



The Solari Report

JANUARY 31, 2013

The Sandy Hook Mystery with Jon Rappoport





The Sandy Hook Mystery

January 31, 2013

This is Jon Rappoport and this is my *Solari Report* for January 2013. Happy New Year, everybody and, once again, thanks to Catherine for giving me the space and the time to cover a subject in depth, which is not something that is so prevalent these days, despite the fact that we have all the space and time we could want on the Internet to make a presentation to people who are smart enough, intelligent enough, inquisitive enough to listen to the whole thing is a privileged situation. And to preface these remarks today, which are all about the Sandy Hook mystery, I have to talk a little bit about education and logic.

The whole point of education today is to limit attention span rather than extend it, to come to quick conclusions, to mirror the network television news in a way and presidential debates and so forth with short pieces, sound bytes, *ad hominem* arguments that try to attack people who are presenting ideas rather than considering the actual content of the ideas and so on, which flies completely against the spirit of what education should be all about. And in this atmosphere, which has been prevalent for a long time, to take up a subject, especially one with as many implications and as many hot emotional buttons as the massacre at Sandy Hook, is not easy. It's certainly not something that's going to be provided for you by the television networks. In fact, what the elite television anchors do is try to present to the public a seamless story that swallows up all contradictions, all previous threads of the story that went nowhere or somehow dead-ended suddenly to selectively remember and forget previous information in the story, all in the service of presenting the viewer with a narrative that is going to be acceptable.

And as I've been writing many articles lately about television and television news and elite anchors, it's important to understand that these people are completely unreliable. First of all, the elite anchor is not a reporter. Although Diane Sawyer, Brian Williams and Scott Pelley may journey to Newtown and Sandy Hook and do stand-ups in front of cameras with some piece of the town in the background, they are not there to report on what they have discovered because they discover nothing. They are fed information from reporters from



their own network and those reporters in turn are also not really there to discover anything below the surface. They take their information from the police, from the investigating agencies. So it's a sort of hand-me-down story that we get that emanated from law enforcement – police, FBI, whatever agencies are involved, town officials who are getting their information from law enforcement.

And all of this is passed along to the reporters, who in turn pass it to the elite anchors, who then are very capable of filtering out what they don't want and don't need and presenting the public with those bits and pieces that will continue the developing narrative of shock, loss, panic, grief, healing and solution of the crime. The solution normally in these massacres comes very quickly. The suspect has been found. The suspect is dead. The suspect has been taken into custody. It's all over. We don't need to think about that anymore, and now it's all about the reaction to the tragedy, which means the emotions of the families, the townspeople, the survivors. As I've mentioned before, there is a series and a sequence of these that is normally followed by the elite anchors: the shock, the loss, the grief, the coming together, the healing and then, of course, the implications; and in the case of Sandy Hook, it's all about the guns.

Get the guns. Take away the guns. We've turned a corner. The culture must change. We will never let this be forgotten. The guns themselves commit the crimes. They jump off the shelves and begin firing. If the criminals or the psychopaths or the mental patients who commit these crimes did not have access to guns, this would never happen. So the narrative continues from the elite anchors as if it were part of the actual story of the crime. And it's the job of the anchor to make it seem as if it is, that the storyline being presented in itself implies that we must now do something about the guns. And in the case of Sandy Hook, because these were 20 children, then there is no doubt this is even worse than what happened in Aurora, Colorado. This is children. So inaction, indifference is out of the question, and so everybody and his brother seized upon this moment to turn the corner in the culture and to make the idea of owning a gun on the same level as smoking a cigarette in a theater or wearing animal fur. And I understand that those are trivial comparisons, but you get the point.

This is now going to be a cultural sea change as well as legal maneuvers, new



legislation passed by the federal government, by the states, executive orders from the President – all of that as well as a cultural change to make anyone who owns a gun a social pariah. Now there are many things in the story that the elite anchors are narrating about Sandy Hook that don't make sense, and I've reported on these and many other people have as well. The confusion, for example, between Ryan Lanza, the brother of Adam Lanza, and Adam. Supposedly, Adam was carrying his brother's ID – a brother he hadn't seen in at least two years – and this is why initially law enforcement were confused about who was who. Also, at first the story was that Ryan Lanza, the brother – his father, the father of both brothers – was killed in New Jersey. That became, "No. The mother was killed in Connecticut." How is this explained, this mistake? Confusion in the early reporting? No. I'm afraid not, but do we get an explanation of the mistake?

Of course not, you see, because the elite anchor is like a giant fish that sucks up and swallows these puzzling and contradictory aspects of the story and just simply puts them down the memory hole into the digestive system, where they're chewed up and forgotten. But inquiring minds want to know how is this mistake made? And if we were to find out, what would that lead us to understand even deeper? Who were the people, if there were two instead of one, who were chased into the woods near the school and captured when the police arrived on the scene at Sandy Hook? Who were those people or who was that person? We don't know. What's his name? Was he released? What did he do? Was he fleeing the school, in which case he might have some information about what really happened there? We don't know. Why not? Swallowed up. Gone, never to surface again.

How did Adam Lanza, the purported shooter, actually get into the school loaded down with weapons and wearing a mask and body armor and so forth when the school had just introduced new security – a whole new security system – which would have meant that the front door would have been significantly strong, not just a simple pane of glass but reinforced glass? Nobody was permitted into the school after a certain point in the morning, early on,

“There are many things in the story that the elite anchors are narrating about Sandy Hook that don't make sense, and I've reported on these and many other people have as well.”



unless they were identified through video cameras in the principal's office. Where's the tape? What happened? Who let him in? How did he get in? Did he really shoot his way in? There is video of the school that shows no broken glass. Another dead-end, never to be investigated again. These just pile up and up and up. Who can actually ID Adam Lanza as the shooter? Same thing with James Holmes in Aurora. A masked man or a man wearing some sort of a gas mask, clad in black from head to toe, comes into the school loaded down with weapons and ammo clips, kills people, is then found dead. Do we just simply take the police's word for the fact that they found him dead there and that the evidence was overwhelming that he was the shooter?

We have massive confusion about what guns were used. Contradictory stories. The rifle that supposedly killed children – was that found in the school or in the trunk of a car? Did he bring two pistols in with him or a rifle or both? Was it a Bushmaster? Was it another kind of rifle? We have many contradictions in that storyline. So the logic of the viewer watching this on television is overwhelmed. This is the point. I call it the information flicker effect, where there's a piece of information that is delivered and then taken away and made to disappear. It flickers on. It flickers off. You get five or ten of these in the space of an hour or two on television and the viewer's sense of logic is completely overwhelmed and now the viewer is in a light trance just listening to the anchor – the television anchor – narrate the story. The viewer gives up, surrenders to the story and this is where the elite anchor – the Brian Williams – makes his money because he knows how, through tone of voice, through facial expression, through filtering pieces of information and selecting those that he wants to weave a tale that is credible to the hypnotized viewer. That's why he makes the big bucks.

So this is mind control. That's what it is and it cuts deep into a lot of people's faith in major media, but so be it because that's what we're dealing with. It happens all the time on all of the network news broadcasts day in and day out, no matter what the story is. There is a narrative, a storyline and it's presented and viewers accept it. In the case of Sandy Hook the disturbance, shall we say, to the inherent ability of the viewer to apply logic and reason puts the viewer even more deeply in a trance because if you're trying to find out what's happening in an event, you see. And you run into multiple contradictions and



non sequiturs and confusions, and yet there is a central voice that is telling you what actually took place, you have to be strong to resist that voice and stronger still to try to carry on your own inquiry into what actually happened. The majority of people succumb. They give up. This is too confusing. This is too strange. There are too many unanswered questions. What about that? She said this and now it's gone. Let me just shut off my mind and listen to the story of the anchor.

Which one shall I listen to? Do I like the highly smooth mama's boy, Brian Williams? Do I prefer the kind of cool, somewhat arrogant factual Scott Pelley? Do I want the sniffles and, "I weep for you, America," Diane Sawyer? Let me choose which narrator I'm going to allow myself to be hypnotized by and *voilà*. Lo and behold, at the end of all of this, what do we have? The three anchors magically agree. They agree on what happened in Sandy Hook. No one seems to think this is significant. Here we supposedly have three separate television networks armed with the very best reporters and investigators that could be hired to find out and report on what happened. And they all magically agree on exactly the same thing by the end of the story and nobody thinks this is strange. I mean, just think about that. That alone should alert everybody that we're talking about one network operating with three heads, just as in America we're talking about two political parties that are actually one and have two heads.

So then we come to the truly weird, which I'll get to in a minute, having to do with Sandy Hook. But I want to press this issue of the hypnosis – the non-logic – a little bit further.

It's an intelligence agency, psy ops – psychological operations – technique to introduce into a story illogic, things that don't add up, false trails. If you wanted to drive yourself completely crazy, start investigating the JFK assassination right from the beginning with a blank slate and read all the books. Look at all the news reports. Listen to them. Read them and try to figure out exactly what happened and who exactly was behind it. You are going to encounter many false trails and some of these false trails are not just three steps out the door. They will take you quite a distance, at which point you'll suddenly find yourself up against a brick wall because they were put there for that very purpose. The seeding of the ground with false trails that take you down a path that might last six months or a year and then you arrive at



nowhere land.

And what are the chances if you're an investigator at this point that you're going to begin to fudge things a little bit because you don't want to admit that the last six months or a year have been a total loss? You know, you're now invested in a scenario. So that's a huge example of contradictions, illogic, false trails – JFK. In Sandy Hook, it's more tight. It's more concentrated, but yet it's still enough to totally disrupt and disorient and confuse the viewer, the person who is seeking to get answers through the news. This is a hypnotic technique. It's a distracting, disorienting technique. Distraction and disorientation lead to hypnosis because, after enough distraction and disorientation and disorientation and frustration, the viewer surrenders and says, "The hell with it. I can't deal with all this, you see. Too confusing. Too weird." You see how that operates? Now I'm not saying that every mistake and contradiction and weirdness about Sandy Hook was intentionally planted there, but I am saying that certain threads were planted there and it is the elite anchor's job to pave over them and provide the hypnotic, entrancing and training story that the public buys at the end.

For example, I would be very suspicious of, "The father's dead in New Jersey. No, the mother is dead in Connecticut," as an intentional false trail because that's just a horrendous mistake. I mean, how do you get from one to the other in good faith as a reporter or as a law-enforcement official? Gee, we thought it was the father in New Jersey, but no. It was the mother in Connecticut. Okay. See, now, in a more sane world, you or I could suddenly step in and say, "Stop the music," right? Everybody freeze right there, okay? I want to know how you got from father dead in New Jersey to mother dead in Connecticut. Lay it out for me. Let's hear it. Well, there's other – no. That's not an answer. Tell me who told you that the father was dead in New Jersey? Well, I can't reveal. Who told you? You see, in an ideal world you could actually track all of this down, just that point alone. You might be surprised by what you find. You might find intentional disinformation to introduce into the story a brain-bending *non sequitur*.

In the same way, what about the two cars, the Honda, the maroon van or even another van? How is that all introduced? And then we have numerous outrageous interviews with parents and families, where the parents appear to be



relatively undisturbed by what's happened. I say, "Relatively." I mean, as one reader pointed out to me in an e-mail, and I entirely agree, a massacre on this scale would put people into catatonia. I mean, families, you know? And yet this was not part of the network coverage. The whole thing had a very strange, artificial climate atmosphere to it in that respect. Where are the people who are so grief-stricken that they can't even take their faces away from their hands, that they're shaking, that they're fainting, that they're passing out? I mean, this would be the normal human reaction, or complete shock and catatonia. Where are those people? This creates a tremendous cognitive dissonance in the viewer at the subconscious level because the whole thing just seems ridiculous. And I know other people are saying, "Oh, these people were actors and it was staged."

"As one reader pointed out to me in an e-mail, and I entirely agree, a massacre on this scale would put people into catatonia."

I'm not buying that, but they're showing you important information by capturing these video clips of interviews with parents – highly selective interviews – and I admit there are things there in these interviews that are unexplained, that are part of the mystery. How can these people even talk on camera? How well were they prepped? I've written about that because there are screeners and preppers and producers that bring these people on camera after, and I'm talking now about the elite interviews, not just in the street. I'm talking about in the studio. Diane Sawyer, Scott Pelley, Brian Williams - you know, prepared interviews. Yes, we understand how horrible this is for you, Mrs. So-and-So, and that you've lost your daughter and so forth, but what we're trying to do here is really honor her memory. We want you to talk about her life, her hobbies, her interests, her friends, what other people thought of her, the joy of her being. And if they can sell this to the parent, then when the parent gets on television the whole thing is just outrageously unreal.

And that adds to the cognitive dissonance of the audience and renders them even into a greater hypnotic state, where they accept everything they're watching on television because at some level – conscious or subconscious – that viewer knows this just simply is not real. It's been prepped. It's been prepared. It's been synthetically produced and, as I mentioned in one of my early articles on Sandy Hook, where is one outraged parent in Sandy Hook that comes on camera to add some semblance of reality to this horrible tragedy? Where is the



parent who is so angry and outraged, who demands to get to the bottom of this because the story is not adding up or because simply wants to know how could this boy, Adam Lanza, have gotten into the school? Whatever – anger, outrage, part of the human panorama or emotions that would be released in the wake of a tragedy like this. Nowhere to be found in none of the elite interviews. Why? It's intentionally ruled out, absolutely ruled out because two things would happen. Suppose they put three of these parents in a row on elite interviews with elite anchors. Suddenly, the public perception is changed completely.

Number one, the public wants to know. How did the kid get into the school? We want the facts blow by blow, not just gloss it over. We want the facts. And two, the audiences in general awakened from their trance by the anchor. The anchor tends to do that, especially when the anger is aimed at let's find out the truth. Can't happen. Won't happen. We're not going to allow this on network television. Absolutely not. Out of the question. Well, we've got a parent here that's very angry. Smart guy. He wants to know some answers and so do we want to interview him? No. Forget it. Out of the question, and all sorts of excuses can be given. We don't want to present someone in the throes of anger here. It's impolite and it's crude and it's not in keeping with the spirit of what? Of some other emotion that everybody's been programmed into believing has to happen in these events? I mean, if people were being honest at the networks they would say, "Hey, baby. We're shooting for grief here. Don't you remember? That's the program. We're shooting for grief, celebrating the life of the dead, healing, the memorials, the coming together. That's what we're shooting for. We're not shooting for anger. That's not part of the program."

The other thing, of course, that an angry parent would do is it would buy inference cast out upon the whole network-television presentation of the narrative, which is all wrapped up with a neat bow. Well, after watching these three parents, why should I believe what Brian Williams is telling me? Hey, maybe there's more to this story. People start to wake up. Hey, bing, bing, bong. Can't have that. Absolutely not. So instead we have to present a synthetic version of all of the emotions and attitudes and responses and reactions of the parents and families in this small town. We have to present a Stepford Village version of all of this, and that's what you've got because, you see, Stepford – I'm sure you're familiar with the reference. If you're not, just Google it and get the movies – a robot android-type small town where everybody is – well, all the



women are slaves to the men and everybody is happy, happy, happy, happy. The real Stepford includes more than just happy, happy, happy. It includes a sequence of programmed emotions.

Yes, you can experience grief. Yes, loss. Yes, celebrate the life of. Yes, yes, yes, the healing, the forgiveness. We forgive. Suddenly, rapidly, the killer's forgiven. We must forgive. Why? Why? Why do we have to forgive? Especially why do we have to forgive before we know the story of what actually happened? Why does forgiveness have to paper over the desire to find out the truth? Why does it have to function as an obscuring of the truth, which is what all these emotions, you see, do because they're all synthesized and sequenced and presented as the entire atmosphere and picture and the full range of the emotions that these people are experiencing in Sandy Hook. I got this point across in articles here about this, but this – what I'm telling you now – is an enhanced, expanded version. It's more difficult to express this on the page than what I'm giving you now. So I hope you get it and appreciate what I'm saying here. You can manipulate the presentation of humans in their reactions and responses and feelings to a tragic event.

You can do that, and it's done and it's programming; and within the networks there are varying levels of consciousness about the programming from simply people who know this is what we do when one of these happen to a more clever, crafted type of awareness at higher levels. Okay, let's insert this interview here and give me the tape on – yes. That'll go well with this. Building the story, you see. Building the picture of the village for the public. This is the village, you see? This is the village. Here are the people. These are their reactions. This is the tragedy. Here is the sequence. Listen to this mother speak. Now listen to that father. Now listen to this mother. We are giving you reality here. Do you get this? I really hope you get this. I mean, this is at the core of programming because it teaches people who are watching television not just about Sandy Hook but how to respond in general to sudden calamities for which they are not prepared, either factually or emotionally. This is teaching. This is instruction. Do you get this? This is programming. People absorb this.

Oh, yes. See? Look at that reaction, and then she said – and then you see – oh. So this is how it goes, and I learn from this how I would respond if I were on television, which is like saying, "This is how I would respond in real life because



otherwise I wouldn't know how the hell I would respond," you see. People don't like that. They don't like to feel. Gee, I don't know what I would do in a situation like that. What would you do, Sally? I don't know. What would you do, Mike? I don't know. I think I'd be tremendously pissed off. Yes. You know, you're right. Uhhhhhh, we don't want to let that be contagious. Uhhhhhh, wait a minute. No. We want to program this carefully controlled. We give you this parent with this emotion and then we give you that one and we give you this one, you see. And what these people who are saying that nobody was killed, it was all actors and so forth are pointing out – I mean, I'm not here to debate them.

They have uncovered significant information, but what I am saying here is that this is part of the programming and that some of these people themselves – the parents, you see – come to this pre-programmed by having watched themselves other television in the past about other calamities and tragedies because they have no clue how to react, either. And now it's happened to them and they're just in a total state of – I don't even know what to call it – and they rely on what they themselves have seen on television in the past and they respond to reporters, especially the elite anchors in interviews. And then you and I watch this and say, "This is unbelievable. This would never happen. This is just impossible. This couldn't be a real human being, being interviewed on television, responding in this way if it was their child who was killed." There's a cumulative effect, in other words, of synthetic, artificial, programmed stage play reality of the culture, of the country, of the world, you know?

Here's reality – the emotions, you see, the fabric of the emotions and attitudes of reality. We present this to you on television, and this isn't just a cop show, although that certainly plays into this too – all of that programming – but no. This is Sandy Hook, you see? We're showing you what the range of emotions is in this town. This is the town. Here we go, you see. You can go A, B, C, D, E, F, G. Those are the feelings and that's it. That's all. There isn't anything else, and we give it to you in the interviews. You see it. Isn't that real? Yes. Isn't that the totality of reality? Yes. Go to sleep. Listen. Hear all this. Watch it. See it. Absorb it. Digest it so that you, too, will know how to respond to a situation like this. This is the invention of emotional reality for humans through television.



That's what it is, and what it tends to do is – well, I've already spoken about what it does, but additionally, it creates pariahs, you see. Who are the pariahs? Well, these are the people who would respond outside the range of A, B, C, D, E, F, G to such tragedy. Those become the outsiders, the outliers, the pariahs, the people that don't fit in, the weirdoes. Once you are entrained and programmed to understand what the range of emotions is that are permissible via television in one of these calamities, now you can also say who the pariahs are because they're the people who display other emotions. That doesn't fit. I don't want to see that. Where did that person come from? He upset the flow, the hypnotic flow. He's out. We don't want him, and there would be a variety of such pariahs and their individual and unique responses to the whole thing, you see – that we, the hypnotized audience, would now say are crazy. They don't fit. They don't belong.

Where the truth is, everything we've been shown on television in the form of interviews with the parents – that's what doesn't belong. That's what doesn't add up. That's impossible. That's what you would never see unfiltered, unprepared, unprepped, unselected if you actually talked to people in such a calamity because, you know, the majority of people don't even want to talk to you on television, you know? Are you kidding? Somebody says, "Listen. We would like to bring you to New York." Are you crazy? My daughter was just killed. Or in Aurora, my brother was just murdered in cold blood and you want me to come and sit in a television? You know, where are all these people? You don't see that, of course, you see. That would tend to wake people up, too. "What's the media doing here?" people would say. "What kind of vultures are they?" Watch 35 people in a row in the space of 5 minutes on network television being approached by reporters to deliver a prepped interview and be flown to a television studio and watch them say, "No," and even scream at the reporters in outrage.

And now you're going to get a whole different view of the emotional range that goes on in these situations. You see what I'm saying? And that's just part of the

“Once you are entrained and programmed to understand what the range of emotions is that are permissible via television in one of these calamities, now you can also say who the pariahs are because they're the people who display other emotions.”



pariahs now. They are the pariahs, you see. That's the pariah land out there. Then there are the people who say, which we never see on camera, "I want to find out the truth." Are you prepared? "Yes. I'll go on camera. That's what I'll say." Oh, thank you very much. We're moving on here. How many of those? A full range that we don't even think of normally in these situations because we never see it on television, a full range of different reactions and responses and emotions from people that are never interviewed on television. Get away from me. Don't get near me with that camera. You know, I'll punch your head off. Hey, father says that, I'm right there with him. To me, that's completely normal. Some coiffed, perfumed idiot with a cameraman behind her and a microphone, trying to stick that into my face or talk to me when some close friend or family member has just been murdered in cold blood, and I were to say, "You get one step closer to me, I'm going to take your head off." Oh, no. That's not permissible. Oh, he's – oh, there's something the matter with him. He needs treatment.

You see, we've been programmed into that when, in fact, that's really the normal reaction of the majority of people. I hope you're getting this. There is a strain of – I don't even know what to call it. I could give you lots of labels and names and so forth, but it's been programmed into our culture at a significant level through television and other means. It's a sort of forgive, forgive, forgive, forgive, forgive, forgive, forgive, immediately forgive, forgive, forget. Move on. Forgive, forgive, I forgive, I forgive, I forgive right off the bat. I'm not talking about 16 years later. I'm talking about right away, whatever the insult, whatever destruction, whatever, whatever it is, no matter how deep it goes, forgive, forgive, forgive, forgive. This is utter and complete insanity masked under a variety of names. You can fill it in yourself, wherever it comes from. Wherever it comes from is a completely bogus interpretation of the original meaning of whatever forgiveness stands for.

You're trying to tell me this is Christianity? Oh, no. You better go back and read the text. You better go back if you're a Christian. I mean, did Jesus of Nazareth walk into the temple and say to the money changers, "Ho, ho. You're wonderful and I forgive you." I don't think so. I don't think that was the attitude presented in that story at all. Not at all. I mean, you could go into as many Biblical stories as you want and you'll see that rooting out corruption was



a significant preoccupation. So that would mean then that the forgiveness element in modern society has been totally perverted and distorted but it has become part of the lexicon in these interviews, in these portrayals of all of these situations. I forgive, I forgive, I forgive, I forgive, I forgive. Really? Is that really true? Let's see all the people on television interviews who don't forgive. Let's balance that off and then see what happens to public consciousness. There would be tremendous conflict and cognitive dissonance to the point where the issue would surface and be debated.

Can't have that. Absolutely not. Now when I started today, I didn't intend to get as deeply into this issue as I did. I had more, but once I began I realized that I haven't been able to give full play to the significance of this emotional programming that I've been talking about here for the last 45 minutes or so. So I could go on with this. I really could. It's cartoonish, and people yet, because of the smoothness and the seamless presentation and the pandering to certain – you know, the grief and so forth and the enormous sympathy that we the anchors are having for these families who are experiencing such loss and blah – this is all scripted. This is all synthetic. This is all a synthetic version of reality, a shortcut version of reality – short-circuited – that people have come to accept in all of these tragic situations. Oh, yes. The anchors are going to have tremendous sympathy for the grief-stricken family. Oh, yes. Sure. Of course. That's going to be the primary reason the anchors are there – to express this. We thought they were investigators and reporters. How crazy were we? No. This is something else.

Okay. Well, we'll accept that. We'll go into that hypnotic trance that short-circuits trying to find out the truth of what happens. Okay. Well, that's the story. We accept that now, you see. Well, yes. Let's go with this cartoon. I call it the shortening of perspective, you see. It's like you've got three-dimensional perspective. You look out at the world and all of a sudden the vanishing point where it all ends comes toward you and you're now looking at something flattened, and if you look at flattened long enough you believe that reality is flat. Well, that's what happens to emotions. By the way, it also happens under psychiatric drugs, many of which are designed – although not advertised – to flatten the emotional life of the person, to reduce it down to a series of relatively superficial feelings and sequences of those feelings.



And with all the people in the country on these drugs and other tranquilizers and so forth, it's no wonder that they are prepped and programmed to accept this foreshortened view of the emotional life of a human being as shown on television by elite anchors during a calamity. It's a cartoon. It's an artifact and it prevents discovery of what really happened. It allows the networks to program the public and to put them in such kind of an invisible trance that people now feel that anybody who's seeking to go below this into the truth and not believe what the anchors are saying is somehow crazy, conspiracy theory buff, disruptive force. I mean, we even had – who was it? The police chief – in Sandy Hook saying that he had spoken with federal officials and people that are putting up information on Facebook about conspiracy theories could be prosecuted.

Are you kidding? As a criminal. Sure. Go ahead. Try it. Try it. See what happens. This is television reality. Talk about mind control. Talk about operant conditioning. Talk about brain washing. Talk about hypnotizing. Talking about psy ops. Talk about what television really does to people, to their minds. And then you see, as I've written – and I could probably talk to you for another hour about this – if people don't like that or if they start to feel itchy with that kind of programming, you see, they can go to the movies, into a big theater or even on some television shows. Then they can watch the lone hero, who is always angry, get revenge against the robots; the androids; the bad guys, whoever they are, the suits; Rambo; Arnold; countless; John Cena, whatever, whoever the heroes are – against the monsters coming from another galaxy.

They can watch revenge purely played out on television screen or on the movie screen and say, "Whew. Okay. Got my dose of that now. Back to home, and now turn on the TV and I can go back into that nice, comfortable, hypnotic trance. And then when I've had enough of that I'll go back to the movies and I'll get that shot of anger that I need, where I am the hero on the screen, destroying everybody in sight. Or I'll go to a video game and experience that, too, when I need that. And then when I've had enough of that I'll go back to sleep in front of the television set." So it's like pillar to post, back and forth, that kind of programming. Absolutely incredible. There were English novelists who touched on this, talked about it. C.S. Lewis; David Lindsay, who wrote *Voyage to Arcturus*; John Buchan, who wrote *The Thirty-Nine Steps*. The British novelists early in the 20th century – H.G. Wells, even – were capable of



showing you how reality was – G.K. Chesterton, *The Man Who Was Thursday*. They show you how reality is constructed as a kind of façade.

Once you begin to back away or see it from the right angle, the three-dimensionality goes out of it and it's just a stage flat, painted, and that this is the reality that we are living in and that we are programmed to accept on all manner of levels – political, economic, psychological, what have you. And that in this reality we are fed a diet of the sequence and the number of acceptable reactions and emotions that we can feel in a given situation. And that clouds our judgment, of course, and our intellect and our ability to spot contradictions and dissect information and discover the truth and to be adventurous in that, and relentless. How are you going to be relentless if you're only experiencing one-sixteenth of the actual emotions that you would feel in a given situation? That does things to your mind, your intellect, your ability to investigate, your ability to discern and distinguish. All part of the deal. All part of the deal.

Now, I could talk for another three hours about how much – at what level is this intentional versus at what level are the programmers themselves programmed. But when you're swimming – let's put it this way. Look at the whole culture. Look at the whole country. Look at the whole world. When the culture is swimming in enough of this constant wall-to-wall artificiality that I've been describing to you for the last hour, then you don't need nearly as much top-down control to keep it moving because it is the status quo. Once you've built the structure and it's dominant in the landscape, once the machinery has been turned on and it's been running for decades, there is much less intentional work that you need to do to maintain the culture, which is what we're talking about – the atmosphere, which is what we're talking about. And I'll close with this brief anecdote, again, with the proviso that we are just really getting into this subject.

I grew up in the 1940s and '50s and by 19 – I'm going to call it '55, '52, maybe

“Once you begin to back away or see it from the right angle, the three-dimensionality goes out of it and it's just a stage flat, painted, and that this is the reality that we are living in and that we are programmed to accept on all manner of levels.”



– I had checked out of watching television pretty much, even though television was still in its infancy in America. And when I re-plugged back in many years later – I’m going to say the early ‘70s – wow. From the early ‘50s to the early ‘70s – and all of this had gone down on television. I mean, not only in television news, which suddenly blossomed into the anchor system and sitcoms and family shows and cop shows and all. When I plugged back in to look at it I was shocked, and the first thing that struck me was people believe this that are watching it? They believe the artificiality of the construction of the emotions and what these characters are saying to each other on the screen on comedy series, drama series, suspense series, talk shows, the news? It’s all there. It’s all the same, kind of. It’s all coming out of the same pipeline of incredible artificiality and people are actually buying this by the ton day after day, night after night?

The network programmers could actually put this on television and sell ads and they get enough viewers to sustain this cartoon of reality? And then, however, if you watch enough of this stuff, for whatever reason, after a while you lose that initial shock. You say, “Well, yes. Okay. Heh heh heh. Yes. It’s kind of funny and yes.” You do a reentry, like coming in from outer space. Yes, the reentry is almost complete now. Yes. He’s back into society and reintegrated and accepts now the total artificiality of emotion as we present it as opposed to the real thing. Yes, I think we’re okay now. All right. He’s ready for release. And on that note, thank you for listening. I hope this has been helpful to you. It’s part of what I did in my collection called *The Matrix Revealed* to unearth and show the matrix in as many dimensions as possible, of which this is one that I’ve been talking about today. Jon Rappoport. Thanks again and see you next time.

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.