



The Solari Report

January 11, 2018

Annual Wrapup Part II: News Trends & Stories With Joseph Farrell



Catherine Austin Fitts



Dr. Joseph P. Farrell



Annual Wrap Up Part II: News Trends & Stories With Joseph Farrell

January 11, 2018

C. Austin Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the Annual Wrap Up – News Trends & Stories. This is Part II with Dr. Joseph Farrell. I've had the opportunity to drive here so that we can be in person on this.

We had a great conversation on Part I, which was 'Economy & Financial Markets' and 'Geopolitics'. Today we are talking about 'Culture', 'Science, Space, & Technology', 'Go Local', 'Unanswered Questions', 'Inspiration', News Videos [0:32] and a few words on 2018.

Joseph, thank you so much for doing this.

Dr. Joseph Farrell: Thank you for having me back.

Fitts: We had a bit of a pre-interview last night, and then talked through Part I this morning. I have to tell you that I've had so many 'aha's'.

Farrell: Same here.



Fitts: I thought I was prepared, and I arrived understanding what happened in 2017, and then I talk to you and say, “How could I have missed that?”

Farrell: And vice-versa.

Fitts: One of the things we said was that 2017 was the ‘Year of Punching Back’, and that is the cost of punching back to the narrative. If they will spend \$66 billion to get control of Fox that shows you how valuable it is to control the narrative.

Farrell: And that shows you how desperate they are. They are very desperate.

Fitts: The first thing that we are going to discuss is, I believe, the most important thing. One of the reasons I think that this is the most important thing is because you taught me over the last five years, the role of culture and the importance of culture. It’s becoming even more and more important.

Farrell: It’s becoming more and more evident every day.

Fitts: Why don’t we start off by you introducing to us why you believe that culture is so important and something that we need to focus on?

Farrell: Culture is the subconscious matrix, as it were, that we base our daily lives on – our decisions and our expectations. Part of our cultural inheritance has been individual responsibility, the rule of law, and things of this sort. I’ll get back to this at a later point, but it’s also a specified intention.



When you break down that culture, you are no longer able to function; everything becomes upside-down, insane, and you don't have a presupposition that you can deal in trust with a stranger anymore if the culture is broken down.

It's extremely important. It's the bedrock on which the rule of law is based. The Founding Fathers of this country had a culture they were coming out of that was implied that they assumed would be there supporting their work on the Constitution and so on. You take that away, and all that you are left with is a document with no context. If the context in which you are making your decisions is gone or it is being deliberately destroyed or changed or turned upside down, everything falls apart.

This is why it is extremely important. I've stressed over and over again that we have three pillars of this Western culture, and they are all under assault. Every single one of them is under assault.

Fitts: Review the three again.

Farrell: I think that the three pillars are the Judaic roots with the idea of covenant, which is really 'contract' if you stop and think about it. Even if you look at the Old Testament covenant, what you have is in law, would be called an 'adhesion contract'. That's what it is. So you have the idea of contract where things are spelled out. Certain behaviors and expectations are spelled out, and certain rewards or profits are spelled out, and so on. So you have there the implicit idea of contract that becomes such a crucial component to our culture because you see the rise of corporate charters in the Middle Ages. You have these things very carefully spelled out, and these are contractual obligations.



Feudal society is a contractual society. So this is one of the bedrocks on which everything is based. Out of feudalism, ultimately emerges the modern nation-state – France and Great Britain being two of the leading examples.

The other pillar is, of course, Christianity. That crucial component is the idea incarnate logos – the idea that the universe has a super-intending reason. This is not a deistic reason that is off in the clouds in the abstract; it is actually mingled and entering into human history. As a result, one thing that happens is that human creativity is now given a divine purpose and sanctions. So you see this explosion also in this culture of the arts and the sciences and so on. That carries its own seed of critique, too. If you are asserting a proposition about universal reason, you are opening it up to the critique of reason.

So you also have a third component, in this culture, which you see, emerge in the Enlightenment and the Early Enlightenment. It's this idea of a humanistic ability and ultimately freedom to critique all of the presuppositions of society. The result of these three things mixed together has created Western civilization. The problem that we have seen, particularly in the 20th century, but even more particularly – I think – since 9/11 is that all three of these pillars are under assault in one fashion or another.

I believe this is the matrix of our culture. The result of destroying these things is what we have now. We have a group of people who basically think that they are free of any sort of cultural restraints and are acting above the law, and they are also acting above the implied expectations of the culture – and in many ways, they are acting counter to it. Everything breaks down.



Fitts: I always tell the story of my friend, John Edward Hurley, who was giving a speech about Southern culture. When challenged by a young man in the audience who said, “Why is this relevant to me?” He responded, “Young man, culture is the integration of the divine in everyday life.”

It’s basically bringing the divine down into habits and standards. I said to John Edward, “You forgot to mention that culture could be the integration of the demonic in everyday life.”

Farrell: That is true, too. There has been an interesting phenomenon in Western atheism in the last 10-20 years. It used to be the case that atheism opposed itself to all religion and treated them more or less univocally and equally. Now you see some people who are avowed atheists, but they are willing to say that you have to be able to distinguish between the good effects and bad effects of religion. In other words, they are coming up with an atheistic taxonomy, if you will, of which religions are more ‘acceptable’ to them. It’s interesting to see that in their ranking, Islam is right at the bottom of their list and they are putting Judaism or Christianity much higher on the list than a 19th century atheist would have done.

There has been this move back towards some sort of understanding that the culture doesn’t function well if you forget this hierarchy of values and virtues and things. I think they are right. I think that this has emerged largely in response to this assault that has been taking place on these three pillars. Our culture won’t survive, and it will be replaced by something much worse if we allow it to collapse.



That is why I think that it is so vitally important that every individual understands that this culture is under assault and that it is their responsibility to bear as much of it and pass as much of it down as they can to the degree that they are able.

Fitts: Part and parcel of doing it, is technically the Constitution is a law, but it is also a covenant. It is a covenant that holds together a commitment to a common culture – not a common culture in terms of if we are Jewish or African-American, but a culture that says, “We hold certain fundamental human and property rights as sacred.”

Farrell: Right, and those things are coming out of those three pillars.

Fitts: They are coming out of those three pillars, and it is fundamentally saying that each human is, in essence, sacred and our divine authority guarantees our freedom.

Frankly, what that does is cut the leg out from under the authority of government unless it has the mandate of the people. The government is not between the divine authority and us; the divine authority works in alignment with us. It puts government back in its place.

Farrell: That took a long time for this culture to get to that point, and it took a lot of blood and a lot of treasure, lest we forget. If you start assaulting it and tearing it away, I draw the analog to taking any text outside of the context of its historical development. We see the same thing with the Bible. You take the Bible out of the context of the historical development of the way that the church understood it through time, and you end up with a book that is incomprehensible and 22,000 denominations.



The same thing holds true with the Constitution. If you're taking away the cultural context in which it occurs, you end up with many different competing philosophies on how it should be read and applied, and that is the problem. We've seen this happen in the American judicial system with judicial activism and similar things where courts will actually overturn the clear, plain meaning of the law to serve some agenda that they think is a higher agenda. That agenda is, ultimately, not coming out of that culture matrix.

Fitts: My favorite line in court was when my attorney said, "But, your honor, you have to do that. 'That is the law,'" because we, not only had legislation, but we had a Supreme Court case on point recently. We were on the law and case law. Former General Counsel of the CIA, Judge Sporkin, said to my attorney, "Mr. McManus, I disagree with the law. If you have a problem with that, take it up with Congress."

But the point that you made in the 3rd Quarter Wrap Up that was so compelling was that you have people in leadership levels throughout society who believe in the Constitution. As long as it's the law, they are going to try to practice it. That makes an enormous difference.

You delete it as law, and they will no longer have that to undergird their commitment to the common culture.

Farrell: You take that away, and you can take away all of the case law and all of the precedents they have been built on. It's a large swipe at the 'functionability' of society in America. We could say the same thing of other countries with constitutions where you see the same process underway. It's everywhere.



Unless people wake up and realize that this culture is incredibly complex, incredibly intricate, and it's like a fine-tuned Swiss watch. If you get one little part that is not functioning properly or you think that you can build a Swiss watch without main springs and gears, then good luck telling time.

Fitts: One of the things that I wanted to discuss within the cultural context was that I think that we are seeing a very aggressive application of mind control technology – ever since the towers went down. The tower network locked into place in August 2001, right before 9/11. In fact, I had a subscriber who was a tower project manager email me mid-August and say, “We’ve all been laid off.”

They had been on a rush for years to build it with maniacal speed and great redundancy. It clearly had nothing to do with communication. Then he emailed me and said, “We’ve all been laid off. Whatever it is, it’s now done.”

I think he worked for America Tower Company, and, of course, the president of America Tower Company just joined the board of Lockheed Martin. That is not a good sign.

I think that with the cell tower network, with the smart meters, with the smart grid, and with smartphones we’ve seen a rollout of mind control, which has had an enormous impact – particularly because the vast majority of Americans don’t even know it exists.

Farrell: They don’t know that it exists, and many of them – if confronted with it – deny it. As we said in the first part, we also need to emphasize the fact that when you and I are talking about mind control -



we're not just talking about hard technologies like cell towers and electromagnetic influence and so on. We are also talking about a constant bombardment of techniques of manipulation. We can boil those down to familiar things like advertising and marketing campaigns. We've seen some very sophisticated marketing campaigns emerge in the last couple of years to control the alternative; independent research community.

We're talking about soft techniques of manipulation like neurolinguistic programming. If people are not familiar with that, acquire some of the videos of Derren Brown in Great Britain when he had a show. Watch some of those because they are truly frightening.

He actually manages to program a guy to think that he had committed murder without hypnotism or anything else. It was totally through neurolinguistic programming techniques. It is an important video to watch.

We're also talking about the way that art influences mind and emotion and movement that have been pushed by the power elites and the financial elites to 'uglify' the arts and dehumanize the arts. Modern Art, I would qualify as Jackson Pollock and all of that nonsense – and similarly in music and similarly in literature.

Fitts: You've made this point many times before. Part of that is teaching people to think in one or a few tracks so that they cannot cope with complexity.



Farrell: They can't. Part of the insanity in the culture now is that so many people have become accustomed to thinking one-dimensionally and simplistically, and now they are being bombarded with this massive complexity of information that seems unrelated. This is the other part of the problem: They are no longer able to connect the dots.

Fitts: Part of that is, if you look at what connects dots, you have to understand how financial flows work. I would return to Hamilton, and we were doing very high-level portfolio strategy off the entire US budget. A group of us who were used to doing portfolio strategy would get in a meeting and we would start talking about, "This happened on the NASA budget. That means that this is going to happen at HUD."

The ones who didn't know portfolio strategy would get very upset and start screaming, "Those two things have nothing to do with it!" because they didn't understand how the cash flows worked. They didn't understand the cash and credit.

Farrell: It's not only necessary to look at the financial flows, but what you are doing is also cross-connecting those dots with political dots, cultural dots, geopolitical dots, and so on. People are not trained or educated anymore to think in that fashion.

Fitts: They have been trained to focus on their pond, not the ocean.

Farrell: Exactly. It's a one-dimensional mentality that has been inculcated with people. That is why we see the fear porn being so successful. Now it's 'hope porn', as you labeled it.

The only way that this is successful is with a one-dimensional audience.



Fitts: What it does is plays ‘connect the dots’ in a way, which tells a narrative that is not true, whether it’s fear porn, or hope porn.

We mentioned it briefly. There has been this great unraveling of disinformation on 4Chan, called the QAnon It’s hope porn. They are re-engineering the leadership from 2.0 to 3.0, and the factions are fighting. It has you believing that you can sit back in the peanut gallery, and the white hats are going to come and clean it all up, and it is all going to be fine. It’s hope porn.

Farrell: The other thing about that technique of manipulation is that a key factor to discern whether or not you are dealing with that is to ask: Does the person or persons promoting it acknowledge that what they are putting out there is a hypothesis or a structure or a speculation or an interpretation of things, or are they simply presenting it as cold-heart fact? If you don’t find the acknowledgement – which you don’t find in the cube material; you find that this is only, “Take this scenario interpretation or leave it.” It’s like the Warren Report.

A key factor is to restore the idea that if you are culturally aware, then you will be aware of the fact that I’m putting out an interpretation, and you tell people that this is an interpretation. “This is an argued case. It may be wrong,” and that cues people to be on guard and think for themselves. Hope and fear porn don’t do that. They don’t allow you to think for yourself; they present it as a picture, and you take it or leave it.

This cultural phenomenon is across the board, and the surest way to fight the soft forms of mind manipulation are to maintain critical evaluation of things and dig deeply. Watch for buzzwords and cues and advocacy of a particular action or inaction in the face of information.



That is a key technique of mind manipulation. You encounter it all the time. Once you learn to look at it and spot it for what it is, you will be amazed at how much of it you see.

Fitts: One of the things that I've been amazed at is the success of the Divide & Conquer efforts. I think that the hardest thing that I've had to do all year – and I've done much of it – is saying to subscribers and clients, “You're among 5-10% of the population which is prepared to deal with managing having to navigate a world where somebody is trying to mind control you. You're willing to look at reality.”

The hard thing about looking at reality is that, first you have to go through the grief of how ugly some of it is. I said this once before, and I will say it again – and forgive me for being graphic. I generally have been absolutely fearless about looking at reality because that is how I was brought up and that is how I was trained. If you look at who trained me – even at a very young age – if they didn't run the planet, they ran the United States. So, you were always hanging out with people who look at the world as it really is, top-down.

It's not that you are cold-blooded or ruthless, but you are used to looking at things as they are. It wasn't until I was spat at by the establishment that I got the ability to look at it from everyone else's point of view.

“Just to do what I do, I look at some very gruesome stuff. I always have, and that is my training”.



This year when Northern California happened, I realized that you had the equivalent of a very aggressive Phoenix Program in the United States of America. This happened faster than I ever dreamed it would happen. I knew that it could happen, but I thought that we were talking about 2022 or 2024. I never dreamed that it would be this quick this year.

If you look at the practical implications, for my disaster recovery plan I have two safes that are adequate up to 1,400 degrees. What this means is that they are toast. In a fire, I have 10-15 minutes to get out of the house. Now I have one minute to grasp what was happening.

You're talking about a radical change in not just practical things, but the implications to the people that I feel responsible to help and take care of is extraordinary because it means that everybody in America has to be prepared to deal with this.

I kept getting emails and taking in information after the first week. It started on Friday, October 13th – interestingly enough. That is when the Templars were rounded up. So the following Saturday, after seven days of this outpouring of information from people in California to me, I awoke on Saturday morning. I started to read some of the roughest information that I read so far, and I walked into the bathroom, and did something that I've never done in my life: I vomited. It was the first time I've ever done that.

The number one reason was because the majority of people in Northern California – from what I could tell – could not face what was really happening. So you have this horrible situation where you have thermal warfare on hundreds of thousands of acres.



People are burned out of their homes. There are deaths, physical harm, and maybe 5-10% of them can face what is really happening. The other 90% can't even fathom it.

I've had to say to people all year long, including in Northern California, that you are among the 5-10% who can fathom it and are willing to deal with it. What you need to understand is that there is a tear in your networks, in your family, in your friends. A large portion of the population is going to move in one direction, and you are going to move into another direction, and you have to let them go. You have to stop trying to persuade them of anything. You have to stop trying to get them to take your pathway. You're on a different path; let it go.

Farrell: That is very difficult for people because we're used to persuasion. My approach has always been, "I'm not here to argue with anybody. I have my views. I have my principles. If I sense that you want to learn more about them and are sincere in that, then I will talk."

Fitts: If I can be useful or be of help, I will.

Farrell: If I can flush things out for people who are genuine about it, I will, but I'm not here to argue with anybody. That wastes my time. Most people in today's culture who want to argue don't really even have an understanding of when they've lost an argument. So I don't bother with them.

We have to adopt that attitude. We are not evangelists; we are putting information out, and what people do with it is up to them. How much they want to believe or accept is up to them.



Personally, I've never been anything less than cynical about the people running the government. I was a child, and I saw the whole JFK thing happen. That woke me up at a very young age and made me very skeptical of the official explanations of anything since then.

In a certain sense, that was good to have witnessed. It was like watching this endless stream of implications and consequences of that action with anything that followed after it – Vietnam, Watergate, and all of it.

We talked in Part I about this entire thing from JFK to 9/11 being one big arc of American history, and there is even a Frenchman who wrote a book called *JFK to 9/11: 50 Years of Deep State*. It's clear to everybody else – if not us here.

There is a cultural divide occurring, and it's going to be between those who get along to go along, on the one hand, and are going to be sucked into something very inhuman if they are not careful, and those who see what is coming and don't want that and are trying to push back. There has been some pushback.

Fitts: I've had to say to many people this year who are talking about friends or colleagues who can't face things, "Look, those people are not going to make it, and you have to let them go. They don't want to make it. You have to let them go."

I think that is very, very hard, particularly if you are committed to a human culture. It's hard to let go of people you care about.



Farrell: It is. We have to have the philosophical approach that they may not wake up now, and they may not wake up on our time schedule, but they may wake up at a later point.

Fitts: So, leave the door open for them to come back.

One thing that I've noticed tremendously – and we talked about it before – is how different the cultural wars are. The cultural wars are fierce in Europe, and here as well. They are very different because Europe is really struggling with alien immigrants who have exceptionally different cultures and education and languages, whereas our immigration is much more compatible with our culture.

Farrell: There is a certain argument to be made that Europe is being deliberately murdered. I can see that happening. I can also see that this is a very carefully designed operation to create a culture around the European Union, which completely lacks one. I can see both scenarios. They are both contradictory to each other to a certain degree and I can see both things happening.

In Europe's case, their infrastructure is so much better than ours. We are a Second World country – if that – in certain places. Europe, on the other hand, has an infrastructure that has always been kept up well. They take care of their roads, they take care of their railroads, their airports, and everything is always kept up. Here things have been allowed to deteriorate to a great degree.



That is one thing that is going to impact their culture war. Barely literate barbarians – and I’m going to use that term very advisedly – from Africa are not going to be able to come into Europe and function at the top tiers of society; it is a very different case there.

Here we are confronted largely with people who are coming out of the same sort of cultural matrix, to a large extent, that the rest of us have come out of – European, Christian, humanistic, and so on. They are much more amenable to the culture.

It’s different here. Our problem is going to be making this transition to 3.0 and keeping it human and keeping the pillars of the culture going. Otherwise it’s going to turn into something monstrous and inhuman.

People are gradually waking up – even if it’s only to the extent that they realize that there is insanity abroad and what is causing it. They are starting to ask the question, “Why is everything so crazy?” That, to a certain extent, is already waking up – just to be able to ask the question.

I see more and more people like that all the time. The real problem is when you say, “Do you really want to know? Do you really want to learn? Because you’re going to have to do some reading. You’re going to want to have to do some research. You may not buy my explanation, but there are other explanations out there that are worthy of consideration.” That is when the rubber meets the road, and most people aren’t willing to do the work.

Fitts: Although some are and I’m always amazed. I will see people join Solari and literally, vacuum clean the entire archives. It’s unbelievable.



Farrell: I've seen more of that on my site lately, too.

Fitts: They really want to know. I think that all of us are grappling with, whether in Europe or here, how you manage the Divide & Conquer.

For example, we are seeing a lot of the Divide & Conquer play out with all of the classical kind of things, and it's clearly very mind-controlled.

Farrell: And it's almost pointless.

Fitts: It's hard to get people out of the discussion.

Farrell: The elites in this country have been able to survive by making this all about politics, all about Republicans versus Democrats, and it isn't. It's about culture. It's not about blacks versus whites. It's not about old versus young or males versus females. In fact, if you are thinking in those terms, you are already conceding the culture game because this culture is really founded on individuals; it's founded on persons. That is how we need to start dealing and challenging our own habits of thought about dealing with these things.

What they are doing is essentially Balkanizing the entire country into groups and collectives. Any time I see that happening, I cringe because it's yielding to the way they manipulate people and it's weaponizing.

Fitts: We are weaponizing people.

Farrell: We are weaponizing groups of people, and that is the problem.



Fitts: I wanted to talk about morphogenic fields. What I'm seeing and hearing in my discussion of the Bitcoin op and my discussion of letting the other 90% go, is that as change accelerates, people are having their morphogenic fields torn up and torn under. Especially when they don't know that there is such a thing as a morphogenic field or how it works and how they depend on it.

One, they don't see that they have a thing called a field and it's being destroyed. Secondly, they don't see how to nourish it and rebuild it.

Farrell: That is interesting because in the vidchat that we had, I had one member in Australia ask a question. His question was, "Do you see the possibility that local currencies would embody a kind of local field?"

My response was, "Yes."

Fitts: That is why there has been so much effort to stop global currencies. It's very integrated and encompassing with place-based optimization.

Farrell: Yes, and that complete idea of a cultural field of information – if I can use that term – is very, very much a part of what is under attack. So how do you combat it? I get this question over and over again. People roll their eyes when I say, "Pray, but be very specific in what you say. That is your intention."

Let me give you an example. In classical Christian theology, classical Christianity is two things: 1) It is liturgical, and 2) it is sacramental.



What that means is that those rituals – the texts of the rituals themselves – are emerging from a field of agreed-upon intention so that it actually is part of the historical teachings of the church. In order for a sacrament to be efficacious and valid, it must be performed with the intentions of the church. How do you measure the intentions of the church? By agreeing or giving assent to the liturgical text as it reads. It's a spelled-out intention.

When you take the same thing and apply it secularly, what do you get? You get William Tiller. I know that you have talked about his work on your site. What did he do? He wrote out a specific intention to raise or lower the pH field and chemical reactions. He had a group of people agree on this intention and then tested to see whether or not that information field would imprint itself on objects in that field of intention.

In other words, there was no direct physical or material contact with the actual chemicals; it was merely thinking about it and agreeing on the intention.

If you transfer that idea to money, what do you have? If you look at it, money is a psychometric object. It has a specified intention on every bill of currency in circulation in this country. This note is legal tender for all debts public and private.

If you look at that intention, research that statement over several decades. That statement has changed. In other words, that intentionality has changed. The field around that psychometric object has changed.



So, if you or your family or your friends or whatever are looking at a phenomenon in society that you strongly disagree with or strongly support, specify that intention and speak it. Literally, speak it into existence. Don't think it; speak it. It works, it really does work.

This is not magic. There is an increasing body of evidence. I've mentioned William Tiller, but there is an increasing body of evidence of people who have investigated these types of psychic phenomena over the past few decades, and over and over again this idea of specificity keeps coming back as one of the key components for being able to impact the field of information.

Let me make one final point, and that is it is the specificity that, in turn, is part of what I mean when I say 'own the culture' because if you look back at all of the great accomplishments of this culture, it didn't come from vague wishful thinking; it came from specific intentionality to specific things. This is extremely important.

Fitts: Right, and it speaks to how important it is as to how you use your time and who and what you let into your mind and your presence.

Farrell: That, too. Once you specify your intention, it also becomes a template by which you are discerning the character of people or the character of a location or the character of a business or what have you. Once you specify what it is that you want to see in your life or the life of those that you care for, it becomes a way of measuring who is going to fit into that. It almost becomes subconscious; it's a habit.



Fitts: I have found myself having serious and very stern conversations with a variety of people this year about hope porn and fear porn. Someone will come to me and say, “Could you please read or watch this hope porn or fear porn,” because the news is explosive. I struggle with not having enough time to read in-depth everything that I want to read. What I say to them is, “I don’t have enough time to read reliable sources. That means that I need 100% of my time for reliable sources. I don’t have time for hope porn and fear porn. So, I don’t have time to sift through crap when I’m trying to sift through gold nuggets.”

What is interesting is, if you look at the momentum that develops by sticking just with the reliable things, at any given moment it’s far less entertaining, but it compounds because it’s good and all good. I said to one subscriber, “I feel like every week all you want to do is drag in another dead rat.”

I’ve never owned a cat, but a friend who has a cat tells me that they are always dragging a dead animal in. It’s like, “Get it out of here.”

Farrell: I know exactly what you’re talking about because I go through this, too, with people. On very rare occasions I will watch a video that someone sends me, but my response is always, “Don’t send me videos. I can scan a document in a few seconds, and with a video I have to sit and waste time and pay attention. It’s a drain on my time, and I just don’t have the time for it. I don’t have the energy for it.”

The other thing that it intentionality does is, once you specify intention, what you are doing – if I can put it in very crude physics terms –



is creating what mathematicians would call ‘a basin of attraction’. You are creating a certain ‘intellectual shape’ in the field, and that very shape is going to attract the corresponding shape into it.

You’re creating a hollow space that you want to attract a certain kind of information into. I know you’ve encountered this phenomenon. Anybody who has done serious research knows about this phenomenon because this information just seems to start coming to you. People need to start doing this.

Fitts: One of the books that we had in ‘Books for 2017’ – and I will probably continue it in 2018 – is *The Field* by Lynne McTaggart. It’s an overview of all of the research in this area. It was written quite a while ago. I think it’s about ten years old, but it is still a very good introduction for people who don’t know of this.

Farrell: Dean Radin has written books about this and I have Lynne McTaggart’s book. Jeffrey Mishlove has written about this. There are many people who have been doing serious scientific research.

Fitts: Here is what really made me focus on this. I read Sheldrake and was very intrigued. Then when I started to do the simulations using place-based data, and once we were able to map out financial ecosystems by place and play with it, what I discovered is that the theory of markets that I learned at Wharton Business School did not explain what I was seeing. It was Rupert Sheldrake and morphogenic fields that explained exactly what I was seeing: People optimized within certain sets of knowledge. . They didn’t optimize according to return on equity; they optimized within a set of knowledge.



This is why you would get the wars. When one culture moves into an area of another culture, what they are doing is re-engineering their field without permission, and you get ‘the data beast’ and the data beast wars.

Farrell: You get conflicting perspectives on the same data set of people coming from different fields. This is precisely what I’m talking about when I say, “Specify your intention and you create an intellectual abstract space that attracts a certain kind of information or a certain kind of culture into it. This is why specificity is all-important.

When you read Sheldrake over and over again, if you look at what he is doing, he is attempting to get as specific as he can. It’s the same thing with Tiller. You are dealing with people who understand the specificity of the information field itself, which is crucial.

Fitts: To go back to your idea of listening to music and building out a world where you can deal with 26 tracks, if you have a field that can only handle one or two tracks, then you can’t lay down specificity on anything.

Farrell: No, you can’t. The other problem with that mono-dimensionality is that complexity overwhelms you. Complexity appears to have no order or pattern or rationale behind it. Once you start thinking in an interdisciplinary, multi-track way, then you start connecting dots and you start to see patterns and so on.

I think that there is a way to formally specify that mathematically, but the very fact that that possibility even exists tells us that we have to be as precise as possible in dealing with this.



This is why it is so very dangerous. Scientists who have investigated this over the years have spoken about blowback from attempts to do consciousness experiments without specifying very clearly the intentionality.

Fitts: We talked a lot in Part I about the current leadership who engineered the Trump election and the extent to which they are looking out and seeing the potential for shifts – globally and geopolitically – to the multipolar world or a real food fight to maintain the unipolar world. They are looking ahead, and they are getting prepared.

Farrell: They are looking ahead and getting prepared, but another way of saying ‘multipolar world’ is to say ‘contrapuntal world’. If you translate it to musical terms, you are dealing with several tracks again.

Fitts: Here is what I wanted to say; “The most shocking thing that would happen if we imploded into a multipolar world and it wasn’t evolutionary, you would have an entire society in the United States that is operating on one track or two tracks or three tracks. All of a sudden, bam! They are going to wake up in a 26-track world, and they are not going to be able to function.”

Farrell: Let me draw the musical analogy again for people. You are used to living in a world of Abba, and now, suddenly, you are being confronted with a world that is more like Bach or Mozart. If they are going to transition to that world, they are going to have to create a population that can deal with complexities. That means that the current cultural paradigm in education is out. That is over; it won’t work.



Fitts: Every person listening to this has to retrain the field in their brain how many tracks they are dealing on.

I'm assuming that if you are a Giza Death Star member or a Solari Report member, you are dealing on more tracks than the average person, but if you look at the world that we are moving into, you are going to have to do three things: You will have to deal with much more complexity, and be able to look at both the ocean and the pond – you will have to be able to toggle back and forth between them. The third thing is that you are going to have to embrace uncertainty. All three of those things are necessary for you to have a higher learning metabolism, and you are not going to make it without a higher learning metabolism.

Farrell: I'm glad that you mentioned uncertainly because this is another principle that people have to understand what I think you are implying and I'm going to use the physics example.

The uncertainly principle in physics is that if you measure certain classes of things, you cannot measure another class of things. In other words, if you choose to measure the momentum of an electron, you cannot measure the position at the same time.

Part of embracing uncertainty means that you cannot assume that you are going to be able to master all data sets; you have to assume one or the other. "This is my data set that I am going to concentrate on, and this is what I am going to master."



That doesn't mean that you can't master the other at another point, but my point is that in choosing one, you are leaving the other uncertainty open in other areas. People are going to have to understand that part of the implicit psychology that the single track way of thinking – the spiritual habit that is inculcated in them – is the idea that they have mastered all knowledge. That has been one of the implicit narcissistic assumptions of this culture that is simply untrue.

The complexity that people are overwhelmed with now is they are being confronted with just the plain old spiritual fact of the limitations of any individual human confronted with all of this. Our ancestors faced it, and they faced it with equanimity because they didn't think of themselves as masters of the universe, "We've arrived. We know it all."

Fitts: But the ones who did well operated from faith. So, you create an intention, you create a picture, and you build into it. What seems impossible and hopeless, in fact, becomes reality. But you know how to operate on faith.

What I find is that, whether they have a religious or spiritual practice or not, most Americans still operate on faith.

Farrell: They just don't know that they are operating on faith. We laugh about this, but I'm very serious with that. I have looked at structures of human knowledge most of my life, and even in formal mathematics you begin with a proposition that is simply assumed, otherwise you can't proceed. You go nowhere. You have to assume something in order to get somewhere. Quite literally, that is an assumption of faith, whether we like it or not.



Fitts: In 2018, you have to understand that you have a field and you are part of multiple fields, and your field is being torn down and broken down and torn apart. The only person, who can take charge and preserve it and protect it and build it, is you. The more you can find other people's sources to help you do that and focus on them, the better off you will be. That is why it is so important to get the criminals out of your network, out of your pocketbook, and out of your life, because you are letting them into your field.

Farrell: That's right. Strip away the draws. I'll go back to what I said before. If you sit down and actually write out what you want to accomplish in life or next week – whatever it may be, what you want to see happen in society – specify it. Write it out. Work with the words to get it just right and get it into your head. That immediately becomes a template on which you start to act and discern the people you want to deal with.

It's that basin of attraction. You're not attracting only to field a certain type of information that comes to you; you are also attracting a certain type of individual who will start to enter your life. By the same token, others will move out of it; they will take themselves out of it oftentimes because they don't want to go there or anywhere else. This is all-important and missing almost completely. Our educational system has been designed – and I think deliberately so – to deaden this faculty that human beings have.

The expression from St. Paul, “Work out your salvation with fear and trembling, for you are coworkers,” which is a very strong word in Greek. It's ‘synergates’ in Greek and a very strong word meaning you are co-operators.



This idea of intentionality and specifying it as specific as possible is very, very important.

Fitts: There is a scripture that I never really focused on, but there is a wonderful pastor in New York named Keller, who was part of our Christmas donations last year. He had a 24-part series that someone sent me on all of Proverbs. It was fascinating and explained the scripture, “The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom,” and I finally realized what that scripture meant.

In my work, particularly with clients, I am constantly trying to tell them, “You don’t have enough time and money to protect yourself from the risks. You need to create a covering for yourself. So you can spend your time and money building a covering that will protect you and help you deal with these risks as they come up day-to-day, or you could only focus on being afraid of the risks and trying to protect yourself against the risks. Believe me, there is not enough time and money to do that. There is no financial protection against lawlessness, as the billionaires in Saudi Arabia are learning.”

What Keller says about, “The fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom,” is that if you understand what is available from the divine source, you can’t imagine living without it.

Farrell: While we are talking about fields and intention, there is a very interesting passage in the Bhavad-Gita, of all places, that talks about the ‘field and the knower and the known’. This passage is extraordinary. It’s as if a quantum physicist wrote it centuries ago. . If you look at the field and look at it in the context of the rest of the Bhavad-Gita, it’s all about this intentionality that you bring to situations.



It's very clear in the Bhavad-Gita that you are not passive before this. You can acquiesce and be passive to it, or you can try to influence it to the extent that you are able.

We are back to specificity here and it's very, very important. Tiller's work, when I first read it, amazed me that he latched onto this notion very quickly. He also latched onto the notion that this works even better if you have a group of people who are coherent. In other words, they are not spiritually conflicted in some major way, and they are agreeing upon a specific intention to do such-and-such a thing to this particular material or this particular reaction. It was astonishing.

Fitts: This is why, for many, many years on The Solari Report, I kept coming back to the story of Gideon. The story of Gideon says that if you have 300 faithful competent people, you can defeat any material power. It's essentially describing the conditions precedent to unleashing a true revolution.

Farrell: In other words, do you want to defeat Mr. Global? Write it in your intentions. "I don't want these people to succeed," and then list them by name. We know who they are. I don't want George Soros to succeed. I pray on a daily basis that he will get his comeuppance, or at the minimum that they will have a change of heart and mind and start doing the good that they claim they are doing.

Fitts: Have you ever watched the movie *The NeverEnding Story*?

Farrell: Sure.

Fitts: The fifth wish was, "I wish you had a heart."



Farrell: It's very, very important. I know that we have many people out there who are agnostic and atheist that listen, too. I tell them, "If you don't pray, then at least speak it or think it." The intentionality is going to be there regardless. This is somewhat of an ex opera operato phenomenon.

Fitts: Some of the greatest people I know say that they are agnostics or atheists. This is not a function of religiosity.

Farrell: It isn't and that is my point. When I say, "You cannot do formal mathematics without a given," you can't do it. There is a given that you start from. There is a proposition that you start from that is assumed in order to get from there to here in the process of the unfolding of the logic. It's everywhere; it's just a matter of acknowledging that it's everywhere. Once you come to that position, then it becomes very easy.

I feel bad for people who lock themselves into a lifetime of combating any faith proposition whatsoever, because you look at these people, they are miserable, and they accomplish nothing because they are spending all of their time trying to get rid of it.

Fitts: One thing that most concerns me is that I see tremendous sarcasm and cynicism. I do many different radio shows and videos on the internet. You look at the comments on YouTube, and they are so debased.

Farrell: There is hatred and snarliness and pettifogging and banality. I encounter this all the time.



Fitts: Here is how I see it: That different behavior rolls up into something that I call ‘embracing powerlessness’.

I was trained to believe that if you want power, then it starts by taking responsibility. In other words, I get power of a problem by saying, “This is my problem. I own it and I’m going to fix it.”

Power comes from getting something accomplished on whatever it is that you choose to make your intention. Faith is the substance of things hoped for but not yet seen.

That is to say, I have to create that picture or that intention. I have to own it and take responsibility for it, and then I have to create the faith that is the building block of getting something accomplished.

I hate to say it, but the greatest example of that kind of creative power was your organ shoes. The fact that you had gone out and bought organ shoes inspired a world of people to believe, “If he can have that kind of faith, we can too.” It’s faith.

Farrell: It is and this book-writing undertaking reminds me to tell the story of how I started all of these books that I write. It was somewhat of a faith thing. I had these weird ideas and I had them for years about the pyramid. I shared these ideas with a professor friend of mine who I was team-teaching with at the time. She said, “You have to write this in a book.”

I said, “Peggy, are you nuts? I’ll be out on my ear if the Dean ever hears that I’m writing this kind of weird nonsense.”



So when I lost my job at the university and went to the casino, another friend of mine said, “What are you waiting for? Go ahead and do it and write it.”

I thought, “If this works, I have a few other books in mind that I will write, too,” so I wrote the book. I was stunned that it actually sold. I was really thrown for a loop. I did not choose this career that I have now; it just happened.

The point is that if you are overwhelmed and feeling powerless, then sit down, write down an intention of where you want to go, what you want to do, what you want to be, what you want to see happen – not just with yourself, but with your family and friends and society at large. You can’t view this as simply about yourself; it has to be something that is beneficial to you and beneficial to society at large in some way.

Fitts: You have to be useful.

Farrell: You know the old story about Edison. He tried 1,000 different ways to make a lightbulb. Thanks to Tesla, which is the unsaid part of the story, he finally figured out a way to make it work. So we don’t remember Edison’s failures.

Fitts: Every one of us is dealing with fields that are being destroyed. One of the things that I learned about the litigation is that I started to talk about morphogenic fields because, what I realized as I was reverse engineering all of the physical harassment and the targeting and the smear campaign was, “Oh, they believe in morphogenic fields because they are trying to destroy my field.”



If you reverse engineer this manual, they have an entire department. They have manuals and books and encyclopedias on how to build and destroy fields. That is when I saw the smart grid roll out, and I realized that they are trying to get everybody to build their field and resonate with a machine instead of with life.

I think I'm saying that we all have to understand that one of our jobs in this world and one of our roles is to take responsibility to build and manage our own field.

I want to get back to Bitcoin for a moment because one of my instructions and my pleas is that I see people destroyed by financial fraud, not only because it steals their money, but also because it steals their time. Moreover, it can steal and destroy their field. They allow their field to get built into a whole community and world revolving around the fraud. So it could be Madoff, it could be some of the hedge funds because you get involved in the network and you meet people, and it goes on and on.

You saw this in the internet. When they pumped and dumped the internet stocks, you had young entrepreneurs who became overnight multi-millionaires with hundreds of millions of dollars, and their family, their social life, their identity, and everything got wrapped up into the pump. When they dumped it, it not only destroyed their finances, but it destroyed their reputation. They lost their souls.

To come back from that, it's one thing to lose your money; it's another thing to lose your field or to have your field completely wiped out. They were never able to see the difference.



If somebody wants to play a speculation and say, “I think McAfee is right. I think that Bitcoin is going to go to \$500,000. I’m going to take some money and put it in, and I’m going to play it like a pump and I am going to financially harvest the pump.”

There is a way to do it where you don’t get involved and you don’t let it into your field.

Farrell: You don’t invest in it emotionally; it’s not your panacea.

Fitts: It’s not your community or your network. You don’t let it suck you in.

I’ve seen frauds actually destroy people’s lives. I tell a story about one wonderful person who spent many years of warring with them and kept saying, “This is a fraud. This is a fraud.”

I made them sit down and calculate how many hours they had spent managing their dinar position, and it was 7,000 hours. It was 7,000 hours over seven years. Imagine what you could do with an investment.

I said recently on The Solari Report that I invested \$30,000 in an op, which was the litigation, but I made the decision that I was going to fight. I made the decision to stop everything and fight this and make a big deal about this and fight. There is a line between freedom and slavery, and that was it.

I’m sitting here criticizing somebody for giving 7,000 hours to an op, and I gave \$30,000. That’s a very big investment, , but we have to see this -



and we have to not allow financial products and financial mechanisms to get us to entangle or invest or field in ways that are dangerous to us.

Farrell: This goes back to the mind manipulation thing again. What we see happening are people investing their emotion, their field, into gimmicks and distractions that are deliberately designed to zap the field – iPads and certain types of music. Anything can become a trap for that, and everything is being engineered right now to be a trap for that.

It's very, very difficult to disengage from it, but I think it's increasingly important to do so. I don't have cable TV hooked up because, first of all, I think its garbage. Secondly, I think that they are doing something with the flicker rate on the screen. Whenever I watch certain DVDs that I have, I get tired very quickly. So, yes, they are doing something. You just disengage from it and don't let it consume your field. It's very important, and it's part of that intentionality. You have to have some awareness of what it is that you want to accomplish as a person, what you want for your family, what you want for society, and so on. It's all-important.

They are trying to strip everything away. If you stop and consider what I've been saying about specificity of intention, watch a commercial with that in mind. What is a commercial? It's a specified intention that they are putting out there, and that intention is affecting a certain group of people and persuading them to buy this product or do this thing or get this service. It's a very, very obvious way of looking at how the elites are using this very same principle to engineer society the way that they want it to go.

It's time to start hitting back at them with their own weapons.



Fitts: In fact, we have seen on many occasions them losing on multiple issues, but it only happens when that 5-10% refuse to play.

Farrell: Right, and those people have to put out a counter-intention. Let's remember something: Advertising is the most obvious form of mind manipulation. Where did the advertising executives come from after World War II? They came out of the OSS and they came out of the psychological warfare programs.

In other words, we have been living in that culture. We have been living in an op for quite some time. The sooner we wake up and take the red pill and realize that we're in the matrix, the better.

Fitts: One of my favorite stories is about our marvelous artist and graphic designer who does our Wrap Ups. He and a friend had started an advertising agency when they were in high school. I was having dinner with him and his friend in Los Angeles. He said to us, "Do you know what the single most successful advertising campaign in the history of advertising is?"

He said that it doubled the industry sales throughout the whole industry. It doubled the entire industry sales and it was three words: Wash, rinse, repeat.

It made everybody think that they had to wash their hair twice. During my entire life I've been washing my hair twice, and you don't need to; you only need to do it once. You don't need twice, but it doubled the industry sales and that was very clever.

It's quite remarkable and that is why the use of intelligence is used.



Farrell: And notice that it's not an intention or a request. Its "Wash, rinse, repeat." It's a command.

Fitts: It has no enforcement power, but it worked.

We've spent this year working to build things, each in our own way in our own culture, but one of the things that we participated in – which has been a wild ride – is the JP Farrell Pipe Organ Crowdfund. I have say, and I've said this many times, this has saved my sanity during the election. I think it was because it was such an unusual thing.

I'd never even heard of a virtual pipe organ before we started, and it was such an unusual, eccentric thing to do. I think that for many of us who participated in it, it was something to focus on that had absolutely nothing to do with politics, absolutely nothing to do with being socially acceptable; it only was this thing.

Farrell: I'm very grateful to everybody and it's a dream for me.

Fitts: All of the people who participated thought that it was such great fun. There was a wonderful gentleman in Silicon Valley who was the second match. We did it in three phases, and he was the second match. I said to him, "I'll put out that it's a match, and after I collect the match you can send your money in."

He said, "No, I'm sending you the check now. I feel much safer with it in your bank account than in my brokerage account."

Farrell: Oh, dear, that says a great deal.



Fitts: We had that wonderful lunch in Louisville, and many people came. Of course, we were hoping to get the organ in 2017, but instead it will come in 2018. My only concern – and this is a criticism of myself – is that I’m a fretter, but you are, too. In waiting for the organ, maybe we can learn how not to fret. Hopefully it will come in the spring.

Farrell: I’m a Capricorn and it’s our job to fret.

Fitts: Hopefully, we can get to spring without too much fretting.

One thing that I was struck by in the process is that our organ master sent us a list of all of his deliveries over the next year, and it’s extraordinary.

Farrell: It’s a bigger business than people can imagine. The thing that I think is unique about this technological revolution is that these kinds of organs would not have been possible a mere ten years ago because of the computing power.

What a virtual pipe organ does is, you are literally buying digitalized sound samples of famous organs and downloading them into the console in your home. So you are actually playing famous instruments. This type of technology would not have been possible even ten years ago because the computing power just wasn’t there to do it.

You can apply this technology across the board with digital harpsichords, and Yamaha makes digital keyboards with all sorts of sound samples in them.



What I think is going to happen is it is going to revolutionize the arts in a certain way. You're going to be able to see more and more dispersed artistic creative activity. We've discussed before the necessity, as we move into Global 3.0, about the necessity to move into human production. This is an entire field that I think is ripe for the picking.

You're going to see an abundance of artistic productivity come out of this technological revolution. I had even thought and written a little thought in my private journals about some of the implications of this type of technology for what can happen in terms of music. I think it's a very unique technology. It's different from having to have the space to build a \$250,000 pipe organ and store all of the pipes. It's a very, very different technology.

Fitts: But it's economical again to make an instrument that can play 26 tracks. If you look at all these masters, this is the instrument they composed for, not the instruments that they are being played on.

Farrell: Exactly. You made an observation earlier that maybe this is bringing back the organ, and it may very well do that. You are going to have the ability for people in their home being able to practice on an instrument that they can then play the same kind of instrument if they get good enough in the cathedral or whatever. The biggest problem I had growing up learning the organ was persuading a church to allow me to practice, and every organist faces that – particularly in that time period.



Fitts: Another thing that happened was that I commissioned one of the people I most admire in the world of culture, who has an extraordinary education and extraordinary professional experience. That is one of the reasons they write anonymously. They publish a column twice a month for Solari called ‘Food for the Soul’. What a huge success it has been. It has been one of my favorite things all year at Solari.

Part of it is this is a person who is very astute about what is happening globally. For example, there was a movie in China this year that I think, in the first month, did \$800 million in revenues. It’s part of the shift to the Asian consumer market.

They’ve written two columns a month, and it is absolutely fantastic.

Farrell: Americans are culturally starved. When I say ‘McCulture’, I mean it. What we’re getting in terms of ‘Food for the Soul’, so to speak, is the cultural version of McDonald’s. That’s not a steady diet.

I like my junk food just as much as anybody else, but as a steady diet, no. I have to have steak occasionally.

Fitts: The ‘Food for the Soul’ columnist sleuthed out all sorts of incredible, amazing things. One of the things that I didn’t bring up when we talked about politics is what I considered probably to be the kickback of the year, which is \$450 million for the Da Vinci, and it came out that Mohammed bin Salman bought it.

I’m not sure that he spent \$450 million on it; I really think that it was a kickback to somebody.



Farrell: It may have been, but when I found that out, it was very unusual because, first of all, that kind of art is forbidden in that tradition of Islam. That he would do that is very interesting, and that he would allow that to be publicized is very interesting. Then you mentioned he is also permitting movie theatres.

Fitts: The same weekend he announced he was the buyer of the Da Vinci it was announced that movie theatres were now acceptable.

Before we close out Culture, are there any other points you wanted to make?

Farrell: No. I just wanted to thank everybody again for the organ crowdfund. It was a dream come true. I haven't played an organ since the early 1990's.

Fitts: I have to say that, for me, it's been a wonderful experience because it succeeded. I remember sitting here once upon a time saying, "How much could it cost to get an organ?" I didn't know that virtual pipe organs existed. Then you told me, and I said, "We'll just crowdfund an organ."

You looked at me like I was completely nuts. Then I talked to Chuck McCorkle, who has been our partner in this. God love him, he did a large amount of work with you to figure out which organ master and how to design it. It was an enormous amount of work.

Chuck was a skeptic, but it was the shoes that did it. Our webmaster did a beautiful website, and Robert Duper made the video.



The shoes were what put it over the top. Everybody saw the shoes and they said, “Oh, what fun!”

Let’s face it. At Saturday night dinner, who can compete with you if you say that you participated in a crowdfund for a virtual pipe organ?

Next is Science, Space & Technology.

This has clearly been the year when artificial intelligence has been the meme. There are so many different places to go with this because artificial intelligence takes us into everything. It’s the re-engineering of everything.

Farrell: In our notes, you have written, “Fear porn, legitimate fears, and inter-dimensionality” as a bullet point beneath that.

Fitts: Let me give you some of my thoughts about artificial intelligence. I think that artificial intelligence is something that can re-engineer many different processes in a way where clearly artificial intelligence and pattern recognition and all of these different areas is much more efficient. So we are going to have a kick-up in efficiency in many, many processes. It’s going to really change the labor markets.

You can also integrate it with robotics. One of the problems with artificial intelligence is that much of what happens is dependent on what you program into the algorithms. There are all sorts of intimation that this is just ‘the software being smart’. No. It’s not the software being smart; it’s a bunch of people engineering certain assumptions and decision trees into the software.



In other words, they have the machine front for something that is far from scientific efficiency.

Cathy O'Neil published a great book that I spent plenty of time recommending in 2017 called *Weapons of Math Destruction*. It pointed out how assumptions and algorithms were destroying all sorts of people and things. It's not efficient, and it's not economical. It makes a great deal of money for a few people, and if anything, things are happening which I would say are illegal or should be illegal.

I think that AI is just fronting. A hedge fund makes money because of AI. Is that really that, or is disaster capitalism going on and AI is only the front?

It is also clear that there are real dangers of AI and machines taking over. We have reports of machines developing their own language and surpassing the programmers and taking over. They are literally moving out of control in a way that has to be shut down, and there is absolutely no governance or regulatory structure to prevent AI from doing incredible damage. This is something that could destroy our society and could kill millions of people.

You see the science fiction movies of the AI taking over the defense systems, and the next thing you know, you have a crisis. So there are legitimate fears here. One of my fears is very much the Elon Musk fear, which invokes interdimensional forces.

Farrell: I think this is a scenario we can flush out in an even more apocalyptic way because if you start thinking in terms of AI being a national-security issue, Russia, for example, , has announced it is -



going to press its own AI programs rather dramatically. So what you are going to create is not a single AI. You could be creating several AI's that are programmed to defend a particular interest and battle those that it views as hostile. In other words, you can get the *Person of Interest* television show scenario where you get two AI's – two machines – that are battling it out behind the scenes with each other and creating all sorts of chaos and upheaval in the process. I think that is one possibility.

If you add to this Musk's scenario that with such massive parallelism and networking, you might be invoking an entity. I wrote a paper years ago in the Members area of my website looking at the description of Lucifer in the book of Ezekiel in that little passage where it says, "Thy tabrets and thy pipes were made perfect in thee." Tabrets and pipes could be describing an organism there. Tabrets is simply an old English term for a membrane, or you could be describing a machine – a cold intelligence. That certainly fits the picture we have of that entity.

If Musk is correct, you could be invoking several entities into these different AI's that are going to be created, and we are going to be caught in the middle.

Fitts: Think about it: If we are managed by a separate species, and they've given up on getting human leaders to do what they are told without corruption, wouldn't you want AI running things?

Farrell: Either that or the AI wants leaders to do something that the leaders think is immoral or amoral. I would be very hesitant to want AI's running things. They might turn out to be much more amoral.



Any way you slice this, they are going to have to figure out some way or some back- door that gives them unfettered and unchallengeable administrative access to turn this off if need be. I've said all along I think some of the market activity that we are watching with these algorithms is so far-removed from any real market activity we might be watching an AI at work already in some rudimentary fashion.

That may be one reason Mr. Global is also so panicked and panicked-acting as they realize that they have a beast on their hands that is running amuck and out of control. Who knows?

Fitts: One of the book reviews that I did this year was on crypto-terrestrials. Mac Tonnie was a writer/researcher. One habit that I have is, when a reporter is assassinated, I want to know what he was writing about because there must be something true there. He died at 34 under what I consider to be highly suspicious circumstances. It appeared like a hit to me. The question is, "Why?"

I read *Cryptoterrestrials*, and his theory was that Earth is governed by a separate species that is small in number and is physically different. There is a very dramatic picture on one of the books that was on the review. Much of the UFO and alien material is an op to protect them because they share the planet with us.

I have no idea what to make of it because my tool for understanding whether something is true or not is money, and it doesn't lend itself to helping you sort out these types of questions. But I keep looking for an answer as to who is really running things and why things are behaving so strangely.



There is certainly something about what he was writing about that resonates.

Farrell: He is not the only one who has been writing along those lines. I briefly touched on it in my talks at the Secret Space Program conference. You have this clear indication in ancient texts that there are other species whose job is to watch and, if necessary, intervene. I think that it is a possibility. One reason I think it is a possibility is that, if you look at these texts and consider what they are saying, one of the things that they are saying is that we have genetic ‘cousins’, so to speak. They talk like us, walk like us, quack like us, and so on, but they have a slightly different DNA signature.

I have been watching the emergence of this genetic engineering technology that they are able now to sequence in the field. This is a fairly recent development, and this has been picked up by law enforcement agencies. I’m thinking, “Why would you need to sequence DNA in the field?”

One thing that comes to mind is, if you are looking for a population like that, and if you suspect that it might exist, the only way you can do that is through genetic identification.

I don’t rule those types of speculations out of the picture. Tonnie is not the only one who has written some of these things; there have been some other researchers who have latched onto this idea.

Fitts: When I started to travel, I would travel 100,000 to 200,000 miles a year. One thing that I started to notice is the phenomenon of ‘Indigo Children’. I would start to see Indigo Children -



throughout the country, but this was like the Cylons; it was the same child over and over again.

I would actually have names for the models. There was a Jason model, and I would see a Jason model. Then I would drive 100 miles, and there would be another one, seven or eight or nine years old. So it would be a couple of years' span, and there would be the Jason model again and again and again. Somebody has the same father; this is a special breeding program. It was the strangest thing.

Farrell: David Jacobs is a professor at Temple, and he has written about this idea. There was someone else who has written about this phenomenon, but his name escapes me. I have not encountered it, but I know people who have.

Fitts: I would never have seen it if I wasn't traveling from place to place to place. This is why I love talking to truckers; they see so much. They are travelling from place to place to place.

There is definitely something happening there, but I don't know what it is, however, it's real.

Part of the AI question is quantum computing and whether or not quantum computing can create an entirely different class of information warriors. If quantum computing will really evolve and develop, we are looking at a group of people that have quantum computing who can protect themselves from everybody else, but everybody else can't protect themselves or encrypt against people who have it.



You are talking about a two-class society. So if you have a group of people who have mastered quantum computing and AI and a group that hasn't, you are really talking about a new form of aristocracy.

Farrell: The only thing that could conceivably break that aristocracy is if that technology is developed to the point it becomes part of our desktop computers. So it remains to be seen whether this is a technology that is going to democratize itself as computers did. If it does, then you are going to see a very localized, decentralized system emerge. If it doesn't, then it is going to be horrendously centralized and tyrannical.

Fitts: Here comes the question: Can the West truly protect SWIFT? Can the BRICS truly protect their network?

Farrell: I go back to what I said earlier. Quantum computing right now is the security panacea. It's the security fix-all, but I'm on the human ingenuity side. Sooner or later someone will find a way around it by whatever means, and that is the problem. The other possibility that we have to think of here is that an AI might find a way around it.

Fitts: It seems that you are talking about technologies that right now have evolved far beyond our governance/spiritual/moral/legal structures. If we continue to evolve and apply this technology without complimentary governance/spiritual/moral/legal structures, it will basically kill us.

Farrell: This is the other reason I've been emphasizing trying to own the culture. At the speed at which governments react to these developments, there will be no reaction in time.



Fitts: It has to be a cultural reaction.

I pointed out in the *3rd Quarter Wrap Up*, Buckminster Fuller's 'Doubling of Knowledge Curve' and the fact that we are leaving a world where knowledge doubled every hundred years, and then in our parents' generation it doubled every 25 years. Now we are moving into, what IBM and Watson now predict, will be a doubling of knowledge every 12 hours. That means that we can't possibly keep up.

You are operating in a world where, by the time you look at and understand something, it will have changed. So how do we function in a world like that?

Farrell: Culture. That is the stabilizing factor. That is the semi-permanent factor at work. That is the matrix, the template, and the interpretive foundation on which to confront all of this change. If you're not confronting it on some sort of stable foundation, or if you are trying to address the phenomenon itself and use it as the basis on which you are dealing with it, you are simply going to be overwhelmed. You are going to be caught in this constant movement of data, this constant movement and shift of interpretation, and no human can survive in that kind of environment. You're going to lose your sanity and, therefore, your humanity.

The response here is 'culture'. I think crucial to that is, there has to be an awareness that the arts are the stabilizing factor in culture. So if you want to retain your sanity, you have to have some food for the soul, and it's not going to come from McMusic or McArt. It's not going to be the McDonald's version of it anymore and that isn't going to work.



Fitts: Space-based economy grows and grows. We're going to do our 1st Quarter Wrap Up in 2018 on the Space-Based Economy. It's just exploding.

Farrell: It is, and it is getting hard to keep up with. I've been trying to follow it, but it's getting to the point now where, almost every day, you see somebody launching some sort of company. This Asgardia country – the first space-based country – is talking about constitutions for space colonies and so on.

Fitts: I swear that somebody is going to be doing offshore havens.

Farrell: Yes, in fact, I'm glad you mentioned that because this is what I think is really happening with things like Asgardia and things like these experimental projects where they are trying to come up with constitutions on how these colonies will run. I think what is happening is you are moving the havens off the planet.

Years ago, I think I mentioned this to you in a previous quarterly Wrap Up. I think that Mr. Global might have decided that this business of trying to get everybody together and agree here on Earth isn't working, so we're going to try a top-down solution, meaning space to here. So they are going to run their beta testing of constitutional ideas in space, and then try to impose it down here.

I don't think, ultimately, that is going to work, but I think that this is part of the model they are trying and testing.



Fitts: In 2016, we did a special report on the state of law related to space. Of course, what happened is, if you are going to move into space this way, you really need to build out the legal systems and the military systems. It stalled, and my theory on why it is stalled is, I think that the US is racing ahead with all sorts of space weaponry, however, that is in violation of the treaty, so they don't want to talk about the law because they are in violation and they intend to control top-down from space. That is our ace in the hole.

Farrell: The other aspect of law here that people are not thinking about regarding space law, is the propulsion technologies themselves that are beginning to be tested, some of these things have 'space environmental impact'. Let's put it that way. So, there is yet another twist to this. It's not only space weaponry that some of these propulsion systems are touching upon, but it's space environment.

There has been no attempt, as far as I can tell, in space law to address the problem of sending a probe to XYZ Planet and the probe is using ion-propulsion, and it's spitting out a cluster of ions into the environment. How does that change the electrodynamics of the system?

I'm not seeing anybody that I know of attempting to address these types of things. We've seen another development in space law that is very interesting concerning the moon, for example, which is protected by international treaty from people doing certain things there, but the loophole around mining and so on is, if you are doing all of this activity under the auspices of 'scientific research', then you can, to some extent, do anything.



You're seeing people already testing the loopholes in these laws to see how they can get around treaty obligations that are already there for mining, for commercialization's, and so on.

I think there has been this halt to space law at the same time that we see them beta testing all of these theories and constitutional ideas. I think this is the next safe haven, and I think this is another reason they are so absolutely keen on getting these cryptocurrencies into place.

That is a perfect way, if you have a distributed ledger, to keep it out of people's eyes. You put it in space, and put the servers in space.

The thing that clues me in this is definitely a covert possibility that has to be considered is that NASA has been talking about expanding internet capability to the moon. Why do you need the internet on the moon?

Fitts: Data banks.

This takes me back to the issue. You have all sorts of disinformation running around, but many years ago I had a colleague who called me. He was a very wealthy fellow. He said, "I need your advice. I have \$79,000 of credit card debt."

I said, "How in the world did you get \$79,000 of credit card debt?"

He said, "Well, all of the fear porn sites were saying that the system was going to implode, so what we should all do is run up credit card debt and then just not pay it, and the system would implode. So what do you think I ought to do?"



I said, “You are going to have to pay your credit card debt because you’re a schmuck. First of all, you read fear porn, then you listen to it, and then you acted on it. How much of this is late fees?”

His late fee and interest was \$35,000. So I said, “Here is what you can do: You can try to negotiate with them, but you have absolutely no leverage. You can afford to pay them off, and you did it; you are liable. So, see if you can negotiate a deal, but if you can’t negotiate some kind of compromise with them, you’re going to have to pay it because you’re an idiot.”

I couldn’t believe it. This is what I mean about getting involved in a financial fraud that is also a field. It takes over your field and everybody is in it. There is massive entrainment. They use entrainment to get people into this thing, and you stop thinking clearly because they just capture your field. It’s like they defraud your mind and your pocketbook.

I was on Twitter, and Coinbase had just lost the case with the IRS and had to turn over databases of purchases up to 2014. I pointed out that we had published a great special report on cryptocurrency taxation. I said, “I strongly recommend that you make sure that you pay attention to your taxation compliance because you have to file currency transactions.”

So some person goes on Twitter, and responds, “That whole world of IRS is all going to be gone in a year.” It was the same thing that they said with the credit cards, “It’s all going to be gone.”



I wrote back and said, “Good luck with your life having a control file.”

He doesn’t get it. We went back and forth and back and forth, and then I realized, “Here we go again with this ‘It’s all going to implode in a year’ stuff.”

It is inconceivable that the people who run the planet by force can’t assert jurisdiction over the information in digital systems. So the question is: What is the end game?

From what I can see, they have thousands and thousands of people buying into this. “This is going to destroy that whole world, and it’s all going to come down, and we are going to control and own everything with Bitcoin.”

Farrell: Absolutely, and no more central bankers and no more Mr. Rothschild. I’ve heard all of this.

Fitts: I’m assuming that what happens are the central banks come out just as Russia is coming out with its cryptocurrency. The bankers decide how they want to use this technology and then they are going to assert jurisdiction, and you either evolve Bitcoin and the other cryptocurrencies or they come out with their own and Bitcoin fizzles away. There are many different ways that it could go, and, frankly, I don’t think they know. I think they are just figuring out how to get the infrastructure built out and how to make blockchain work on scale economically.

One of the books that I keep recommending to everybody is by Tim Wu, *The Master Switch*. What he describes on the telegraph, the telephone, the TV, and any time that new technology comes out -



there is this new period of innovation. Everybody invents the thing, and then as soon as it's figured out – wham! One or two providers totally centralize it. It's wave after wave of constant centralization.

When you go back – and it's beautifully written; Wu does a fabulous job – you realize, “Here we go again.”

Every time we talk about science and technology, I have to talk about the fact that the systems have absolutely no integrity. It's unbelievable.

Farrell: They don't. I've had people pressuring me to buy Bitcoin when it first came out. I told them, “Number one, I don't have that kind of money to invest. I just don't. Number two, you're nuts if you think this is a panacea and a fix-all and this is going to bypass Mr. Global and the bankers and all of that. You are just plain nuts.”

My biggest problem is t there is no cyber system currently that is secure. There just isn't.

Fitts: If you look at the hacks- we've been keeping a list of them- there is a new hack every day with the cryptocurrencies. When you look at the hacks, they are stealing enough to do whatever they need for price manipulation.

This is putting a tremendous amount of money into the hacking community. So you are moving hundreds of millions – billions, really – of dollars into both the hacking and the activist community. You're creating a whole new generation of hackers and economic hit people.



Farrell: This is the new platform for the economic hitmen. Part of the time I think this is what it's designed to do. It is designed to be the new platform if it takes off and gets sufficiently big. This is the new platform for the World Bank and the IMF to do the economic hitman thing. I'm just not sold on these things.

In fact, I've started using more and more cash in response to this.

Fitts: That is the danger. If they can get cash to go away, we are in trouble. We cannot let that happen.

Farrell: Even if they succeed in doing so, you're going to see the rise of global currencies. I'm convinced that you cannot have a completely digital system of media of exchange because, at some point, you want something tangible. It is either going to drive local currencies, or it is going to drive barter and bills of exchange.

Fitts: You're going to see the crypto-world trying to do local cryptocurrencies, and that is going to be the ultimate control mechanism.

Let's move onto 5G. I'm really blessed by my relationship with Jason Bawden Smith. Jason is an environmental scientist, and he has really dug into 5G. He is convinced that the physical impact of 5G on us is going to be devastating.

Farrell: Explain what 5G is for those of us who don't know.

Fitts: 5G is the next level – and I'm going to say this incorrectly because I'm not a scientist –



of cell service and internet service. You're basically talking about cellular technology that is much more invasive to your health and your brain and your electromagnetic field.

It will give you the capacity to do three-dimensional hologram technology and massive more capacity, but it is also massive more capacity for mind control and for ops.

I've shown you that great hologram of the whale jumping out of the gym floor. Imagine what you can do with false flags. So you are talking about virtual reality and 3D.

Farrell: You're talking about Operation Blue Beam, for that matter.

Fitts: Right, but it is this effort of pushing everybody into the cities where it's going to be much easier to mind control everyone. In California, they are putting up these little towers that they literally staple to utility poles. They have passed laws saying that the local planning board can't say anything. So, they are just running around stapling these mini-towers to everybody and everything.

Mark my word, they are going to try passing laws saying they can staple them to our front door and we can't stop it. These are the train tracks that you need to deliver a whole new massive layer of influence and control and surveillance.

Farrell: At that point we have to take the Swine Flu approach and say, "No, you don't. Over my dead body."



Fitts: Well, it works; they backed down.

This gets us to the point now that you have 90% of the population that can't fathom that entrainment and subliminal programming and all of these things exist.

Next is net neutrality. We have the FCC vote to rescind net neutrality. Obviously it goes into the courts, and it's quite a legal battle. In my experience, the cable companies and the telecoms are the least enlightened of anybody among us. So are we talking about something where we are going to have complete censorship and a lockdown of the internet?

Farrell: I have gone both ways on this. I have been reading and getting articles from people on both sides of this. Quite frankly, I don't know what to make of it. I really don't.

Part of me is taking the standard cynical approach that if the government and the corporations are behind it, it's bad. But part of me is thinking, "Right now, the way things stand, I'm paying for services that I don't want and don't need. I don't want cable TV and I don't want 500 channels of nonsense coming into my home."

All I really need is the internet connection, the landline, and a telephone. If I want to watch TV, I will watch a DVD or something. So, I am torn about this.

On the one hand, it might bring back what I used to experience when I could buy a package of what I wanted.



If I didn't want cable, I got the internet and the phone service, and that was it. I paid for an internet service and for nothing I didn't want.

I suspect that those who have issues about this regarding censorship, some of their concerns are legitimate that they are going to try to censor certain websites they don't want to get any traffic by this means. So, I don't know what to think about it and I am genuinely torn here on this issue.

I've been listening to local talk radio, and the local host has had people on who are talking about this. It's gone back and forth. You hear one side, and then you hear the other, and they are all passionate and I don't know what to make of it.

Fitts: I do think that we are going to see a real push by the corporate infrastructure to censor significantly. We've already seen it. It's had a dramatic impact on cutting revenues to the independent media that uses Facebook and Google. But it's a reminder of why it is imperative that whatever you do; don't build your life on that platform. They are not trustworthy.

Farrell: They are not at all. It is also another reason to directly support independent websites. We both know a certain individual who is well known in the alternative media who was hit hard by the corporate demonetization of his site. So, I am torn about this and I don't know what to make of it. If I were to draw percentages as to where I lean – good or bad – right now I am leaning about 70% bad, 30% good.



That is because I am so accustomed to anything that the government says is going to be good for us is usually going to end up being bad.

Fitts: I think that the telco's and the cable companies have skimmed an enormous amount of profit off something that was a big infrastructure financed by the taxpayers, and we don't need them. It's the same as the healthcare. We need healthcare; we don't need healthcare insurance.

Farrell: We need healthcare, not healthcare insurance care. We don't need pharmaceutical insurance care.

Fitts: I'm higher than 70% bad because I don't trust that industry.

The last thing that I wanted to bring up under Technology was Advanced and Invisible Weaponry.

We saw a great video circulate by a group of scientists on autonomous weapons. Basically, they pointed out that if you let drones and AIs function as autonomous weapons, we are talking about total control.

I think that it is very concerning.

Farrell: I would go further and say that it is another step towards tyranny. This is yet another reason they want to confiscate guns and leave you with nothing to defend yourself. I am totally against this trend that we see emerging of law enforcement agencies now deploying robots in certain places in this country. I am totally against this because a robot has no discernment or judgment; it is only going to issue tickets or fines or what have you on the spot for some violation of its program.



Fitts: Part of our problem is not only advanced weaponry; I think that the big problem is invisible weaponry. Whether it is whatever is causing fires, whether it is whatever is causing weather warfare, and then following it up by making it impossible for news to get out of Puerto Rico or the Caribbean islands, you are talking about being able to essentially isolate people and then genocide them, and do it invisibly.

Farrell: I share your concerns there. The Puerto Rico thing bothers me because I have a couple of members of my website there, and one in particular was a regular poster. Since the Puerto Rico disaster, he has not commented or posted.

Fitts: He probably doesn't have internet access.

Farrell: He may not have internet access, and he may not even have power. I know that another member has told me that they are still struggling to get the power system up and functioning properly. They are struggling to get the water supply back up to Federal standards. It's a mess. They can kill news coverage of regions now, and this is what bothers me.

We're going to have to accept the possibility, I think, that we might have to communicate the good, old-fashioned way with typewriters and letters.

Fitts: A couple of times I've almost bought a typewriter.



Farrell: I have one because a friend of mine bought me a typewriter. We were talking about this after an event that took place in Russia. A few years ago, suddenly, Russia bought tens of thousands of typewriters because they were concerned about the security of their systems. That stunned me.

What it told me was that for their most secure communications – sending inter-office memos back and forth – they are putting them on typewriters and handing it to a messenger, “Take this to department so-and-so in the Kremlin.”

I’m thinking the very same thing. We are going to have to rely on old-fashioned methods of communication to really be secure.

Fitts: Part of it is, if you can isolate a group, whether through mind control or shutting off the internet on that island, there are a variety of different ways that you can isolate people. When you come back to building culture, you are also talking about how you can build communication and connection so that people don’t feel alone.

One thing that I’ve noticed – whether I’m travelling by email or travelling physically around the world – is I come upon so many absolutely excellent people who feel alone.

Farrell: Oh, I’m so glad you mentioned that.

Fitts: They’re not alone, but they have to have faith that they are not alone, and they have to go and find their compatriots.



Farrell: I have noticed this phenomenon myself here where I live. This place used to have a thriving ‘coffee shop’ culture where people would just go to be with other people. They would go and sip coffee and smoke and discuss things. That is all but gone. It doesn’t exist.

Fitts: It’s gone where I am, also.

Farrell: When you do go to these places like Starbucks or what have you, most everybody in there has their nose or their face buried in their phone, and they are texting. Sometimes they will be texting to someone who is right next to them.

I’ve had people comment on my website and email me, “I’m so thankful that I found you. I felt so alone.”

I think that it’s going to come to the point where we will have to start figuring out a way to find people again and bypass this social media nightmare that we are in, and start sending letters to people again.

Fitts: I mail a large amount of cards and notes and things by mail. I’m a frequent user of the US Postal Service.

Farrell: I’m guilty of this. I’ve become email-reliant for communications, but I think that it’s going to come to the point where we are going to have to start writing letters and forego the speed in order to maintain the freedom and security. I’m tired of this and I’m tired of being alone. I’ve felt that way myself, and I know that you have.



Fitts: The reason I don't feel alone, even though I live in a very isolated area where I am alone, is because I travel a great deal and you don't travel much.

Farrell: I don't travel much. Even if I did, the way that the culture is going, I don't even feel safe travelling in this country anymore. The way that law enforcement in some places is behaving now, you may end up Tasered or dead or have your assets confiscated because they plant evidence. I don't trust anybody anymore.

Fitts: I'm not worried about that. I haven't carried traditionally when I've traveled; I use my guns at home. I may start to carry only because I think that there is deterioration. I want to see whether this bill passes that will allow us to carry nationally. If you are permitted to carry in a state, then you can carry nationally. But there are some states that I will never carry in. I'm waiting to see if that happens.

I'm very concerned about the invisible weaponry, and that includes the Cuba embassy attack. So let me just say as background that Bill Binney and his team are doing a survey for a group of targeted individuals because we have a growing, exploding population of people who are targeted by electromagnetic and other invisible weaponry. They are fundamentally being tortured and manipulated.

I think that it is a prototype for a bigger rollout of all sorts of technology. So what I'm hoping is that Binney and his team can figure out how to describe, document, and prove this kind of data. This year I've tried to put more information about targeted individuals on the website because, if you understand that it exists, you can deal with it and get away with it much faster.



I had to deal with it on the litigation, and it was one of the reasons I left Washington. I had serious problems with electromagnetic weaponry and it's bizarre beyond words.

When I started to research and try to understand it, one thing that I discovered was that most of this technology is really cheap, and it is being applied in real estate, it is being applied in organized crime, and it is scary. It's also moving virally.

It reached a new level of consciousness because of the Cuba embassy attack. Could you explain what happened?

Farrell: I don't know what happened. I have a theory and a speculation of what they were dealing with. It has been admitted now by the government that they have found physical white cell alterations in the brain of the people who experienced this.

Fitts: And this was American embassy personnel?

Farrell: Right. They found similar things with Canadian embassy personnel who suffered similar events.

When this first came out and people were saying that this was an all sonic weapon, I read these articles and the descriptions of what was happening, and my first conclusion was, "No, these were not sonic weapons. These people were hearing things that they were experiencing, but they were hearing them in their head."



You can research this technology of microwave interferometry. If you interfere two or more ways with microwaves, it will create an interference pattern – like throwing rocks into a pond where the ripples are crisscrossing over each other – in a particular area. In other words, you can localize that interference pattern. It will set up a wave pattern of its own. That wave pattern can be modulated with information.

You can modulate the voices into it so that people are actually hearing voices in the audio processing part of the brain, but no one else is hearing it. You can engineer these templates to create emotional responses and to create chemical responses. The Russians did enormous amounts of research on this type of medicine and disease induction during the Soviet era. So this has been around for a long time.

The point I'm making is that technology is to the stage that if you go back and look at what the Soviets were doing in the 1970's, and you've had some 40 years to perfect this, I'm thinking that now this can literally be targeted on a person's bed like what we saw in some of the reports in Cuba where they are hearing these high chirping noises or metal grating on metal and they are in excruciating pain.

When they get out of bed it immediately ceases. In other words, they have removed themselves from that area of interference. That tells me that you are dealing with some sort of microwave interference technology, it is probably ground-based, it is probably portable, and it may not even be the Cubans doing this. They may be telling us the truth when they say that they don't know who is doing this.



Would they have that technology given their relationship with Russia through the years? Maybe and probably. Would they have a reason for doing this? I don't think so. I don't see any clear benefit to Cuba for doing this. I don't see the Russians doing it either.

Fitts: The benefit would be that the members of both the US and the Israeli intelligence agency would be busted up.

Farrell: They want to create Cold War tensions again. I'm not thinking that Cuba is behind this. I realize that puts me in the minority of people looking at this.

Fitts: It's interesting for me because, when I first dealt with it, you actually could not talk to people about it. You were not allowed. It was not socially acceptable to bring this up or discuss it even though it was clearly happening in very significant amounts, but it was very isolating. Because I was on my own, I had to deal with it on my own; no one would help other than people who were experiencing it as well.

There has been more that has come out. Here you are watching the former chairman of Exxon, Rex Tillerson, have to deal with it.

I am watching the Secretary of State, a good Texas Christian, having to deal with it and acknowledge that it exists.

Farrell: It does exist. I think that part of the problem – and I'm going to suggest a book for people who may not be familiar with the Soviet era research. Lt. Colonel Tom Bearden, US Army, now retired, calls it Gravito Biology.



He reviews the work and the published papers of the Soviet scientists who were perfecting this kind of medical technology. It's truly astounding once you see what they were doing, and this was in the 1970's.

So extrapolate from what he says, and I think the problem that the powers that be have in acknowledging the existence of this technology is the massive effect that it is inevitably going to have on jurisprudence and criminal cases because how do you adjudicate this? The classic case in American law where there are clear indications of a mind control technology at work is Sirhan. How do you adjudicate this?

If you start admitting the technology exists and that it can influence human behavior – and for that matter, we might think of John Lennon as well because there are indications that his killer was somehow manipulated – then how do you handle this in a court of law? What does this mean for standards of proof? What does this mean for insanity defenses? And on and on it goes.

This poses a big problem to them, even if they are predisposed to deal with it.

Fitts: There is another thing, and that is we have taken the position so far in this country, as a practical matter, that the sheriff is in charge of enforcement on physical crimes and some financial crimes. But when it comes to cybercrimes, that is not their responsibility. When it comes to electromagnetic and other invisible weaponry, that is not their responsibility. . So the advantage of saying those things don't exist is they don't have to take that on in their budget or in their personnel.



The reality is, if you look at most Americans, the crimes that are costing us the most money are those crimes. So increasingly we are paying for a service, but the service is saying, “We are not going to protect you from the crime that you are suffering from because it’s not on our scope.”

Farrell: It’s not on our scope and it’s not in our jurisdiction.

Fitts: It doesn’t exist, so enforcement and safety have to be reinvented.

Farrell: The trouble here is: How much financing do you need to have a local or state or province level to deal with these types of cybercrimes?

Fitts: The problem in financing is education.

Farrell: That, too, and financing is a big part of the problem because you’re going to have to have people trained in how to recognize this and deal with it. So this is a capital outlay that many local governments may not be able to support.

Fitts: Yes, but it is remarkably inexpensive for grade school and high school to teach children how to do this.

Farrell: But they are not teaching them how to do this and this is the problem. How do you train an entire law enforcement agency country-wide to take on and tackle this problem?



Fitts: How do you train a local area to be sophisticated in telecommunication and information systems so it stops being harvested by them?

If there is no information sovereignty in the neighborhood, it will be totally harvested and drained economically, which is exactly what is happening. So the time has come where we all have to sit back and say, “How do we learn enough about information systems to get our sovereignty back?”

Farrell: I’m not trying to disagree with you here; I’m trying to anticipate the response that we know that we are going to get from local governments with all of this because this is the excuse that they are going to offer.

I think that if you look at the law and the Constitution and the sheriff’s role as a Constitutional officer, that responsibility can be avoided. But I know from the state where I live what the response of state and local governments is going to be, “We don’t have the money.”

This is a conundrum. This is a big conundrum how we are going to deal with all of this and the legal system and the criminal justice system and so on.

I did want to mention – because you profess, “Go locally” – what we can do locally since we are talking about this question. I think that it is going to be increasingly necessary for us to identify people locally who have top-notch cyber security expertise and who don’t have associations with the government or corporations, -



only as a matter of vetting these people and trying to get them involved in these types of issues, and what they can do to help these things. Thus far we are not doing it, and this is going to be a crucial step. We have to start identifying people like this.

Fitts: I have found that most of the things that I've tried on a local basis have failed completely. Part of it is that so many of the things that have happened in the last 10-15 years is that Divide & Conquer has alienated people from each other. The 5-10% are very alienated from the 90% because the 90% keeps selling us down the river and throwing us under the bus.

Part of this is finding the 5-10% and organizing in a way that saves you time and gives you energy. Much of that revolves around either safety or food. You have to do it in a way that you are very, very careful about whom you associate with.

Ultimately, this has to come down to better networking locally.

Farrell: I don't see any way of doing that in this culture without people at local levels starting local websites dealing with local issues and trying to attract people of a similar mind. There is a certain amount of it that goes on here, but not nearly enough.

Fitts: Every now and then somebody will write me and ask me to revive Community Wizard. I'll tell them, "No. You need to do Community Wizard in paper on your kitchen desk and keep it offline."



Let's turn now to Unanswered Questions. The one question that people always ask and ask is, "Who is really in charge?" On one hand, I can say that we are making progress and we are getting better at killing off the disinformation, but we still don't know what in the world is happening in Antarctica and we still can't figure out where this planetary dividend is disappearing.

I think that there are more people who are asking questions, so I would like to see us make progress on that in 2018. The other thing is that one of the disinformation efforts that I think has been absolutely horribly devastating is Corey Goode. 2017 was the year the Corey Goode got absolutely outed. I would say that the harm is now over with Corey Goode being a phenomenon. It's done. It has devastated what it has devastated, and now we have Corey Goode 2.0 in the form of Tom DeLonge.

I watched what happened with Corey Goode, and I watched the effort it took for a whole variety of people to push back, and it ended with Bill Ryan and Daniel Lis doing a series of interviews. Daniel Lis really did the heavy lifting on this, and essentially, wiped Corey Goode off the face of the map.

It was astonishing to see how far this disinformation project went. What was frightening was that MUFON invited Richard Dolan and put him on a panel with all of them.

Farrell: I was stunned they would have Corey Goode and that entire crowd there, and then, stunned again, when I heard that Richard had been invited to this in a devious way. My impression was that he was not informed about the other people who were going to be there.



Fitts: What is interesting is that he did two things: He gave the panel presentation and spoke openly, and then he wrote a letter on Corey Goode and the whistleblowers, and he did a remarkable job. He was very gracious and personally kind to many people who had done plenty of damage, and he absolutely called them out. It was a surgical strike.

Farrell: We've seen a great deal of these 'disinfo' ops. From my point of view, I think that they were in deliberate response to what we were achieving with the two Secret Space Program conferences and the danger that that posed to the narrative.

I never placed much stock in Corey Goode and that complete thing, simply because it was so ridiculous.

Fitts: I was appalled, and I'm still appalled at the time and energy that was soaked up and wasted by it. I'm still appalled at the people.

I am regularly encouraged by people I respect and admire to have David Wilcox on The Solari Report. My attitude is that my job, more than anything, is to run a filter so that you can come into Solari world and know that you have credible people.

I run a much higher filter.

Farrell: You're not afraid to talk about these kinds of things, but your filter is not turned off just because you are willing to talk about them. This is what I can't understand either. There is a certain segment of that community that has no filter – none whatsoever.



Fitts: There is a difference between entertainment and actionable intelligence. There is nothing wrong with entertainment and I love great entertainment. I'm not saying that there is anything wrong with it, but the total goal of Solari is actionable intelligence. Get the information while there is still time to do something about it, and make sure that you thrive and are successful in this world.

I want people to have actionable intelligence. Do not confuse actionable intelligence with entertainment. Period. End of discussion.

When you listen to Putin screaming about the West, he is screaming as an intelligence officer who sees a clear demarcation between actionable intelligence and entertainment, and he doesn't understand why the Western world can't.

Farrell: Clearly, this was an op to suck and drain quantities of energy to paint the whole idea of breakaway groups or secret space programs or exotic technology research as kind of a fringe element. In that I think they ultimately failed, but they drained a lot of energy.

The DeLonge phenomenon is a much more slick operation in that DeLonge is not a stupid man, and the people who he has gathered around him in this corporation that he has started to build – building the spaceship with advanced technology – has some very serious people. It catches my attention when I see people like Hal Puthoff on the board.

I will be blunt: People know that he contacted me to be involved in the project, and my response was guarded. My response was essentially, "Okay, I'm willing to participate, but in order for me to give you a final say, I have to see all the details that you have assembled, -



particularly if you want me to write about it. Secondly, you need to tell the people who you are involved with and, let them know upfront, that you are considering having me involved in the project.”

I never heard back after that, and interestingly enough, he, at one point, was referring directly to my works by my title and my name. Now he is referring to the concepts, but the attributions are missing.

I’m looking at that project as being, perhaps, another more sophisticated operation to put out the meme that the governments are friends, and yes, they have the UFO issue under their control, and they are telling their version of the story, and so on.

We have seen them do this before in the ufology community. Don’t get me wrong; I don’t consider myself an ufologist, but I have touched on the subject.

We’ve seen the government stage these types of operations before with Paul Bennewitz. We’ve seen William Moore come out and admit at a UFO conference that he was acting as a government disinformation agent. So, we’ve seen this happen before, and it has happened at precisely those times that the ufology community appeared to have been getting very serious and going after certain issues. Then it gets muddied up again.

I’m skeptical. I’m looking at DeLonge precisely as you are. This is the Corey Goode marketing op 2.0, jazzed up a bit, and going after a more serious audience. But you will notice something about the way that they are going at it.



They are still going at it, not just as entertainment, but also with the presupposition that ETs are real and, I'm still not convinced of this case. I'm not convinced that you can discount spiritual or interdimensional or whatever you want to call it. And I'm not convinced that the government is still being entirely forthcoming.

Fitts: I'm sure that they are not. Part of the DeLonge message is, "Don't worry about the \$21 trillion. It was well spent. They are protecting us from the aliens. Just be grateful. So, don't ask questions about the \$21 trillion."

Farrell: So, eat your popcorn, sit back, and be grateful. This is not my response to the problem.

Fitts: Let's dive into some more questions that are not such big picture questions. One is: Going into the 2018 and 2020 elections, people are mad because there was a chance after the election was over that they could go back to the business of government. Instead we had a war over Russia, which turned out to be, as the CNN reporter said, "Russia is a nothing burger."

So, we spent an enormous amount of money and time having a war over a 'nothing burger'. Then we got hit with Donna Brazile's book, which the French have published and there were a couple of other books.

My question is: Who is going to get eaten by the lions here?

Farrell: Are we talking about our list?



Fitts: Between the shakedown purges and the sex purges that we talked about, we are watching rolling purges. But if you look at the extent of the purge, this is nothing serious enough and sufficient enough to entertain the crowd.

Farrell: It's not. In 2018, as we said in Part I, the Bundy/Uranium One story is not going away. This is really big, and it's going to be the election issue. Whether or not the mainstream media makes it such or not, the alternative media will. That is going to drive it again into the conversation.

I'm like you. I'm thinking that one of the ways that they are going to try to handle this is by throwing many people under the bus.

Fitts: Let's talk about what I want. If I'm the leadership that now controls the Administration, what do I want? I want control. I want to exercise far greater control of the machinery than I currently have. I think that the gem that I want control of is the Department of Justice. What I would want to do is replace everyone and put my team in.

Unfortunately, what they did is put a 'scaredy-cat' in as Attorney General.

Farrell: I'm thinking that there has to be some sort of pressure on Sessions coming from outside the Deep State faction that puts Trump into office. This is the only way that I can rationalize his behavior.

Fitts: Was he playing for the other team, or is he apprehensive? I don't know.



Farrell: I don't know either. He is acting like a 'scaredy-cat'. He is acting, in my opinion, as if he is under some sort of duress from somewhere, and it's not coming from inside the Administration or the factions backing him.

Fitts: Still, controlling the AG's office is not enough to control the Department of Justice. You have a culture, you have AG's all over the country, and you have the FBI. You're talking about a major house cleaning if you are going to get control of that place.

Here is why it's important. If I'm bringing all that money and all that corporate power back in here, you cannot have a bunch of 'Howdy Doody's' running around and doing to companies what they did to Howard Root's company.

The guys at DOJ are not inclined to do it against the big companies, but you are still destroying the productivity of the country.

Farrell: I don't know. If they are going to try to sidestep the Bund and Uranium One business; we talked in Part I that has implications that are going to affect the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, and, basically, everybody but the Pentagon.

If you are going to try to distract from that story, and if the people behind Trump are going to try to go after the DOJ, if you want to prevent that and take the heat off, then the only solution I can think of right now is they are going to have to pick some big names that they throw under the bus as a distraction from all of this.



Fitts: Given what has happened on Bundy with the whistleblower these last few days, it appears to me that Hillary Clinton is going under the bus.

Farrell: I think you may be right. But whether or not they are able to use that as a distraction, I don't know. As you said in Part I, the Bundy thing is naming names and they have a legal team.

Fitts: They are going to be able to name names.

Farrell: Yes, and the danger there is they cannot play the 'miscarriage of justice' card because that is when things will start to get hot – if you take my meaning – because that group of people will not put up with it anymore. So they can't play that card.

I'm thinking they are going to have to throw names under the bus, and Hillary Clinton may be one of them.

Fitts: Eric Holder may be one, as well.

Farrell: Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch and it may even get back to Obama in some form or fashion. I don't know.

C. Austin Fitts: Here is my other unanswered question: We've seen plenty come out on two mysteries. One is 9/11, and one is Seth Rich. Do those mysteries make progress going into these elections?



Farrell: I'm going to answer that with a big, fat 'maybe'. The reason I'm smiling when I say, "Maybe," is because we've been given little hints that something like that may happen. The reason I say that is because I am going back to the symbolisms leading up to the Kennedy documents release, which I think is another huge, symbolic message. You had the inauguration with the military guards coming out and standing next to Trump. We were never told why that happened.

Fitts: It was very suspicious.

Farrell: It was very suspicious, and it was clearly a message. If you recall, in some newscasts the camera was deliberately on the Clintons and Bush when the military came out. You saw looks of very extreme discomfort on their faces and very tense body language. Then you had Trump going to the CIA and making that 'damnably weird' speech about, "It's nice to see you all here. Oh, this room has lots of columns. We're going to build you a new room with no columns."

Then I remember the episode in the primaries when Trump dropped 9/11 Truther items into the primary and absolutely silenced Jeb Bush. It appeared that the world had just fallen on his shoulders. A few days later, he dropped out of the race.

Then Trump did the JFK issue to Ted Cruz, and a few days later he dropped out of the race. Then he, subsequently, goes to work for the Trump campaign and mans the phones.



I'm looking at all of this, and then you have the JFK documents released and that, I believe was a message. What he did was reversed the decisions of the Clinton, the Bush, and the Obama Administrations to keep and extend the classification limits on some of those documents. They were pressuring him, "We need more time to clean these files up," and he went ahead and did it anyway. That was a clear message.

So, I'm looking at all of this and thinking that we may see the Bundy/ Uranium One issue spin out to an expose of aspects of 9/11 and the intelligence community involvement, the drills that people have been harping on that were concurrent with 9/11, and there may be more coming out about that. We may see some sort of movement on Mr. Rich's murder. I wouldn't be surprised if we are, and that is the reason I smile and say, "Maybe."

All of this indicates that Trump was a Deep State candidate and was recruited to do this. Secondly, it indicates that somebody in the Military-Industrial Complex is terribly upset, as we've been arguing in our scenario during these talks, with the way the CIA part of the faction has been running things.

So, yes, we may see an abundance. I think there is a good possibility they are ready to throw Hillary under the bus. The real 'proof in the pudding' here is how many big names they are willing to throw under the bus besides her. Are they willing to start going after the Bush part of the 'pay to play'?



Fitts: We saw four allegations against Bush on sexual harassment, and then Andrea Mitchell comes out to defend him. So, I started Tweeting nasty shots to Andrea Mitchell. But that was very unusual to have those four against Bush, and then, suddenly, it shut down. If you look at where it could have gone, that is what takes you back. That is going to take you back to pedophilia, Franklin cover-ups (Franklin Federal Credit Union scandal), sex slavery, and all sorts of ugly dirt.

It was stopped, so they stopped with the Bushes, at that point. But the fact that they did those first four, somebody was being sent a clear message.

Farrell: Absolutely, and I think that you might see some action against Hillary and might even see some action against Bill. That could spill over.

Fitts: I think that they are going to leave Bill alone because he was the President.

Farrell: That could be.

Fitts: I think that is too damaging to the brand. They will stay away.

Farrell: They've been sent the message.

Fitts: Bill tried to stop Hillary from doing much of what she has been doing since the election, and he gave her good advice on the election, and she ignored it. He has given her good advice since then.



Bill is imminently likeable and is a member of the ‘Let’s Make a Deal’ party. They might not be able to get her without getting him, so they might throw him under, too.

Farrell: It could easily spill over to many people and I could see that happening. I give it a 50/50 chance.

Fitts: Right now we are having the sex purges in the US. We haven’t had shakedown purges yet, but if they need to do the shakedown to get control of large amounts of money, then they will go after the Bushes. That is where you get the really big money. If you want to know whom the number one person is who got off with the \$21 trillion, there it is.

The last question that I have is: How are we going to enforce the Constitution? If we don’t enforce Article I, both War and Appropriations Clause, then we are going to an inhuman culture. There are many different ways to do it, but I think it comes back to your discussion of culture. We have to make the decision that we can and that we want to.

Farrell: I go back to something we said in the last Quarterly Wrap Up: People are going to have to start getting out there and demanding of every candidate – from dog catcher on up – what their stance is on specific issues. If they don’t get a response from these people, publish their nonresponse somewhere on the internet. Start a website or do something and publish their nonresponse. Indicate, “We are not voting for you if you are not going to defend the Constitution.”

Fitts: It’s the old message of how to make it on Wall Street – unrelenting, unremitting, unceasing pressure.



Farrell: Yes. Hold their feet to the fire.

Fitts: Looking back on 2017, what was the source of your greatest inspiration?

Farrell: It would have to be the Crowdfund. That was easy! That's not hard!

But I know what you mean. That is actually a difficult one, and I have to say that there wasn't much inspiration until this Bundy deal and the release of the Bundy's, and then the whistleblower. Up to that point, there was some moderate encouragement with the JFK documents release. That grabbed my attention. But the Bundy deal is yet another sign that there is some sort of big movement taking place behind the scenes, and things are getting very serious.

Those would be my picks. What about you?

Fitts: I reviewed last week the Year of Pushing Back, and it was fundamentally working and connecting with all of these people who are pushing back and punching hard – from Bill Binney to Helen Chaitman, to Richard Dolan's thing on false flags was great, there are so many of them.

If I had to pick something that was the greatest inspiration, it would be Dr. Mark Skidmore because, to carry the missing money revelations for 17 years alone, it was so draining. Then to have somebody who is competent and reliable show up and do the hard work and that was very hard work. He has a big brain, he did a great deal of hard work, he wasn't afraid to pick it up and do the drudge work of going through it, and he was really thinking about it.



When we met in Washington, I thought, “How are they going to trick this guy?” What I’ve seen so far is that they are not tricking him.

I think that he is also going at it in a way, which is exceptionally responsible. I have to say that, with Dr. Skidmore and his team and the people who have been helping him you now have a variety of capable people swarming in. I finally feel that the cavalry has arrived.

I’m an investment banker and I’m not a public finance guru. So carrying this, for me, was out of context; it’s not what I do. Now we’re talking about getting it into a network of people who have the professional skills and the resources and the capability to really drill down.

I’m not so much interested in bringing transparency to the missing money as I am in seeing the US budget and credit turn from a negative return on investment to a positive return on investment. I’m tired of seeing money wasted away when good people are being underinvested in.

Farrell: And good people are being robbed and worked to death to support that system.

Fitts: My whole attitude is that I want to see this money turned into a positive return on investment, and it’s going to take a massive open-source effort to do that and figure out the nuts and bolts of how you do that. It’s going to take thousands of people and so, it has to be open-source.



Seeing it go this way, I'm starting to see the kind of movement that can happen to convert it into something that is, what I would describe as, 'actionable intelligence'. So, I am seeing a conversion of a great amount of the kind of intelligence that Giza Death Star or Solari has been working on to much more actionable intelligence. So that was my inspiration.

Finally, we put up some of the top videos. I've mentioned a few as we've gone through. I know that you say that you don't watch videos, but I know that you have seen some. What were the top news videos or news stories that you've seen?

Farrell: I would have to think about that because I don't watch that much news. Most of my news I get from articles.

Fitts: My favorite for the year was Schumer explaining that the President cannot run the executive branch; the CIA ran the executive branch.

Can you imagine? Who would have ever thought that Chuck Schumer would do something nice for us like that?

Another one that I wanted to mention was Lavrov and Tillerson snubbing Andrea Mitchell at a press conference, totally deservedly.

Farrell: That one I did see, and that was classic.

Fitts: That was very funny. You felt as if the adults were back in charge. It was great!



Farrell: And they were not paying a bit of attention to the children.

Fitts: Then, of course, I mentioned that wonderful woman who castigated the CNN host on Charlottesville saying, “The people were killed because the police stood down.”

Of course, Putin on cryptocurrencies is another video that I’ve mentioned. Then the Putin interviews were very significant. I thought that Oliver Stone did a great job on those, and they were very informative.

Skidmore’s USA watchdog interview on the missing money is a great classic. I think that it made a tremendous difference because, when he published the article, there were many people who hadn’t met him and didn’t know him. That was a great introduction to the fact that this is a very serious person.

The video that the scientists made on autonomous weapons really showed you the danger of these things.

Finally, I have to mention the video of Trump saying to people – just to quip to a reporter during a photo shoot – “The storm is coming.”

They said, “What do you mean by that?”

He said, “You’ll see.”

So the question is: Have we had the storm yet, or is the storm still coming?



Farrell: I don't think that we've had it yet.

Fitts: So what is the storm that is coming?

Farrell: Like I said in Part I, what we've just had is the prelude. Now we get the fugue.

Fitts: The purge fugue?

Farrell: What we've seen thus far are the storm clouds on the horizon and the distant rumble of thunder. I do think that this next year is going to be dominated by some housecleaning – not necessarily the whole thing getting cleaned, but I think that there is going to be some housecleaning. There are going to be people thrown under the bus.

You asked me if I could get rid of anybody in Congress who I would get rid of – who I would retire and send off to the pastures to enjoy their pensions. Right at the top is McCain, Lindsey Graham, Nancy Pelosi, Maxine Waters, Mitch McConnell, and Chuck Schumer – all of them.

Fitts: The entire financial coup crowd.

Farrell: It's going to be an interesting year to see who gets thrown under the bus. I do think that there is about a 50/50 chance that they are going to throw Hillary under the bus.



Fitts: The other night I gave it 40%, but that was before I heard about the whistleblower on Bundy. This is a very big development.

Farrell: This is huge. It's finally catching up, and here is the thing that is vitally important. The listeners overseas may not know this, but there has been a group of people in this country for many years – going back to when they were in Arkansas – tracking the Clinton body count. If they throw Hillary under the bus, all of that is on the table for investigation.

Fitts: That includes the Bushes. The Bushes were planning on Hillary to cover their exit.

Farrell: They were, and it hasn't worked out that way. I'm elated, to be quite honest with you.

Fitts: So, for 2018, take a look forward. What are you most curious about? What are you thinking about? What do you think 2018 will look like?

Farrell: If people thought that 2017 was a long slog and felt like an entire Administration packed into one year, you 'ain't seen nothing yet'. I think that 2018 is going to be bumpy. I think that we are going to see many revelations emerge. I think that if the election cycle and 2017 were about the 'lamestream' corporate-controlled media going nuts, I think that we have not seen anything yet. I think that in 2018, they are going to go ballistic, and it will be the final nail in their coffin.



Fitts: They will go ballistic over the election and what else will they go ballistic over?

Farrell: They will go ballistic over the election, but it's this Uranium One/Bundy thing. They are going to pull out all the stops, all the tricks, and they are not going to go anywhere. I really believe that and trust me here. They are going to try to dodge it, and they won't be able to.

Fitts: My concern is that you have a leadership which is moving fast to rebalance into North America and ratchet down the risk of being spread thin globally. They have to move fast. Who knows? We don't understand enough to be able to always get out of their way when they are coming in to move fast. They have much to deal with. They are dealing with a whole society that – to a certain extent – is out of alignment because we don't share a common picture, a common map, and an announced strategy. We don't have what China has, which is a public plan.

We don't understand where they are going, and we don't know how to get in alignment or whatever. So it's a bit of a challenge.

The other thing is that with tax reform, if they pass that by the end of the year, they will have a big 'nut' to move forward. That means that they are free to do things that are less politically popular. They will not do all of them because we are coming into an election.

The Republicans, right now, have made an absolute mess of their ground operations and support, from what I can tell, so they are going to have a real food fight.



If I were the people running the Administration, I would not want to lose the Senate, and I would not want to lose the House. The question is: How? How do they keep them both? It's a big question, but it is one that they had better be thinking about now. If they lose one or the other, they have a big problem.

Farrell: I think the only way they can come up with a strategy to do that is they are going to have to revive the Reagan Democrat strategy, and update it to 2.0. They have to reach out to those people in the Democratic Party who are equally upset at their leadership. They are going to have to do that somehow so, even if they get a bunch of Democrats in there, we might be getting a new group of people who are going to break with the party and vote with the Administration on some of these things. To do that, they are going to have to get their message out and convince people.

I'm going back to the Bundy topic because I think this is going to be underneath it all, and this is going to be the central issue of 2018. To do that, they are going to have to give people the perception of movement on all of this. They are going to have to give people, not only the perception, but they are going to have to keep communicating this somehow. So that means that they are going to have to clean up Trump's Twittering, they are going to have to clean up the way they are dealing with the media, and they are going to have to reestablish that base of support they had in the alternative media.

So far, I don't see anybody thinking along those lines, but that is what they have to do.



Fitts: Who is responsible for strategic planning on the whole effort? I don't know. If you are John Kelly, you are just trying to manage a 'bucking bronco' and it's a very difficult thing to do.

In the meantime, what this kind of domestic politics does is leaves the world free to continue to move on without America, which is very unfortunate.

Farrell: It's creating a vacuum that is a very bad time for us. I think that you are going to see Britain try to fill that vacuum to a certain extent, although May is a very weak Prime Minister. Much of it depends on her handlers.

I don't see anything coming out of Europe because they have their own problems. I don't see Merkel as being strong enough to take over any sort of leadership role in that vacuum. I certainly don't see it coming out of Macron in France. So, this is a very troubling period.

One country that I do think is going to respond to the vacuum in a major way is Japan.

Fitts: That is interesting.

Here is my concern. Once you get through the election in November of 2018, you have your insourcing set up and structured. You are through the 2018 election and it is what it is. If you are going to do the control demolitions and accelerate control demolitions and pull the social safety net, that is when you do it.



Welfare, food stamps, Divide & Conquer – I think that the general population has been left off sides. If you live in the United States, you need to be prepared for a period where your political unimportance reaches new heights. Rather than gripe about it, it's a time to be useful to each other.

Farrell: Yes. It is a time to be useful, and it is a time to start battening down the hatches and taking charge locally.

Fitts: So, if you have been sitting around being interested in national elections, it's time to get really interested in state and local government, and start to make a difference.

Farrell: As you have said, “If you're not in a conspiracy, start one.”

My attitude is also, “If you're not part of an elite, become part of it,” at a state and local level. That can be as simple as starting watchdog groups to hold everybody's feet to the fire across the board.

Fitts: So, if each one of us does what we can and what we are interested in and what fits and suits our skills, a mighty army arises. The reality is that if we don't do it, we are left behind or thrown under the bus.

Farrell: And we have to do our specific intentions. Divide those intentions precisely into local, state, regional, family, individual, church, friends – all of it – and start thinking very specifically about what it is that you would like to see.



Fitts: It's a little about racing into the future because where you are standing is going to disappear.

Farrell: You're right; it is. It is going to disappear, so get on the boat because the island is shrinking.

Fitts: It reminds me of Curtis Mayfield, "You don't need a ticket. Just get on board."

Farrell: It is going to be a bumpy year.

Fitts: This was a bumpy year, but I've been more inspired this year than I have been in a long time.

Farrell: There has been punch back, and there are clearly some people somewhere in the deep state that realize that there is a problem and they have to fix it and they have to fix it fast. It's the 'fast' part that is going to be rough and bumpy for most of us.

Fitts: It has been a delight to come and share News Trends & Stories with you, Part I and Part II. I am looking forward to another great year in collaboration, ignoring Corey Goode 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0.

Farrell: Somebody emailed me at the beginning of the Corey Goode issue coming out, and they asked me, "What do you think of Corey Goode?"

I said, "I don't think about him at all."



Fitts: Do you have any last words or advice for 2018?

Farrell: Batten the hatches down. Here we go!

Fitts: We are recording this on December 16th. If there is an amazing event between now and the end of the year, then we will do an addendum.

Farrell: Yes, if Hillary gets hauled off to the International Criminal Court in The Hague, we will do an addendum and I'll be here with my party hat.

Fitts: If you look at criminality, there are so many that I can't be satisfied with just one.

Farrell: I can't either.

Fitts: I want to see all \$21 trillion back in the coffers.

Farrell: I would like to see some real criminal investigation – not just of the Clintons, but also of certain shrubbery that has been around for far too long.

Fitts: I mentioned the \$21 trillion missing money, and they said, "We should prosecute and put those people in jail."

I said, "You know, you can't pay pension benefits with higher prison expenses."

They said, "It's good that they are doing an audit."



I said, “You can’t pay pension benefits with audit reports.”

You know me; I want to get the money back into the coffers.

Farrell: Can we say, “Shakedown”?

Fitts: \$21 trillion will be the ultimate global shakedown.

Farrell: Come here, Prince Mohammad, show us how this works.

Fitts: The rumors were that they were using the Blackwater successor in the Ritz Carlton. Maybe that is why the Administration wants to bring Erik Prince and his team onboard. What a bad idea.

Joseph, thank you again for a great 2017 and I look forward to even better in 2018. You have a wonderful day and thank you so much.



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.