



The Solari Report

October 12, 2017

3rd Quarter Wrapup Part I: News Trends & Stories With Joseph Farrell



Catherine Austin Fitts



Dr. Joseph P Farrell



3rd Quarter Wrap Up Part I: News Trends & Stories With Joseph Farrell

October 12, 2017

C. Austin Fitts: Ladies and Gentlemen, welcome to The Solari Report. I'm having fun because I'm sitting with Dr. Joseph Farrell, and we've been having some great discussions.

I'm guilty of bad habits because I stayed up far too late last night reading his new book, which is a doozy! This is Part I of News Trends & Stories for the 3rd Quarter Wrap Up. What an explosive quarter we've had! I'm so delighted that Joseph is back to help us make sense of this.

In Part I, and we will be talking about the Economy, Financial Markets, and Geopolitics. In Part II, which will be next week, we will talk about Culture, Science Technology, The Unanswered Questions, Go Local, and Inspiration.

One thing that Joseph and I have concluded is that the most important part is Culture, which threads through everything. We will focus on it next time but bring it up this time.

It is always a pleasure to welcome Joseph to The Solari Report, so welcome.



Joseph Farrell: Thanks for having me back.

Fitts: It's a beautiful sunny day, and I'm with the voice of sanity.

Farrell: Sunny, yes. Beautiful, no. It's not raining, so it's not beautiful.

Fitts: Before we start, I want to update everybody about the crowdfund and the book. So why don't we start with the book? I haven't finished it yet because you plopped it on me last night after I returned from a long, long drive. I couldn't put it down, and I'm looking forward to finishing it.

You have a new book, and you've kept this under tight wraps.

Farrell: I tried.

Fitts: Tell us about the new book.

Farrell: The new book is called *Hess and the Penguins: The Holocaust, Antarctica and the Strange Case of Rudolf Hess* because, to put it in a nutshell, most people don't realize the significance of the Hess case, but you get a measure of the significance by the fact that most of the documents in the Hess case are set to declassify this year – the same year as the JFK assassination. That should give people the measure of the importance of it. When they read the book, I think they will discover that there are certain parties very interested in keeping him under wraps for various reasons for most of his life.



I don't want to give away the plot, but he essentially was on a peace mission to Great Britain, but the peace that he was proposing was extremely comprehensive. Basically, I think that what he and certain parties in Great Britain were trying to do was realign the geopolitical structure of the world completely – cut the Soviet Union out of it, cut the United States out of it, and have Europe under some type of Anglo-German hegemony and make Europe the predominant power.

It was a huge gamble and they came very close. Most people don't realize how close they came.

Fitts: It's absolutely fascinating. Of course, everybody has been peppering you for years, "What's happening in Antarctica?"

The reality is that you can't discuss that without looking at some of the deep history, and there is a very deep history here.

Farrell: Oh, there is enormous history. Hess was involved, in my opinion, in a plot that also involved Hermann Goering, who was the sponsor of the Nazi Antarctic expedition. So there was something definitely happening between those two regarding Antarctica, and I think, as part of the piece that he was proposing, Antarctica was definitely on the table for discussion with Great Britain.

The simplest explanation is that there are many untapped resources in Antarctica, and I think that it was a case of, "Let's just divvy up the pot."

Fitts: We can go to your website, www.GizaDeathStar.com, and can link and order the book, which is available now for order.



Farrell: The book is available But I have not yet linked it on the website, so you either have to get it directly from Adventures Unlimited Press, or go to Amazon or Barnes & Noble and get it there.

Fitts: The second thing is that our wonderful organ-maker, Chris Martin, has been buried in the same kind of shadow work that you and I get buried in

Farrell: Apparently.

Fitts: I'm laughing because 'we laugh so as not to cry' – the old Mel Brooks' expression. We are now hoping to get it in November, and I'm thinking, "What an appropriate time for you to receive your organ, in the middle of Thanksgiving?"

Farrell: It would be nice.

Fitts: So the organ has not been delivered. We're hoping it will be delivered by Thanksgiving.

I want to put out a message to all of the donors to let them know what is happening. I see that you have purchased more music.

Farrell: I purchased more music, and I've been trying to rebuild my music library. In all of my moves over the years, I lost plenty of my organ music. I retained most of the volumes of the old Widor, Schweitzer, Bach edition. I've purchased the Barenreiter, which is the critical text of the scores. I've replenished some Widor scores and the critical text, and a fellow who I called my 'secret weapon'. He was the last student of J.S. Bach, and is a very interesting composer to listen to if you haven't heard him before.



Fitts: Right, and you redecorated your living room, which is prepared to receive the organ.

Farrell: I don't know about all of the boxes, but the living room is at least set up with a space that I cleared for it.

Fitts: It's artwork and you have the picture of the Haarlem Cathedral there.

Farrell: Yes, I have a picture of one of my favorite instruments, which is in Haarlem, Holland. It's the Miller organ and most organists will be familiar with that instrument. It's a lovely baroque era instrument.

I also have some pictures of some of my favorite organ grinders.

Fitts: I don't know if you remember this, but our wonderful ally, Jeroen Van Straaten, lives in Haarlem and I've had lunch with him in there. He insists that he is going to get permission for you to play the Haarlem organ. I've agreed that when he does and when you're ready, I will sail you to Europe because we know that you don't fly.

Farrell: I told Jeroen this: "That instrument is a tracker and tracker instruments require a great deal of physical stamina to play. The key depressions are about a full inch on that instrument, and you're overcoming the pressure of the mechanical action in the instrument, so your hands have to be very strong. I haven't played a tracker in years.



Fitts: I've been on an organ tour of Europe, because we went to Verona this summer to see Beethoven in the Arena, and I discovered that the cathedrals were having free concerts, and everyone had organs. It was quite remarkable.

Then, of course, I went to Iceland, and was in the cathedral there, which was magnificent; it was a magnificent organ and a much newer organ.

Farrell: The Dutch are good about keeping their instruments up and in good repair and introducing young people. Many of the world's organists now are very young; they come from Germany and Holland. I'm glad that the instrument is having a bit of a revival. And believe it or not, they are building pipe organs fervently in China.

Fitts: Really?

Farrell: Yes and you see these organs with Chinese decorations on them.

Fitts: I'm not sure that the folks who have funded the organ realize this, but because the pipes for your organ are digital, you've bought all types of components allowing you to switch between different organs of Europe. So you can switch from Haarlem to Notre Dame or whatever?

Farrell: Yes, we have three organ sound samples and a harpsichord sound sample. So this will actually double as a pedal harpsichord, which is another one of my favorite instruments.



You can buy sound samples of many famous organs now for your virtual pipe organs, and I've occasionally put up plinks on my website for people to listen to them. I've put some Widor on the forum and so on. You can actually hear these virtual pipe organs using a sound sample from some famous organ somewhere. It's a very interesting technology.

I think that ultimately it will revive the instrument. It's very, very difficult in this country to get on a decent, large instrument to practice because they guard them more than they do the sacraments, unfortunately.

Fitts: I, for one, am looking forward to the arrival of this organ.

Farrell: So am I!

Fitts: We will have an update on the Annual Wrap Up and, hopefully, it will be there by then.

Let's dive in! You and I sat last night and, normally, we have a great web presentation for the Wrap Up and have listed and organized it under seven categories of the top stories. In Part I we are discussing the Economy and Financial Markets and Geopolitics. Usually you and I review the different trends and stories, but we're not going to do that this time.

Last night we had a very deep, productive conversation, and realized that there are some things that are so important that we just have to focus on what is very, very important.



To a certain extent and I've said this many times, in travelling and talking to subscribers, what I'm seeing is that it's not getting into their spirit. So I don't care how redundant it is; we're going to repeat ourselves, and we're going to go deeper.

There are certain things about this environment that we really need to understand.

Farrell: Yes, we need to look at certain things from several different perspectives, and I think that is what we are going to try to do.

Fitts: The first thing that I wanted to talk about is, when I came in you said, "We have to really hammer on the Constitution."

I was thrilled because that's what I've been doing all quarter long. I don't think that it has been absorbed yet.

Farrell: What I do think that people sense is the confusion. Since the election, we've seen, what I think, is a revival of Weimar, Germany. By that I mean that everybody is creating their private armies for Antifa and Black Lives Matter and all of these different groups, basically, to go out and cause violence and reap chaos and push a particular political agenda. However, this has reached a head for me – as I think it probably did for most people – during the Charlottesville mess.

What became evident to me, is in the aftermath of Charlottesville, where you had this sudden attack on American history and culture in the form of, "Let's tear down all of these Confederate Generals," and so on. Now, this has even reached where I live – and probably where you live.



Now they are going after names of schools, and are not limiting this anymore to leaders of the Confederacy. We're seeing people like Washington and Maddison coming under attack and people wanting to rename the schools.

I think that what this whole agenda is and the ultimate purpose of this is to get rid of the Constitution. What they are going to do is say, "This was a Constitution created by a number of white males, land and property owners, and the Constitution is no longer reflective of our modern values and our modern technology."

Fitts: "It's out of date; it's old."

Farrell: "It's part of a bygone era, etc." So, behind all of this culture war, it is being used to drive an agenda and the agenda is to end the Constitution. I'll say it again, and you and I have discussed this before, you turn over a Constitutional Convention to this current political class and this current popular culture, which does not understand these things, and you are going to have a real mess. You are no longer going to have the Constitutional protections that you now have.

I think this is a cultural agenda that is driving a political agenda.

Fitts: One thing that I've seen in the last two months, and I have really come to appreciate it, is I flew to Bangladesh just to do an interview with Cynthia McKinney.



If you look at who is pushing the cultural war, that is the group that she did war with. She calls them the Ziocons. They threw her out, and she regained her position. They threw her out again, and she has been fearless in warring with them. She knows them and she understands them.

I flew to Bangladesh to sit down with her because, before I did an interview, I needed to talk with her. We talked for a week before we did the interview. We talked about, “What do we do? How do we do it?” Then I wrote something called, *How to Enforce the Constitution*, and that is available publicly on the web.

What I discovered, and what she and I talked a great deal about before the interview, was that the American people have lived their entire lives under the umbrella of the protection of the Constitution. Even though it’s been disrespected, even though it’s been eroded, even though they’ve played all of these games with national security, we have no concept of what it would be like if it wasn’t there.

We’ve lived our entire lives under the umbrella, and we can’t fathom what it’s like when the umbrella comes down. I can, because I’ve lived outside and, to a certain extent, you have lived outside so we can envision it. However, most Americans have no idea – despite all of the erosion – what an obstacle it is for these folks.

Farrell: It’s an obstacle, and I think that it is important for people to understand why. As long as it is there as a governing document or a governing compact, there is a certain segment of people in the government and a certain segment of people in society, and a certain segment of people in various corporations that are going to be obedient to it in a sincere fashion.



Remove that and put in something that is concocted by social justice warriors such as Antifa, and so on, and ‘update’ the Constitution and remove that, all of those protections disappear.

Fitts: That includes the right to own property.

Farrell: Precisely. That includes the right to own property. If you remove that, one thing that the framers of the Constitution did in order to insist upon a continuation of the sovereignty of this nation was placed a clause in the Constitution that all of the debts incurred under the Articles of Confederacy would still be acknowledged under the new Constitution.

In other words, the Constitution, in that sense, did preserve the connection to the old Articles. I’m a fan of the Articles, but I’m not a big fan of the current Constitution, however, I am adamant that getting rid of this would be far, far worse.

I hear Libertarians say, “The Constitution is the root of many of the problems.” That may be, but you don’t want to get rid of the final thing that offers protections to our basic rights.

If the government continued to acknowledge the debt, it continued to acknowledge the principle of property. What we see now, in terms of the social justice warriors – and I’ve spoken about this before at some of your events – is the application of cultural Marxist tactics in order to achieve a political agenda, and that agenda is precisely to overturn the Constitution.



So you could lose your property rights, and at the same time, it would allow the people who have driven these debts and driven the financial mess that we're in to escape any responsibility.

You've raised that issue very many times.

Fitts: Here is why I think the Libertarians are all wet: When they say that the Constitution is all wet, we have not enforced the Constitution.

Farrell: That is the big problem.

Fitts: If you look at the source of the problems, it is the absence of enforcement. So I have always said, "Crime that pays is crime that stays."

The missing money- thanks to Dr. Mark Skidmore and his team from Michigan State University- as documented on our website with government documents from two agencies – and remember that there are 21 covert agencies – amounts to \$21 trillion dollars. I expect that these two agencies are the worst, but I haven't yet checked the other 19 agencies.

That is \$1 trillion more than the total debt of the United States. I appreciate that an undocumentable adjustment does not represent cash, but I also would say that, if you refuse since 1996 to produce audited financial statements as required by law, your financials are meaningless. You are a liar, and you are a criminal enterprise.



If you simply sat down – and this is what Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney and I talked about – and enforced the Appropriations Clause and the War Clause of Article 1 of the Constitution that says, “Congress has to authorize each war.”

We put into place a blanket authorization after 9/11 that basically said, “You can run throughout the world and kill anybody and do whatever you want, including using drones to assassinate people who have had no due process, including American citizens.”

Farrell: Yes, that is what they said at the Star Chamber.

Fitts: They set up a global Star Chamber where Congress is authorized to do whatever it wants in violation of the Constitution.

The second thing that they’ve done is, and this started in fiscal 1998, said, “You can spend as much money as you want on whatever you want. You can issue as much fraudulent security as you want,” in defiance of the Appropriations Clause that says that Congress has to appropriate it for it to be spent, and it says that you have to provide disclosure from time to time.

I would say that, if you look at the Libertarians with only those two things, the failure to enforce those two things is the source of most problems.

Farrell: I would definitely agree with that.



Fitts: You and I could sit down with people who we totally disagree with on almost every issue, but if they would just agree that the money has to be spent honestly and has to be disclosed, most problems are going to go away.

Farrell: I think that the Libertarians get too involved in philosophical discussions and aren't looking at the reality of the situation.

Fitts: I think that most Libertarians are terrified to look at reality, so they go around in circles because they don't want to face the fact that they are scaredy-cats.

Farrell: They don't, and what they are offering doesn't really address the situation. The situation is that it might be a flawed document, but the problem is that – flaws or no flaws – it does have protections and it does have an aspect of covenant that is not being observed. When it's not observed, we see the mess that results.

Fitts: My attitude is, "Enforce the Constitution." After you finish enforcing it, if you don't like it, then we can discuss improving it, but until you're willing to enforce the things that we like.

Farrell: I wouldn't even say that I would be willing to discuss improving the Constitution because this takes us back to what I think the fundamental problem is. We are in a culture where the political class itself has no real grounding in the conventions of law and jurisprudence that lead to the Constitution because they don't believe in it. Secondly, we have a popular culture that, regardless of what documents such a convention might produce, they will spin it so that it sounds good and people will be stampeded into accepting something that really is not a workable document.



I think that the culture has to change, and it has to change – if I can be blunt – in a traditional direction before we even contemplate touching the document and touching the system of government.

Fitts: Now the Constitution represents a covenant that we all share and agree to. The reality is, that if you tear it down, there won't be any new document. What there will be is chaos, and there will be the ability of the people who stole all of the money to buy everything for pennies on the dollar.

One thing that we are doing in the 3rd Quarter Wrap Up is to talk about Control 101. That is our theme. You know that our cover is very clever; I love it.

We get into all the gruesome things – entrainment, weather warfare, false flags, everything. It's peculiar because, for many, many years, as you know in the financial community, I've been saying that it is going to slow burn, and you have an entire alternative financial media system that says, "It's going to collapse," and I say, "No, it's not, it's going to slow burn."

The difference between them and me is that I understand control technologies. I understand how you can manipulate the stock market or the bond market because I know how you can manipulate all of the different people involved. I have found myself in constant war with the alternative media world and the financial media for 15 years.

One thing that amazes me is that they will say, "It's all going to implode in July, and the dollar is going to go to zero in July," and then in July, the dollar goes up.



This war goes on and on and on. One of the few people who ever came back to me and said, “You know something? You were right and I was wrong. I want to learn more about what you have to say,” was Greg Hunter.

I sat on his show, and it was approaching July of 2014. Foster and Kimberly Gamble, who were friends, and I went to their house and they said, “The dollar is going to collapse in July.”

I said, “No, it’s not. It’s going to explode; it’s very strong.”

They said, “No, it’s going to collapse.”

I said, “Guys, if you’re going to say that, a lot of people could lose money listening to you. I’m going to have to part company with you publicly over this.”

It got tense because, what they were saying was dead wrong. So I got on Greg Hunter’s show that month, and I’ll never forget it. I left Foster and Kimberly’s house and got on the air with Greg Hunter, and he says, “The dollar is going to collapse.”

I said, “No, it’s not. It’s going to explode. It’s going to go up and it could go up a lot.”

It turned out that by the end of the year it was up 30%, which was a huge move in the currency markets.



Greg got very upset. He is a very passionate person, and I love him to pieces for it. He said, “You don’t understand. Every person on this show” -and he has many people- “say that it is going to collapse and going to collapse soon. Every person. You are the only one who says that it is going to go up, so you have to be wrong.”

I said, “No, I’m right.”

So he bet me a dollar, and I made him pay me a dollar and it’s framed in my office.

He came back to me and said, “How could everybody be wrong and you be right?”

I said, “Greg, it’s because I understand control technologies.” As a result of the litigation, I had the opportunity to learn how a few people can control many people – enough to make things go up that have no value.

Part of it is that you have to understand how they use the Federal credit mechanism. If I can engineer the Federal credit mechanism with all of its securities and all of its money and all of its cash flows and all of its credit flows and make it do things that are highly contradictory to fundamental economics, and I could do it for a long, long time, and I have these control technologies, then I can do what they are doing.

I would never have believed it when I was Assistant Secretary of Housing. I would never have believed it possible if I hadn’t drilled down to the control technologies.



Every time since then, I will sit down with most financial professionals and say, “Let’s talk about the control technologies.” So off we go, and suddenly I am offering up the first one, such as pedophilia or control files, and they say, “I don’t want to go there.”

I say, “How can you not go there? How can you recommend to other people that they invest their people in a system when you won’t take the time to understand the mechanics of the system?”

The next one is that I try to explain how you can do surveillance capitalism using software and AI. So the NSA doesn’t need 1 million people listening to all of us; they can do it all with software and AI.

They say, “I don’t want to go there.”

I’ve had a couple of years of, “I don’t want to go there.” There is this state of denial. One thing with the missing money is, “I don’t want to go there. It’s too big. It’s too overwhelming.”

There is a state of denial about looking at the nuts and bolts of what we’re dealing with. I believe, if we want to stay alive, if we want to protect the Constitution, we have to go there.

The reason I’m saying this and the reason I want to record these sessions with you is because you are willing to go there. So where in the heck did you get the courage?

Farrell: Frankly, it comes partially from academic experience – when I was in academia – and partially it comes from the fact that I’m a victim of all of these wonderful social programs and faulty market analysis.



The bottom line is that economics, as an academic subject, does not teach you to look at these human mechanisms, and that is the big problem. We've discussed this before. The influence of technology on market manipulation is astronomical at this stage.

Laying aside all of the other things; laying aside control files, blackmail, and all of the other things that are part of this system, if you look simply at the impact of technology on markets, what we have now are equities markets, commodities markets, and I would even go so far as to say bond markets – everything – is all managed, and most of the trading is being done by computer algorithms that even the programmers, half of the time, don't understand.

Actually, we're living in a type of a parallel track world, as far as I'm concerned – as far as the public financial system goes. We are living partly in a virtual system where prices are no longer reflective of a human reality.

In other words, when I think of Wall Street, it's virtual reality.

Fitts: It's virtual reality, and it doesn't reflect the analog world.

Farrell: Precisely. It does not reflect any actual human trading that is occurring. So what this means, if we drill down to the brass tacks – because you mentioned this last night and I wanted to make a point of bringing this up – is price is no longer a signal of actual value. It's no longer a signal of actual productive reality. It's a completely artificial world.



You cannot have a functioning economy over the long term if that is the basis because you're leaving out the screaming traders on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange, waving papers around and having them punched and mailing out stock certificates at the end of the day. That world is gone by and large, and that is the world that I think needs to come back. That is a world that is reflective of real human market conditions.

What we are living in now is make believe. It's nothing but make believe, and if you can't understand the markets, it's because the markets are no longer reflective of that human reality.

Fitts: However, here is the nasty little secret: You can only replace the markets with interventions. So there is no market; there are just interventions. You can only do that if you control the Federal credit mechanism and have access to an infinite amount of money to rig things. You have to have that plug. If you don't have that plug, then the tail – in the worst case – is your private equity.

Farrell: You said something very crucial, and I hope that people have latched onto it. You have access to an infinite amount of money. So in other words, the standard models that you and I would be familiar with from economics class in high school or college or whatever, simply no longer apply. They are not operating with these models anymore; they are operating with models of infinite money, infinite debt, and so on. I tried to bring that out in *Babylon's Banksters*.



The other thing that I think is a crucial component of what people need to latch onto with all of this technology and the ability to have a system of constant intervention in the markets – which is what we are looking at. This is coming out of certain studies that were done at the same time that we saw the change in the financial markets really begin to take hold and get a deep grip, which I think was around the mid 1990's.

The other thing that happened at the same time was that the Military-Industrial Complex – the intelligence complex in this country – came up with the idea of full-spectrum dominance. What that means is that we want to control everything. We want to control the information, we want to control the weather, we want to control space, we want to control the schools, and we want to control the textbooks. This is the system that they have put into place.

Fitts: They are putting it into place.

Farrell: Yes, they are putting it into place. I view all of this – Common Core, the vaccine issue, GMOs, and all of this – as coming out of that determination by certain powerful individuals in the deep state to implement this sort-of full spectrum dominance. They want – quite literally – to turn us into slaves. Technology is the way that they are going to try to do it. So it should come as no surprise, if we look back at the markets from that point of view that what they are going to be setting up is a system of constant intervention.

This is exactly what we are looking at. It is caused by intervention everywhere.



Fitts: Right, but to control markets you need to control people one at a time. That's how they're doing it.

Farrell: That is how they are going to do it.

Fitts: And to make the economics work, you need to harvest people one at a time. The reason I keep hammering on the Constitution is because that is their biggest obstacle. They are trying many different roads to tear it up or bring it down.

One of the reasons they feel a real urgency to do so is because they don't want to pay the \$21 trillion back.

Farrell: Right and they are liable for it.

Fitts: Under the Constitution, we have a legal mechanism to get that money back. I'll give you an example. I litigated, as you know, for ten or eleven years with the Federal government over issues, and one of the issues was that they asserted the right to seize \$2.3 million of money owed to my company, they asserted the seizure of that money with a common law right of offset, and they asserted that if a loan sale – which had made them a fantastic amount of profit – or something other had happened, we might have made them \$2.3 million. So it was a theoretical opportunity cost; it was not cash. So we're not even talking about cash; we're talking about a theoretical opportunity cost – like \$21 trillion of undocumentable adjustments.

They asserted a common law right of offset to grab \$2.3 million of our cash to offset against a theoretical opportunity cost.



If you take that theory, the Federal government has the right to assert a common law right of offset against the New York Fed, the New York Fed member banks, the San Francisco Fed, and the San Francisco Fed banks because they have transacted \$21 trillion of legal transactions intentionally and knowledgeably, as have the different defense contractors who run those payment systems.

So people say, “We could never get that back.” Of course we could get it back. We have a legal mechanism. All you have to do is assert a common law right of offset.

Farrell: Exactly. This is why I am so skeptical of all of this. Return to the Constitution and what it says about the debts incurred by the government under the previous Constitutional system – under the Articles of Confederation. All of those were to be carried over.

A Constitutional Convention could conceivably wipe all of that off the books, and you could simply walk away from it all. In the process of walking away from it all, strip everybody of their property rights and leave every one of us under the gun to the people who committed the crime in the first place. This is all interconnected, and I hope that is what people take away from all of this.

Fitts: That is why we had the cartoon in the 2nd Quarter Wrap Up because I wanted to make a comic book of this. The financial coup is not over. Whether it was the internet pump and dump or the missing money, you have \$27 trillion or some amount of money on the bailouts. You have the \$21 trillion of missing money. You have the pump and dump of the tech market and other things, so let’s call it \$50 trillion.



You have the \$50 trillion, but you still have liabilities. If you look at the liabilities on the government balance sheet – whether it's the debt or all of the different commitments – you have your liability to the trust fund because the trust fund is not a government entitlement or benefit. The social security trust fund represents money paid in and it belongs to them. What is sitting there is an asset, which is a debt of the US government.

You have military pension funds; you have food stamps, and all of these commitments that you've made. If you can tear up those commitments, you would double your profit. It's like winning the lottery twice.

So you've stolen \$50 trillion, but you need to tear out \$50 trillion in liabilities if you're going to get away with the assets. Then you want to be able to do whatever you want to manage the people because, if you look at the corporate stocks in the Fortune 500, they've been going up steadily. From 1955 to 1995, they tracked with the GNP and since then, they've gone up fantastically faster. The reality is that they can't keep doing that without starting to strip and steal very directly and boldly. It's been happening quietly and covertly, and now you have to get out front.

You're talking about significant social and political re-engineering, but if you look at where they want to go, in terms of chipping people and making money digitally, this is why they want to get rid of cash.

Farrell: Absolutely, with cash, you have a measure of privacy and a measure of sovereignty. Without cash, you're essentially dealing – and we'll probably be getting back to this in Part II – with a system that has no oversight and is being run by the very same people who have robbed us blind already.



Fitts: So let's look at the profit: I steal \$50 trillion, then to make that \$50 trillion worth a great amount, I tear up my \$50 trillion of obligations. Then when I do that, I implode the economy so that I can turn around and buy everything for pennies on the dollar. Then it's a triple play.

What do they call it in the lottery when you hit a triple play?

Farrell: They call it 'fraud'.

Fitts: I think that for many people it's hard to imagine that someone would have the hubris to do this.

Farrell: I think that the average person on the street thinks that is too gargantuan to be able to pull off. These people have documented all of this, they've told us about the missing money, they've told us about these adjustments in the Federal budget, and it's reached the stage now of trillions of dollars – more than the gross domestic product of the United States.

Fitts: More than the outstanding debt.

Farrell: Even there, let's look back at the bailouts when we found out there were \$14 to \$17 quadrillion worth of derivatives sloshing around in the system. That is in excess of about 15 to 16 times the domestic product of the planet.



That takes an extraordinary amount of hubris. They've documented their own inability to deal with reality. They've documented their own willingness to go to the mat and enslave everybody. This should not be a problem for people to wrap their heads around. This is clear and it's documented.

The problem for me ultimately, is that you are dealing with people who have networked sufficiently, who now control all of the levers and mechanisms through control files, mind manipulation, weather derivatives – which is the latest thing to come on the scene, and is a handy thing to have around if you have the technology to manipulate the weather. You're dealing with people who are playing with and for the entire planet. There is no doubt in my mind that the last thing that they want is a mechanism in the form of a system of governance, namely the Constitution, that recognizes the sovereignty of the individual over their papers, person, property, and their life.

This is the last thing that they want because that holds them accountable. They are under that umbrella, too. Take that umbrella away and you 'ain't seen nothing'. We are in for bad, bad times if they get away with that agenda.

What disturbs me, also, is we've seen the creation of, what I call, the Weimar Republic where you have private armies creating social chaos. Most of this is coming from the left but, eventually, this will happen on the right as well. That is when things degenerate into chaos. At that point we're going to either see calls for a Constitutional Convention or calls for a strong arm – a strong individual – to come in and 'restore law and order'.



This profoundly disturbs me and we need to remember the Reichstag Fire. The Constitution issue is this country's Reichstag Fire. This is where they're going to make their big play.

Fitts: That's why I'm so concerned about the weaponization of the population.

Farrell: This is precisely what is occurring. Absolutely.

Fitts: I haven't seen the new Kingsman movie, but I've had several people call me and say, "Oh my God! I can't talk to you about it, but you need to see it."

I see many different signs that they are prototyping that. I talked to you about the conference that Harry Blazer and I recently attended. Harry and I are going to record a report and explain it in much more detail. You and I are going to touch on some of the things that I learned.

There was a wonderful young woman there who was talking about how divided we were as a people because there are these wonderful citizens showing up in black hoods and breaking windows and being violent, and I realized that she has no idea that it's an op. These people were paid.

On the 'Precious Metals Market Report,' Franklin said, "People don't have time to leave their jobs and drive 1,000 miles to break windows. They're too busy for that."

Farrell: I read a report recently that during the campaign, Hillary Clinton had donated \$800,000 from her campaign fund to Antifa.



Fitts: Oh my goodness!

Farrell: That says it all right there, folks. This is a put-up job with professional paid actors, with agent provocateur, probably from various rogue elements within the intelligence community. As I said, it's only a matter of time. If that part of political society is willing to do that, then eventually there is going to be a pushback of a similar nature. Once that happens, things degenerate into chaos, you create a Constitutional crisis, and so you are going to solve it with a Constitutional Convention, which is going to be a disaster.

I want to point out to people: Do you want Jeb Bush, Hillary Clinton, Nancy Pelosi, and Mitch McConnell being the people to draw up a new Constitution for the country?

Fitts: They aren't the ones who will be drawing it up; it's going to be somebody much more terrifying.

Farrell: It will be somebody much more terrifying than them, but I'm using them because they are people of our time.

Fitts: All those crazy people on the internet who say that they're going to round us up and put us in FEMA camps; everybody pooh-pooh's it, and I pooh-pooh it. Well, that thing is going to happen.

Farrell: Exactly. It's either going to be that, or it's going to be the call for a strong man to restore law and order.



Fitts: One thing that happened at the conference was that I heard ‘Plan B’ about how we could get rid of the Constitution. One of the plans to get rid of the Constitution is to do the Con Con, and that is working state legislators and trying to get them to pass a request for a Con Con. You get there, and then – of course – everybody is entrained. Then you tear it up and do something new.

I had a great interview with Edwin Vieira where he explains why you can’t limit a Constitutional Convention. Once you start it, it will be out of control.

So that is one pathway to it and is coming from conservatives. However, there have also been several liberal attempts, and those have to do with climate change or other different angles they’ve tried. It’s as if they are trying everything.

I saw an activist who is being financed anonymously through Bitcoin. Bitcoin is giving the powers that be the ability to launder infinite amounts of money into activists’ pockets, and all of these people are on an anonymous basis. It’s not anonymous, in my opinion, to the NSA, but other than that, it is.

What he said is as follows, and it’s on his website: “First the Libertarians win, and the first thing that we do by executive order is shut down the government. The second thing that we do is put all of the assets in a trust fund, and then privatize them.”

Farrell: That sounds like Russia 2.0.



Fitts: He said, “We tear up the Constitution because it’s old and passé and we don’t need it.”

I stood up and said, “That’s very interesting that you bring up this plan because this plan has been tried once before.” Actually, it’s been tried several times before. Greg Palast has documented how it was tried in Latin America, but Anne Williamson of the *Wall Street Journal* documented how it was done in Russia. It’s called *The Rape of Russia*. In a population of approximately 145 million, it is estimated that 10-25 million people died. This is financial genocide.

What you’re going to do when you implode the government on the first day is stop 50% of the cash flows in every county in America. They are just going to stop. That means that they have one to three weeks of food. Maybe they have one to three weeks of cash, and maybe they can go one to three weeks without food. So maybe they have nine weeks before they start dying. That means that the entire economy will implode, and you can then sell all the national forest lands and all other lands and all the assets for pennies on the dollar.

Farrell: Interstates, highways, airports – everything.

Fitts: Right, and if you have 10-25 million people in Russia, you are going to have 30-75 million people in the United States.

Farrell: I agree. That is exactly what they are up to. When you told me that, I thought about how they did the test run in Russia. It was successful for a certain period until the KGB put a stop to it and brought in Mr. Putin, which is why they so hate him.



He put an end to the looting of Russia. That is actually what it was all about – or at least he put the looters back into the hands of Russians.

Fitts: It's interesting. I watched Stone's Putin interviews, which I think is one of the most interesting videos to come out in the 3rd Quarter. What you see by watching all of them – and it's long, about four hours – is that Putin's success with the economy, which has been much better than what I would have thought was possible, has been his ability as, both intelligence officer and attorney, to use the law and ensure that law exists and is respected. No economy can function without that, and that is one of the problems with our economy and why it is requiring so massive of a subsidy from the Federal credit mechanism.

Farrell: If you don't have a system that is grounded in good faith and trust and goodwill and good behavior and morality, then the economy breaks down.

Fitts: If nobody respects contracts, productivity is destroyed.

Farrell: Bingo! That is the problem. He has restored that to a certain extent in Russia. That is what the criminal class in the West does not want to see happen because then their game is over at that point, and all of the money that they've stolen is back on the table for discussion. I'm in total agreement with you. This needs to be put on the table, and the Constitution is the only thing that permits it to be placed on the table. That's why they want to get rid of it.

Fitts: I think that there are a couple of tensions that are happening at once that are playing around both the Constitution and the missing money.



One is that within the population, there are about 5-10% of the population who are finally beginning to get the map. They are finally getting the intelligence and seeing it.

I think that one of the reasons they did Charlottesville was to make those people feel bad about themselves and give up. They don't want that 5-10% to connect up and get together and start to take action. I think that has been an important dynamic.

They are worried, and it is interesting because I have been promoting and trying to warn people about the missing money. In 1999, I started to speak publicly on radio shows, writing about it, and warning them of the housing bubble, the fraudulent securities, and the missing money.

The bailout happens, and then more and more servicing fraud is divulged on the mortgages. Then finally, in about 2012, people started to understand what I was saying about the housing bubble. It was a bit late, but some people got it and sold their houses right before the high, so that was good.

With very rare exception, no one has ever been able to resonate or connect with the missing money story. What I've said is, "Look, if I can steal all the money I want from the Federal credit mechanism, then I control."

So this is about governance. If a group of people can steal as much as they want and act with impunity outside the law, then they can control. All these other debates about policy and everything else are irrelevant.



We had a Congressman who was moving on a series of different issues, including pedophilia and human trafficking. He and his group had threatened to not reauthorize the NSA bulk collection – which I suspect was the real issue, not the pedophilia. He was shot, and we'll see if he might be harmed for life – very seriously.

You have an entire world of Congress critters and senators who don't want to be shot. They are kowtowing and they are playing the line.

One of the big control mechanisms that was put into place was Obamacare, and yet we haven't been able to repeal it.

Farrell: That is a sign of how deep all of this goes. We heard from that particular political party, "Just put us into office. Give us the Senate, give us the house, give us the White House, and we'll repeal."

We now see that has 'gone up in smoke'.

Fitts: Right, and John McCain has been in the lead of making sure that it doesn't repeal.

Farrell: This brings up this complete control mechanism again because they are either doing this because they are under threat from the corrupt system, or they are doing it because they have bought into the system and have profited from it.

It is absolutely crucial to understand that these people are not abiding by the Constitution. This is the bottom line once again.



Fitts: Here is another thing. If you have to look at the system, it can't work economically.

Farrell: It can't work economically, and it's not working at a human level. Let's remember that Obamacare was under threat from suits that were pending before the Supreme Court and Justice Roberts flip-flopped. I've always thought that this was a clear indication that there is some control mechanism that is being used to ensure that the system does not collapse, which it will. Plain economics says that it is going to.

That is an indicator of how deep all of this goes and how corrupt the system is and how unconstitutional it is.

Fitts: Back to my stock market chart, if you look at the financial charts that we have for the 3rd Quarter, they cover how the different markets have done. What you will see is that the bond market is outperforming the GNP, the stock market is outperforming the GNP, precious metals is outperforming the GNP, and commodities are not outperforming the GNP. So equities, bonds, precious metals, and everything but commodities are outperforming the GNP.

Part of that can happen because technology is making a difference – and certain kinds of productivity – but we know that general productivity is flat line and labor productivity is flat line. So that can only be possible if you're liquidating living things – people, environments, etc – and you're stealing massive amounts of money from the Federal government to continue it. You can't keep that going unless you bust the Constitution.



We have a leadership – whether it's corporate or political – because the politicians are getting all of their contributions from the capital gains coming off the rising real estate and stock market values, and you can't have that last without tearing up the Constitution at some point.

Farrell: That is the problem and you said it last night: The only thing that can possibly keep it going is tyranny. That is the only thing that can make it continue.

Fitts: For a short time, however, what you have to do – and this is their vision – you have to replace all labor with software and AI and robotics, and then depopulate the people, or give them a universal and give them a chip in their arm and go to a casteless society.

If you look at what is happening, the reason healthcare costs are exploding is because you are essentially poisoning the population to convert them to infertile people. So GMOs, vaccines, spraying, and all these things are part of a long, slow depopulation. That is exploding the healthcare expenses because you're also drugging them with pharmaceuticals, feeding them GMOs, and poisoning the population and weakening them and making them infertile, and that is exploding healthcare costs.

Farrell: And you're poisoning their minds, so let's not forget that.

Fitts: Right, you are poisoning their minds. You're trying to make it possible so they can't see the game and take control of their own healthcare but it's not hopeless. You can deal with this if you can see the game and take control of your own health.



I think that the reason McCain voted against the repeal is because Obamacare was the infrastructure put in place to manage the liquidation of the population.

Farrell: Precisely, I totally agree and I've always agreed with that.

Fitts: When you drive around the country – and you and I have talked about this before – you see it because it's the equivalent of the Nazi model, but friendly. Rappoport calls it 'Hotel Auschwitz' because it's like a hotel.

Farrell: It is.

Fitts: During the 1990's and the early 2000's, for the last 15 years, every county has a brand new hospital or healthcare clinic complex. So there is a brand new healthcare clinic and a brand new prison and a brand new criminal justice center.

The middle class is liquidated through the hospitals, and the lower class is liquidated through the criminal justice system, and both are drug systems. So the middle class is on pharmaceuticals, and the low-income go to illegal narcotics and through criminal justice, but it's the same process, and they are making money on both of them. The lines between the two are nicely calibrated to optimize their profits – both on the pharmaceuticals and the covert cash flows.

Farrell: And let's not forget the culture part of this, which, in my opinion, is the most important. Let's remember that the CIA was involved in promoting modern art and certain types of music.



Fitts: Incoherence.

Farrell: In other words, they're trying to produce 'epistemological warfare'. They are trying to produce a state of rational incoherence and cognitive dissonance in about everybody so that you can no longer spot a moral hypocrisy and then act on it. This is the bottom line.

They are keeping everybody drugged and zombified through television and music and the 'whole nine yards'.

Fitts: I noticed with the criminal justice centers – and they were popping up in every county, which was amazing.

Farrell: And the private prisons.

Fitts: . So you do the pharmaceutical liquidation, and then the narcotics liquidation. Marijuana is a big thing. Interestingly enough, if you talk to the drug dealers where I live, what you discover is that the biggest reason for buying marijuana is because you don't have healthcare insurance and it's an alternative painkiller.

Farrell: Oh, I know.

Fitts: It's so carefully calibrated.

Farrell: I knew somebody who had a prescription for medical marijuana – the small pills. He took it for pain and for appetite control to help control the appetite.



The prescription cost the government \$1,700 for a bottle of 30 pills when he could buy a bag of marijuana for \$50 on the streets.

Fitts: Yes, but then a local farmer would make money.

Farrell: We don't want that!

Fitts: I'm watching the criminal justice centers being built and the shiny new hospitals, and, in the meantime, when you go into the grocery stores, they are significantly expanding the pharmaceutical and off-the-shelf drug section by a lot – by 10-20% of the space.

In fact, there was one time when an entire checkout line at the local Walmart was moved aside so that they could put in a special vaccine place where people could get their vaccines.

Also, I went into one CVS or Walgreens – one of these chain stores in California – and they said, “Ten percent off all purchases if you get the new vaccine.” I couldn't believe it.

Farrell: I can.

Fitts: I'm watching, and it's clear that the publicly traded stocks – whether food companies or drug companies – are planning on big profits from this drug push. I was talking to somebody the other day that said, “You're not going to believe this.” They never go to the doctor, but for some reason they had to. I think it was to get a form for insurance or something. The doctor said, “How many pharmaceuticals are you taking?”



They said, “None.”

The doctor wrote down, “Nine.”

They said, “No. Not nine; none. Zero.”

The doctor was shocked, but he was not shocked by nine. Nine was the appropriate, expected answer. Can you imagine taking nine pharmaceuticals?

Farrell: Yes I can because part of creating the cultural dissonance and breakdown has been to drug children. We’ve seen the vaccines and autism connection that they are in absolute denial of. That is part of it. The other part of it is giving youths Ritalin and Adderall, particularly young boys.

Fitts: Retired teachers in Tennessee reported to me that one of the reasons they retired is because they were so heavily pressured by the parents to put the kids on drugs so that they could get a social security disability check because, otherwise, they couldn’t afford to feed their kids.

Farrell: It’s insanity, but the important thing for people to take away from this is that. what we are saying, none of these things are happening by accident; these are coordinated efforts. I’m going back to what I said earlier about full spectrum dominance. This is not, in my opinion, just a military policy and doctrine. This is the policy that they have adopted for domestic governance and management.



Fitts: Right, and it depends on a lie. One of the lies is that there is no money. The reason that lie is only ya-ya is because it's similar to a farmer who has a milk can that has a hole in the bottom. If you milk the cow and put the milk in the can, you never have enough milk because it's always leaking out of the hole in the bottom. The solution is not to shoot the farmer and not to shoot the cow because the cow is producing milk. The solution is to get a new can or plug the hole.

The reality is that our economy is being run for these different reasons. You and I have talked about the earth as a REIT, and it's being run to get the dividend and we're all being harvested.

If you could, in theory, turn the returns by place in every county to a positive on investment instead of a negative on investment, if you could allow markets to work, most people can't be productive unless they can get an honest price. Price is what helps them understand how to allocate their time, how to allocate their learning, and how to allocate their money so they can be productive and acquire what they want.

If you turn off the price and turn off the smoke alarm, they are going to act stupid. So if you look at whether it's turning the government money to a positive return, getting back the money stolen, returning the governance of our society to something relatively lawful – as it appears Putin may have done – and give people an honest price, then you are back to a productive society.

Farrell: You are back to a mechanism, which goes back to what we said earlier about price and these virtual markets and the constant intervention in the markets.



Price is no longer a mechanism that people can use to determine their decisions.

In the absence of that, what do they do? They shut down and quit producing. There is too much confusion.

Fitts: I would say that some of the greatest enemies of the US Constitution are: Silicon Valley and the software industry. We have created a software industry which derives pleasure from disruption, believes it is free to disrupt, not only private market functions, but governmental and civic functions, believes it should be free to do it outside the law, believes that it should be above the law, is perfectly happy to be sneaky and make sure its code is unreadable, and basically is subject to enormous amounts of blackmail and manipulation. In addition, they think that it is all very clever.

The last thing is that they are completely and utterly ignorant of their various subsidies. They don't understand that most of their technology was laundered into them. The regulators have left them alone, and they have massive capital subsidies. Massive.

So they are similar to surfers on a wave, and all that they know is that they have the wind at their back. They don't understand that they are being used. They are the patsy, and they don't see it.

I have heard top venture capitalists say, "Hey, I'm in the private markets. I have nothing to do with government."



I want to say, “Pal, the government killed millions of black people to raise capital so that you could have the cheapest cost of capital in the world. You don’t know that? You don’t know that South-Central LA was destroyed so that you could have free money? You don’t know that?”

Farrell: And they don’t.

Fitts: “You don’t know that Area 51 and all that technology was laundered into you and your pals? You don’t know?”

These people are very smart, and have worked very, very hard. They are very ambitious and very smart, and they don’t know.

In certain respects, you are looking at people who have an IQ of 180 that are the stupidest people you have ever seen, and it’s terrifying.

Farrell: It’s terrifying, and it’s not only because they are ignorant of their own subsidized roots, but they are also living in that virtual world themselves. They are helping to create that virtual world. So they don’t have any real connection to human activity and this is the problem. Everything is a virtual reality to them, and they don’t see the human cost of some of the things that they are doing.

Fitts: They don’t care.

Farrell: Many of them don’t care.

Fitts: The two books that I keep trying to have everyone read during the 3rd Quarter is Tim Wu’s *The Master Switch: The Rise and Fall of Information Empires*.



The other one I will put up a book review on the Solari website. It's Cathy O'Neil's *Weapons of Math Destruction* about how software and algorithms are being used to engineer an industry, not reflecting where the market would take it, but where you can take it if you rig it with centralizing software, which is not open source and for which there is no regulation when it's doing real harm to people.

They think that if you can rape a population of poor people and make money doing it, it's good.

Farrell: We're probably going to talk about this in Part II, but the important thing to drive home now is for people to understand that if we have systems of financial clearing and market manipulation being driven by software, and if you think that a cashless society would be a wonderful thing, just look at all of the stories of hacking that we've seen appear in the last three to four years.

The Federal Reserve has been hacked, Equifax was hacked, also Sony and JP Morgan Chase, and who else? The FCC was hacked. I think there was a story somewhere about the Bundesbank being hacked.

Fitts: Certainly the Office of Management and Personnel was hacked and that was frightening.

Farrell: That was horrid. In addition to all of this, we've had security breaches in Los Alamos with hackers, the Chinese spy case, and on and on it goes.

You've said this so many times, but I'm going to repeat it.



These systems are not secure. We don't know the extent of back doors in blockchain technologies with things like Bitcoin and so on. We don't know the extent of that because there is no oversight. So we can use Bitcoin to fund our private armies.

Fitts: The money that they are laundering to the activists through Bitcoin is astonishing from everything that I've seen.

Farrell: That was Hitler's dream: create your private armies with anonymous sources of funding.

Fitts: Right, but they're not selling it off Hitler's plan; they are saying, "Let's triple Goldman Sachs' profits."

Farrell: The results will be the same and it's an antihuman agenda.

Fitts: When Goldman Sachs came out with their new plan to do retail lending, I thought, "Why would Goldman Sachs do that?"

Then after going through how blockchain and cryptocurrencies could essentially wipe out 8,000 community banks and 5,000 credit unions I said, "Oh, that's why. There you go."

Farrell: Exactly. This technology subject is not the boon that they are saying it is – this cashless issue. No.

Fitts: Especially if you look at all of the shadow work. The software industry is destroying productivity in this country.



Farrell: Absolutely, I totally agree.

Fitts: I said at the conference, “Look, we have a political system that has no integrity, we have a financial system that has no integrity or has lost plenty of integrity within the political system,” because the financial system is just a subset of the governance system. Now we’ve added information systems that have no integrity. How do you think a digital product is going to solve all of those problems? Control is analog.

Before we leave Constitution and the Missing Money I want to discuss a couple more things. The Administration failed to achieve a repeal of Obamacare, but the other thing that they are now working on is tax reform. The reality is that one thing that we’ve seen over the last two years was, when the price of gold was rising in the early part of the century, we saw the creation of ETFs like GLD and SLV that sucked enormous amounts of money out of the physical market and into the paper market. If it hadn’t, the gold price would have skyrocketed.

Now we’re watching the same thing happen with cryptocurrencies. It’s sucking a huge amount of money out of the physical gold market, and that makes it possible for the smart money and the central banks to buy more gold cheaply.

They’re buying gold and buying land. The Federal Reserve is better off because cryptocurrency can soak all of the money that they’ve printed and not compete for the hard assets that everybody wants to own and control. I think that land and gold are at the top of everybody’s list.



It's very clever, and if you look, gold is still up more than 10% this year. It's amazing how much the price of gold has gone up given the circumstances. I call it 'GLD 2.0'.

One thing that is happening is the President is very committed to getting tax reform. One of his dangers is that he would like to get tax reform across the board with simplification, but lowering tax rates for everybody. What will get through Congress is his danger. What will make it through the sausage factory is what is good for the rich. To a certain extent, once you go into the process, he can't control it.

What is great for the rich is his danger. One thing we know is that the US corporations have kept trillions abroad and haven't brought it back because they don't want to pay taxes on it. The reality is that if he engineers it and Congress engineers it so that it can come back, we are going to see a wealth of money coming into this country that wants to buy everything.

They can get much cheaper prices if they implode the US government, but I don't necessarily believe that they think they are better off doing that. Then you have a very chaotic situation.

Farrell: Right, and they don't have all of the mechanisms in place. In fact, I think certain things like the hacking incidents and some other things that we will probably discuss in Part II have given them the yellow light to slow down. Now they are confronted with them thinking that there are groups and people – possibly other nations – that have systems that can render ours ineffective and take them down on a very selective targeted basis.



That means that they, to a certain extent, have lost control of the situation. I don't see them under such circumstances risking a full-out implosion. I think that is still going to be part of their game plan, but they have to slow down the schedule and act much more circumspectly.

Fitts: If that money comes in, many different things could be happening if it does. I think there is a very good chance that they will get from Congress two things: One is to repeal the estate tax, and the other is to let that money come back.

They've been trying for more than a decade to set the United States as the ultimate safe haven. So they did everything that they could to shut down Switzerland and get Switzerland under the US thumb. They've made Nevada and some of the other states really prime locations for offshore money. But here is the thing: When I was in Hong Kong, the PRC were moving in to establish their control in Hong Kong. You have in Asia large amounts of money, but they don't want to come here as long as there is an estate tax.

So you have two pressures to get an estate tax: One is that you have baby boomers throughout the heartland. They own farms, own car washes, own dry cleaners, and want to set their estate up so that the wealth transitions. They need no estate taxes because maybe the carwash and the land is worth \$10 million. Otherwise, they are going to get overwhelmed by taxes.

There is pressure from the baby boomers, there is pressure from all the new billionaires, but now you have tremendous pressure from around the world of talent and capital that will come here if those families feel safe from estate taxes.



I believe that as an economic matter, what is actually going to drive it is offshore money. In fact, while the repeal of the estate tax could look terribly unfair, we might all be better off for having those people here and there is a lot of talent.

Farrell: There is a strategic and geopolitical military calculation to this, too, which I think needs to be considered. In terms of a power base, Mr. Globaloney is still reliant on North America. What they've been doing the past 20-30 years under globalization is farming out too much, and now it's caught up to them. Stop and think about it. We have weapons systems in this country that are produced under licenses from foreign companies, and if you are Mr. Globaloney and looking at the hacking incidents and so forth, you realize that, not only do you need to reshore that money, but in the process you need to reshore manufacturing of certain key, crucial industries that your operation needs in order to survive.

Fitts: You have to bring in liquid capital.

Farrell: I think this will be happening under those circumstances. It may not necessarily be of immediate benefit to the baby boomers, but I suspect it will. The problem that people will need to be alerted to is that this is the same group of people who have stolen all of this money to begin with. So it may look good for a while, but basically my warning here is: Stay on your toes and keep watching these people. This is a strategic calculation for them that they have to do and do it fast. We're going to get into this in Part II.



Fitts: You don't want your space program outsourced. So here is what I think: If they get the tax reform that they want, I think what you're going to get – at a minimum – is the corporate money repatriating, and I think that you are going to get wealthy families around the world redomiciling into the United States.

Farrell: I think there are indications that this is already happening. The Rothschilds have been buying land in this country – in Nevada if I'm not mistaken. That is something that we will talk about in Part II; what I think could be realignment between the Rockefellers and Rothschild interests.

The Rockefeller interest has always been about controlling the technology, and the Rothschild interest has always been about controlling land and hard, tangible assets. You brought this up last night about David's death in March, and that was a major event because the old guard and the conservative attitude towards things is no longer there.

Fitts: The Amazon deal went forward right after David died. That takes us to our next topic, which is accelerating up the S-curve of the shift from Global 2.0 to 3.0.

Thankfully Harry Blazer was at the conference in Colorado. We're going to record a report with him, which we will publish shortly.

You and I invented together – at this very table – the shift from Global 2.0 to 3.0. We somewhat invented that together, and have been talking about it for years.



However, when Amazon bought Whole Foods I said, “Okay, the bell just rang,” because their stock went up \$13 billion, and all these other stocks went down \$70 billion. So the market shrunk and that is deflation.

So this is the bell. David has died, and now they are going to go up the S-curve. I’ll be really blunt. If you said to me, “Who gave the kill order on Kennedy and 9/11?” I would have said that it was David and that is what I believe.

Certainly Talbot has more than proved that in *Devil’s Chessboard* with respect to the Kennedy assassination. So his death was a very, very big moment because he appeared to be very active up until the end.

I have said this many, many times to Harry Blazer. Harry and I had done a show about Amazon buying Whole Food where we discussed it. However, one thing that you could see diving into what is happening with blockchain and cryptocurrencies and the plan disruption over the next two to five years, including the 2020 election, was the speed at which these people believe we’re going to go up the Global 3.0 S-curve.

Harry said, “Oh my goodness! Now I understand what you’re saying.”

I said, “You mean you haven’t understood until now?”

He said, “No. Now I really see it and feel it.”

Farrell: The brakes are removed.

Fitts: Perfect! This is why I think you are a genius.



Farrell: It's very clear. You had two deaths that removed the foot from the brake pedal, and that was David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski.

Fitts: And Bush is now incapacitated, and Cheney is essentially out.

Farrell: So you have an entire group of young Turks, essentially, in that segment of the deep state who: 1) Don't have the experience, 2) Are much more stupid and much more arrogant.

Fitts: They are very, very smart, but what they have is the fever, and they don't know what they don't know.

Farrell: That is part of it. I think they are the 'yes' men that the old guard surrounded themselves with. Now that the foot is no longer on the brake pedal and they no longer have that realpolitik and experience that is guiding them, you can see it in our blundering in foreign policy; it's all over the place. Now that that brake is removed, they have the fever and they are going to run with it.

I think this is part of the problem. I think this is why you are seeing the retrenchment. I think there is a certain segment of the global crowd that realizes they are in a strategic pickle. You have an emerging conflict – and I'm going to predict that people will watch for this very carefully – from the people who do realize the strategic mess they have put themselves in, and they are going to have to reshore the money, reshore the manufacturing of this country, and then you have the people with the fever pitch who want to press forward full steam.

That is a dangerous mix because this is also playing out in the background of all these other activities that we see happening. It's a very, very dangerous situation.



Fitts: The first group understands herd management. The second group has always been living in virtual reality.

Farrell: Precisely. I think this is going to be one of the themes over the next five years – if not the next decade or so. This is going to play itself out, and it's going to play itself out chiefly in this country. I think that, to a certain extent, you are seeing it played out in Europe. You have it playing out in terms of the faction behind the Brexit vote, which I would include the royal family with that, and then, on the other hand, you have the people living in their virtual reality world – Macron and the Vice Chancellor of Europe, as someone once said.

Merkel has just been reelected.

Fitts: Although with a much weaker mandate.

Farrell: The alternative for Deutschland Party grew. I think it has 90 seats in the Bundestag, and that is a sign that things are very shaky. She dismissed Schäuble, which is monumental and the end of an era. That was a huge, huge move because he understood things and I don't think she does.

Fitts: I think he is a brilliant man, and I was fascinated. One of the most important books that I read this year – and I recommend it to everybody – is the Greek Finance Minister's book, *Adults in the Room*. A couple of things that you see are: 1) The austerity plan is war. They don't want Greece's economy to turn around and succeed. They don't want to get paid back. They want to strip the place.



It is the Rape of Russia in a much more sophisticated, subtle plan. 2) The guy's naiveté allows the process to occur and his ability to record all of the conversations with an iPhone basically shows you that.

One thing that you see at the end, is that Schäuble is a very ultimately human person who knows how horrible what is happening is and how wrong it is, and somehow his humanity comes out. It wouldn't surprise me if that book cost him.

You know he's going to be running the Bundestag. He's going to be the President of the Bundestag.

Farrell: It's going to be interesting to see where his career goes from this point now that he is no longer officially part of her cabinet. I think this puts him in a position of some strength over the long term.

Fitts: If I were him, I would much rather be the President of the Bundestag.

Farrell: Especially under the conditions now under this new parliament that is coming into office.

Fitts: I think austerity might be dead.

Farrell: It's not only that, but the other long-term thing this presages is, is that we are going back to the old guard and the people living in their virtual reality. Merkel is living in her virtual reality, and he's not. If I remember correctly with Schäuble – and you pointed this out about a year ago –



it was Schäuble who pointed out that there is no fixing of the financial system that is not a reform. That's huge.

Fitts: That growth model is over. There are no reforms that are not real reforms. I'm curious, but my guess is that he understands that Fortune 500 chart.

Farrell: Absolutely.

Fitts: We can't keep destroying the economy just to make the stock market rise. Ultimately, this is the issue of the pilot seniority. Did I ever tell you the pilot seniority story? You speak your point first, and then I'll tell you the pilot seniority story.

Farrell: The other thing that we need to remember about Europe, and particularly Merkel's government, is that Merkel is coming out of a mentorship from Chancellor Kohl. He was her mentor. The Christian Democratic Union in Germany was, in turn, heavily financed by the German chemicals industry – in other words, the big multi-national global corporations there.

Merkel always appeared to me as though she was a national globalist kind of person, and she's been running Germany and Europe that way, and it's not working. So Schäuble's dismissal from the government, I believe, indicates that there were some really deep philosophical divisions between her and her Finance Minister. He has cut himself loose. I would not be a bit surprised to see him start maneuvering for control of the CDU and see him as a candidate that stands against her next time for leadership of the party.



That would not surprise me at all, particularly – and I’m not predicting this because I don’t know enough about German politics to know whether or not he is going to go this way – if he is successful in reaching out to the Alternative for Deutschland Party and certain elements of the SPD. Where Germany goes, Europe is going to go and so he is the person to watch here.

I do think that there were deep, deep philosophical divisions between him and Merkel.

Fitts: What is very interesting about him is, if you go back and look at his history from the beginning, this person understands nuts and bolts. This is a guy who can re-engineer the train tracks of power because he knows where all the switches are, he knows where all the lines are, and he has walked the lines. He is not only an experienced politician, but also a master bureaucrat, and a master negotiator of financial transactions.

Farrell: The other thing that it demonstrates is that her coalition is very weak, and she is losing her grip on her cabinet. He was very outspoken, even as a Cabinet Minister, as was her Foreign Minister at the time, Steinmeier and she booted him.

In other words, she has completely rearranged her cabinet from the people who were there, and the people who were there were the relatively sane people in the group. Who knows what we have and now we have Macron. He’s not a member of the German Cabinet, but I’m very serious. We’re going to see the same situation of these factions that we’re seeing maneuvering to fight it out in Europe. I suspect that it is going to proceed in Europe a bit faster than we’re seeing it in the U.S.



Fitts: Remember this: Many of these people came up in 2.0.

Farrell: Yes, they did.

Fitts: The shift to 3.0 is throwing them for a loop, too.

Farrell: It is, and Merkel has not a clue, she just hasn't.

Fitts: Even though she's a physicist?

Farrell: Her degree is in quantum chemistry, and there has even been some flap in Germany over whether or not she wrote her thesis.

Fitts: Oh no!

Farrell: We don't know.

Fitts: There was one piece that we published during the 3rd Quarter that was about 'The 20 Things you Need to Know about New Technology' and it went into all of the changes that are going to come in the next four or five years, such as driverless cars.

One subscriber read it, and she wrote, "You've been talking about this shift to 3.0, but sitting down and looking at all of these things, I realized I'm not mentally ready for this."

I really, really want our subscribers and listeners to get ready for this.



If you go back and look at when we switched from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy, one minute you have 80-90% of the population working on the land farming, and then in a relatively short period of time, everybody is in the city doing industrial, and you have complete chaos.

This one is going to go faster; it is going much faster. I've never lived through the shift from Global 2.0 to 3.0, but I will tell you this: If they are able to abrogate all of the contracts in Global 2.0 as they are talking about trying to do – and I don't know if that is just a plan to keep the young people entertained and busy, or doing what they want to make them organized and malleable, or whether they are serious about that – I don't know the extent to which they are planning on abrogating, but most people in America are depending on cash flows from Global 2.0.

Who knows how Global 2.0 evolves, implodes, or whatever, but I want to encourage people to think about what the difference scenarios are that could happen to Global 2.0. How do you make sure that you are thinking about how you make the switch?

Farrell: I believe the key is going to be to be in control of your information as much as possible. I think that shows like this one are going to survive and probably thrive. I think what people need to start thinking about is doing a similar thing on the scale that they can do it and build up information outlets for local issues and alike. I think that is very critical because we don't have that. I think that you are the only one out there talking in terms of locality.

Fitts: No. There are others.



Farrell: There are others, but if people were to start publishing information on the web, doing websites and podcasts and so on about local and regional issues, that would help.

Fitts: We had Chuck Marohn of Strong Towns on. I'm excited about what he is doing. Dr. Skidmore is looking at state and local government finance. He teaches county commissioners and other people. We recently put up a great article by Gary Heckman, who is a retired City Manager in Michigan, on going local. There are many great people.

I think that what you and I are saying is that we all need to focus on actionable intelligence. We don't have time for fake news anymore.

Farrell: Right, and it needs to be done. We need local versions of Solari Report and so on. We need these types of things to be done by people on the ground where they are to get information out.

Fitts: Everyone can get together. I keep saying, "Get together. Call it a club or a circle or whatever you want. Sit down and use it to collect information about what is happening, and then take action."

People say, "I can't afford organic food." Yes you can. Get ten people together, and once a week one person goes to the terminal market and obtains cartons of wholesale organic food for everybody.

Farrell: The other thing is to start building up social circles again. Get together and play cards and discuss all of these things and do things that we used to do.



Fitts: Get a nurse practitioner into the circle that can teach you how to take care of your health. Get an attorney who can teach you how to do the simple things. Get a banker who can make sure that you're banking at the local bank and that you're okay.

Farrell: There is another thing that I think that people need to be aware of that is coming down the pike, and we've mentioned it before in terms of technologies and how they're going to transition from 2.0 to 3.0: Robotics in the home. There are already little robot vacuums that you can buy that will clean up your home. The problem is that some of these technologies have already been shown to have little hidden cameras and things, and they map your home. So you want to be very careful about these technologies and bringing them into your home. They are going to happen sooner or later.

The other thing is that if you're concerned about your personal information getting into the databanks, there are other alternatives to search engines on the computer to use other than Google. There is a search engine that I used called DuckDuckGo.

Fitts: I use DuckDuckGo, but I'm prototyping Brave, which is a new one.

Farrell: Just avoid using the big names that we know are spying on us. It could be that these things are, too, but by moving our business away from those platforms, you are already sending a signal. I think that those things are very important for people to do and be aware of.



The robotics in the home is a big thing, and the other big thing that is coming down the pike – and we’ve talked about this – is 3D printing. I’m actually enthused about that because, what it will allow people to do is replace parts and make it yourself, which I am experimenting with already. I think that is something that people need to study.

There are all sorts of things that people can do to make good use of this technology and not be subservient to the multinational corporations.

Fitts: Here was the story that, in my opinion, personified the first part of your message – the warning part. To the extent that you incorporate digital technology into different applications and appliances and pieces of hardware around your house, it’s a two-way street.

There was a great article a couple of years ago about how, when you signed the terms and conditions of Samsung, you are basically giving them permission to watch you and record you.

My favorite one on the 3rd Quarter was the warning by an expert that your sex robot could be hacked and turned into an assassin.

Farrell: Your sex robot – how sick can you possibly be?

Fitts: Can you imagine? Essentially, the world has been so worked over and weaponized by the intelligence agencies that now the only way you feel safe having sex, is not with a human, but with a robot.



If the population is weaponized, then you can't afford to have sex with anybody in the population. So you spend \$10,000 getting a robot and your robot gets hacked and kills you. That has to be the saddest story.

Farrell: It is, and it conjures up all sorts of images that I don't want to go to, but seriously, you're right.

Fitts: It's the complete end of intimacy, even robotic intimacy.

Farrell: It's over, folks.

Fitts: With that, I want to discuss the Peace of Westphalia. That is a perfect dovetail into the Peace of Westphalia. You and I started talking about this about a year or two ago, and it's finally beginning to sink in.

The Peace of Westphalia, among other things, was in 1648. It established the practice that physical control – force – was a monopoly of a sovereign government within that place. So if you're in any place on the planet, the only person who has a monopoly on force and can use force within that place is the sovereign government overseeing that place.

With the exception of many wars that we all know about, it's been a remarkably stable governance structure for more than 400 years. Now what we're watching is that within a 20-30 year period of time – thank you, George Bush and Dick Cheney, and I take this back to giving the CIA control of the hidden system of finance – you've put the intelligence agencies in charge of the biggest secret bank in the world, and you have created a situation where you have really torn up and shredded the Peace of Westphalia without even a discussion.



You have financed all of these private corporations creating mercenary armies, and now with cryptocurrencies, you've financed enormous waves of hacking armies. So whether it's cyber armies or physical armies, you have shredded and torn up the Peace of Westphalia without even a discussion or a mentioning of it. It's quite remarkable.

Farrell: We're probably going to return to this in Part II. The Peace of Westphalia is actually a series of seven or eight treaties. It ended the 30 Years' War – the wars of religion in Europe. Fundamentally, the principal of Westphalia was that if you were in a country or what have you that the sovereign was Catholic, then he had to respect and obey equal application of the law to his Protestant subjects, and vice-versa. If you were in a country that had a Protestant sovereign, he had to obey the law and apply it equally to Catholic subjects. That was essentially the peace.

What the Peace of Westphalia did was enshrined the idea of the sovereignty of law and the equal application thereof. In other words, it was a crucial development in European jurisprudence on the way to what became in this country, the equal application of law, freedom of religion, etc.

It was a set of treaties that also enshrined something other, and that was the sovereignty of the nation state, which ultimately becomes the sovereignty of the states and individuals in this country.

What we see now – and what disturbs me – is that, to a certain extent, you've seen emerge in the last 100 years or so three different types of things emerge. All of them are non-state actors.



First of all, you pointed out last night when we were talking about all of this, the bureaucracies of this government alone, but you can pick any government on the face of the planet and they would probably have the same thing. You have the bureaucracies of this country, which are acting as sovereign entities, which have a different point of view than other bureaucracies of the same government.

Fitts: Right, and they all have weapons and the ability to use them.

Farrell: You no longer have a common culture of governance, but we also have – as Mr. Global keeps pointing out – transnational global corporations, which, under law in the Western system of jurisprudence, are persons and, therefore, have a certain amount of sovereignty. However, they don't have the obligations, and that is the problem. That has to be looked at long term and very carefully in the evolution of Western jurisprudence.

It would be interesting to see how Russia does this because they come out of a theological system that gave rise to all of this. Therefore, how do they view corporations? Are they persons? Are they obligated under the law? Do they have rights under the law?

The third actor is somewhat of a non-territorial actor. It's not necessarily corporations, per se. I've been talking about things like the mafia, which would be an extra-territorial actor. Fascist International would be one, and similar.



So we have three new types of actors on the world stage that: 1) Are not signatories or under any sort of obligation to the Westphalian system, and 2) Whether they are or not, they are certainly not acting as if they are.

That has contributed to tearing this thing up. So we need to take a very long, hard look over the long term. This is what scares me about a Constitutional Convention because they won't do that, and it needs to be done and those aren't the people to do it.

Fitts: Here is what is interesting. If you take any bank or corporation in the world, your state can enforce against them. First of all, they can fire them because all these companies have contracts or are depositories for your state. So don't complain about the Federal government; just pull the plug on them in your state and county.

When the state of California was going to issue script because of the fight over the budget, JP Morgan Chase refused to take it or honor it or let them do it, and they were over a barrel. I would fire them in a second; you're out!

That was number one. Number two; they can pull their charter to operate within a state. For a corporation to function within a state, the state has to approve. It's one thing that I said in my article on how to enforce the Constitution. Get everybody; New York Fed member bank or San Francisco Fed member bank that has carried out all these shenanigans or the contractors who are responsible for the missing money, and pull the charter on them in your state.



Farrell: The problem there is the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the Constitution. That would probably be used by their lawyers to defend them, but I take your point.

These types of entities do have state charters for the most part.

Fitts: They may have a charter in Delaware, but they are not allowed to operate in your state if you pull their right to operate. You can throw them out and don't have to hire them.

Farrell: I understand that, but that is not going to address the bureaucracy. These are the things that I think have torn up Westphalia.

If that system of equality under the law that became a cardinal principal of international law is going to work, then we have to go back. I've said this many times. We have to take a very good long, hard, philosophical look at the development of jurisprudence with respect to these things, and I don't see anybody doing that sort of analysis now.

The other thing about Westphalia that is very, very interesting is that last year there was a Saudi prince who suggested that they needed to expand the Westphalian system to include the Islamic world, which I think – in a certain respect – makes a great deal of sense. There isn't much sense coming out of Saudi Arabia, so that caught my attention.

As things are going now, we are heading to some type of civilizational conflict with that culture and that civilization, and nobody wants it. They certainly don't want it. I don't think that it would be good for us.



The only people who it is going to be good for are the weapons manufacturers.

I think that the Westphalian system has at least caught the eye of other people in the world for very obvious reasons. It's going to be interesting to see if we can make it work.

The problem is that, in this country, the entire concept of equality under the law is breaking down, and they are deliberately breaking it down. So I don't know if the system can be restored or not. I certainly hope so, but it can't be restored until we take a long, hard, close, philosophical, jurisprudential look at the evolution of all these things, particularly where the law impacts corporations, and particularly where it impacts bureaucracies.

Bureaucracies are now acting like legal agents in their own right for their government, and that is not the way that it is supposed to be.

Fitts: I would say it another way. They are using government powers to make money outside the law.

Farrell: Precisely and that is only creating more chaos. Agency A says this, and Agency Y says that. So, where is the common citizen caught? They are caught in the crossfire and they don't know what to do or what to think. The courts themselves are in shambles. The Federal court system hardly obeys the Constitution at all and we've seen example after example of that.

Fitts: That's why it's coming down to decision time.



When I was in litigation, I had a very dear friend named Court Skinner who was a Silicon Valley executive. When he left, he started a small, not-for-profit, to fundamentally take the computers from the big corporations and get them transferred over to the youths in the neighborhood that couldn't afford computers. It was called Computers for Everyone.

In the year when there was the most tension, the life expectancy of one of my computers was 29 days. I was using all Lennox and open-source software, which is the most invulnerable to hacking, but it would still only last 29 days. They could hack them and absolutely destroy them.

The only way for me to stay online was to get a new laptop every 29 days, and Court would completely throw something together. These things were old and clunky because you knew it was only going to last 29 days, so why spend money?

I would get a FedEx package, and the cost of the FedEx was more than the value of the computer. I would get a new second-hand computer that Court had slapped together from the parts in his garage, and that would keep me online for the next 29 days until he had to send the next one and within a year, he had sent me 13 computers.

Here is what was amazing: I am getting hacked – my property, my rights being destroyed every 29 days – and I can't go to an enforcement agency; there is no one who will help me.

Farrell: I know, the government is not functioning for the people anymore.



Fitts: There is no law and it's chaos. So what I can do is manage the chaos. If it weren't for Court, I wouldn't have been able to keep doing the work that I was required to do.

We are in and are moving into a situation where I think it's going to get much worse. So that means that I'm in a place, and I can have any one of these three groups and multiple groups within those groups, so within a place, I am subject to the force of thousands of groups who can use force against me in a place, and I can't figure out who they are.

Farrell: The same thing has happened to me in a different way. I had many books placed by my publishers on a certain ebook format from a certain company whose name won't be mentioned here. The next thing I knew – and this has happened to a friend of mine, as well – all of my books are on free PDF on the internet.

This last book – the Hess book – I told my publisher, “Do not permit any ebooks because they are too easily hacked.”

I wouldn't be a bit surprised to find out that there were people who work for the government involved in some of that. It wouldn't surprise me at all.

Fitts: My favorite one happened a few years ago. I was invited to a conference, and I was somewhat suspicious. Why in the world would these people pay me to give a speech?

While I was there, two newsletter writers who are people that I don't respect, followed me . I don't respect them or their work, and I don't like them. I think they are basically in the fear porn business.



They followed me, and one of them is a marketing person and that is writing notes and listening to everything that I say. When the conference is over, suddenly my entire subscriber list is hit with marketing from these two groups. So, somehow, they had the database and that is criminal. What they do is, all the target marketing is using my words and expressions, and it's designed to look like they agree with me. From talking to various subscribers who were all happy and excited about this, it sounded as if they were probably using entrainment. I can't prove it, but that is what it appeared to be.

Farrell: I've had the same thing happen to me.

Fitts: People would call me all excited and in a rush, "Oh, this is wonderful. They agree with you. I have to get this because they agree with you."

I'm thinking, "What is this? This doesn't make any sense."

I don't know how much money they made from that, but it was actually a criminal hit.

Farrell: I've had the same thing happen to me. I've seen my research popping up in places and with certain people whose names you can probably guess that are spun into these wild directions. There is no credit given.

I have another friend that this has happened also. He writes in the field of research, and it happens all the time. I have people emailing me, asking, "Did you talk to such-and-such because what they are saying sounds very much as though they lifted it from you."



“Yes, they did.”

Fitts: I don’t mind that in the sense that ideas are free.

Farrell: Sure, but you are an academic and I am an academic. What you do is reference and footnote and credit your source.

Fitts: Here is the thing: When you steal somebody’s private information and hack their list, that is a big deal.

Farrell: That is criminal, right.

Fitts: Especially if they were using entrainment. That is also criminal. I feel as though they were doing deceitful to people. That’s why I won’t get on Facebook. They are going to create lists that get used, and I will not be a party to that because we work very hard.

The intelligence agencies could get anything they want, and I suspect that is where they get it.

The story that I was about to tell you is one that I’ve told many times on The Solari Report. In 1998 I was sitting in my office, and an acquaintance of mine at the CIA, who was very senior in strategic planning, sent me an email with a link to a speech that George W. Bush as Governor had given. The CIA was promoting him to be the next President. They were working on it, and they were trying to make him out to be the ‘education President’. His father tried it, and it hadn’t worked, so they were going to try it with him.



So he gave his speech on education, and she said, “What do you think?”

I wrote back, “It’s so stupid.”

She said, “Why is it stupid?” She became very upset. “If you wanted to be the ‘education President’, what would you have said?”

I told her, “I would say this,” and I wrote several paragraphs of what I would say and how I would say it. I didn’t hear back from her. About three weeks later, we were sitting in the office and my attorney was there. I opened the *Wall Street Journal*, and there is a news report about a speech by Bush for education, and there is an entire paragraph lifted from my email.

I’m sitting there thinking, “Did I get paid for this?”

Farrell: Did you get referenced or cited? No, of course not and I’ve had that happen to me. This goes back, not just to the rule of law, but also to something much deeper. This goes to common courtesy and academic method.

If you’re basing something on somebody else’s idea or using their words, you footnote them and credit them with what you said or with the idea.

Fitts: You and I will occasionally have a disagreement where I tell you that you are more powerful than you realize. That is because, if you look at how your material is spreading, it’s unbelievable, but it’s being stolen. However, here is the thing, and this is what Ronald Reagan said, “You can get anything done in Washington as long as you don’t want the credit.”



I think it is possible to shift things in a really positive way; we only have to let them keep stealing it from us.

Farrell: The problem is that when they steal, they spin it in directions that you would never go. This is happening under a certain marketing scheme that we both know about now. I've seen it happen before. I gave 30 hours of my time talking to a television producer, and then I saw a program with all of these ideas that we talked about in the program, and absolutely no mention that I was his consultant – absolutely none. From that point, I won't deal with American television. I will deal with Russian television because they credit me. They know the standard academic game.

Fitts: You know that McCain placed a provision in the new Appropriations Bill, the National Defense Authorization Act. Mattis asked for an increase, and Trump increased the increase, and then McCain increased Trump's increase to \$700 billion.

One of the provisions he put in was that, if it passes and gets signed, RT is not allowed to broadcast in America. He is outlawing Russian TV.

Farrell: Well, that leaves the internet. I'll still watch it and I'm sorry, Senator McCain.

Fitts: They can still broadcast on the internet from anywhere. So much for that.

Back to the Peace of Westphalia, I want people to focus on this.



One of our challenges is to realize that we are functioning in places where there are multiple actors acting with impunity outside the law. One of the chief things that we need to think about is: How do we provide security for ourselves in a way that is reasonable so that we can be productive? It's a problem, and this is one of the reasons the gun issue is such a do or die issue.

If I could stress anything – whether it's on the Constitution or the Peace of Westphalia – we are coming into what I call the 'swine flu' moment. I tell the story that I told last week on precious metals with Franklin. When the swine flu vaccine came out, they were going from state to state to mandate it. I called Franklin and said, "I'm not going to take this vaccine." I really believed that it could be extremely harmful and it could kill you.

I called Franklin and said, "Can I come over to your house and bring my guns? I'm going to die in a gunfight, and I'd rather die in a gunfight with you than alone."

He said, "Oh, yes. We're not taking it either. Feel free to come over because there will be a gunfight."

I think it's one of the reasons they backed down on the swine flu vaccine. I think that they heard thousands of phone conversations.

Farrell: They've been very confrontational in a variety of ways where they've had pushback – the Bundy Ranch incident and the one in Oregon.



There have been incidents like this previous to that where they've tried to go in and do something, and then they have been stopped by locals who were armed. That is their big bugaboo.

Fitts: I said that I wanted to tell you the senior pilot seniority story. Let me close this out as we finish the Peace of Westphalia.

When I was doing mortgage auction loan sales, we were using the AT&T optimization methodology, which they developed for routing telephone calls. Then, of course, when bandwidth became cheap, they took the technology and used it for other things. One thing they developed it for was airline cruise scheduling.

So an airline would have fantastic variables to optimize against each other when a pilot said, "I want to fly this week, but not this week. That day is my birthday, and I don't want to fly that day. I like going to Europe and Asia, but I don't want to go to South America," and of this becomes fantastically complex.

One thing that they did – because they did scheduling over many, many years – is over time they could price out the cost of a rule, whether it was a government regulation or a union rule.

One thing that they discovered was that seniority so constrained the model that the people with seniority would do better if they gave up their seniority. The optimization would be so much greater, and they would get more of what they wanted.



By insisting on seniority, the senior pilots made life worse for themselves than if they had no seniority. I believe in part, that is what we are looking at in our society. By these varieties of different groups exercising or having the belief that they can exercise force invisibly any time they want outside the law, are basically destroying the entire thing for everybody, including for themselves.

This turns us to Russia. Speaking of ruining everything, one of the stories that most struck me in the 3rd Quarter was the story from Saker about the Russian General being killed, and Russia publishing the stories of US Special Forces collocating with the ISIS terrorists, so who is really financing ISIS?

I took one look at it, the implication being that World War III is about to start because the Russian issue has escalated. In the meantime, a story that NASA has signed and announced an agreement with Russia to do a moon station together is published.

If we're about to start World War III, why would we sign a deal with Russia over a moon station?

Farrell: Especially during sanctions and that is highly suspicious and I'll tell you why. A few months ago, Russia also inked a similar deal with the European space agency, AKA Germany, to do essentially the same thing.

What you have is the United States, Germany, and Russia looking as though they are going to build a space station somewhere between the Earth and the moon. What is very interesting here is not only, "Okay, we're going to be cooperating in space, but not here on the ground," and look who is shut out of the deal: China.



Fitts: I'm assuming that is why they did it. They didn't want the Russians to do the deal with China.

Farrell: That could very well be. I suspect that there is something else happening here, and it goes back to what we've said before about commercialize space; you have to militarize it and weaponize it. If this plan goes through, this means that they are putting heavy assets out there. There is no doubt in my mind that they are going to be of a military nature. As to why they are doing that, is it simply because of commercialization, or is it something else? I don't know.

It is highly suspicious. We are demonizing Russia on the one hand, and yet they are trustworthy enough to be involved in a major project in space, which is the new frontier for everybody. What is this? I honestly don't know. The only thing that I can think of is that if NASA is doing this, it's doing it in the aft of our friend Richard Dolan's idea of a Breakaway Civilization or a Breakaway State. This is more the American deep state doing this than the people in Washington who have big problems with Russia.

We are back to our two-track civilization idea again. That is the only thing that I can think of that explains this.

Fitts: One of the most phenomenal videos of the 3rd Quarter was the video of Morgan Freeman shilling for Rob Reiner's committee on 'Get to the bottom of the election hacking'. You've never seen Morgan Freeman look so scared and insincere – even in a movie where he's playing somebody who is about to be killed.



You think, “What did they do? Did they threaten his kids?” You watch it, and here is a man whom I can’t imagine what they did to get him to do this. He obviously does not believe a word he is saying.

Farrell: It’s not only that, but if we are that concerned about Russia hacking our elections, we’re going back to the matter of systems that have no integrity. The elections have no integrity because, first of all, they are predominantly computerized. Certain individuals in this country whose abominable name will not be mentioned by me (Soros) but who has been heavily involved in financing these color revolutions and Antifa and so on. They are certainly involved in malfeasance in the elections.

If we’re so almighty concerned about Russia influencing our elections, then it has to be a level playing field, and we have to be concerned about Israel influencing our elections – which they clearly do. They have their own organizations.

Fitts: And we’re going to have to stop interfering with every election throughout the world.

Farrell: That is the other thing. The Germans had their national elections last week, and the problem there is that the Germans were worried about election hacking, also, but they weren’t worried about Russia hacking their elections; they were worried about us hacking their elections. By the way, we did bug the Chancellor’s phone.

Fitts: If you look at how the fake news has rolled out so far, the Russian story has been made into a joke. I think it’s one of the reasons we’re seeing an effort by Hollywood to revive it. It’s not working.



Farrell: It's not going anywhere, and I think the reason is because people realize that if you're going to pick on Russia, then we need to expose all election fraud on the part of both parties in this country, and that is never going to happen. There are other foreign influence agents available to pick on.

Fitts: One thing that came out when I challenged this young activist about implementing the Rape of Russia story here was, essentially, very few people from the audience knew what the Rape of Russia was or what really had happened.

Anne Williamson has joined us on The Solari Report twice, and, of course, Saker has joined us. We've been through it before, but I think it's worth underscoring the extraordinary reality of what happened.

Dmitry Orlov has also been on The Solari Report. He was from a Russian family, although he is now living in the United States. He went back and spent a great deal of time there and has written several good books on what it's like to live when an entire large, complex society collapses.

I don't think that most people understand – whether it's what we did in Russia or what we did in Latin America – with collapsing. We're certainly watching it in Venezuela.

We have a leadership that feels empowered to implode societies and has been going throughout the world for the last 30 years and imploding many societies – Libya, Haiti, and Russia.

Tell us about the Rape of Russia and why it's so important that we understand it at this moment in time, given what is happening with Russia.



Farrell: Essentially, what happened was, when communism collapsed and the Yeltsin government came in, you had the Russian government selling off all of the nationalized industries that had been nationalized under the Bolsheviks.

Fitts: Everybody is cashing in their stock.

Farrell: Exactly. They privatized these industries and set up what were, essentially, the equivalent of a Western trust to sell these things off for pennies on the dollar or kopeks on the ruble. What happened is you had a number of Western capitalists move in via the so-called Russian oligarchs buying all the state-owned industries and basically plundering the country of its wealth.

This proceeded to the point – and there is no doubt in my mind – that this was a decision taken by a certain directorates within the KGB to put in Mr. Putin. They put him in, in my opinion, for several reasons, one of which was that he knew people in the West who had dealings with him when he was a middle echelon apparatchik in St. Petersburg – then Leningrad. He was also an agent in Germany, but this was during the final years of the Soviet Union and into the Yeltsin era.

There were two things that people continually mentioned about him. First, he was always very polite and courteous. Secondly, he was absolutely incorruptible. He could not be bribed, would follow the rules, and would follow the laws. So that worked in his favor, plus the fact that he does have his doctorate in law, and international law.



I think that they put him in because of his intelligence connections and because of his reputation to handle this problem, which he has done. We may not like the way he has handled it in some cases, but what he has done – as you have pointed out – is observed the measure of Russian law, and in the course of his government, has expanded those laws, but has done so in a most un-communist way. He's gone to the Duma and he has passed legislation through the Duma and so on. He's not ruling by decree contrary to the way the Western press portrays him.

The other thing that he has done that Russians like is stood up for their national culture. We all remember the Pussy Riot where a rock group went in during an Orthodox liturgy and committed sacrilege. "Off to jail you go."

The Western press howled in indignation with that, and I congratulated him. Number one, that is not behavior that anybody should condone. The only reason the Western press condoned it is because they are essentially anti-Christian as far as I'm concerned.

Putin stood up for the Russian national culture, and this has become – without getting into detail – the hallmark of his administration. I think that it reflects a deep analysis that the Russians are undertaking when the Gorbachev era was coming to an end. This has certainly continued under Putin and some of his academic advisors.

I think they took a detailed analysis of the failures of the system and came to the conclusion that, sooner or later, this entire thing will have to be scrapped, whether it's the communist party of the Soviet Union that does the scrapping or whomever. It needs to be scrapped.



Central to their analysis was this system that they were under was fundamentally inhuman, and that is why it wasn't working. Also, it was not at all reflective of the indigenous shape of Russian culture and tradition. So what you see Putin doing – and this is very interesting– is not only speaking to that when he makes his public speeches, but is also taking back and offering cultural critiques of the West: the pedophilia scandals, vaccines, GMOs, non-nutritious food, and the full gamut.

Fitts: What is interesting is as he does it, without saying it, he is saying, “Your culture is inhuman and we will not tolerate an inhuman culture.”

Farrell: That is what he is saying, and he is also speaking for those people in the West who say the same thing. So he is playing a very, very clever ‘soft power’ kind of cultural geopolitics by pointing out the hypocrisies and systemic inadequacies in the West.

Fitts: What is interesting is, if he keeps it up, if the Russians can maintain this, within two generations they will have a fertile population and we will have an infertile population.

Farrell: It's interesting that one of the things that he did is he has given tax breaks to Russians having children, and over here we are slaughtering them. So, yes, that is a clear signal that they have taken an analysis of the communist system and all of its detailed aspects and are rejecting it and trying to move back something that is rooted in Russian institutions and culture. This does not mean that they are going to restore the czars tomorrow or what have you. As far as I'm concerned, and I've always maintained this, if they get rid of Putin, they may think that they are getting rid of the problem, but I can assure you that this is not the case. Putin is reflective; he's not an individual.



Fitts: He is reflective of a power structure.

Farrell: He is reflective of a power structure that has done a prolonged analysis of the situation – both internally and externally – and these are the conclusions that they have arrived at. I’m absolutely insistent on that.

What I have always said, and I believe it, is that Russia is the first post-post-Modern state. It has looked at all of the isms of modernism, communism, fascism, progressivism, so-called liberalism, and said, “No, none of those are working. We’re going to launch on our own and do our own thing and try to root it somehow in our culture and in its institutions.”

Whether that experiment in the long term will work or not, I don’t know, but I think you’re absolutely right. They have targeted the inhumanity of what has emerged as Western culture, which really isn’t. They have targeted the inhumanity of it, and they’ve noticed the systemic hypocrisies in it and have said, “We’re not going down that road either,” because it’s just a soft form of what we’ve just been through.

Yes, he is a very unusual man and Russia is a country to watch.

Fitts: They have recently said that they weren’t taking dollars at several of the ports, and they have agreed to be trading oil with gold in yuan. They are setting up many other payment mechanisms.

Farrell: Don’t forget that two years ago they incorporated Japan’s credit system into their system so they can use the Japanese system that is in so many places in the Pacific.



They have made a number of very, very key moves. Most recently they've offered technical assistance to Japan for the Fukushima mess.

Fitts: It's peculiar because that received very little attention, but is a major development.

Farrell: Oh, it's massively huge. The joint development that Abe and Putin have signed for the Kuril Islands is another very big agreement. That is a geopolitical earthquake, whether we realize it or the empire at the Pentagon realizes it or not. That is a large geopolitical move.

Fitts: Even though Russia is in the BIS system, they are part of the trading relationships with North Korea that make it possible for North Korea to stay out. We have a new round of sanctions trying to pressure Russia, China, and everyone to stop helping North Korea. It's very much in Putin's interest for North Korea to stay out.

Farrell: Absolutely. The last thing that Russia needs is a large number of North Korean refugees pouring into Eastern Siberia. It's the same thing for the Chinese. The last thing that they want is numerous refugees pouring into Manchuria.

From North Korea's standpoint – in playing devil's advocate here – if I were looking at dealing with the United States and the way it's behaved over the last 70 years, I would want a nuclear deterrent, too, quite frankly. Even though they are communists, from a standpoint of their own national self-interest, it makes sense to me. They're not going to use it, but as long as they have it, it is going to be a difficult nut to crack.



Fitts: They will be free to stay out of the BIS system.

One of the subscribers said to me, “You mean I should be rooting for North Korea?”

Farrell: I’m not rooting for them, but I’m simply saying that they’ve made a decision for their own national interest, and this is the problem. The globalists don’t want anybody to think in terms of national interest, and that is the problem.

Most people don’t remember this about North Korea and Russia and China and Japan and South Korea, but a few years ago South Koreans elected a government that attempted to make noises that, “We can solve this ourselves amongst Koreans.” Of course, the next thing you know, the US put the squeeze on, and that government is out of power.

So, yes, this is a tempest in a teapot. I don’t think that North Korea is ever going to give up a nuclear deterrent. I don’t think that we would go in there, especially now,- and we’ll get more into this in Part II- given some of the things that we’ve discovered about our military holes.

Fitts: This has been Economy & Financial Markets and Geopolitics for the 3rd Quarter. Looking ahead to the 4th Quarter, given what has happened in the 3rd quarter, what do you think are the things that the people listening to this need to consider and think about and watch for?

Farrell: The first thing that they have to watch for is the increasing use of the multicultural agenda to drive fundamental revisions in the financial and governance structure of the country –



– in other words, a Constitutional Convention. This is what the ultimate objective is. Look for signs of that to continue and to increase.

I would also expect that, eventually, you will be hearing about pushback. “If one political section of the country could have its own social justice warriors going out and causing chaos, we can, too.” I think that is coming down the pike.

Fitts: Remember that with Bitcoin they can launder tremendous amounts of money anonymously to people and pay them to go around and do ridiculous things.

Farrell: That is exactly what I am thinking.

Fitts: People who are not having tremendous amounts of money laundered into them have to go to work.

Farrell: I would look for that.

Fitts: One thing that is so important and is not happening is, when I see those folks – whether they are breaking windows or whatever –I see a paid employee who is simply doing their job. I don’t take them seriously and it’s reality TV. They are paid to break those windows. It’s a job, and that is what they do almost like the Truman Show.

I don’t take them seriously because it’s an op. So we need to get real about it being an op and that is all that it is. Think of it as a mini street theatre false flag. It’s an op, and we now need to stop taking it seriously.



There are many different ways to handle each situation, and everybody is different. I think the time has come for us to stop playing back. We have to say, “This is our country. If you want to get a job breaking windows, you need to go elsewhere.”

I think the American people need to get over their embarrassment, their political correction, and their shame, and need to start asserting the law – whatever that means in each situation and whatever they want to do. If you look at the 2nd Quarter Wrap Up, there are many ideas of what everybody can do. Everybody is different, so I’m not telling them which ones are appropriate, but if everybody would do what they could, it would be a mighty army.

Farrell: It’s a matter of withdrawing support from mechanisms that no longer represent your individual worldview. I’m going to hammer my favorite topic here. That means, first and foremost, the universities and colleges. Quit sending your kids to these institutions that are turning out nothing but social justice warriors and people with studies in Women’s Rights or Women’s Studies or this clap track.

Fitts: You can’t afford to spend \$60,000 a year to have your child come home with enormous amounts of entrainment and mind control.

Farrell: And you have to start standing up for those professors who have been speaking out against it and are under fire at the universities. That is also crucial.

This is not going to get turned around unless we recapture the academy.



Fitts: There are also plenty of schools abroad that you can attend. So if ours are mind control laboratories, go elsewhere.

Farrell: Right, or start our own.

Fitts: Exactly. I think there are so many different ways to contribute to it, but we are going to have to get serious.

The other thing is that the missing money issue is coming to a head. I've seen so much spin in the 3rd Quarter saying, "Well, social security is an entitlement, and Americans are too materialistic, and there is \$20 trillion of debt, and there is no money," and all of that is a lie. We can't let that lie stand.

One of the reasons I keep redundantly pushing the missing money story is because any time you're at dinner and somebody says, "There is no money," you say, "That is not true." It's all there. We've made it public. Anybody can read it and everybody can get the government documents. It's time that we go on the offensive about the spin on this.

Farrell: Absolutely. Create so many fronts that they can't deal with all of them and that is the key. So far, they have been very successful in keeping everybody divided and in a herd mentality, and it's not about that. I go to what I said previously. Figure out what you can do that will give you some pleasure and happiness in doing it by way of sharing information in your neighborhood, in your city, your township, whatever, and start putting this information out there. Just start being a big nuisance.



Fitts: Recently, I did another interview with Greg Hunter on the missing money, and one thing that he said was, “I love math. I love money. Then it’s everybody. This is \$65,000 for everybody – black, white, male, female, old, young.”

\$65,000 is almost \$250,000 for a family of four.

Farrell: It’s obscene, and that has been stolen from the people. We know who these villains are. They are the banks, the big corporations, the hedge funds and so on. Just look at the rape of Argentina, for that matter, on hedge funds.

We know who they are, and it’s time to let them know that we know who they are. Then the real crunch comes, “We know where you live.”

It’s what we said when we were talking previous to the recording; it’s coming down to a choice between: Do you want to live under a system of slavery and death, which is what they have planned for everybody? Do you want infertility?

Fitts: Do you want your children and grandchildren to be infertile?

Farrell: Or, do you want to live under a system where you are still free? That may require your death at some point, but there are worse things than death.



Fitts: For many of us, I think it's going to come down to a swine flu moment. I've been through this in the litigation. I had to decide which was more important: My freedom or my life? I chose my freedom. If there is anything that I can communicate, I will say it again, death is not the worst thing that can happen.

Farrell: No, it isn't. If you don't have freedom, you don't have life. You're only living through the motions, you're living a facsimile of it and that's fundamental.

We need to learn from history that every tyrannical system in history thinks that it is the latest and best and, "We'll make it work this time because we have the best technology."

Fitts: "It's different this time."

Farrell: "We have the technology, we have all of the ideology down correctly," and it never ever works.

Fitts: There is no life; it's inhuman.

This has been a rich discussion. Remember we are planning on the crowdfund organ coming. We will have much to give thanks for at Thanksgiving, but we definitely ask your prayers for our very, very busy overworked organ builder, Chris Martin.

Your book is available, so tell us again the name of your book and how we can get it.



Farrell: It's called *Hess and the Penguins: The Holocaust, Antarctica, and the Strange Case of Rudolf Hess*. I don't have it on my website yet, but you can get it through the publisher at Adventures Unlimited or Barnes & Noble and those places.

It is out and is definitely a book worth reading.

Fitts: I've started it, and it's a 'whopper-doozy'.

Farrell: It's a 'whopper-doozy'. The further you get into it, the bigger and bigger and bigger, and you will think, "My word! It's a 'whopper-doozy'."

Fitts: If you want to try to understand what is happening in Antarctica, you have to know the history.

Farrell: . If you want to know what is happening in Antarctica, you have to understand that the modern history of it begins with the Nazi expedition in 1938 and 1939 that was sponsored by Hermann Goering, of all people. This person is not sponsoring a science fair because that's not his bailiwick.

The Hess case is a part of that in my argument – a very big part of it.

Fitts: The other thing that I noticed in the acknowledgements is that you put my name with them, and I was very touched. Needless to say, my collaboration with you is a source of great amazement, information, learning, astonishment, and laughter.



Farrell: I put you in there because we both were wondering what the heck was happening down there.

Fitts: What is happening in Antarctica?

Farrell: I don't know, but I think that Hess was a part of it, whatever it was, and Goering. What a weird group of people if you stop and think about it: Hermann Goering, Rudolf Hess, Admiral Richard Byrd, and then you find out James Forrestal and fleet admiral Nimitz were involved in planning that whole thing.

In more recent times you had Apollo astronaut Buzz Aldrin and even had the Secretary of State, John Kerry.

Fitts: The Secretary of State was there during the election.

Farrell: During the election, of all things! And the patriarch of Moscow was there.

Fitts: He was there with the Pope, right?

Farrell: He wasn't there with the Pope, but he went there immediately after he met the Pope. Dig a little further, and you find that King Juan Carlos and Prince Harry and the list goes on of who went there.

Fitts: When the owners land, everybody comes from around the country to bring tribute.



Farrell: Exactly why is Antarctica an international zone?

Fitts: As you said, it's not on the way to someplace.

Farrell: It's not on the way to anywhere. All of those 19th century claims on Antarctica since World War II have fallen by the wayside. Don't think that is part of the story.

Fitts: Tell us the name again.

Farrell: *Hess and the Penguins: The Holocaust, Antarctica, and the Strange Case of Rudolf Hess.* The book is about Hess, not Antarctica, but there is a part of Antarctica that it touches on.

Fitts: You definitely need to know the Nazi angles if you're going to understand Antarctica.

Joseph, this was a great discussion. I look forward to next week to discuss Part II. We're going to be talking about Culture, Science & Technology, and the Unanswered Questions that still plague us. What are the penguins doing in Antarctica?

I look forward to our discussion next week. Thank you again so much.

Farrell: Thank you for having me.



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.