

CAMBRIDGE ANALYTICA



by Miles Mathis

First published January 2, 2019

I know, I know, I am getting to this one very late. But my readers understand this is how I am: I get to things when I get to them, and sometimes I never get to them. I don't follow the news, so I pretty much missed this whole thing the first time around. I just hit it today by sheer accident, when someone mentioned it on *Cutting through the Fog*. They mentioned the little gay pink-haired guy and I thought, WHAT? So I Googled it and got drawn in. Very soon I saw the lay of the land and it occurred to me that maybe, just maybe, some of my readers hadn't seen what I was seeing. We will see what we can see with my fresh eyes. If you already know it, chat amongst yourselves.

I will take you in the way I got in, since it probably isn't the way you got in. This is why it helps to drop from a balloon into these events, as I do. I don't come in on the mainstream escalators, so I am not herded properly. I come in on a cold Hyperborean breeze, ignoring all signage and beating my own path.

I went to Christopher Wylie's Wiki page first. It is nothing but a pile of red flags. We will take them in order. In the first sentence we are told he was previously Director of Research at Cambridge Analytica. Really, this baby-faced kid was Director of Research at this major company? You will say this is high-tech and these things happen in high tech. I doubt it. It doesn't smell right from the first word. In the second sentence, we are told he was the whistleblower in the recent scandal. Again, it doesn't make sense. Whistleblowers normally come from mid or lower levels. They aren't directors of research. Also, we see Wylie playing exactly the same part that Manning, Snowden and Assange played, so our first assumption should be that—like them—he is a CIA or MI6 front, chosen mostly for his looks to sell some conjob.

The next big clue—that I suspect most missed—is in sentence three, where we are told Cambridge Analytica stole personal data from Facebook in order to create targeted political campaigns for the 2016 election. This supposedly drew Trump into the scandal. But remember, *all* the elections are stolen or predetermined, and always have been, so there is no need for Cambridge Analytica or any other company to data mine for that reason. Your vote is just immediately jettisoned into thin air, so no one has any need to target you. You could be voting for Bullwinkle for all they care. Yes, they target you generally, because they still want you to *think* politics and political campaigns matter. They want

your eyes glued to the TV or computer, so that you aren't noticing more important things. But they don't have to push your vote in this way. They are way beyond that. They simply ignore your vote altogether, then make up numbers in any way they want. If they want Trump to win by 1%, he does. If they want him to lose by 5%, he does. The votes aren't tied to the results *at all*.

In this way, the Cambridge Analytica scandal is a subset of the Russia-stole-the-election-for-Trump fake scandal. They are both manufactured to keep your eyes on Trump and all these sexy subplots, rather than on who is really running the country. They want you watching that, talking about it, and arguing about it, because if you are you won't ever figure out the truth: the election wasn't stolen by Russia, it was stolen by those running the US. The last US election, like all other US elections in history, was predetermined by the trillionaire families that run the US and the rest of the world. Nothing changed in 2016. Nothing got worse with Trump. It has always been like this. The only difference is it gets a bit more obvious every year. The propaganda gets more transparent every year, and the gambits get sloppier. The subtleties of the past are gone.

Next we find that Wylie gave his evidence to the UK's Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee. Since that is a committee of Parliament, it is meaningless. He might as well have given testimony to Santa Claus and his elves. Like the US Congress, UK Parliament is a wholly owned subsidiary of the trillionaire families. Both are vastly outranked by Intelligence, and since Intelligence is running these projects, we cannot expect them to police themselves, can we?

Next we move sideways and look at the text beneath Wylie's photo at Wiki. It says, "Wylie at Chatham House, 2018". They have just dropped a clue directly down your gullet, though most people will miss it. Chatham House is the **Royal Institute** of International Affairs, an NGO founded in 1920 by a **Curtis**, a **Balfour**, a **Cecil** and a **Grey**. All of the peerage, of course. So this is the trillionaire families again. Why is Wylie hanging out at Chatham House, getting his picture taken? You forgot to ask yourself that, right? I will tell you: he is a spook doing his job. This is where spooks hang out.

Next we get Wylie's personal section, which is a hoot. Although he dropped out of highschool without a degree at age 16, somehow by age 20 he had been accepted to study law at the London School of Economics. If we check the sidebar, we see that he got his MA from George Washington University. They don't tell us where he got his bachelor's degree. They wouldn't, because that might lead you to ask these questions: how did he get into college without a highschool diploma? How did he get both a BA and MA in about three years? Normally that would take six years. Most people don't start law school until they are about 23, and if they got a master's first, they would be more like 25. And yet we are told Wylie, the highschool dropout, was accepted at LSE at age 20. What makes it even harder to understand is that we are told he was working for Canadian opposition leader Michael **Ignatieff** by age 17. So we have to fit that into his schedule as well, while explaining to ourselves why Ignatieff was hiring 17-year-old dropouts to work on his campaign. Clicking on Ignatieff gives us the probable answer, since his mother was a **Grant** and his grandmother was Russian **Princess Meshcherskaya**. His grandfather was Count Pavel Ignatieff, one of Nicholas II's chief ministers. Count Ignatieff was captured after the October Revolution and allegedly sentenced to death, but was let off by a Polish commissar in charge of the executions. Convenient. Pavel's father was also a count, and he was nominated to be King of Bulgaria. He lost to one of his cousins, a **Saxe-Coburg**.

So, a 17-year-old Wylie was only two degrees of separation away from a Russian princess? What are the odds? Wylie is clearly another child of the Families, chosen for his looks to spread confusion. His face is the perfect cognitive dissonance, since it will cause almost everyone to do a double-take. *This guy* graduated from London School of Economics? *This guy* was the research director of a large

company by age 25? *This guy* is testifying in Parliament? *This guy* is all over the news?

He is also a continuation of the Bradley Manning project. They played that one for all it was worth, so they had to start over. Bradley is now Chelsea, as you probably know. It's all another fake, of course, but people got tired of hearing about it. So enter Chris Wylie, who will transition next year into a German Shepherd or an Orangutan or something.

They give you another clue with a quote of Wylie in his school yearbook. Under “probable destiny”, Wylie allegedly wrote,

Just another dissociative smear merchant peddling backroom hackery in its purest Machiavellian form.

Amazingly predictive and prescient, right, since that is exactly what he became.

At age 25 Wylie allegedly co-founded Eunoia Technologies, which was awarded \$100,000 by the Liberal Party of Canada, which is pretty much equivalent to being awarded the money by the Canadian government. This company was a data-mining company just like CA. Although it soon folded, Wylie had no scruples about spying while he was there, saying, “I want to build the NSA's wet dream”. Does that sound like the kind of principled person that would become a famous whistleblower?

So without leaving Wylie's Wiki page we have blown the whole project. The Cambridge Analytica scandal wasn't about what we were told it was about. What was it about? To find out, let's next go to the [2017 Guardian article](#) that threw it into high gear. It was written by Carole **Cadwalladr**, who later convinced Wylie to confirm her research. Her title is our first clue:

The Great British Brexit Robbery: How our Democracy was Hijacked

What? So until this Cambridge Analytica scandal, the UK and US were democracies? Things were fine up until then? Only recently have things gone down the tubes, and it is because some people are data-mining Facebook?

And here is her lead-in:

A shadowy global operation involving big data, billionaire friends of Trump and the disparate forces of the Leave campaign influenced the result of the EU referendum. As Britain heads to the polls again, is our electoral process still fit for purpose?

Again, she wants you to think that before Trump and data-mining, there was no shadowy global operation and that our electoral process was “fit” in some way. Which is absurd. This isn't a new problem, you know. It is the same problem we have always had: things are run by invisible trillionaire families. But she doesn't want you to remember that. She wants to hypnotize you into believing this is new in some way, or limited in some way. She wants you to think that, because if she can keep your eyes on Trump and Cambridge Analytica and a few other minor players here, you will miss all the big players hiding just beneath the surface.

Her lead-in quotes perform exactly the same service:

“The connectivity that is the heart of globalisation can be exploited by states with hostile intent to further their aims.[...] The risks at stake are profound and represent a fundamental threat to our sovereignty.”

Alex Younger, head of MI6, December, 2016

You are supposed to think there is a threat to our sovereignty. Which is rich because there *has never been any such sovereignty*, understood either as the sovereignty of the people or of the countries he is talking about. He wants you to think that Russia is a threat to our (US or UK) independence, but the US and UK aren't independent. They are fully owned by the trillionaire families, who also own Russia and the rest of the world. So you see how this whole story is a diversion. It is selling you a fake threat, so you miss the real threat. Or, the real threat isn't even a threat, it is a longstanding reality. This whole scandal is sold to re-affirm your old misapprehensions. The scandal is manufactured to keep you in the MATRIX.

My analysis is soon confirmed, when Cadwalladr says, “London in 2013 was still basking in the afterglow of the Olympics. Britain had not yet Brexited. **The world had not yet turned**”. So the world was still sunny and clean in 2013? Is that how you remember it?

Her next quote is really strange:

“That was before we became this dark, dystopian data company that gave the world Trump,” a former Cambridge Analytica employee who I'll call Paul tells me. “It was back when we were still just a psychological warfare firm.”

So the world was not dark and dystopian until 2016-ish, eh? It was just a straightforward, above-board psyop.

Next we are told that the dominance of Silicon Valley—Google and Facebook—signals a global tectonic shift. So she is creating a bogeyman here. Along with Trump, you are supposed to fear Google and Facebook. But is there really any shift, tectonic or otherwise? No, since Silicon Valley is owned and run by the same trillionaire families that have owned the world for centuries. It is just one more tool they are using for greater control, so there is no shift. Just an acceleration.

She says this scandal reveals “a critical and gaping hole in the political debate in Britain”. Cue laugh-track. The public political debate in Britain (and the US) has been nothing but a gaping hole since the beginning, *on purpose*. The “debate” is manufactured by the media between two scarecrows, and these scarecrows are ordered and paid to make sure nothing of sense or import is ever said. Rather, the debate is a canned and salacious simulacrum, sugar-coated to draw attention and spread cavities, but otherwise without content or nutrition.

Next, we find this:

There are three strands to this story. How the foundations of an authoritarian surveillance state are being laid in the US. How British democracy was subverted through a covert, far-reaching plan of coordination enabled by a US billionaire. And how we are in the midst of a massive land grab for power by billionaires via our data.

The foundations of an authoritarian state are just now being laid in the US, are they? You have to be

kidding me! The US has been an authoritarian surveillance state from the beginning, with tech just making surveillance somewhat easier. It used to be done with human eyes, but is now done with virtual snoopers. We have always been a nation of spies, but only now is the game coming out of the closet. Ironically, the spies being machines instead of humans has allowed for their partial outing. Machines don't require anonymity. Pointing to them doesn't embarrass them or blow their cover. They keep snooping regardless.

And British democracy is just now being subverted? Who believes this? Do you really believe that some new US billionaire is to blame for the recent crash of democracy in the UK? It couldn't be all the old fascists who have been running the island since the dawn of time, could it? It couldn't be those trillionaires holed up in the City of London and Anglesey and Oxford and Liverpool and Northumberland, could it?

A land grab for power by billionaires via our data? I don't think these people need to be grabbing for power. They already have enough for the next hundred centuries. Do you really think data-mining us beyond the levels of say, 2005, will make any difference? So they confirm I like skinny blondes and cats and bicycles and books. They confirm you like fat red-headed sailors, standard poodles, Cooper Minis, and head-to-toe tattoos. How does that help them? Beyond getting us to the proper Amazon or Ebay page faster, it doesn't. We can't spend money we don't have, and we can't be sucked for power or ideas we do not have. And they don't need to mine our opinions otherwise, since those opinions don't matter. They already ignore them with no discomfort. Government never was about polling for opinions and following them, it has always been about creating opinions or ignoring them. That is to say, they try to force you to think as they wish you would, but in the cases you don't, they just go over your head. If they fail to force your agreement, they just do it anyway.

The only real reason left to data-mine you like this, beyond getting you to the right Amazon page faster, is to see if you are continuing to buy the Matrix. They want to see if you are still reading articles like this at the *Guardian* and if you are believing them. If you aren't, they want to know how to spin you back to center.

Well, if they are in such great control, not needing your vote or your acquiescence, why do they bother to spin you at all? Because if you aren't buying the lies, you aren't as good a consumer. They know that those who question most buy the least. The best consumers are those people they keep right on the center stripe.



All this leads us to ask who Carole Cadwalladr is. No information is forthcoming on the web. She has a Wiki page, but there is no personal section. But for those who know their history, her last name is a big red flag. The Cadwalladrs were kings of Wales back to the year 655. Henry Tudor, upon winning

the Battle of Bosworth Field, was linked in poetry to “Cadwalladr's blood lineally descending”. Remember, the Tudor's were really Owens, and were linked to Northern Wales, especially Anglesey. They were installed by the Stanleys, who were Kings of Mann. Henry's personal emblem was the Red Dragon of Cadwalladr. More recently, the Cadwalladr's were linked to the Erskines, Barons of Restormel Castle and later Earls of Buchan. This linked them to the Steuart Baronets, the Dalrymple Baronets, the Hamiltons of Udston and Wishaw, the Campbells, and the Power Baronets. The Cadwalladr's still exist in the peerage, though they have mostly been absorbed into other noble families. We do not know if Cadwalladr is Carole's birth name or married name. It may even be a nom de plume, which would make it an even larger red flag.

Regardless, this ties us back to Bradley Manning, whom Cadwalladr has also promoted. As it turns out, Manning's mother is a **Fox** from. . . Wales. Manning and Fox are both prominent peerage names, and Manning's father was also an Intel analyst.



I just have to divert into Manning for a moment. He went to highschool in Wales. His height is contested, but may be under 5 feet, which should have kept him out of the army. We are told he had to go through basic training twice, and was nearly discharged as both physically and mentally unfit. Regardless, the rest of the story also makes no sense, since we are told that immediately after basic in April 2008, Manning was sent to Ft. Huachuca for advanced training as an Intel analyst. Upon completion of the course in August of the same year (so, 3 or 4 months later) he immediately received top security clearance. This doesn't happen, for obvious reasons. Manning had no college degree and no prior training of any kind, and showed mental instability in basic. So why would he be picked for Intel and immediately given top security clearance? Do you think that sounds like a good idea? By early 2010 Manning had already been arrested. He was convicted in 2013 and sentenced to maximum security for 35 years. Two days before leaving office in 2017, Obama commuted his sentence to time served. That's convenient for the story, isn't it? Anyone can see that this story doesn't add up. It is obviously another project, meant to bolster the Wikileaks project while at the same time promoting sexual confusion.

So, is Manning really a trannie, or is he just cross-dressing for his part? Who knows? I doubt that you or I will ever know. He may be a real trannie, he may be a child of the Families chosen for his acting abilities—which are admittedly pretty good, or he may be a sad victim of his screwed-up Intel family. My guess is the middle one.

The name Cadwalladr also links us to Chris Wylie in a rather strange way. Wylie is from British Columbia, remember? Well, what are the mountains there called? The Cadwallader Range. It was named for Evan Cadwallader, a Welshman commissioned by Governor **Seymour** to investigate mining potential in the area. There are still Cadwalladers living in the area, including a living Evan

Cadwallader. This indicates to me that Carole Cadwalladr may be related to both Christopher Wylie and Bradley Manning. Which explains why they all tie together in this story.

Next, Cadwalladr sells you the idea that Google has been “gamed” by extremist sites run by the alt-right. But wait, that conflicts with what she just told us two paragraphs before, doesn't it? There, she told us that Google was at the head of a global tectonic shift of power. Well, if Google is so powerful, why is it so easy to hijack by alt-right extremists? She has just manufactured a fake opposition between Google and the alt-right extremists, hasn't she? But if Google is allowing this naïve “gaming”, then shouldn't we assume Google and the alt-right extremists are one and the same? And of course they are: Trump and the trillionaires that own Silicon valley are from the same old families that have been running the world from the beginning. Trump and the alt-right are just propped-up targets. They were created specifically to take your fire, like in the two-minutes hate.

And it is at this point that we see the project aimed at people like me. They want to tar me with this brush, since they want you to think I am one of the ones that has “gamed” the internet somehow. According to their story, I am one of the extremists who is spreading fake news. If my pages rank high on Google, it can only be because I have found some way to cheat the ratings. It isn't because I am telling the truth to an audience hungry for it, it is because I am some sort of hacker-savant, I guess. As with Flat-Earth, it is the attempt to discredit me by association: to surround me with noise, to blackwash that noise, and to hope to jettison me with that noise. It isn't working, but their methods are becoming more convoluted and extensive year by year.

Next, Cadwalladr attempts the truly mindboggling: convincing you that the mainstream media is the victim. She wants you to think the mainstream media is being “smashed and replaced” by Robert Mercer and Steve Bannon. You have to laugh. How could these two guys double-handedly replace the mainstream media, even with all the “gaming” in the world? Are we to believe they are going to achieve this only by hypnotizing the Google spiders?

Actually, Cadwalladr tells us it was all done through AggregateIQ, an “obscure web analytics company based in an office above a shop in Victoria, British Columbia”. Right. And exactly how did AggregateIQ undermine the entire web, Google, the mainstream media, and national voting? According to Cadwalladr, it was done by

Offshore companies, money poured into databases, unfettered third parties... the caps on spending had come off.

Yes, but spending on what? For AggregateIQ to take over the mainstream media, or even the internet, it would actually have to *do* something. A computer program doesn't take over the world by spending money.

Next, Cadwalladr keeps turning the screw. She tells us these web analytics companies come from “deep within the military-industrial complex”. Cue mood music. She says they are not only military, but “old-school Tories”. Oooo! Scary. But wait, if they are old-school Tories, then how is any of this a “global tectonic shift of power”? If it comes out of the military, it must be same-old, same-old, right? Cadwalladr can't seem to keep her story straight. Instead she just keeps dredging up bogeymen. She even drops a couple of names: Lord Marland, David Cameron's trade envoy. So he is supposed to be part of a tectonic shift? Geoffrey Pattie, former undersecretary of state for defence procurement. And he is supposed to be a part of a tectonic shift? What about the bag boy at Tesco? Is he also a part of the tectonic shift?

I really encourage you to read this article at the *Guardian*. It is a mess. Not only is it poorly written, but it jumps all over the place. I defy you to make sense of it. It has all the earmarks of being written by MI6, since it reads just like the crap from Langley we have become accustomed to. For the illiterate by the illiterate.

Cadwalladr takes this link to the military nowhere, but even if these web analytics were coming out of the military, it wouldn't be indication of any shift. Just the reverse. It is business as usual. And do you think the military and Google are enemies? Let me ask you it this way: is there any reason for the military to “smash and replace” the mainstream media? No, the mainstream media has been in bed with military and Intel since the beginning. The internet was invented by military and Intel, for criminy's sake! Google, the internet, and computers themselves were initially military projects, and we may assume they still are. So it makes no sense to claim the military is trying to smash the mainstream media. It is like claiming the military is trying to smash and replace itself.

Next, having nothing else, Cadwalladr implies that these web analytics firms “gamed” the internet simply by stealing information off of Facebook. She doesn't bother to tell us how this information would allow them to undermine Google, but that is what you are supposed to think, I guess. Somehow, just by discovering that you like dogs and I like cats, these analytics firms were able to hypnotize the spiders, lasso them, and lead them where they wished. The entire mainstream media is being victimized by a couple of rich guys and a gaggle of ex-military, via this spider hypnosis.

Next, Cadwalladr returns to the voting thing. We are told that the secret there is “finding the right emotional triggers for each voter”. So, while appearing to warn about the undermining of voting, she is actually confirming its sanctity. She wants you to think they are after your vote, which makes you think it is important to them. This will make you feel empowered through your vote. It will make you talk about voting, lobby for voting rights, argue about voting, and in general waste a lot of time and energy on voting. But the truth is, they don't give a damn about your vote. The only thing they care about is making you *think* your vote counts, and that is what Cadwalladr is selling here. She wants you to continue thinking your vote counts, that elections are real, and that elected officials are real. But none of them are. Votes are no longer even counted, if they ever were. The scenes of officials counting votes are just theater. All elections are predetermined. And elected officials are just actors reading from teleprompters. They make no decisions. They are like a line of pawns, set up to draw your fire. Trump is just an actor in a suit, reading from a screen. All the ridiculous things he says are scripted. They are fine with you hating him, since that hate keeps your eyes on him. You read about his daily scandals instead of researching the real world.

Which is not to say there is no story here. The trillionaire families are indeed data mining you all the time and spying on you all the time. But that shouldn't be news. It has been known for years. And, as I have said, they have always done that to the best of their ability, back to 1776 and before. It is just that now they have some new abilities. High tech gives them new ways to do it. But it actually isn't doing them much good, since they aren't as in-control of society as they were back in the 1950s. They were far more invisible and far more subtle back then. The percentage of people who saw through the charade was very small back then, but now it is large and growing.

And besides, although snooping and data-mining is reprehensible and should be illegal, it isn't nearly as reprehensible as many other things the same Families are doing. Which is why they write stories about it, but don't write stories about the other things. What, for instance? Well, I don't like the fact they have been data-mining us and spying on us, but I am much more upset that they are directly stealing

trillions in taxes from worldwide treasuries for fake projects. Fake military projects, fake science projects, fake space projects, fake art projects, etc. I am much more upset that they have killed art, science, history, and literature. I am much more upset that they are splitting the sexes for profit. I am much more upset that they are splitting the family for profit. Strip-mining the earth for profit. Filling the oceans with garbage for profit. Drugging children and animals for profit. Poisoning food for profit. Lying all the time about everything for profit.

That is what I mean by misdirection. They want your eyes off those things and on their manufactured scandals and tragedies. And they want your eyes on Trump and Mercer and May and Macron and Gates and Buffett and Bezos and other fake and petty billionaires and off the trillionaire families that really own the world. They want your eyes off the banks and huge investment groups and Intelligence agencies. As far as possible they want you lost in a vast trivia game of meaningless details and names and personalities, where all your “knowledge” is just rote propaganda. In that state you can be led by fear and anxiety into a lifetime of plastic purchases. If they flog you just right, you will wear pictures of them on your t-shirts and paste their slogans on your cars, til that moment when—with your final gasping drug-induced breath—you will your last dollars to their fake charities.