



The Solari Report

JUNE 14, 2018

The Cosmology of Jon Rappoport with Harry Blazer





The Cosmology of Jon Rappoport with Harry Blazer

June 14, 2018

Harry Blazer: I'm Harry Blazer. My guest today is Jon Rappoport. If you are a Solari subscriber, you know Jon. But maybe we are going to find out about Jon in some ways that we haven't yet today – I hope.

Hello, Jon.

Jon Rappoport: Hi, Harry. It's good to be here.

Blazer: Jon, if you don't mind, I'm just going to ask some questions, and then you give some answers.

Rappoport: That sounds like a deal.

Blazer: Who is Jon Rappoport?

Rappoport: Who is Jon Rappoport? Never heard of him!

Well, I was just thinking about a period of my life when I started working as a reporter in 1982. I had spent some years before that writing fiction and writing poetry. I had never really gotten interested in journalism, but then I had a friend who worked at *L.A. Weekly*, which was becoming a very popular newspaper in Los Angeles.



She told me that they were looking for an article about nuclear weapons, and I happened to know a guy who was an expert on the subject. There was a lot of political debate at the time about something called the ‘nuclear freeze’, which was an attempt to get countries to stop making new nukes.

I interviewed my friend, and I gave the interview to the paper. They liked it and they printed it and they paid me. They said, “We would like you to do more work for us as a freelancer.”

I said, “Boy, that’s about the easiest writing I’ve ever done, and I got paid, and they want more.” So for the next several years I became Jon Rappoport the journalist and eventually realized that I could do that and that I enjoyed doing research. Frequently my research went further than other reporters. I began to make pitches to editors at other newspapers and magazines. It seemed pretty easy. I would write stories for them, they would publish the articles, but occasionally I would pitch a piece that they wouldn’t like – that went a bit too far.

For example, ‘Did the researchers actually ever find the virus they claimed causes this new disease?’ That would put them off. They would get kind of nervous. I began to see the boundaries – even in so-called ‘alternative media’.

Eventually I decided that I was going to continue all of this. I was going to continue to be a reporter and investigate. In 1987, a small book publisher approached me to do a book about AIDS.



I said yes, and I started to look into the subject of what AIDS really is, what people are saying it is, what the researchers have found, what they are lying about, etc. I think that was really what sold me on the idea of continuing to work as a researcher and a journalist. It was both frustrating and fascinating.

The further I went and the deeper I went, the more possibilities existed, the more lies came to the surface. The lies got bigger and bigger until finally I was in a position to look at a very large chunk of what I later came to call ‘the medical cartel’ and see that it was entirely based on false statements, lies, omissions, deceptions, etc. at an extremely deep and basic level.

That became a role that I took on enthusiastically to work as a reporter, and it has continued to this day. So that is part of the story, I would say.

Blazer: Tell us a little bit about Jon Rappoport the kid – where he grew up, where he went to school and what your education background is.

Rappoport: I grew up for the first five years of my life in New York City in Manhattan. My parents moved during World War II to White Plains, New York where I went to school all the way through high school in public schools. Then I went to Amherst College in Massachusetts and graduated in 1960. I majored in philosophy which I grew disillusioned with in my last year and a half because the basic questions that I was interested in, such as, “Does freedom exist?”



What is freedom?” were papered over by most of the faculty in that department. Somehow they didn’t look at such questions as being legitimate or real.

I kind of limped to the finish line with my degree, and I swore that I would never sit in a classroom again at any kind of educational institution. I decided that I wanted to be a writer. I had pretty much made that decision when I was 17.

I moved back to New York, and I began to write. I did a few jazz reviews for a magazine called *Metronome* that was going out of business, and moved out to Los Angeles in 1963. I took a series of teaching jobs at private schools, and I just scuffled and shuffled my way along for a number of years writing, taking part-time jobs, and maintaining a very low overhead life until 1982 when I started working as a reporter. I would say that everything changed at that point.

Blazer: So now I know one of the reasons why I love you so much – about four different reasons. I was a philosophy major, too and I got totally disillusioned. I was a jazz musician for quite a while. I dropped out of college in my fourth year for a lot of the same reasons that you talked about.

We are going to get into a bunch of things, but what do you hope to do that you haven’t done yet in your life?



Rappoport: That is a really good question. I've done a lot of things. I think that I may come up with a new way of teaching people about the power of their own imagination beyond anything that I've done so far. I don't know exactly what form it is going to take. It has already taken various forms. I have a private consulting business for clients. I have several collections – all of which impact on imagination – that I have put together at www.NoMoreFakeNews.com.

I write articles about creative power and imagination, but I'm looking at the possibility of extending that even further in some form or another, and I haven't decided or figured out or envisioned yet exactly what that form will be. But that would be very interesting to me – to empower still more people to look to their own creative potential as the key to their future and finding that power and applying it and using it as opposed to just thinking about it.

Somewhere in there would be something that I'm contemplating doing that I haven't done yet.

Blazer: Art and politics also played a role in your life. Why don't you spend a minute on that.

Rappoport: In 1962 I began painting in New York. That was something that came over me as an urge because I got to know several painters in New York, and I saw them in their studios. I looked at their work. I had no background whatsoever in painting. I just decided that I had to do this. So I did in a very small apartment that I lived in New York, starting in 1962. It was a revelation to me.



It was like moving up onto another plane of existence. It is hard to describe, but it was a fulfillment of a dream that I didn't even know I had.

The way that it played out from that point was that I knew that if I really dug down into my creative core, that my whole life would change – which it did. Relationships changed, my outlook basically changed, my connection to my family changed – not because I forced it, but just as a result of painting I had a completely new viewpoint and vision of my life. My life in general felt much more free, and I've continued to paint on and off ever since then. So that was a major, major thing.

On the other end of the spectrum we have politics. In 1993 I got very fed up with FDA attacks on nutritional supplements, raids on alternative health practitioner offices, and it just made my blood boil. Of course, I was already – at that point – working as a reporter for about a decade.

It occurred to me that maybe I could carry forward my ideas on all of this by running for office. I happened to live in a district in Los Angeles where 20-year incumbent Democrat Henry Waxman in the House of Representatives seemed to be on the side of pharmaceutical companies and against the whole concept of what was being called 'health freedom' then, which was the natural right of every human to manage and make decisions about their own health.

So I talked to a good friend of mine and decided, "What the hell! Let's go! I'll run in the Democratic primary against Henry Waxman, and we'll see how much trouble I can cause." That became a very interesting six-months of my life in a campaign.



I didn't get a lot of media coverage. I got a bit. I gave some talks, campaign speeches, a few interviews, and on the night of the vote my team and I went down to the county registrar south of Los Angeles where the vote was being counted, and long story short, it seemed to us that there might have been vote fraud. I was pretty sure of it because the percentages of the vote that were being assigned to my opponent and me every half hour during the night as we watched the computers never changed. They virtually never changed. It was as if at every new influx of votes that were counted, the percentages were split exactly the same way.

So I learned a lot about vote fraud, I learned a lot about computer voting, I learned about the difficulty in trying to challenge your computer vote, and the whole episode convinced me that if I were going to be involved in politics in any way, I would have to take a different approach. In fact, at some point in the campaign, one day I woke up and said, "If I win this, what am I going to do in Washington?"

By that time, I was well aware of the degree of corruption in the Federal government, and the idea of trying to sponsor new legislation and so on and so forth seemed to me to be a losing proposition for the two years or four years or whatever it would be that I would be in Washington. So, I decided on a strategy which was: If I won, we would just spend all of our time trying to expose the corruption in Congress, and we would make ourselves persona non-grata for everybody there. We would cause a lot of trouble.



For example, one idea was that we would rent out big trucks, and every day we would have people driving them around Washington DC with giant posters on them titled ‘Corrupt Congressman of the Week’. We would have a picture of a Congressman or a Congresswoman. In one column, we would have the bills that they voted for, and right across from that would be the moneys they received from lobbyists that obviously created a conflict of interest or influenced them to vote the way they did. Every week it would be a new Congress person who would be the ‘Corrupt Congressman of the Week’.

We figured that we would get a lot of publicity on that, and we would stir people up, cause a lot of problems with constituencies even back home for some of these Congressmen, and just try to expose one of the corruptions going on in Washington.

That became my attitude after my foray into political office, which was to expose everything you can. So I’ve tried to follow that in my reporting.

Blazer: Jon, in your life, what are you most proud of or pleased about with yourself?

Rappoport: It’s hard to isolate one thing. On www.NoMoreFakeNews.com I do write a lot about the news behind the news and what is really going on as opposed to what major media are promoting. So in the process, I’ve uncovered a lot of very deep stuff on many different fronts.



At the same time, I keep coming back to the idea of the individual. The individual who is free, independent, imaginative, creatively powerful, determining his own future, envisioning it, and inventing it as the cornerstone of civilization for one thing, and also one of the most important things on the planet in the sense that if you erase that whole thing – the individual – and try to build whatever you want to build in its place, it utterly fails as we can see in the collectivist experiment that is going on now on Planet Earth.

The individual is the rock, the basis, and should be in any political system. Despite whatever shortcomings existed in the Constitution of the United States, it did, in fact, liberate the individual and hamstring central power. That was its aim, and it accomplished that to a large degree with certain shortcomings.

But it was by far the most brilliant attempt in the history of the planet, and as far as I'm concerned, it still is. But the idea that it engendered was that we want to liberate the individual to create his own future in the widest possible terms. In order to do that, we have to set up a political structure that does not impede unnecessarily the individual. We know from bitter experience that central power has always tried to take too much. So we are going to create a system that intentionally checks and balances and severely curtails that structure.

Even with all of my reporting, I haven't lost sight of the fact that I keep coming back to the individual, and I'm pleased about that. For one thing, it keeps me motivated. It keeps me percolating. It keeps me alive and cooking whereas if I just said, "Yeah, the individual is very important."



I'll put it to the side because all I want to do is to write political stories or medical stories, and that's it," then by now I would have run out of gas.

I am pleased that I am making room to do both, and I recognize that some readers can't handle it. They want one or the other, but not both. Well, that is just the way it is. Fortunately, there are many, many readers who are interested in both, so they have been supporting my work over the last 17 years online. I think that is a really good thing.

Blazer: We are going to go into bigger depth on some of these themes, but I'm just going to go down my list here.

What do-over's would you like in your life? Are there any?

Rappoport: I could think of some, sure, but all in all not really. You could say, "I want to do this over because now I see much more than I saw when I was 15 or 27. So I would do x in a different way."

Absolutely, but knowing now what I would have done and knowing that I can't go back and do it over, that is sufficient for me.

If I didn't recognize that I would want to do something over in a different way, then that would be a different story – if I just didn't recognize that. But seeing it and knowing it and understanding it and having distance from it and learning so much more than I knew then – that is enough.

Blazer: From your perspective, what are humans' biggest shortcomings?



Rappoport: In certain ways, they have been brainwashed. They have brainwashed themselves to believe that they do not have enormous creative potential. That, to me, is ‘the big one’ because there is an urge in every human being – whether they know it or not – to be intensely creative, to sit in the present and look in the future and say, “What do I want to create?” and then to go ahead and do it in the most intense and wide-ranging ways possible. That is there. That urge is there. It’s in every human being. It can be damped down, it can be sat on, repressed, buried, etc., but if it is, then all kinds of other problems develop. All manners of other problems develop, and the person fails to make a connection between all of those problems and the big one that he is sitting on and repressing – which is his own creative power. He doesn’t make that connection.

Conversely, if you could find a way to unleash that creative power in that person and it happened, he would magically realize that all of these other problems were dissolving and going away on their own because that is where they came from.

I think that is the biggest shortcoming. We would have a completely different world if every person realized that he/she were an ‘artist of reality’ as I call it, inventing reality and shaping reality and creating reality and imagining reality as you want it to be, and then making it so.

Blazer: You’ve been elected to the Galactic Council as a representative of the human beings, and the chairman asks, “Would you mind taking a moment and telling us about the most favorable aspects and attributes of human beings?”



Rappoport: They will go to great, great, great lengths to help each other. That interconnectedness is hugely unreported. The people are unknown, but it happens every hour of every day, and it's awe-inspiring. It's amazing. That is one thing.

Blazer: Jon, what do you hate?

Rappoport: Oppression and bureaucracy that is robotic. "That is the rule, so this is the way we do things."

"Yes, but it doesn't make any sense. Can't you see that it would be better to do it this way?"

"We don't think about that. We have the way that we do it. Those are the rules, and this is how we do it."

Based on that, you are going to get every kind of distortion possible. The people you should be supporting you are going to step on, and the people you should be stepping on, you are going to support. It is absolutely horrendous.

Blazer: Do you believe that there is a God? If so, what is your concept of a God?

Rappoport: I don't have a religious faith to start with, and I certainly don't have organized religious faith. That is for sure, nor do I have traditional religious faith. But I have had experiences where let's just say that 'help' arrived in unexplainable ways.



You can call that whatever you want to call it, and I don't have a name for it, but I know it happens, and I know that it has happened to me. Other than that, I really don't have anything to say about it.

Blazer: Do you believe there is the soul? If so, what is it?

Rappoport: Yes, I do. Take the Bhagavad Gita, one of the sacred texts of India. If you read a good English translation of that, particularly the conversation between Krishna and Arjuna on the battlefield – a famous passage – you will find the soul referred to in several different ways which I would find contradictory.

The individual soul is part of a much larger consciousness or soul, or the individual soul is itself immortal and has always existed and always will exist.

You could, if you wanted to, try to combine the two, but the way that I read those accounts, they really are contradictory, and they are both put forward in the dialogue in the Gita.

My notion of the soul is that it is the individual. It's not something he's got in his pocket or in his left kidney; it's him. He is cloaked in physical form here and now in a physical structure and body. He hasn't always been. Eventually he will exit that physical structure and go elsewhere – who knows where? Who knows whether he comes back or doesn't or whatever?



To me, the soul is not affected by the laws of nature or the laws of physics such as we understand them in the sense that things deteriorate and run down and get worn out and eventually crumble into dust and disappear. That happens to everything physical, but the soul is not physical, so it doesn't happen to the soul. It can try, but it doesn't happen.

Blazer: In a way, does that soul and what it knows and the connections that it has remain accessible for other souls? Does it add to the cumulative knowledge or wisdom of the universe or our planet or other souls?

Rappoport: I think it could, but the problem seems to be that people don't realize that they have that access or that they could share that access. They tell lots of stories, and some of those stories might touch on something real in what you are suggesting, but I think that most individuals are blocked off from that – blocked off from all or even a lot of what they already know – because they decide to live in a limited hangout or a limited structure.

“Okay. So here we are in America in 2018. Look at all that is going on here. We've got cell phones and cars. Pretty soon we are going to have robot cars. This is where I live, so I'm going to have to adapt in order to get ahead. What good is this immortal knowledge that I may have accumulated over God-knows-how-long? What I really have to focus on is shrinking down in order to be able to fit in and to accommodate and to find a niche that will be acceptable to me, where I can have some measure of success, etc.”



It seems to me that most of the trouble around the issue that you are raising here is that the soul wants to fit in, and it wants to fit into a limited structure. Therefore, it has to develop amnesia around a great deal of what it knows in order not to be troubled or bothered by it.

You've got to become a 'card carrying member' of the association here, which is the citizenship of some country on Planet Earth in 2018. From the perspective we are talking about, that is a pretty scaled-down version of the soul.

Blazer: You've talked in many ways about the power of the individual and almost the 'duty' of the individual to create their world and to create reality. Do you also believe that there is an objective reality that is to be discovered or known, or is everything a subjective creation?

Rappoport: I believe that there are levels or phases. On one level, the physical world is obviously very, very real. There is no question about it. We can call that 'objective reality'.

Regardless of the fact that the individual can create his own world, so to speak, there is this physical world around us. It's here. It's real on this level. But on another level, it is something else. It is not the same.

To try to give an illustration of that, I'll give you a simple one. Dean Radin is the author of several books on what you could call 'paranormal ability', and he is a researcher-scientist. In his first book, *The Conscious Universe*, he did an extensive overview of all of the published evidence of paranormal experiments in universities and —



labs and so forth since the beginning when the first ones were done. He isolated what he determined were the well-formed, credible studies, gathered up all of the results, and his conclusion was that on the whole they demonstrated paranormal ability. In other words, they demonstrated that the ability to do telepathy and even mind over matter, depending on what the experiment was, showed more than statistical probability in the outcome.

It's very hard to match up that conclusion with, "Yeah, the physical world is real and it's here and it follows certain laws, and that is the way it is, and there is no such thing as exceptions. It just happens. We've got atoms and we've got electrons and quarks and so forth, and they do their thing." It's very hard to square that with the idea that people have abilities that are really not explainable in physical terms.

That would be one starting point for beginning to investigate and think about, "Is this objective physical world as objective and unyielding as we believe it is?"

I think that the answer to that question is, "No, it's not."

What Radin has done, which in my mind is a very valuable contribution, would be the beginning of that exploration that would eventually by degrees show that, "No. As real as this world is real, as in when a car crashes against a brick wall, there is another level at which that is not the case."



Blazer: What is reason and how does it relate to intuition, logic, and math?

Rappoport: I spent a lot of time describing that in one way or another in my articles and in one of my collections, *Power Outside the Matrix*. Reason is the ability to determine evidence – evidence for or against a proposition.

Is the evidence good enough, or isn't it? Are there flaws in the process of coming to a conclusion about an event or a situation or an institution or a person? Or is the trail of evidence credible?

Logic lays down certain laws and rules of inference and validity that are extremely valuable and sharpen the mind. However, after working as a researcher and a reporter all these years, it is not the only tool in the bag because you have many situations in which you would like to have a smoking gun that finally and ultimately reveals the truth of a given situation, but you can't get it mainly because it's being hidden on purpose.

So what are you left with? You are now left with degrees of probability from very low to very high. You are left with what they call in the legal profession 'circumstantial cases' in which you assemble evidence that you believe points to a conclusion without having that smoking gun.

So reason, logic, and investigation all come together when one explores a question that he wants to answer – hopefully a significant and deep question. He understands eventually that he is not going to get to a perfect 100% iron-clad answer.



Intuition can guide him and does guide him to look into certain areas that he never would have thought of using his rational reason and explore those areas to see what he can find that is relevant to his investigation. Intuition also permits new ideas to pop up, seemingly out of nowhere, that can be guides to finding better evidence and answers as he goes.

I use the idea of investigations and research because it's a very good place where all of these things come together. If you try to knock out one in favor of the others, you're going to come up short. Or if you try to overemphasize one at the expense of the others, you are going to come up short. Some people just indulge in complete fantasy, which you might say is a kind of a pretentious brand of intuition where they will make an association between the third letter in somebody's name and the third planet from the sun and conclude something about a plot to derail the production of automobiles in China.

Well, that is getting into an area that is just not going to be productive. In the same way, you can develop such an iron-clad sense of logic in rejecting everything that does not absolutely spell out a valid inference that you ignore all the probabilities and a whole ream of evidence that is pointing in a certain direction. So there needs to be a certain mix of these qualities in investigations.

If you want to see how that works, you have to do it – or at least you have to read somebody else who has done it, and who also explains how he did it – to get a sense of how these equalities intermingle and prove fruitful. But these qualities collaborate with each other.



Blazer: In terms of another interesting mix, you've been a great champion of freedom. You've been an advocate and also a seer warning us and urging us to be more free and be more creative. But do you believe that there is also determinism? If there is both, then how does that mix work?

Rappoport: I'm not really a believer in determinism when it comes to the individual. As evidence of that, I would say that a person can become freer and freer and freer, especially through the use of imagination, so that he can not only envision but put into effect the kind of future that he wants.

You could have taken a snapshot of that individual five or ten or fifteen years ago when he might have been able to conceive of that future, but he could never put it into effect because he was at the mercy of certain ideas in his own mind that inhibited him. Then you could go even further back to the point where he could never even have conceived of the future that he wanted for the same reason.

What I see as determinism, vis-à-vis the individual, is the inhibiting ideas and thoughts that he has about his own limitations which then prompt limited action, limited thought, limited conception of what he is capable of, and all of those kinds of things. If you took a snapshot of a person in that lowered state, it would look very much like determinism, and you could deduce all sorts of reasons outside of that person as explanations for why he couldn't conceive of this and why he couldn't do that, etc. all over the map. But really you would be wrong.



If you jumped ahead in time, you would say, “My gosh! This person has now become much freer.” The situations around him didn’t really change; he changed. He changed in offloading certain ideas about himself and his capabilities. More important, he added on ideas about his own creative power and confirmed those in one way or another. Now he is, in fact, much freer.

So, yes, there is determinism in the sense that a person can load it up for himself and what he can do, and then be hamstrung by it. But he can also unload it and become much, much freer.

Blazer: You’ve been one of the most outspoken folks consistently over the years about psychiatry. Would you say that psychopathy is real?

Rappoport: It seems to be, in the sense that there are people who are very indifferent and uncaring when it comes to all other people. They are also violent. You put those two things together, and that person is going to wreak havoc. In that sense, I would say that there are these people. But to then make the kind of leap that psychiatry makes in its catalog of so-called ‘mental disorders’ where they give the impression that they’ve proved that this disorder and that disorder really arise out of some brain malfunction and they’ve really nailed that down and they can test for it and they can come back with a test from a lab, no way. That has not been done in any defining way.

I recently wrote about that a couple of times. People mistake what psychiatrists say about what they’ve done with what they have actually done and not done.



There is a lot of technobabble around, “The breakthroughs are being made, we have new imaging techniques, we’ve seen distortions in certain areas of the brain that correlate with certain behaviors, etc.”

Okay. Fine. You boys in psychiatry have a bible, and it’s called the DSM – the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. It is published by the American Psychiatric Association. You’ve got your bible.

All of the babble aside, all the PR aside, all of the promises and the breakthroughs aside, where are the laboratory tests for any of the 297 supposedly distinct and labeled mental disorders that define the disorder such that if the test comes up positive, it amounts to a diagnosis of that disorder? If you had any tests like that, they would be in the DSM. If you want to torture yourself, read through the entire bible – the DSM – and look for one such defining diagnostic test for any mental disorder, and you will not find it; it’s not there. People in the profession have admitted it, and I have quoted them.

But they go on to say, “We are doing a different kind of science, you see. This is different.”

No, it isn’t. It’s the same thing. It’s bad science. It’s no science. It’s pseudo-science. They collect menus of human behavior and patterns of thinking in committees of psychiatrists who sit around and debate and argue, and they decide, “We are going to cluster these behaviors together, and we are going to put a label on it – ADHD or whatever – and we are going to say that it is a distinct mental disorder and that it results from a chemical imbalance in the brain.



We are going to say that, but we have no tests for it. But we are not going to worry about that.”

That is what they do. That is how they operate. They are completely shameless.

I wrote this the other day: It would be as if you walked into a doctor’s office and he talked to you for ten minutes, and he said, “You have cancer.”

“What? Where are the tests?”

“Oh, we don’t need to do any tests. I’ve just been watching your behavior and what you’re saying, and I can tell that you have cancer. We are starting chemo tomorrow.”

That is psychiatric diagnosis. Do people have problems? Do they have pain and emotional pain and suffering? Of course they do. But deducing the cause and claiming that you know the cause and putting a label on it and saying that you are doing some kind of medicine where test are all-important in making diagnoses, that is an utter fabrication.

Blazer: Do you think that evil exists? If so, what is your perspective on it?

Rappoport: Evil is intentionally harming somebody else, and people do it. You can argue about the degrees of evil and when it rises to the level where you want to put a capital ‘E’ on it.



“We are going to launch a war, and we are going to kill half a million people and make a lot of money,” is different from, “I am going to cheat this customer and charge them \$4 extra for the product.”

There are all manners of degrees, and we can argue about at what point it really becomes ‘evil’ as opposed to just cheating. I certainly have never tried to define that, nor do I think that it is particularly important, but we can recognize that at a certain level, intentional harm is evil.

I’m not saying that evil is a force that exists and floats around like the weather. I know that some people do, and that is fine; that is their view. But I would say that if you are going to do that, don’t let the individual off the hook. Don’t do that. There is something going on with a person who commits evil on a significant scale that is right there with that individual. He doesn’t need to have a cloud of evil floating through the sky descend upon him in order to do what he is doing.

For those people who say that there are these clouds, okay, fine, but that does not let that individual off the hook. And that individual could, if he so decided, reform his own actions so that he was no longer doing evil.

Blazer: So in a way, Satan doesn’t exist in your world?

Rappoport: Right.

Blazer: But there is Satanism, which is a human invention from your perspective.



Rappoport: Yes. It is a conjuring.

“Let’s have a ritual. We are going to sacrifice some animals, and we are going to drink the blood in this grove, and we are going to say certain things that we decide mean other things, and we have symbols which we have consented to that mean this, that, and the other thing, and we believe in engendering as much chaos as possible and destruction of every order that might exist. That is our group. That is our people. That is our club. That is our secret society. We have these rituals and meetings where we do this six times a year.”

Yeah. You can conjure up a boatload of evil that way, and you can get to the point where collectively you have invented it. It now has a form that you have put into being or put into effect that you can feel and sense and see as confirmation of your own ‘power’.

You can also do this with other things that have nothing to do with evil. In fact, there was an experiment with a group in Canada. I can’t remember all of the details, but these were pretty healthy, well-balanced people. They just decided that as an interesting experiment they would sit around many, many times, and they would invent a character, and they had a name for him like ‘Bob’ or something. That is what they did.

‘Bob’ for them took on real meaning and existence. Supposedly – and I can’t confirm this, but as best I can recall – the group mentioned certain very unusual phenomenon that occurred during some of their meetings. I think that it had to do with objects moving around on their own and so forth.



Sure. I think that is possible. Absolutely. But the people who do Satanism, for example, that is their religion. They believe in that, and they do everything possible to make it as real as they can. They want to do evil, and they also understand certain mechanisms of human behavior that have to do with initiating people.

For example, if Person A can get Person B to do something really destructive and nasty and harmful to someone else as a ‘rite of passage’ or initiation, that initiate is now faced with a very heavy dilemma. He has crossed the line of his own prior world view. How is he going to get back? What is he going to do?

Somebody says to me, “We are going to initiate you into this evil group, and the first thing that you have to do is burn down the house.” (I’m just making that up.)

For one reason or another, I do it. There is somebody inside the house who dies. How am I going to come back from that? That is the whole point. The people who are initiating the newcomers want to drag them across that line and keep making them do evil until they see no way of getting back.

Now those people who have been dragged across the line, those initiates, believe that they must continue to do evil, and that is their only course of action. So they develop ‘religion’ around the idea of doing evil. It is really nasty, and it is evil.



Blazer: Do you believe that mind control is possible? Do you believe that it exists and is being used, and that essentially the technology exists to enslave?

Rappoport: I think that the technology does exist, and I think that it is being used, but I have serious questions about the ‘coverage’ in both mainstream and alternative media to the extent to which the control works.

I think that many people exaggerate it, and I think that many people exaggerate it in order to make an excuse for their own inability to get what they want out of life. In other words, “Hey, there is nothing I can do. We are all victims. We are under control, and we can’t escape.”

That is all bull. And here is what I mean: By the use of electronics and electromagnetics and acoustics and light and microwaves and all of this, you can make tremendous impacts on people and on the brain and on the nervous system. You can engender a certain reaction and emotion in people. There is no question about it. But the idea that you can populate somebody’s mind with a complete set of memories and thoughts to the point where they are just completely fools down to the most subtle nuances of their own ability to think and discriminate and discern and so forth and so on is a whole other ball game, folks.

In certain forms of MK-Ultra, the CIA mind control program and other forms, torture was used. Well, now all bets are off. You’re going to torture a person with enough pain and enough chemicals and all of the really hideous stuff and try to induce in them as a result of that multiple identities or personalities or whatever?



I think that is probably possible. But without the sheer pain, enslavement, and torture you are going to do the same thing? Show me that technology. Don't show me the promise of the technology or, "We did it with mice. We transferred memories from one mouse to another."

Show me the extent of this in humans. Make a good case. Let's see what you've got.

What I'm saying is that especially in an individual who has cultivated his own freedom and independence and power, it is extremely difficult without extended torture to control that person's mind in a top to bottom way. I think that people have to recognize that instead of just saying, "Oh, they've got all kinds of technology. We're all victims."

Really? Show me what they did to you. Let's get specific. Bring it out here. Describe it in detail. You're saying, "Hey, you're a victim too, right?" Explain that, and explain it in terms that are not just about harassment, which obviously exists.

You can aim a pulse of electricity at somebody or microwaves or acoustics or whatever, and you can disable them. You can scare the hell out of them. You can terrify them. You bet! That's not really that big of a feat to be able to perform. But to completely transform a person's mind – to his alert, aware, free, independent, reasonable, logical, imaginative mind? Show me.

Blazer: At least that person should have a sense that something is going on and they are a little wary of it.



Rappoport: Right. “Today was a little bit different. Where did that thought come from? Do I really want to abide by that thought and act on it? No, I don’t think so. So wherever it came from, I’m discounting it because I don’t really feel like going down to this polluted river, stripping off my clothes, and jumping in. I don’t think that I’m going to do that.”

Blazer: Do you believe other intelligent civilizations exist in the universe, in the galaxy, in our solar system and potentially even our planet?

Rappoport: In the universe I do. In the galaxy, yes I do. In the solar system, not that I know of. On Earth, not that I know of.

I have heard some of the stories and I’m a little bit familiar with some of the extrapolation that leads people to say that there are hidden civilizations on planets in this solar system or inside the earth. I haven’t investigated any of that far enough to say that I agree or disagree. So I don’t know about that.

Purely on the basis of probability, in the galaxy and in the universe, if the measurements we are being fed by scientists are pretty real about the size of these areas and how old they are, then I don’t think that there is any doubt that in the galaxy and in the universe there are many, many, many, many civilizations. I don’t have intimate knowledge of one that I could say, “Yes, let me describe this one,” but sure.

The whole idea that we are alone in the universe just seems preposterous to me.



Blazer: Do you believe as Dolan and arguably Fitts does that there is a *Breakaway Civilization* with high technology, using stolen money? As the head of the Lockheed Skunkworks said 20 or 30 years ago, “We have the technology to bring ET home.”

Rappoport: I’ve heard these statements, and I think that they are very interesting. Like I said, I understand the extrapolations that lead to that conclusion of a *Breakaway Civilization*, but it’s not one of those areas where I’ve said, “Hey, this is a gigantic question, and I’m going to spend a year or two trying to come to some conclusion about it.”

So, I don’t know. I could see how people would conclude that, but I don’t know whether if I looked into everything they ever said or wrote about it that I would end up agreeing or not. I just don’t know.

Blazer: Is there anything you’ve come across that would indicate that maybe Earth is paying a dividend to someone else or that this planet is owned or looked at as a subsidiary of a much larger galactic corporation?

Rappoport: Nothing that I could specify or put my finger on. I mean, I’ve heard the idea. In a way, it’s very appealing emotionally. I don’t mean ‘appealing’ as in, “I think it’s wonderful,” but appealing (compelling) in the sense that it makes sense in some way.

Things are crazy enough on this planet that if we assume that we are just a small subsidiary of a major corporation based off-planet, then that could explain a lot about what is going on.



For example, the people who run us and own us don't really care about the condition of nations and societies and people; all they want is production. As long as the quotas are being met, it doesn't really matter how much chaos is caused. That is appealing to think about in the sense that it explains certain things. It's a hypothesis that explains why things are going as crazy as they are going. So I kind-of like it as a piece of storyline, but I don't know.

As far as advanced tech is concerned, now we come to something else. I understand that advanced tech is one of those premises on which certain people base the idea that there is a *Breakaway Civilization*. So from that starting point, the statement made by Dr. Rich, who was the head of Skunkworks, "We can take ET home," and the Star Trek stuff. We've got that.

Follow-up questions: What have they been doing at Skunkworks all this time?

A former head of Skunkworks or head of projects at Skunkworks is on the advisory team now of Tom DeLonge and *To the Stars Academy*. They are talking about UFOs and ETs and so on and so forth. I'm saying, "Sit down with this Skunkworks guy, and let's hear what he has to say about advanced tech and where it comes from and how it was developed in secret facilities."

From the few statements that I've seen, the reports that I've read, I glean that there is advanced tech from some of the UFO sightings. The ship was here, and now it's there.



It's way up in the sky, it comes down in ten seconds and hovers 50 feet over the ocean, and then it zooms away. What is that? Where does that come from? How are laboratories that are carrying on research in secret in the US and in other places involved with that? What is that?

I have to say that I am particularly interested in how these labs have appropriated/stolen impressive research of Earth scientists like Tesla, for example, who when he died, FBI agents swarmed into his room and took a lot of his papers – whatever they could find – and appeared to never have returned them. That's kind of an odd thing.

Obviously Tesla was onto a great many things – maybe not as many as people say that he was, but even what he was not onto, he was in the early stages of. So what has happened in the interim with research? What has happened with scientists like that?

If indeed there are retrieved ET craft that have been reverse engineered, I would think that the guy whose name I can't remember who was the head of Skunkworks – now on DeLonge's team – would have a lot to say about it if he would talk. I'd love to hear him talk. I would love to sit down with him and ask him about 600 questions in very great detail. But, of course, he's not talking. That seems to me a little disingenuous, to say the least.

“We are going to be exploring the realm of ETs in all of the universe. We are going to build a ship that traverses time and space,” and other such statements that DeLonge has made. Now turn it around. You've got a guy right there – former head of Skunkworks projects. Why aren't we hearing from him?



I believe that there is advanced tech that has been shielded and kept from the public, but I don't know exactly what it is. I sure would like to.

Blazer: Do secret societies exist? From your perspective, to what extent have they shaped human existence and are affecting us today?

Rappoport: I think they certainly exist and they always existed. In some desert civilization, the high priests who rule have an inner core, and they sit down and talk turkey. They are not subject to the cosmology and the teachings and the principles that they use in order to hypnotize and enslave their own population. They know it's a con. They are the major con artists. They are the mythmakers and the fairytale tellers, and they name the gods. They describe them and they talk about retribution and punishment and all of these kinds of things on purpose to make people feel guilty and make people feel smaller than they really are.

They sit down, and they talk turkey. "Okay, boys, how are we doing? Do we have these people under our thumb, or don't we? To what degree? Do we have any rebels that are serious contenders that we need to discredit or wipe out? Let's have a progress report here."

I get this all the time – at every stage of civilization. It's happening.

Then you've got the guys who are controlling the money – the printing of the money, the distribution of the money, the invention of the money, and the contraction of the money. "There is a lot of money today, and there isn't any money tomorrow. Let's get our dupes to explain in terms that any fool could see through why this is so when we know why. We contracted it and we expanded it."



Then there are the secret societies – the Satanists and people like that who we described before. You get some overlap with pedophilia and all this kind of evil stuff.

They've been all over the place. I don't necessarily agree with some people's characterization who think that they've nailed down the entire story. "It's all the Illuminati." Really? Are you talking about the 1776 Illuminati, or are you talking about the Rothschild Illuminati who didn't call themselves Illuminati? Are you talking about some other Rockefeller Illuminati who didn't call themselves Illuminati? Who are you talking about?

I think that those people tend to get swept up in various generalities. No question about it.

Again, I don't subscribe to the idea that these secret societies have a stranglehold on everything, because a stranglehold means that there is no way out. "Let's just give up. Why are we sitting here talking? It doesn't matter. Nothing matters. Everything is done and gone."

I don't buy that. I never have, and I never will. I can't do it. I think that some people buy that because they want to buy it, not because it's true. It gives them an out, and that is what they are basically looking for. I don't like that.

Blazer: You have this remarkable series that you refer to occasionally in some of your articles about getting out of the Matrix. You have a three-part series. I want you to talk just a little bit about that – how people can get it, your website, and how people can learn more about you.



But also I want you to come clean about one thing. You talked about these numbers of characters that you met who helped educate you about certain aspects of the ‘real deal’ in terms of propaganda and so on. Are these people real? Are they composites? Are they something that you made up to explain points?

Rappoport: The people are real; they are not composites. They existed, and through a confluence of events involving one or two of them, I met more.

Two of them were very reluctant to talk to me at all. As I’ve explained, eventually they said that they would talk to me off the record. The reason was because they were partially reformed bad guys who were retired. In their retirement, they looked back on their life, and they realized what it was that Wild Bill Donovan, the head of the OSS, the predecessor to the CIA, used to say, “We’re wild cowboys. We can roam over the earth, destroying and doing whatever we want to. It’s a great life. Fantastic.”

These people, particularly one of them, was like that. In his later years, he deeply regretted it. He was a compound, complex guy, and he never really totally reformed in his mind, but he came a long way. He wanted to talk, but he was afraid.

I wasn’t looking for anything in particular at first; I was just interested in what he had to say. After a while, it became apparent that he wanted to talk a lot. I said, “I can give you a way to do that without compromising who you are. You have to decide what to say and what not to say that will protect your identity. That is entirely up to you. I have no way of vetting that.”



That's how all of that happened. That is the short version. There is a longer story that gets into how I decided that these people were for real, which I wanted to do as well and satisfy myself.

Many of these interviews are in the first collection called *The Matrix Revealed*. They synchronistically add up to more together than they do as interviews with separate individuals in the sense that if you read all of the interviews with how reality is put together, so to speak with the nuts and the bolts of it, you begin to see much more about how the Matrix is created – much more.

The other two collections move further in the direction of liberating and accessing your own creative power and imagination and how to do that in exercises. There are many, many exercises that I developed over a long period of time to enable that to happen if you practice these exercises in a daily way.

The Matrix in that sense is what is presented to us as reality. I described it in the past as a bunch of mural painters painting a gigantic mural and pointing us towards it and saying, “This is reality.” Eventually, through study, getting up closer to the mural, looking at it in many different ways, we begin to see details emerge that tell us that this is being put together for us and that it is not just reality. We begin to see how it is built, and then we begin to see that if they can build it for us, then I can build my own. Why do I have to accept the mural?

That is, to a significant degree with many additions, the subject of the other two collections, *Exit from the Matrix* and *Power Outside the Matrix*.



You can read all about these and order them at my website www.NoMoreFakeNews.com and also get on my free email list so you can read all of my articles that I publish there, which is pretty much everything that I write these days.

Blazer: As we near the end of this conversation, tell us a little bit about your wife. You've actually chosen over the last few months to talk a little bit more about her in some of your articles.

Rappoport: My wife, Laura, was for me – and I think that this is true in other marriages for people as well; I'm not setting myself apart – a complete bolt out of the blue. Her capacity for connecting with people and helping people and being alive in the moment and the connection between us developed into something beyond anything that I ever thought of.

She opened my eyes to something miraculous in terms of what I knew before. It's not one of these stories where I say, "And I thank my wife for supporting me..." I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about life day to day. I'm talking about seeing somebody else whose beauty and goodness shines so bright that it just astonishes me. It doesn't just please you or satisfy me; it astonishes me.

So, yes, I've written a couple of articles about Laura recently. I really have no idea where I would be or what I would be doing now without her.

Blazer: She has her own business in helping people, too. Could you tell people a little bit about that and where they could access her services?



Rappoport: Actually she is winding that down, but she has been a nutritional consultant and counselor for probably 30 years now in a variety of settings, and she has done enormous good for people. That is just the beginning of a 37-day story (a story that would take 37 days to tell).

Thirty years is a long time to be dealing with individuals on that level, day in and day out. So she is winding that down, and she is going to pursue other projects. I'm looking forward to seeing what they are and what creative decisions she makes.

We are together side by side. We do some things together, and we do some things on our own in terms of enterprises and projects and so on. It's worked out beyond anything that I could have predicted.

Blazer: Part of the mission statement for Solari is helping people live a free and inspired life. You've given us great guidance, not only today, but over quite a few years through your writings and conversations.

If you had a nephew, and he said, "Uncle, tell me the three or five most important books that I should read," or, "Tell me the three or five most important pieces of music that I should listen to," or, "Tell me three or five of the most important pieces of art that I should look at to kick start this 'free and inspired life'," what would you tell them?

Rappoport: I don't know about the books. One painting that I would tell him to look at is Piero della Francesca's *Legend of the True Cross*. It's a fresco in a little church in Arezzo, Italy. It's done by a 15th century Italian painter.



Look particularly at a panel called ‘King Solomon receiving the Queen of Sheba’. It’s recognized as one of the great paintings in the history of the planet. I would certainly recommend looking at that hundreds of times and seeing what you see in it and feeling what you feel with it and recognizing what a great, mysterious, marvelous achievement it is.

I would also suggest looking at books of reproductions of painting and sculpture in the Dunhuang caves in China on the edge of the Gobi desert wherefore I don’t know how many centuries artists came and lived. Some of them were monks – maybe many of them – and continued to paint and do sculpture on the walls of rooms in these caves. It used to be called Tun-huang.

The reason why I would suggest these to my fictional nephew is because when you look at these, you begin to understand what can be created and, in fact, what has been created. You begin to reassess your own capacity to do and to create. That is one of the reasons that these things exist. Ditto for music.

Listen to Isaac Stern playing Samuel Barber’s Violin Concerto conducted by Leonard Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic, especially the last movement. You will find something else in modern terms. How did they do it? They did it. There it is.

Immerse yourself in it. Jump into it. Stand away from it. Look at it. Listen to it. Then you begin to see, “So this can be done. This has been done. Let me think about myself and my future and what I can create.”

Those are the kinds of things that I would recommend.



Blazer: To me you have shown that there is great power in being creative, being reasonable, and being empathetic – arguably being human. You are a great paragon of those qualities.

So you are my vote for being the representative of the human race to the Galactic Association.

Rappoport: I will take your letter of recommendation to them because my admiration for you is very high. If they don't know who you are, then I'm not willing to join.

Blazer: You are the best. I totally appreciate your time, and I cherish everything that you write, and now most everything that you say.

Rappoport: Thank you, Harry. It's great talking with you as always. We haven't talked in a long time, and hopefully one of these days we will be face to face again.

Blazer: Thank you so much, Jon.

Rappoport: Thank you, Harry.



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.