



---

# The Solari Report

---

OCTOBER 17, 2013

**Obamacare, What is Really  
Going On?**

**with Jon Rappoport**





# Obamacare, What is Really Going On?

October 17, 2013

---

This is Jon Rappoport and this is Thursday—well, actually I'm recording a little bit in advance of this, but this is the October Report for Solari. This month I'll be talking about Obamacare. What is really going on?

We've heard a lot of talk over the past several months about back doors and big tech companies, computer systems, and so on and so forth allowing the NSA to get in there and spy. It seems there are back doors in everything and we should assume the same is the case with Obamacare. All of the data is going to be fed through to various agencies, spying agencies, and so on and so forth because that's what they do. Their obsession, is to gain access to collect and store all information everywhere, which when you think about it is pretty psychotic. I mean, suppose somebody came up to you with this program. Your job is to gain access to and store all information—all information. Why? What good would it do you? This is what we are heading toward in the information age. It's a terrific metaphor actually for what's going on. It's the premise that the more information you have, the better off you are. It doesn't matter how much information we're talking about. There is no limit. The more you've got, the better off you are. I—it just boggles my mind. On what basis is that possibly true?

Of course you want a certain amount of information and you want a certain quality of information about certain subjects. That depends on who you are, your interests, and so on and so forth. But all information, as much as you can possibly get on as many possible subjects and people as you can spy on? That is psychotic. It's completely insane. It actually renders you powerless ultimately. The more you have, the less powerful you are. Well, when you take that over into NSA, what are you talking about? Is there a comparison there? I believe there is, because I don't care how proficient your software is and so forth. There comes a point when the collection of information is too much. It



becomes too difficult to sift through. You're automatically going to pick up on irrelevancies. Your original mission, whatever it may have been, is going to deteriorate completely, and psychopaths are going to take charge of the store. That's what's going to happen. It's inevitable, because you're just doing too much. You're going too far. "Oh, well, we found a person here who wears a red hat with a pink feather on it—aha. Yes, we have a picture? Okay, let's bring up the profile. Okay, let's have the complete life history. All right, let's have all the connections to friends and so forth. Is he talking to anybody in other countries and blah, blah, blah?" All because of the hat, because the hat's a little bit unusual and it pings something, somewhere, and somebody takes a look. It's irrelevant; it has nothing to do with anything, you see?

But beyond a certain point, information takes you into conformity. It takes you into a concept of normalcy, of average, of good citizen, of proper person, et cetera, et cetera. The "oddities" are the things that stick out. That's where people become suspicious. "Well, we've got 80 quadrillion data centers full of information, and 87 percent of all of this information we judge to be normal and average. But the 13 percent"—which of course is 16 galaxies' worth of information—"the leftover is suspect." Why? Because it's not "normal" or "average." It's not android. It's human. Humans have eccentricities. They have uniqueness, each one. But this becomes suspect because you've collected too much information. You've gone too far, and now the whole tenor of the enterprise becomes corrupt to the core, no matter who's running it. I mean, there are psychopaths running it, but it doesn't matter in the area that I'm referring to here. It's just the amount, the quantity, and the preposterousness of thinking that everything is somehow relevant.

There was a time—I think—in education when an intelligent person was considered to be someone who could separate the wheat from the chaff. "Okay, well, all of that is nonsense. I don't need any of that. This over here is important. This is what's important. I can make the distinction and I can tell you why." But that is being lost. And of course the technocrats that I refer to numerous times in these programs like the Roy Kurzweils of the world—Ray Kurzweils of the world and so on. These people have turned it into a religion. They believe that if you collect enough information or you put the brain in touch with or link up the brain to enough computerized machinery, that all of a sudden the human being is going to ascend to a cosmic level of consciousness



and life will never be the same, when in fact just the opposite begins to occur.

So backdoors in Obamacare, storage, computers, and so forth—files, of course, naturally. It's undoubtedly already there. But what we're seeing now in this absolute joke as the launch occurs is that people who want to sign up for Obamacare can't even get in the front door. They can't even get into the site, or if they're onto the site, sometimes they can't get out. You thought Obamacare was the individual mandate that you had to buy the insurance, but it's also the mandate that you have to stay in the website; you can't get out. What is it that I read this morning? Five people in Iowa haven't been able to sign out? The system is, from what I can tell, beyond repair. They're going to have to start over. But smarter people than I in this area will have their own opinions on how much of a fix is necessary. It was like saying, "We're ready to launch. Welcome to the crash. We're ready to launch. Welcome to the crash." That's what it was.

Only absolute fools would launch a system as miserably built as this one. It's just, unfathomable, you might say, and yet you can point to other government snafus of the past and say, "Well, this is what happens when you give the federal government power over large areas. There's always going to be complete disaster."

**“Only absolute fools would launch a system as miserably built as this one. It's just, unfathomable...”**

What I'm proposing is that we look a little further into this. For example, when Don Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense some years ago—I think it was 2001—announced that—depending upon people's memories here it was either \$1 trillion or \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion missing from the Pentagon budget that could not be accounted for in terms of where it was spent and how. The conclusion was in the press that this was just another example of the government not being able to find its own tail or its own address or its own identity or anything about itself because it was massively incompetent, which is true. There is tremendous corruption and waste in government. We all know that—and stupidity, and ignorance, and lassitude, and boredom, and people who have jobs that should never have those jobs, and the jobs themselves shouldn't even exist. We know all that. Yes. We know this. We know this. We know this. Yes.



But the larger possibility that loomed in the wake of Rumsfeld's statement was that this money was accounted for. It was accounted for by disappearing into the black budget. It wasn't just a series of foul-ups in the accounting procedures. It was stolen. It was taken under the cover of saying, "Well, you know, we have—whatever it is—135 separate computer systems just in the accounting division of the Pentagon, and therefore these things can happen from time to time, and we are now in the process of rebuilding the entire computer system," et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, you see. That's the explanation that's given. That's the cover story, where it's well known in military and intelligence circles that money disappears. That money is earmarked for projects about which the Congress doesn't have any knowledge at all, or scanty knowledge, or generalized knowledge. But they don't know the details. They don't know what's really going on. These projects have existed for decades, decades, and decades. MK-Ultra, the famous CIA mind control project, was one of those, and is still yet one of those—completely unaccounted for in terms of how much money has been poured into the research, the facilities, the scientists, the mad doctors, the psychopaths, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

So why should we assume now with Obamacare that this is simply a series of stupid mistakes and glitches and amateurish construction of websites that are supposed to enroll people in this program? Why should we assume that? Because the major media tell us this? Because we have statements from politicians saying, "We're going to fix this and get it right," and other statements from politicians saying, "This is absurd; they can't even put together a decent website"? Is that, given what we know about the way black ops work, covert operations, the news behind the news—why should we accept these statements at face value? Why should we say that the crash of the system upon launch is just incompetence? Think about it. If you are the government and this is a highly volatile subject—Obamacare, national health insurance, the raging debates, the Supreme Court decision, the apparent blackmail, bribery, arm-twisting that was necessary to get the Supreme Court to say that Obamacare and the individual mandate were constitutional, and on top of that to absurdly claim that it was really a tax and that's why it was legal, it was not really a mandate at all, when everybody saw through that—the debate has just done nothing but escalate. Some of the articles that I've written about Obamacare recently on my site at No More Fake News have spread like wildfire, and so has the response.





This is the kind of project which, if you are the government, the White House, the people responsible for foisting this insane program on the American people, the last thing you're going to want to do—come on—is to launch the thing with a complete crash. So you're going to be checking up on the progress of the computer people as they set all this up. You can say—saving much more face than what you're able to save now, you can say on launch day, “Oops, sorry, it's not quite ready yet. We want to iron out some glitches that we've found so we're postponing the launch date,” rather than, “Let's launch this thing with a massive crash,” because they obviously know for months what was going to happen if they fell in line with the deadline. The whole was going to be a total catastrophe. Yet in the most volatile issue, one of them at least, in the last decade in terms of debate and anger and outrage and so on, they blithely, the White House, just walked into this whole thing with their eyes wide open and say, “Hey, tomorrow we're going to launch this catastrophe. Oh, boy, this is going to be pretty interesting, wouldn't you say, Joe?” “Yes, yes. I'll be taking a lot of Valium tonight and trying to sleep through the next couple of days, but hey, that's kind of a lark. It's sort of fun. Let's do it anyway. Who cares?” Really? You really think that was the operation there? You really think so? When they knew well in advance exactly what was going to happen and how bad it was going to be?

Boy, it's like walking into a burning building. “Hey, look, the building is burning down there.” “Yes. What are you doing tonight?” “Not much.” “How about you?” “Not much.” “Let's walk in there.” “Sure, why not? Why not?” Okay. No, I don't think so. It simply doesn't add up. It doesn't add up at all.

So then what are the alternatives here? This is where we go down the rabbit hole. This is where most people check out, I have to say—right at the beginning here. Most people will check out of the conversation and discussion and the exploration because what is down the rabbit hole when you go down it? Revelations that challenge your view of reality; in this case political reality, economic reality, the reality of who's actually running things in America and who's running the planet. All of those issues begin to show up down there in the rabbit hole, and people would rather now have them jump up because then they would have to change their view of reality. It's contagious. If you find one scandal which when you probe it gives you a kind of answer. On the one



hand you just can't believe it, but on the other hand you know it's true. That tends to spread. It's not just that one scandal anymore. Now you're looking at the world in a different way than you were before. For a lot of people that's too much. They don't want to do that, so they retreat. What do they retreat to inevitably? The cover story.

I've gone over this before, but when people who are involved with black ops plan a significant operation, among other things there has always got to be a cover story. The cover story explains what happened to the public, to other politicians, to the press, and so on and so forth, which is a lie. It's just not the truth. But it's convenient. It makes everything seem reasonable and okay, even if certain people have to take the fall. That's why the cover story is intimately related to limited hangout. Limited hangout is a cover story that admits blame or guilt for a small piece of what really is going on. With the hopes, which are usually realized, that this partial admission will be a sop that will satisfy the press and the public. They'll say, "Oh, that's what happened," and, "Okay, well, that's the way it is," you see. All right? Sometimes it works. Most of the time it works. It particularly works when the cover story is well crafted.

When it's not, then it doesn't work. Then most people begin to wake up. A lone gunman firing a gun out of a book depository, a gun which simply was not capable of reliable sighting at that distance, after missing the first shot rapidly was able to reset the rifle and within a matter of seconds deliver a perfect shot to kill the President of the United States while acting alone. Hmm. Weak cover story from an intelligent point of view, pathetically weak, seen through in a matter of hours by a number of people. Thousands of books have subsequently been written about the JFK assassination.

So the cover story is what people retreat to and accept even if they don't really believe it; when they don't want to go down the rabbit hole and find out what else could really be going on. So in this case of the launch that was a crash, what else could be happening? Somebody wanted the crash to occur. That's the first thing we look at as we move along the corridors in the rabbit hole. Somebody wanted this to happen.

Number two: they didn't want it to happen at the last minute. In other words, it wasn't sabotage two days ago, all of a sudden, that undermined an otherwise



pristine system, because we now know that people in government and in security and so forth in the corporate world were biting their tongue for months as they watched this debacle take shape, this online system. So we are now talking about someone who wanted this system to destruct and in the lead-up to the whole launch made sure that it would. Now we're in strange land, high strange land. How do we understand this? How do we try to comprehend what's going on here?

Being down in the rabbit hole we've admitted that the cover story is absurd. It doesn't hold water; therefore we reject it. But now we have to find what actually took place and what is going on here.

I'm exploring this with you. I've got 25, 30 years of experience with some of these ops, how they're built, what the cover stories are, what the real intentions are behind the scenes, and so on and so forth. So let's look at the word destruction, okay? What does that imply? Are we only talking about somebody who wanted to sink the Obama administration in a quagmire? Someone who wanted to further damage the reputation of the President and the White House on a kind of somewhat parochial level? In other words, on one issue, one volatile as it is, Obamacare? Are we looking at an operation that was designed to make Obamacare fail because the people behind it simply did not want a national health insurance plan? In other words, are we looking, say, at covert operatives from, I don't know, the American Medical Association or certain insurance companies? I don't think so. That doesn't ring a bell.

We would have to look deeper. Yes, there is a possibility here that on a kind of superficial level somebody wanted the system to fail because they were hoping that it would torpedo the entire national health insurance plan embodied in Obamacare. We don't rule that out—in which case we are looking at what is called a layered op or a layered operation, and that is at different levels at the operation different people have different motives. People at what you would call the lower, more superficial levels of the op, are used by people at the higher levels who have completely different intentions.

**“Being down in the rabbit hole we've admitted that the cover story is absurd. It doesn't hold water; therefore we reject it.”**





A good example of that, as I've gone over with you I believe in earlier programs here, is the pharmaceutical industry. You can look at the toxification of the planet through medical drugs, which is extensively—I've documented it up one side and down the other—as being simply a drive for profit, okay? The pharmaceutical companies want to make money and so they market the drugs and they urge researchers and encourage them with money and so forth to come up with new diseases and new disorders so that they can—the pharmaceutical companies—develop new drugs and sell them and they make more money and so forth. That's all they care about, is the money. If they are aware of the toxic effects of the drugs, which some people in the pharmaceutical hierarchy certainly are, they just don't care. They may rationalize it on different grounds, but who cares? Basically they are just immune from any sort of human feeling. It's all about the money. So that's one level of the operation, to poison the planet with huge amounts of medical drugs.

But then if you start to go higher you begin to see, "Well, wait a minute now." The heritage of the entire pharmaceutical industry, if you had to put, let's say, two princes or kings at the top of that hierarchy, historically it would be Rockefeller and I.G. Farben, the infamous Nazi chemical and drug cartel that still actually exists in several component corporations like Bayer and Hecht, even though Farben was officially broken up after the Second World War. What are the intentions of Farben and Rockefeller? Well, if you look at the funding for the Rockefeller Foundation and all of the research that it's been doing for decades and decades, and if you look at the fact that Farben put Hitler over the top in Germany and the entire eugenics plan of the Nazi party and Hitler in particular, you're now looking at depopulation. You're looking at debilitating populations with poisons promoted as drugs. You are looking at an attempt to pacify the population, weaken the population of the planet because in that case people are easier to control. That's at a much higher layer of the level of that op.

So in the case of Obamacare, what sort of destruction might we be talking about if what we're looking at here is an intentional torpedoing of the launch of this whole program? Well, I can give you one clue, which really has nothing to do with national health insurance per se at all, or Obamacare, or even this particular online system. It is simply destruction through destabilization of the economy, the government, the public, and institutions.



This is a kind of operation that has been carried out since the dawn of time. You want to conquer an enemy. You destabilize him, his people, his territory, his land, his resources, his systems of governance, and so on and so forth. This is an ongoing operation. It is not simply one thing you do one time. It is on and on and on and on. It's quite real, in which case we could be looking at simply an instance of that occurring, yet one more screw-up, one more catastrophe, one more discombobulation of government. You see, in these operations it's not a question of 'is government as it's presently formed good, is the economy good, are the institutions of the country good or bad' or whatever. That's not the point. The point is to simply take the lynchpins of a society and destabilize them, loosen their foundations, shake them up, make them less competent, and disorganize them, because then, like some sort of a disease, the destabilization spreads and ripples outward into the society at large and things become less capable. Things become less workable. Things become more screwed up. Things become more chaotic.

From chaos, what do you get? You get the imposition of order, a new order. This is a slogan that goes back centuries. From chaos, comes order. You create enough chaos, you then can come in behind that and establish new order because there will be a demand for it, you see? It will be demanded, because people simply don't want to put up with chaos. That's the way it is. So they will attach themselves to any sort of entity or person or group or organization or whatever institution that promises to reinstitute order. "Yes, we've seen this break down and so forth and it's a chaotic situation, but we are going to bring order to it and make it resolve." That you can count on. Then that entity, whatever it is, becomes more powerful, more influential, and more controlling in the long run, because the people say, "Well, they did what they said they were going to do. They brought order and now things are more peaceful and it's better and so I'm on their side." It's a simple equation, a very simple equation really. It's as old as the hills.

We have been seeing that in America for a very long time, because from the point of view of the globalists, those people who want a planetary management system for earth, not for one nation or two nations or three nations but for the whole planet, America was the biggest sticking point. Then you have several other major sticking points—Russia, China—but America traditionally was the big one for several reasons. So if America could be brought down, destabilized,



made sufficiently incompetent, then eventually it could be pounded into taking its place in the “New World Order” alongside other nations, having given up its own imperial ambitions to go out and conquer militarily and economically and corporately as much of the world as it possibly can, because that really ultimately runs counter to globalism. Ultimately what globalism wants is one world, one planet, organized under one system, no borders, no nations, homogeneity, a pasteurized planet, homogenized planet, under the control of a very small group of men. This has been in the works for a very long time.

From that much bigger context, if we look at what’s happening here with Obamacare, and not just in this online debacle, but also from the beginning. The beginning goes back a long way, but we’ll just take it back to 1993. Remember the attempt when Hillary was tasked by Bill to go out there and begin to talk and have secret meetings, which actually were illegal, with all sorts of insurance companies and bigwigs and CEOs and policy experts and so forth to put together a national health insurance. This was a design, and it was extremely chaotic. Chaos just sprouted up like weeds all around Hillary and all around Bill and all around these efforts and so forth. This created a lot of disturbances at many different levels of society: just the effort to make something like this happen. Political outrage and opposition between the two major parties are both part of destabilization. When you get to a certain level of animosity things begin to not work and not function and fall apart and so forth, which is the design of the conspirators who want chaos, out of which they will bring order.

So when Obama came into office and announced that his first priority was going to be Obamacare, his closest advisors backed way up in shock and said, “Are you sure you want to do this, sir? Are you sure that this is the plan and this is the program and this is the issue? Because I’m sure you’ve observed that there’s a whole lot of people in America that are out of work, and jobs is the number one thing on people’s minds, the economy. Remember? This is where you can really make your hay, sir, if you can turn this around, and this is what the people are clamoring for, and this is what is tearing the country apart. So our recommendation is that you put it back together. Find a way. Make jobs happen.”

But Obama, as the agent of change, decided, “Absolutely not.” Out of left field



he pulled out of the hat, to mix a metaphor, Obamacare, national health insurance. “This is it. This is where I’m going.” Not education, not jobs, not anything that you would expect, but suddenly national health insurance for everybody. It was like dropping a stick of dynamite into Congress, and in the press, and in the country, and in the two political parties, and everywhere. All of a sudden you had two epicenters of chaos. One was the tremendous outrage and animosity that the idea of passing this program, this healthcare program was causing right at the outset and would continue to cause, and that Obama would suddenly reach into his bag of tricks and pull this out at all, because what was the primary chaos in the country at the time? Jobs, unemployment, foreclosures on houses, people hurting, and the unconscionable bailout of these gigantic, too-big-to-fail corporations and banks and so on.

But Obama just let that one spin. Keep on spinning. Just keep on spinning with all of that, yes, because that’s chaos. Agent of change, agent of chaos, not Democrat, not Republican, not comes from Chicago or comes from Alaska—none of that is really relevant. The man is an agent of change. He is an operative, an agent, and at another time we can discuss to what degree these are conscious actions on his part in which he knows that he is an agent, a conscious agent for larger forces and to what degree is he unconscious and so forth. But one way or another he functions as an agent of change, an agent in other words of chaos, because that is how you take over a formerly very robust and dynamic entity, in this case the United States of America. You torpedo it at many different levels in many different ways to create more chaos, more incompetence, more inability, and more dependence. Obamacare is just one example of that from the beginning.

**“You torpedo it at many different levels in many different ways to create more chaos, more incompetence, more inability, and more dependence. Obamacare is just one example of that from the beginning.”**

So if we were just to back up a little bit and look at the history, the fact that we are looking at this debacle and catastrophe right now in terms of the launch is really no surprise. It could be viewed as a seamless part of the whole operation, the whole plan to pour a little more fuel on the fire, add a little more chaos to this national scene, demoralize the country a little bit more, because



demoralization is another very important psychological op that is part of many covert operations. How can we demoralize the people? Well, we can keep pounding at them with these preposterous pieces of legislation. We can enjoin them to become outraged and then to see that nothing happens as a result of their outrage. We can make them so frustrated that eventually seeing no outlet they just simply fall into passivity, into a state of kind of a trance, which is what we want. Demoralization of a population is a key op.

When this Obamacare system, if it is not defunded, actually takes place and the wheels really start turning, we will see even more demoralization in the country than we see so far, because of the way the system is going to function, the kind of medical care. As bad as it already is now, how much worse it's going to get? As unexpected things show up, "Well, we didn't really think it was going to be as bad as Canada, but boy, there are some people that are waiting a long time for a doctor because, well, I don't know, lots of doctors are leaving the profession, there are so many reasons for this. Yes, it's possible that in your former insurance policy you were covered for something very expensive as a treatment, but you see under the new policy you won't be able to get that. But we have something else for you. You can't get prime rib, but we've got a Big Mac. Okay?"

There are going to be just multiple, multiple examples of this kind of thing in the delivery of medical care, in the glitches of the system of the delivery, in the quality of the delivery, in the frustration involved in the delivery, in the incompetence and ineffectiveness and toxicity and damage done through and by the delivery. It's going to get even worse than it already is, and for the last 20 years I've been writing about how bad it is under the surface. So I'm fully aware of that. It's just going to get more chaotic and worse, leading to more demoralization.

So now perhaps things are coming into focus for you, as I continue to discuss this and explore it here. Looking at Obamacare itself on the timeline from its inception until now and looking ahead up the line into the future as a continuous kind of thread, that really was put into play as a form of inducing chaos, in which case the present glitch is just simply par for the course. It's just a piece of the larger chaos. Now we begin to see how these things really work, how these operations actually work.



That's why history is important. That's why it's important to be able to go back to a certain time and to see the development of a concept, of a program, of a policy, of an operation that induces the handful of major qualities that lead to a certain brand of destruction, inducing passivity, demoralization, bringing chaos, coming in behind the chaos with new order eventually.

Well, how long does it take for the chaos? These sorts of questions come up. Well, if the men behind the curtain are just inducing more and more chaos, when will they stop? When will they stop? Please stop now! Please stop now! How long will this go on? Well, typically it goes on until the men behind the curtain decide that they have enough control. They've brought in enough new order on top of the chaos to resolve it to where they are satisfied with the amount of control that they have. If you're talking to a sociopath, that would be a long, long time.

Even once, if you look at the history of Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union, China, and other places; even when the Iron Fist takes charge and control, that personage keeps inducing and provoking more and more chaos so that it can be destroyed and order can be put in on top of it because it is a teaching moment for the population to see all that play out, and also a kind of reminder. "Look at what these people did over there. Look what I did to them after they did what they did over there. Do you have any doubt now as to who is in charge?"

To go one step further, you also have something called controlled opposition where you actually provoke chaos among groups that seem to be opposed to the Iron Fist of order. In one sense they are, but they've been taken over and co-opted and they are now the official, although secret, controlled opposition. So you run all controlled opposition through such people in order to ensure that there really is no revolution. I would submit to you, although we don't have time to discuss it today, but I've written a recent article about it that was titled something like "Are the Anti-GMO Ballot Initiatives Just Another Covert Op?" They're controlled opposition. Monsanto can deal with labeling of GMOs if it has to. It's doing it right now in England. It can deal with that. That's not its first choice, but it's kind of limited hangout. It's a sort of partial okay. If states began to pass laws, which made the labeling of GMOs mandatory, Monsanto could deal with that. But the one thing they can't deal with and won't deal with is banning of GMO crops, individual counties in the United States one at





a time banning the growing of any GMO food. The other thing they don't want is three million people out on the street in Washington D.C. protesting against Monsanto as an evil corporation. Those are the two major things they don't want. So what's the good controlled opposition? Well, let's infiltrate the ballot initiatives in various states, because we can deal with that either way, whether they win or lose, and we'll do everything of course to make them lose, and that will be the controlled opposition.

So you will see that even in this case of Obamacare there is controlled opposition. There are certain politicians who have been ranting about it, but on closer inspection they're really not going to try to do anything to destroy it. They're going to make noise. They're going to protest. They're going to look good. They're going to make a point with their constituency and so on and so forth, but it's really not going to make a difference. It's the controlled opposition.

There is a more in-depth analysis of what the last few days looked like. "Oh, my God, these people are crazy. They launched a computer system for Obamacare and the thing doesn't work. I mean they're crazy! They're just insane! Well, that's government for you, back to the chickens. That's the way it is." Or, "Back to my job in the cubicle in the skyscraper where I keep my eyes on my desk straight ahead because, boy, it's crazy out there and I just don't want anything to do with it." Yes, exactly. That's what they want to happen. If they can get 300 million people to say, "Hmm, man, it's just too crazy out there for me. All I want is just my little thing here and stay safe and nobody notices me and I'm just whatever. Whatever, I'm just under the radar. Under the radar, yes, yes, yes." Talk about covert ops on the level of the individual human being where the individual human being works a covert op on himself. You will get people who actually adjust their beliefs, their values, all of that, so that in the end what does it add up to? The ability for them to say, "The best thing I can do is to live my little life under the radar. That's the answer that's spit out of the machine. "Oh, live my little life under the radar and get by."

Yes. The political and the personal interact. This could be certainly a subject for another whole report or 2 or 12, is the covert ops that individuals play on themselves. When I say covert I mean they do it to themselves, but then they magically become unaware of what they've done to themselves so it all looks



legit to them. “Yes, I arranged all my beliefs and values—you see, it was very clear—so that in the end what it all added up to was that I should live my little life under the radar and not be noticed and have a kind of nicey-nice life and that’ll be it, and then I’m gone.” People do that. Not the only reason by far, but one of the reasons they do that is because of the covert ops that are afoot in the general society which impact on people and give them the impression that things are just too crazy out there. They’re too screwed up and people are nuts and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, and therefore how should I look at my own life? And you see, “Oh, yes, I should just—don’t bother me. I’m watching TV. I have my beliefs, I have my values, and they all add up to an anonymous life passively lived under the radar.”

That’s the report for this month. Jon Rappoport here. Thank you very much. My site is [NoMoreFakeNews.com](http://NoMoreFakeNews.com). I recommend to your attention two collections of mine, “The Matrix Revealed” and “Exit From the Matrix.” You can read all about them at my sites and order them if you wish. Thank you very much. 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.