you are imminently able to participate in it. That's called decentralization, and until you get to that point, you haven't decentralized far enough.

So when people talk about 10th Amendment nullification, which I firmly support – I just recently wrote an article about it – where the states refuse to obey federal laws because those laws were passed in violation of the powers enumerated to the federal government in the Constitution. Yes, yes, yes. And that happened six times on election night, by the way. Three states said that the federal government has no right to tell their citizens to purchase insurance. So they nullified ObamaCare. We'll see what's going to happen, but this is not just some weak opinion by the states of Montana, Wyoming and Alabama because the rubber is going to meet the road. There's some interesting times ahead there. And then two other states decriminalized marijuana and one, Massachusetts, passed a ballot measure that will bring in medical marijuana. This is all nullification because there's a federal law still on the books against possession of marijuana, and there's certainly a federal law called, in shorthand, ObamaCare.

Still, at the level of the state government, are you seeing power? No way. Are



you kidding me? You're not seeing power that you can really directly participate in and feel it and know it. You're going to have to decentralize way, way, way, way down below that. That's the test. That's the test. And my experience on election night in 1994 proved to me that I certainly had not decentralized power down far enough to see it. I didn't see it in Norwalk at the county registrar's. What I saw was fraud. I didn't see at the level of trying to take over the machine and fix the fraud. I saw no way I could do that.

And, in fact, and I'll close with this: it was about two-thirds of the way through that congressional campaign long before election night that I said to myself, "What the hell am I doing? Suppose I win? What am I going to do then?" You know the question posed at the end of that very entertaining movie, *The Candidate*, with Robert Redford when he begins to see that he could win, and then what is he going to do? And I asked myself that question about two-thirds of the way through the campaign. "You're going to go to Washington and you're going to – what? What are you going to do again? Are you going to cast a vote for the Hatch Bill for health freedom and then – yeah, and then what?" Uh... you know. "Are you going to stand on top of the Washington Monument with a bullhorn and give a speech and return everybody to the Constitution?" and that was a real conundrum. And then finally I decided, "Okay, this is what we're going to do. If we get to Washington..." and the team would have come with me and what a bunch that would have been, we would hire trucks, big, big trucks and put big, big, big signs on the sides of the trucks, and the trucks would have drivers, and the drivers would drive around Washington D.C. all day long, everyday, and there would be a photo of a congressman or senator on the side of the truck on the giant poster, and above that: "Corrupt Congressman of the Week," and then down below the bills that he had voted for, and then on the other side, the monies that he had received from special interests that would line up with those votes. That would be my job for the two years that I would serve as congressman.

Every week it would be a new Corrupt Congressman of the Week. And I told my guys that, and they said, "Yeah, let's do it, baby." That would have gotten

**“You're not seeing power that you can really directly participate in and feel it and know it. You're going to have to decentralize way, way, way, way down below that.”**



some publicity, don't you think? That would have been, to me, a reasonable step one in the art of decentralization. Just a beginning little step. There would have been a gigantic furor, all kinds of accusations, law suits, whatever. Who cares? Keep doing it. Injunction against doing it, then we got a course case. Then we got lawyers. Then we got all kinds of other publicity. Why can't we do that? First Amendment. We've got the proof. We're not saying corrupt; we're proving corrupt. Yes, you would become excommunicated by your own party. Who cares? What party? No one would talk to you. Good. Don't want to talk to them. We've got work to do. We're completely bent on exposing corruption. What about your constituency back home? What about them? Same bills are getting passed, regardless. That's what we would have done. Step one on the road to decentralization. I still like it. I think it's a great strategy.

Okay. That's my hour. This is John Rappoport. Manipulation, manipulation.

#### **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.