


Wake Up to the Illusion

Most of us assume that our vote holds government accountable; that our elected officials work for our best interests; that the newspapers and magazines we buy, or the radio and television newscasts we watch, are careful to give us the truth as honestly and objectively as possible. Do they? Are you ready to see the truth behind the illusions?

In the movie, *Arlington Road*, Jeff Bridges plays a university professor, Michael Faraday, who is trying to wake up his students to media manipulation about terrorism. When he questions the handling of an act of terrorism similar to the Oklahoma bombing in the US, a student responds: "C'mon, professor.

I mean the Feds they did this huge investigation." Faraday responds, "Oh, that's right. An investigation, I forgot. Well the investigation didn't satisfy me. Miss O'Neal, when you first heard the news—a terrorist attack in your own country, how did that make you feel?" She hesitates so he prompts, "C'mon! What did you feel?" She responds, "Angry. ... Scared. ... Stressed." Faraday replies, "Did you feel safe?" Miss O'Neal answers, "No."

Faraday presses further, "And then the next day, when they found Scobie [the accused] dead, did you feel some relief? Did safety return?" The student nods in agreement. The professor sums up, "We don't want others. We want one name and we want it fast. It gives us our security back. ... we feel safe. Because we know his name."¹



Do you recognize this pattern with acts of terrorism? Media reports lead us to believe that the government has done a "huge investigation." The guilty party is quickly identified. We feel safer.

For example, possibly the most protected airspace in the world could not stop the planes that crashed into the two World Trade towers in New York on September 11, 2001. The government was, however, able to produce a list of those who died flying the planes within hours of the tragedy. And within hours, the leader who masterminded the event was also named. Having identified the guilty party, government leaders promised to hunt and capture the leader.

Despite interviews with credible on-site witnesses, engineering experts, seasoned pilots, air-traffic control experts and high-ranking military officers featured in numerous documentaries, books, and websites questioning the official version of events on that fateful day in the US, mainstream media has not questioned the US government's official version of how the World Trade Towers were demolished with the deaths of 2,801 people on September 11, 2001. Do you feel safer?

Is that what you want from life—to feel safe? In our quest to feel safe, we shout for government to save us—to make laws in an effort to control others. The result is loss of freedoms for everyone.

Ensuring individual freedom—the purpose of government?

Each of us should have freedom to the extent our beliefs and acts do not limit that of another. Let's look at an issue that is highly sensitive and evokes an emotional response with many of us—pornography on the Internet. (*Editor's note: We assure you we are not advocating*

Sources that Question the Official 9/11 Story

"ZERO, An Investigation into 9/11,"
A documentary produced in Europe.

[Watch Video](#)

"9/11: Explosive Evidence - Experts Speak Out"
A documentary produced by Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth.

[Watch Video](#)

Testimonies of politicians, military personnel, CIA officers, university professors, and others.

[Go To Website](#)

The Top 40 Reasons to doubt the Official Story about 9/11.

[Go To Website](#)

Former FEMA videographer, Kurt Sonnenfeld in exile in Argentina, reveals "disturbing" on-site information about 9/11.

[Go to Website](#)

Several books and documentaries are offered by Reality Zone.

[Go to Website](#)

pornography.) To feel safe, many are crying out to government, "Save our children. Regulate the Internet." If we want freedom, however, we must give freedom to others—that includes adults who want to make and view pornography. We are, of course, referring to adult pornography. Pornography involving children is a criminal offence—as it should be.

So what is the answer without limiting others freedoms? If we clamor for government to regulate the Internet on one topic, where does it end? Do you want your ability to gain information about other topics such as natural health therapies restricted as well? What can be done to restrict children's access to pornography without limiting the freedom of others? Parents are responsible for their children—not the government. When there is a need, the marketplace provides the service. There are products on the market that enable parents to limit a child's access to the Internet. We believe our creativity as human beings ensures there is always a solution for every problem—a solution that ensures individual freedom rather than government control and suppression of freedoms.

The government has already started the process to suppress freedom on the Internet. The FDA (Food and Drug Administration) and the FTC (Federal Trade Commission) in the United States have received gobs of money from government to police the Internet. They do this to "protect the public" and make you feel safe that health information on the Internet meets their standards. Do their standards protect or suppress our freedoms? Are their standards meant to uphold truth? At present, the Internet is the only world-wide communication system that allows us to get information freely. The Internet gives each of us the freedom to decide what is truth. Are you willing to allow your government, or should we say individuals in government, to decide what you should have access to on the Internet?

Our government plays a role in perpetuating our need to feel safe.

The illusion is that those who run our governments—both elected representatives and paid bureaucrats—are there to protect us, protect the country, and have only our best interest at heart. Do they? What is the truth?

Have you ever heard of the FDA or Health Canada conducting a raid on a pharmaceutical company? We haven't. Have you ever heard of the FDA or Health Canada raiding safe holistic

Television Host Speaks Up

With governments increasingly invading our lives, Rick Mercer, a popular CBC television host in Canada stands up to be counted. In response to the Canadian government's Bill to give regulators surveillance powers over the Internet and our emails, Rick sent a message on behalf of the Canadian people.

[Watch Video](#)

health practitioners and natural health companies? We have. Pioneering and maverick medical doctors in the US, such as Stanley Burzynski and Jonathan Wright have been raided. Companies such as one marketing stevia—a sweetener that has health-giving properties—have been raided. These are only a few examples. What are government regulators protecting us from? Whose truth are they upholding?

The company manufacturing aspartame received FDA approval for its use as an artificial sweetener despite concerns over its safety—concerns about brain tumor development in animals, seizures, headaches and an adverse effect on the developing brain. Was it merely neglect: that the FDA approved aspartame based solely on studies conducted by the manufacturer ... that the public has not been informed by the FDA that aspartame dangerously alters the chemistry of the brain?² Is the FDA protecting us? Are these regulations in our best interests?

Several years ago, the Canadian government appointed an Advisory Committee on Health to find out how the people of Canada wanted to regulate Natural Health Products. The Advisory Committee, composed of a group of elected representatives from across the country, conducted hearings in key cities. Was it merely neglect that:

- 1) Citizen groups interested in the health freedom issue were not notified of the hearings?
- 2) Members of the Advisory Committee ignored presentations by citizen groups that had found out about the hearings and didn't have a special invitation? [We attended the meeting in Vancouver BC and witnessed the behavior of committee members.]
- 3) The speakers who supported excessive regulations got the undivided attention of the committee members and those advocating health freedoms were ignored as the members doodled and chatted among themselves?
- 4) The final report by the Advisory Committee rubber-stamped the excessive regulations proposed by government bureaucrats even though the majority of presentations heard by the committee questioned the need for the regulations and supported health freedoms?

Governments form committees to give the impression that they are gathering information and listening to the public. Often they are not. With the Canadian Advisory Committee on health, it was obvious that they already knew what outcome they wanted. They only listened to those who spoke in favor of their desired outcome, ignoring the majority who were in favor of less regulation for natural health products.

***Are these committees about truth?
Do our elected officials represent us?***

All governments in developed countries are simultaneously implementing a program to excessively regulate Natural Health Products. Is it merely neglect that:

- 1) All these governments ignore that vitamin and mineral supplements have been safely used for decades and herbal products have been used safely for thousands of years ... without regulation?
- 2) These regulations are wiping out small companies?
- 3) These regulations are paving the way for the large multi-national corporations to gain control of Natural Health Products?

***Who is directing our governments to regulate natural products?
Are these regulations in our best interests?***

In order to help us feel safe, governments create the illusion that what they do is about truth and is in our best interests. In our need to feel safe, we risk losing our freedom. Are you willing to allow the government, or should we say individuals in government, to decide what is truth? Is feeling safe more important than freedom? Is the need to trust more important than truth? Are you ready to see the truth behind the illusion?

The media plays a role in perpetuating our need to feel safe.

We trust the media to ask the right questions and keep governments honest. The illusion is that we can trust the media to investigate and give us the truth. Can we? What is the truth?

The *Fifth Estate*, a Canadian television program, painted Dr. Stanley Burzynsky, a medical doctor using a different approach to cancer, as a quack that preyed on cancer patients. The show aired at the same time the FDA was pursuing a series of court cases to close down his clinic.⁴ Was it merely neglect that:

- 1) The intent of the program was not to investigate but to discredit?
- 2) They did not interview anyone who had been helped with Dr. Burzynsky's protocol?

Dr. Burzynski's Struggle

*Dr. Stanislaw Burzynski, MD, PhD, has endured years of harassment from medical authorities and government regulators. A movie, *Cancer is Serious Business*, documents a spell-binding account of the intrigue he has been dealing with for several decades. The United States government has relentlessly tried to stop him from treating cancer patients with a medicine he developed in the 1970s. This movie takes you through the treacherous, and to-date victorious, journey both Dr. Burzynski and his patients have endured as they attempt to obtain FDA-approved clinical trials for his medicine called Antineoplastons.*

Perhaps the most shocking part of the movie reveals the motivation behind United States government actions. His fight continues.

[Watch Video](#)

3) No television network reported that Dr. Burzynsky weathered two lengthy trials and was fully vindicated and cleared of all the FDA charges?

Could it be that the media is more interested in spreading government propaganda than investigating for truth?

Current Affair, a television news program in Australia painted a picture of a company, selling units based on a health protocol, as shysters who preyed on the sick. Was it merely neglect that:

- 1) They didn't ask to interview any of the people who had purchased the units?
- 2) The program was manipulated to view anything that isn't presently used by the medical establishment as quackery?
- 3) No attempt was made to objectively investigate the story?

Could it be that *Current Affair* was more interested in a sensational story than the truth?³

Two investigative journalists in Florida were fired by their television network when they refused to further cut incriminating footage from a documentary about the use of Monsanto's growth hormone (BGH) to increase milk production in cows.⁵ Why didn't the media report that:

- 1) After a Monsanto lawyer visited the president of Fox television's network news division, the local station manager requested extensive editing of the footage?
- 2) The journalists were offered a large settlement if they agreed never to discuss the story and how the station handled it?
- 3) When they refused to do so, the documentary was not aired and they were fired?

FOX News Kills Monsanto Milk Story

Investigative reporters, Jane Akre and Steve Wilson, bring us the inside story on their battle with FOX News. They recount the drama which led to their being fired and the networks refusal to air their documentary. Mainstream media has still not revealed information about the dangers of Bovine Growth Hormone (BGH) in the milk supply:

[Watch Video](#)

Who does the media serve?

In 1997, as we watched events unfold on television, we felt safe that a government agency was busting up a dangerous cult involved in child abuse and illegal firearms. The ATF, a government agency in the United States, was protecting us when they raided the Branch

Davidian compound at WACO.⁶ Were they? Why didn't the media inform us that:

- 1) The media kept their distance and only reported the propaganda fed to them by government officials as truth?
- 2) FBI officials lied under oath stating they never fired on the residents of the WACO compound?
- 3) The FBI forensic photographer observed: "I'm left with an overall disturbing opinion that many of the residents were homicide victims." when he viewed the scene after the compound had burned to the ground?
- 4) There was no evidence of child abuse or illegal firearms?

We do not hold the beliefs of those who were members of the Branch Davidians. We do, however, support the freedom of belief of any group as long as they are not invading the freedom of others.

Could it be that the media plays a role in making us feel safe? That everything outside of what is accepted in society must be portrayed as wrong or quackery so that we can feel safe—safe that our medical system serves us well ... safe that our government agencies serve us well ... safe that our elected representatives serve us well?

The Newsroom

A role played by Meryl Streep in a 2007 movie, Lions for Lambs, illustrates how difficult it can be for individuals working in the media to maintain their investigative role. As a top-ranked newspaper reporter, she recognizes that a US Senator is trying to use her to forward government propaganda about the war in the Middle East. She is determined not to cooperate. With pressure from above that threatens her job, however, she eventually capitulates as she needs the income to support her elderly mother.

Reporting of propaganda or news simply because it is sensational is the reason many of us no longer watch or read mainstream news. When news is presented with integrity as depicted in a refreshing program, The Newsroom, a television series that debuted in 2012, we will be motivated to once again check mainstream news. This show brings a fresh breeze as it reveals how reporting that keeps asking questions rather than regurgitating propaganda or simply pandering to sensationalism, is a reflection of the integrity of a collective group of individuals ... something we need to earn as a society.

[Watch Video](#)

In our need to feel safe, we blind ourselves to truth. The media can fabricate any story and present it as truth to help us feel safe. Are you willing to allow the media, or should we say individuals in the media, to decide what is truth? Is feeling safe more important than freedom? Is the need to trust more important than truth? Are you ready to see the truth behind the illusion?

What can each of us do?

Wake up to the illusions around us—be open to truth no matter how threatening truth may seem. Waking up to truth is realizing that individuals in power—government, government agencies and the media—have their own belief systems. These individuals impose their belief systems, sometimes without realizing it, through regulations, laws and the control of information. Do you want their beliefs—or your neighbor’s beliefs—to decide how you can conduct your life? This is what we are allowing. This limits our freedom. Are you willing to give others freedom when you don’t agree and when their freedom doesn’t impose on the freedom of others?

Are you ready to free yourself from the illusions?

In order for the illusions to lose their power over us, we need to see that our feeling of safety is an illusion too. As each of us wake up, we can replace our need to feel safe and trust authority, with the higher ideals of truth, freedom and accepting responsibility. As an example, when Maureen Kennedy Salaman, a long-time advocate for health freedom, was a child, she wanted to pray for her father when he left to fight in World War II. She was told to change her prayer from, “God, keep Daddy safe.” to “God, make Daddy brave and keep him true.”⁷

References

1. <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0137363/>
2. *Excitotoxins, The Taste that Kills*, Russell L. Blaylock, M.D., 1997
3. *Fifth Estate*, CBC, October 27, 1999
4. *Current Affair*, Television Program in Australia, January 25, 1999
5. www.inmotionmagazine.com/fox.html,
www.foxbghsuit.com/bgh2.htm,
www.greens.org/s-r/18/18-10.html
6. *WACO Documentary*, Fifth Estate Productions, 1997
7. *Health Freedom News*, December 1999. <http://www.thenhf.com/health-freedom-news/>