



The essence of The Great Reset

by

Jon Rappoport

on

[Jon Rappoport](#)



Wikipedia: "John Dewey (October 20, 1859 – June 1, 1952) was an American philosopher, psychologist, and educational reformer whose ideas have been influential in education and social reform. He was one of the most prominent American scholars in the first half of the twentieth century...Dewey was one of the primary figures associated with the philosophy of pragmatism and is considered one of the fathers of functional psychology."

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen and other genders. I am Field Marshal Hermann Mao Octavio Pinochet Dulles, Chairman of the Joint Philosopher's Committee of the World Economic Forum, the Bilderberg Group, the Trilateral Commission, the CFR, and the CDC/WHO.

You are distinguished financiers, professors, scholars, heads of government, attorneys, judges,

journalists, doctors, social media CEOs, and pharmaceutical princes.

Tonight, I will be interviewing a hologram of the late John Dewey, the foremost educator of the 20th century, philosopher, and leader of the still-vital Pragmatist movement.

We will take up the thorny problem of free speech. And deeper still, the meaning of meaning.

This event is sponsored by Snacker Cracker Whacker, a weight-loss munch between meals for the quasi-active lifestyle.

And now, please turn on John Dewey.

Hello, Hermann. Thanks for having me.

Hello, John. Delighted to see you. Were you able to peruse the documents I had my secretary send you?

Suffice to say, Hermann, I believe I'm caught up on the blizzard of developments since my departure.

Good, John. We need you more than ever.

I can't disagree, Herm. The Prime Directive is ORGANIZE. And that Directive is being violated from Nome to Tierra del Fuego.

Sad but true. Let's jump right in. What about censorship, John? People are breaking out into opposing camps on the issue.

Blanket censorship, Herm, is a necessary pause, in order to allow us to study hesitancy.

What sort of hesitancy, John?

The reluctance to define and describe OCI.

What is OCI?

The Organization of Categories of Information.

Aha.

Indeed, Herm. Every piece of information that has ever been produced, and is being produced, must be collected, and placed into distinct categories-which are then evaluated on the pragmatic principle of instrumentality.

John, remind our audience what that principle is.

Of course. The meaning of any statement-aka piece of information-is nothing more than the practical use to which it can be put. That is what meaning IS. Period.

And therefore, we must ask, "Who is in charge of deciding 'practical use'?"

Herm, many possible practical uses exist. Someone has to determine which use is paramount. For example, consider the statement, "Vaccines are life-saving." The factual accuracy or inaccuracy of that statement is entirely beside the point. What matters is, who is deciding how to use that statement. Let us say it is the CDC. In that case, the statement, "Vaccines are life-saving," means, "Everyone must get vaccinated."

And, John, we WOULD want the CDC to be in charge of deciding PRACTICAL USE in this instance.



Yes. I can certainly see that you would. What I'm talking about here is a complete restructuring of language itself, of what language MEANS.

We'll explore that in a moment, John. But first, what happens to the people who are claiming that "Vaccines are life-saving" is a gross lie?

They would be censored, of course. Because they're trying to assert their power to decide the practical use of the statement about vaccines. Their practical use is: don't get vaccinated.

I see. Censor them.

Otherwise, meaning itself collapses into a muddle of competing interests.

Right, John. Yes.

Restructuring language involves redefining the meaning of meaning. Anyone should be able to see that. The meaning of any given statement or piece of information is: the practical and pragmatic use to which it will be put. A statement has no other meaning.

Truth and falsity are outmoded concepts, John.

That's correct. They're a waste of time and effort.

John, your analysis strips things down nicely.

During my life, I had many enemies. They opposed instrumentality. They preferred their own slovenly models of meaning.

We're in a position to correct that now, John.

I hope so.

If the State takes over language itself, John, we have a chance to revolutionize the process of thought.

Herm, that is indeed a solution. And after careful consideration, I believe it is necessary. We would start with the courts.

Really?

Yes. All verdicts would hinge on the practical use to which criminals can be put. A thief, if he proves he can stir up enough trouble, would automatically be defined as innocent.

In that instance, John, the thief becomes an instrument of chaos?

Yes, chaos-the breaking down of traditional order-permits new forms to enter the scene. New forms of thought and definition and language. The meaning of JUSTICE undergoes a complete transformation. Henceforth, justice is defined as an action which adds to State power by seeming to promote equality.

We must ponder that last sentence deeply.

Herm, JUSTICE must be taught in schools from a very early age. It is defined as "equality of outcome." Every person is granted the same benefits and penalties in life, regardless of his talents, ambitions, skill, discipline, dedication, imagination, creative impulses.

However, John, we must make it seem we are bringing the oppressed peoples up to the level of everyone else.

Yes, Herm. It's a bait and switch. Every word in the language becomes an instrument for executing that bait and switch.

We have much, much work to do.

Herm, words are instruments. People are instruments. There is no such thing as "an individual." A person is an opportunity to advance an agenda.

If I'm catching your drift, John, you're suggesting we have two basic classifications of language. One is for us. We know how words are actually used and what they mean. The other classification is for the masses. They're taught meanings that appear to equip them to gain equality and power-but in the end, they obtain no power.

Correct. If they did gain power, they would use it in disorganized ways. As I said at the outset, what is sadly missing from civilization now is ORGANIZATION. It must be overall and very specific. Every word and item and person must be folded into a coherent and coordinated and unified structure.

And, as you say, John, it all starts with language. The meaning of meaning. I'm not sure I've understood everything you've said today, but I'm trying.

Good, Herm. Remember, free speech really means the right and duty to use words as instruments, for the purposes designed by those who run things.

Yes.

Imagine this, Herm. Every child, in kindergarten, is taught the definition of the word "I." Every child memorizes that definition and recites it over and over. "I am an instrument. I am useful. I serve a purpose. I disappear into that purpose."

But a very young child will have no idea what he's saying. John.

It doesn't matter. As he repeats it over and over, from one grade to the next, he will get glimpses. Those glimpses will become clearer. He will see a new reality taking shape. What does CAT mean? It means "how you can use a cat." What does BOOK mean? It means "how you can use a book." Herm, we have to replace things with words, and replace the meanings of words with new utilitarian meanings.

This goes very deep, John.

Thank you, Herm. Down through history, all the truly great philosophers have wanted to remake the world.

One question, John. If all of us here today had been indoctrinated in the new and improved version of language, would the conversation you and I are having now have the same shape?

Of course not, Herm. It would be stripped down and streamlined. You and I would be uttering brief phrases, more or less like the old telegrams of the past. You would utter three words, I would utter four words, rapid fire, and we would grasp the instrumentality of our mutual meaning. BUT for us, Herm, that day will never come. We will continue to speak and think as we do now. This restructuring program is for everyone else, for the masses. THEY are ones who need complete reeducation. Think of those of us who are gathered here today, and our trusted colleagues, as the meta-people. We hover above the rest of the population, modulating their style of comprehension. We are injecting them with the vaccine of new language, in order to prevent DISORGANIZATION.

Could you provide an example of a word or a phrase, as the masses would use it, and then as you and I would use it?

Of course, Herm. The word VIRUS. To the masses, that word is already pregnant with instrumental

meanings. VIRUS equals threat, fear, danger, infection, contagion, need for masks and distancing and lockdowns and business closures and economic wreckage and government bailout and testing and tracing and vaccination. You see? That's what VIRUS MEANS. But to you and me, it means an imaginary construct never proven to exist, never isolated or actually sequenced, which is USED to accomplish a manner of social destruction which will then lead to the imposition of greater ORGANIZATION.

Yes, John, now I'm really beginning to understand the principle of instrumentality.

Freedom is the enemy of organization.

John, what you're saying is illuminating our understanding of technocracy.

Herm, technocracy began as a movement led by engineers. For them, instrumentality was the core of life. They were builders. Equations, methods, materials, ideas-the engineers accepted science ONLY in so far as it helped them build structures. Practical use. Pragmatic purpose. So naturally, they applied that point of view to government, the economy, politics...

The engineers were already pragmatists.

Yes, Herm. They saw the vision of a better world. A world in which every human would be used and controlled as an instrument for constructing civilization as a leak-proof system.

And that, John, is what we are doing. Every human fitted into a designated slot. That is the essence of the Great Reset.

Yes.

It occurs to me, John, that in the years since your departure from Earth, you've come to new insights about freedom. In your earlier days, you were a proponent of the wide sharing of ideas among all people.

Herm, those of us in responsible positions are always wrestling with the concept of freedom. It's the wild card in the deck. A system is a system. You can't define it fully if you want to retain that wild card. Freedom doesn't fit anywhere. It isn't a slot. Worse, it leads to...it multiplies the number of unpredictable events. Freedom is a corrosive acid that eats into perfection.

What you just said, John, applies to you yourself. You're a hologram. You were designed by AI. That design had to make you into a system with no leaks. Correct?

Interesting point, Herm. People like to claim that AI creations have freedom and choices, but is that really true? As a hologram, I have options WITHIN A PRE-PROGRAMMED FRAMEWORK. And each one of those options is governed by my practical and instrumental use. And somebody decided what that use was.

Therefore, John-

Therefore, I'm an instrument. I fulfill the meaning of what an individual IS. In the future, we want all individuals to be similar instruments.

Yes, John, that's my point. You, the hologram, give us the model for future humans.

Well, Herm, that brings up a question. If humans are programmed in the same way I am, will they be content, will they be happy? I'll answer my own question. We must consider happiness itself an instrumental function. That is to say, we must program humans to believe happiness is what they already have. Happiness is whatever state of mind they're IN. Do you see?

I do see, John. I think that's an excellent place to leave our conversation for now. Thank you so much



for being with us.

Thanks for having me, Herm.