Propaganda is the Art of Overwhelming Logic

Source: No More Fake News

by <u>Jon Rappoport</u> November 6, 2018

One type of mind control involves defeating logic as a method of thinking.

Modern formulations of basic logic begin with the statement: You can't have A and not-A. Which is a way of saying contradictions are unacceptable.

So it's no surprise that mind control attempts to introduce contradictions into rational processes.

You see this in propaganda.

For example: People who are vaccinated are in danger from those who are unvaccinated. ("Keep your unvaccinated child away from my vaccinated child.")

There is a concealed contradiction here. You can see it by merely defining (according to conventional terms) the meaning of "vaccinated."

It means "immune," "protected from contracting the disease targeted by the vaccine."

But if the vaccinated person is protected and immune, then coming into contact with an unvaccinated person will bring no danger.

Therefore, the notion that vaccinated people are A) protected but not-A) in danger is absurd, a contradiction.

The easiest way to defeat logic is through deficient education. Never teach logic. Ignore it. Instead, teach specific values. Teach anything except logic. Don't teach children how to spot contradictions.

<u>A deficient education plus tons of ceaseless propaganda</u> equals mind control.

Logic is a significant problem for people who want a closed and unfree society. Teaching logic tends to produce sharp and independent minds.

Logic produces personal power.

Here is another example of non-logic: A ballot initiative passed by the voters of Maui County is illegal, because it set up a new law regarding commercial agriculture, when in fact commercial agriculture is regulated by state and federal laws, which trump county laws.

There are several ways of attacking this proposition, but the most basic way is:

The ballot initiative was not aimed at commercial agriculture. <u>It called for a moratorium on all Monsanto/Dow experiments using non-commercial GMOs</u>.

In what has become a federal court case, the judge and the lawyers for Dow/Monsanto are proceeding from a false basic premise.

Of course, the failure in this case is a willful ignoring of the facts. The argument is: A is B. No it isn't. A is A.

There are a number of arguments afloat these days which proceed this way:

"The science concerning ABC is settled."

"'Settled' means 'true.'"

"Therefore the science concerning ABC is true."

However, on closer inspection, "settled" means <u>"there is a consensus among officially favored scientists."</u>

Science doesn't operate according to what officially favored scientists claim. It doesn't operate according to consensus at all. It operates according to what is true and valid—and the best way to ascertain that is through the broadest possible analysis accomplished by a wide variety of independent researchers, who attempt to replicate prior experimental results.

Even then, there is always room for reasoned dissent.

<u>There is much, much more I could write about logic</u>. The issues I raise in this article are basic and should be addressed in every high school, <u>in great detail</u>, <u>with many illustrations</u>.

For instance: what are the full tacit implications of the statement found at the end of every television drug ad—"ask your doctor if X is right for you."

For instance (at a more sophisticated level): when the press reports a new outbreak of disease, claiming it is caused by a particular virus...how was that assertion determined? On what grounds do scientists say they have found the virus that causes the disease?

I ran headlong into that one while writing my first book, AIDS Inc.: Scandal of the Century, and the further I investigated HIV as "the cause of AIDS," the more I was stunned by the lack of logic present in the argument.

Logic is a sword.

Learning its many uses, while still young, creates formidable students and citizens.

Propaganda is the art of overwhelming logic.

It works, when the mind is unprepared.