

from JonRappoport Website

Jack True was one of the most innovative hypnotherapists of our time.

Largely unknown in academic circles, uninterested in publishing his work, Jack focused on his patients.

We met in 1987. We became friends and colleagues.

Over the course of several years, I interviewed him many times. Jack eventually gave up on straight hypnosis-and-suggestion as a way to do therapy.

He said, "I'm finding that people who come to my office are already in a hypnotic state, so my job is to wake them up."

Jon Rappoport

## REFLEXIVE RESISTANCE

by Jon Rappoport

January 14, 2012

from JonRappoport Website

## INTRODUCTION

Since I've written hundreds of articles that attempt to stimulate imagination, I've had to take into account the resistance - many people pretending they're simply "the audience." They watch. They keep their distance. They enjoy the show.

If they think I might be writing about them, they deflect the message like a matador.

In some strange way, the reflex to deflect keeps the universe in the condition of status quo.

Because, think about it. What would happen if a few billion people, on this planet alone, woke up one morning galvanized by their imaginations to such a degree that they began to create new realities at an unprecedented rate?

Life would never be the same.

To personify what I mean by status quo, it's as if a deal were taking place, under the table, between humans and the universe. "We'll pretend imagination doesn't exist, and you, universe, keep us enchanted by things as they are."

Hopefully, you understand that I'm talking about magic here - or the lack of it.

Almost all discussions of mind control, programming, operant conditioning never visit this territory, where the really big-time programming lives.

Well, what is this conditioning? What is its nature?

After many years of considering these questions, my answer is simple. It's resistance. That's the beginning and end of it. I know, it sounds too simple.

There must be a complex structure involved. In fact, humans would be drawn to a structure like that. Fascinated, absorbed. They would sign up in droves to study it. Why? Because it would constitute yet another deflection. It would allow them to wriggle off the hook.

I'll offer you another considered conclusion. Even if there were such a structure, whose purpose was to keep people from exercising their imaginations to the fullest, once that system was probed, understood, and eradicated, humans would remain in limbo. They would still be one step from creating new realities - just as they are now.

In another context, with a different implied meaning, T.S. Eliot famously wrote,

"We shall not cease from exploration/and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started and know the place for the first time."

Remove all the supposed programming, and we're really where we started, but in this case we don't know the place for the first time, we don't know very much more than we did. We're rather bewildered, like the institutionalized person who looks at the open door to his cell one day and doesn't step beyond it.

Because the resistance is still there.

The word "will" has been pretty much removed from the modern vocabulary.

"He doesn't have the will to do the work."

We're taught there are layers and layers of social, psychological, and political factors that separate a person from acting on an idea. And all these factors must be addressed.

You want operant conditioning? There it is: the deleting of the idea of will behind an avalanche of fake knowledge.

To live through and by imagination is a choice, taken or not taken in freedom. That's the short and long of it, and no amount of complaining will change the situation.

To put it another way, resistance is not a thing that sits in the mind like a solid object. It is a generalized description of a person saying NO. It really refers to a refusal to act.

People ask,

"But why does the person say no. Why does he refuse?"

They hope to find a mechanism which, if corrected, will turn the no into a yes. In words, a revolution achieved passively.

"Sir, just sit here and we'll insert this needle and remove the obstruction and then everything will change."

Really?

It doesn't work that way.

Here's another picture.

All the refusals, over time, tend to pile up into a glob. If you could peel them away, one by one, you wouldn't have curtailed the ongoing decision to refuse, you would have merely taken off some incidental debris surrounding it.

TO IMAGINE OR NOT TO IMAGINE

TO INVENT REALITY OR NOT TO INVENT REALITY

Choice.

That's the background for a conversation I had in the late 1980s with my friend and colleague, Jack True, the most innovative hypnotherapist I've ever encountered.

In this interview, I touch on the beginnings of the Magic Theater:

QUESTION: (Rappoport): Just give me your response to this: a person can say YES or NO.

Answer: (Jack): Yes isn't necessarily better than no. It depends on the situation.

Question: Are they both pure choices?

Answer: What else could they be?

Question: The result of habit? The result of long chains of cause and effect?

Answer: Yeah, sure, you could analyze it that way, but then you'd miss the point.

Question: Which is?

Answer: Take this kind of thing. "Shah ousted. The president refuses to send troops to Iran." People assume the president has a choice. They don't say, "The president couldn't send troops, because when he was a small boy, his father punished him for shooting a water pistol at a neighbor." (laughs)

Question: He's accountable for his decisions.

Answer: Yes. And he's free to make those decisions either way. So is everyone.

Question: We have mountains of "psychological research" that deny that.

Answer: Yeah, well, we have mountains of research that say the universe started with an explosion. So?

Question: Freedom exists.

Answer: If not, what are we doing here?

Question: Why are we talking at all?

Answer: Right.

Question: You can lead a patient to water, but you can't make him drink.

Answer: No. I make him drink.

Question: How?

Answer: I find an avenue that's clear and I send him down that avenue.

Question: Not sure I understand.

Answer: I find a channel along which he can use his imagination, and I can get him to do it, because it's fairly easy for him.

Question: You give him a taste of what's that like.

Answer: Many tastes.

Question: Which takes ingenuity.

Answer: I have a fair amount of that.

Question: For instance, you have patients invent dreams.

Answer: They're used to dreaming. They know what it is. So I can tip the scale a little and get them to create dreams they never had. But if I had a patient who told me he never dreamed, I'd find another way.

Question: Suppose you have a patient who digs in his heels and says he doesn't want to use his imagination at all?

Answer: That's the "no." He makes his free choice.

Question: Why does he choose "no?"

Answer: Why? Because he prefers "no" in this case, just like he prefers to eat fish rather than spinach. He prefers the city to the country. I take him at his word.

Question: So if he doesn't want to invent anything, you leave him alone?

Answer: Hell no. I trick him.

Question: How?

Answer: Maybe he makes furniture in his garage. So we talk about that, and I have him speculate about what kind of furniture he might make. New things. I get him going in that direction. And finally I say, "Well, suppose you were dreaming about furniture? What kind of crazy thing might you see in the dream?" And he starts talking about a chair with six legs. Whatever. Or he has a problem with his boss. And I ask him what he'd really like to say to the boss and that develops into a little role playing.

Question: You play the boss and he plays himself.

Answer: Sure. I've done that. So he's making it up. And I lead him into new places. As the boss, I'll suddenly say, "You know, I have this project I want to get you involved with. I need you to spy on a few people who wormed their way into the company.

They're plants from our competitor." And that might work. We'd be off and running. He says he doesn't want to use his imagination, but he's doing it. I play out that

string as long as I can. I had a guy, we ended up talking about missions to another solar system, and he was the cook on the ship.

Question: Theater.

Answer: Yeah.

Question: Any roles are possible. I like it.

Answer: No limits on that.

Question: I could play a president and you could play the sap rising in a tree in March.

Answer: Why not?

Question: I've always admired Psychodrama. But I've wanted to extend the range of possible roles.

Answer: Well, with any psychologist, that range tends to be limited, because you're thinking about direct therapy. You want to choose roles that seem relevant to the patient's problems.

Question: But that's not necessary. Maybe the wilder the roles, the better.

Answer: As long as the patients is imagining and inventing, why not?

Question: I once had a dream where I saw these poles in the ground. It was as if I was looking at the universe. It was a huge space with poles in the ground. That's all it was. The poles were sunk very deep in the ground. The idea was, this is the pattern. This is where things are placed. It's fixed. It doesn't change its basic structure. That was the feeling.

Answer: But if you start playing all sorts of roles, the pattern does change.

Question: That's right.

Answer: Well, that's what I do with patients. They have a kind of fixed firmament.

So instead of trying to pry one pole out of the ground so we can move it, I just have the patient invent. I get him to invent dreams he never had, and the pattern shifts. Things that were fixed become mobile. And when that happens, the system he has starts to disintegrate. It's like moving an iceberg.

Do you get behind it and push with your hands, or do you go to the root? The root is, a person has a pattern of ideas and feelings, and he keeps it in place. I have him imagine other things, and after a while the pattern moves. It breaks apart.

Question: How did you figure this out?

Answer: Well, partly through conversations you and I have had about painting. Also, from Psychodrama. And initially from old Tibetan techniques. They were all about imagination.

Question: This isn't hypnotism.

Answer: It's reverse hypnosis.

Question: Meaning?

Answer: I once had a patient, a business type. An executive. He was always falling asleep at his desk. It was like a sickness for him. That's how he saw it. And I told him flat-out that he was trying to have a dream, and that was what was going on. He was trying to dream something, and he couldn't get to it.

We talked about that for a long time. But then it occurred to me that he was in a sort of waking trance. He was, every day, succumbing to a little bit of that trance. So I put him in a light trance, in my office, and I tried to find where that thing was coming from. I tried to locate the "state of hypnosis" he was in. And I couldn't.

So I had him invent a few dreams. And he was off like a rocket, making up dreams. It was pretty powerful. We did this for six or seven sessions, and after that he wasn't falling asleep at work anymore. The change was quite remarkable.

Question: What conclusion did you come to?

Answer: He had been in a waking trance at work because he was in a basic trance, a more basic trance.

Question: I don't get it.

Answer: He was in a trance "about imagination." He was putting himself in a trance so he wouldn't use his imagination.

Question: Oh.

Answer: That's the granddaddy of all trances, you see? A person puts himself in a trance as a way of saying no to his own imagination. And in this patient's case, he

would literally fall asleep. So when I had him invent dreams, he went right with his imagination, and he woke up. He didn't need that waking trance anymore.

Question: You're saying everybody is in that trance.

Answer: You bet. That's what we're dealing with here. That's planet Earth.

Question: So people-

Answer: Look, you talk to people about their imagination, and most of the time they draw a blank. They don't think you're talking about anything important. See? They say, "Yeah, well, that's interesting, but I have to get back to folding napkins."

Or moving pieces of paper around on their desks. You could give that guy speed and he'd seem to wake up, but he wouldn't really know what to do. He wouldn't start imagining and inventing like crazy, because he's still saying no to that.

A person pretends, on some level, that all this business about imagination doesn't mean much at all. But actually it's very, very big. The trance he's in is all about not using his imagination. That's how he says no. He falls asleep. He walks around, but he's asleep. He's asleep IN A PARTICULAR WAY.

He asleep when it comes to imagination. Which means he's asleep when it comes to the core of existence!

Question: Imagination.

Answer: Yeah. Reality is what's left over when a person doesn't use his imagination in a powerful way.

Question: So if you had him play the role of God and you played the role of Merlin, something might trigger him to wake up.

Answer: Theater is waking up if you do it right. I had a patient who wanted to be a choreographer in the worst way. She was a secretary but she wanted to be a choreographer. So with her, it was a straight line. I had her imagine all sorts of dances. You know, programs. Performances. Fragments of ballets.

And eventually, she became a choreographer. I used desire as the way in. Her desire. Because it was right there, in the open. I used her desire to get her to use her imagination, and eventually all the barriers fell. See, other people would say I

tapped into her desire to be something different in her life. But that wasn't it. I used her desire to get her to use her imagination. And that was the key.

Once she was rolling with that, she woke up. She woke up from the trance. She was saying no to her own imagination, and I helped her turn that no into a yes. Sounds corny, but that was it. It wasn't faked. It was real.

Question: How long did it take?

Answer: Six months.

Question: But you didn't undo any programming.

Answer: What programming? Her refusal to invent? I don't give a damn about programming or conditioning. I'm not trying to undo anything. I'm not trying to do surgery. I'm not trying to pick things apart.

Question: Why not?

Answer: My boy, you and I could sit here and make up thousands of quite sophisticated patterns or systems of programming. We could invent all sorts of crap that supposedly resides in consciousness that keeps a person from imagining and inventing. We could speculate and assume and presume.

We could play the roles of brain researchers or whatever. But in my experience, there's NOTHING THERE. There isn't any programming. Not really. Not when it comes to imagination. You either imagine or you don't imagine. My job is to get people to imagine. I'm deviously clever about it. I'm a genius at getting people to go out on some road of imagining.

Question: If we wrote a book about the whole pattern of consciousness that keeps people from imagining-

Answer: If we did that, if we made it all up, we'd have people drooling to learn about it. They'd come out of the woodwork. They'd pay good money to learn all about why they're screwed. People LOVE that. But it wouldn't amount to anything. The whole idea is much simpler than that. You either imagine or you don't. And my job is to get them to imagine.

Question: Not just in little drips and drops.

Answer: No. FOREVER.

End of interview

## JACK TRUE ON ULTIMATES - STEVE JOBS AND THE TECHNOLOGY FETISH

by Jon Rappoport

October 29, 2011

from JonRappoport Website

Here is another interview with my late friend and colleague, Jack True, innovative hypnotherapist and philosopher.

Twenty-three years after the conversation, I've written an introduction to it:

### STEVE JOBS AND THE TECHNOLOGY FETISH

Over years and decades, I've watched religions and quasi-religions spring up and flourish and disappear.

I've watched some of them become hard and nasty. Little dictatorships. I've watched people, overnight, drop into fundamentalism.

The clothes, the hair, the slogans. I've watched spiritual movements soften and spread out into the culture like attenuated marshmallow, hypnotizing their followers into believing in imminent apocalypse.

The "good kind." Space aliens. The Force. Gaia. The Universe.

"And a Prophet will arise among you."

The eulogies for Steve Jobs testify to the love of his products. I'm trying to figure out what the weeping was all about. The inconsolable weeping.

So let me speak as a representative of the Stone Age.

I don't own a cell phone or a laptop. I work at a sturdy three-piece block that sits on my desk and doesn't go anywhere. I don't know who manufactured it and I don't care. I wrote my first book, AIDS INC. - Scandal of the Century, on a portable typewriter in 1987.

The manuscript, chapter by chapter, was retyped by my publisher on what he called a word processor. I wrote *The Secret Behind Secret Societies* on an ancient computer. The screen was black and the letters were orange. The floppy disks were converted to little hard discs by Dave.

But when I was 22, in 1960, something new hit the scene. Audio cassettes and cassette recorders. Until then, it was all reel to reel. The shift to cassettes was rather astonishing, because you could carry around a little machine and record people. You could interview them. You could tape (badly) their music. (Much later, when I did hours and hours of lectures for my San Diego publisher, I would sit at my desk at home with a cassette fieldpack and a mike and talk.)

No one at the time (1960) went RELIGIOUS over audio cassettes. There were no armies of geeks who publicly celebrated the change and made Prophecies about the Dawn of a New Future.

The first time I had an inkling that people were taken with the technology itself was 1977, when a friend told me jazz musician Joe Zawinul had a little inexpensive tape set-up he used to record himself playing piano at home, and the sound quality was professional.

I asked my friend if he'd heard any of these home recordings. Was it good music? He scratched his head. Of course he hadn't heard them. But that wasn't the point, he said. The point was you could establish a home studio for very little money. I persisted in thinking the music was what was important. That's my fetish.

I had reacted to stereo the same way, when it first came in. The idea that the sounds of different instruments were channeled into separate speakers seemed like a bad idea. In clubs, I had never heard music that way. Rather, it came at me like a wall of sound. That's what I was used to.

And surround-sound was particularly absurd, because who cared about hearing music moving in from behind? Ditto for headphones. I didn't like them. They produced sound in a space I didn't care about. For me, the music (live) was always coming from a bandstand and traveling to me on a line. Even if that was actually an illusion, given the placement of speakers in the club, it was the way I conceived it.

Messianic prophets, of course, have been touting Digital as the awakening of mass salvation. The machines and the programming are what counts.

And this machine worship is somehow tied in with the popularity of the equipment, as if we have proof, by the degree of consumer demand, that we're indeed entering into a new age.

A movie called The Social Network arrives on the scene. It's hailed as a masterpiece, a "reflection of the enormous changes the culture is experiencing."

Changes in what direction? Is the fact that a billion people can announce their existence to "friends" achieving some sort of instant magic? Are we supposed to celebrate the arrival of a boy billionaire? Is the praise for Mark Zuckerberg's work any different from the kind of admiration ladled on the earlier breakthrough in creating the Barbie Doll series?

Does consumer demand automatically make a product vital and wonderful and even spiritual?

Think about how this demand (audience response) operates in the area of politics/media-

"Well, Joe, I think he handled the press conference well. He said all the right things. He didn't make it appear he was reading from a script. The Independent voters out there are going to like this."

In other words, it doesn't really matter what the pol actually stands for. It only matters that the broad audience will like how he said what he said.

And so a product like Facebook is judged solely in terms of how consumers react to it. If they love it, it's an innovation. It's satisfied a hunger. It must be brilliant. More than that, it must be heraldic. It must be a step forward in the evolution of the species. It might even be from God.

"Zuckerberg knew what the public wanted before the public knew. That was his genius."

As if, what else could genius be about? You see a hole in the market, you develop a product, you sell it into that hole.

"Well, that's all IQ has ever been. Even a guy like Einstein - he knew the world was ready for some kind of relativity, so he put together a theory and sold it."

And the iPad. It's wonderful because people want what it allows them to do? Before it appeared, people didn't realize how much they'd love it? But then, there it was, and it struck a universal chord? And therefore, it's automatically AMAZING?

So if the Roman Church has a billion members, that means the Pope is a tremendous person? The Pilgrimage to Mecca is good because millions and millions of people make it?

"No, no, no! You don't get it! All these devices give us multiple options for instant global communication. We can reach out anywhere in milliseconds!"

Yes, I agree. It's good. But that does mean people should actually weep when Steve Jobs dies?

Should we place flowers on the grave of the inventor of the Walkman?

I'm just pointing out that times have changed. Larger numbers of people have developed a deep cosmic love for machines. (Star Wars, 1977, sparked a profound passion for two of them.)

When walking talking robots come along and serve your needs in the home and at work, address you by name, anticipate what you'll want in the next five minutes, you'll cry when they're superseded by the newer model. You'll bury them in the backyard next to the dog. You'll hang their photos above the mantle. You'll see a shrink to work out the issue of their passing.

Some of you.

And when the man or woman who invented that robot dies, you'll stand outside their building and light candles. You'll agitate for a national holiday. You'll watch the funeral on whatever television looks like then. You'll store holograms of this inventor next to your bed, and you'll activate them on occasion before going to sleep.

And people will say,

"That saint knew what we wanted before we did. That's what made him so great. That's real greatness."

Churches will spring up.

"The very meaning of what a thing is, is measured solely by how many people want it."

And as usual, the actual art involved in inventing those robots will be overlooked. Because people will say such talent remains a mystery locked in the genes of a very few. They will say the rest of us are merely ordinary folk who have no imagination at all.

But not to worry. We can put our picture up on a page and list our interests and recount our activities of the day and share them with other people who have the same interests. This is our miracle. This is our reward and our basic hunger, and we can feed it.

Rejoice!

Look no further!

Thousands, millions of little boys and girls will grow up who spend their every waking hour calculating the sizes of audiences. This many people attended that historic concert or that Super Bowl or that post-election speech or the launch of that product or that religious convocation or that parade. To them, the events themselves will mean absolutely nothing.

And when these little boys and girls grow up, they'll find a career which allows them to do marketing. Marketing will be metaphysics. It will describe and explain the universe as well as it can be explained.

And many robots will serve them. The marketers will be the most important people in the world. The search for meaning will have reached an apotheosis.

"If X is a person, place, thing, or event, what IS it? Its existence is identical with however many people express praise for it. It is nothing else, and it never was. All prior formulations were in error. Persons, places, things, and events are not composed of anything. They don't exist at all, except insofar as other people like them, love them, want them."

From which two corollaries flow:

It doesn't matter why people want an X or to what use they put it.

And that X which is most wanted is automatically the most important thing in the world.

Doll, fertilizer, dog, applesauce, cigarette, Facebook, nail polish, the Bible, burger, slavery, iPad, Moses, brain implant, ice, microwave, heroin, ice cream - whatever emerges from the pack with the largest audience is THE FINAL AND PROFOUND MEANING OF VALUE.

Amen.

In this formulation, people don't really have anything in their souls except what they want to own. And the main item they pass back and forth to one another is that preference. A few billion people pass, back and forth: I LIKE THIS, I DON'T LIKE THAT. And what most people like, whatever that is, must have been invented by a transcendent genius.

Facebook and iPad. Their inventors have to be Prophets, right? Not just smart, not just clever.

I don't know. If I have to pick a messiah out of the marketplace, I'm going with the guy who invented the belt for pants. Or the shoe. Or the garage. Maybe the shovel.

I'm weeping for the passing of the guy who came up with the concept of haircuts. That's my church. Why not?

Maybe it's too many people who took too many drugs. I don't know. But I look at an iPad and I remain unmoved. Yes, I know it's smart. Very smart, okay? It can play music but it doesn't invent music, right?

By the way, if you think the revolution in Egypt was started by a hundred "student intellectuals" in Cairo cafes working Facebook, you need more drugs. Or fewer drugs.

So that's my shot from The Stone Age.

And yes, I know I'm typing this on a computer, and I can post it in seconds, and it can travel around the world in a few minutes, and that's pretty terrific. I know that. But I'm not thinking "revelation" or "iPhone in the heavens" or "the new Jerusalem."

I'm not sitting on the floor of my living room building a hill out of dirt and debris, mimicking the place where the Mothership will land and make Contact.

Okay. That's the introduction - here's the interview with Jack True.

QUESTION: (Jon): People seem to be taken with discovering ultimates. I mean, they want to-

Answer: (Jack): They want to escape from themselves and meet up with the Cosmic Radio Station.

Question: The what?

Answer: You know. It broadcasts information and wisdom at the same time. And the wisdom has this fantastic quality to enter into the brain and mind and transform them.

Question: Like a drug.

Answer: Well, yes.

Question: So this is what people are looking for.

Answer: All the time. They're putting out SOS signals and waiting for a response from the aether.

Question: It's like the wrap-up of a story.

Answer: Exactly. They're looking for the end of the story. It's just like television. Suppose, all of a sudden, all the dramas on TV were shown - for, say, a month - with

all the endings chopped out. People would riot in the streets. They'd attack the White House. They'd burn down cities.

Question: Got to have the end.

Answer: Absolutely. Write a story without an ending and people will say you're subversive. It must be scheme to take over the world.

Question: You see this in your patients?

Answer: Sure. They think, at first, that I'm the end of their story. I'm the one who will write the conclusion. In the old days, when I was doing standard hypnosis, I had a patient who was all screwed up because he had a story wedged into his subconscious about a war. I won't go into all the detail, but I used to find plot lines floating around in people's skulls.

These stories came out under hypnosis. They didn't necessarily have anything to do with the patients' lives. They were just there. And this one was about a weird war. And it had no ending. The patient didn't know which side won. (laughs)

Question: Weird.

Answer: Very. But I was used to that kind of thing. So I had the guy make up a dozen or so endings to the war. Just cook them up. And the story drifted away and didn't mean anything anymore. But I use that illustration to show you how important endings can be to people. Ending equals Ultimate. They're essentially the same thing. "How does it end? I have to know."

Question: With an Ultimate, the person has to know and he has to possess it himself. He has to be there and live it.

Answer: And of course, that ending has to vector in from Somewhere Else. You see?

That's what magic is to most people. It's the ending that floats in from the aether. The final illumination and enlightenment. The funny thing is, people will grab on to almost anything. The culture gives it to them. The culture could give them cookies and milk and they'd take it, as long as enough people accepted cookies and milk as an Ultimate.

That's all it takes. Other people accepting it. Cookies and milk. A king with divine right. A new car. A trip to Italy. A climb up a mountain where a lost city once existed. Doesn't matter.

Question: People are very keen on "the latest trends," when it comes to Ultimates.

Answer: Yeah, that's what I mean. The legitimacy of the Ultimate derives from the fact that other people, lots of other people buy it. A guy writes an article about a shaman in the jungles of South America who says the Rain is coming.

And this Rain will be the last thing that happens - and after that, we'll all experience The Great Change and that will be the ending. See? And that article gets repeated over and over, until it becomes a Prophecy. And lots of people are talking about it. Attributing special symbolic importance to it.

And then some person in Atlanta hears about the Rain from twelve of his friends, and he says, "This is what I've been looking for. The Rain. This is the ending I've been seeking." He's got to have an ending. So he grabs this one.

Question: Because, if he didn't have an ending?

Answer: He would be on his own. He doesn't like that. He doesn't have the wherewithal to figure out what to do then. He doesn't see himself as a person with extraordinary resources, so he doesn't know where to start, where to dig in.

Question: So that's where the Big Audience is.

Answer: Hell yes. If you want to build a big audience, give them endings. Narrow it down to One. The Ending. Teach it, preach it. The enslavement of the whole world. Even that could be an ending. It sounds awful, but at least it's an Ultimate.

See? People will grab that. I'm not talking about whether such an enslavement is actually going to happen. Doesn't matter. Sell it anyway. You'll have an audience. Anything that smells like an ending - they'll grab it. Their psychology demands it. Their conditioning demands it. They've got to have an ending.

Question: What about The New Future?

Answer: Yes, that works. On one level, it sounds like a non-ending, but to the mind it tends to register like an ending. To a lot of minds. Because The Future comes across like a fait accompli. "From that moment on, when the future arrives, everything will be different. We'll all be in a different space. We'll know what we need to know."

Even freedom can work that way, if it's twisted in the right way. People will think of freedom as an ending because they don't think about action. They think about possession, as in owning something. "I own freedom." Therefore, everything is okay. They have that abstract idea called freedom - it's given to them on a silver platter, and then that's the ending. A complete delusion.

Question: I suppose security and protection can work that way, too.

Answer: Sure. More endings. "When the State has all the means necessary to protect me, I'll be in a safe cocoon, and then I'll be fine. I'll be an Ultimate." It's very, very, very shortsighted, of course, but a mind can buy that.

BECAUSE THE MIND IS LOOKING FOR AN ENDING. A REVELATION OF SOME KIND THAT PROMISES A VAGUE PERFECTION.

Here's another one. "Technology will save us." What the hell does that mean? How in the world is technology, all on its own, going to save anybody?

Question: It's a totem

Answer: It's transplanting a very old idea on to a new thing. The technology is new, and the idea of Pagan Illumination or Tribal Apotheosis or whatever you want to call it is grafted on to that. The technology buffs see themselves as a kind of special tribe - mostly, I think, because they want to believe they have a "primitive kind of strength."

It's just like kids who buy caps with the logo of their favorite sports team on it. But in this case, the technology crowd - a lot of them - come from a cerebral background. They didn't play sports. They want to seem rough and tough in some way, so they love this idea that they're in a tribe, a clan, with special powers. It is like rubbing a totem or an amulet.

And they build this up in their minds, and then they think it's their Ultimate - they're members of the Tribe who will take the rest of us into the Promised Land. They're the muscle-minded leaders. They're really the ones who'll take us into Outer Space.

Question: The technology tribe.

Answer: I had a patient who was trying to bring me into one of his groups of friends.

See, I would be the "mind specialist." I would be the guy who had all sorts of wise things to say about the power of the mind. I opted out, of course. I didn't want to have anything to do with it. Besides, this guy had a boatload of problems with his wife. He needed some serious help. He had gone into marriage thinking it was the Ultimate that would end all his problems.

And he found out he couldn't talk to his wife at all. He was tongue-tied. When he came to me, he thought I would put him in a trance and make some suggestions to him, and then he'd wake up and all his problems would be solved. It took me a few months just to convince him that wouldn't work.

Question: Why wouldn't it work?

Answer: Because a person isn't a machine. Despite all evidence to the contrary (laughs), a human being is alive. These technology people have all sorts of naïve ideas.

Question: So what did you do with him?

Answer: I put him in a very light trance, and I had him invent lots of dreams about his wife. Situations that would never occur in ordinary life. He came up with space voyages and trips into underground cities and so on. I mean, LOTS of dreams. This went on for many sessions. And then something happened to him. He began to see he could talk to his wife - about what was most important to him.

He was in love with the idea of going out into space. So began to talk to her about that. She was very relieved that he talking at all. She listened. And then, gradually, she opened up to him. And it went from there. He was staggered to discover that they could talk about things.

Question: Did you know it would turn out that way?

Answer: I had a hunch and I followed it. A lot of people are afraid of what happens on a day to day basis.

Question: What do you mean?

Answer: They think if they just give in to living every day, something bad will happen. So they look for an Ultimate. But the Ultimate can be injected into the every-day reality and transmute it. Completely transform it. And when that happens, the Ultimate turns into something else. Not just a Final Principle, but a path into action. That's the test.

Question: What's the test?

Answer: Take the most profound thing you think, and inject it into your life. See what happens to it then. Maybe it collapses and falls apart. Maybe it can't stand up to the every-day. But maybe you find what you're looking for. You get a platform for real exploration. Let me give you a negative example. You've got all these military and intelligence people playing around with computers.

After a while, because computers process information, these people think they've got their hands on something mystical. Pieces of information, run through machines - they see that as mystical.

Because they're buffered off from life. They live in compounds. They get weird. They play their games and they think they're approaching some sort of religious revelation that will give them the power to control everything with information and the machines that process information. They think that "everything is information." See, that's an Ultimate.

But these people, as I say, are living an artificial existence. They never really get to test that theory in real life. They have no real life they can just walk into. Everything for them is military. They think that there is a sum total of pieces of information, and if they can build big enough computers, they can run the sum total and something like "God" will come out the other end and they'll have it.

But information is just information. It isn't naturally imbued with power or life or the kind of subjective slant that can give a person leverage for his future. And neither will the sum of information. No matter how big the sum is.

Question: The same thing is true about technology in general.

Answer: Yes. I mean, you can become much more facile when you have better technology. But we've all known facile people. What do they get in the end? Nothing. You need more than facility.

Question: So what are we supposed to do? Strip away technology and strip away all that facility from people?

Answer: Can't do that. Doing all this work with patients, I've learned you can't do "surgery." You can't remove the things that are bothering people. You certainly

can't remove things people think they must have. You can't take that away. Even if you could, it wouldn't do any good.

You have to establish a setting in which they discover, for themselves, other options, other ways of living and being. When I have people, for example, in a light trance and I have them invent many dreams, all sorts of dreams, that's what's happening. The accretion of other possibilities. It bleeds into their consciousness.

Sometimes quickly, sometimes slowly. You take a horse who's spent many years dragging a carriage around, with a bit and harness, and you put him out into a field, he'll slowly realize he has space. And one day, he'll trot, and then he'll run. He'll start running. He'll get to that. Well, with a human being, there isn't just one thing he'll do. He's not just destined to realize one thing he was built for.

A human has all sorts of choices. But he'll come to them, and he'll make a choice, given enough time and enough space.

Question: And enough invention.

Answer: Yeah. When I have a person inventing dreams, that's the elixir. That's the thing that opens up the spaces. Many spaces. That's what pulls the trigger on transformation. In the absence of invention, people will reach for some sort of unmoving Ultimate, because that's all they can see.

Question: But you're not against technology.

Answer: Of course not. You think I want to live without a light bulb or a refrigerator? I like technology. I want to see the human race get out into space in a big way.

But if the love of technology becomes an Ultimate, I think we'll lose the necessary will. We'll mess around with lesser technical things. We won't see the need and the adventure on the big stage. We'll bog down. Going into deep space is about us, not the machines. It's destiny for us, not the machines.

If you asked people whether they'd rather have a little device they could put on the roof of their car that would move around and wash and wax the car and crawl under the hood on its own and check the oil - or a real rocket ship that would take ten

people to the middle of the galaxy, I don't know...I think a majority of people would rather have the little thing for the car.

And if ten companies made those little machines for the car, and if people talked to each other about the relative benefits of the little machines - you see how we can get caught up in technology as the main subject, when it's just an adjective hanging from us and OUR future.

Question: The Church of the Robot.

Answer: Yeah, that's coming, too. "I named my robot Lulu. What's your robot's name?" "Mike. Can Lulu make dinner in less than ten minutes from scratch?"

## JACK TRUE INTERVIEWED - THE TITANIC FUTURE

by Jon Rappoport

October 26, 2011

from JonRappoport Website

Here is another interview (from 1991) with my late friend and colleague, hypnotherapist Jack True. I've been publishing these conversations for years now.

If this is first time you've read one, you're in for a treat. Jack was a magnificent thinker and practitioner. He never tried to talk down to people. He let fly with his deepest insights, no matter how revolutionary or complex.

He always laid it all on the line.

QUESTION: (Rappoport): What was it you were saying before we sat down?

Answer: (Jack True): The major fact of our time is that there are large numbers of people who have freed themselves from the prison of ideologies and fundamentalisms. They just don't know where to go next. At some level of mind, they're considering magic.

Question: The basic confusion surrounding this subject [magic] hasn't been well articulated. It comes down to a question: is magic a space you enter, or is it something you create?

Answer: You just said a mouthful. Let's get to that later. Meanwhile, I want to talk about experiences I've had with patients.

Question: Go ahead.

Answer: With a surprising number of people, under hypnosis, we find that they already have a picture of the future.

Question: Their own future?

Answer: Well, yes, but it's more than that. They have a vision of the future of the planet.

Question: You mean an opinion about the future?

Answer: No. This is much bigger than that. It's as if the whole future, like a big chunk of reality, is just sitting there, in their subconscious. They had no idea it was there until they bumped into it.

Question: Like a -

Answer: Like a whole novel. A book. The future. It feels to them like precognition. It's knowledge about what hasn't happened yet.

Question: Really.

Answer: Yes.

Question: Each one has a "book" about the future? Each book is different?

Answer: See, if we suppose that somewhere there is a record of past, present, and future, what some people call, for example, the Akashic Records, what's the assumption?

Question: What do you mean?

Answer: What's the common assumption about what these records reveal?

Question: You tell me.

Answer: The assumption is these future events are laid out, they're described, they're revealed. You know, THIS will happen, and then THAT will happen.

Question: Well, sure.

Answer: No. Something is wrong with that. I think people have been misinterpreting what the Akashic Records are all about. They're taking too narrow a view. They're looking through narrow filters.

Question: And if you take off the filters?

Answer: You see hundreds of different equally-convincing futures sitting there, side by side. That's what's in the Records. Not just one future. And what I'm saying is...

Question: The exact same situation is mirrored in your patients.

Answer: You bet. Exactly. In other words, the Akashic Records are really distributed in the subconscious mind of people. That's where they are. It's a whole vast library.

Question: Keep going.

Answer: This is the hard part. You have to be there with a patient, when he's under hypnosis, to see and experience and feel how CONVINCING his "book of the future" is. It's quite fantastic. It isn't some little dribbling thing about what's going to happen fifty years from now. It's titanic. It's as if you came across a whole block of hidden treasure in the patient's subconscious. There it is, undisturbed, in a cave. No dust on it. It's pristine and very detailed. And when the patient describes it, it just rolls out. It's a river of information.

Question: That's pretty spectacular.

Answer: Here's what I've found with some patients. They're already living in the "book of the future" that's in their subconscious. They already have a role in that future.

Question: Even though they're here and now...

Answer: They're acting in the present according to their role in the future. It sounds weird, I know. But that's what's happening.

Question: That would make a person pretty maladjusted.

Answer: Yes and no. No, because the power of that "future role" is so strong, they are acting in the present to bring about that future. That's what they're doing.

Question: But they have no idea they're doing it.

Answer: None. They're totally in the dark. Until they get a look at the future book in their subconscious. Then everything changes for them. Then they open their eyes.

Question: It's funny, you're turning the traditional view of psychology on its head.

Answer: Yes. Supposedly, what's happened to you in the past has a tremendous influence on how you act in the present. What I'm saying is, the future that's

embedded in your subconscious is a much stronger influence on how you act in the present.

Question: It's as if a person has been cast in a stage play that's going to take place in the future.

Answer: Yes, let's say the play is going to take place four hundred years in the future. But you start acting out that role right now.

Question: So the present is the sum total of all futures?

Answer: (laughs) Yeah. That's what I was getting to. The present moment in Earth history is the sum total or average of all the futures that are embedded in people's subconscious.

Question: All right. What happens when a person becomes aware he has a whole future embedded in his subconscious mind?

Answer: He recovers power.

Question: Just like that.

Answer: When he sees what that future is, a tremendous amount of energy is suddenly available to him. How can I put this? It's as if he has this 5000-piece orchestra in his mind. He doesn't know that, all right? But he's a trumpet player in that orchestra. That's his future role. And in one way or another, perhaps symbolically, he's acting out that role in the present, right now. But because he can't hear the whole orchestra, he doesn't feel the overall power. Then, under hypnosis, he finds the orchestra. He hears the whole thing. NOW the power of that transfers to him.

Question: And what does he do with that power?

Answer: Yes. That's the key question. The answer is, he has to create with it. There's nothing else he can do with it. That's what the power is for. Here is the catch, the important thing. Now that's he's seen the future embedded in his mind, for the first time, he has a choice. He can use that power to create anything he wants to. It's up to him.

Question: So in hypnosis, you give people the experience of power.

Answer: That's what I'm doing. That power is magic. And to answer the question you posed, at the beginning, about what magic is, it's not about entering into a space of magic. It's really about creating.

Question: Creating magic.

Answer: With that power. Yes.

Question: The history of Western philosophy had three basic phases. The first episode was taken up in depicting What Exists as a final Reality. Metaphysics. The second episode shifted the focus to the investigation of how we perceive and know. Epistemology. And the third phase, which has barely begun, involves imagination and creative power - in other words, inventing that which has never existed before.

Answer: I would agree with that. Creating is magic.

Question: Extraordinary talents and so-called paranormal abilities are actually offshoots of imagination?

Answer: Talent, which seems to be a native and natural phenomenon, is created by the individual below the threshold of his own conscious mind.

Question: Why does the individual create talent he can't remember creating?

Answer: (laughs) He wants to be a human being who can do extraordinary things. He doesn't want to step out of the shadows and reveal himself as a magician. Here is the real question: what do you do when you are imagining and creating enough of unique reality that it glides past the eyes of others like a silent and invisible train?

Question: You see the need to bring others to perceive the level at which you're creating.

Answer: Maybe so. Because if you are creating magic, you will run into many, many, many people who are blind to that. They won't see it. They just won't see it.

Question: Let's get back to this "book of the future" in a person's mind. Any idea where that comes from?

Answer: I think so, yes. In one sense, and you have to look at this from several points of view...in one sense, the "book" is basically a long-term creation by the person himself, out of bits and pieces.

Question: It doesn't come down from some "higher power."

Answer: The higher power belongs to the person. But I would go further. In some sense, the person has already been to the future.

Question: Explain that.

Answer: It's hard to put it into words. It's more than [the person having] an opinion about the future. It's more than [the person engaging in] mere prediction. It's that, plus other factors. It's supernatural or paranormal, for lack of better terms. The person has already been there. He's been to the future. He's gone beyond where it's supposed to be possible to go. It's not just seeing. It's more like traveling. It's a combination of creating and traveling.

Question: That's pretty far-out.

Answer: Consciousness can travel. Consciousness isn't bounded. It can go anywhere. But we assume that isn't so. We live by other rules.

Question: What do you mean by that last sentence?

Answer: We're invested in a picture of reality. In that picture, certain things are possible and certain things aren't. We bought stock in a restricted picture of reality.

Question: Why?

Answer: Well, I could give all sorts of answers to that question. It depends on what level we are looking at.

Question: Level of consciousness?

Answer: Yes. Consciousness doesn't necessarily see a limited picture of reality as a negative thing. It sees it as an opportunity. A configuration, if you will. You're a painter. You can paint on a tiny canvas or a huge one. Both have their advantages. Do you see? We're able to have different and unique kinds of experiences within this picture of reality that we've bought. We have different options.

Even though we're living inside this picture of reality, it's an infinity. There are an infinity of things we can do. It's just, you might say, a different infinity of things than what we could do inside a much larger picture of reality.

Question: So you're saying that, inside this picture of reality we've bought, magic isn't supposed to be possible.

Answer: I'm sort of saying that, yes. The extreme boundaries [of this picture of reality] are fuzzy. But you see, there are rules and then there are Rules with a capital R. They're different.

Question: How so?

Answer: Rules with a big R...that would be a final kind of judgment rendered by some external higher power. That would be, "No, you can't do magic in this sphere [picture of reality]." That's not what I mean. That's not the case. We set our own rules. We bought our own picture of reality, this reality, and we set the standards and rules. So we can break them. It's possible. It's going against the grain, but so what? We can do that.

Question: It's like undoing a habit?

Answer: Yes. For example, we have the habit of stashing what we can't create or are not supposed to create - where do we stash it? In the future. That's where we can put all the things we don't do inside this picture of reality.

Question: Which creates a kind of longing.

Answer: Yes.

Question: A nostalgia for the future.

Answer: Right.

Question: And wouldn't you say that, at this point in the history of Earth culture, that longing is increasing?

Answer: I would. So we have a collective force that is building up for the magic that we have put in the future. That desire is growing.

Question: In that sense, then, the limited picture of reality we've invested in is expanding?

Answer: Yes. The more important sense of "expanding universe"...this is what it is.

Question: Can this picture of reality expand to the breaking point?

Answer: That's what I see.

Question: We've had enough.

Answer: We're tired of it. We're fed up.

Question: That's a natural outcome?

Answer: Oh yes. I would say it is.

Question: Because when I look at the history of the arts, that's what I see there. The trend, for some time, has been in the direction of cracking apart the old picture.

Answer: Sure. I would agree. But you see, in that process, you need people who can understand what, for example, the arts are doing.

Question: Meaning what?

Answer: You can have, say, a hundred thousand people who are breaking apart the old picture, but what happens if...let me put this another way. When you break apart the old picture, you're changing the modes of perception. That goes along with the breakthrough. You're actually speaking another kind of language, one that has different meanings. And those meanings don't exist inside the old picture of reality. This is crucial to understand.

Question: You're saying that, in order to keep existing inside the old picture, you have to restrict the field or the range of meaning.

Answer: Absolutely. You see? Inside the picture, you can express a whole range of meanings, but if you go outside that range, it doesn't compute. It doesn't get across. That's one way you actually hold the restricted picture together. You restrict the range of expressions and things that MEAN SOMETHING. People limit their comprehension of meaning. So if you come along and start talking with meanings that go outside the accepted range, people scratch their heads and shrug and say they don't understand.

Question: As an analogy, it's like the light spectrum.

Answer: Right. We limit the range of what we can see. So if someone comes along and shows us a wave-length that isn't in the so-called visible spectrum and says, look at this, we say there is nothing there.

Question: It's the same thing with meaning.

Answer: Yes. We have languages that, by their structure, permit a certain "territory" of meaning. It's big. But it isn't everything. Not by a long shot. And as long as we hold on to these languages for dear life, we're going to claim we have a monopoly on all possible meaning.

Question: And therefore we're going to harden the structure of the picture of reality we've bought into.

Answer: Yes. It's that structure that's weakening. People are accepting meanings that are borderline. They're stretching their comprehension.

Question: Everything we're talking about here has the ring of a state of hypnosis.

Answer: It's programming at deep levels.

Question: Self-inflicted.

Answer: That's what many people find the hardest to accept - that they're hypnotizing themselves.

Question: Hypnotizing themselves into believing that MEANING can only exist within a narrow framework. And everything else is complete gibberish.

Answer: That's called society. Civilization. That's what you get as the collective outcome. That's why people will sign up for going out and trying to expand various empires through conquest. Because essentially, they'll blame everything else under the sun for the programming they've inflicted on themselves. Of course, it's all done on an unconscious level.

Question: It's been my contention that consciousness creates more consciousness, and in that sense, existence is dynamic. There is no such thing as a "final" state of consciousness.

Answer: That's a very fertile area. You're going against the idea that there is an ultimate reality.

Question: That's right. Whether you look at reality as something external to us or internal to our state of consciousness, there is no final place where you wind up and discover you've reached the destination.

Answer: Every experience I've had with patients tells me the same thing. And what we've been discussing here - pictures of reality - that also confirms it for me.

Question: We buy this picture of reality, because living inside it, we can create more and new consciousness, consciousness that never existed before.

Answer: Every reality affords the same opportunity. People have the wrong idea about infinity. They say, for example, that there is a state of infinite consciousness - but you see, that's really like saying you have all the consciousness there is to have. That's not so. You never have it all, because you create it, and creation has no limit.

Question: Infinite consciousness isn't like some gigantic coat you can slip on. It doesn't already exist.

Answer: No. We keep creating it.

Question: This limited picture of reality we live in - how long can it last?

Answer: As long as we want it to.

Question: But the individual doesn't have to wait for everyone else to break out. He can exit from the picture.

Answer: Sure. But other people won't necessarily understand he's escaped.

Question: Because other people are still loyal to all the restrictions they've programmed into themselves.

Answer: It's a tug of war. Old meaning versus new meaning. Science, for all its advances, is still basically married to old meaning. Old ways of formulating language.

Question: Old meaning has a kind of structure.

Answer: It gives birth to many structures, but they all obey the same old rules. They may be fascinating and instructive, but they still obey the old rules that say, "THIS means something, but THAT is meaningless."

Question: I remember a philosophical text called The Meaning of Meaning. It was actually about literary criticism. IA Richards.

Answer: You can actually analyze "old meaning" and see something about it how operates. For instance, if words describe what exists in the physical world, those words mean something.

If you have a sentence that has a subject, verb, and object, the sentence probably means something. But if you have a sentence that obscures or erases the distinction between subject, object, and verb, then that is often called "meaningless." When you stop and think about it, though, why? Why can't we understand and comprehend outside that linguistic structure?

The answer is simple. We've HEAVILY programmed ourselves NOT to understand anything outside that structure. We're ABSOLUTELY sure it's meaningless. That's how good the programming is.

Question: So there is a major connection between magic and language.

Answer: Language, as we usually accept it, is built to rule out magic.

Question: The language we use rules out many possible relationships between things.

Answer: It also rules out the KINDS of relationships that are possible. See, let's take this example. A man looks at a radio on a table and he focuses on it, and it rises three feet into the air. Most people would say, if there was no trick involved, that was magic. But it's still within the realm of subject, verb, and object. We may not believe the event happened, but we understand what it means.

But there is another level of magic, where the basic relationships of subject, verb, and object are gone. New kinds of relationships enter in. We don't have words in our language to describe those relationships. So we don't see them. They're invisible. This would be magic that is invisible to us.

Question: Based on different kinds of relationships.

Answer: Right.

Question: Then we have people who attempt to explain mysteries by claiming that things we already know about are the cause of that mystery. Like genes.

Answer: Sure. These scientists try to make their speculations into respectable theories. They'll say that all human behavior is explainable by genes. You have a gene for this and a gene for that.

Question: There is, for example, they'll say, a gene for imagination.

Answer: Imagination is a mystery to them. They want to explain it away. So they claim a gene controls it. Language does the same sort of thing. It attempts to reduce mysteries down to relationships we're programmed to accept, relationships we're familiar with. But in the process, it misses the magic completely.

Question: You actually see this kind of programming in your patients?

Answer: All the time. You just have to want to find it. I'm NOT talking about making hypnotic suggestions to people to guide them where you want them to go. All I do is use hypnosis to put them in a light trance where they can focus more clearly. Then we nose around in the interior landscape. We see what's there. Patients encounter their own programming. They encounter...it's not exactly RULES...it's more like cardinal illustrations of the kinds of relationships that are meaningful...it's almost like looking at the simple grammar of our language.

Question: But you don't try to dismantle that programming, do you?

Answer: Why should I? That would be like saying we should all destroy the English language. Ridiculous. That would be like saying that, in order to teach a person to fly, you lead him out on a cliff, and then you blow up the cliff under him, and then he'll fly. No, you use the cliff as a platform, and then one way or another, you figure out a way to fly off the cliff into the sky.

Question: Well, if you look at the history of poetry, that's what you see. Poets who use the language to keep stretching "the meaning of meaning." The expansion of meaning and possible relationships between things.

Answer: Which is why imagination is magic.

Question: I would say that on this planet, imagination is just getting started.

Answer: I agree. My new experimental ideas about therapy are all in that direction. Getting people to invent realities.

Question: Whereas society is moving in the direction of turning out androids.

Answer: Societies always do that. It's their bread and butter. They create Reality Soldiers. People dedicated to the picture of reality we're living in. It's the organizing principle.

Question: There are lots of names for that.

Answer: Doesn't matter what you call it. It's the same pattern. You're trying to organize people. It works up to a certain point, and then it doesn't work anymore. The already limited picture of reality shrinks. It becomes a pressure on the psyche, and the psyche wants to break out.

Question: But people always think that when they break out, they're going to find a super-reality sitting behind ordinary reality.

Answer: Well, basically, when you break out, you don't find ultimate reality. You find you're the reality. Which makes absolutely no sense at all unless you're creating. You're the center, and you create.

Question: For many people, that's an idea they don't understand.

Answer: For them, it's an invisible idea. It goes right by them, and they don't notice it.

Question: There are lots of smart people who try to use the limited picture of reality to explain itself.

Answer: If I understand what you mean, that's like asking an elephant to describe his digestive processes. But let me take that ball and run with it.

There are sociologists and psychologists and futurists and computer types, information analysts, who try to make predictions about the future based on the concept that events and people are in a meaningful flux. They document trends. They see what seem to be random occurrences as moving toward a meeting place, where they will combine to produce an important change.

They factor in all sorts of aspects, from earthquakes and weather to population shifts, to the innovation of new technology, to political developments, to what is happening in markets, and so on - all these factors - and then they make their predictions.

Question: They believe in Pattern.

Answer: Well, that's the whole point. They believe the background context of the picture of reality contains moving parts that conspire to produce change, sometimes momentous change. They might not admit it, but they think the conspiracy of these moving parts is inherent in reality itself.

They, the researchers, are searching out these relevant moving parts, and they're pretending to see how the flux is coming to a place where the parts collide and make something very important happen. What's significant is that these people are smart, they're in good jobs, they're listened to, and they constitute a kind of elite.

They are opinion leaders, you might say. Everyone thinks they're a "new intelligentsia." This is the supposed cutting edge of knowledge. It's a cultural phenomenon that these futurists have risen to the top of the heap. Here's what is basically happening: by assuming that there IS some inherent pattern in the ways things work in this picture of reality, by assuming that this pattern comes together at certain moments to produce THE FUTURE, we have a new class of people who are, actually, RE-ENFORCING THE PICTURE OF REALITY WE'RE ALL LIVING IN.

While other people are breaking apart the picture, these futurists are shoring it up. And I think you're going to see a lot more from these so-called experts...because the Reality Soldiers are becoming more desperate. They feel the ground rumbling under their feet. They sense that the cluster of Old Meaning is breaking apart and new meanings are leaking in.

They don't want that to happen, so they're floating a spurious science of prediction, they're claiming that the picture of reality can tell us "all about reality"...but that is a sham. It's not true.

Question: Fake science is being invented all over the place to cement in the old picture of limited reality. The dam is breaking, and these people are trying to patch it up.

Answer: Yes. You can see that everywhere. For example, in the area you cover as a reporter, health and medicine, the old picture is disintegrating. People are realizing that disease can be best understood by taking into account the whole body, not just one piece here and one piece there.

And if you take into account the whole body and the whole person, the picture of reality gets bigger, and what passed for correct assessment in the past is outmoded. This is viewed as a threat. So researchers keep inventing fake diseases and mental disorders to try to keep the old picture in place. And they're failing. I think that's also true on a larger scale.

I hope we're going to see extremes of new meaning leaking in all over. Then we'll see some magic.

## JACK TRUE IN CONVERSATION - JACK TRUE AND THE MAGIC THEATER

by Jon Rappoport

October 22, 2011

from JonRappoport Website

Here is another interview with Jack True, my late friend and colleague, hypnotherapist extraordinaire.

This conversation contributed to the eventual creation of the Magic Theater.

QUESTION: (Jon): Talk about the word "identity."

Answer: (Jack): It's a poor word, a lousy word, a deceptive word, a meaningless word - because it seems to encompass the whole individual. If a patient "loses his identity," he's got nothing left. He's in a vacuum. That's nonsense. He doesn't lose his identity. I prefer "role." There are many roles. You can pick one and act it out, and if you don't like it, you can throw it away and pick another one. There is no "identity." It's a phony word, in this context.

Question: So in hypnotherapy, you don't fool around with "identity."

Answer: Of course not. I sometimes present a stage, a theater, though. It's a space where the patient can picture anything he wants to. It's open. It invites creative action. It has characters on it. Not mine, the patient's. A stage gives you real experience.

Question: An example?

Answer: The patient invents a scene. Let's say he puts a mother up there arguing with her son. Drama. Then, a few stragglers show up and mill around. Then, a tiger walks out on the stage and starts talking.

Question: A tiger?

Answer: Sure, why not? You have something against tigers? He talks about his life, or he talks about the price of coffee, or he talks about the mother and the son. I'm not doing any of this, you understand? I'm not making any suggestions. The patient is. He fleshing out the scene. Some remarkable things happen. Often, it's fun. The patient feels liberated. He can populate a stage with characters.

Question: Sounds a little like Psychodrama.

Answer: Yes, but you see, the patient picks the roles. And there is no way to know why. Or what connections exist to him, if any. It's wide open. Just like existence. Why hem it in. We have whole universes to play with. Once I had a man who staged a whole Central American revolution on stage, in his imagination. As I recall it was secretly bankrolled by Coca Cola. He was laughing much of the time. He had CIA people moving in and out, KGB, Chinese spies, ETs. It was like a Bosch painting reworked by Groucho Marx. At the next session, he told me he'd just had the happiest week of his life.

Question: Opening up things.

Answer: Of course. That's the whole point. You invent characters and you have them talk to each other and do things to each other. I picture it as a kind of tinker-toy set expanding out of the mind. A set of characters.

It's the change from mono-theme, which is the setting of the mind under usual circumstances, one theme, one attitude, one circle of emotions you play over and over - you extend mind with characters popping out all over the place. You theatricalize the mind, and the mind seems to want that, seems to have been waiting for it.

Question: The word "mono-theme." That strikes me as very important.

Answer: Well, that's what mind tends to do, see. It takes one central viewpoint and everything comes out from there. It's like the mouth of a trumpet. All the music comes out there. Mono-sound. And then, and this is the revolution, you change that. Instead, the person invents characters, roles. All sorts of roles. Any roles. King, peasant, slacker, alien, ant, fly, tiger, tree that talks, rock that talks, sky, a cloud, a piece of gold, whatever. And there is no formula for picking these roles.

Question: Now, is the patient under hypnosis when he does this?

Answer: He's in a light trance, which is to say he's relaxed, he isn't thinking about ordinary stuff.. He's in an easy frame of mind. But I'm not making any suggestions to him then. I'm not telling him what stage to invent or what characters to choose. None of that.

Question: You're making basic assumptions about reality?

Answer: Damn right I am. I'm assuming that people live in a shrunken reality, much narrower than they want. But there they are. And this is a problem. You might say it is THE problem. From it flow all sorts of difficulties.

So I'm setting the stage for people to open up that narrow reality. I'm encouraging that tendency. I'm opening the windows so more light and air can come in. Look at it this way. A guy goes into his garage and sees his old hopeless car. Lots of things wrong with it. He fixes this, he fixes that, he hopes the car will last. He tries to hold on to that car for as long as he can. So what is he thinking about? The one car. The only car.

But instead, I introduce him to another garage in which there are 100 cars. Bang. Everything changes. Well, this is the mind. It tends to focus on a limited number of things. It works those things over, and eventually the mind feels there is a cloud of a problem looming overhead. Why? For no other reason than it is focusing on a very limited number of things, possibilities, ideas.

The things themselves really aren't the problem, although the person certainly thinks so. No. The problem is the narrow focusing. The constant massaging of the same material, the same old stuff. Over and over. So I open all that up. I set the stage so the person can imagine and invent 30 new things. On a stage. Characters interacting.

Some characters stay, others disappear. It doesn't matter. Nobody's keeping score. No rules.

Question: At first, this seems counter-intuitive.

Answer: Yeah, because the person has the habit of massaging six things in his mind over and over. But then the light dawns. He can invent characters, personae, roles. He can do it. He can do it without concern for plot or story or tight definition. He can just do it willy-nilly.

Question: So his mind relaxes.

Answer: It relaxes and it becomes more active, more adventurous, more imaginative. The patient feels this happening.

Question: From problem-consciousness to creative consciousness.

Answer: Yeah.

Question: Is reduction ever the answer?

Answer: Sure, if you're engraving somebody's name on a plaque. You concentrate on that and nothing else. But generally speaking, no. Some people suggest that if you can reduce thought and mind to zero you'll be fine. Better than fine. Well, let's say you could do that.

Then what? Sooner or later you're going to have to create. You're going to want to create. And that's where reduction doesn't work. You'll create one thing and one thing only? No. Create widely, with energy. The political destination of the power elite in this world is reductionism as a philosophy. But not for themselves.

For everyone else. It's a con. It's a game wherein they try to convince people to shrink. As if shrinking is the answer. Shrinking is never the answer. Shrinking creates the apparent necessity of groups. The individual is submerged. That's ludicrous. It's theater with no theater. It's like religion.

See, religion is making a bet. It's betting that the imagination involved in its stories are enough, are enough for the masses, are enough for the masses to say, "Well, I can't imagine any kind of theater better than the theater in these religious stories, so I'll stick with the Last Supper and Jonah and the Whale."

That's what it all comes down to. It's silly. But there it is. The bet. And I'm betting on the opposite thing. That a person can come up with stuff that makes those coagulated religious mass-stories look like child's play. And I've been proven right.

And when that happens, the patient becomes more joyful, more flexible, more alive. I like that. I like to see that.

Question: You're running your own theater.

Answer: Yeah, I guess I am. The theater of expansion.

Question: When you have a patient, and he's doing this kind of theater you describe, does it matter whether it's tragedy or comedy?

Answer: That's an interesting question. Here's what I've found. If a patient starts out with sadness and gloom, if he keeps going long enough, if he keeps populating the stage with more characters, things get lighter after a while. It happens because he's offloading reductionism and shrunken realities. He's getting rid of that, and so his mood lightens. Things become more juicy and alive. He's feeling his oats. He's flexing his creative muscles.

Question: And that affects his state of mind and his feelings.

Answer: I told you, some time ago, that I stopped doing traditional hypnosis with patients, because I found that most of them were already in a hypnotic state. Some part of them was already in trance and reacting to old suggestions. At that point, my job was to figure out how to reverse the hypnotic state that was already there, was already in place.

The answer was: get them to create. Get them to imagine.

That reverses a hypnotic state. A hypnotic state is a state of reduced mind. Traditionally, a trance is induced to prepare a person for suggestions. But he's already acting and thinking on the basis of suggestions. So what good does it do to add more crap to the pile?

Question: From an elite-control point of view, you'd want a whole population in a trance, so you could run their behavior through suggestions.

Answer: Yes, and that's already happening. Media are the instrument for conveying suggestions. So our job is not to swat all the suggestions like flies. There are too many of them. Our job is to eliminate the trance. But even that isn't enough. Because a person who just woke up needs more. He needs an overall direction. He needs a way to approach life. The approach is imagination and creating. But you see, you don't create much if you don't use imagination. Imagination gives you new avenues along which you can create.

Question: That kind of knocks out the idea of revelation.

Answer: Revelation is something you see suddenly. Something you never saw before. So suppose I could snap my fingers and make you experience a revelation. Then where would you be? You'd be sitting there seeing something fantastic. For how long? A minute? An hour? And then what? You only know seeing. (laughs) Get it? That's all you know. Seeing.

And then what you're seeing fades out. And then you're just there. You don't have anything to do. People have a confusion about this. They think if they see something new, it's all they need. That's baloney. They need to imagine and create, because that's endless.

Question: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't recall any religion with that doctrine.

Answer: (laughs) That doctrine would be a sure-fire way to empty out the churches.

Question: Maybe we need to start a religion.

Answer: The Church of Create Your Ass Off.

## THE UNIQUE OBJECT - AN INTERVIEW WITH JACK TRUE

by Jon Rappoport

March 11, 2011

from JonRappoport Website

This interview with Jack took place, to the best of my memory, in the summer of 1990.

Reconstructing it from my notes, I see Jack is describing one of many ways he worked with patients to move them into "a new way of seeing."

Question: Why is it important to allow your patients to see "beyond ordinary reality?"

Answer: The answer to that is, of course, obvious. But I'll try to give you a slightly different slant on it. You could say that everything a person believes or is conditioned to believe is held in place, held in one place, like a corral.

The sheep in the corral are all his beliefs, and they stand there. There is a fence around the corral, and the gate is locked by the way he views reality. As long as he views reality in the same way, the gate is going to be locked. And his beliefs are going remain there. They're not going to change.

But if, for some reason, he begins to see reality in a new way, the lock on the gate is going to spring open, and the beliefs are going to scatter and disperse.

Question: So, in hypnotherapy, you try to get patients to-

Answer: Not through suggestions, but by other strategies.

Question: For example?

Answer: With certain patients who I feel are up to to it, I bring in the idea of a unique object.

Question: What's that?

Answer: A unique object, for my purposes, is a one-of-a-kind thing that never existed before and will never exist again. It could be anything.

Question: There are lots of unique objects.

Answer: Depends on how you look at that meaning. I'm talking about a thing that isn't composed of whatever everything else is composed of. So a unique object isn't made out of atoms. It's different.

Question: Like a very strange chair?

Answer: Why not? It could be anything. But it's utterly unlike anything else.

Question: Not sure I follow you.

Answer: I put a patient in a light trance. That means he's aware, and it also means he can focus. His mind is, for the moment, uncluttered. He's not thinking fifteen thoughts. He's in a sort of zero state. Calm. He can think and he can respond, but he's not distracted. His consciousness is relaxed and open. He's not overly receptive to suggestions. He's not in a Pavlovian condition. He's in the moment.

Question: Okay. Then what?

Answer: Then I describe, in general terms, what a unique object is. And I ask him to conceive of one.

Question: Does he?

Answer: It varies. Some people work at it but they don't come up with anything. Other people give me lots of objects, but nothing much happens. In some cases, though, a very interesting thing occurs. The patient begins to see or imagine or think about a truly unique thing.

An object of great significance to him. It's not me who is telling him the object has great meaning. He comes upon that by himself. It's all subjective. You see? I give them the general idea of what a unique object is, and then he takes it from there. And what he describes to me isn't a startling revelation, in terms of the object itself. It's how he sees it and how he feels about it. It's like trying to catch lightning in a bottle.

When it happens, the patient experiences a change in perception. Right away.

Question: Because he feels he's really seeing something unique.

Answer: That's right. He feels that. You know, people go through their lives and they see all sorts of things, and nothing much registers with any great impact. It's often just cultural responses, like, "Well, I'm standing here on top of a mountain, and I'm supposed to be enthralled, so I'll act like I am." Or "I'm walking through a forest and I'm supposed to feel the majesty of the tall trees, so I will." My idea is to have a patient actually experience something in a spontaneous way.

Question: Give me an example.

Answer: One patient was quiet for a long time. Then he began talking slowly about...it seemed to be a musical instrument. He got this look in his eye, as if he was feeling something he had never felt before. As if he was making a real discovery. As if this object wasn't part of the known world.

Question: And then what?

Answer: The next day, he told me his blood pressure, which had been high, was down to normal levels. His low-level chronic headache was gone. He didn't need his glasses.

Question: Was this change permanent?

Answer: The blood pressure never went all the way back to the high level. For about a week, he didn't need his glasses. The chronic headache eventually became a once-a-month headache. But he also began to see his life differently. His marriage really underwent a revolution. He reconciled with his wife, and they became much happier. His overall mood changed.

Question: All from...

Answer: From that experience.

Question: And you would say his beliefs changed.

Answer: Absolutely. Until that point, he had a very restricted view of his possibilities. That all shifted.

Question: Because he glimpsed a unique object.

Answer: It sounds strange, doesn't it. But yes. It was a moment in a session. The "gap" between what he believed and what he could see just...fell apart. Here's how I would characterize it. Perception is often an apparatus where you have whole strings of things that are deemed to be similar.

The person sees A and subconsciously thinks, "Well, A is like B and B is like C and C is like D..." He's not really seeing A. He's linking A to other things he's seen or heard about. It's not true vivid perception. It's perception plus memory and thought. It's a hybrid. And it's dull. It's really uninteresting. Which has emotional implications.

The person's level of feeling becomes dull, too. So what happened in this case with the patient was, that whole pattern was broken. For a few minutes, the perception, the seeing was direct. He saw a unique object. Or to put it differently, he saw uniquely.

Question: And what caused his beliefs to change?

Answer: Well, if perception is dull, feeling is dull. If feeling is dull, then a person begins to adopt beliefs that will go along with that level of dull feeling. Limited beliefs. Limited ideas about the possibility of his life and even existence itself. So when that whole pattern broke apart, the sun came through. He perceived uniquely. He did it himself. Not through my suggestions. Not through drugs. He did it. And so, automatically, his dull beliefs began to slip away, because there was nothing to hold them in the corral.

Question: He perceived uniquely, so he felt uniquely, and then his beliefs, which were based on, as you say, dull feelings, were unsupported.

Answer: Right. Life tends to form into an un-unique pattern. That's what characterizes it. The un-uniqueness is the glue that holds the pattern together. When you melt that glue, you get a chance at liberation.

Question: This reminds me of preconceived knowing. A person has a set of assumptions, and then anything he comes across - information, ideas, concepts - he fits them into the assumptions he already has and...grinds out a conclusion about whether these ideas are of value or not.

Answer: Yes, it's the same thing, but what I do with patients relates to direct perception. Direct spontaneous experience.

[At this point, we took a long break. When we came back, we continued the conversation. Jack reiterated some of things he'd been saying, adding a few twists.]

Question: You were talking about political structures.

Answer: Yes. They are built in relation to public blindness.

Question: What does that mean?

Answer: To the degree that people think they are blind to what is going on in the world, the political structures that act on their behalf become larger.

Question: Governments are people's eyes?

Answer: Absolutely. So the more complex the world becomes, the more people think they are blind, and they allow governments to expand. The formula works from both ends. Government is an apparatus of perception.

Question: Of course, what governments "see" is colored by their agendas.

Answer: Sure. I didn't say the government is a reliable set of eyes. I just said it substitutes for people's blindness. It's second-hand perception. But I bring it up because it's very much like what happens within an individual.

Question: How so?

Answer: A person tends to believe he can't see what's really going on, in front of his own eyes. This comes about because of disappointments the person suffers. He sees something and he wants it, and he tries, but he doesn't get it. So he begins to believe there is something wrong with the way he sees.

Question: That's a strange idea.

Answer: Yes, but it's true. People start out with a simple formula - if I can see it and I want it, I can get it. When that formula doesn't work enough times, the person begins to believe he isn't seeing correctly. So he enters into a complex process with his mind, where he appoints a structure, an internal structure to see for him.

Question: A proxy.

Answer: Yes. And this structure is based on comparisons. A is like B, and B is like C, and C is like D. A person begins to see in categories. He doesn't perceive directly. Instead of seeing A directly and uniquely, he sees the things A is compared to. He sees a concept. And he gets into cultural norms, seeing what the culture tells him he is supposed to see.

Question: You're talking about a habit.

Answer: A deeply ingrained habit.

Question: Aside from the technique of "the unique object," how would it be broken?

Answer: You're the one who told me how.

Question: Through imagination.

Answer: Yes. Because imagination throws a monkey wrench into the apparatus of second-hand perception. It doesn't go along with A is like B and B is like C.

It comes from a different place. I once did an experiment with ink blots. You know, the ink blot test psychologists use. I took a small group of people and told them I wanted them to look at a few cards with ink blots on them and write down what they could imagine when they saw them. It was all imagination.

The people knew that. So first, they wrote down a number, before they looked at any of the cards. The number represented their estimate of their "feeling of well-being" at that moment. It was a scale from 1 to 20, with 20 being highest. Then, after I showed them the cards, and they spent about an hour writing down what they imagined... they wrote down another number - their state of well-being at THAT moment.

And in all cases, the second number was higher than the first. The well-being index. (laughs) Imagination raises the level of emotion. It raises energy. And it creates perception. That's the most important thing. So, essentially, imagination shreds the apparatus of second-hand perception by creating new perception.

Question: The culture isn't set up to accommodate that.

Answer: The culture is all about showing people what they're supposed to see, through sets of definitions and categorizations. That's what a culture IS. An apparatus of perception. Imagination works at cross purposes to that.

Question: Because imagination doesn't care what the culture says or thinks.

Answer: Right. When you imagine something, you see it right away. You see what you imagine. You perceive THAT. So it's a different way of seeing.

Question: And it only applies to the individual.

Answer: Of course. As soon as it becomes a group enterprise, you're building a culture. You're building another second-hand perception apparatus.

## JACK TRUE ON TIME AND SPACE - AN INTERVIEW

by Jon Rappoport

March 8, 2011

from JonRappoport Website

In this conversation, from 1990, hypnotherapist Jack True discusses the space-time continuum.

QUESTION: (Rappoport): How does hypnotic trance relate to space-time?

Answer: (Jack True): That's a question I've looked into for years. First of all, all trances are not equal. I have my own way of putting people into a light trance, which isn't deep enough for suggestions to have any effect. It's about getting a patient into a place where he is able to focus clearly without any distractions. But there is something else, too. In this state of mind, he's not tied so closely to physical reality. He's aware of it, but he's floating. He's a bit removed from its influence. He's not so much a slave to it. He's, you could say, in a different space, and a different time.

Question: He's in a dream state?

Answer: Not quite. More like a pre-dream state, just before a dream begins.

Question: Does this have something to do with why sleep is so important?

Answer: Well, sleep is necessary for several reasons. But in this sense, it's important because the shackles that tie a person to physical-reality space and time are unhooked. He can go elsewhere.

Question: And why does that matter?

Answer: Because the space-time continuum is just one reality. And at some level, a human being knows this. That's the point, you see. He knows this. And he doesn't

want to stay glued to that one reality. Why should he? There are lots of other places to go. And those places, in certain respects, are far more interesting and fulfilling.

Question: You keep coming back to this theme.

Answer: I have to. It's central. Desire precedes reality.

Question: That's an interesting way to put it.

Answer: It's accurate. So if a person becomes all wound up in this continuum - which of course he does - than he loses sight of what? Desire. Because it seems then that reality defines what can be legitimately desired. Everything is backwards. Desire becomes diluted and blunted. And that's when people lose power.

Question: There is pressure to desire something you can make and sell.

Answer: Yes, and that's a culture that reflects this obsession with "the one and only reality." If you desire to create something that maybe other people can't understand and won't buy...well, reality-governing-desire steps in and says ARE YOU CRAZY?

People think they make no sacrifice by adjusting their desires, but they do. They build up frustration. They accumulate stress. They want to break out. They're told they need to grow up and act like everyone else - but that's not it.

The space-time continuum and gravity and the way energy works and all the rest of it...in one sense, it's hype. Pure hype. It's a message that says: you can't go against the laws. You can't move into other dimensions. But think about music. You can create any tempo you want to. You can make a whole new space or series of spaces. You're inventing space and time. It's right there. People just don't want to follow the implications.

Question: Is the mind in some way married to this continuum?

Answer: I don't think so. Does your mind keep you from breaking some rule? At bottom, YOU do. It isn't something like a mechanism of mind, although that would make a good science fiction story. It's you.

But when I work with a patient, at some point he realizes that I don't care about any of that. He can float right off the chair and it's fine with me. He can disappear and reappear in London, and that's okay with me. A kind of partnership develops in that way with some of my patients, and it makes a great deal of difference.

Question: In that sense, you're like the patient's subconscious.

Answer: Yes, that's right. In his subconscious, he has all sorts of desires that involve going beyond this continuum - and that's the way I am.

Question: None of this involves religion.

Answer: Religion? That's indefinite postponement.

Question: It's the idea that, in order to reach beyond this continuum, you have to be in debt and you have to be discharging that debt.

Answer: In what I do, there is no owing. No one is beholden to me for anything.

Question: Do you see space and time of this universe as being connected?

Answer: I think that's a hoax. Space is curved and space and time merge in some way? What? I don't see it. It just seems like apples and oranges. A distraction. A diversion. A confusion that adds to the problem. Maybe it's a way of expressing a latent desire to become a master of space and time. But time is all about duration...and space is a stage set.

Just because space and time are integrated in equations doesn't mean they actually merge. Would you say that the men in a rocket are merged with the fuel in the engines? Poetically, maybe. But physically? No.

Question: Let's get back to this partnership you mentioned, between you and the patient.

Answer: It's a key. The reason I'm tapping into his very deep desires to go beyond the space-time continuum is because I understand that. It's not just a "therapeutic device." It's me. Suppose a patient tells me he sees an astral location and he describes it. I could discount that and move on.

But of course I don't, because I KNOW he's feeling a new power and eagerness welling up in him, he's moving into a place he really wants to be, and I want to be in a place like that, too. I want to go exploring. I keep saying this in different ways, but...it has everything to do with repressed desire, on a level that is immense.

At that level, the person is all about going beyond the reality defined by this universe. It isn't just a passing fancy. We all have this tendency to say, "Well, it's raining today, so we can't go outside."

But underneath that, we don't care. Rain is not a problem. We don't care about the excuses we give ourselves. We want more. We want to experience magic. You see, think about Freud. He had a propensity to define repression in terms of sex. That was where he was tuning in. He made a life out of that. That was the level of repressed desire he was looking at. I'm talking about something that is buried much deeper in the psyche, in the subconscious.

To turn away from it would be absurd. To turn away and say, well, that's not real, that's not doable, that's not a subject for therapy...why would you do that? It's staring you right in the face. It's there. So the first thing a person needs to do is admit he has this desire for magic, for going past all the supposed limits of this physical reality. He has to see and feel that desire in himself.

Question: Are space and time powerful inhibitors and limiters?

Answer: I prefer to think of them as delusions.

Question: In what sense?

Answer: Let's say you're in a car and you're driving along a road. The road is very long. It seems never to end. You keep driving. You believe this road is the only one. You think if you're driving, you're on that road. Where else would you be? But of course, there are a million other roads. And-

Question: You can invent roads, too.

Answer: Yes.

Question: The subconscious knows this?

Answer: For my purposes, in my work, the subconscious is a generalized term that indicates an interior place where a repressed desire of great proportions is kept under wraps.

Question: What's real versus what's delusional - that's a tricky subject.

Answer: Yeah. Part of the reason is semantic. You're using the words in different ways. On one level, physical reality, space and time are very real. But we foster a delusion by thinking they're the only space and time.

On another level, space and time are invented - they're not just "there." This is the subject of a great deal of myth, which is an attempt to understand who made the

continuum. And, as with any unsettled argument, some people will step in and try to use the situation for their own benefit.

But in the meantime...musicians make their own space and time, which is different from the continuum, and you can see by the response of the audiences that this invention has great power and desire associated with it...with music, people are responding to a new universe that is being created.

Question: The creative is the trump card.

Answer: The energy of it is-

Question: Unlimited.

Answer: Yes.

## POWER - AN INTERVIEW WITH JACK TRUE

by Jon Rappoport

February 27, 2011

from JonRappoport Website

This interview took place in the fall of 1988. As you can tell, if you've been reading the prior interviews, Jack and I tended to jump from one theme to another.

Part of the reason was we'd already covered so much ground together, we could anticipate where things were heading.

QUESTION: (Rappoport): In all our conversations, we always seem to come around to the subject of imagination.

Answer: (Jack True): Well, you convinced me, finally, it was of the greatest importance. I was always working with it, but I needed to think more about the wider implications.

Question: Such as imagination creates reality?

Answer: Yes. So there are an infinite number of possible realities. That perspective gives you a different view of the world.

Question: In your work, do you ever approach the issue of power directly?

Answer: Early in my career, I tried that, but it didn't work.

Question: Why not?

Answer: Because my patients were shy about that or afraid.

Question: Even under hypnosis?

Answer: Yes.

Question: That's interesting.

Answer: I thought so. It taught me something. People tend to have a taboo about the whole thing. They go through all sorts of contortions about power. I could see that clearly.

Question: What kind of contortions?

Answer: Well, it's like pin the tail on the donkey or musical chairs. Where you put power. To whom or what do you attribute it? See, people know power exists. But it's not something they admit they want. So they go around in a very circuitous route to pin it somewhere else. The sky has power. Wind has power. The Earth has power.

Question: In recent culture, the word power has taken on a distinctly negative meaning. It's been conclusively associated with corruption, oppression, and criminal activity.

Answer: Pop psychology gives the word a slightly different twist, as in "personal power." The context is often "taking back your power," which assumes that, somewhere along the line, someone else had control over you - and now you're recapturing it. But at best, this diluted vision implies that, from now on, you'll be able to make your own decisions. That's pretty weak.

Question: Power means you can DO. It means you are able. From a Latin root.

Answer: Let's go far out. Suppose you want to do something that is thought to be impossible? Suppose you want to read a person's thoughts from ten miles away? Or you want to move an object on your desk with your mind? Suppose you want to levitate.

There is a general consensus that these paranormal feats of power are impossible. In fact, the consensus weaves together with the fabric of the space-time continuum.

One aspect is dependent on the other. Consider the image of two mirrors standing across from each other. The reflections bounce back and forth. One feeds the other. In the same way, the general consensus that levitation is impossible nourishes the "rule of the physical continuum" which states that unaided human levitation is verboten.

Let's shift the focus. Let's say there is a manuscript in a museum. It has been dated at 4300 BC. For over a century, scholars, linguists, and cryptologists have tried to understand the rows of symbols - and they have utterly failed. They haven't made a single inroad. Now you look at it. You stand in front of it and look at it for an hour.

Do you think your imagination will swing into gear? Damn right it will. You'll start imagining all sorts of "paranormal" possibilities - even though you can't name them or describe them. Your imagination will go to places that aren't pedestrian. This is what happens with a mystery. The mind, the imagination begins to write script, and the script is about realities that are beyond what we ordinarily think about.

The imagination is waiting in the bushes, for an opportunity to come out and stretch and get beyond this humdrum continuum. That's a natural tendency, which we keep under wraps.

Question: To understand power, you need imagination.

Answer: Otherwise, you just think about power in terms you already understand. You repeat yourself. You become bored.

Question: You use the word boredom a lot.

Answer: That's because it's the bottom line on the accounting book called Reality. That's what you finally get to. Reality bores. Power is about exceeding reality. When you stop and think about it, why didn't humans imbue their gods with no power at all? Why should gods have power at all? They could be farmers tilling the soil or stone masons. The gods have power because human imagination gives it to them. And that happens because humans need to imagine power somewhere. They're afraid to give it to themselves, so they invent the gods. This is another deflection of the truth on to spaces where it's "safe" to attribute power. The taboo is: we have power.

Question: In modern times, we have comic books and super-heroes. Superman. Batman. In ancient Greece, another super-hero,

Prometheus, stole fire from the gods and gave it to man. Fire is energy. Energy is a function of imagination. Prometheus stole awareness of creative power and gave it to humans. Power starts with imagining power.

Answer: But Superman doesn't try to figure out a way to give his kind of power to humans. That never happens. Several years ago, I met with a man who was trying to start a school. He had this idea. He'd cram grades one through twelve into eight years, and the other four would be nothing but art. All day, all the time. Students doing art. All the arts.

Question: What happened?

Answer: He could never raise the money. People were afraid of what he was talking about. Immersion in the arts to the point where a reality shift would take place in the minds of the kids. I mean, that's what he talked about, so his potential investors dried up. They disappeared into the fog. Art is about walking right up the ladder of power. An artist has power. Even if there is no consensus about that. Consensus is the last thing that happens.

Question: Energy is a function of imagination. We've talked about that before.

Answer: I'd liken it to a very dark night. You're wandering around. You don't know exactly where you are. Then you see a glint of light ahead. Suddenly, you feel an injection of energy. You feel it. THAT'S the way to get out. When you imagine something new, and you feel it, you get that shot of energy. It's a potentially endless supply. The old nonsense about entropy [dissipating energy] is a wrong concept.

Question: Why not another kind of theory: there are multiple universes pouring energy and receiving energy from one another. The process just keeps going.

Answer: If there's one thing we don't have a lack of, it's energy.

Question: So is that how you approach the issue of power with patients?

Answer: Energy through imagination. And when a person experiences enough energy, he begins to know he has power.

Question: In traditional alchemy, in their cross, the four ends represented the four elements of nature [earth, air, fire, water]. Where the two sticks meet, in the center - that's called Quintessence. This the quality that can resolve the conflict among the four elements. The Quintessence is imagination.

Answer: It would be, because it is the thing that gets you beyond the four elements. It puts you out there beyond the inhibiting rules of nature. This whole resurrection of the nature religion that started in the 1960s - it was supposed to be about resolution and peace, but-

Question: The factor they left out of the equation was imagination. They substituted drugs for imagination.

Answer: I had a patient who, in a light trance, would invent dream after dream.

That's what I had him do. He must have fabricated fifty dreams altogether, over the over a period of a few months. In every one of those dreams, he put in a power source. Some god or entity that had great power. And then one day, he got a different kind of message. From the sheer invention of these dreams, he was getting a whole lot of energy. He was feeling that.

Then it began to dawn on him that he had power. And from then on, the character of the dreams he invented was different. And in his life, he knew he had power.

#### THE MIND CONTROL INTERVIEW - WITH JACK TRUE

by Jon Rappoport

February 26, 2011

from JonRappoport Website

In the early 1990s, hypnotherapist Jack True and I sat down and discussed his views on mind control.

To say the least, Jack presents a very radical interpretation of this subject.

QUESTION: (Rappoport): Okay. What's your definition of mind control?

Answer: (Jack True): It's the belief that your mind and/or its programming is a complex affair that needs to be unraveled a detail at a time.

Question: What?

Answer: You heard me.

Question: Sounds like you're talking about a general approach to the mind.

Answer: Think it through.

Question: You made the statement. Clarify it.

Answer: What makes mind control mind control? What makes any kind of limitation limiting? Do you see? It's the false belief that, in order to undo what has been done, you need to engage in...you need to walk back the way you came. You need to have a set of keys that allows you to unlock all the doors that have been locked in sequence.

Question: Okay. I get it.

Answer: This is what stops people. The real control factor is what they believe they need to do in order to undo what they believe has been done to them.

Question: And that's-

Answer: That's the cardinal factor of mind control. See, take a person's life. He goes through all sorts of experiences. He has a few traumas or whatever. He buys some crazy ideas other people are selling. And so forth and so on. Now, he wakes up a little, and he wants to throw away all that and start fresh.

But he thinks he has to enter into a systematic undoing of whatever negative energies and ideas he has picked up. Now he's really stymied. Because he's looking at mind as if it's a closet hung very neatly with things, and he believes he has to find a way to unpack the closet one piece at a time. It's a very big closet, he believes. It stretches from Alaska to Mexico.

Question: And you're saying he has a wrong portrait of the mind. To begin with.

Answer: Right. Mind is much more fluid than that. Mind is not really the problem. The person is the problem.

Question: What about so-called trauma-based mind control? You know, the CIA MKULTRA-type stuff, or the Soviet version. What about that?

Answer: There are a lot of misconceptions about it. Those bastards used force and drugs. It was basically torture. Now, they might have gotten real cute, in order to create what they said was multiple personalities in a victim.

But whatever system of trance or suggestion they employed, it doesn't matter. It only matters if the victim, emerging from it, escaping from it, believes that, in order

to undo what was done, he has to unpack the closet, he has to undo, a step at a time, what has been done to him. If he does believe that, you're in a pickle.

You now need to bring in a therapist who believes what the victim believes - and together they explore this territory. The therapist offers a complex a system of un-brainwashing that the victim can accept. Based on a shared belief, they can make progress. Here's an analogy. Let's say you're lost in the woods. You've been lost for a month.

You're in bad shape. You're eating leaves and roots. You believe the only way to get out is to walk the way you came - which is a complex task. But that's what you think. As long as you think that, what else are you going to do? You might be able to make it work. Maybe. In the same way, a complex system of un-brainwashing might work, but to suggest it's the only or best path is way overstating things.

Question: Some people are predisposed to playing chess.

Answer: Exactly! They look south and they see chess. They look north and they see chess. You try to sell them checkers or a helicopter and they turn you down flat. They don't believe in that. They believe in chess. If they're lost, you can get them out only if you present your solution so it looks and feels like chess. Otherwise, they refuse.

Question: So for them, chess is mind control.

Answer: (laughs) Yeah. It's the filter through which they see reality.

Question: And where does THAT come from?

Answer: That's not mind. That's the person himself. He has chosen that filter and he uses it all the time.

Question: But why did he choose it to begin with?

Answer: See, we're walking right back into the same trap. Suppose we say there was a long concatenation of events that FORCED this person to choose that filter. Then where are we? We're about to conclude, well, the only way to get rid of the filter is to reconstruct the exact string of events that FORCED him to adopt the filter.

To put that whole string under a magnifying glass so he can see it in every detail - and then he can throw away the filter. Which is nonsense. Because when you go back far enough, what you really see is, he chose that filter. He took it and placed it

over his eyes. That's what happened. It doesn't matter why. It doesn't matter what reasons he gave himself for choosing it.

Sure, he can gain some insight that way, by scoping out the reasons. But really, he has to find a way to leap beyond that filter and start seeing reality in new and different ways - and then one day, he'll remember the filter and laugh at the whole thing and how silly it was.

Question: What if he can't?

Answer: Who are you? The devil's advocate?

Question: I'm trying to be.

Answer: Well, if he can't, he's in the mud. It's like asking me, if a guy is standing on one side of a river that runs from one eternity to another, and he wants to get across, and he refuses to step in the water, how will he succeed? He won't succeed. He'll stand on that riverbank for 50 lives or 300 lives or 50,000 lives, until he jumps in the water.

Question: Understood.

Answer: You're a painter. So I'll give you an analogy from painting. A painter is in his studio. He's looking at the blank canvas. He has the brush in his hands. His filter is "Renaissance perspective." He believes that everything he paints has to have that kind of perspective in it. But he wants to do something new at the same time. That's his urge. How is going to proceed unless he gets rid of that filter, unless he dares to leap beyond it?

Question: Since anthropology became such a well-known field of study, we've had the premise that cultures have different customs, different filters, and "it's all relative."

Answer: This is the biggest bunch of baloney going.

Question: Why?

Answer: Because it assumes that everyone in a given culture has the same filter. Nonsense. When you probe deeper, you find out every person is an individual. But that's not a popular idea anymore. From my work with patients from all over the world, I've satisfied myself that every person has his own filters, which go a lot deeper than cultural artifacts.

See, when a person is dreaming at night, he sometimes lets go of those filters. He takes a leap of imagination, and he's out there in a new territory, and he's experiencing things he really wants to experience. And if he remembers what happened when he wakes up in the morning, he feels that exhilaration. He got past the gates.

He got past the filters. He was free. And why? Because he created a dream. He imagined his way past the filters. What I do in my work is try to bring that state of affairs into waking life.

Question: Talk a little more about filters.

Answer: Okay, you've got a person who is involved, in his job, with technology. He's an engineer. He sees things in terms of problems and solutions. Everywhere he looks, there is a problem to solve, and the way to solve it is through rational exercise. Take a step forward. Formulate a way to make something work a little better. There is nothing wrong with that. Fine.

But as his life goes on, he's in that basic position. He's a solver. He sizes up situations as problems, and he works to solve them. It doesn't make him as happy as it once did. That's the main thing. He doesn't get the same kick out of it. Most people would say that's a function of aging, but it really isn't. It's a function of the filter. His filter.

His way of approaching reality. You've heard of this word entropy? It's a goofy theory that all over the universe, available energy is running down. It's dissipating. It doesn't disappear, but it's stored in, what could you call it, places of quiet, where nothing is happening. Like a warehouse. Well, what really runs down is a filter. It begins to deteriorate, because the person it belongs to is finding it less and less interesting and exciting. It's like a book he's read a thousand times. How much more can he squeeze out of it?

This is what mind control comes down to. Your filter. And the general tendency is for it to deteriorate, which doesn't mean it goes away. It just means it's less useful and interesting, but nothing takes its place. That's the problem. It's a replacement problem. But you see, because this engineer has spent his whole life using that filter, he doesn't see an alternative. He doesn't know what else he can do.

He's like a one-trick pony. The trick is wearing out. He looks around for an answer. He looks here and there. He reads a few books. Nothing really clicks. He tries to formulate his own state of mind into a problem he can solve, but he can't really define the problem.

Well, how could he? He's looking through the problem. The filter.

Question: And as I've suggested to you many times, the answer is imagination.

Answer: Yes, and in my work and in your work, the issue is, how do you get a person to make that leap? How do you get him to recognize, first of all, that he has this thing called imagination? How do you get him to use it? How do you open up that whole territory? It takes ingenuity. It isn't just a problem that needs solving. It's a lot different.

Question: People use filters that can't process the fact that you can invent something that wasn't there before.

Answer: This is true. So that needs to be overcome. You can trick a person into it, but that way has brief results only. You need to go deeper. Higher.

## REBELS AGAINST REALITY - THIRD INTERVIEW WITH JACK TRUE

by Jon Rappoport

February 25, 2011

from JonRappoport Website

NOTICE TO MY READERS - As most of you know, I move back and forth between very different subjects in my work. Medical fraud, political commentary, the moves made by global elites, and imagination/creative power/magic.

As of late, I've stepped up the action by assembling several more interviews with Jack True. These interviews represent what I consider to be the most important area of my long-time focus: imagination/creative power/magic.

I'd like to get responses from readers who are really interested in this aspect. I'm thinking of doing a new seminar on this subject - possibly an in-person live seminar.

I sense that events of the past three years have moved some people away from this area, as society has been undergoing various crises. For me, these crises underline the need to dig deeper...to further explore the actual truth and meaning of magic. Are you there? Are you still interested?

In 1988, during a conversation with hypnotherapist Jack True, I kiddingly suggested we form a group called RAR, Rebels Against Reality. A few days later, we picked up the thread of that comment, and we did an interview, part of which I've been able to reconstruct from my notes.

I hesitated to print this one at first, because it moves into areas lots of people are quite unfamiliar with - particularly if they're looking to learn something by comparing it to what they already know... but then I realized I'd crossed that line a long time ago. Way long ago.

Buckle up...

QUESTION: (Rappoport): So you like the idea. Rebels Against Reality.

Answer: (Jack True): If it's taken far enough.

Question: Well, I think we could break it down into several groups. Rebels Against Space, for example. Meaning we would insist on New Spaces.

Answer: To whom would we lodge our request? City planners?

Question: Hell no. We'd go a lot farther than that. We'd appeal to the Space Mafia.

Answer: Who are they?

Question: People who make space and sell it. They control the market.

Answer: So we'd have to raise money to buy new space from them.

Question: No, we'd threaten them by saying we're ready to make our own.

Answer: And how would our own be different?

Question: It wouldn't be continuous. It wouldn't require time, for example, to move across a chunk of it. You could just disappear from one end and reappear at the other.

Answer: I'd think there would be a market for that. The military would be very interested.

Question: Yeah, but we're not selling to them. Our market would be the people who want a break from ordinary reality. Billions of people. Of course, they can get that break if they go to a museum and look at paintings for a long time. But they don't know that. They think they're hemmed in.

Answer: You've talked about art as a flood.

Question: Yeah. Flooding the world with so much art that perception of reality changes. It would take a while for it to sink in, but when it did, all sorts of new phenomena would surface.

Answer: I'd guess that telepathy would expand terrifically. People would get used to space on a different level - not as something you have to travel through, but as a medium. A fluid, maybe. Or better yet, a definition of position. Space simply tells you where you are. It doesn't tell you what you have to do to go from one position to another. You can transmit thoughts as easily as driving to the market. Easier.

Question: The point is, once you realize that telepathy is very available, the character of thought begins to escalate, because why bother to exchange messages with someone when the thoughts involved are so pedestrian? "I'm going to the movies. Want to go?" "Sure." I mean, who would care about that? [Apparently, I was wrong, because now we have instant Twitter, and people are comfortable sharing the most inane messages.]

Answer: So you're saying art would come into its own with telepathy.

Question: Yes, in the form of new languages. Many new languages, where the symbols aren't denoting specific meanings. They're open. You get the aesthetic punch, but you leave out the literal. When people are confronted by art at every turn, adventurous art, and when they begin creating it, too, they need to become far more inventive.

I'd compare it to a situation where you have a lot of land - lots of people have a lot of empty land - and you grow vegetables. And then you have enough for your needs, and so does everyone else. So what are you going to do now? You're going to plant flowers, maybe. You're going to step into art. You're going to escalate. See, on a mental level, people are involved with thought-forms all the time. These are like pictures, but they're not exactly pictures. They're more like feelings. They have the impact of sensation and feeling.

But at the same time, take these people and lead them into a museum, into a room where abstract paintings are hanging all over the place, and they claim to be baffled. Absolutely baffled. It's ridiculous. It's like saying people who own cars go to a garage where a hundred cars are parked and they have no idea what they're seeing.

Answer: I'd be in favor of forcing people to live in a museum for a few years. I think some interesting things would happen. They can't go outside. They have to stay in the museum.

Question: Well, people used to talk about the effect of space on astronauts. This would be like that. Here in the museum, there are hundreds of vastly different realities hanging on the walls, and people see them every hour of every day. Eventually, I think they'd stop their incessant whining about not understanding art, and they'd actually begin to look at what's on the walls. They'd become involved. They'd realize people have been sending advanced "messages" to one another for centuries.

Answer: If you were a citizen of ancient Egypt, and you went to sleep and had a dream, my sense is that, when you woke up, you'd be required to seek out an interpretation of the dream from a so-called expert.

Question: Just like now.

Answer: (laughs) Yeah. You'd go to a local priest who was trained in the accepted cosmology - all the gods and sub-gods, and sub-sub gods, the cosmology that tells you all about their functions and histories and powers...and you'd have this priest tell you what your dream meant. He'd give you the party line, in terms of that cosmology, and you'd wander away with the standard party line.

Question: And after a while, you would lose the passion for your own dreams, once you became bored with the cosmology, because what else would you have? There was a complex picture of the universe, and only the priests understood it, and they gave you the chapter and the verse. It was really an anti-art movement. Art is your own. It isn't some communal culture, despite what the wardens of culture tell us.

Answer: People are afraid of individual meaning.

Question: They want that shared porridge, handed to them by the people who have so-called special insight. Eventually, this devolves down to a feeling that only the initiated understand anything profound. And then the next phase is complete disinterest or open hostility toward art, unless it imitates physical reality. So imagination goes to sleep. The big sleep. And then people say they don't understand anything that isn't practical.

Answer: This is where waking life becomes hypnosis.

Question: What did you just say? People are afraid of individual meaning. They think that if everyone has his own meanings, there won't be any basis for understanding. They think this means isolation, even insanity. But it's just the opposite.

If everyone was transmitting meanings of his own, intensely his own, the level of understanding would rise - because the drabness would be taken out of it, as well as all the false pretension that something horrendously boring is interesting. All that would be gone, wiped off the board. That's what the flood of art would bring.

The character of space and time would change. The drabness of repeating space and time would drain away. People think that going into outer space is so fantastic, and it is, but along the way you pass through interminable stretches where there is nothing but nothing. Space just keeps repeating over and over. It's completely redundant.

Answer: I've seen this with some patients. When they're in trance, it appears that nothing is there. You ask for things, and you get empty space or a vacuum. It goes on and on. I take this as a kind of...coefficient of non-creation. The person isn't creating anything. But it's not by clear choice. It's not like he's sitting in the Big Void and realizing his potential power. It's like narcosis.

Question: Amnesia. In those empty spaces, he's convinced that his creations would only be replicas of what already exists, so he opts out. It's like watching people fall asleep in church. They're in their seats listening to a third-rate recitation of a chunk of a cosmology that is already centuries old and nobody really cares about it...and they fall asleep. It's nothing listening to nothing. What is the sound of no hands clapping? A snore.

Answer: I'm against instant comprehension. With TV, people know right away what's passing across the screen. Do you see? They sit there for hours watching these images, and they become trained to expect that they'll understand everything they see right away. But with art, you have to become engaged. Actively engaged.

You have to work at it. People are losing this faculty. It's the same with certain ideas. People want ideas laid out for them, nice and neat. If ideas show up that don't admit to instant understanding, people walk away.

Question: That's why I say people have to live in an atmosphere of art. They'll reject everything at first, but gradually they'll start to get used to it. They'll absorb it. Then they'll start exploring it. Then they'll start to create it.

Answer: There is a parallel to hypnotherapy. People think it's something like sleep, but if it's done right, what you really get is focus. Concentration on a specific thing. You put a patient in a situation where he can actually look at something.

An idea, an image, a desire. You create the atmosphere where that's possible. In a real sense, the history of our times will be seen as a history of distraction. People moving from one thought to another, never really digesting anything along the way.

Question: I'll tell you about a dream I once had. In the dream, I was sitting in a coffee shop talking to a man who had acted in a repertory company for 30 years, with the same group of people. They had done hundreds of different plays and acted in hundreds of different roles.

And in that conversation, it came out that this man's immersion in art for 30 years with his group... that man had experienced and created all sorts of effects we would call paranormal. Telepathy, especially. He had a kind of elevated level of thought transference with other people in the company. It happened frequently.

But the thing was, they were all used to it. What I mean is, they didn't talk about it and they didn't think about it, and they certainly didn't trumpet it. They didn't really notice it.

Answer: So you mean they were isolated.

Question: Right.

Answer: They took it for granted. These "paranormal" effects happen all the time in art. But people overlook it, they don't stop to recognize what's actually happening. Meanwhile, other "scientific professionals" argue about whether anything paranormal is happening in the world or is possible. It's a ludicrous situation, when you stop and think about it. It's right there, under our noses, and still we have-

Question: This slavish devotion to ordinary reality.

Answer: Yes.

JACK TRUE INTERVIEWED AGAIN - DREAM ANALYSIS

by Jon Rappoport

February 24, 2011

from JonRappoport Website

In this interview, my late friend, hypnotherapist Jack True, discusses dreams.

He and I talked about this subject many times.

QUESTION: (Jon): I look at dreams as adventures. Cultures have always been fixated on analyzing them and finding the hidden meanings.

Answer: (Jack): Well, when you think about it, trying to dissect things for hidden meanings happens all over the place. The point is, when you arrive at the meaning, what do you have? The whole business falls apart. You're sitting there with a few sentences of translated meaning, and it really doesn't help much. I admit it can be an intriguing exercise, and I'm not knocking it, but it makes me yawn.

Question: The most interesting thing about dreams is that people have them. They're lying in bed, and they're entering into all sorts of dimensions, and it feels very real. Adventure.

Answer: Well, you would say that, because you're an artist.

Question: What would you say?

Answer: I agree. Many dreams follow the sequence of desire and then manifestation. You want to experience something, and then, bang, it's there. You're in a full-blown setting, and there are other people, and you're feeling what you want to feel. Or you could reverse it. You're in a setting, you size it up, you see what you desire, and then it happens.

Question: In other words, it's natural. It's what people want.

Answer: They would like their waking lives to be like that. And in the service of that goal, in dreams, all the rules of physical reality go out the window. Dreams are a glimpse into another kind of reality, where the rules aren't the rigid context. The rules about what can happen with space and time and what can't happen don't apply. In that sense, dreams are like art. In art, you can create what you want to.

Question: So there is a general universality in dreams.

Answer: The universality is, the rules of physical reality don't take precedence. They don't determine the outcome. They don't inhibit the action. You can be in a room

talking to someone one second, and the next second you can be up in the clouds flying over a city. This isn't "a symbol" of something. It's not about hidden meaning. It's what it is.

Question: That's too stark for a lot of people.

Answer: Well, sure. But so what?

Question: In a lot of cultures, if you have a dream, you're bound to interpret it by the doctrine of the current mythology or religion.

Answer: Yeah. One story used to explain another story. If you wrote a novel, would you feel compelled to write another novel explaining the first one? It's ridiculous. Dreams have inherent magic in them.

Whereas, in your waking life, if you want to go from one city to another, you drive, or you book a flight. You go through all sorts of preparation. Those are the rules. That's the way it works. In a dream, you can just move from one city to another in no time at all.

Question: That's what I'm saying. That instant travel - it's part of the adventure. If you want to think about a dream after you wake up, think about that.

Answer: Let's say you actually had a person who could do that. He's standing on the corner of 42nd Street and Broadway, and then he's standing on the beach in San Francisco. No time elapses. All sorts of explanations would be given, in addition to all the denials that it ever happened. He's an alien from outer space.

He's a god. He's the devil. He's able to hypnotize everybody and make them think he has this extraordinary power. He was using some fabulous machine to make the space shift happen. It was technology, because otherwise it couldn't have happened.

You see, this is the analysis. The interpretation of the event. In the same way, people have dreams and then they wake up and analyze what happened.

Question: They can't just accept it.

Answer: They can't enjoy it.

Question: You must have patients who tell you about their dreams.

Answer: Sure. One woman has flying dreams. I finally got her to remember and really feel the sensation of taking off from the ground and how good it was. She

decided that was a hell of a lot more important than "what the dream meant." She was flying! She was showing off! She was a performer with an audience. And she was flying!

Question: When we say people are asleep and they need to wake up, we don't mean they need to stop dreaming.

Answer: Dreaming is being awake. Awake to a different kind of reality, where imagination has much greater power. Dreams supply what's missing in physical reality. There are places all over the world where professionals conduct experiments designed to see whether paranormal events can happen. They run tests, experiments, and so on.

That's fine, but I like to point out that the flavor of the experiments is very bland compared to dreams. Magic isn't bland. It's alive. It has color and depth and profound emotion. If you try to leave that out, you don't have magic anymore. I don't know what to call it, but it isn't magic. Do you want to put Merlin in a lab? That would be a joke.

Question: You have some of your patients invent dreams by the truckload.

Answer: Yes. It's a natural tendency and deep desire - dreaming - so why not do it more and do it when you're awake? What happens is you begin to blend different states of mind. You have states of mind while a person is asleep that give birth to dreams, and then you have the states of mind people usually inhabit when they're awake...so why not blend them? Why not explore that?

Question: You're saying there is more than one kind of desire. The sort of desire people experience when they're awake is different from the sort of desire they experience when they're asleep.

Answer: It's a different quality. In dreams, desire produces a scene, an event, an experience just like that. Desire gives rise to fulfillment. In waking life, it feels different.

Question: Is that because waking life is so different from sleeping?

Answer: Maybe. But I think it's something else. When we're awake, we bamboozle ourselves into thinking that our desires carry relatively little power. And we make the excuse, "Well, the world doesn't work according to desire. It works on its own, like a machine, and we have to plug into the machine and go along with its processes."

Question: Lots of people have come along and talked about manifesting desire in the world.

Answer: I know. And usually it doesn't pan out. Something goes wrong. What I'm saying is, it has to do with state of mind. A person can occupy all sorts of different states of mind - and then different outcomes will result. Dreaming is a state of mind that works when you're asleep. So what happens when you're doing something to blend that dreaming state or connect it to waking life in the world? That's what I'm doing with my patients now. It's a work in progress.

Question: Any preliminary findings?

Answer: I'm encouraged. That's all I can say right now. I have people keeping a book of dreams. Every day, they invent and write down dreams in the book. They aren't reporting on dreams. They're creating them. While they're awake. You see? So in that writing, they're moving through states of mind they wouldn't ordinarily occupy while they're awake.

Question: A similar thing would happen in a play on stage.

Answer: Yes. An actor is playing a role that doesn't exist anywhere except on the stage. He's inventing. The whole play - somewhat like a dream - is taking place on the stage. And the audience is watching a dream unfold. They want that. They want to be awake and watch a dream. They want that experience. They want to blend different states of mind. But most of all, they just want to see a dream while they're awake.

Question: What you're doing with patients is like the other side of the coin of lucid dreaming.

Answer: It seems like it. From what I understand, the practice of lucid dreaming involves cultivating the ability to realize, in the middle of a dream, that you are dreaming - but you don't wake up in bed. You're still "in it." But you know you're having a dream. And then you direct the rest of the dream according to the way you want it to happen. Well, I'm saying, let's take people who are awake, and let's have them invent dreams and write them down. Let's take it from the other end.

Question: What about nightmares?

Answer: Well, this goes back to what you were saying. A dream is an adventure. Suppose you could decide to embrace "a bad dream" and not be thrown way off by it. While the so-called nightmare is happening, you're embracing the whole thing because you want to experience it. And so the dream itself takes on a different character. You don't retract and shrink back so much. You "wrap your arms around" the nasty creature who is coming at you. I believe then that the dream will take on a different character. It won't be fearful in the same way.

Question: The ancient Tibetans were very much involved in cultivating extraordinary capacities. Levitating, telekinesis, and so on. For them, universe was

a product of mind. If you could fully know that, you could experience it. You could make things disappear and create new things out of nothing.

Answer: I find something of the quality of dream in their work. The flavor of it. They had a culture that supported that. They were intensely creative. They did very intense exercises over long periods of time. It wasn't your standard religion.

Question: In the past, we've talked about film as dream.

Answer: Well, I think that was the early impact of films. They were dreams on the screen. It was a bit like being led into your own psyche and desires. Whereas, realism is about the fixation on having things as they are in the physical world.

Question: The early films of Ingmar Bergman had a certain dream quality. And even though the subject matter was, at times, despondent, it was alive.

Answer: When a person goes to escape depression, where does he go? He looks for any kind of life line. He tries to get back into the world. The everyday world. But after a while, what does he have? He may be somewhat happier, but the "real world" doesn't give him the sense of really being alive in an intense way. No matter how you approach it, the physical world is missing certain factors. It's missing everything that lies beyond the boundaries laid down by the rules. It's missing all those qualities you can find in dreams.

Question: The phrase "inventing dreams." What does it mean?

Answer: Just what it says. You make up a dream. Then another one. It doesn't matter what they are. It doesn't mean "the one dream you want to fulfill all your life." Sure, throw that one into the mix. But it means plural. Dreams. Invent dreams. Write them down. Flesh them out. Not just vague general statements. Just keep making them up. Dreams. One after another.

Question: It occurs to me that no one I've ever talked to has described a dream in which he was buying and selling something.

Answer: (laughs) Yeah. That's the main thing that goes on in the world. But when people sleep, they want to do something else. There is something about the human race - they want to build and envision all sorts of complex machines. It's fascinating.

And the mind sometimes works that way, too. How complex a thought can you lug around? How intricate can you make the processes of mind? How many halls and corridors and rooms can you install in landscapes of the interior?

This gives rise to the idea that the mind itself - and everything you want to discover about it - is very complex. It has to be. You see? So the journey of discovery will be a very long one. I have no problem with that, if people want to entertain and amuse themselves that way. Great.

But I think there is short-line way of understanding. You see how the physical world works. It has space and time. And so on. You can't go from point A to B without some amount of time passing. You can't look at a clock on a table and make it disappear. You can't conjure up a rock out of nowhere and make it sit on that table. There are things you can do and can't do. That's the message of physical reality.

People who are conscious know there is something wrong with that. There's something wrong with that formulation. It isn't complete. We humans aren't just another species that fits into the overall framework of physical reality. There are groups who want us to believe that, who want us to make ourselves more stupid, who want us to imagine ourselves as just another kind of primate. But that's not so. We aren't. The trouble is, when some people get hold of this idea of the dream, they use it to remain forever adolescent. They use it to become-

Question: Glazed donut heads.

Answer: Yes. They use it to excuse themselves from having anything to do with the world. In a juvenile way. They don't really want to think. They just want to get what they want when they want it. They don't want to work. They want a gift to arrive in the mail that will change them for all time. It's pathetic.

I'm not talking about that at all. I'm talking about something much, much different. Why do we have this capacity to dream when we sleep? Why do we have this capacity to experience a different order of reality full-bore? Do we say it's just a minor diversion, like a TV show?

Or do say it's a profound clue about the nature of multiple Realities and how we've accommodated ourselves to this one type of physical reality, when in fact an infinity of other types of experience are available to us?

None of this would be a problem, if it weren't for the fact that we want and desire those wider experiences - and if we don't reach them or move toward reaching them, we become frustrated and bored and passive.

Question: By "wider experiences," you're including the capacity to make paranormal events happen.

Answer: Of course I am.

Question: You were...[there is a break in the conversation, and then Jack is off on another topic]

Answer: I once saw a man dance out a dream. It was a very interesting experience. He did it in a dance studio. There were a few of us there. This was a dream he'd had a few months earlier, which he called the most thrilling experience of his life. He was walking on clouds above a forest covered by fog, in the early morning, and birds of strange shapes and colors came up from the canopy and hovered near him.

He walked on the clouds and felt green rays shooting up through his feet, all the way up his body into his head... when he danced this out in the studio, the whole thing transformed. There was no music. His dance was obviously about him absorbing and using that energy to be able to fly.

The dance went on for close to two hours. He was trying to learn to fly, literally. And the process was an exhilarating struggle. A few days later, he told me several nagging health problems he'd been having went away. He said the whole business about being able to fly had been stuck in his craw since he was a child, and he finally realized it was causing him chronic frustration, for many years. He said it didn't matter if he never learned to fly, he was "working on it," and his body was undergoing many changes, as a result.

So, in that case, a desire or goal which everybody would say was totally impossible and crazy became the impetus for him to transform himself. He didn't automatically reject the whole idea.

He accepted it as a real desire, and he began to dance it through. He kept at it, too. He did his dance many times after that. It was alchemy in motion.

Question: That's quite unusual, to say the least. He didn't reject the desire.

Answer: He kept expanding on it. I thought it was also interesting that he was a football player...see, the point is, we all have desires which are theoretically impossible. These are kinds of desires that show up and are temporarily fulfilled in dreams. We decide to bury them. And we think it doesn't matter. But it can matter.

Question: You're talking about the tension between "the rules" of physical reality and what we want.

Answer: Right. I could also extend that to the rules of society, but let's stick to this, because I think it's far more interesting and less understood. Let's suppose you have a person who really wants to move a cigarette lighter across a table with his mind. He sits there, every day, and he tries, for an hour or two. Nothing happens. But he wants it to happen. That's tension. He can't do it.

So he starts to write about it or dance it through or whatever. He's now giving expression to a desire that runs counter to the limits of physical reality, as these limits are generally understood or accepted. He's engaging with a desire that "has no basis" in what we call ordinary life. You see? It doesn't mean he's gone crazy or he quits his job or he does drugs.

It doesn't mean he leaves his family or grows a beard two feet long or mumbles to himself. This is a straight-out expression of desire. Now, he has to find a way to express the desire. He has to work with this.

Question: In a way, this was what the Tibetans did. They had exercises for this.

Answer: Yeah. In a way.

AN EXPLOSIVE NEW INTERVIEW WITH JACK TRUE

by Jon Rappoport

February 22, 2011

from JonRappoport Website

Over the years, I've had many requests to publish further interviews with my late friend, hypnotherapist Jack True. I've assembled another interview here, from my notes.

What strikes me about all the interviews I did with Jack... he takes his time. He doesn't feel pressed to make a few points and stop. He not only has a generosity of spirit, but of language, too. It seems, these days, people want quicker and quicker messages. They have less patience. It's too bad. But I'm certainly not going to cut down things to fit the present mold. Jack deserves all the space I can give him.

In the late 1980s and early 90s, Jack and I had many conversations. He was, I believe, the most innovative hypnotist who ever walked the face of the Earth. Yet, he eventually gave up traditional hypnotism for other methods which he felt would better serve people.

The following conversation took place in the spring of 1988, just prior to publication of my first book, AIDS INC.

Jack was instrumental in that project, along several fronts. And just after the book appeared in print, in his typically mysterious way, he told me the book was on a plane, in a diplomatic pouch, to the USSR, where, he said, people "will be very interested in your findings."

The following interview (which is not about AIDS INC.) focuses on magic and the means to attain it.

QUESTION: (Rappoport): Do you think people are becoming more superficial?

Answer: (Jack True): Not only that, they're becoming cartoons of themselves. But thankfully, there are still some of us who can think.

Question: What do you mean, cartoons?

Answer: They assess their supposed strengths, and they carve themselves down to fit a desire for success. This leaves them in a strange place, like a bright penny lying in the street. For a second it looks good, but then you realize it's only a penny. This is how you get a personality shift. A person fastens on to one idea about themselves or the world, and then he sculpts himself to fit that idea. Then everything goes to hell.

Question: Because he becomes terminally bored.

Answer: Not at first, but eventually, yes. The key to all movements and groups of any kind...a person joins up, feels a thrill of newness - and then up the road realizes

dimly something is missing. (laughs) What's missing is a significant part of himself! It's fabulous joke when you think about it. A self-performed lobotomy.

Question: Done to attain success.

Answer: Broadly speaking, yes. And you're right, boredom is the outcome. But not ordinary boredom. A deep cloud of nothing. A cloud that wraps a person up in non-creativity. It's like a hypnotic state, in which the patient is sitting there, hoping for a suggestion that will change his life. But it never comes. It's quiet. Nothing happens.

Question: People have to decide what they really want.

Answer: But you see, how can they decide when they're only half themselves, when they're cut off from the bulk of what they are? It's a pickle. It's like trying to drive a very fast car with your knees, or with your eyes closed. Self cut off from self. People parading around like caricatures of what they are. It's the Disney dream come true.

Question: In the old Disney version, the fantasy is very narrow. It's a very narrow road.

Answer: Or here is my analogy. It's like a performer with no audience.

Question: Why do you say that?

Answer: You can look at this in one of two ways. You can say we are all the audience now, or you can say there is no audience. Because audiences have been trained to react like dogs. They hear certain bells, and they drool. Is that a real response? No, the point is to break through all that and come out on the other side.

Question: And that's done how?

Answer: That's a secret.

Question: What?

Answer: It's a secret. Every person who wants to has to find out for himself. There is no other way. Do you see?

Question: There is no system.

Answer: Exactly. Systems are sold to prevent breakthroughs from happening. That's why they're so popular.

Question: "Here, buy this system and you'll fail for sure."

Answer: Yeah. But the package looks nice. Isn't it great? People don't open the package because they were only buying the package and the idea that they could be a winner.

Question: Tell me what you mean by breakthrough.

Answer: You find lost parts of yourself. You stop repeating yourself over and over. You stop being so gentle about everything. You know. "Be nice and you'll get a gold star." Be nice and you'll get psychically dead. This gold-star crap is a form of behavior modification. Try this sometime. Tell people they should become spontaneous. Tell a lot of people. Watch what happens. Nothing happens. Because most people don't even have an inkling about what you mean.

Question: Why don't they?

Answer: Because they've programmed themselves to ignore that whole area. They've built a wall.

Question: They've done this consciously?

Answer: Yes. And then as time passes, they forget what they did.

Question: You've seen this with patients?

Answer: Of course. I've had patients remember what they did to themselves, as clearly as they remember walking down the street yesterday. It's quite illuminating. They see it like a map, all laid out in front of them. But that doesn't mean they're suddenly free.

Question: Why not?

Answer: Because freedom is just opportunity. You actually have to do something to make freedom real. Removing brainwashing doesn't result in a miracle. You have to eliminate the tendency to brainwash yourself again. And you do that by creating something you really desire.

Question: Desire is a tricky concept.

Answer: Sure. You get a person who makes a living picking lint off the boss's suit. Then he un-brainwashes himself, and he says, "Now I'm going to pick the lint off with my left hand rather than my right. That's my desire." You see? Some people want that level of superficiality.

I mean, that's the only level they can see.

They need wider experience. They need to live. They need all sorts of new experience, so they can find out something closer to their real desires. I've worked with patients who, even after a long time, show no evidence that they have deep

desires. It's rather astonishing. It can drive you to believe some humans are actually androids. (laughs)

Question: What do you think is going on there?

Answer: I have several answers. I'll give you one. Some people are so thirsty for control coming from outside themselves - they want to conform so badly - they'll opt for a whole slate of desires that are entirely synthetic. They sound synthetic and they look synthetic. It's a form of conformity that runs very deep in them. They basically come into this life with that thirst. Nothing will deter them.

Question: Have you learned anything from these people?

Answer: Yes. Looking for the programming that causes them to function this way is a dead end. They're inventing their own destiny as they go. They're building the conformity, brick by brick.

Question: Dead art.

Answer: Dead on arrival. They're inventing the whole charade. It made me look at the whole notion of programming from a new angle. You see, people are imagining reality and then responding to it. So I could put them in trance and then give them suggestions, but then they'd just start to imagine reality according to my guideposts. Do you see? I'd start them on a new path, but they'd be doing the same basic thing.

Question: How do you get around that?

Answer: It took me a long time to see it. You get them to invent all sorts of different realities. This isn't as easy as it sounds. But the fundamental approach is valid. How do you wake a person up? You get him to do what he does while he's asleep. You get him to sleep in many different ways. You go on and on with this, and eventually he'll realize he's asleep and he'll start to wake up.

Question: This works with everybody?

Answer: No one thing works with everybody.

Question: I know you sometimes use a technique where you have people invent many dreams.

Answer: It's one way to get a person to widen their scope. Invent a dream. A dream isn't bound by time constraints or time patterns or location or plot line. You can have a dream where you're shifting from place to place without apparent reason. It just happens.

Question: In physical reality, this doesn't happen.

Answer: And that tells you something about physical reality. It's only one form out of many possibilities. Just because it happens to be the form we live in, that doesn't mean it's the only way consciousness can operate.

Question: So we have art. An artist goes outside the background context.

Answer: And why should he want to do that? Because he's frustrated by the constraints. He glimpses or sees other possibilities and he wants to express them. We could do a lot worse than write our own books of dreams.

Question: A lot of people wouldn't be ready for that.

Answer: Well, a lot of people wouldn't be ready for a free society, either. Does that mean the rest of us shouldn't have one? What makes a person not ready is obsession. For instance, someone is fixated on having something. I mean really fixated. And in life, he can't get it. He's chaining himself inside all sorts of limitations, and yet at the same time he wants something that lies outside those self-imposed boundaries. So if he begins to invent or imagine all sorts of new possibilities for himself, he's always going to do it so he can get that thing he so desperately wants.

Question: He keeps undermining himself, because he always brings it back to that thing he keeps obsessing about.

Answer: Yeah. It isn't a pretty picture. He's in too much of a hurry. He wants a billion dollars tomorrow. That's his fixation. Or whatever it is. So when he opens up his imagination, he can't really fall in love with that process - because he always thinks if he has more imagination and creativity, maybe he'll get that billion dollars tomorrow.

So his experience is one failure after another, because he has that desire to become Midas tomorrow. It's an odd thing, but I've seen it. It's one way people can stay immature for a very long time. They don't really grow up. They're in perpetual adolescence.

Question: On a larger scale, that seems to be happening to America.

Answer: More and more people believe they can be Midas tomorrow. And more and more people believe they can have political utopia tomorrow.

Question: The utopia turns out to be some version of collectivism.

Answer: I've had a people write their own books of dreams.

Question: How does that work?

Answer: It's very simple. They just keep inventing dreams and writing them down. Do that for a year every day, and you'll see some very interesting changes in your conception of reality. But you have to remain grounded at the same time. Because you are living in this world, in this form of reality. That's the trick, to remain grounded.

Question: Almost sounds like you're talking about a contradiction.

Answer: Almost, but not quite. An analogy. Yoga. You're moving into different areas of consciousness, but you're also doing strenuous physical work. One isn't separate from the other. Or take this as an example. A person has an objective - and he can dream about it and see it fulfilled in the dream. The more this happens, over a period of time, the more power he actually has to make that desire come true in life.

His psychic power becomes stronger. But he's also working to make the desire come true. I mean real work. Get-your-hands-dirty work. Every day. The two aren't completely separate.

Question: But there is magic.

Answer: Of course there's magic! Behind every mask is a magic state of affairs. You can see it, you can feel it, but you also have to pursue it. Work and magic aren't contradictory.

Question: What about this old statement - the world is just a stage.

Answer: Physical reality is a stage set. Just one. We're slaves to that one way. And we tend to react like slaves when the door to the jail cell opens. We peek out, we take a few steps, and then we go back in. This is the joke. It's a very big joke. If only more people could laugh at it. That would be progress. But we take it all so seriously. Even the part about escaping. We're in a comedy, and we're playing the part of tragic figures. It's a bad fit.

Question: It's like a debate with argument and counter-argument. It goes on and on.

Answer: Yes, that's right. You remember Steppenwolf, the Hesse novel. Harry, the main character, is all wrapped up in his loneliness, his sense of exile. And Pablo, his guide, is brimming with good cheer and amusement. And the scene at the end, the cosmic laughter. It's real, that laughter. It's the exposure of the grand joke. You were living inside a jewel box, and you thought it was the whole universe. And then the lid comes up and you realize the truth, which you've always known, underneath all the tons of bullshit.

Question: What happens in hypnotism?

Answer: Essentially, you have an unspoken contract. The patient is saying, "I want to get out of the thing I'm in. So get me out. I'll surrender myself to you. Get me out." And the therapist is saying, "Follow my lead. Do what I say. And you'll experience a shift that feels better than you're feeling now. You'll get out for a little while. You'll feel that."

That's what happens on one level. On another level, the patient is saying, "I want to believe. Make me believe something exciting." The therapist says, "Okay, I will. I'll make you believe the rules can be broken. I'll show you they can." So he puts the patient in a trance, where the patient is relaxed and receptive, and then he says, "That ankle of yours that's sprained. It's healing right now. It's getting better."

And the patient believes what the therapist is telling him. He believes in the therapist. Strongly. And that belief puts him in a new reality where things can happen spontaneously. That belief surpasses the rules. And when the therapist brings him out of the trance, his ankle is better. The swelling is down. The pain has diminished.

Question: So why can't that breaking of the rules become the new reality all the time?

Answer: Well, it can. But not because the patient has such a strong belief in the therapist. That would be unworkable as a permanent and forever fix.

Question: But if the patient, on his own, radically changed his beliefs?

Answer: Yes. That's how magic comes about. The question is, does it happen in five seconds?

Question: You don't think it does.

Answer: I think the patient - who is not a patient anymore - needs to find a vehicle to carry him forward. Well, the vehicle doesn't do the work. The person does. But he uses a vehicle to help him.

Question: What kind of vehicle?

Answer: That question is like asking, "Is there one fingerprint we can all share?" And I would say no. Each person has to find such a vehicle for himself. It has to suit him. He might change vehicles a dozen times, as he goes. For example, for you it might be theater. You act. You write. You direct. I don't know. I'm picking something out of a hat.

Question: And how long would I do that?

Answer: Now we're going to get metaphysical. How long does it take a person to become a slave? How long until his own slavery, as real as it is, becomes entirely invisible to him? How long does it take for him to fully accept the rules of physical reality - this stage play we're in? This is where we have to depart from the culture we're living in. We have to talk about many lives, living many lives, reincarnation, and so forth.

Question: You're saying it takes many lives to sink all the way down into the stage play we call reality, with no consciousness that there is something else - and therefore, it could take many lives to get out of it. To get to magic on a permanent basis.

Answer: Yeah. I know people don't like to hear that. They want the glimpse of magic, the moment of magic they had on Tuesday to become permanent right now. They want that dream to take hold now and never leave. They want to levitate tonight and be able to levitate and hover and fly forever after that.

So I say, sure, okay, why not? Are you ready to stop believing in the rules of the stage play altogether? Are you ready to move beyond that now? And are you also ready to be able to leave the stage play and come back to it whenever you want to - because, since you're here in this stage play, it appears you have some attachment to it. It appears on some level that you want it.

I'm not imposing limitations on anybody. I'm just reporting on the situation as I see it. What's magic? Levitation, bi-location, invisibility, instantaneous shifting from one place to another, seeing the future, telepathy, changing shape, time travel, telekinesis...is that what magic is? Spontaneously projecting a thought and turning it into a reality in front of you and everybody else? This is what we all think magic is? Right? Okay, I agree. These are magical things.

So how long does it take for a slave to get there, to leave this old reality behind? And then to come back and be here and live inside this stage play? Exit and enter? Anytime he wants to? Isn't this what we mean by magic? So I'm saying magic is invention of new realities relative to this monolithic one. And you get there by inventing all sorts of new realities, on and on.

You keep doing that, regardless of what you may feel. You keep on. And for that, you need a vehicle. And you keep on inventing realities that are close to what you

desire. That's what you do. You need a vehicle to do that. Maybe a better way of saying it is, you need a medium by which to express those new realities. Do you see?

Question: The traditional culture supposes that a person has to remove or de-condition limiting beliefs in order to make progress.

Answer: Yes, I know that. I know all about it.

Question: And?

Answer: And I haven't found that to be true. First of all, many people get all wound up and tied up and encased in the method, whatever it is, of getting rid of limiting beliefs. They get snarled up in that. It becomes a habit. A crutch. And second, how do you really get rid of a limitation? You put a cow in a corral with a fence, and you leave him there for two years.

That's limiting, wouldn't you say?

Now you open the door. Is he supposed to stand there and think about how and why he's become used to being inside the corral? Or is he supposed to walk out into the open field? He has to walk out. So it's the same with this reality. But there is one big difference. We don't see the open field. All we see is this reality. So we don't just walk out of the corral. We wouldn't know how or where to go. Instead, we invent different and new realities.

Is that a little clearer now? We become inventors of new realities. And in doing that, we gain new power. And somewhere up the line, that power translates into magic. We can do magic.

Question: So, to invent different realities, you need a vehicle, a medium like paint or words. You don't just sit there and ruminate.

Answer: Right. I knew a person who made maps of lands and countries that don't exist. Hundreds of maps. An architect. After working with him for a while, I told him it was time for him to invent new realities by the ton. And he didn't know how. I said to him, "You're an architect! Make models. Make cities." And he went off and thought about it and decided to create maps. From what I hear, he's still going strong.

Question: By inventing realities, you eventually get to magic.

Answer: It isn't hocus-pocus.

Question: People wish it was.

Answer: Yeah. I know. (laughs) Sorry to disappoint them.

Note: Some of the ideas in this interview came from Jack, and some came from him by way of me. Jack and I talked a great deal in the old days. A large amount of cross-fertilization occurred. I carry on this work today.

## The Jack True Interview - Part 1

by Jon Rappoport

April 27, 2009

from RealTalkWorld Website

I met Jack True in 1987 while I was working on my first book, AIDS INC. A mutual friend introduced us one afternoon at the UCLA Biomedical Library, where I was combing through medical journals.

Jack seemed to know a great deal about medical-research fraud. He pointed me to studies in the stacks, and then we sat down and had a long talk about animal research, and I learned more than I wanted to know about the cruelty of that industry.

I discovered that Jack was a Hypnotherapist. I had always been interested in hypnosis. He suggested we meet again and talk about his research. This led to many dinners at a Chinese restaurant in Santa Monica, California.

A few days after AIDS INC. was published, Jack casually told me a copy of the book was in a diplomatic pouch heading to Moscow. I tried to press him, but he refused to give me details, except to say people in Russia would certainly be interested in my conclusions about the inaccuracy of the viral studies that had been carried out at the US National Institutes of Health.

As I discovered over the next five years of conversations, Jack had been approached by "government contractors," who were interested in his work on the cutting edge of human potential. Jack consistently turned down their offers.

After his untimely death in the mid-1990s, I went through my notes and tapes of our conversations. What emerged were the astounding findings of a unique mind.

Spread out in front of me, in these notes, were wide-ranging and daring explorations of a researcher who was determined to extend the possibilities of human capacity.

Jack and I shared many ideas we had independently arrived (at), from different routes. Painting had unlocked many doors for me. Jack had ventured into creative areas that went far beyond the traditional notion of hypnosis as a method for planting suggestions.

I'm happy to present, here, a compilation and re-editing of several of our interviews. I think you'll find, as you read Jack's remarks, that there IS something new under the sun. Jack had great disdain for limits, and he wasn't just pushing the envelope. He was pushing the envelope and the letter and the whole Post Office. He was a rare combination of researcher, artist, and rebel.

I call him the Spy in the House of Infinity.

Question: Why hypnosis?

Answer: At first, it was a fascination with the idea of changing beliefs. I could put a patient in a trance and make suggestions, and these suggestions would appear to alter the patient's inhibiting convictions.

Question: Why do you say "appear"?

Answer: Well, that's the point. It's a dead end. The patient keeps kicking out the new beliefs and retreating back to familiar territory.

Question: Give an example of a suggestion.

Answer: "You're happy." "You're satisfied with your life." "Your leg feels better." "You can run faster." "Your arm is healed."

Question: Seems pretty simple.

Answer: The immediate results can be tremendous. But, in most cases, they faded. The patient slips back.

Question: Given that this was what you were doing with patients, you must have become discouraged.

Answer: I wanted to go farther, understand more. I began looking for a system. I wanted a protocol that would do an end-run around the patient's tendency to fall back on old habits.

Question: A system.

Answer: You know, a better mechanism. A smarter approach. I wanted tricks. But that didn't work, either. It seemed as if something in the patient was much smarter than what I could devise.

Question: Smarter in what sense?

Answer: In remaining essentially passive.

Question: But if a patient were truly passive, wouldn't he then accept all your hypnotic suggestions and become different?

Answer: No. The kind of passivity I'm talking about is "staying the same." I found deeper levels, shall we say, where people want to stay the same. And when you look at what that is, you see it's an acceptance of a lowest common denominator of what they already are. It's like a person who drives his car a few miles to a lake, he's got his bathing suit on, he gets out of the car, he goes over to the lake, he sits down, and he stays there. He's in his bathing suit with a towel next to him, but he never goes in the water.

Question: What would happen if he did go in the water?

Answer: He'd feel something new. He'd have a new experience that would change his whole outlook on his future. It would be revolutionary for him.

Question: But that's why he went to the lake.

Answer: We don't know that. That's not definite. While he sits at the edge of the lake, he starts thinking about all sorts of things. And that rumination becomes the substitute for actually jumping in the lake. When he finally gets up and goes back to his car and drives home, he decides the rumination was why he really went to the lake.

The rumination was enough. He rationalizes the whole trip and turns it into something acceptable. I have no problem with that. We all do it. But after he goes to the lake a few hundred times and never jumps into the water, he develops a kind of crust. He's shielded against a breakthrough.

But think about this: Why is it that human beings can be hypnotized at all? I mean it's not inevitable in the scheme of things.

Question: So what's the answer?

Answer: Most people want to give up their will to another person. They want that experience. They're waiting for it, so to speak. It's part of what they think of as life - like going to the movies or running on the beach or flying in an airplane.

Question: They want to surrender.

Answer: Not always, but yes.

Question: And this is because?

Answer: They think something good is going to happen.

Question: They think they'll find out some secret?

Answer: It's a very fundamental idea.

Question: Explain.

Answer: You search through the jungle for the lost fountain of youth, and you hack away overgrowth and you endure bugs and snakes and all sorts of unpleasantness - trying your best to exert your own will power toward that fabled goal - and then what? Then, when you finally find the fountain, you surrender to it. You drink and bathe in the water and you let it do its work on you.

Question: And that's like being hypnotized?

Answer: You're looking for something to override your normal will power, your normal processes, your normal drive to go get what you want. People want Ultimate Experiences or Illuminations, and they believe these revelations will come as a result of their surrendering the whole shooting match to something else. Rather than treating this human tendency as perfectly normal and natural, I treated it as a kind of marvel to be examined and rolled around and examined from all sides.

Take the example of an amusement park. You see people throwing baseballs at lead bowling pins to win a stuffed bear, but the most popular events are the rides like the giant roller coaster - because they take you over at some point, they make you surrender your "normal" state of mind to a "revelation" - that of being thrown into, forced into, another reality, a so-called special reality where your normal perception is shoved into the background.

In the early days, when I was learning about how to hypnotize people, I found that I was very good at it, because I was utterly convinced that people wanted to be put in a trance. They were lining up to surrender their will power. I knew that in my bones. And so I instinctively found a way to give them exactly what they wanted.

I never felt I was breaking some internal rule they were living by. The deeper rule was: Do me; hypnotize me; take away my will.

Question: It was a kind of pleasure for them.

Answer: To be taken over.

Question: "Let the sound of the ocean roll over me, and let the sun beat down on me." What's wrong with that?

Answer: Well, in my early days, I didn't think there was anything wrong with it. I was just cooperating with what I considered was the Deeper Law.

Question: How far did you take that?

Answer: In some cases, all the way. If a person wanted a new outlook on life, an outlook that he thought was better than anything he could manufacture himself, I was there to give it to him. That was my job. To turn things inside out and install a better, more positive theme to his life.

Question: And you were okay with that?

Answer: For a time. I refused to think there was anything better. For example, I was treating a kleptomaniac, a woman who couldn't stop stealing. She told me she had tried everything to stop, but nothing worked. So I dove in and tried to give her a new outlook, an outlook that didn't require her to steal. I tried to give her a better state of mind in wholesale form, by making suggestions over a long period of time while she was under, while she was in a trance.

Question: How did that work out?

Answer: She loved the short periods when she was under, when she let go of her own will power. It was like a vacation for her. But eventually the whole thing collapsed of its own weight and she was back to square one.

Question: What did you conclude about why your effort collapsed?

Answer: First, I assumed that I hadn't done the actual hypnosis well enough. That was silly. I had done it well. Then I decided that I had failed because I hadn't ATTACHED this new outlook I was "installing" to some key part of her personality. The "imported new personality" had no foundation; it just floated in the sea of her mind like an island, and eventually it was overwhelmed by her stronger impulses. I assumed my attempt at mind control wasn't reaching deep enough roots in her. That's when I went back and re-studied all the information on CIA mind control.

Question: From a new perspective.

Answer: Yes. Because I had to admit I was doing mind control, pure and simple. I had to admit that.

Question: It didn't make you happy.

Answer: Not at all.

Question: So what did you see when you reviewed the CIA data again?

Answer: The obvious, I guess. They were working from duress. They were attaching their suggestions to their "patients" by forcing them to surrender their own personalities, at which point they tried, in a sense, to install new personalities.

Question: Talk more about the whole idea that a person wants to surrender his will in order to find some Ultimate Thing.

Answer: The sense that a person wants to surrender his will at all - where does that come from? It comes from past experiences where he taught himself - or others taught him - that will power is frustrating and doesn't get you where you want to go in life. So he looks for another way out and he selects THE SURRENDER OF THE WILL. There are many places in the culture he finds that teaching.

Question: How did you feel when you came to this conclusion?

Answer: First depressed, then elated.

Question: Why elated?

Answer: Because it became apparent to me that a person could, on his own, without the mind control factor, INVENT his own outlook on life and thereby reach his goals. And hypnotism, if it were going to do any good at all, would have to somehow participate in that journey.

Question: When you say "invent his own outlook" -

Answer: I don't mean blot out the past and become a smiling robot with a Plan. I don't mean some horribly grotesque smiling mask of "positive thinking." I mean something much richer and fuller.

Question: How can hypnotism assist a person in this work, if hypnotism is all about getting a person to surrender his will and accept suggestions from the therapist?

Answer: That was the question. I was elated because it was a very stark question, and it framed my future work. Things may not have been solved for me, but they were suddenly clear, for the first time. My job was to take a "science" that was really all about surrender and use it for the opposite purpose. My job was to make hypnotism into a thing that could make the will more powerful. My job was to help people create at a deeper level for themselves. On the surface, it seemed like this task would be impossible. But that was just fine with me. I've always enjoyed paradox. I felt at home with paradox. Give me a saw and tell me I have to find a way to paint pictures with it, and I'm happy.

Speaking of which, you paint, so let's use that. Let's say you really want to do a huge painting, a fresco that spans a whole wall. That's your major idea. So how do you get there? You may, while you're asleep, dream of some of the images, but you're going to have to get on the ladder and PAINT. And keep painting until you say, that's it, and then you stop.

If you keep on creating long enough, creating in the direction of what is most important for you, you'll also learn about CREATION ITSELF. See? Creating is will power that has found its home. That's where will power really wants to be. CREATING. The more you create, the more you're moving into it, you're immersed in it, and you're becoming more satisfied.

Question: "Only the gods really create."

Answer: Yeah. That's a major piece of mind control.

Question: And if we go the other way? If we just keep creating?

Answer: We become what we really are. I worked out ways to use hypnosis to stimulate the creative urge in people. As a kick start.

Imagine a fictional ant colony. On the lowest level, the ants just follow their orders, so to speak. They do exactly what is expected of them and nothing more. No deviation. Now, a few of the ants graduate from there to realizing that following orders has the flavor of, let's call it, doing the right thing.

They're following orders, but they also realize they're doing the right thing. Then, out of that small group, a few ants begin to see that they're creating. They're creating their own actions - and at that point, they veer off. They don't follow orders anymore. They think about what they really want to create. And then THAT'S what they create. And they feel they're on a whole new level. And they are.

Question: At which point, the whole ant colony could begin to disintegrate.

Answer: Don't blame me.

Question: But you think this disintegration is a good thing.

Answer: Disintegration of a perfect system that makes more and more obedient ants? Yes.

Question: On a political level -

Answer: I'm talking about healthy disintegration, which is really decentralization of power.

Question: Many people would say we all need to act in concert to preserve civilization.

Answer: Concert is not necessarily the same thing as obedience. But let's not split hairs. If you want to be an ant, go right ahead. You'll always have a place. As long as you surrender your own will long enough.

Question: As times get tougher, more people look for a way to become ants.

Answer: Yes they do. And this is what they call "preservation of civilization." The whole question is, what do you mean by CIVILIZATION? Do you mean a billion people acting on orders from an elite? Ants always drift toward the absolute Collective.

Question: Are you taking a cruel position here?

Answer: Not at all. Cruel is getting people to surrender their will to create. Cruel is getting people to think they must create in the mode of the All.

Question: What's the All?

Answer: The fiction that we are really constrained to making our little part of the anthill and that's it. And the fiction that there is a wider purpose and entity behind this, and it's running the whole show, and we have to surrender to THAT.

Question: And what is the opposite?

Answer: What each person can find by flying over the anthill.

Question: That's a whole different picture of what society would become.

Answer: Yeah.

Question: In this picture, what is the glue that holds things together?

Answer: The glue is what we always said it was. You can't use your freedom to curtail the freedom of another. We always said that, but we didn't really mean it.

Question: Suppose a person wants to create something shallow and stupid.

Answer: Then by creating it and getting it he stands a chance of discovering it's shallow and stupid, whereas if he just hopes for it and wishes for it and whines about it, he has NO chance of finding out it's shallow and stupid.

Question: Suppose he creates it and finds out it's stupid. What does he do then?

Answer: Figures out something else he wants. And then creates whatever he has to create to get that.

Question: And if THAT turns out to be shallow and stupid?

Answer: Repeat step A and B over and over until he decides he's creating something that isn't stupid.

Question: And in this process he finds out something about creation itself.

Answer: That's the bonus. And the bonus becomes the main event, eventually.

Question: How so?

Answer: You take a special horse that is very dumb. And you think, this horse is so dumb I have to lock him in the stall and leave him there, because he doesn't know what to do with himself. Will that work? Of course not. So instead, you let the horse out of the stall. The dumb horse is now free to create. So the first thing he does is, he eats 12 bales of hay. He vomits it up. Then he eats 12 more bales and pukes again. Then he walks around in a circle for three weeks and falls down. Then he walks in a straight line toward the horizon because he thinks that's where he wants to go. But he gets tired and lies down and goes to sleep. You see? He keeps creating dumb things. But finally, after three years, he decides to try running. And discovers he loves to run. THIS is really what he wants. He's not dumb anymore. So he runs and runs, and in the process he realizes that he's CREATING. And a light bulb goes on in his head. Now he is doing more than running. He is somehow more than he was. And eventually, by this process he learns to fly, and you've got Pegasus. (laughs)

Question: Okay. Suppose the first time you let this dumb horse out of the stall you force him to run. Won't he get where he wants to be faster?

Answer: He might. But chances are he's too dumb at that point to realize that running is what he wants. So he keeps stopping. He didn't go through the process himself.

Question: Do you think there is a limit on what a person can create?

Answer: No.

Question: He can create gold bars out of thin air?

Answer: Yes.

Question: You really mean that?

Answer: Yes.

Question: How does a person create gold bars out of thin air?

Answer: I'll tell you this. He doesn't do it the first time he's let out of the stall. It might take a million incarnations. Depends on who he is.

Question: What about a person who creates crime, murder?

Answer: The principle of freedom applies. You are free to create anything that doesn't curtail the freedom of another person. If a person commits murder, you lock him up or you execute him.

Question: If a person knowingly creates 50,000 tons of toxic chemicals as the head of a huge corporation that he has built?

Answer: You lock him up. And you make him pay for the cleanup. I say lock him up for a long time.

Question: But then you are limiting his ability to create.

Answer: I sure as hell hope so.

Question: Do you believe a person can create his way out of the space-time continuum? If he wants to?

Answer: Of course.

Question: What gave you the idea that individual creativity has such great potential power?

Answer: Many, many clues. For example, in my own practice, I saw patients who were able to do extraordinary things, if only briefly. A patient moved an object on a table without touching it. Another patient blew out a light bulb in my office. By "looking at it." He did this twice. These are the very little things. There are other events and experiences. But it doesn't matter what I've seen. It only matters what other people believe and do.

When I put someone in a light trance, what I'm dealing with is a person who, for the moment, is free from a whole host of suggestions that otherwise would be guiding his opinions and perceptions. It's an interesting moment. What should I do? Just give him more suggestions? He already has too many of those in his waking life.

I have that person create reality. I have him invent a dream or construct a scene, any scene. Something. Anything.

Question: But that would seem to be the opposite of discovering what reality is.

Answer: IS? Creating reality is putting your foot on the road to discovering what reality CAN BE. The situation is very fluid, my friend. Reality is malleable. That is what I learned from my patients. Reality isn't just one thing, like a present you unwrap.

Question: That's like saying you have to tell lies to arrive at the truth.

Answer: You're a little off base there. But I'll go along with it. In which case, the whole point is these are YOUR lies. You fumble around and create lies or whatever you want to call them. And in the process you arrive at the truth, somewhere down the line.

I'll give you a patient summary. Man of about 35 comes into my office and tells me he's bothered by his marriage. Things are not working out. He wants to find the right formula, but he can't. No matter what he does, he feels a lack. He feels he's screwing it up. He tries to do all the right things, but nothing good comes out of it. He just gets himself into more hot water.

Question: He's confused.

Answer: And this is good, because otherwise he never would be making the effort to make things come out right. So I put him into a light trance. I then get him to INVENT scenes and dreams. All sorts of scenes.

Question: And this helps him how?

Answer: He begins to expand his own ideas about what reality can be. And once he does that, he begins to get a kind of feedback from his own inventions. He tends to drop his fixation on fixing his own marriage. You see, "his own marriage" is a more or less a fixed "non-idea" that traps him into thinking that he is tinkering with one thing that needs the right part inserted - like a car that won't run.

Question: Whereas?

Answer: His current marriage is a lowest common denominator that he derives from vague images. He is laboring under the delusion that his current marriage is one very real thing, like an object inside a vacuum jar.

Question: But it isn't.

Answer: Correct. It's a congealed derivation. For, example, we look at a table and think it's one thing that has a set number of uses. But then an artist comes along and takes that table and paints it and cuts it up and re-glues it and it's something else entirely.

When I had this patient invent all sorts of scenes and dreams, he began to see that his marriage was just one outcome of his own sense of reality. He was living inside a trap. The trap didn't need tinkering. It needed something else introduced from the outside. And "the outside" is his own imagination.

Question: So, suppose his marriage was suffering because he was insisting that his wife should do x,y,z when she didn't want to.

Answer: And suppose I then say, "Look, all you have to do is stop insisting she do x,y,z."

Question: And he follows your advice.

Answer: And then something else will crop up. Some other problem. Forever, over and over. Because he is living inside a trap. A trap he made. But he doesn't see this.

And even if he and I completely dismantle that marriage into "parts" and I make him examine each one, that process isn't going to fix it. It's like a physicist who is trying to gain a new understanding of life itself. He keeps breaking down particles into smaller and smaller particles. And nothing happens. Because he's in the wrong pew to begin with.

Well, that's the way it works with reality itself. Reality is not one thing like a car. Reality, the ordinary boring repetitious version, is WHAT WE ARE LEFT WITH WHEN WE STOP CREATING REALITIES. And how do you fix THAT problem? By tinkering with the sludge you're left with? No.

Question: How does this connect to the whole subject of the master-slave relationship?

Answer: A slave has one reality, which is formed by his abandonment of the process of creating realities.

Question: Therefore, anything that will make him stop creating realities functions as a way of making him a slave.

Answer: Yes, that's right.

Question: And you came to this in your work?

Answer: I sure as hell did. You see, one of the basic problems is the drive for perfection.

Nothing is perfect. To want perfection is to want that leftover sludge called reality. You fuss with that sludge and you try to even out the corners and paint it pink and fix the edges and so forth. But you lose. Because you can't get perfection out of something that is a residue to begin with. I've had many patients who wanted to change their lives by fixing a losing proposition - a bad house that was sinking in its foundations, so to speak, and the person wanted to replace shingles on the roof and bring in a new carpet.

Question: Where does that drive for perfection come from in the first place?

Answer: It comes from the sense that the reality you are dealing with is the only one that exists, and therefore you must make it as obsessively good as you possibly can. That perfectionism is based on a basic insecurity, because, deep down, the person knows that he is working with a lie. One and only one reality is a lie. A reality that is GIVEN is a lie. Realities are created.

Question: Even in terms of the cosmos itself -

Answer: We are working with a lie. There are an infinite number of possible cosmoses. Let's say I have a patient who can respond to the idea of creating a brand new cosmos. He can do that. He does do that.

Question: In his mind.

Answer: Right. And over the course of a year or two, he creates five thousand more. What'll happen? He'll begin to get a whole new sense of what is possible. I did have just such a patient. He had come to me because of a personal crisis in faith. After we finished, he no longer felt he needed to "fix" his current metaphysical belief system. He saw that as a foolish enterprise. He graduated from being a tinkerer to being a full-blooded adventurer. In the process, he became quite a good remote viewer. That was just a byproduct. We weren't aiming for that.

Interview With A Hypnotherapist

by Jon Rappoport

April 16, 2009

from RealTalkWorld Website

Note: The following article/interview was written by Jon Rappoport for his teleseminar: Techniques for Stress Reduction. I think Jon's interview with the late Hypnotherapist, Jack True is compatible with our discussion.

This piece is about the GRAND ILLUSION.

It has to do with the conviction that impending events are forming a pattern that has some climax, some revelation, some grand finale.

In the late 1990s, we saw this conviction at work in a huge way. Millions of people were swept up in the coming Y2K disaster. Radio shows spent hours on it. And Y2K wasn't the only element.

In general, many perceived that the turn of the century was a magnetic force, drawing to it all sorts of happenings that would crack the egg of normal reality. Once and for all.

Not because anyone here on Earth was DOING something, but because events were forming up by themselves, under the direction of unseen causes.

There was the specter of earth changes, earthquakes on a new scale, and a collapse of infrastructure. Radio hosts wove together every strange occurrence to create an expectation.

Of course, as we know, the end of every century has seen such machinations.

Here is a brief interview with the late Jack True, who was, in my opinion, the most innovative Hypnotherapist on the planet. The approximate date of this conversation was June 1991.

Question: What do you make of the constant idea that "there is something in the air, something afoot"?

Answer: It stimulates people, which isn't a bad thing. But it also gets people to think that every good or bad thing, on a grand scale, is a Force to which they should hitch their wagons. It's a human attempt to FIND ENERGY SOMEWHERE.

Question: Find energy?

Answer: Yes. People are walled off from the sense that they can create energy, so they look for big amounts of it wherever it might be, and then they try to swim with it.

Question: And when that doesn't lead anywhere?

Answer: Depression sets in.

Question: Well, on a political level, the same thing happens every four years.

Answer: I know. The same desire to be part of the big force that is sweeping the nation, to support one candidate, to catch the wave.

Question: So this is a habit.

Answer: Right.

Question: And what is the antidote to it?

Answer: At the risk of sounding trite, creating your own energy.

Question: And how does one do that?

Answer: That's like asking how you use your fingers to grip an object. If you've forgotten, you have to remember or re-learn the skill. This is the hardest thing for people to understand.

Question: Yet, in your work with patients, you have them do all sorts of techniques to re-learn that ability.

Answer: There is no contradiction there. Except, I'm not making myself the source of their ability. I'm trying to empower them so they act on their own.

Question: When you have people literally invent dreams - what is happening there?

Answer: Dreams are often happening on a somewhat larger scale than daily life. So when people invent their dreams consciously, they are creating larger energies. They get familiar with that.

Question: And after they do it, what happens when they go back to their lives, where those energies don't usually play a part?

Answer: People feel a contradiction. I encourage that. It's the first step to making a change. Why would you change your life, unless you felt you had much more to give than your life was able to absorb?

Question: And this works out for your patients?

Answer: Not always, but sometimes. The analogy I would offer goes like this: you discover that you can sing. But you are working as an accountant. So do you change course, or do you fall back on the tried and true? No one can make that decision for you.

Question: How about this analogy? You find out you can make a cup slide off a table with your mind. Now you have to figure out a way to integrate that ability in your life.

Answer: Yes. That would be the same sort of thing.

Question: There is a reflex that makes people think every large accomplishment they achieve has a hidden cause, that it "comes from somewhere else." Not from them.

Answer: I could analyze that reflex for a long time. But to boil it down, I would say the individual Self, in this day and age, does not usually perceive its own size and

scope. Therefore Self thinks things are coming from somewhere else, when they are actually coming from an uncharted or forgotten area of Self.

Question: That's an exciting idea.

Answer: It also happens to be a true idea. So then, should one simply wake up part way and accept these marvelous moments as "subconsciously derived," or should one also explore the forgotten areas of Self? I choose the latter road. I'm an advocate of individual power. I don't think one has to be afraid of it. I think one has to find out about it.

Question: And what about the people who use their power to do bad things?

Answer: That's just the way it is. Every power can be turned north or south. Which is the justification often used to try to limit the power of everyone - -to put that power under a ceiling - a ceiling built by those few who think they know what's best.

Question: Reminds me of the "Hitler syndrome."

Answer: Yes. Unfettered power is equated with Hitler, as if we would all become Hitlers if we were left to our own devices. A lie. And in a way, Hitler was created as a prelude to all this NWO (New World Order) stuff, which is based on the idea that power is bad and must be reserved for the elite, who know how to handle it.

Question: The population is given these object lessons.

Answer: Yes. Every villain is portrayed as someone whose real crime was tapping into too much power - and therefore, we have to reduce everyone down to weakness. "For the good of all."

Question: So these waves of feeling that "something incredible is in the air, something incredible is afoot" -

Answer: It is a way to make people feel their best bet to have power is to give it away to unseen forces and then to connect, as slaves, to those forces.

Return to Consciousness and The Conscious Universe

Return to The Psychic Universe