



The Solari Report

JUNE 20, 2013

**The NSA, Edward Snowden
and What It All Really Means
with Jon Rappoport**



The NSA, Edward Snowden and What It All Really Means

June 20, 2013

Hello, everybody. This is Jon Rappoport, *Solari Report* for June 2013, and as always thank you, Catherine, for the opportunity to present this information to your members. And of course, we have a gigantic story – boom, boom, boom, boom, boom – breaking in the press: the NSA, the National Security Agency, Edward Snowden, who has leaked information to the *Guardian Newspaper* in England, the *Washington Post*, sat before a camera in a hotel room in Hong Kong and explained himself, and everybody’s going crazy.

So what does it all mean? I’m gonna take the opportunity to look at this in part as a kind of intelligence operation, a clash perhaps of intelligence operations, assuming, which is always a pretty safe assumption, that what we’re getting in the press is far from the truth – far from the whole story. And in fact, in analyzing the press reports – the initial reports – there are a number of strange bits and pieces of Snowden’s history. So I wanna go over a few of those just to show you that things are murky, shall we say: murky.

So in the year 2003, he was a kid of 19. He had no high school diploma, no higher education whatsoever, and he enlisted in the Army. And he began a training program to join the Special Forces. We don’t know exactly when that training program kicked in, but I find it strange. How does a kid who just joined the Army, he’s 19, he has no high school diploma, suddenly enroll in the Special Forces program? As I wrote, “Does he need to demonstrate some exceptional ability before Special Forces puts him in that program?”

He doesn’t seem to have any special abilities aside from the fact that he may be a “whiz kid” – computer genius, etcetera, etcetera. And if that is the case, and Special Forces needs somebody like that, okay, maybe they put him in a training program. Maybe that’s possible. But then he breaks both legs in a training exercise, so we presume that he didn’t do that sitting in front of a



computer and falling off the chair. Maybe he was jumping out of an airplane or off some sort of an obstacle course platform – whatever. And then he’s suddenly discharged from the Army – boom.

Well, if he joined the Special Forces program because and only because he’s a whiz kid on a computer and they really need guys like that, then why did they discharge him? Why not just let him heal up and put him back in front of a computer? Doesn’t seem to be a difficult situation. Okay – then sometime 2003, we’re not sure exactly when, he’s out of the Army, and he gets a job as a security guard for an NSA facility at the University of Maryland.

So I have to ask myself if that’s an accident. Is it just, “Well, I couldn’t find a job, so I thought, ‘Well, security guard – let’s see what’s available. Oh, look, NSA needs a security guard. Okay, I’ll apply’”, he does, he’s taken in to be a security guard? Or is something else going on here? Is it – are we supposed to just kind of accept as coincidence the fact that he’s a computer genius, he’s gonna go on to a career, however brief, with the NSA, not as a security guard? He’s in fact gonna be in the CIA, but, eh, you know, just so happened that the security guard job that he was looking for was at an NSA facility? I’m not buying it – certainly not on first glance.

Then possibly in 2003, we have no date on this, he quits that job, and now, boom, he’s in the CIA in IT. He’s an IT guy in the CIA. He still could be 19. He could be 20 – 21 – whatever it is. Still has no high school diploma, apparently, unless he got his GED by this time. But that’s about it. But he’s working in IT, so we have to assume, “Okay, well, I guess he is a young computer genius. That’s why they took him in. They need people like that. They’re hiring, and it doesn’t matter if he has no degree. He’s fine. Okay – all right.”

But three – four years later, CIA sends him, 2007, to Geneva. He’s only 23 now. Not only do they send him there. They give him diplomatic cover, which means he’s a covert agent for the CIA. I mean, this is responsible now in terms of CIA. This is important. Not only that, but he’s put in charge of maintaining a computer network security for the CIA? For the U.S. Embassy? It’s not clear, okay, but it’s a significant computer system and a highly secret one, and he’s now in charge of maintaining the security of the system.



That makes him more than just a nerd or a whiz kid. That's now morphing into an executive position. He may well have people under him. He may have people that he's issuing orders to. He may be working systems to make sure that security is maintained, which involves executive responsibility because the people working under him and around him can break the rules. They can do stupid things. They can do crazy things, and so his job apparently would bleed over to some degree into their jobs.

Still only 23. Maybe he's got a GED. Not just a whiz kid. More than that now in terms of job classification. And of course, he has access to a very wide range of classified documents. Now, presumably he knows what it means to work for the CIA. He wanted to join Special Forces. He knows about war. He knows about covert ops. He knows about the CIA. He's read about the CIA.

He knows how they operate, and yet he says that during this period in Geneva working for the CIA, one of the formative incidents that really soured him on the agency is when a few guys from the CIA "turned" a Swiss banker, which means that they got this guy drunk – this banker one night – and encouraged him or made it inevitable that he would try to drive home. They got him busted by the cops anonymously. Then they turned around, these CIA guys, and actually helped him escape from scandal of some kind or prosecution or both and then formed a bond with this guy, and eventually they got this guy, the banker, to reveal deep banking secrets to the CIA.

And this is what turns Snowden against the CIA, working in a significant position now, access to a wide range of classified documents, knowing what the CIA does, he's really so disturbed by this really minor incident relative to what the CIA actually does to people that he's going to now seriously think about quitting? He's gonna say, "I didn't sign up for this"? No – no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. But he hangs in. Two years later in 2009, he leaves, presumably because he's disillusioned.

Now, we have to take note of the fact that in his video interview with the

“He may be working systems to make sure that security is maintained, which involves executive responsibility because the people working under him and around him can break the rules.”



Guardian from Hong Kong recently, Snowden claimed that in 2008, he could do very heavy damage to the entire U.S. intelligence community, but decided to wait because he thought Obama, who was just elected, might really live up to his promises. Hmm? I would have serious doubts about his capacity in 2008 working in Geneva overseeing those computer systems, which yes gave him access to a wide range of classified documents, but most probably not the entire panorama of CIA classified information or the panorama of other intelligence agencies in the United States and all of their classified data.

And yet he claims that in 2008, while working in Geneva, he could do very heavy damage to the entire U.S. intelligence community, if not take it all down completely. Um, that is not to me, on the surface at least, credible at all. So in 2009, he leaves the CIA and goes to work for a private defense contractor. Another red flag. Why? Why does he do that?

He's disillusioned with the CIA. In 2008, he's thinking about taking down "the entire U.S. intelligence community," and yet he goes to work in the heart of the U.S. military industrial intelligence complex. Why would he do that? He knows what these private defense contractors do. He knows how much influence they wield in the endless war on terror. He knows presumably all about the phony U.S. war – wars in Iraq. And yet, as I wrote, he chooses to work for a sector that relentlessly promotes such wars and keeps such secrets from the American people about these wars and lies about why they go to war.

Uh – big red flag! This defense contractor that he just goes to work for in 2009, unnamed, assigns him to work – here we go – at an NSA facility in Japan. Boom! He was at one time working as a security guard for an NSA facility. Now he's working at the NSA for a private defense contractor, and now he is big-time computer whiz kid, we presume, at the very least, with executive experience in the CIA. So let's see – let me just review this for a minute here.

So in 2003, he was 19; so now in 2009 he is, what, six years older – 25. Okay – he understands what the NSA is. He knows that if the CIA is secretive, that the NSA is triply – quadruply secretive. And yet no problem. No problem at all. He's already completely disillusioned with the whole show, but he's working for them in the heart of the beast. Maybe – is he doing it now so that



he can obtain further access to classified data in advance of blowing a big whistle? I wrote, “Okay, perhaps. He doesn’t say that in his interview. He doesn’t try to, in other words, make more rational his work history by saying that. He just kind of leaves it in midair.”

He goes on to work for two more – apparently two more private defense contractors: Dell and Booz Allen Hamilton. And in this last job, Booz Allen, he’s back at the NSA assigned as a private contractor working at NSA. All right. He’s an outsider, in a sense. Yes, NSA is using lots of people from private defense contractors and so on. But he’s not – Snowden is not what you would call a full-time, inner circle, completely clued in guy into the highest levels of NSA secrecy, it would not appear. And yet, as this outsider, he claims to have so much sensitive NSA data, I write, “that he can take down the whole U.S. intelligence network in a single afternoon.” Hmm – yeah.

Now, Glenn Greenwald, a reporter at the *Guardian*, claims that he engaged in serious in-depth conversations with Snowden to vet him to make sure that he was who he said he was, and he’s satisfied. However, if I were sitting in front of Ed Snowden, the NSA whistleblower, I would be asking these questions that I’ve just laid out for you and asking for serious, specific answers and explanations. And there are other questions that I haven’t raised that I won’t even bother going into about his work history and what he’s said about his own history.

But the *Guardian* doesn’t do that. The *Washington Post* apparently doesn’t do that, or if they have they have certainly not explained themselves. Instead, what they have given us and any intelligent person who’s willing to take the time and think is big, gaping question marks and holes and red flags in the background of Edward Snowden. Why do they want to do that? Why would they do it if they could plug up those holes? They’ve had ample time now. They could certainly answer questions, but they choose not to. They choose not to, or they never found out the answers to the questions, which means that they never thoroughly vetted this guy, Snowden, which they should’ve done, which raises even more doubts.

Okay – that’s Part 1, shall we say. Part 2 is what is the NSA? What are we talking about when we talk about the NSA? We’re really talking about the



surveillance state, which is more than the NSA. The NSA may be the king of the hill in terms of secrecy and spying on people's phone calls and now, as we discover, as if we didn't know it before if we've been paying attention, that they are spying on everything that happens online – everything that everybody does because they have unfettered access to the largest tech companies in the world like Google and Microsoft and Apple – go down the list.

I mean, as I said in a radio interview this morning, first, we discovered that NSA and other spying agencies had access to phone calls – all phone calls – the Echelon System. There was the GWEN system. There were other systems. You know, they wanted to spy on everybody all the time, all phone calls. Okay – we digested that piece of information, and then along came the Internet. So would we seriously think that these spying agencies would go, “Darn, there's nothing we can do now; yeah, we've got all the phone calls tapped, but now with this kind of weird, cranky thing called the Internet, we just don't know what to do, so hands off; we'll stick with the phone calls”?

Of course not. Of course not. They're gonna go hog wild. They want everything that happens online just the way they wanted everything that happens on the phone. It's just another form of communication, obviously. And then of course, we have video cameras everywhere now. We have checkpoints at airports. We have drones that are overhead spying. We have satellites that are spying. We have people being encouraged to snitch on their neighbors – see something, say something.

Department of Homeland Security is now taking on the responsibility of doing anything that could be remotely interpreted as having to do with the security of anybody anywhere domestically. They have made gigantic purchases of ammunition and weaponry and so on. Surveillance is coming from all corners. We have businesses and offices and companies and stores and banks and – you know, everybody's got video cameras recording them. It's ubiquitous. It's everywhere all the time.

There are your medical records, which under Obamacare of course will be a far more transparent to many more people than they were before. To say that the federal government is going to oversee a universal program of health insurance that involves – intimately involves records – your records for eyes-only basis of



very few people including your doctors is completely absurd. You'd have to be a total fool to believe that. So medical records are now entered in here. School records – every kind of record.

There are systems that track your purchases – what you buy, where you buy it. We have smart appliances coming into being that will be able to spy on you in your house. I mean, in your car – black boxes will be introduced in cars that do all sorts of recording. And even now there are ways of accessing what's happening in certain respects to automobiles and passengers as those cars drive on the roads. So come on! Come on! What's all this about?

“Even now there are ways of accessing what's happening in certain respects to automobiles and passengers as those cars drive on the roads.”

Is it just protection from a terrorist event? No, absolutely not. And now, as I've recently written and actually spoke with Catherine about on one of our live *Solari* presentations, we go further in understanding what it means to have total surveillance. For example, the NSA would be capable, and certainly has been doing this – capable of tracking billions of bits of financial data that relate to trading markets – you know, the conventional trading markets – stock markets – we're talking globally now – commodities markets, money markets, currency markets – whatever, okay – bond markets.

In other words, on top of the massive manipulation that's business-as-usual with these trading markets by such as investment banks – you know, the Goldman-Sachs of this world – big-time financiers and money people and bankers who manipulate the markets by taking them up and taking them down and taking them sideways and discouraging investors to sell and then buying and taking it up – and all of these manipulations and mechanisms which are well known to insiders forever. I mean, you can go back to the earliest trading markets in human history, and you're gonna find manipulation rife at every level.

But in addition to all of that, we now have a super-structure – a kind of meta-structure of the NSA and other spying behemoths that are able to look over the shoulders of the manipulators and see what they're doing and make inferences about that and use all of that information themselves or funnel it to their



favorite partners so that those partners can make billions or even possibly trillions of dollars off of advanced notice of financial data and through active manipulation of markets.

Crimes laid upon crimes. Now just as an example here, who would that anger? If you were a master market manipulator with billions of dollars at your disposal and partners, and it came to your attention that somebody was literally looking over your shoulder piggybacking off of all of your secret information, data and also tracking how you manipulate markets, and making use of that to perhaps make even more money than you are, that is not going to sit well with you.

And you might turn around with your immense influence and power and say, “We have to torpedo this; for example, we have not knock a big hole in the public perception of the NSA and let them see at least a little bit of what’s going on and cause a ruckus in the press, in the government – make these legislators suddenly stand up and start howling,” which they do just because that’s what they do – demanding hearings, or defending the NSA, or defending Obama, or attacking Obama – whatever – causing enough of an upheaval in the establishment to possibly put a crimp in the activities of NSA or at least to send a signal like, “Hey, we can do stuff, too, guys.

“We don’t have to sit there and let you piggyback on our crimes and commit your own crimes and make more money than we do. We don’t like that, and we’re gonna show you how much we don’t like that. We’re gonna cause you to go into a scramble and a panic and to issue all kinds of lies to cover up your other lies and just give you some really bad things to think about.” Quite possible. Quite real. Quite obvious when you think about it, and that’s the problem for most people is that they can’t stop and think about it – just can’t.

And the number of power players in the world – serious power players who might want to take some revenge on the NSA is surely not limited to big investment bankers and financiers. You can believe that for sure. For example, the CIA and the NSA have been at each other’s throats for decades: intramural warfare. Oh, wait a minute. Ed Snowden once worked for the CIA – in fact, in a very responsible position in Geneva. Isn’t that interesting? And then, oh, he soured on the CIA, and he quit, but that didn’t stop private defense



contractors from hiring him, nor did it stop them from putting him right into the NSA.

So did Ed Snowden have help from the CIA in being able to access certain key NSA documents and reveal them to reporters because the CIA has engaged – has been engaged in a mutual turf war with the NSA since the beginning? Is that out of the question? Are you kidding? That’s a very reasonable hypothesis, which of course you’re not hearing about from any of the major media outlets because that would be embroiling the federal government on the level of security of its citizens, exposing a very ugly kind of turf war that still exists amongst these agencies, despite the fact that they’re under a Director of National Intelligence now, and there’s the DHS and all of that; the war continues to go on. You bet.

And let me take this even one step further. And yes, we are through the looking glass. Yes, this is Alice in Wonderland, but this is, I’m afraid, the way these operations work at several levels. And in order for you to be aware and cognizant of some aspect of the matrix, you need to be able to see the larger picture – pictures. Suppose, for example, that Ed Snowden never did tap into NSA computers – that he was shut out because he simply didn’t have access, which is again a very reasonable inference – that he didn’t have – he wasn’t privy to all of this information at all because he couldn’t be, because as criminal as the NSA is in their surveillance, they aren’t always stupid.

They don’t just open up the door and say, “Oh, we’ve got this guy, Ed Snowden.”

“Where’d he come from?”

“Booz Allen.”

“Yeah?”

“Well, he quit the CIA. He was disillusioned.”

“Oh, yeah, no problem. All right – give him access to everything. Yeah, sure – all right.”



“You mean that program?”

“Yeah, yeah! Give me that and give him this. Give him that. We know he’s a computer whiz. We know we could lock him out if we wanted to because that’s all we deal with are computer whizzes, you see, and we know how to lock them out if we want to. But Ed seems like a good guy. Ah, let’s give him access to the Prism documents detailing how we’re using tech companies to spy on everybody in America. Yeah, sure, he’s a good kid. Why not?”

Suppose he never had access. Suppose the CIA had access, and suppose the CIA gave him the documents. “Hey, Ed, meet us down by the dock. You know that little café over on Main Street. Yeah, yeah – you know, where you eat veggie burgers at the – in Honolulu? Yeah – let’s have lunch.” So Ed, when they’re sitting down having lunch, “Are you ready, kid?”

“I’m ready. I’m ready.” And why is Ed ready? Why does he want to torpedo the NSA? Well, it would be hard to isolate one factor and say, “I know that this is true,” that he is patriotic, loyal, honest, dutiful, obedient to the founding principles of the republic because he voted for Ron Paul. Maybe he is, and in that case they’re just using him. Happens all the time. You can be honorable down to the core of your being, true blue, and they use you if they can.

Or he’s a covert agent who knows how to present himself as true blue, and he was part of an operation that was long term, that probably went back to Geneva in which he was informed, “Hey, we’ve got something cooking, but we need somebody who’s going to go all the way, Ed. It might cost you your reputation, your job, your life. Are you ready?”

“I’m ready.” Could be either of those things. Anyway, they’re sitting in the café, and this sort of guy who looks like any other guy is sitting across from Ed – maybe he’s got a ponytail. Maybe he’s got a tie-dyed t-shirt. Maybe he’s wearing a sports jacket and buttoned down blue shirt. Who knows? Long hair – short hair – just a guy, and so he just kind of sits there, and they chat, and he just puts a file folder on the table and says, “There you go, Ed. You’re launched, baby. You know what to do now.”

And Ed knows that these are NSA documents. He knows what to do with



them. He knows his life is gonna change drastically in the next few days or few weeks or whatever. He's gonna go to Hong Kong, and he's gonna give an interview. He's actually been already communicating perhaps, or maybe this is the beginning of that in January 2013, with the *Washington Post* and the *Guardian*, a couple of reporters, setting them up for a big revelation, preparing them, digging the soil.

Is all of this possible? In a heartbeat! In a heartbeat, not a problem – could easily take place. But now back to the overarching picture of the surveillance state. What is it? Why is it? And here is where I keep insisting to people, and I will keep insisting that if you don't understand the philosophy and the psychology behind the people who run the surveillance state, you can't really grasp what they're doing or why. It's a problem they want to solve, like a chess problem. And the problem is what do you do – let's take America, for example; what do you do with 310 million people?

Well, that question itself presumes that (a) you are in a position to do something, and (b) that you feel it's important and – so as obvious as the sun comes up – that something ought to be done, collectively speaking, with all 310 million people. Because why would any sane person make that assumption, that something ought to be done with all of these people? He wouldn't. But these are not, in that sense, sane people. These are people who are looking at a chess problem. That's what they see when they look at the world: problems that need to be solved, period.

And I'm just writing a piece now where I give an illustration of that from one of the first stories I ever did in 1982 for *L.A. Weekly* when I interviewed Bill Perry, who was the PR chief at Lawrence Livermore Labs up in Northern California where they do cutting-edge research on the next and the next and the next generation of nuclear weapons. He was in charge of PR, and it was a very illuminating interview which *L.A. Weekly* published. I don't have a copy of it, or I'd reprint it. But somebody somewhere probably has the hard copy. The *L.A. Weekly*, I'm sure, does not in its archives. Bill basically told me – he said, “This was my dream job.” He said, “I was in PR” – you know, “You're in

“If you don't understand the philosophy and the psychology behind the people who run the surveillance state, you can't really grasp what they're doing or why.”



PR. This is what you do.

“And what you want is you want access to major media. You want to be able to get on the phone and call up CBS, NBC, ABC, *New York Times*, *Washington Post* and say you’re holding a press conference, and they show up,” because you only get that when you reach a certain level in your profession, and that was his ambition, and he got there. This was the dream job of his life. You see. He could just book a ball room with big chandeliers and lay on food, you know, and the press will go anywhere where they can eat for nothing – the best food – and bring speakers up to the platform to talk about their research. Scientists who are trained in how to talk to the press and make their esoteric mathematical points understandable and articles – I mean, he’s got it all, Bill does.

And then something happened to this guy. He began to look at protestors who were standing outside the fence during the nuclear freeze campaign of the – let’s call it early 1980s – and he saw that they weren’t all hippies. They were people in suits. They were mommies and daddies and kiddies. There were every – everybody was there. And he began to – oh, dear me – refer back to his conscience and think about what they were doing at Lawrence Livermore Labs. And he described to me a particular incident that happened one day that he said it was a turning point, where he walked up to a physicist who was, you know, whatever at his desk making mathematical notations, and he said to this guy, “How’s it going?”

And the guy looked up, and he said, “Not very well. Not very well.” And then, “What’s the problem? What’s the problem?”

“The problem is we need more money. We need more funding, Bill. We’ve just gotta have more money,” and that just stopped Bill dead in his tracks. And he said, “Hey, listen, right now you’ve got the power to blow up the world a dozen times – right now. What else do you need?” And the physicist looked at Bill with a neutral gaze and said, “You don’t understand, Bill. This is a physics problem.”

So if you want to know how the people who run the surveillance state look at reality, their psychology, that’s how they look at it. And in addition to that,



what they also see when they look out at the world – what the problem basically is that they perceive is freedom. They see a whole bunch of people running around that apparently have some kind of a thing called individual freedom, up to a point. And the whiff of that is something that serves them. They don't like that. It seems dangerous to them.

So dangerous, in fact, that something ought to be done collectively. And so they move one inch over to the right in their minds, and they take a default position on what they're seeing when they look out at the world. "No, no, no, no – we weren't seeing freedom. I'm not seeing freedom at all. How could I have thought that? No, no, no – what I'm seeing is a bunch of machines that are out of control. That's what I'm seeing. Okay, okay, okay, okay – I'm all right now. Whew! For a second there, I thought, 'Woo!' That just – oh, my God – too horrible to contemplate.

"No, what I'm seeing here is a bunch of machines that are out of control, because anybody can see that they're out of control because they're not moving in any coordinated way. You see? Anybody can notice that. I mean, just look at the footage. Let's roll the footage, boys. Let's see what – there's all these people. They're moving around, and it just seems so – you know, they clash. The conflict. No rhyme and reason. But they're machines. Okay – they're machines, which means they're programmed to be doing what they're doing.

"Uh-huh – so it's programming errors that I'm looking at. Ah, now I'm feeling better. I'm looking at programming errors, whether it's evolution that did the programming or, you know, early family life – whether we want to go Freud or we want to go this way or that way – doesn't matter. The programming is there, and it is mistaken. It's really lousy programming. That's what I have to understand, because now the obvious solution to the problem that I'm looking at here is to change the programming. How do I do that?

"Okay – we need new programming. And in order to implement new programming, we have to understand better what these machines are doing all the time." In other words, "We want to be able to watch these machines wherever they go, whatever they do – how they operate alone, in small groups, in large groups – how they react to various stimuli," you see, "just as any



machine would – these biological machines,” you see. “And so we need a surveillance state. We need to be looking all the time and to – compiling massive amounts” – I mean, “massive” is a massive understatement.

“We need everything. We need all the data about all the data about everything all the time, 24/7, in real-time, and we need to be able to collect it. We need to be able to collate it. We need to be able to cross-index it, and we need to be able to analyze it. And from our analysis of it, then we won’t simply be dealing with short-term fixes anymore. Society will not simply be a series of covert ops which we lay on in order to influence public opinion and make people afraid and so forth.

“Yes, this is the way we operate now, but in the future that will seem like caveman strategy, because what we will now have is a map of everything. All the movements of all the biological machines, wherever they go, whatever they do, and to some degree what they think, and certainly everything they say, and then from that we will be able to create algorithms that will create new programming and new ways of implementing the programming so that we can bring order to all of this and coordinate everybody all the time in a cooperative society where everyone is pleasantly satisfied. And there will be peace.”

That’s a philosophy. That’s a psychology. That’s a worldview. That is what the surveillance state is ultimately all about. That is why they’re doing this. Does everybody know why they’re doing it – the people that are doing it? Of course not. They don’t need to know. They don’t need to know. Does the guy who worked for the CIA in 1954 in MK-Ultra, the mind control program, cleaning the equipment in a storage facility in a lab – did he need to know the ultimate philosophy behind MK-Ultra? Of course not. He just needed to want to have a paycheck.

Compartmentalized access is what it’s called. That’s where the surveillance state is going. That’s why all of this is being done. That’s what the technology is being deployed for. That’s what’s happening, and that’s what’s going on. And as a coda on all of this, that very brief whiff and smell of something called freedom that so frightens and disturbs these problem-solving obsessives, why does that really disturb them so much? Because it reminds them of their own intrinsic, inherent freedom, and that reminds them that they don’t have it



anymore – that they have let it go a long time ago.

And that is even more disturbing – very disturbing because when you come face to face with your own freedom to the degree that you not only intellectually know you have it, but feel it and experience it on many levels, that is something that you cannot brush off. You cannot deny it. You cannot just simply say, “Oh, yes, another interesting datum.” To deny it, you are now bringing in the battleships and the aircraft carriers and the bombers, you know. You need the whole Army to deny your own freedom, and that’s of course what these obsessive problem-solvers have done. They’ve brought it all in, and they don’t want to be reminded of that because it’s a titanic trauma for them.

“You need the whole Army to deny your own freedom, and that’s of course what these obsessive problem-solvers have done.”

And that’s part of what drives them to keep on solving, solving, solving the problem of these biological machines that are just going every which way and are not operating according to a central program. They will fix that, or their descendents will fix that – however long it takes, whatever the time span is, by installing a workable, central program for everybody, everywhere, all the time. That’s what’s happening. And if you ever want to read a book that is about ostensibly a completely different subject, but really blows you away on the issue of freedom, read *Summerhill*. It’s a school in England – I’ve mentioned it before on live *Solari* programs with Catherine – by A.S. Neill.

It’s a school that he started in England I think in 1920 – somewhere back then. It still exists, although I have doubts that it’s exactly the way he ran it. But the idea was that you could bring up children with real freedom from an earliest age, and you wouldn’t simply be birthing and assisting in the production of some vegetative, chaotic, no IQ human being. Quite to the contrary, if you knew what you were doing – and he spells out exactly how the school operated. And he makes the point that the parents – many of them – are absolutely terrified – terrified down to their shoes of what he’s doing.

But in an internal struggle with themselves, they realize it’s important to be doing it, and they go along with it, but it’s a tremendous conflict within them



because of the fact that when they see how the school is run they recognize the fact that they have sacrificed their own personal freedom in their own lives on whatever altar they sacrificed it to, and that is extremely disturbing to them, and that fact is reflected back to them when they see their own children for the first time whom they've tried to control every day of their lives now being free and out of their control – out of their obsessive control. And this is highly traumatic for the parents, and it was Neill's constant battle.

Excuse me for my hoarseness and coughing, but I've been on radio and other media all day so far. And that's what happens. The parents just freak when they really see what freedom looks like. And if you want to see what freedom really looks like in the most perhaps impactful way, look at a kid. Look at a kid. Look at a kid. Look at the kind of kid who revels in his own freedom – not licensed freedom – who lives it to the last drop of joy every possible day.

And if you happen to be an obsessive controller, problem-solver, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, and you see that, your immediate response after the black hole threatens to open up and swallow you is, "I've gotta control that. I've gotta control that. That's a problem. That's a problem. That's a bad program operating. Program bad. Program bad. Must correct. New program necessary. Bring order. Bring order. Bring order. Bring organization."

That's the surveillance state. That's why it was built. That's why it's operating now. That's why it will continue to operate in the future. And so the Ed Snowden story lifts a tiny corner of that, and so I take the opportunity to, as I always do, push it hard all the way because that's what people need to know. And this is the venue where I could do that – here and *No More Fake News* – I can do that. And I'm very happy to be able to do that.

Okay – I think we've done it. I think we've done it for the month of June. So thank you all very much. Come to my site to read articles: NoMoreFakeNews.com. Acquaint yourself with the two mega-collections: *The Matrix Revealed* and *Exit from the Matrix*. And 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.