

BUILDING WEALTH IN CHANGING TIMES



The Solari Report

NOVEMBER 28, 2013



Imagination Creates Reality
with Jon Rappoport



Imagination Creates Reality

November 28, 2013

This is Jon Rappoport, and this the November edition of my report for Solari. Good to be here, as always. The title of this is “Imagination Creates Reality.” I’ve talked about this before from a number of angles because it’s so incredibly important. It’s important to know that you have a thing – that isn’t really a thing at all – called imagination, and that you can do a great deal with it in order to create the reality that you want, not just in your head, but in the world: in your life, where you live, where you’re going to live, with whom you associate. Bring about the fulfillment of projects, some of which you may not even yet be aware of because you haven’t imagined them.

So if you didn’t have imagination at all, you would be a robot, an android. You would be operating within a relatively small number of coded instructions that would guide your every action, underlying themes, principles, rules, and regulations. Yes, we’ll set this android loose because he’s programmed according to these particular items, and so everything that he does, thinks, (the way he behaves, how he acts, et cetera, et cetera) will all be within that set of boundaries, and so we don’t have to worry about him. He’s going to be just fine, just fine. Yes. That’s what you get until and unless you have imagination, which sets you into new spaces, new thoughts, new ideas, new dreams, cook up different approaches, discover hidden desires for the future that you really want, et cetera, et cetera.

People downplay this all the time because they want to be extremely practical about everything, and then they end up with a situation I may have described before. I remember giving a talk to a small group of men somewhere in Los Angeles. I believe it was around 15, 20 years ago. I was invited on the spur of the moment. These men had been attending a conference or a little seminar during the week. This was now the last day. I think the seminar was about freedom, paradoxically, and the law, and so on. So I walked into the room ready to talk about imagination and creative power, and I saw this row – kind of like a murderers’ row – of about ten guys sitting at tables with their



notebooks spread out and so forth. Also on the tables were various leftovers from pizza, McDonald's, Burger King, and so on, strewn all around. I looked at these guys and – in memory it's a little bit hazy – but I would say that three quarters of them were all 40, 50, 60 pounds overweight.

This is your task, Mr. Rappoport. You have an hour to completely revolutionize the lives of these men. So that was the gig, and where to start? Where to start? Could I say, "You're all programmed to be overweight"? Should I just say, "Why are you eating this crap?" Should I say, "You have hidden powers," when really it seemed like all their attention was focused on junk food? Where to begin? So this was an extreme example of a situation where people were indeed programmed, or self-programmed, to have their lives be all about eating. To be blunt about it, it seemed like that was the case. Freedom, yes, but how are you going to exercise freedom when you can barely get out of the chair because you're carrying all that stuff with you wherever you go?

So that's a metaphor for the greater proportion of the human race by far when you bring up the subject of imagination. They're already somewhere else other than imagination, and they are committed, dedicated, devoted to being wherever that somewhere else is in their self-induced programming. They are committed and they want to stay there, but for some reason they're willing to sit and listen to somebody like me talk about other things. But are they really going to do anything about it? Is anything going to happen?

I find this is true in the political realm as well, which is really what I want to focus on here. I was going to say a few things about global warming until this other issue that I'm going to discuss today kind of took over. Global warming has now been redefined or rephrased as a "climate change," to avoid the subject of warming because statistics are showing that we are at a level plateau and have been for a while now as far as temperature on the planet goes. We have hundreds of scientists and journalists, literally, coming forward saying that the whole thing has been hoaxed and propped up on false data, that the attempt to actually measure temperature change has introduced figures and facts that are not true or under dispute, that the graphs and the computer models are all wrong. But yet the science is completely settled, says our president and everybody important in the administration.



So taxes through, business taxes for putting CO₂ into the air seem imminent if Obama is really going to move ahead with an executive order overriding Congress, and we have to check that out and see what happens here. He has initiated a kind of a study, or reports that are demanded from government businesses, government agencies, as to how they can reduce their carbon footprint and so forth and so on. This is sort of an opening salvo in the whole thing. It is indeed all based on a hoax. If you want to really get into the excruciating details, you can go to a website called “The Air Vent” and read back through the archives, going all the way back to at least the East Anglia revelations of hacked e-mails – if you remember, from that UK university – among global warming scientists and how they really talk when they’re off the record about their findings and how they want to suppress critics and people who deny manmade global warming. Anyway, that’s a resource that you could tap into: many, many articles and many, many comments from people who are conversant with aspects of this field of study.

Moving right along, we have something called genetically modified food. I’m sure you’re all aware of it. I’m going to try to bring up an article of mine here, under the file name of “Stop Whining,” that I just posted today. We have a proposition about an initiative in the state of Washington that, unless a miracle occurs, has gone down to failure, in attempt to make legal and mandatory the labeling of all foods sold in the state of Washington – or most food – as to whether or not it is genetically modified by Monsanto or Dow or Syngenta or any of the other ag-biotech companies. So, before that we had Prop 37 in California. It went down to defeat on the same issue – we want labeling for all food in the state as to whether it’s genetically modified – and the vote went against it in the state of Washington a couple weeks ago, and here we are.

“If you want to really get into the excruciating details, you can go to a website called “The Air Vent” and read back through the archives, going all the way back to at least the East Anglia revelations of hacked e-mails ... among global warming scientists and how they really talk when they’re off the record about their findings and how they want to suppress critics and people who deny manmade global warming.”



I have been extremely critical of these campaigns because I thought they were doomed to fail because of the message that they were putting out to people, above and beyond all other messages, which is you have a right to know what's in your food. It was a consumerist type message that was meant to get people to vote yes on these two propositions and therefore bring in mandatory GMO labeling. Because I've been highly critical, various activists have tried to take a few potshots at me and say that I was "disrupting the flow of events" that would certainly lead to the demise of Monsanto and the other biotech giants. If I would only just step back and let wiser heads prevail and let these campaigns move forward and so on and so forth. Whatever.

But really, in a way, what I was criticizing was the lack of imagination because the men who are bankrolling these labeling ballot initiatives are the CEOs of health food companies of one kind or another: Stonyfield Farms, Dr. Bronner's Magic Soaps, Mercola.com, Lundberg Farms; those kinds of companies. To me, they are suffering from a severe deficit of imagination as well as courage and other things. But I want to focus on the imagination part of this because I want to show you how something could be done. In an alternative universe, you look at the possibility of imagining this a completely different way, these campaigns, and what they might accomplish, because what they've tried has failed because the message is too bland.

In fact, in the state of Washington, Prop 522, the communications director, a woman named Elizabeth Larder, came out and said to the press, "You see, this campaign isn't about good GMOs or bad GMOs. It's just about the consumer's right to know what's in his food." Wow. So, in other words, you're telling people to vote for mandatory GMO labeling, but in the same breath you're sort of suggesting that – good GMO, bad GMO – that's not the issue at all. So then people could say, "Well, then why should I care? Why should I vote one way or another? If you keep beaming this message at me – the right to know what's in my food – but you say there is nothing in my food that I should be worried about, coming from Monsanto, am I really going to be motivated to vote the way you want me to vote?" The answer is no, not really.

But these men who bankroll these labeling initiatives are adamant that this is the strategy, this is what we have to do, and this is the message we have to leave with, and this is the only message. Yes, way down the lines, some of the



workers in these campaigns have tried to educate the public a little bit about the dangers of GMOs and so on, and Monsanto. But that takes a very far back seat to this primary call: “You have a right to know what’s in your food.” The imagination factor there is hovering close to zero. I’m sure they brought in PR people and experts, and maybe even infiltrators from Monsanto, who have cooked down and boiled down the message to this foolish sort of meme to spread failure, complete failure.

I have been asked, “Well, how would you run this campaign?” which is now a call to imagination – how would I do it? I would say, let’s go to the television ads because you have spent presumably about, \$6 million, \$7 million in each state, maybe more, to put on these ads that say you have the right to know what’s in your food, and vote yes on prop whatever – 37, 522. So let’s go to the ads and let’s re-imagine them, such as, “Hello, my name is so-and-so. I’m a researcher with a long track record. I study what’s in your food. I know that Monsanto, the company that puts genes in your food and sells a toxic herbicide called Roundup, which is also in your food, wants Prop 522 to fail. They don’t want you to know what’s in your food. I’m willing to debate Monsanto any time, anywhere. Their GMOs and their Roundup are toxic, unhealthy. Vote yes on 522 so you don’t have to eat Monsanto.”

This guy who is standing there in front of the television camera is not just some little sort of – No. You find a scientist, of which there are hundreds, if not thousands, who are qualified, who understand the toxic properties and unhealthy dangers of both the inserted Monsanto genes in the food crops and the Roundup toxic herbicide that turns out they need to be sprayed even more on these crops, when Monsanto claimed, “Oh, well, you’ll be using far less pesticide.” Not the case. Have this scientist the right kind of looking guy or woman, who’s standing there looking straight at the camera, no nonsense, commands a significant air of authority, is ready to go to war, and just tells it like it is.

You start putting that ad on television and you now have a real story, first of all, in the press. All kinds of things are going to happen. Plus, you’re going to wake up people who are on the fence or people who favor labeling but are too lazy to go to vote. Okay? So that’s the start of trying to re-imagine reality, in this case a political campaign that could change the future of the food supply and how we eat and what we eat and whether we are poisoned or not poisoned



in America. So it's not just a little thing that we're talking about or a little reality; we're talking about something big time here, major, which can be affected by imagination, directly affected in the form of these TV ads, because that's really the heart and soul of these political campaigns.

I'm scrolling down now in the article. I say here:

What's happening is this: huge numbers of Americans are being lulled to sleep by the labeling initiatives. "Yes, it's great. People can vote for labeling, and that'll solve the problem. It's wonderful. The system works. I'll vote when it comes my time. Meanwhile, I think I'll take a nap." That's the effect of these political campaigns. Nobody's really energized in the public, except the workers on the campaign, who are working themselves to the bone on no money, for no money, in some cases mortgaging their homes, losing their jobs, et cetera, et cetera, delivering a bum message that is not going to carry the day. It's a bad situation. It's a bad situation.

So then I write:

Let me run down the underlying factors here. Start with this: when things have been going against you for too long, when the bad guys – Monsanto – have overrun the field and taken it for their own, when they hold political and economic power, when they're the insiders, do you say, "We can't fight them directly and win. We can't go for the throat and publicize their crimes. We have to soft pedal it. We have to tread lightly. We have to coexist with them. It's too late to try to rip away all their victories and territory. We have to go through a different door." Is that what you say? Is that what you do?

Analogy: look, the government has taken away so many of our freedoms. We can't just demand all that freedom back. No, we have to start small and easy. We have to ask for the right to label ourselves free and win back the right to cross the street because it's too late. No. When it's too late, you go all the way. Now, you show everyone the crimes of the oppressor, for starters, up front, immediately. You're eating poison and we can prove it. Lead with that. Don't be shy. Don't tap dance. Reveal the threat.

Why do you think millions of young people took to the streets to protest the Vietnam War? The threat to themselves. They knew they could get drafted.



They knew they could get sent to the jungle to get their behinds shot off. Reveal the threat right up front, right away. Lead with that. You're eating poison. Don't hide behind "right to know what's in your food."

Now, some people might say, "Well, that's not really imagination what you're talking about here. That's just good politics." No. It's imagination if it's not already happening. If that's what you would like to see happening, if that's how you want to change reality and create a new reality in this country about the food that people eat and the food that people don't eat, you're going to re-imagine and create a new reality. People have all sorts of excuses for not doing that. "Well, we can't imagine, re-imagine reality and try to do it a different way because it's already happening this way." That's the most frequent complaint.

If it isn't voiced, it's sort of subconscious, which is, when you boil it down, "you see, this is the way things are. We can see that this is the way it is and this is where it's going, so what do you want us to do about it, because that's reality." Yes. That's reality because someone imagined it that way and created it that way, and now you're looking at it. You're looking at it and you're saying, "Well, that's what is. That's what exists. What do you want me to do about it?" You fail to understand that somebody imagined it and created it that way and put it into the world.

"That's reality because someone imagined it that way and created it that way, and now you're looking at it."

In my collection called *The Matrix Revealed*, I interview Ellis Medavoy, pseudonym for "propaganda master" for the various elites, who worked for years. He explains, not only in meticulous detail but also in ways that have never really been explained before. How propaganda is really done, the nuts and the bolts of it, how it's put together, how the pros really do it. In other words, how they invent and create and imagine reality for everybody else, how it really works, how it really operates day-to-day, how it's imagined and put into effect.

So anybody, we, can re-imagine reality quite differently, and we can put it out there. We can make it happen. You can make it happen, certainly, for yourself



because every individual is faced with what is. When they look around them at the world, when they look into their own minds, when they look into their own homes, their own situations, their own finances, and their own lives. There's a big fat "what is," what exists right there. "Well, this is what exists. What do you want me to do? Yes, I could try to change this somewhat, but really, I mean, no." Whatever exists on a political level, economic level, personal level, at some point prior to when you're looking at it, it was imagined somewhere by somebody and created as fact, and that person could very well be you when you're looking into your own mind and seeing what's there, seeing what you accept, seeing what you believe, seeing the way you view things.

So back to the political example here, all of these excuses you see for why what exists cannot be changed. "Oh, but you see our polls show voters want a softer message. Polls show and our experts tell us we have to go easy." What exists, right? Then I write: Have you been hiding under a rock? Have you missed seeing thousands of political campaign ads, the negative ads that actually work, in other words the attack ads?" In this case, they would be going after Monsanto. They'd be going after genetically modified food as dangerous, against Roundup, the pesticide, as dangerous. Yes. Re-imagining it.

Then you would get from some people an objection like this: "Oh, but that's so negative. That's so – oh, no. We can't do that. We don't want to go down that road into the –" Well, wait a minute, though. You mean there's something that says that when you've got a criminal corporation that's destroying lives, you can't "go negative" against them? Where does that come from? What propaganda of that nature was installed in the human psyche? If you want to look back at certain elements of the so-called New Age movement that started in America in the 1960s, you will find an enormous propaganda operation behind that, part of which was aimed precisely at this idea of 'never go negative.' "There's negative and there's positive, and you have to remain positive. Otherwise, something bad will happen to you. Lightning will come down from the heavens and strike you."

So now, suddenly, we have a rule about what you can imagine and what you can't imagine: "You can't imagine and then actually create something that is negative. No." If you've been aware these past 50 years, you have seen what a tremendous impact that piece of propaganda has had on massive numbers of



people who now believe that if you imagine something “negative,” that it will have a negative consequence upon you. Where did that come from?

That came from propagandists who want to pacify the population. Think of it this way: in a criminal proceeding against a murderer who has in fact murdered a number of people, would you say that the prosecution in that courtroom setting is “going negative”? Would you rather somehow just release this person because that’s a positive element? Or take a psychopath who is determined and dedicated to murdering people and put him in a sort of soft rehab setting where somehow his mind will be changed and he’s free to roam at will and so on and so forth? I don’t think so. I can tell you that I wouldn’t want to do that. No, not at all.

So imagining the negative is not really imagining the negative at all. The label “negative” has been put on it, but suppose we change that and said, “Would you like to imagine justice delivered?” “Oh, I think, yes. Definitely. Yes, sure.” Why not? Well, suppose that running certain kinds of ads that attack Monsanto could bring you much closer to justice delivered? “Oh, well, in that case, I might – yes, sure.” Just changing the phrase, the term, putting the brainwashing and the programming off to the side suddenly changes everything.

So I will scroll down here to the end, because I give another example of a political ad that should be run. Okay. Here it is. How about this? Images flashing by the on screen, or you’re looking at a authoritative spokesperson.

Monsanto. Remember Agent Orange, the poison sprayed all over Vietnam that caused widespread cancer? Monsanto made it. They’re the same people who say you don’t need to know they injected genes in your food. You don’t need to know that Roundup, their toxic herbicide, is in the food you eat every day. You don’t need to know. Do you buy that?

Hmm. Yes. That’s beginning to get it. That’s beginning to get it. Now, let’s track this down all the way – response, answer, response, answer.

“Oh, but, you see, we can’t run ads like that. We could get sued by Monsanto.” Really? Your First Amendment right, in a political campaign, is



trumped by Monsanto, a corporation? If so, let them bring a suit. Run an ad that says, “Monsanto is now suing us for false statements. Bring it on. We’re happy to go into court and prove that GMO food and Roundup have dangerous health effects on you, the people who eat their food. When’s the court date? We’ll be there with our experts. Vote yes on 522.” Imagination creates reality.

What’s that? Television stations wouldn’t let you run attack ads against Monsanto? Then sue the stations for abridgement of your First Amendment rights and run hundreds of ads on the Web, on sites that residents of the state of Washington look at. For example, an ad like this: “Guess what? We’re ‘Yes on 522’ and television stations in the state of Washington won’t run our ads. They’re scared of Monsanto. They’re shutting down our right to free speech. What are they hiding? These stations don’t want you to know there’s something bad and unhealthy in your food? They don’t want you to have the right to know what’s in your food?”

Re-imagine all this. Play out the consequences of what you’re re-imagining in your mind, and imagine the response for that. What do you have in the case that I just described there? I’ll tell you one thing you have: you have a national, blockbuster media story. “Television station shuts down political campaign’s First Amendment’s rights.” That’s like saying I can’t make a negative statement about Mitt Romney or Obama or Bill Clinton or George Bush. Really? It seems to me the history of political campaigns is making statements against other candidates. But because this is now a corporation called Monsanto that sells food seeds and pesticides and herbicides, I can’t say anything against them? You mean they’re on a higher level than any political candidate?

You see what I’m saying? The story begins to take off. If one of these campaigns like 522 or 37 – vote yes on GMO labeling – have any kind of PR people at your disposal, which you’re supposed to have because you’ve got about \$7 million or \$8 million on these campaigns, they’re going to make this kind of story take off even more. Wow. This is going to become a horror show for Monsanto and for television stations if they turn you down, if they turn down your ads. Now where do you think the sentiment is going to lie, the voter sentiment? “Man, these people on 522, Yes on 522, they can’t even



get their ads on television, and it's a major national media story. Wow. Vote yes on 522. You bet." Because No on 522 now represents all the nasty folks who want to abridge your First Amendment rights, want to limit your freedom of speech in a political campaign, which is against the law. Yes.

Re-imagining reality and creating a new reality in the world, that's what I'm talking about. But in order to do that, you have to be able to imagine, right? You can, if you are willing. My collection, *Exit From the Matrix*, has 50 or 100 imagination exercises that I've developed over a long period of time to increase the scope and power of your imagination so that reality takes on a completely different hue. Your capacity to change or invent new realities in the world for yourself, in your life, personal realities, political realities, economic – whatever realities you want to invent and put into the world – your ability is enhanced.

I give this as an example:

Polls in New Hampshire show that 90 percent of voters want GMO labeling. So last week a legislative committee voted against a GMO labeling bill and it recommended the full legislature kill it. Does that tell you something? The fix is in. It's in on so many levels. The self-appointed leaders in the Yes on Prop 37 and 522 labeling initiatives have been playing the wrong tune. They've been using a feather to knock over a giant.

When the odds are so stacked against you, it's a wake-up call. It's ultimately a wake-up call for your own imagination. If you ignore that call, then you accept the consequences of whatever the giant is doing, whatever the giant is imagining. See, the giant's coming down the street and he's imagining, "Okay, this is what I want. All right. This is how I want to put it into effect. Let me hire these guys over here to do it, and get endless amounts of money and put all this money into – oh, okay. Now, all right, guys; let's sit down. This is what I want. This is the reality that I'm imagining, and this is the way I want to put it into effect. Okay? So how long is it going to take you, six months, a year or

“Your capacity to change or invent new realities in the world for yourself, in your life, personal realities, political realities, economic – whatever realities you want to invent and put into the world – your ability is enhanced.”



two? All right. That's good. But don't fail me. Bring it in. Bring it in. That's what I want. That's the job."

So are you going to try to handle them with a feather? "Oh, we have to stay positive here. Yes. You have a right to know what's in your food." Well, thanks a lot. I have a right to know what's in my food. Great. Okay. So? So what? No. You start talking about the giant in the political campaign. That's how you imagine it. Maybe you show a campaign with a giant, and then you show the voter and show what happens in an animated version. When the voter gets bigger and bigger, the giant gets smaller and smaller. You know, there's just millions of ways to go here, and they're not all killer expensive that suck up all your money at once. Not at all.

This could have been done in California. This could have been done in the state of Washington. But it wasn't. It wasn't done at all. Why not? Well, from what I've been saying here, the answer should be quite obvious as to why not. Yes, there are other issues – courage. The people who are bankrolling these Yes propositions in favor of labeling, they own companies. They sell organic food. That's what they do. They're the people who are in charge of this whole effort to get GMO labeling, because they have the money.

So let's see – David Bronner, Dr. Bronner's Magic Soaps; Gary Hirshberg, Stonyfield Organic; Grant Lundberg, Lundberg Family Farms; Joe Mercola, Mercola.com; Joe Sandler, an attorney advisor to MoveOn.org and former counsel for the Democratic National Committee, who was significant advisor on Prop 37 in California. Yes, there are other things that we can say about why these men decided, in their wisdom, to carry only the message of "you have a right to know what's in your food" to the voting public. The situation could get sticky for them if they went after Monsanto. They might be afraid that their own companies could be affected and so on and so forth.

Sure, there are other issues there. No question about it. But what I've learned over the last 20, 25 years is that, when it comes to the question of 'do I use my imagination and then go on to create realities that I am imagining, create them for myself, in my life, or in the world', there's an endless number of rationalizations and excuses and explanations that people can come forward with as to why they shouldn't do that. I've gotten sick and tired of buying all



of these excuses, so I don't buy any of them anymore. Zero. No rationalizations because they're endless. If you knock one down, the person will come up with another one.

"Well, we couldn't – we can't imagine that. No. Oh, no. No, that would be bad if we imagined that. Oh, yes. Because this." Well, this doesn't really take you off the hook, because of that. "Okay, well, I can see your point there. Let me tell you something else as to why I can't imagine reality and then make it happen." The carpet of excuses rolls out forever, on and on. "Well, I don't even know what imagination is." Oh, really? Is that right?

You did when you were a child. You understood it very well. You lived through and by imagination. Everything you looked at you've provoked your own imagination to enhance it, to make it into something, to reach levels of thrill, adventure, excitement, energy, and ecstasy. Do you think that was just some sort of a cellular reaction? No. It was you with your unfettered imagination at work from dawn to dusk every day. Summer would come and it was all about imagination. Got out of school on the last day. I got the whole summer to imagine and create reality, essentially.

You could call it play. You could call it whatever you want to. Call it freedom, open space? Yes, sure. But without imagination, it would be a disaster. Nothing would happen. It would be all gray androids and robots wandering across the landscape, little androids looking at each other and going, "Mmm, ah, ew, oo." So you're already using your imagination all the time. Everybody is. The question is do you want to become more conscious of it; do you want to enhance the scope and the power of it to create reality? If so, what is it that you want? What is the reality you want?

So I just want to give you a couple more political excuses here because they're just fabulous. I mean, wow. Let's see. Well, here's something that I wrote:

To all those who have been working for the self-appointed leaders of the Yes on Prop 37 and 522 labeling initiatives, who have been laboring for months, for years, to get GMO labeling, and to those who may work for these leaders up the road. I say demand to meet with them, your own leaders. Refuse to work for them unless you get that meeting where everybody has to lay his cards on



the table. Demand to know why “you have a right to know what’s in your food” is the leading message and the only out front message. Make them explain themselves and don’t settle for easy answers. Make them explain why they won’t go after Monsanto with real power in these campaigns, why they won’t nail Monsanto to the wall.

Hey, that’s an idea. Why didn’t we think of that? Because you didn’t imagine it, that’s why. But here’s the excuse. “Oh, but you see we couldn’t do that. You want us to actually meet with the health food CEOs who are bankrolling the ballot initiatives and question them? Question their strategy? Raise serious doubts? Air it all out before we work for them? I’ve never heard of anything like that. That wouldn’t be nice.” So that excuse is a combination of “everything has to be nice all the time, everything has to be nice” and “I never heard of anything like that suggestion before.” Which is to say I’d have to imagine what you’re suggesting happening, and I don’t want to get into my imagination, so I say I’ve never heard of anything like that before.

How many times does that come up as an excuse? Person A says to person B, “Hey, how about this? Just picture this happening?” The other person says, “I’ve never heard of anything like that. I’ve never heard of anything like that. So, therefore, it couldn’t be possible because when I look at reality, what exists, I don’t hear anything like that, and now you’re suggesting we do this thing, and I’ve never heard of anything like that. So I’m going to reject it because I’ve never heard of anything like that before.” People use that excuse all the time, “I’ve never heard of anything like that, therefore, it couldn’t be a good idea.” Well, how about imagining it happening? Does that help? Maybe you can actually do it then.

Okay, so I’m looking for other excuses here. Let’s see. So here’s another one. This is an excuse for why the out-front, primary, number-one message in these labeling campaigns has to be “you have a right to know what’s in your food” and only that message. Okay? “Oh, but you see Americans are in such a deep hypnotic state these days, we have to go soft with our message. We can’t really get into the realities of the situation because voters won’t respond to that.” So what you’re saying is that Americans are in a deep hypnotic state, but you’re going to wake them up with just a little tap on the shoulder saying, “you have the right to know what’s in your food.” That’s going to really wake them up.



It doesn't work that way. It works just the opposite way. You have to imagine that you're taking a torpedo down into the depths of their subconscious core trance and blasting it in order to wake them up. The way to do that is to go after Monsanto directly. Yes. These are the corporate criminals who did A, B, C, D, and E. Now they want you to believe that what they're doing to your food is okay and doesn't need any oversight and you don't have to know about it. Are you really that crazy?

“You have to imagine that you're taking a torpedo down into the depths of their subconscious core trance and blasting it in order to wake them up.”

So I hope that I've given you a little bit of insight at least into how taking an actual series of events here, these GMO labeling campaigns, and re-imagining them in a different way begins to open up space and “Yes, wow. What is that –? Yes, if we imagine it this way, if we create it this way, if we do it this way from now on, we could really have a different effect. We could blow this thing wide open, in fact. We could have such a major media story here, that Monsanto would be forced to back down eventually – if we don't give up. They could be forced to admit that they have been trying to violate our First Amendment rights to free speech by saying that we can't criticize them in political ads because they're a corporation who sells food seeds and herbicide.”

Wouldn't you like to put an opposing political candidate in that kind of a painted-in corner? Wouldn't you like to have him try to defend himself? Wouldn't you like to have him say, “Okay. I tried to limit my opponents' First Amendment rights during this campaign, and I'm not going to do it anymore,” or “I am going to do it. I'm going to keep on doing it because he –” in this case Monsanto is saying this person “is falsely labeling our products that we sell.” Oh, I see. Well, it's part of a political campaign, and you've donated millions of dollars to the other side, so I think we can accuse you of whatever we want to accuse you of, as long as we believe it's legitimate and we're willing to show evidence for it.

How about a debate on the Web to four or five billion people? Bring your experts. We'll bring ours. We'll have a six-hour debate. If you want to take us to court, fine. We'll be there. If you want to sue us, great. We're looking



forward to it. It's a terrific idea. I think you should have done that a long time ago. By the way, we'll also counter sue you on several grounds, and then we'll really have a picnic. It'll really be a tremendous occasion that will energize all people across the world. Yes, does Monsanto really want that?

So in these campaigns, political campaigns that have tried to get mandatory GMO labeling, there has been a tremendous failure to think things through. But "think things through," you see, is just a sort of watered down phrase for imagination. It's not too late for these people. They could come to understand a great deal more, if they're willing to. We'll see. But I thought I would play that out for you to show you the alternative world, the alternative event.

People should be much more able to construct in their imagination an alternative to what is, an alternative to a particular event, a particular campaign, a particular reality, a particular life that they're leading, a particular future that they have planned on. People should be much more capable of constructing, building, imagining, creating, alternatives to these so that they can compare them to what they have. So that they can find greater fulfillment, success, satisfaction, reward, et cetera, et cetera, on every level on which you would want to define success, reward, fulfillment, and satisfaction. Imagining alternatives.

I only have a couple minutes left here, so there's certainly not enough time to do this, but part of my analysis of American history and where history has gone and where we are now in this country is exactly that, a result of imagining what would have happened if, at the very beginning, we took road B instead of road A. What might road B have looked like, and, therefore, what should we think about now? Because, yes, history has gone, history is in the past. But, even there, reviewing past realities, past events, past decisions and choices can be extraordinarily illuminating because you construct an alternative path leading to an alternative present, and you see how things would have turned out differently, much differently. Then, yes, you see what is necessary if you are the kind of person who wants to change the future of this country. You see what needs to be done in a way that you never would have seen it if you hadn't re-imagined the past.

I sincerely hope that you have been sparked by some of this today, and that you



take it to heart, take it to mind, take it to psyche, take it to soul. This is Jon Rappoport for The Solari Report. My website is <http://www.nomorefakenews.com>. 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.