The Solari Report

AUGUST 29, 2013

Doing Your Best
with Jon Rappoport

Doing Your Best
August 29, 2013

This is Jon Rappoport. It's great to be back again for my monthly *Solari Report*. This is 12 August 2013 and the title of this talk is "Doing Your Best." It's very simple, "Doing your best." It sounds easy. It sounds like a walk in the park. Do your best. Everybody has been told that at one time or another by somebody. "You've got to do your best, got to do your best."

So I want to start off by recounting a little bit of personal history, recent history. Some of you, who've been following my work at nomorefakenews.com, know that I started this website back in 2001 and I guess I was blogging before people talked about blogging as blogging, and I was also writing news stories about what was behind the news, and at the same time, this was my business, and I made no bones about that of course.

I had a newsletter, subscribers, went out every Friday, and since then, the business end of the operation has gone through several incarnations, and there's always this calculation, how does what I'm doing play? How is it being received? What do people think? What's the size of the audience? How are they responding? Am I selling products? It's a business, but it's not quite like selling matches or little trinkets in the store where you fill up the shelves with thousands of different little trinkets and you figure that people are going to buy something. It's different because I'm writing and I'm writing about the truth.

So how does truth sell? That's a big question. It's a question I've been wrestling with for a long time. Well, about a year and a half ago, something happened. It's hard for me to pinpoint it exactly, but I realized that some of my writing capacity, I was not really employing on the website in my articles and essays and so forth. It was the kind of writing I would do when I wrote poetry or fiction. In other words, I wasn't bringing everything to bear on whatever subject I was covering, and so by degrees, it occurred to me that I should do that.

I should do more of that. I should bring in those aspects of my writing that I had excluded on the basis that "well, I don't think that would play well. I don't think that would communicate well. I'm not sure if it would be understood by as many people." All of those considerations are certainly in the mind of a writer, but also in the mind of anybody who has a business of any kind. You could be selling apples. It doesn't matter.

Okay, so do I sell one type of apple or six? I have my favorite apple. I know what the best apple is as far as I'm concerned, and if I had my druthers that's the only apple I'd be selling, but I've got customers out there and they don't necessarily agree with me, and I do have access to six different kinds of apples, so maybe I should sell all of them to give them a choice. I mean, it sounds perfectly reasonable and it is reasonable, and it's certainly good business.

And yet, you're thinking, "Well, Apples No. 4, 5 and 6, I don't really like those apples. No, they don't taste good. They just don't." But, you know, they're on the shelves in stores. People buy these apples. They buy a lot of them, so why not offer all six and then of course I would hope that a lot of people would buy the apple that I know is the best. So there's that approach.

But I found myself going the other way. "No, I'm going to deploy all of my writing ability and bring it to bear on the subjects that I'm covering." And lo and behold when I started to do that, I found that it wasn't just a matter of pumping up my style, so to speak, it was that I was now beginning to cover these subjects in a different way. The actual attack you might say. The actual analysis was morphing. It was becoming something different, something more, something larger; something more all-inclusive. It was connecting more dots. It was bringing in more of the matrix. It was incorporating elements that I would've ordinarily left out.

And this became inspiring to me and again, lo and behold, readers began to comment on this to me in numbers and in ways that I had never received feedback before. That was a shocker. I don't mind telling you, that was a straight ahead shocker to me because I sort of expected the opposite would happen or at best, I expected some sort of silence, neutrality, but that wasn't the case. That wasn't the case at all.

I discovered that there was an audience out there that I had hoped for. I had seen signs of it certainly. I knew from comments that I received in the past that those people were there, but not in such numbers as were responding now. It was as if there were many, many, many, many people out there, sitting there kind of privately; didn't belong to anything, not part of any particular group or political persuasion in terms of party politics. People – individuals – definitely individuals with their own point of view.

But their point of view was, for them, no doubt much larger than they found in people around them, and they were connecting to the work I was doing, and they were letting me know that in significant numbers, which was, I guess you could say, the most gratifying thing that's happened to me in the, I don't know, it's got to be 55 years of work as a writer. It's the most gratifying thing.

> "Their point of view was, for them, no doubt much larger than they found in people around them, and they were connecting to the work I was doing, and they were letting me know that in significant numbers, which was the most gratifying thing that's happened to me in the … 55 years of work as a writer."

And then, as I continued on my merry way writing every day, it occurred to me that I could go father, and again, the same questions played themselves for me. Is this is good idea, if I go farther out with what I'm expressing? If I even bring in fictional elements, mix and match, and write in a way that is quite, quite uncommon for most readers is it going to get across? Is it going to work? Am I going to get the same kind of response that I've recently been getting or should I stop and not go any farther? Should I just say, "Okay, this is it. This is the ceiling. This is where I am."?

This is doing the best I can do in view of the facts as I perceive them about the audience out there and about the fact that I do have a business and I'm selling products and I'm making the very, very best products that I can true, and I'm loading those products up with offers that I hope people can't refuse in terms of the sheer quantity of the information and it's range and son on so forth, but yet, maybe this is the end of the road, and maybe what I should do now is just say "I've arrived and just keep on doing what I'm doing," knowing all the while as I'm saying this to myself that it's impossible for me to do that because I run

into serious problems whenever I stagnate, and stagnation for me is defined really as doing a quality of work that I've already done.

I guess that would be the nutshell definition: doing the quality of work that I've already done. No matter what my assessment is of how good that quality is, if I stay there, I stagnate and then I run into all sorts of problems -- fatigue, boredom, and irritability. Those alone are serious problems for me. And then the actual, my own interest in what I'm doing suffers, and it all begins to go into decline.

So I know that I can't do that. I know that I have to keep pushing the boundaries and eliminating and going farther than I've gone before, but now I've got a lesson learned for maybe the thousandth time in my life, and that is never compromise. Compromise nothing. Take it all the way and then go farther even, and then even again go farther and keep on doing that. That's the lesson. Does it have risks? Absolutely. Could there be a point at which, in terms of a business, my business would suffer? Absolutely. It could happen. And yet, the evidence so far is that the reverse has occurred as I've just explained.

And perhaps some of you have had that experience yourself. I hope you have more than once. You discover that the best you can do as you perceive it right now has an audience. It satisfies you and it satisfies them. That's a phenomenal experience. It goes against the grain of everything we've been led to believe which is all about lowest common denominators and if you're in business you've got to diversity, and you've got to sell as much stuff to as many different kinds of people as you possibly can, and on and on and on and on.

It goes against that grain completely, and yet it works. It works. It's a phenomenal experience. So that means that doing the best you can is doing better all the time. Doing your best is doing better, and then better, and then better, and then better, and each stop along the way of better is your best at that time, but having achieved that, you can now go further. Do you see how that works? If you didn't achieve that, you couldn't go further because you wouldn't be in a position to see what further is.

It's like climbing a hill. You do your best, and you get to the top of the hill,

"phew," and you stand there, and now you see what you couldn't see before. There are mountains out there. Wow, never saw those mountains before, but I can see them now from the top of the hill. So you go on and you climb one of those mountains and you get to the top, and now you see an even higher range of mountains which you wouldn't have been able to see before had you not climbed the mountain on whose summit you are now standing.

So the lesson there is you don't know everything. You don't know everything all at once, even when you think you do. There are a lot of people out there who make a decision in life, "Well, I know everything worth knowing. That's it. I've got the basics down and the rest is, you know, I might do a little exploring and research and so forth, but I basically got it all together and I know everything worth knowing."

Well, that's fatal to put it bluntly. In fact, it often leads to a decline in health because mind and body and linked. It hardens the shell, and it hardens the exterior. Eventually, the person begins to block himself off from anything new and unknown because, obviously, he knows everything worth knowing. Doing your best implies that you do your best long enough until you see something that is better and then you do that, and you also know that you are enabled to see something better because you had already done your best.

That's the ladder. That's the range of mountains behind mountains behind mountains. That's the journey, that's the voyage, that's the way it works. That's how it happens. So you, of course, are in control of what your best – that phrase – means, and also in what direction you are pointing it because of the infinite number of directions where you could shine your light in deciding what it is that you are now going to do or continue to do, you know, there's an infinite number of 'what's.' There are an infinite number of things you could be doing.

So you're doing the best thing that you can do. That's one aspect of it, and you're doing it, and you're doing your best at it. See? Well, I did have a shop where I sold doilies. Okay, maybe that was my best, but it isn't anymore. So why don't I find out what my best is? Why don't I undertake that explanation and decide if it's not going to be doilies anymore, what is it going to be? And having gotten ahold of that one and decided "Okay, this is now going to be my

best. It's going to be my objective. It's going to be my work. It's going to be what I do every day. Now I'm going to do my best at it."

It's a double header. And then having done that long enough, you are now equipped to see how you can do whatever that work is that you're now doing even better and you do, and you keep on going, and then at some point the venue itself may change because now you're high enough in the mountain ranges to see, "I want to even shift again what it is I'm doing, and then do my best at it and to keep on going, and to have those experiences where one part of me is saying, "If I go here, if I do this, and if I do it in the best possible way that I can, with the greatest energy and power, and imagination, and so on, I don't know what the response is doing to be. I don't know what the audience is going to be. Don't know what's going to happen."

And you do it anyway, and you discover that there are people out there who have been literally waiting for you to arrive. They've been waiting for you to arrive. And then you're breathing a different kind of atmosphere than you were breathing before. Conversely, if we look at the way society has gone, look at the way the world has gone, look at the way that civilization has gone, we could analyze it by understanding how when you do the opposite, this is the kind of society and civilization you get. When most of the people are not doing everything that I've just described, this is what you end up with, what we see around us.

"Well, I'm doing average. I'm doing sort of my best at something that isn't my best choice to begin with, but, you know, it's the world, this is life," etc., etc. Well, you put millions of people on that course and what do you get? What do you get? On the one hand you get complete mediocrity, and on the other hand you get people who are dissatisfied who have gone off the rails of what they truly want to do, and who are therefore willing to compromise much more readily with evil. Ah, yes, evil. Because evil thrives upon getting people to do things that they ordinarily wouldn't do.

If you are Mr. Evil sitting out there on a plateau and you're cooking up all kinds of fantastic evil to let loose on the world, but you can't find anybody to help you, then you're in rough shape, right? But there will be a great supply of people to help you because these are the people who have already compromised

their way through life in exactly the way I've described, and you can rope them in, and you can conceal, of course, your motives and so forth, but even when they begin to understand what the effect is of what they're doing as part of your organization, they're going to look at it through half-lidded eyes with compromising minds, and all sort of rationalities, rationalizations and excuses for continuing on to do what they're doing.

"Hey, it's life. It's the way it is. What do you expect? Nothing is pure. You can't really –" blah, blah, etc., etc., and all of these things. You've got a built-in organization of people who are willing to compromise with evil. That helps to get us to where we have come in this civilization certainly, and the other point that I made, mediocrity, which is the mass effect of many people who are doing something they don't want to do and not doing even that very well.

That mediocrity now creates a state of mind of public consciousness, if you will, that is not only derailed, but is incompetent to understand information, incompetent to understand any degree of subtlety whatsoever, incompetent to understand greater ideas, and that really puts you up the creek without a paddle when you've got a civilization like that because now people are dead, they're dead to exactly what they need, and that is why we've come to where we are. That's how you get there. That's how you assemble masses and masses of people, and put them in a state of mind and action that is self-destructive and publicly destructive and destructive in every possible way.

> **"That's how you assemble masses and masses of people, and put them in a state of mind and action that is self-destructive and publicly destructive and destructive in every possible way."**

Okay, so with that as background, I'm going to pick up an article that I just posted here. Let's see if I can find it. I always change the titles, you see, while I'm writing them, so the original file name is not very helpful, but I just clicked on something I think is the article, and as soon as it comes up here. Here we go. "Surveillance, vaccines, android, Snowden, control systems." It's one of those fire sales. Everything's up for grabs, and it starts out, "Every political system, when applied, wears out because the people using the system make it more and more mechanical, less and less conscious. The Constitution was a noble attempt to explicitly limit systems by eroding the power of centralized

authority. That document was mainly about enforcing less structure. Its brilliance, naturally, has been lost on government."

That's another vector on what I've been talking about here. "It's more and more mechanical, and less and less conscious." That's what happens to the mind and to the person when they're embarked on years and years and years of doing something they don't really want to do in the first place, and then not even doing that well. And since that is a mass tendency in societies, as time goes on, you get a breakdown of the brilliance, whatever brilliance may have been there in the original fought, in this case, the political system of the American republic.

Because, think how brilliant it really was. I mean, where do you find a document these days? Here's a challenge for you. Go find a document these days, an official document anywhere at any level of officiality whether it's corporations, government, anywhere that is all about enforcing less structure. A significant document; find it, send it to me. Do you see? Because you put people in a room and you say, "You are now going to write a document and it's an important document," what do you think you're going to get from those people the longer they stay there?

Guess what? You're going to get – ready? – more structure. That's what you're going to get because that's what people do. "Well, it's very important. We're here. We've got to do something. We've got to build something. Okay. So let's build something." And they build a little bit and they say, "Well, that's enough. No, how could that be enough? I mean if we turn in this report, this document, people are just going to say 'you guys are idiots. You didn't really do anything. We've got to do something. Let's build it bigger. Let's build a structure that's more complex,'" and so on and so forth and they keep going.

That's what happens, inevitably. And yet, here were men who got into a room in the 18th century, and they devised a document that was all about enforcing – not just stating, but enforcing, less structure. Wow. Freedom opens up the mind. Freedom allows a person to do his best. That was the idea wasn't it? – At least part of the idea. Incredible, and yet, of course, it wears out over time, and yes, it wears out because there are people who want to do evil, absolutely, and manipulate and control, but also because they can enlist all sorts of other

people to help them break down the brilliance of the system.

And then to continue, could you find a larger, more inclusive system than the modern surveillance state? The hunger to develop structure is what android-like humans possess in abundance. They impose structure and live off of it like junk food. People do eventually get into an android state and I would define that or describe it in the following way. If a person has been doing what they don't want to do long enough and badly enough, they become an android which is a programmed person, and a programmed person wants more programs. That's one of the axioms which I should write down some time: the android axiom.

An android is programmed. Androids want more programs. Androids devise more programs. Androids assist in devising more programs and implementing them. They have a hunger for more structure, more system. Overwrought, believe me. I understand that systems can work wonderfully well when they are adapted to an objective, but we're talking about going way over the top on this. Way over the top. Triggering the systems thinkers (androids) happens by giving them a problem preferably one that appears to need an endless number of solutions.

For example, how to share everyone's medical data with hundreds of agencies achieving "smooth interface." Yes, that calls for a very big system, doesn't it? It calls for a system that links up many, many other systems. Oh, boy, oh, you got people that are just dying to do that. In fact, this morning, I read an article that was so full of gobbledygook pseudo techno speak about exactly this subject that it just bowled me over. There's a whole industry now, in case you didn't know – which I did, but I didn't really think about it – a whole industry of people, professionals, that are dedicated to nothing more than facilitating the sharing of private medical records with government agencies.

It's an industry. It's not just a pastime. It's not something a few people are cook – this is now a burgeoning industry. "How do we get this guy's medical records from there over to here so it's part of the insurance Obamacare thing, and then from there it can be sent over here, and we've got to be sending pictures and X-rays and so forth and what's the best way to send those without any sort of disintegration of photographic value?" That's one problem among

hundreds and thousands of various problems – and the interface between different kinds of systems and storage, your file storage, and labeling, and category.

Man, this is a big time now in America, a big time. What the security industry was undergoing in the early 1980s when everybody was getting hip to the idea of "Wow, this is it. You want to make money in America, security industry. This is it." Well now, it's sharing medical records. That's going to be huge.

Here's another example of how you can trigger systems thinkers to really get rolling: solving threats to national security. That's the big one, solving threats to national security. And I'm continuing to read now from my article. "…also known as institutionalized paranoia." There's never enough of that to go around, so enemies have to be invented. They don't need names. They don't even need to be specified. They just need to be asserted, and of course, we're seeing that now.

Suddenly all the embassies are closing and, oh, yes, we have some threats and condition blue, green, red, yellow, purple, black, whatever, and yes, and this certainly shows that we need more surveillance and NSA has to pump up their budget and surveillance capabilities. It's all about invalidating Snowden and about invalidating the fact that more and more people are now conscious of the fact that these agencies are spying on everybody all the time, so we need a threat. We need to assert another threat to tune people up, to make them realize "Hey, hey, hey, we got these enemies. Don't forget. Don't forget. We need more surveillance." Okay.

"The same sort of strategy" – I'm reading again – "is employed in the medical arena. Take, for instance, childhood diseases. Once baseline nutrition became part and parcel of Western societies, at least for a significant number of citizens, these diseases ceased being a widespread problem. Children got sick; they recovered. Their immune systems became stronger in the process. But, that lowered the "disease threat." Not good for the medical cartel. They had to reinvent these illnesses as enemies. They also had to sell a solution: vaccines.

Suddenly, the typical childhood diseases were devouring monsters. No respectable parent would allow his/her child to contract them. No, that would

be cruel beyond the telling of it. Parents had to vaccinate their kids. A nationwide system of promoting and giving vaccines needed to be created; system and structure again. The FDA had to be enlisted to make sure no competent studies were done to assess the dangers of the vaccines, especially when dealt in combinations, when given frequently.

You can be sure national vaccine surveillance programs will expand. A database to keep track of who is vaccinated and who isn't will become a normal feature of Obamacare, and myriad pressures will be brought to bear on parents who refuse vaccines for their children. So you see, in the medical arena, the same strategy. Threats to national security are the basic idea or threats to institutional security and survival. "Hey, children are recovering from childhood diseases. Not a good idea. Not a good idea at all. We have to do something about that. We have to reframe" – here's the evildoers coming into play.

> **"A database to keep track of who is vaccinated and who isn't will become a normal feature of Obamacare, and myriad pressures will be brought to bear on parents who refuse vaccines for their children."**

"We have to reframe the public understanding of all these childhood diseases like measles, mumps and chickenpox and so forth, so that they are now looking at horrible monsters." "Oh, my child mustn't get any of these diseases and recover from them and his immune system gets stronger. No, no, no, no. That's all garbage. No, these are creatures that come in the night and steal your children and therefore we need protection and therefore we need vaccines, and therefore we need a system, a structure to ensure that vaccines are being delivered to everybody."

See, that's the kind of problem that you give systems thinkers. You say to androids, "Okay, vaccine program. We want to vaccinate everybody all the time, and we want to keep track of who is getting vaccinated and who isn't. That's your first problem. Go to it." We're talking about 310 million people here. That's a big system all on its own. Cross-referencing medical records, etc., etc., etc. Now, androids think they're doing their best, but they aren't. They're doing 180 from their best. They think they doing their best because they have sunk to a level at which they are ready to sign up for anything that

looks like a system or a program and devote themselves to making it better.

That's already inhuman. "You mean you're not going to look at the system to see what it really is?" "No, I don't care what it's about. It's just a system, you know, it's got to be okay because systems are good and I'm going to help make the system better." "But don't you want to, you know, wouldn't you like to back up a step and see what the effect of having this system will –" "No, no, I'm not interested in that. Who cares?" Reading further, "The overall template of the surveillance state is based on the premise that everyone is a potential threat and danger to the herd. Why bother –" just like the person who's not vaccinated – "Ooh, a danger to the herd. A danger to the herd, he could spread disease."

Well, wait a minute. If I'm the only guy that hasn't been vaccinated in the whole world, and everybody else is vaccinated, you're saying they're all protected against getting the disease, so how does my not getting vaccinated affect them adversely? Okay, we'll have to discuss that at a later time, but for now, let's not pay any attention to the elephant in the room. Okay, why bother searching for particular offenders to national security? Spy on everybody and then apply profiling algorithms to filter out and I.D. the likely enemies. 10,000 enemies, 100,000, 1 million, 20 million? Boom, it's accomplished in the blink of an eye. We've got them listed; we've got the whole thing there. Sure, why not, we can do that. Yes, it's a system.

At some point a system will be developed that identifies people who use the word "individual" with frequency. That will become a marker for threat. Yes. Satire? Yes. Reality? Oh, yes, I believe that's going to be true. Fifty years up the road, perhaps sooner, people will receive a survey form. "It's come to our attention that you don't belong to any groups we're aware of. Is this true? Please specify your reasons for abstaining. Sign up for one of our educational programs." Possible? You bet. You bet.

As we speak, DARPA, the tech branch of the Pentagon is developing mass mind control strategies. Using brain imaging, researchers are attempting to isolate neurological markers that indicate people are following a narrative, accepting it or objecting to it. DARPA asks, "Why is a given propaganda psyop story working or why isn't it working?" Key words and phrases are being used

as correlatives. In other words, what words trigger passive acceptance of government narratives and media news reports and sales campaigns?

This is happening. This is how androids can get. This is how far away individuals who are massed together in this system can get from actually doing their best when we understand what doing your best actually means. This is really important. You know? This is really important. Little Jimmy grows up, you see, and Little Jimmy wants to do stuff when he grows up, and he's got all these dreams and visions and they are thrilling beyond the telling of it when he's a kid. I mean, the amount of energy, inspiration, motivation, etc., etc., generated by Little Jimmy's visions of what he wants to do when he grows up, phew, enormous, enormous and volcanic, astonishing.

And then at some point as he gets older, he decides that one dream after another is (a) not possible to achieve, (b) would be upsetting to his family or friends or peers if he did go for it, (c) is just a dream that he once had but it's no longer important, not really. It was something that, yes, he loved, but it's time now to make a shift, to get practical, to get real because following that particular dream, there is not guarantee of success whereas if he goes to school and gets a degree in accounting and so forth, even though he never wanted to be an accountant, there's a good chance he can get a job, and that's a good thing. In fact, it's the best thing. In fact, it's doing his best as it is now redefined.

And you've got a lot of Little Jimmies working for the Pentagon at DARPA. That's what I'm trying to say here. They were all Little Jimmies at one point, right? And they all had these fantastic, fabulous dreams. Very few people are born androids; they are made and self-made. So let me just flesh out this DARPA thing a little bit more, you see, because I'm sure at this very moment, and you can read this in the article, they're thinking about the Edward Snowden narrative from the point of view of "Okay, to what degree is the narrative that Snowden is a villain selling and to what degree isn't it? And to what degree is the narrative that Snowden is a hero selling it, and to what degree isn't it, and why in each case? What is making the public decide A or B?"

See, this is the kind of thing that DARPA is thinking about, and they want to

do experiments, you see, where they actually get volunteers and they put electrodes on them or however they do it to measure brain impulses and reactions to various stories, various narratives, the kind of narratives that you hear on the news or in releases from the government and so forth, and they want to be able to isolate which brain responses go along with passive acceptance of the narrative, and then they want to go even further and try to figure out which words and phrases in the narrative are triggering which specific brain reactions that indicate acceptance of the official narrative.

And then of course, they want to be able to deploy those words and phrases in many different contexts. That's the point of the whole thing is to tell new stories, new myths, new fairy tales, new narratives, and rope more and more people in to accepting those. That's the kind of stuff they're doing at DARPA, right? And nobody's objecting in Congress because what does Congress do? They have their own narratives. That's what they're doing.

The representatives are selling narratives to their own constituencies back home and to the press and the public and so forth. That's what they do in Congress. They sell narratives, so they're not going to suddenly stand up and say, "This is horrendous. Selling narratives is evil. Where did this idea even come up in the first place that what we're all about in this country is selling a narrative? This is just insanity." When, of course, that's what they do themselves 24/7.

All right, so there these people are, you see, enmeshed in the bowels of DARPA, and they're all Little Jimmies who grew up, and they were very, very different Little Jimmies, I want to tell you. I'm sure that in every case, you would be able to find a time in each Little Jimmy's life when he was precisely the opposite of the kind of android he's turned into at DARPA, a time when he had these great dreams and visions.

And maybe if you took one of these people aside, and if by some miracle you could engage him in a conversation long enough, and non-threateningly enough, he might confess to you something like, "You know, when I was 19" – and he looks around and makes sure nobody's hearing – "I still wanted to be a fireman." That's his big secret. There it is. He just laid it out on the table. Don't say anything. Just sit there quietly and listen. He's giving you his soul. He's putting his soul on the table to the best degree that he's ever understood

it, you see. He just laid out on the table his best understanding of his entire history of his life of what doing your best means. Okay?

He said, "You know, at 19 I still wanted to be a fireman. I wanted to be a fireman from the time I was 4 and I always wanted to be a fireman, and even at 19, that's what I really wanted to do, but you know my father was a lawyer, and my mother working in the publishing industry, and all my brothers and sisters went into the professions, and, I mean, it was just impossible. There's no way that I could be a fireman working in a fire station, wearing a uniform, getting on a truck and whizzing down the street with fantastic speed to put out a fire, climb into buildings and save lives, but that's what I really wanted to do. I wanted to be a great fireman. That's what I wanted."

And then maybe, just maybe, who knows, he's 42 now, maybe he follows that up with a kind of a self-deprecating laugh and he tells you, "Even now, if I had my druthers, "ha-ha-ha-ha" I'd be a fireman. That's what I'd be and I'd be happy." That's Little Jimmy who's now doing mind control experiments at DARPA trying to figure out how to brainwash the entire American public. Wow. Wow. That's the morphing and evolution of "doing your best."

This is real history, hidden history. This is the history of every individual; went off the track, came back on the track or didn't, went way off the track, never came back, never went off the track of doing his best. This is the kind of history – you want to create a web TV show? You want to do something interesting? Do that. Find people and interview them. Take the best interviews, long interviews where you see that morph. Little Jimmy at 5, Little Jimmy at 10, Little Jimmy at 19, Little Jimmy at 43. That'll wake some people up because they'll recognize themselves in it in an instant, and of course they'll have all sorts of internal resistance and objections and so forth and so on, but you will have lit a spark that had gone out. You bet.

> **"That'll wake some people up because they'll recognize themselves in it in an instant, and of course they'll have all sorts of internal resistance and objections and so forth and so on, but you will have lit a spark that had gone out."**

We've even gotten to the point in this society, and I go into this in some detail later on in this article – looking for the place here – and this is happening

already, and it's going to happen to a greater degree. The idea – I could spend ten hours talking about this – but part of the idea with this DARPA thing is it becomes an element of a larger program in which the government, some aspect of government plans and stages an event that when it occurs will be made to appear random, but it isn't, and because they feel confident that they can induce passive acceptance of their narrative, they will be able to predict the public's response to the event before they've even staged it. Get that?

Plan an event, like a disaster of some kind, mass killing, whatever, make it appear – I mean, stage the event, make it appear to be random, and already have in your pocket a prediction of the public response to the narrative that you are going to tell after the event has happened. Okay? And I write a little bit about that down here. This is a good article. You should read this article. Okay? "Last year we were able to predict the response with 50 percent accuracy. This year, we're up to 61 percent. Our goal, the Holy Grail, is 98 percent." Wow. You see? "Yes, if we could predict with 98 percent accuracy, the public response to our narrative that we disseminate after the staged event that we put on and made to look like a random event, well, we can control space, time and the future."

You know? That's where they're going, folks. They want to invent history and future with a very high degree of probability when it comes to controlling the response to what they are creating. That's what this DARPA thing is really all about. That's where it's heading. And then I say, you'll get this kind of craziness, bet on it, "Hey, I want you to meet Bob. Bob, come on over. Bob works for the government. He has a fantastic job. He predicts public reaction to events before they happen. Wow, isn't that something? Bob knows how we're going to feel before we do. Great." And Bob will be a very popular guy.

You won't get people screaming at Bob at a party about how he's so evil and helping an evil system. He's going to become tremendously popular. "Gee, Bob, that job sounds terrific. Interesting, I wish I could get up in the morning and know I was going to work like that. I wouldn't need so many cups of coffee to start my engine. By the way, what qualifications does a guy have to have?" And Bob says, "Well, a Ph.D. helps, but let me tell you about our historical research on the Snowden affair." This little fictional dialogue is happening out there in the future.

"It's all about figuring out what played well with the public. Lots of polls were done at the time. The country was sort of split over whether to call Snowden a hero or a villain. We tracked 40,000 media reports in the period, and we isolated the significant factors," etc., etc., and it goes on, you know, "We analyzed Snowden's voice; the pitch, the frequency, the rhythms. They worked against the government narrative to assemble the majority who believes a defector is a traitor, you need his voice to be in the frequency range of, well, I can't say, it's classified, but we have the exact parameters."

Yes, you bet. And then later on in the article, "Millions of people are in the bubble because they want to be. They want to be profiled and sliced and diced. They want to add their own assessments about what sells and especially why. They want to profile themselves. They gladly assess their own reactions to the Snowden affair based purely on the factors that sold Snowden as white hat or black hat. It has nothing to do with whether he did the right thing or not. He's a product that was pedaled because to them, everything is a product."

So the only fascination comes with analyzing the effectiveness of the sale. How is it done? What succeeded? What didn't? We're looking at a kind of Mobius strip or Escher drawing that feeds back into itself. In this state of mind, people tend to perceive reality on the basis of what they think other people perceive. "Actually, I don't feel anything. I only infer what other people are feeling, so I can understand marketing better." Okay, that's how far away it can go from doing your best. That's how far away.

And the two collections, to put in a plug here at the very end, on my site nomorefakenews, the *Matrix Revealed* and *Exit from the Matrix* are, you might say, taking off from here and going into mega, mega, mega realms to flesh out how this consensus reality called the Matrix is built, the nuts and bolts of it in the first collection, and then "Exit from the Matrix" many, many, many, many exercises, techniques and background descriptions of what it means to exit from consensus reality on all levels. Check it out. This is Jon Rappaport. Thanks for the time and see you next month on *The Solari Report.*

THE SOLARI REPORT

DOING YOUR BEST

AUGUST 2013

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.