

An Interview with Ellis Medavoy

Jon Rappoport

This document was sourced from: <http://www.nomorefakenews.com>

Okay. Another heavy week. I have brought back my most popular interviewee, Ellis Medavoy (not his real name), a man who has specialized in the use of disinformation for several decades. Retired, sometimes ornery, sometimes placid, this long-time source of mine has worked the media like a Wurlitzer, and he knows how's it's done. He has handled a number of medical OPs for the med cartel, including floating levels of lies about AIDS. He views "reality" as a series of false portraits painted for the people by pros. He is here to talk about the 9/11 events and the aftermath. This may develop into a series of new interviews with Ellis. He has a lot to say.

Q: Where do we start?

1 A: We start by admitting that we may know nothing.

Q: That's your motto, isn't it?

5 A: Has to be. Otherwise we're sunk.

Q: What about the attack itself?

A: The perpetrators, whoever they were, are dead.

10 Q: Do you trust the FBI?

A: Are you kidding?

15 Q: They often lie.

A: The field agents follow orders, and they work the investigation as it is defined by the higher-ups. They are told what to look for, and when they find "contradictory" evidence, it is shipped off and hidden. That's how that works. That's how it worked in Oklahoma City. That's how it worked in the RFK assassination and the JFK assassination. The FBI is a political police. Let's get that straight. They are only in the business of discovering the truth when they are told to. It is a political police force, as one would expect, since the Constitution makes no provision for its existence. It was added for the express purpose of carrying out slanted investigations, for managing crime scenes, as far as I'm concerned. They manage data. That's their actual job. They are a wing of the government cartel, and they serve it. They plant evidence. They have survived as an agency in the past by blackmailing people. Hoover had evidence of the sexual affairs of JFK and RFK and he used it to maintain his power. Of course, the mafia had evidence that Hoover was a homosexual, and the mob used that to keep Hoover in his place—which is to say, Hoover made a habit of denying that organized crime even existed. He

17 took that position because the mob had him blackmailed seven ways from Sunday. So we are talking about an agency that has been corrupt for a long time. Planting evidence, ignoring evidence. It's a certain skill. Sooner or later the young agents learn the realities, but they practice an extreme form of denial. You know, patriotism above all. National security above all. "I guess I was wrong. Poppa knows best."

Q: How has the 9/11 tragedy been spun?

A: bin Laden has been characterized as a mad man. This follows in line with the famous lone nut theory.

Q: The truth is...

30 A: He is a highly skilled operative. He is, in his own way, a general. I have spoken with several reporters who have interviewed him. They say he has always had a plan. A long-range plan. As you've written, this is a man who has had no country, no army, no single political base. And yet he has managed to put the world on the defensive.

Q: And the truth about him has been concealed because...

A: Forget because for now. Look at how . . . *how* . . . Stories in the press. That's how. The International Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, the NY Times...they have floated stories about him over the years. Bin Laden the bomber, the insane man, the man out to get revenge on innocent people. Forget morality for a moment. Just realize the characterization is false. He is a planner. He may be an insane planner, but insane gets you nowhere in understanding him. Planner gets you somewhere. I *know* that in the past stories about this aspect of his character—the planner—have been suppressed.

Q: Why?

A: To keep the public from realizing that the US should have taken him out many times. To keep the public from realizing that for years control of Saudi Arabia has been his goal. If that truth were known, the US would have been forced to take him out, and the US was stopped from doing that.

Q: Stopped by whom?

A: By the energy cartel, which was using him as wild card—which he is *not*—in order to keep people focused on oil as the central game. Bin Laden has been painted as a symbol of the vague uncertainty of oil supply. He is that symbol. The energy cartel has wanted oil to be uncertain in the minds of the public, so that it, the cartel, could be seen as the good guy, the guy on the white horse, the group that holds fate in its hands. In that regard, bin Laden was very useful. Psychologically, a subliminal equation has been planted in the minds of the public: a bomb thrown equals the uncertainty of oil supply. This is not on the surface. This is below the surface. A bomb thrown in a café in Germany equals bin Laden equals terrorism equals the Middle East equals the uncertainty of the oil supply equals the necessity of trusting the energy cartel which gets that oil to the people. It's an old formula:

Make the public believe that what it needs to survive is uncertain, is not guaranteed, and therefore the public must trust the authorities who provide that essential survival-commodity.

This is important stuff I'm telling you. It's the ultimate tease. It's the *watch out* factor. It works in all sorts of ways. Let me make a leap to another subject. Sex. For the past 30 years, since 1965 in America, sex has been shown to American men in millions of ways, millions of tantalizing ways. Men have come to believe that it is absolutely necessary to have some of this sex for the survival of their self-image. But how do you get it? What do you have to do? And the answer is, you have to figure out how to behave, how to talk to women, how to get drugs to give women, how to have a nice apartment for women to go to, how to dress, how to act, how to think, how to present yourself. How to get around the specter of AIDS with women, how to drink alcohol, what brands, in what quantity, how to smoke, how to hold the cigarette, how to seduce, how to pretend, how to fake, how to buy a watch that sparkles on your wrist, what ring to wear, what kind of car to drive, whether you should act smart or stupid, whether you should be sympathetic to women or macho, whether you should wear a track suit or a tuxedo, whether you should buy flowers or cocaine. *You establish the uncertainty of a commodity*, and

then you come in behind that with the authority who can get the commodity for you. In the case of sex the authority is *behaviorism*, a vague shadowy thing that has no face or real name, but men begin to mythologize this authority (just as people do with the energy cartel, another vague and shadowy entity), and men begin to believe that they must get sex by *behaving*, which in part means *consuming* and buying products, and then they will get what they have been teased endlessly into *needing desperately*. It's the same game. And it is run as an OP. I used to have friends in the ad game who were psychologists, and they worked that game to the n-th degree.

In the case of oil, bin Laden was the tease factor. That's what he was used for. *and therefore, he could not have been presented to the people as some kind of general out there planning a long campaign against the west. He could not have been presented as a planner. The press had to work him as a crazy wild card, as the herald of uncertainty, the lone nut who could go off his rocker at any time.* In order to create the uncertainty factor about oil. It's an op, pure and simple, and the reporters who have written thousands of

stories about him...those reporters have simply fallen under the spell of the main, floated premises about bin Laden. But most reporters always fall under the spell. They work that way. They take a premise and they don't ask where it comes from, and they run with it. It's easy. They take the path of least resistance, and if they don't do that, they end up writing occasional editorials on op-ed pages and no one pays them any attention or decent money. But the premises, the *premises*, they would come from people like me. That was part of my job. I wouldn't invent the premises myself, I would get a word from my "boss," my contractor, and then I as the sub-contractor would contact the so-called reliable sources of these reporters, and I would have meetings with these sources, and I would give them interesting details about a subject, details which embodied the *premise*, and then those sources would pass that stuff on to the reporters. Down the food chain it goes. And pretty soon the *premise* about, say, a bin Laden, is "common knowledge," and everyone believes it. Even within the CIA, this premise is floated, and the people there, just like the FBI field agents who get their marching orders on a case—these CIA people begin to inves-

tigate bin Laden from that point of view. You see? The people who originate the *premises*, they create reality. Because you can find out facts which will support *any* central reality. So bin Laden becomes the wild lunatic who strikes at random because he's crazy—and *everybody and his brother investigate him and see him from that point of view, from the ground of that premise*. And within, say, the CIA, if an analyst tries to change the central premise and says, "Hey, you know what, this guy is planning everything, it all has a pattern and all roads lead back to Saudi Arabia," or something like that...that analyst is marginalized. He becomes placed off to the side. He is the "minority opinion," at best, and he is slid down lower on the scale of important people. And if he keeps up his protests, he is transferred out to a less important case. Just look at the American press over the last ten years on this guy [bin Laden]. Only now, reluctantly, are a few writers saying this nut case really has had an overall agenda that has cohesion in its details. *long* after the horse is out of the barn.

Q: What about the people who float the premise in the first place?

A: They are the reality shapers. That's what they do. They figure out how to position a symbol in the subconscious of the public. What that symbol will look like. What it will do. What effect it will have. They're looking at cause and effect on a sociological level. They're following the time-honored practice of the creation of symbols of people the public will never actually meet. Stereotype is too vague a word. This is pretty precise stuff I'm talking about here. It starts, for example, here: *what uncertainty do we want to create? See? What do we want to do, what equation do we want to manufacture in the subconscious of the public?* And this all goes back to the conviction that the public is a machine that can't think for itself. Therefore freedom doesn't exist. Therefore the public has to be shown what to think, *but the public can't know what it's really thinking, the public just has to act on the basis of what its subliminal reality is thinking for it.*

Thinking for it

Just like a machine.

But you see how it's done. This is so important

because it shows how you can take whole agencies and set them off on the wrong track. The wrong premise. That was my bread and butter.

Q: But even the CIA...

A: I'll get back to them. Let's stick with bin Laden, the symbol. For the reasons I've described, the energy cartel wants him perceived as a nut case who can strike anywhere at any time because his brain is miswired. And so that premise comes down from above *to the government*. Get the sequence here? *It doesn't start with government*. They're in the middle of the ladder. The cartel is on top and the government is in the middle. The cartel runs the show. The CIA is a helper for the cartel. It helps the cartel. But the sequence begins at the top with the energy cartel. If you don't know this, you're operating in the dark. You have no chance. The people who ran me, they were cutouts for one cartel or another. They were from, say, the Council on Foreign Relations, or WHO, or maybe the IMF. See? I never worked for the government *per se*. I was operating outside that whole command structure. In essence, I had a job that very few people

even knew existed. Think about it. Just use a little common sense. You've got this guy, bin Laden, and his father was a bigshot in Saudi Arabia, a construction guy. He once got a King banished. (laughs) So he was big. And he has a few billion dollars. Now his son, Osama, is living there in 1991, and the US puts in a strong military presence, and Osama is insulted. His country, and US troops are walking around there, and Osama thinks Saudi Arabia should be a holy Islamic country. So he rebels and he shoots off his mouth, and a few things happen. He leaves. He's disowned by his family, but he leaves with 300 million dollars. This is a highly educated man. He wants to start a war against US and he wants to win back his country. The intelligence on him...any idiot could figure it out. This is not exactly your lone nut. He is connected. So right there you know that you're dealing with someone who has potential for danger. So how come the intelligence in the ensuing years doesn't reflect this? Because the intelligence is perverted. It's skewed from the *premise that comes from above*. You see, you can paint a picture of anyone or any group just the way you want to.

Take the CIA itself. What's the popular conception of the Agency? You just saw the show last

night, the first show on CBS, The Agency. What was that about? The Agency has made a lot of blunders. It tried to assassinate Castro 40 times and it failed. Blunders. Bumpers. See? Honest people who try hard, but they do screw up.

But then, really, if you throw all that crap away, and go back to Nicaragua in the 1980s, you find out that the CIA wrote a manual for the so-called Contras on how to do guerrilla warfare against the Sandinistas, and the more you read that manual, the more you realize that this was a *systematic* program for destroying the Sandinistas. It involved the arrest, torture, and murder of key types in the society. Agricultural people, teachers, health workers, and so on. It was a careful plan. It was a warfare terrorist plan. Take out the key pillars of the society and it collapses. This was not blundering. This was not blundering. This was not the public image.

Q: So was bin Laden involved in the 9/11 attacks?

A: Was the Vatican directly involved in a war against Martin Luther? They used cutouts. The Jesuits. It's the same deal. Bin Laden created a machinery of people and cells who could go anywhere and destroy anything. Once he set up that it could

carry out long range plans and attack specific targets. So the answer is yes. But with a huge network that involves Iran, Iraq, Syria, and so on, and you've got some old Soviet influence in there too, it's like tracking down the Jesuit priests who attacked Martin Luther. You're working way down the ladder of influence. And bin Laden had some people working for him as lieutenants, and they could have mounted the 9/11 attack on their own.

Q: It's like the JFK assassination.

A: A network of people who have their own agendas and motives, and they're all woven into a long-range plan. From above. The *weave* tells you that. You don't spontaneously get middle-level groups who suddenly all veer in on the same target. That's ridiculous. That's not history, it's fantasy.

Q: Now we have all sorts of stories in the press about many terrorists being investigated and pursued for their potential role in the 9/11 attacks.

A: Let me tell you how this works. First, you have the FBI and other police forces around the world mak-

ing arrests. This is news. This is the minute tiny level of news. This gives you a spread. The public thinks, wow, these guys are busy. They're doing something. That assuages the public. That keeps them well fed. Most of these people they're arresting are not involved. A few are. But it doesn't matter. What matters is the sense that the FBI is on the case. "Hey, they just arrested McVeigh. Wow. Two hours after the bombing and they've got the man. Helluva job. They're quick. It's over." You don't hear "*We have no idea what the hell happened.*" You don't hear that. You don't hear about *an absence of information*. Information has to flow. That's the first rule of propaganda at that level. Information must flow. It must look like things are getting done. This is the *overriding* rule. Contradictions are fine. Who cares? The pilots are all dead and they used fake ID but we pretty much know who they were. No word about bodies recovered or fingerprints or DNA or anything like that. Just the overall impression that the FBI knows who the pilots were. They have airport video, they have Korans from hotel rooms, they have crop-duster manuals, they have airline flight manuals in hotel rooms. That's the impression.

We are being fed. We are being given enough. 1
It's enough. It's like the lake in the French painting 2
that is really five thousand brush strokes when you 3
get close. But who cares? If you back up ten steps 4
it looks like a lake. Everything is okay. Now some 5
of this FBI information is good information. But a 6
lot isn't. It doesn't matter and it won't matter 7
because even if they pinpoint some of these dead 8
guys, it isn't going to get to the root of the opera- 9
tion. Everybody really knows that, but no one says 10
it. *You are not going to get a firm trace that leads 11
from the dead guys to the mastermind who is liv- 12
ing in a hotel in Algiers or something like that. 13
See? With a few second's thought, anyone would 14
see that. But people in the public don't see it 15
because they're being assaulted with lots of very 16
low-level information that has to do with suspects 17
and evidence and that's all anyone wants right 18
now. I have been involved in PR ops like this 19
before. I know how it's done.* 20

AIDS is the issue? Let's get pictures of people 21
dying, lots of people and empty huts because 22
everyone is dead, and let's get statements from 23
the medical people about the plague that is 24
sweeping everybody away, and let's get something 25
from a government official in Uganda, and some

picture of reality which is still in existence. That 27
picture is the war for the minds of people [what 28
I call the Sovereignty War. bp] and it keeps the 29
war, the true war, going. 30

Q: And if you don't answer the real questions?

A: You lose. You never get past the first few layers. 31
Now, if you read and study history, you find out 32
that in every case of these events, like the attacks 33
two weeks ago, *you get the immediate response, 34
and people say we must respond right away and 35
they are right on one level, but curiously you never 36
get the follow-up. It's like that whole sex business. 37
The kid says, I don't care, I have to have sex right 38
now, we'll find out later how I'm being manipu- 39
lated by my you know what, later on we'll see 40
about the finer points—but the overall op, the pro- 41
paganda mind control op stays hidden, that's the 42
way it always works out. Always. Later on the his- 43
torians debate the finer points and no one really 44
cares, and the same cartels stay in power and then 45
you get another outbreak at a different place and 46
no one connects the dots. They think it's event 47
23567 which is different from event 4352, but it 48
49
50*

shots of hospitals from the outside—let's barrage 1
the public with all this and some stuff too about 2
HIV and how it works, and the vaccine in 3
progress, and in five seconds the public has the 4
picture, the impression. That's all you want. And 5
then no one says, "But does HIV really cause 6
AIDS?" No one says that. They are drowning in 7
"information."

So if tomorrow Bush says, "Bin Laden is not 8
merely the suspect, he *is* the mastermind, he is 9
the definite absolute man," it's over. There will be 10
grumbling, and analysts will keep saying Iran and 11
Iraq and Syria, but Bush will simply say, "Yes, 12
they're terrorists too." And it's done. *But very few 13
people will say, what about bin Laden the gener- 14
al, the planner, the man who has been waging a 15
total war to take back Saudi Arabia, why didn't 16
we pursue and destroy him on that basis long ago 17
since he was a general in the field waging a coher- 18
ent definable war against the west? Why was he 19
let loose to roam? What is he a symbol for? Who 20
made the symbol?*

And these are not academic questions. Not at 21
all. Because answering them leads you to the 22
energy cartel and the intelligence cartel and the 23
people who are devising and shaping the whole 24

*isn't. It's the same strategy. This isn't magic. This 25
is how propaganda works.* And in this sense, all 26
the FBI arrests and releases to the press, they serve 27
a *very* important function. They *propel* the imme- 28
diate solution, which is the only solution. And 29
even if Bush does try to make good his promise to 30
track down terrorism everywhere in the world, it's 31
all on the same level. It's guy A and guy B and cell 32
4 and outpost 12 and training camp 16 and cave 7. 33
It's all on the same level. Even countries are really 34
on the same level. 35

Q: So terrorism is controlled from above.

A: Terrorism *is* mind control. It's supported by the 36
cartels for various reasons. It's for the purpose of 37
guess what, *terrorizing people.* Big surprise. The 38
loss of freedom. The imposition, by degrees, of a 39
de facto military state. It's, "We must fight the 40
enemy forever and here is the latest report from 41
the battlefield." 42

Pretty soon whether you call it that or not, *you 43
do have a military state.* But...and this is very 44
important, you are conditioning people to accept 45
little battlefield reports as the whole picture. Battle 46

X, attack Q, assault V. You get people conditioned to the press reports on this level. And they feed on that. It becomes the daily diet. That was World War II. Every day a new battlefield report.

Nothing about the men who were supporting and financing both sides. Nothing. Just battlefield reports.

Like in my example about AIDS. See? Same thing. This village wiped out, and that gay man, and this innocent person who just had a blood transfusion and that bathhouse and this country which has suddenly seen an explosion of AIDS.

Battlefield reports.

I learned that early on in my career. *Run an op by giving the press [the] battlefield.* That's what they want. At that level, you tap into the public fascination with cops and robbers. He did that crime, they pursued him, they finally caught him. Well, we bombed Iraq today. We bombed Iran. We attacked a serious terrorist cell in Miami. Battlefield. Except new terrorists rise up. Now, with nuclear weapons on the loose, you're dangling on the end of a very short string.

don't put the inert materials in there." And the bomb went off in the WTC and killed people. The NY Times ran a story about this.

Q: I spoke with the NY Times reporter who wrote that story. He wouldn't say anything.

A: Why would he? His job was on the line. But what about connect the dots? What about asking what happened between the time Salem was told not to ad the inert materials and the day of the bombing itself? This story was killed deader than a door-nail. It was run and then it was killed. So we have to ask now, what exact prior warning did the FBI or the CIA have about 9/11 and what did they do about it? But no reporter is trying to get at that. The climate is impossible for that.

Q: The story about Salem is quite incredible.

A: It certainly is. And yet, no real follow-up. I spoke with a CNN reporter who told me it was completely out of bounds. They wouldn't touch it. The dominant paradigm is: These things just don't happen. You don't get the FBI being responsible

1 Q: And government leaders?

A: Most of them are without a real clue. They are woven into the cartel structure; into the cartel storefronts like the Council on Foreign Relations and the Bilderbergers. They are swatting the flies paid for by cutouts who ultimately represent the cartels...the press has a large amount of leeway in covering an event like the 9/11 attack *if it does not try to connect the dots at any level.* For example, I'll bet you a nickel you will not see a story which connects the dots between "prior warning" and "government sting operation" in this case.

15 Q: What do you mean?

A: Look, since we don't really know what happened, let's return to the 1993 World trade Center bombing. There, the FBI had this mole inside the operation. Salem. He was told...

Q: To place inert materials in the bomb. The FBI told him that. I know.

25 A: Yes. He taped conversations with his higher-up in the FBI about this. Then the FBI said, "Forget it,

27 for the first bombing at the WTC. By definition it can't be real. Therefore it *isn't* real. End of story. It's like daddy having sex with his daughter. It couldn't happen until it does.

30 Q: Same with the OKC bombing.

A: There has been a terrorist cell operating in OKC for some time. And yet it was never investigated after the bombing in any serious way. You have witness tampering down there. But it couldn't have happened, therefore it didn't. Daddy wouldn't do that. The cartels count on this factor of extreme disbelief for the success of their operations.

Q: What else?

A: Let's go back to that period when the CIA, through its cutout, the Pakistan intelligence service, was arming and training bin Laden in Afghanistan. I know something about that.

From speaking with several sources, one in the press, I learned that the CIA knew exactly what they were getting into. They knew that bin Laden and others like him were extremely dangerous to

the West. This was not some form of blindness. This one reporter for a wire service tried to get an assignment, early on, to expose this while it was happening. He had good evidence. He was talking to the right people. His bosses were very reluctant to have him go on this story. Then one day he was yanked out of there. He was given another assignment in another faraway place. That was the end of it. The reporter tried to write a book. He got no takers. He was shut out on every front. But when you realize that the CIA is actually a cutout for a global intelligence cartel that is linked up to other cartels, you begin to see that, in a very precise way, the CIA was tasked with the effort of having all that heroin out of Afghanistan end up on the streets of the USA. It was, in fact, part of their job.

But *that* goes against the dominant paradigm. It couldn't have happened. Therefore it didn't.

Suppose you had a murder case, and the judge finds out that the prosecutor at one time had trained and funded the murder suspect. Don't you think the judge would throw up his lunch right on his desk? But people make all sorts of excuses for these "happenings." People will say and do almost

anything to avoid looking straight at the situation.

They will say that very smart people are actually stupid. They'll say that the moon is the sun. That's how people like me stayed in business. We could walk into a village in Africa where the water was filthy and practically killed you when you look at it, and no one has any food, and no one has a job, and we could say all the deaths were because of a new virus no one had ever heard of. And we were believed. Some people called us heroes.

Q: The disbelief factor:

A: It runs rampant. Most people's minds are little scooters. They're all set to go, and all you have to do is give them a whole pattern of little roads and alleys and they'll follow right along. The smarter ones will ask for a map, but they'll still take the exact same course.

Q: I've heard you talk about "the story of the day."

A: That's a concept that has become an integral part of the news business, but it was really invented by PR people. Now, with 24-hour coverage sometimes you need three stories of the day. The FBI

PR people figure, well, we'll float out six stories today and hopefully one of them will get picked up as a lead piece. We'll go with the arrest of the three men in Florida and the thing about the flight school and the Korans in the hotel rooms and so on, and let's see how we do. The PR mandate is, show them we're busy. Show them we're on the case. Show them we're making progress. Build a story line. Give the press lots of little hooks and they'll get on their scooters and go. Keep them moving from alley to alley to road to street. Don't make them think there is nowhere to go. Fill up their little gas tanks.

Q: And another phrase you used to use. The "assault factor."

A: Yes, that one. Fill up people's heads with so much information that they don't ask questions. It works. That's one reason that Salem story in 1993 disappeared. There were new stories every five minutes. You get 50 stories into print and one says, "Mars Disappears" and everyone reads it and forgets it. There is no follow-up and after awhile people don't even believe they read it. They think

it was a dream. It's part of the battlefield strategy. You run 100 stories about battlefield and one of them says, "And we think there may have been a chemical weapon," and then no one follows up on it because it's shut down from above, the story is shut down, and pretty soon people scratch their heads and think, did I read a story about a chemical weapon? No, it must have been a mistake.

I figure that about 1970 the overload really started. At that point people began to tune out. They were unable to think. The news became a carpet that unrolled in front of them, took them from one thing to another. It's gotten even heavier. We're seeing that now. With all the stories at the level of battlefield, the general public is less disposed to think about who might be behind all this. Even less disposed.

Q: Any other formulas or equations at work here?

A: Pin the tail on the donkey. I'll explain:

In 1990-91, we had the Persian Gulf War. The lead-up and the war. Bush needed a reason to send the troops in. He couldn't say oil. Well, Kuwait, whose homeland had been invaded by Iraq, was a

pretty brutal regime itself. Kuwait hired Hill Knowlton, at the time a huge PR firm in Washington, and paid them a very nice slice of cash to promote war in the US to the people: Send our boys over there. Pin the tail on the donkey. Find the person or thing that would justify to the American people supporting Bush's war. Find the donkey. Make it pay off. A lot of things were tried, many of them centering on Iraq's treatment of "our friends," the so-called gentle Kuwaitis. You might remember that the Kuwaiti ambassador's daughter posed as a nurse at a hearing in Washington and told a [completely fabricated] story about the incubators. The Iraqi soldiers who marched into the hospital and threw babies out of incubators to die on the floor. 312 babies. No one has ever been able to confirm that. But it may have put Bush over the top in his effort to make that war. Now, at one level, we have the search for the people or person who *really* launched the attack on the WTC. At one level, there are people in the field who are trying to do their best, based on orders they are getting. But at another level, it's pin the tail on the donkey. This is the PR stuff. This is picture-making. Shall we blame Saddam? Bin Laden? Both? Shall we blame a bin Laden henchman? Iran? At this level, it's like taking

a poll. What will fly the best? And I can tell you that right now there are people in American who *are* actually being polled, and one of the many things they are being asked is, "How would you feel if it turned out that Saddam was behind all this?" or some such. Polls take place all the time, and this sort of question is being slipped in there or gotten in through a little series of clever questions. It's being done. At this level, the poll isn't being used for investigation purposes, it's about *what will fly best with the American people*. And there are people in Washington as well who are debating about what the best looking donkey will be for the American people. This has nothing to do with facts. It's all about the donkey. It's all about what will strike an acceptable and hopefully deep chord. That will keep people unified now and in the future as this war moves on. And whatever the donkey turns out to be, it will be trotted out and used. It will be dressed up just right. Hell, there are a hundred places and more on the Earth we could move into tomorrow saying we are here to stop brutal human rights abuses, and we would have a point. But the PR mandate is, we select and massage the right donkey, the one that will have some emotional legs for the American people. This will be done. It's like

sending a photographer in to shoot an epidemic in progress for some medical group that is going to raise funds to build a hospital there. The photographer enters a village and there are dead bodies. There are always dead bodies. But he's thinking, at what angle should I shoot this for maximum effect? What will have the most impact? Suppose I get up in that tree and shoot down? Maybe if I get someone to move a few bodies over *there*, that will work better with the shadows from the rocks. You know. And in the case of the 9/11 attacks, that means that what we hear about the perpetrators will be what they think will move us. We will hear the result of the PR effort. It may contain some truth, but that's not the real point. Not for the long run. For the long run, they want us to hear what will start the adrenaline pumping and keep it pumping.

Q: Not reality.

A: Reality is what you make it. It's your pogo stick that vaults you to the next station on down the line.

Q: We're talking about some monsters here.

A: This society used to be glued together with a few ideals. Now it's glued together by everyone's cooked up explanation as to why what he's doing is the best thing under the circumstances. In that atmosphere, it pays to lie and invent lies and find the keys that will make people react in the ways you want them to react. I don't know whether you ever read a novel called, "[*The Ninth Wave*](#)." It was written, I'll guess, 40 years ago. It was about a young man who went to work for a presidential campaign. His childhood pal was working on the campaign too. Now the young man finds out that his pal has invented an ingenious system for polling people and then adjusting your message to reflect what people think and want. It's so ingenious it'll sway the election and give it to the candidate—whom the young man discovers is a noxious rat. So before this system can triumph, the young man takes his pal, who invented and controls this whole evil polling system—takes him out to the beach and into the water and *kills* him. Does that tell you how far we've come with PR in the last 40 years? Now if you *don't* do that kind of polling, your boss will fire you in a second. What I'm telling people here is, *they* think you are noth-

ing. They think they just have to find out what will 1
make you jump to the right or the left. Now if you
realize that this is the case, then you should also
realize that they'll say whatever the hell they want
to about who pulled the trigger on the 9/11 5
attacks. They'll tell a story they hope will fly, and
they'll tell more after that. Do you feel that the
government has treated you honorably? Do you
think that it has done the right thing most of the
time? Don't kid yourself. If it did the right thing it 10
would have long ago tried to detach government
from crime, from many crimes. My job was to
control people's minds through the media. What
the media are doing now is not unfamiliar to me.

15

20

25

27

30

35

40

45

50

It's no surprise.

A *real* media would start, say, from bin Laden,
start pulling on that string and go into his past
and find all the sub-threads, and it would take a
very, very, very hard look at the people he knew,
the places he went, because he has been fighting
a war; and some of his allies are strange people.
People you would think would want to destroy
him. You have to see what's there. That's all I've
got to say right now.

Jon Rappoport