



The Solari Report

February 2, 2017

The Emerging Multipolar World with The Saker





The Emerging Multipolar World with The Saker

February 9, 2017

C. Austin Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, it's a pleasure to welcome back to The Solari Report, The Saker, who is with us again in 2017 for the quarterly reports. The topic, as always, is The Emerging Multipolar World, and it was very prescient that he was available to do that last year because, sure enough, we are smack-dab in the emerging multipolar world.

It was the number- one variable in our scenarios for 2017, and thank heaven, The Saker has been educating us about it. So, Saker, welcome to The Solari Report, and Happy New Year!

The Saker: Thank you very much and happy New Year to you, too. It's great to be here.

C. Austin Fitts: We had a good call last year in October. You said there was a schism in the deep state. One faction wanted to preserve North America at the cost of the empire, and the other wanted to sacrifice North America for the empire. We are lucky. Thank God the 'preserve North America' faction won, but it was an excellent call on your part. I think more than anything, as well as my description of productivity last year, and it explained what happened in the election.



So with retrospect to you, do you agree it was a good call?

The Saker: It was a good call to say that the deep state was split and that the elites were split. I did not predict the victory of Trump – or the defeat of Hillary. You said, “Thank God,” and I agree with that.

If we had been with a Hillary presidency, by now, it would have been awful. There are no other words to put it.

C. Austin Fitts: Right. It truly would have.

I wanted to start by saying that this is the defeat of the neocons – not to say that they’re dead yet, but I was very curious what your take was on what happens to the neocons now.

The Saker: That is the big question because I had wrote an article before the election saying that the US was about to undergo the worst crisis in its history. I wrote that before the election, and that is what we see happening right now.

Clearly, the neocons are doubling down. To the extent that any of us had a small hope that they would gracefully get the message and leave, which is not happening. So what we see now in the United States is a call to revolution in the United States now with an attempt to overthrow Trump. I think that is exactly what is happening.

The real question is: Will they succeed in overthrowing him or not because they are not going to accept that?



C. Austin Fitts: Yes, these are people who don't go gracefully.

The Saker: No. I truly don't think they can. They've never been known for that. They always double down until they eventually get a backlash of humongous proportions against them, and that is what they are playing with now. I think we are entering a huge crisis, and I will not make a prediction about the outcome because I believe there are too many variables. There are too many unknowns; we simply don't know what is happening because it involves very powerful actors in the deep state.

As I said, I think the deep state is split, and it's impossible – for me at least – to have a sense of what part of the deep state backs the neocon and what part of the deep state supports Trump because Trump is getting backing. He didn't come out of anywhere. He's not just one man; that's not true either. He clearly has some very powerful backing.

So we see a struggle. It's paradoxical. It's very similar to the situation in Russia, except that I would say that about Russia fourteen or fifteen years ago. We saw a struggle to death within the elites with one man who might or might not, depending on his personality and capabilities, make a huge historical difference. We see that the real threat for Trump is internal, not external. It's more for the United States as a country, I would say. There is no external threat to the US in my opinion. whatsoever.

We see a struggle to the death. They lost Russia, and now they are losing the United States.



C. Austin Fitts: Let's talk about what I call 'the Russian meltdown', and then we will delve into the color revolution. What happened right after the election is a debate about Russia that was beyond silly. It was beyond fake news.

The Saker: It was.

C. Austin Fitts: If you are an American, it was a very humiliating experience to have the world see this. Let's go through it.

Immediately after the elections, the allegations were raised that Russia had hacked the DNC, had provided those emails to WikiLeaks, and this resulted in the Democrats losing the election – which obviously is totally absurd. However, let's go through that. What happened? Where did that come from?

The Saker: I think there is an expression, "To somebody with a hammer; everything looks like a nail." The neocons just went for their favorite option. They had two choices: They could blame it on the Palestinians or Hezbollah, or they could blame it on the Russians. The Russians were less not credible, so they blamed it on evil Putin who is behind everything.

I should tell you, by the way, that in Russia, people are really laughing about this. They say, "Oh, aren't we powerful? We even get to dominate the next President of the United States." Everybody knows it's not true, of course. Nobody inside Russia buys that – absolutely nobody.



I think what happened was, first of all, they had to obfuscate the fact that to the extent that WikiLeaks did catch the Democrats manipulating their own elections and all the ugly stuff that came out, they had to blame it on somebody. So they made it about Russian hacking versus the unveiling of the ugly operations of the DNC. Secondly, once they lost the election, yet again they would be blaming Russia for it.

Even the investigation said that the alleged hacking did not influence the vote count, but that gets lost in the fine print. So it's just, "Blame Russia," because – think about it this way – if you don't blame Putin and Russia, you're going to make the mea culpa and say, "I lost the election fair and square," and that is utterly unthinkable for them.

I noticed another thing that is characteristic. Like in the Brexit, they blamed the people, as well, which is very typical of these elites who came up with concepts like the 'basket of deplorables'. I think Brecht wrote the poem that said, "Since the government lost the confidence of the people, we have to dissolve the people." That's what happened here.

In Britain, the people who voted for the Brexit were all 'old people', and in the United States all those who voted for Trump were 'angry, white, racist, bigots', etc. So you smear the people who voted, and you blame an external actor. They're saying that all those white American racists are all in a conspiracy with Putin to cease power from the beautiful rainbow coalition of diversity in the United States, and it's evil. It's primitive, but that is what they are doing.



C. Austin Fitts: It's very interesting. If you look at what was in the DNC and the Podesta emails –they never were quite clear about whom, exactly, provided the Podesta emails – there are tremendous intimations and indications that there was more than a little pedophilia happening in and around the Clinton Foundation and the Democratic Party. In his Christmas speech, Putin referred twice to the fact that pedophilia was a very serious practice in the West. It was an example of the West's corruption.

The Saker: Right.

C. Austin Fitts: The relationship between those emails, that speech, and the brouhaha reaching a whole new level of absurdity was more than a coincidence to me.

The Saker: I should tell you that I never personally researched the veracity of all those rumors of pedophilia in the top elites, but I would mention that very reputable, credible people did an outstanding amount of research in Europe about that. It is well known that the European elites are all involved in this. The cover for the pedophilia networks is all over the place.

My first reaction is to say, “Yes, it's absolutely credible.” Secondly, I noticed they had to attack Trump as well – not coincidentally – on morals with that ridiculous invention about him being filmed with prostitutes in, what I believe, was St. Petersburg or Moscow when he made a trip to Russia.



C. Austin Fitts: Let me give you one data point. If you watched the stock market, they called the rise in the market after Trump won the 'Trump surge'. It didn't begin the day after the election; it began at the end of October when the FBI and the New York police department got clearance to access the Anthony Weiner laptop with the 650,000 emails for the Clinton Foundation investigation. That is when the market started rising.

It was Booz Allen Hamilton, who had been briefing him before the inauguration instead of the CIA. They started trading up the next day. The following day Goldman Sachs started trading up. In the first month after the election, 50% of the Dow increases after the election came from three stocks; the number one was Goldman Sachs.

Goldman Sachs had really been in the soup over the summer, and they came flying out. The last time that I looked, two weeks ago, it was up 72% since last summer.

I believe that the faction backing Trump, once they had their hands on that, made a deal, and that was when the Clinton folks stood down and the election was over.

The Saker: They folded, yes. Very interesting.

C. Austin Fitts: Whoever could have come out of the closet and rigged the vote for her didn't do it. So who knows what the shenanigans were going on behind the scenes? But when the market starts trading the victory a week ahead of time, something is up.



The Saker: Very interesting.

C. Austin Fitts: When Trump won the election, if you watched his announcement that he had won and Clinton had conceded, there was a back and forth between him and Giuliani and special thanks to NYPD. You got the feeling that it had taken them 15 years, but NYPD had finally gotten the Bushes and Clintons back for 9/11.

The Saker: Would you suggest that the Clintons are not involved and that the neocons are continuing to try to overthrow him without them, so he neutralized them, but there is another faction that is still at it?

C. Austin Fitts: Right. So after the election, we started watching this process of throwing mud on the wall. To most people, it looks ridiculous. But they're putting mud on the wall, and they're trying to create what I call a 'swarm'. They're trying to throw some mud on the wall that will catch on, and they can run with it.

What is interesting is that first they tried to play mud on the wall in the Electoral College, and it went absolutely nowhere. It ultimately didn't work.

It was amazing because I kept telling people a week coming to the Electoral College, "There is going to be no problem. Trump has it. It's a lock; don't worry about it."

People kept saying, "No, no. They're not going to vote for him."



The noise was very effective at misleading people. Sure enough, there was no problem. It was a lock, and everybody said, “How could it possibly be that we had that much noise and there was no problem?”

I said, “Look, I’m telling you that the media and all these folks are just flat-out liars. It’s a game.”

It was the same thing going into the inauguration, “Trump is going to be shot.” Again, it was just mud on the wall. The most embarrassing one is Rubio and McCain and Lindsey Graham. Of course, they looked like clowns; they looked ridiculous.

Traditionally when you throw that kind of mud on the wall and had the media behind you, you could get it going. People could make money on getting it going.

It’s not going, and people don’t believe it. Part of it is the credibility of the mainstream media has been cracked. The people understand now that there is at least some faction back there on the deep state who is prepared to deal with reality. That has encouraged them to ignore the media.

So that’s when the fake news thing went ballistic. Whoever it was, realized that this entire mechanism they created to invent reality isn’t working. Much of it is Hollywood plus the media. There are some other folks there, but they realized it’s not working. So what do they always do? They double down and double down. That is what they’re doing right now. It’s exactly what you said.



I went through eleven years of litigation with the Department of Justice, and they repeatedly tried to frame me, including falsifying evidence. I had to prove it wasn't true, it wasn't true, it wasn't true. We finally went to the last trial in 2004, and my attorneys had over-prepared and over-prepared and over-prepared. We walked in, and they had nothing. They had no evidence. It was all an empty hand, which I had tried to explain to the attorneys for eight years, but they didn't believe me.

My attorney turned to me on the first day, his face as white as a sheet, and he said, "They have nothing. It's a complete bluff. It has always been a bluff."

I said, "I told you!"

He said, "I didn't believe it."

That's why you need enough people in the American population to understand that these guys will double down for years on a bluff when they have nothing. However, we've figured that out, Saker. We've figured it out!

The Saker: Yes, but I have a major concern. That concern is I do not see an alternative presented – for the lack of a better word – for the Trump supporters.

These include many people who are Hillary opponents who have hopes but not expectations with Trump.



Practically speaking, the media is in lockstep against him, but there is no other media; there is no alternative. The best that you could name is *Russia Today*, out of Russia.

I don't see Trump being aggressive and going on the counter-attack. I see him so far handling the attack well. However, what I hope and pray for is a very active counter-attack. I don't think he can afford riding out that kind of campaign against them and just hoping that they will exhaust themselves. I really am concerned about that, and they are going to come up with more and more and more.

C. Austin Fitts: He attacked very hard on the fake news; they've been attacking back pretty aggressively from what I've seen.

The Saker: Nevertheless, it's not enough to call them 'fake news'. He needs something tangible. My idea was to have him start a TV channel to do an American version of *Russia Today* – an American TV channel that would be what the media ought to be in this country, which is truly diverse, including Trump opponents, but honest ones. There are legitimate Trump opponents, too. That is what I am not seeing. I'm not seeing him taking these measures.

The other thing that I think he should do is to start going legally after his opponents, which is what Putin did in Russia. He should start seriously going after them. You would know better than I, they are all involved with corruption, tax evasion, conspiracy to defraud the government, obstruction of justice, etc. The FBI should go after these people. He should make them feel that they are not safe. I don't get that feeling right now.



C. Austin Fitts: Right. He needs an Attorney General in place. He can't do that until he has the Attorney General in place. So I think once the Attorney General gets situated, that's when we are going to start to see what he does and does not do.

The Saker: That is what I hope.

C. Austin Fitts: One of my big questions is whether or not Obama gave the Clintons a secret immunity deal, and the immunity deal is there, and we just don't know about it.

The Saker: How would a secret immunity deal work?

C. Austin Fitts: It would give them a 'get out of jail free' card for any felony prior since the time he gave it, including the Foundation and Chelsea.

The Saker: If he did that, imagine the political costs. They would maybe walk, but anybody even remotely involved with the Clintons would have so much stain on them that it would still be a victory for Trump.

C. Austin Fitts: Yes, but if it happens, that would only happen in secret. The point of keeping it confidential is the stain.

The Saker: Right, but if they get indicted and get prosecuted, they can't invoke the immunity secretly and walk.



C. Austin Fitts: They would never be indicted. I'm assuming that anybody at the Department of Justice would be free to know. So there's no way that they're going to get indicted.

The Saker: And then it would be leaked.

C. Austin Fitts: Not necessarily. It could all be done behind seals.

The Saker: And you think they would not find somebody who would gently leak it to whoever needs to know about it?

C. Austin Fitts: I don't know. It's possible that it could stay behind a seal.

Let's talk about US-Russia's relations because there was no doubt in the confirmation hearings and in everything that has gone on – both before and after the inauguration – there is an effort by all of Washington, both media and Congress, to insist that the Trump folks be supportive of the neocon policy in Russia. And it's not working.

Where does it look like the Trump people are going vis-à-vis the Russian relations?

The Saker: I think it is too early to call this one. They probably don't quite know. There seems to be various people within the Trump cabinet who have different views on that. In Russia, there is a great deal of discussion right now about that – the Who's Who and, 'What can we expect?'



The consensus position is: Don't expect Trump to be pro-Russian; he is going to be pro-American, which is legitimate. It would be ridiculous to expect the US President to be pro-Russian.

Expect Trump to be infinitely better than Hillary. There is a 100% consensus on that. Then the hope is that he is going to be simply rational and pragmatic and not ideological.

The big concerns are: First of all, he floated one goofy idea. He said that he would consider lifting the sanctions against Russia in exchange for nuclear disarmament. I don't know who suggested that to him, but that is silly for many reasons. The first reason is that I am not at all convinced that Russia wants the sanctions to be lifted. There is a strong, strong lobby in Russia, who wants the sanctions to stay for as long as possible because they benefit the diversification of the Russian economy and entire major sections of the Russian economy – agriculture being one of them. Secondly, there is no way Russia is going to disarm nuclear weapons in the face of an overwhelming numerical superiority of the West in conventional weapons. Thirdly, that was a clumsy attempt. The Russians looked at it and went, “This is not happening.”

The other concern is that he might try to pull Russia into the US camp in exchange for Russia moving back from her alliance with China, and the contacts Russia has with Iran. If that is what he is going to do, that is not happening either for more complex reasons. If you want to discuss those, we can.



So there is a bit of skepticism, a large amount of hope, and a ‘wait and see’ attitude. It doesn’t matter what he says now actually. What is important is once we sit down and try to get a rational, pragmatic deal between the two countries, he is going to be a good partner to work with.

I would notice that there was one ironic thing happened this week that I took absolute delight in. The media did not notice it.

During the telephone conversation between Trump and Putin, some sources in the US announced that Mike Pence would be sitting in on the conversation.

Pence is viewed in Russia as a neocon agent. They are very, very suspicious of him. I tend to agree. I think Pence is probably Medvedev, the guy he has sitting next to him to balance his agenda.

The Russians very politely indicated that the participation of Pence was not included in the planned conversation and basically, turn him down. They say, “Let me speak to Trump,” which is a nice way of putting Pence back to a place, and to reinforce Trump’s position as the person who they are going to talk to. If that is what happens, it also shows a good understanding of the dynamics inside the Trump Administration.

C. Austin Fitts: Right. I think once Tillerson is in place and confirms, don’t you think that communications other than directly to Trump will go through Tillerson?



The Saker: I don't know. From what I hear Trump likes to do things himself.

C. Austin Fitts: Right.

The Saker: I don't know. It is going to be interesting to see the other guys. General Flynn, with whom Russians have had communications, thinks very highly of him. So there are at least three people – Tillerson, Flynn, and Trump – who I would love to see travel and meet with their counterparts in Russia. That would be the best way of handling it. That's certainly what I hope for, that they will sit down in a several-day meeting somewhere.

There are so many issues that can be settled rapidly. The other ones that are more complicated can be at least cleared of useless attachments and worked on directly. I still want to have high hopes that this will happen.

By the way, everyone in Russia is aware that the neocons are trying to sabotage Trump. All the things that could be perceived as hostile, including sending armored personnel carriers to Syria now, the expelling of the Russian diplomats, and all the sanctions. Everybody on the other side says, "We know exactly what is happening; they are trying to paralyze Trump." So that doesn't hurt them one bit. That has not worked.

I am more concerned about the neocons saying, "Well, that didn't work. Let's try to do something else. Let's try to put pressure on Russia over Iran and China."



That would actually be something that could block otherwise very needed negotiations between the two countries.

C. Austin Fitts: The last Administration was very pro-renewable energy, but the Trump group is very favorable to fossil fuels. That is the basis of numerous conversations between the US and Russia, particularly given the opportunities in the Arctic Circle and the fact that Tillerson understands that business well.

So fossil fuels are vital to the Americans and the Russians. It seems that they have plenty of meaty things to talk about, which is crucial to both parties' economics and the world economics.

The Saker: Yes. The neocon attempt to strangle Russia by bringing down the costs of oil obviously has failed. I think now that both countries have an interest in bringing the oil prices to something much more reasonable.

You mentioned the Arctic, which is a huge potential source of revenue for both countries. That is a fantastic opportunity for the United States because the United States has a lot of technologies that could be useful and much needed by the Russians. On the other hand, the Russians more or less own the Arctic regarding the global technological package required to explore that. The Americans are way behind.

So there is a natural symbiosis here that could happen. America provides certain key technologies to Russia and participates and becomes co-investors in Arctic exploration.



The Russians would love that because they've been working towards that already for several years.

If that's what Tillerson wants, he will get it. I have no doubt about it.

C. Austin Fitts: One of my favorite quotes of 2016 was Jack Ma saying, "When trade stops, wars start."

The way to prevent war and get peace is everybody gets so busy doing deals and building things together that they have too much going on to be bothered with war.

The Saker: Absolutely.

C. Austin Fitts: The neocons make money by destroying things. So what you have to do is create a momentum for, "Let's all go make money by building things."

The Saker: I completely agree. I think Russians will go out of their way to help Trump along that line and accommodate the US as much as possible, particularly on a line like this. Absolutely.

C. Austin Fitts: What does this mean for the Ukraine?

The Saker: Well, that is a fascinating issue. Actually, they have lost the neocon support, but there is also much inertia that is left over. There is going to be a very powerful lobby in the United States still trying to push for a continuation of anti-Russian policies in the Ukraine.



Then there is the German factor, and quite a few European elites who have lost are also dead-set on that.

I think in the long run, my hope is that pragmatism will prevail and the United States will put pressure on this. The solution for the Ukraine is pretty obvious, which is to keep it as a neutral non-alliance country as a bridge between East and West, but that also requires a number of steps.

Let me put it this way: The Ukraine has affected Europe. They had a slogan saying that the Ukraine is Europe, and they reverse that to say that Europe has become the Ukraine. In Europe, the anti-Russian rhetoric is almost as hysterical as it was in the Ukraine. To reverse that, the entire European security system has been dismantled by the move of NATO to the East and the deployment of the anti-ballistic missile system, and all those provocative maneuvers by NATO.

There is a large establishment in Europe, which has essentially become 'linked at the hip' – as you say in English – with the Ukrainian elites. They all have the same interests. Somehow Trump will have to deal with that inertia, and it's going to be very hard. There is not much Russia can do about it.

C. Austin Fitts: What do the French, German, and Netherlands elections do to that?

The Saker: A lot. In France, we are relatively confident that the Russophobic people in power right now are going to be replaced by some form of, if not pro-Russian, at least no anti-Russian or Russophobic regime. But the big one is Germany.



Germany is now the heavyweight, and also England. Even though they withdrew, they are still at it because of NATO, and because there are an establishment and an entire class whose political relevance depends on, by all means, trying to create a Cold War in Europe.

Let me put it this way: If you want a Europe that is at peace, which has a European-wide security arrangement, you don't need war in the Ukraine. If you want a Europe that 'prosper' on a Cold War, that has its relevance as the frontier against the Mongol hordes of the revanchist russkies on the East; you want the war in the Ukraine as much as possible.

The future of the Ukraine is also dependent on the struggle of the elites in Europe, and to some extent in the United States, as to which party will prevail. Right now in Europe, they are very much against Trump. They are totally in sync with the neocons.

C. Austin Fitts: So here is the problem, and let me say it another way. If you look at the stock market and the equity ownership of the G7 elites, they've built their equity ownership with more and more war, more and more military spending. It's not a job program; it's a stock market subsidy program.

Since World War II you've had this enemy and that enemy. There is always a search for the best enemy that money can buy. The reality is that the planet is now overwhelmed by debt, and the debt growth model is over. What they are trying to do is keep the game going by doubling down on the war rhetoric.



The problem is that the financial implications of keeping the war going are getting more and more expensive and harder to finance with the debt growth model.

You actually have a class of people who are financially dependent on something that is dying.

The Saker: Absolutely, and here is why I am cautious, but I am optimistic. Time is not on the side of the warmongers in Europe, and they know that – hence the panic. Russia can ride it out. The worst is behind Russia. The International Monetary Fund came out and said, “Russia beat the sanctions and survived the drop in oil prices. Politically Russia even came out stronger.”

The Ukraine is an absolute mess. There is a reason there is a resurgence as we record that today of combat activities along the line of contact in the Donbass. Time is absolutely against the Ukrainian elites and the Nazis in power there. That means that time is against the European elites who are backing them.

So, it’s entirely unsustainable. That’s why I’m hopeful that the realists in the West can, first of all, use a popular mood, which is against the previous elites. Secondly, they have a pragmatic financial, economic argument saying, “This is unsustainable; we can’t continue that. We need a deal.”

Indeed, at the end of the day, nobody can save the Ukraine except for Russia and the West acting together.



Right now we're still in the mode of who will get what part of the Ukraine, which is the wrong question to ask. The real question to ask is: Who will have to pay for that mess? There is no way that Russia can do that. Russia will never accept that burden. She has a small economy with Crimea. She is not going to rebuild the Ukraine. That is not happening.

So the Europeans and the Americans will have to sit down and start paying for the reconstruction, but they can't do that without security guarantees from Russia. What that means is that, at the end of the day, Russia and the West will sit down and will have to rebuild the country. I'm not saying it's going to happen in a year, but at the end, everybody knows that. Then what is going to happen?

So why prolong the agony? Doubling down the way they're doing it right now is completely counterproductive; it just raises the bill at the end, and that is all it does.

C. Austin Fitts: The lead story in *The Economist* this week is called *In Retreat* and it's about the fact that the multinationals' profits have been dropping steadily because of globalization, in fact, is not as economical. The local guys are becoming much more economical. The article doesn't get into it, but I'll get into it. A lot of globalization has been massively subsidized with sovereign government debt to build the centralization.

Whether it's the war machine or corporate globalization, you're facing running out of the subsidy that made it go. That's why I call it a productivity backlash.



The same thing is happening in Europe that is going on here.

When you're in Europe, and you talk to people about the European Union, the European Union with millions of more rules every year is destroying productivity – not just to the people, but to businesses, too.

The Saker: Right.

C. Austin Fitts: The world would like to be productive. I think the challenge for all of us is: How do we turn the Titanic back to something which is economically productive? Whether that means decentralizing or centralizing, what is important is that it is productive. The neocons and the war machine have wasted trillions.

At Davos, Jack Ma said, “The Americans have spent \$14 trillion over the last 30 years on war.”

The model has to change, and you have all these elites in Europe and the United States who are financially vested in the old model. They don't understand that screaming and yelling and playing these games won't put more money on the table.

The Saker: Here is the big hope: I think there might be big money in the United States who did understand that and who are backing Trump today. So we would have a very interesting dynamic where the old model is objectively unsustainable. The United States is the only country that has an independent policy because Europe is essentially a colony of the United States. All these elites have no policy whatsoever – neither good nor bad; they are just taking orders.



So it's somewhat natural that the reaction would come from the US and it would be an American leader who would take the lead. I like your expression 'Titanic turners' very much. So we're going to turn this thing around. That's what I hope is happening. The big money in the United States is pragmatically playing a positive role in building up a multipolar world with an entirely different kind of globalization and a completely different kind of international system; not because they are morally Mahatma Gandhi's, but they are pragmatically realizing that the other model – the neocon model – is simply unsustainable and unprofitable.

So being profitable and being moral would really be the same thing for once.

C. Austin Fitts: Right. That is one of the reasons I am so glad to see Tillerson come in.

Here is the interesting thing: I did a deep dive into the portfolios. If you take Mnuchin, Wilbur Ross, some of the Goldman stuff, and Tillerson, I researched the portfolios that they are personally responsible for as a board member or investor or whatever. The picture you see is the picture I've been looking at across the board, which is, when Obamacare happened, it wiped out the discretionary income of most middle-class and working-class families in a way that suddenly you had thousands of businesses who were competing for that discretionary income. Suddenly, Obamacare came and knocked it all out. It wreaked havoc with their valuations in their portfolio.



What they realized, just like all the guys in the casino business such as Trump and Wynn realized, is that if you destroy the middle class, our businesses are toast. What you're doing is wiping out our customers.

So all of these businesses go to a zero valuation. I think it's one of the reasons you see the group coming into the cabinet that is coming in. What they realize is that if this continues, and you destroy North America, you're talking about an equity wipeout that is very, very significant.

The Saker: My question in this regard is: I can't imagine – and I hope you have an answer for this – how they are going to go about replacing Obamacare with anything acceptable politically in the United States? I think it's a no-brainer. You do a single-payer system as in any other developed countries, and I'm not sure that there is a political consensus in the United States that is willing to live with that. So what else can they do?

C. Austin Fitts: Here is the problem: You have the general population, and then you have corporations, which make money from healthcare. Both right now, we are in a state that is completely unreasonable.

The Saker: Agreed.

C. Austin Fitts: So, for example, if you look at the general population, last summer I studied the 12 prior months' grocery sales. \$2 billion went for fruits and vegetables, and \$10 billion went for carbonated drinks.



What that tells me is that the general population is ultimately going to fail, although it's not the corporations making them buy the carbonated drinks.

You have a general population that is being unreasonable, and then look at the pharmaceuticals or everybody else, they are unreasonable. The reality is that all solutions require both fundamental changes on both the corporation and the general population's side. Right now, they want the government to fix it for them. The government can't fix it for them because the entire ecosystem is being entirely unreasonable and throw in TV and media and everything else with it.

I think the Republicans, when it comes to Obamacare, are struggling with the details now because you can't solve this problem. When you have something that is highly unproductive all around, you can't solve the problem by throwing more money at it.

We have been doing a food series, Saker, which is quite incredible. We had a guy who I think is the top butcher in the world whose name is Francois Vecchio. He is Swiss, but he lives in the United States now. He said, "Europeans pay twice as much for food as Americans, but then Europeans spend half as much on healthcare."

The Saker: That is definitely true.

C. Austin Fitts: So there you go. You can't re-engineer healthcare without re-engineering agriculture.



The Saker: Yet I see Trump passing what I would consider a ‘non-measure’. It’s a non-topic, this entire so-called Muslim ban, which is not a Muslim ban. It’s a temporary measure primarily based on Obama’s actions in the past to suspend the entry of a number of people. When I see the reaction to that, can you imagine the response to something, which would require painful compromises?

My fear is that they are going to paralyze Trump on everything. If they can get to such a level of hysteria where Chuck Schumer is sobbing and Madeline Albright volunteering to become Muslim, can you imagine what they will do if Trump tries to pass whatever form of sensible healthcare reform in this country? They’re going to trigger a full-scale civil war. That is the problem.

The big problem with Trump is that right now the anti-Trump forces are on the offensive, and he seems to be very, very passive in riding out the attack and just saying, “Not true. Fake news. Not true,” and that’s not sufficient. He needs to go on the offensive very, very hard. That’s how he is going to change the political dynamic in this country which, right now, makes any reform impossible.

He can’t do anything if the media and Congress are totally set against him. If tomorrow he says, “Two and two equal four,” they are going to say that he is a Putin agent and a nutcase. That is the problem.

C. Austin Fitts: We have the Congress and media who are vested in being as extreme as possible to protect their position. So let me give you an example.



Chuck Schumer whom, when the United States dropped military in to destroy Libya, steal their gold, take their oil, destroy the wealthiest country in Africa, and leave it completely decimated and non-reconstructed but in chaos, costing the lives of an American ambassador and soldier, didn't cry.

The Saker: No, he didn't.

C. Austin Fitts: He and his pals were too busy making money.

The Saker: Yes.

C. Austin Fitts: We need to talk about what the immigration topic is really about, but when Trump banned the 13,000 Syrian refugees if you look at the number; we are talking about tiny amounts.

The Saker: That is small. Absolutely.

C. Austin Fitts: So let's just pick the number of 10,000. One person pointed out the other day that the cost of bringing in 10,000 Syrian refugees this year, is the same amount of money you could settle 120,000 Syrian refugees in the Middle East. So when you think of the cruelty of doing 10,000 here, as opposed to taking that money and doing 120,000 closer to home and closer to their family, in a milieu that is more comfortable for them in the Middle East, that is evil. That is number one. Number two, it's evil to go and destroy their country, and Chuck Schumer had no problem with that. So Chuck Schumer is making money, and he and his pals are destroying countries, but suddenly he is crying big crocodile tears?



I think, when you look at the level of malevolence that it takes to do something like that, I'm hopeful that more and more people are going to start seeing it for what it is now. Here is the problem: If you watch the media and Congress, that network has entrainment technology that they can use on people. If you talk to a lot of people about the things that are causing the color revolution, there is a tremendous amount of entrainment being brought to bare.

We are talking about mind control technology on a massive scale. It's not just Congressmen or media lying; it's people using technology that does mind control.

The Saker: I am unaware that there is a real technology acting that way directly. I know that there is a system based on social psychology, and propaganda techniques that have been honed for years achieving that kind of result. But I'm open to seeing things otherwise. I simply don't know of it. As for myself, I've never seen the technology.

C. Austin Fitts: We did a Solari Report on entrainment technology, and I investigated it because it was used on me during the litigation. Then I started to notice it. I thought Enron was using it on Wall Street analysts, but I had a scientist brief me on it when doing a Solari Report interview in 2006 – which I will send to you. Right afterward I went to a conference where it was being used.



My personal experience was that I had a problem with clients who were having it used on them on phones and the Internet, and it was persuading them to make investments where they had 100% chance guaranteed of losing money. So it was being used to push financial fraud.

I went to him and said, “Will you please do a Solari Report because I have to get my clients to understand that this is real?”

It causes you to resonate with something that usually you wouldn't resonate with. You think it's going to be a great investment because you're resonating. They don't understand they could be tricked.

I struggled with it in the financial area. That's why I started to make such a big deal about it. Now that I have gone through that process and had him on The Solari Report, I'm running into it being used to sell consumer products.

I've done different studies on how it's used to create pornography addiction or gambling addiction. The economics of this subject concerning marketing a product is very powerful. So I will send you a copy of the report.

The Saker: I will read it with great interest and open mind, but I will say that if such a technology is available, imagine the multi-trillion dollar interests that would be affected by it to not have it happen or to denounce it or to use it to counter-use. I would see it as an extensive lobby who would be directly affected by it and who would either denounce it or prevent it.



You make it sound like it's used, but if it's effective, then why is there no reaction to that on anybody's part?

C. Austin Fitts: I don't know. It seems like nobody wants to talk about it. I think it was critical concerning the Arab Spring and these different 'soft revolutions' around the world.

For example, when you watched the Hong Kong leaders manage the strikes in Hong Kong, I think they were very aware that children were being influenced by this technology and didn't realize it, but they didn't feel free to talk about it. I think that there is plenty of understanding in the intelligence community that this exists.

Entrainment is what happens when somebody is watching their phone, and they actually walk off the cliff. They are in a state of electronic entrainment.

The Saker: I will be very interested in reading that information you send me.

C. Austin Fitts: Okay.

The Saker: There are technologies out there, whatever they are, to get widespread movement of people and to make people in masses and crowds act in a certain way. I would think it was more of a social psychology type of thing, but it doesn't matter. The results are the same. Yes, they are manipulating them for sure.



C. Austin Fitts: I agree with you a tremendous amount. Until Trump came along, I think many people were afraid to have an honest conversation about many different topics.

The Saker: Absolutely.

C. Austin Fitts: So when he started pulling it into the campaign, suddenly they felt free. It's been that freedom that has certainly caused a tremendous shift in the sinking in attitudes in many different places.

The Saker: I always think of the Soviet Union of the 1980's. It reminds me very much of that. Many people who knew the Soviet Union in the 1980's think the same way. People whisper their political ideas. It's so strange to see Americans whispering, "I actually voted for him, too, but don't tell anybody."

Even now I know people who tell me that, not only they but also their entire family voted for Trump, and they're afraid to admit it to anybody.

C. Austin Fitts: It was unusual because, before the election I drove out to California and back. Saker, it was unbelievable. There were so many people who have graduate degrees who are highly successful financially or professionally, and they were all voting for Trump. Everybody was voting for Trump. They would tell me, but they would say, "Please don't tell my wife. They don't know."

The Saker: Right.



C. Austin Fitts: It was incredible. So I went back, and I remember as soon as I got to Memphis I went to see a healthcare practitioner who is wonderful. They said, “What do you think about the election?”

I said, “If you listen to the media, Clinton is going to win, but I just drove to California and was in 20 different cities, and I talked to people from diverse backgrounds, and everybody is voting for Trump. They just won’t admit it. So I don’t think they’re telling the pollsters.”

The healthcare professional just looked at me like, “Poor dear. She’s crazy. She doesn’t know that Clinton’s got it in the bag.”

I said, “I think Trump might actually win here.”

It’s unusual because I haven’t seen them since, but it was inconceivable to them. It was like saying that there was no Atlantic Ocean.

The Saker: It’s definitely true. It’s ironic because it ends up being a discussion about values. I notice that a lot of the same people who tell me and my wife, “We voted for Trump,” in whispered voices also say, “We also like Putin very much. This guy stands for values like America.”

I think it’s true. Somewhere I see a lot of convergence. It’s fascinating to observe that the values of the general public of the people in Russia and in United States are very similar in many ways. I think that they have the same people against them, by the way.



So in the last conversation we had, do you remember we were talking about the lawful versus the unlawful or the elites versus the masses? We're seeing that struggle taking place before our eyes where people in Russia supporting Trump, who is an American nationalist.

I've talked to quite a few people who ask me, "What do you think of Putin?" because they're afraid that I'm going to criticize them. When I confess to the sin of being a Putin groupie, they say, "Me, too. I like this guy!"

It's amazing that we are living in times like this! It crosses the borders, and it almost becomes a class thing.

C. Austin Fitts: So the big question is, and I'll get right into it: Are we going to be a human society or an inhuman society?

The Saker: I completely agree with that 100%.

C. Austin Fitts: That is the question before us. What is so sad about the color revolution going on in the United States is that you have many people who think they're for human, and don't understand that they're being used to front for something which is horribly, horribly inhuman. They're watching Chuck Schumer cry his big crocodile tears and not thinking about how the money works when this was actually happening. So they are easily manipulated. I believe the entrainment is a part, but let's turn to your article.



You have a fantastic new article called *The Color Revolution*. Maybe you could talk a little about it and your concern that those tactics are now being turned on in the US in force.

The Saker: I absolutely see the same tactics used. First of all, you did delegitimize the President by saying, “Not my President.” It’s typical. It was like saying the majority does not elect Yanukovych. Then you cast a shadow on their patriotism. That is this entire deal about Trump being a Putin agent or Flynn being investigated by the three-letter agencies for his telephone calls with the Russian ambassador, which is something that any senior intelligence person would have normally been doing.

Then you see all sorts of special interest groups coming out. I would not characterize many of these groups as standing for human values; they stand for very narrow agendas. It can be people who stand for the feminists or the ecologists. You can have people who are defending hardcore liberal values like Michael Moore who promised 100 days of resistance. That very much smacks of the same kind of thing that has been happening in the Ukraine.

They are promising that they would resist every step of the way, which they are doing. They are trying to replace the ‘one person, one vote’ democracy by fundamentally mob rule in the streets. They say that the street by itself and having x many people in the street, is democratic legitimacy. They see it as a mandate from the fact that they’re protesting and burning tires or limousines in the streets.



I even observed that there was a Syrian girl who wrote a letter to Trump, asking him to help the children of Aleppo. Well, we all remember the Kuwaiti nurse who was whining about Iraqi soldiers throwing babies out of incubators who ended up being the daughter of the ambassador. We remember Neda in Iran who conveniently died on TV and became the face of the Iranian revolution.

They are trying to give that little girl's face to the Syrian opposition now. It's not working so far. They are failing every single time. Although I see them going through their toolkit of radically trying to overthrow Trump. I think that is exactly where they are headed. What concerns me is that Congress and the media seem to be backing that effort. That is one thing that, in most of these other countries, and in the Ukraine as well, is more split.

C. Austin Fitts: Every cycle we vote a group of people in to go to Washington who then goes in circles because the real problem is the ecosystem that corrupts. I'll use healthcare as an example. The general population doesn't want to change, and the big corporations – the pharmaceuticals – don't want to change. Behind all of the pharmaceutical and vaccine agenda, there are many lies. Nobody wants to face reality; we want to blame everybody in Congress for not figuring it out, and then fire them, and get a new bunch. The problem is not in Washington. The symptom is in Washington, but the problem is not just in Washington.

You have to look at the whole ecosystem and say, "Okay, we have an ecosystem which is entirely and utterly unproductive from the point of view of humanity or economics, and we're going to have to get it economic or it's not going to work."



This side is insisting that it must be human, and we have a few other people who are good at manipulating and insisting that it is going to be inhuman. If you look at some of the practices going on, they are utterly inhuman.

Unfortunately, I was watching a presentation last night on the business of organ trafficking. It was a rather gruesome discussion. One of my conclusions in watching Trump go ballistic about the murders in Chicago is that there is, what I would call a ‘rendition center’ that was done in Chicago, called Homeland Square where some very suspicious things are going on. I sat down and said, “With Obamacare having digitized the records for all these poor people who thought they were going to get insurance, instead what we have are these murders and organ harvesting.”

It’s a pretty gruesome thought, but the reason I ask is because if you look at the networks related to the immigration from the Middle East, there is some allegation that it is connected to an organ harvesting network. So my question on why Trump went early on shutting down immigration from those seven countries and doing it before he had all of his cabinet officers in place is: Is there a deeper story there?

The Saker: I don’t know about organ trafficking in the United States. I know that there were cases for sure in Kosovo and in Israel of people profiting from violence and murder of Palestinians in Israel and murdered Serbs in Kosovo that were used for organ trafficking. . I would not be surprised one bit of that happening in Chicago, of course.



However, I think the bigger story is much greater than that, and at the same time I think that Trump dared to do something. He actually sat down and made a decision. That by itself, for the neocons, is a declaration of war. They have to respond by making him unable to do anything.

I think it could have been something else besides this, but frankly, that's a non-measure because there is nothing much that is going to result. You said that the numbers were very small. I am a green card in the United States, so I'm not preaching for my own people. I come from a family of refugees, and I worked with refugees and interviewed refugees in Europe. I can tell you that what he did is mainstream to what any normal sovereign country has a right to do, and it's a non-issue.

The reaction tells me that they are going to block everything that Trump does – it doesn't matter what it is. The goal by itself is not to respond to any positive or negative rationale for the policy; it is actually to prevent Trump from being able to do anything and to break him down. That is my fear and my concern. I think that they are that narrow-minded.

C. Austin Fitts: So here is the issue: If they succeed you will end up taking over a machine that will never be able to achieve a unipolar world, which means that you head towards implosion.

The Saker: Correct, and we are right back to the Hillary issue because that implosion is possibly and even probably going to happen through an international war.



So, yes, we are back to Hillary or Obama, but only worse and further down the road. That is what is at stake. If they succeed, the entire planet will suffer from it severely.

C. Austin Fitts: If you implode the United States, you are going to implode globally.

The Saker: Yes.

C. Austin Fitts: If you implode globally, where exactly are they going to live?

The Saker: There is that old story about the scorpion and the frog who wants to cross the river. “That’s what they do.”

I don’t think they pursue that question that far. Your concern is for the welfare of mankind further down the road, but I don’t think that they think that way. I think they do what is in their nature, and their nature is to destroy, corrupt, and sit as parasites until they finally kill the host. Then they scramble to find another host. That is really how cynical I am about these people.

C. Austin Fitts: I worked with them when I was in Washington, and you are exactly right. They have always operated with a luxury of something very wealthy that they could host off of, or they could parasite.



It's peculiar. I did an article on the transition where I created four cartoon characters: Titanic turners, piggies, scaredy-cats, and the final one was the scorpion. I'll send it to you. The cartoon has the body of a scorpion and the face of Dick Cheney.

The Saker: Exactly.

C. Austin Fitts: I agree. It is the scorpion's inability to think ahead.

The Saker: Or even admit that he was wrong. When you are so self-enamored that you think you are in a self-elite of the best people of mankind, and you look down at everybody else; you're not going to accept you're the cause of the problem and by removing yourself will solve it; it is just not going to happen.

C. Austin Fitts: There are a few times when people get really irrational. One is when they are going to lose money, but even greater is when they're going to lose prestige and status. So if you've enjoyed privilege, and think that you've pulled yourself up by the bootstraps and made it all by yourself, but haven't because you've been the beneficiary of a rigged system and privilege, when you try to take that privilege away from people, they go crazy. They literally go crazy, and it's quite extraordinary to watch.

The last thing is when you have a control file and videos of them engaged in you-name-it, and then they really go crazy. I wrote an article about how I worked for a cabinet secretary who was being blackmailed by pedophilia during the Franklin cover-up, and you've never seen a more terrified person who was willing to do anything.



It's like they lose their minds.

Watching Rubio in the confirmation hearing with Tillerson, it was a similar kind of 'lose your mind'. I don't know if you saw the Congresswoman from L.A., Maxine Waters. She did an interview calling for impeachment, and it was, as though she truly lost her mind.

The Saker: I think they're freaking out. I think you're right. I think they're unquestionably freaking out because for the first time, they sense that they are truly in danger, and I think that they are in danger. I wouldn't put it past Trump and the people backing him to succeed actually. I'm concerned. I don't know if they can. I am very worried by certain things, but I think it is still a possibility. As long as the possibility is out there, they're going to be freaking out and doing everything – no matter how vile, immoral, or recklessly stupid – to achieve their goals.

C. Austin Fitts: Here is the thing about Trump and his team. If you look at the people he has brought in – and I think Pence did a very good job on the transition, by the way – they are clearly the A-list in the Republican conservative side, and they are deeply confident of what they do. These are extremely hard working, very experienced, very intelligent, very respected people, for the most part. They are also people who don't need a job. They're not looking for their next gig.

The Saker: Yes, but I tend to believe that people are not enough; what you need to have is people representing a constituency. Putin had a big advantage.



When he came to power, the security services were backing him – not completely. He had to clean house there also, but he did have that.

Who is really backing Trump? Conversely, let me put it this way: Do you think most of the Pentagon is behind Flynn and Mattis? I don't know. I hope they have that kind of constituency behind them. However, only individuals will not be enough, no matter how good they are.

C. Austin Fitts: Right. I think Mattis has a very significant constituency.

The Saker: Yes, but I have doubts about Mattis personally. I'm not that thrilled by him – by his record, by his personality, by his actual performance in Iraq. He and Pence are both giving me cold sweats. I'm much more comfortable with Tillerson and Flynn as people.

C. Austin Fitts: Tillerson is unmistakably very, very capable.

The Saker: Correct. He and Flynn, I am comfortable with. My question marks are Pence and Mattis. I am afraid that what might have happened is what happened in Russia, a compromise was deal made. "Trump gets to go, but he has to accept Pence next to him." That is what happened during the first conversation with Putin. They obviously didn't want to trust him to be alone on the phone. They tried to put Pence on the phone with him.



So is Pence playing the role of keeping Trump in check? Secondly, is Pence playing the role of the VP who can become President if something happens to Trump? These two things really keep me up at night.

C. Austin Fitts: Right. Well, it's clear to me that in the heartland – outside of the East Coast and the West Coast – if you study the Democrats in this election, you had Hollywood and the Silicon Valley on the West Coast, and you had Wall Street and Washington on the East Coast. All four of those power centers and businesses work with computers and invisible assets. They don't have to drill a well; they don't have to build a pipeline; they don't have to harvest a field.

In other words, the world that dealt with digital assets voted for Clinton. The world that deals with concrete assets ended up behind Trump. It was that simple. The people who deal with invisible assets think that running a global empire is really easy because they don't have to fight the wars, they don't have to grow the food, and they don't have to drill for the oil. So they are truly big on concept and really short on action and performance in the field.

If you saw who swung it for Trump, you had military and intelligence saying, “Look, we can't make this work operationally anymore. You guys are in la-la land.”

If you examined how Silicon Valley, Hollywood, Wall Street, and Washington were rigging it, they were getting people who get paid government subsidies, plus they were swinging at immigrants strategically so that they would hold the Electoral College.



That's what the sanctuary cities are.

So they were swinging in enough immigrants so that a very small group of people who deal with digital assets could control the country and the Electoral College. That is what Trump stopped.

I think that if you examine the Pentagon or the intelligence agencies and anybody in civil service who cares about winning, has to realize a group of people who only understand digital assets and don't understand what it's like to get something done concretely in the real world, you can't build a global empire with people like that. They are too clueless.

The Saker: That is true. That is correct, but you're suggesting that the goal is to build a global empire.

C. Austin Fitts: The question is...

The Saker: Is that a goal for them?

C. Austin Fitts: Let me go back. If you studied the last three Presidents, two were lawyers who couldn't price a deal, and one was a guy with a silver spoon in his mouth that couldn't price a deal either. The reality is that they were process people. Trump is a price guy.



I have friends who say that Obama was wonderful. I said, “No he’s not. He took \$27 trillion – which is many multiples of all of our retirement savings – and he gave it to the bank. Now we hear from pension funds that there is not enough money for our retirement. So, no, I don’t think he was so great.”

They’re saying, “But he is so elegant and graceful, and he is very stylish and kind to people.”

I said, “Stealing all of our retirement savings is not kind, because I come from Wall Street where price is everything. We’re going to have a money war, and if you steal my money, you’re not kind.”

The Saker: Exactly.

C. Austin Fitts: So Trump is very blunt. He can be a bully, but he is clear about price, and he is very, very respectful of people’s money and not stealing their money and not having the middle class destroyed.

So if you look at what he is doing with price, he is walking into the Federal bureaucracy, and saying, “Okay. Capital is no longer free. The central bank game is over. The debt growth model is over. Now we’re going to talk about money because it’s real. We can’t spend \$4 billion on Air Force One. And for you, the pharmaceuticals, the ride is over.”

He is talking price. You have an entire culture for the last 50 years, which has been nothing, but a process, and they have never mentioned a price.



The Saker: That is certainly true.

C. Austin Fitts: That, for them, is a cultural change that they can't make. They are too stuck in the process. They can't fathom because, in their world, they've lived their entire lives, Saker, where money wasn't real; it was free.

The Saker: The inevitable conclusion to what you're saying is that he has to fire them.

C. Austin Fitts: Yes.

The Saker: Agreed. I completely agree. That is what I hope to see.

C. Austin Fitts: The problem is that you have big US companies all over the world retreating into North America, and it's not going to work. They have two choices: They can do the Rape of Russia in the United States and piratize everything and keep going for another 10-20 years, or they can rebuild the economy legitimately.

So Tillerson is a 'rebuild the economy legitimately' guy; he is not a piratization guy.

The Saker: Yes.

C. Austin Fitts: The question is: Will Gary Cohen decide that this is the time in his life when he becomes a Titanic turner?



If he does, it is going to be very powerful. If he turns out to be another piggy who helps the scorpions make money, we have a big problem.

So they have two choices: They can play Rape of Russia, or they can rebuild. I think Trump sincerely wants to rebuild. He doesn't want to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. He knows that isn't the way to go, however, you need enough people.

The neocons don't understand. If you play piratization and do Rape of Russia here, then the whole globe could collapse.

The Saker: Oh definitely, however, Trump needs a power base from which to act and threaten this class of parasites that you've described. To me, it's clear to somebody behind him but who is a deep state, behind the scenes.

I hope you are right that the military stands behind Trump and Pence generally, but the third option is the American people. I think that if this continues Trump should look for a possibility of getting people in the streets. That is what happened in Russia during the attempt of the color revolution there – I think it was in 2012 – where there was, in fact, an anti-Maidan demonstration. A huge crowd came out to the streets of Moscow and sent a message that, “We're the majority; not the rioters.”

That is something that Trump might have to do eventually. He may have to say to the people, “I need your support in the streets.”



C. Austin Fitts: Here is what I think he is going to have to do, and I don't think Trump can do it. I believe that it's going to have to come from the intelligence agencies. I think they're going to have to take the Anthony Weiner laptop files, whether it's Pizzagate or organ harvesting or the money laundering or whatever, and both for Congress and for the media, I think they're going to have to dump an enormous amount of that material out.

The Saker: Right, and make an example.

C. Austin Fitts: The scorpions are going to have to be so humiliated publicly. If I were Trump, I wouldn't want to do it. What I would want to do is whatever I could to make the economy strong. But the reality is that you're going to have to use the equivalent of nuclear bombs on the neocons. The way to do that is with Pizzagate and all the others because the corruption is so over the top. Yet you're going to have to do it and I think you're right; they are scorpions and nothing else will work.

The Saker: I agree. I think the model that you're describing is making one big, loud example, telling everybody else, "If you continue opposing me, you're going to be the next one whose laptop is seized." So that could work. That is one possible strategy.

C. Austin Fitts: Trump can't do it from the White House. The intelligence agencies have to do it.



The Saker: Of course, but it's pretty clear who will okay that. Something of that political level is not just done by the agencies; it would have to be done by the Attorney General.

C. Austin Fitts: Actually, in America it is done by the agencies.

The Saker: Oh, I doubt it.

C. Austin Fitts: I hate to say it.

The Saker: You really think that they can do that?

C. Austin Fitts: Oh yes.

The Saker: On a political level that high? Maybe. You would know better than I.

C. Austin Fitts: The big issue going into the inauguration was when you saw the interview of Charlie Schumer when he said, "Look, you have to do what the intelligence agencies say. You can't buck them."

The Saker: I heard that.

C. Austin Fitts: Right. It was very interesting. I don't know if you saw Trump's first speech at the CIA.

The Saker: I did.



C. Austin Fitts: You saw the reference to columns?

The Saker: Yes, but as for the rest of the speech, do you think the CIA can be turned around to not be anti-Trump? That also worries me.

C. Austin Fitts: Here is what I think was happening. I think he was reaching out to the Langley-based civil service, which is not on the covert side. So you have an intelligence gathering, an intelligence analysis, and civil service at Langley, and those folks are not on board for destroying North America – let alone doing it in a way that destroys the planet when there is no place to go. So I believe you have too much brains and intelligence there who can be turned.

Now, you have a whole covert side. The problem with the covert side is it's implementing a model that is highly dependent on organized crime money, and that goes back to: How do you turn the model financially so that we can make more money on building instead of more money on bringing narcotics into US neighborhoods?

It's the same problem that Ben Carson is going to have at HUD. He can't change the model at HUD to make neighborhoods wonderful if you have other agencies, which are dependent, or the financial institutions are dependent on those neighborhoods failing. So you have to get the model discussion clear.

The Saker: I agree with you. Intelligence agencies are often linked to organized crime. But the beauty of that link is that you can use it to purge them by precisely saying that the connection is legitimate. So you have a lever to use against them.



C. Austin Fitts: I think if you see who is taking over – whether it’s people coming out of the casino industry or coming out of the intelligence communities – you have people who have been responsible for operations, including on the covert side, who are saying, “Wait a minute.”

Did you ever see the movie *Good Shepherd*?

The Saker: No.

C. Austin Fitts: I’m going to send you a video from *Good Shepherd* with Matt Damon playing a CIA guy. He’s talking to Joe Pesci, who is playing the mobster. The mobster says to the CIA guy, “You know, us Italians have our family, and the black folks have their music. These folks have this. What do you people have?”

The CIA guy is from a New England lofty family, and Matt Damon looks at him and says, “We have the United States of America. The rest of you are just visitors.”

The Saker: Yes.

C. Austin Fitts: So when Trump ran, I said, “Joe Pesci has finally had it and he’s putting up his own candidate.”

The Saker: Hopefully. I agree with that, yes.

C. Austin Fitts: I will send it to you.



You're listening to this conversation. What should everybody listening to this do? What would you recommend that they do over the next year to make sure that the Titanic turns and we don't end up overrun by piggies and scorpions?

The Saker: My first advice would be: Give Trump the benefit of the doubt – not in a naïve way, not in a trusting way that makes him into a god that he is not. But as long as he has not apparently betrayed his voters, and as long as he is fighting there, I would say to give him the benefit of the doubt. That is the first thing.

Secondly, I would say to support him, as long as he is worthy of the benefit of the doubt by action if needed. If it comes to a point where a demonstration or public action is necessary not to leave the monopoly to the neocons and the people who are manipulating, I would say to go out and support him in any way you can. Indicate that this is your President, and oppose those little-specialized interest groups and their attempt to overthrow the Presidency.

I think everything right now hinges on this: Will he stay in power? Will he deliver?

I think everybody owes him as much support as they can honestly give him, as long as he delivers on his promises.

C. Austin Fitts: Right. It's funny. I was listening to a CD where the nickname for him is the 'Trumpet'.



I think it's good to understand that the people financing what you are calling the 'color revolution' are very much scorpions and are extremely dangerous, and what they're pushing for is very inhuman.

The Saker: Yes. That is why if suddenly the President was listening to me, my advice to him would be, "Don't try to appease them; fight them. There is no appeasing that crowd."

What we're witnessing this year will be the year of the struggle of basically the inhumans against humanity. Honestly, I would put it that way. We all have to pitch into our limited ability. All of us can do something, however limited, to not be a bystander and not be passive and to do the right thing.

C. Austin Fitts: Right. I know that one person who fights for humanity at every turn is you. We have a section in the Annual Wrap Up, which I'm going to send to you a link. We do a great deal on food that you may find very interesting because, if the model has to change, then the food model has to change. That is an extremely profound change. We took a hard look at that in the Annual Wrap Up.

We have a section called 'Best Books for 2017'. People always ask me, "What are the best books that I need to read for understanding how to navigate this year?"

Your book, which is absolutely a delight, is one of the best books. Maybe you could take a minute and tell us about the book and how people can find it.



The Saker: The book is called *The Essential Saker*. You can get it easily from my website, which is www.TheSaker.is or you can get it on Amazon. It has a number of articles that I wrote on very different topics ranging from the very serious to the not-serious. It actually is a sampling of my writings.

C. Austin Fitts: I told you that I had my assistant print it before I realized how long it was. I had it on the den ottoman, and every day during lunch, I would come read about 20-30 pages and laugh my head off.

The Saker: That was part of the hope, too. I wanted to make people smile and look at things differently. Humor is paramount. One of the most beautiful ways of fighting against our self-appointed leaders is to disrespect them by laughing at them – laughing at their ideology, laughing at their values, and laughing at their attitude. Humor can be an extremely powerful weapon. It's a peaceful one, so I very much like to indulge in it and encourage it.

C. Austin Fitts: It's a very compelling book, and certainly is exceptionally entertaining to read. Between the laughter, you get some truly profound insights. I understood what a multipolar world would look like. It's similar to walking around and sensing what that world feels like. I recommend it to everybody. It's a great book to help you understand what's going on in this world.



Saker, before we close, do you have anything else that you would like to add? Tell us how we follow you on your website and what you think you're going to be writing about in the next couple of months.

The Saker: It's www.TheSaker.is. I have new things on it every day. Certainly, I would say with no modesty at all that world-class guest authors write the guest columns. Over the past month, the guest writers have been sizzling. I highly recommend it.

C. Austin Fitts: Yes. You've had some great things and we've been republishing much of it. I check in on your site all the time, and it is absolutely terrific. You're right. They are great people.

Well, it's always a delight. We are looking forward to talking with you the next quarter as well. When we did the scenarios – I'm a great believer in scenario planning – for the Annual Wrap Up, I said that the variability of what could happen is mind boggling because the whole financial market globally is trading off the US Federal budget. Now the US Federal budget could turn in many, many different ways – including, as we discussed, implosion. The variability is unbelievable.

We're all going to have to get out of predicting the future and get into inventing it because if it goes the wrong way, we're toast. If it goes the right way, things could be pretty wonderful.



The Saker: We should keep a strong optimism and willingness to fight hard.

C. Austin Fitts: Yes. Go humanity, go!

The Saker: It might get ugly, so we can't whine about having any options. Now we have options. We have hope. We should seize the moment and do everything that is in our power.

C. Austin Fitts: Absolutely. Saker, you have an excellent quarter.

The Saker: You, too. Thank you so much. It's always a pleasure, and it was a pleasure today again.

C. Austin Fitts: Goodbye.



MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

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.