

# WHAT NO ONE ELSE IS SAYING

by *Miles Mathis*

*First published February 2, 2022*

*Just my opinion as usual*

The whole Neil Young/Joe Rogan thing got me thinking again. The governors wish I would quit doing that, but I can't help it. I said in my last paper that I didn't believe Spotify had really paid Rogan \$100 million for the rights to his podcasts. In the same way, I don't believe anything I am told about Neil Young, Joni Mitchell, or anybody else for that matter. We are told these old musicians have huge revenue streams and millions of downloads every month, but why would they? I can't make sense of it. I don't see how these people have *any* current revenue, except maybe from radio royalties or from use of their songs in period films. I have never paid to listen to a song and never will. If I want to listen to any old music, I just put an album on the turntable. That's free. You will say I had to buy the record. Yeah, back in 1975, I did. I doubt Neil or Joni is still spending that \$4. If I need to replace an old album, I get it for \$1 in a bin somewhere. Or for free at the library sale or a garage sale. Or, at worst, I get it for \$4 on Ebay. The artist gets no royalty on that resale.

You will moan for the poor “artist”, claiming I am depriving him or her of hard-earned income. Right. To start with, all these people like Joni and Neil are from rich and connected families. That is how they got famous in the first place. Some of them like Joni have some real talent, but even so it was her connections that got her in. She's now a nasty old bitch, and basically always was, so fuck her. She gave away her own baby when she was in her 20s, because she couldn't be bothered with it. She has made up a story about being too poor to care for it, but it just sounds to me like the same sob story these people always tell. So that's who she always was. She has been paid for her work a million times over, and like the rest of them is way more famous than she has any right to be. Yes, she wrote some nice songs 50 years ago, but she ain't exactly Beethoven. I am so angry I just threw all my Joni Mitchell vinyl in the garbage. Nine albums and two CDs, some of which I have had since high school.

As an analogy, I have painted some very nice paintings. Did that guarantee me constant promotion from the time I was 20? Did that guarantee me huge contracts? Should I be able to live off paintings I painted and sold decades ago, via royalties? Do people have to pay me everytime they look at one of my paintings or read one of my articles? No. Royalties are only for the pampered children of the Phoenicians. Like taxes, it is one more guaranteed and permanent income for the wealthy and their children.

Even more to the point, I assume you have done some good work. Do you expect to be paid royalties for work you did decades ago? You may be a teacher. Are your students from 1980 paying you royalties for teaching them what they know? Are your children paying you royalties for raising them? If you are a good doctor, are your old patients paying you royalties for their current health? No, if you want to get paid, you have to cure new patients. If you are a lawyer, you have to argue new cases. If you are house cleaner, you have to keep cleaning houses.

As for Neil Young, I don't own any of his albums and never think to myself “Gee, I would sure like to hear a Neil Young song”. About the only one I could name is *Heart of Gold*. The only time I listen to Neil is when I put on an old CSNY album, and even then I think how annoying his voice is compared to Stills or Crosby. So whenever I see him on TV, being slobbered over by anyone from Paul Schaffer to Jimmy Fallon, I find it a huge mystery. I think to myself, “Are people really this desperate for

entertainment? Are they really so easily impressed?" Do they really care so much about Neil Young, or are they just bowing to the promoters, as usual.

Why should Neil Young be living off *Heart of Gold*, a three-minute song, for his entire life? It would be like me living off just one of my best papers for my entire life. I could pretty easily argue that any one of my best papers is more important to the history of the world than a 3-minute song about a heart of gold, and to be honest I don't have to argue it because any of thousands of my readers would do it for me. How about my paper mapping the atomic nucleus? That paper has generated pretty much nothing for me, since I basically gifted it to the future. So explain to me again why Neil Young, who has already gotten millions from *Heart of Gold*, thinks he deserves millions more for it? You will say if he doesn't take the money, the record companies will just take it, but it wouldn't have to work like that. Instead of selling the rights to their songs, these rich old musicians could just keep those rights and give those songs away for free to listeners, charging only people who wanted to use the songs to make money. That is what I do, you know. I allow free dissemination of all my work, except in the case of resale or other for-profit uses. No big companies are profiting from my work. . . as far as I know.

But, to be honest, I would only be a little nicer to old musicians I like, such as . . . sorry, drawing a blank. There is some old music I still like, but I am not so sure about the musicians. But let us take Barry Gibb as an example. He is not pushing vaccines, as far as I know. He tends to stick to what he knows, and keeps his mouth shut otherwise. I will always have a soft spot for "How Deep is Your Love" or "Too Much Heaven", which colored my highschool years a pleasant warm gold. The man had an amazing falsetto, and there is no denying it. But was he way more rich and famous than he deserved to be? Of course. Promoting entertainers and sports figures above everyone else has always been perverse, and gets more perverse every decade. In the grand scheme of things, these people are relatively unimportant. They are so famous mainly to keep your eyes off other things. It is a brightly colored diversion.

I say it gets more perverse, because they aren't overselling Barry Gibb or Joni Mitchell anymore, they are overselling Taylor Swift or Billy Eilish. Joni and Barry really are music gods compared to those phonies. Even someone like Rick Beato, who has some sensible and interesting analysis on Youtube, is selling Taylor Swift as real, which is scary. But I guess that is why and how Beato is an insider, and how he avoids being booted off Youtube while all other real people are gone.

Plus, as we have seen, in most cases it is even worse than that. We have caught these pop musicians, including Joni, involved in the big propaganda machine. She was not among the worst, but she was there. She was complicit with her cousins, which is one reason she has gotten ever nastier over the years. She doesn't want you to mistake her for Bob Dylan, [because she knows exactly who Dylan was](#). And she knows *because she was on the inside*. A few decades earlier she didn't want you to mistake her for Leonard Cohen, because she had dated him and figured him out as well. She thought that by partially outing him she could cleanse herself. It didn't work Joni.

All these people don't know when to shut up. Joni and Neil could have rested on their laurels and gone out smiling quietly, but [like Noam Chomsky](#) they decided to keep yapping to the end, destroying their own legacies. The vaccine deaths will continue to climb and the whole medical genocide will eventually come completely out in the open, at which point all these people who helped push it will be washed out to sea with Bill Gates, Anthony Fauci, and all the rest. Fairly or unfairly, all their creations will be washed out with them, being tainted by the personalities of their creators.

They should have seen this coming, realizing that their legacies rested on emotions. Those old songs

are little bits of emotion, and as such they depend in part on your feeling about the artist. If you have a positive impression of the artist, or no impression, the emotion is free to transfer. But if you have a negative impression, it isn't. You can see how that would be less true about something like a scientific paper or the discovery of a planet or something. Believing Einstein was a male chauvinist has little effect on most people's opinion of Relativity.

---

---

Tom Brady is also in the news today, so I want to comment on that as well, since it ties in. Brady just announced his retirement, and we have to read about it even at places like Zerohedge and Gateway Pundit. Why? What does that have to do with economics or politics, or real news? Like the musicians, Brady is another person way more rich and famous than he should be. He throws a football around on a field. So what?

I was a big Cowboys and Roger Staubach fan in 1975, so I understand the feeling. I have been there, so you don't have to explain it to me. Except that. . . I was 12 years old. I grew up and realized there were things more interesting and more important than a bunch of big guys crashing into each other and trying to cause injury. You will say not everything has to be big and important. Some things are just for fun. Which is true. I have nothing against watching sports, listening to music, or having fun.

But I do suggest that the party is over for a while. The 75-year party or rave we have been lost in since the end of WWII had to come to an end sometime, and I suggest to you that it is over for the time being. Best take the party hat off and remove the whizzer from your mouth. Time to pay attention, because the governors are now killing your husbands and wives and parents and children right in front of your eyes. If you got vaccinated, they may have already planted a bomb in you. Which is to say the revolution has already started without you, and you must pick a side. It is the most important choice and action you will ever make, so you may want to study before you jump. Take a few weeks off and cram. Turn off CNN and ESPN and let the *New York Times* rot on the lawn. You will not learn anything there. Try sifting the wind for better information, since the truth is out there. The truth is always out there, though it won't come via the TV. Dig deeper, try harder. Talk to a trucker.

As for Brady. . . . I know, he has seven rings. Wow. He can throw a little piece of inflated leather 70 yards. Impressive. He is the GOAT, the PATRIOT, the BUCCANEER, and who knows what else. He's got a pretty face and a skinny wife, bully for him. He looks good in a uniform, granted, and is fun to watch. OK. But \$30 million a year? For playing a stupid game? You do realize that it doesn't matter in the least who wins the Super Bowl or any other game, right? You do realize that talking about sports stars and Hollywood stars and pop musicians all the time instead of talking about more important things is what got us where we are, right? You do realize that in a democracy, the success or failure of the enterprise depends upon the active participation of citizens, and that this is the way the governors have kept you INACTIVE. They have kept you on the sidelines, carrying water for them. While you were partying, pursuing sex, drugs, rocknroll, and Hollywood, they were erasing the Constitution line by line and building a high invisible wall around you all other partiers. Now that you are coming out of your coke-coma and the ringing in your ears is dying down, you may wish to start by admitting you were wrong about everything. You may wish to admit that the whole mad "progressive" rush into the shiny future wasn't progressive at all, but a fascist nightmare in pig-lipstick.

Or, if you have been camped on the other side, cheering for Reagan or Bush or Trump, you may wish to admit you were *also* wrong about everything. Those people were the most novel of anyone, and

pushed the New World Order harder than anyone. What did they ever wish to conserve? Did Republican administrations ever reverse course in any meaningful way? No and a thousand times no: they always rushed as headlong into the future as their blue cousins, and still are. They are all RINOs and always have been, since there was never anything Republican about that party all the way back to Lincoln. Republicanism, by the original definition, was about protecting the rights of the masses against an aristocratic minority set on oppressing them and preying on them, the protection coming from constitutions, universal suffrage, elected bodies, and courts. But no American party was ever for that, except in name. Both major parties have been undermining true republicanism from their inceptions, and are doing so more now than ever. The entire government and all parts of it have been bought by the corporatocracy, and both parties have resisted it not at all. There has already been a coup, the government is already obsolete, and only the full report is yet to be filed. So when the revolution comes—and it is already in progress—it must be aimed not at the pretend government, which is just a scarecrow, but at the corporations and banks who really run the country. In this sense, the truckers are surrounding the wrong buildings and the wrong people. The Trudeau goose chase in Canada is just that, since that goose is just a puppet. Parliament too is just a front. It is the billionaires and trillionaires that need to be surrounded and brought to trial, not the mincing little nobody actors like Trudeau.

Tucker Carlson had a Canadian party official on Monday night, doing his little dance, pretending to be the opposition and supporting the truckers, while advising them they had done their jobs and that they should disperse. He assured them the Canadian opposition party would take care of it. But don't be fooled by him. Whatever that guy advises, do the opposite. The truckers should not leave until they find a better target. I have given them the hint.

---

---

Today's tack-on will be about an equally important subject, though one that is not so immediate. It is something else I have been thinking about. I have been trying to figure out why the human situation seems so intractable and insoluble. Nothing I have read in my entire life really seems to be to the point. Nothing explains why civilization is such a monstrous failure in almost every way. Yes, some of the details are positive: some amazing art, architecture, machines, some beautiful ideas, some attractive people. But in general we don't seem equipped to build a successful civilization. We just aren't up to the task in most ways. We seem like children in a man's world.

It came to me after saying that in a recent paper: *we never grow up*. We are all Peter Pans. We are all younger and older children. Even the eldest of us act like stupid adolescents. And then it dawned on me why that is.

I think we are all dying before our times. I think we were meant to live much longer, which is why we develop mentally so slowly. We are a species with a very long adolescence, and we never get out of it because we die too young.

The other thing that got me on this track was the idea in another recent paper that maybe WE are the aliens. If we drifted down to Earth from Titan, for example, after polluting that little Moon to the point of no return, then it is possible our lives were very different there. The charge levels were different, our diets were different, and the fresh water probably had a different mineral content. It would explain why we don't fit in here. We aren't anything like other animals, or even other primates, who we resemble only distantly. We are much less hardy and need far more water to drink, just for a start. And

hairless, of course.

And a third thing clued me in to this: my own experience. I am just now coming out of my adolescence as I approach 60, as I would be the first to admit. It is weird to say that, but I don't think I am a special case, except perhaps in honesty. But just as I start figuring things out, my body starts failing. I don't think that is how it is supposed to be.

Leonardo commented on this 500 years ago. One of his famous quotes is “I thought I was learning to live, I was only learning to die”. That is another way of saying what I am saying, you see. Leonardo only lived to 67, so perhaps just when he had developed the wisdom to join government as an elder statesman, he found he was dying. We needed people like Leonardo to build the next civilization, but they never have. They have died too young, been killed, or been overlooked.

I now think humans were meant to live to around 200. The immortality dreamed of by some in the AI community is a mirage, but the idea we should live to 200 is not. If we could quit finding new ways of killing ourselves, we would be getting there much faster. The average age of death is rising, but not very fast. I didn't start aging until very recently, and if I could put it off to my mid-50s, others could do even better.

The problem is that while we were ditching the tobacco and booze lifestyle of the 1960s ratpack, the environment was getting ever dirtier. The poisons in food, air, and water keep rising, killing much of the progress in other areas. GMOs have been a disaster, as has HFCS, soy, and canola. Wheat and corn have been all but destroyed. WIFI is another disaster. And stress levels have risen steeply since 2000, also on purpose (as part of the plan of destabilization). The destruction of the heterosexual relationship has taken years off the lives of many.

This is of ultimate importance, since civilization was meant to be built and governed by those over 100—those in their second century. The rest of us are just children, without the maturity to make the important decisions. For this reason, I don't think we will move to the next level until we are able to produce lucid and healthy people well above 100. We need our best people—our Leonardos—to live into their second centuries, where they can use their experience and wisdom to lead us out of this mess.

Here's more anecdotal evidence in that direction. Did you know that there are housecats that have lived 40 years? Like dogs, cats are supposed to live 7 years for every one of ours, so if we do the math those cats were 280 years old. And that is cats who we assume were eating cat food—not the cleanest food.\* We may assume the multiplier isn't really right, but even if we take it down to 5, we are at 200. The life expectancy for a domestic cat is 18, so the maximum age is more than double that. The life expectancy for a human is about 80, which indicates that in the most coddled situation some of us should live to be 160.

So why is it so much harder to coddle a human than a cat? Well, cats don't drink, smoke, or get addicted to any other drugs, do they? Cats have no stress. Cats don't get divorced. They don't spend time in hospitals. They don't grieve losing children or spouses, or not as much. They don't have parents telling them they are losers. They get petted all the time.\*\* They sit in any lap they want to. They don't watch TV. They don't have jobs. And they sleep A LOT.

\*It reminds me of the 112 year-old guy in California whose doctor was complaining that he wouldn't eat

anything except waffles and sausage.

\*\*I just watched Anchorman and Anchorman 2 for the first time last night. I actually thought Anchorman 2 was funnier, especially the first half. My favorite part was when Paul Rudd was photographing the kittens.