BOYCOTT EVERYTHING!

by Miles Mathis

I was already working on this paper when the boycott of A&E was announced. For those who aren't up-to-date on the latest news, a show called “Duck Dynasty” on the cable channel A&E suspended one of its actors for things he said in a magazine interview. He said he thought homosexuality was a sin, so he was basically fired for having an opinion. Political correctness now trumps the Constitution, by which you are supposed to have a right to free speech. Many groups are now boycotting A&E, and not just Christians. Everyone who believes in free speech—including progressives like Camille Paglia—has joined the boycott. We may see a follow-up lawsuit on this, but I am not here to comment on that.

The reason I led with this nod to today's headline is because I wish to tie this boycott to my paper already in progress. That paper was started after I recently got another email asking me to suggest a reading list. I get lots of emails like that, and have for many years. Some of these emails come from those reading my science site, some from my art site, and some from my political articles. All these emails have a common thread, although the thread is often unstated in the actual emails. That thread concerns my method. These readers mainly seem to want to know how I got to where I am. They seem to think if they read what I have read, they will get where I am. The world is so compromised and corrupt, your first assumption upon finding a new thing (in the media) should be that it is propaganda of some sort, and therefore to be avoided. For instance, one of my older recommendations is that you should avoid reading anything written after WWII, and the newer it is, the more assiduously you should protect yourself from it. If it is famous, double down. If the author is rich or well known, double down again. If the author has a major publisher, run like the wind.

Of course there are exceptions, but I stand by that general rule. I have been personally aware of that rule for at least three decades, and have been promoting that rule for at least two. That should seem somewhat uncanny—even to me—considering that I didn't understand the extent of propaganda until the last decade. With hindsight, it appears I had a natural nose for propaganda from a young age, and intuitively avoided many things after only a sniff. Only later did I come to understand exactly why I was avoiding them, and how right I had been.

I will give you an example. I have always avoided drugs of all kinds, pharmaceutical and recreational. In the beginning, I mainly did that because I wasn't impressed by those offering them to me. I didn't wish to be like them, so I wasn't too interested in doing what they were doing. But even after I became an artist and a sometimes hippie, I still wasn't interested in experimenting with drugs. They simply
held no fascination for me. I never avoided recreational drugs because they were illegal, since I have never had much respect for the law; but avoid them I did. Now I understand that the hippie culture and alternative culture and youth culture were flooded with dangerous drugs on purpose by the fascists running this country, so I have facts to back up my feelings. But at the time, I was existing mainly on intuition.

It wasn't all intuition, since there were tangible things that affected my judgment. I may not have known that the government was trying to confuse all progressives by a general drugging, but I could see that those already doing the drugs were confused. I could also see that the heightened confusion was an outcome of the drugs. So why would I wish to experiment along those lines? Who wants to be stupider? Who wants to pay money to be stupider? Some people, I suppose, but not me. So I have boycotted all drugs from an early age. It wasn't strictly a boycott, since a boycott implies avoiding something you previously didn't avoid. But the effect was the same either way.

What else? I killed my TV in about 1985. Again, this wasn't a reaction to learning about propaganda. At the time, I didn't know anything about that. I just began to have a sick feeling every time I watched TV. I hated almost all the programming, and the news the most. I hated the news even more than the advertising. I could see it was all bullshit, and one day I just pulled the set from the wall and stomped on it until it was a pile of crumbs. I have never regretted it. I have a TV now—or my fiancée does—but it gets no reception. We use it only to watch old movies.

But back to books for a moment. I said that some books after 1945 are exceptions to the rule, but I should have reminded you of the flip side: many books before 1945 are also fascist propaganda. Although propaganda went into high gear after the war, and has accelerated ever since, I don't mean to imply everything was clean before the war. In recent papers, I have gone back to 1875, and even back before the Civil War, showing some main lines of modern propaganda; and of course it goes much further back than that. But in general, the further back you go, the cleaner you will be. Even if you trip over some propaganda, it will often be outdated and harmless, and you can usually just chuckle at it. In most cases, propaganda is very culture and time specific, and a century will have defused any power it once had. But of course if you find some propaganda that looks very modern, get your defenses up immediately. If it looks like modern propaganda, it will act like modern propaganda, and may still be a danger.

One of the ways I avoid new books is by avoiding the bookstore. I haven't been to a Barnes&Noble or similar bookstore in years. Why? Because they don't have any real books. Like the major newspapers and magazines, the bookstores were taken over long ago. They are just fronts for the CIA. I suspect they are subsidized and they may be run directly from Langley. Again, I have been avoiding mainstream bookstores for at least 20 years, but I only recently figured out why they don't have any real books. Real books don't fit their agenda. They want you reading Oprah books on self-help or pseudo-psychology. Either that or fake history books, fake political books, or fake current events books. They want your reading experience to be totally manufactured by their inserted agents. Yes, they still have some classics, but only the classics that don't interfere with their program. You will find that most classics that contain any useful information have been phased out. And the ones that remain are fronted by asinine introductions and ugly covers. They are sprayed with formaldehyde, coated with toxins, inserted with tracking devices, and then marked up to three times their value. You can get old first editions on abebooks or ebay for cheaper than the smelly new books.

So let that be my first positive recommendation. Buy your old books from one of the online outfits or from a local used bookstore. For myself, I go to ebay, type in a date from 1850 to 1920, and just look
at all the books that come up. If I have a certain subject I am studying that week, I also may type in that searchword. But most commonly I just let the Muses guide me. If I find an interesting book I know nothing about, I do a websearch on it. Sometimes I can read parts of it at Googlebooks or the whole thing at Gutenberg.org. Or if it is really interesting, I just buy it for a few bucks. A lot of old books you can get for little more than the price of shipping, and they are well worth it.

As for science, I really don't know what to tell people when they ask for a reading list. They seem to want me to point them to a corrected textbook, one that avoids all the mistakes I reveal on my site. Of course that doesn't exist. Since it doesn't exist, any reading list I could offer would be mostly a negative list. I would recommend you read these things because it is important to see exactly where they are wrong. Just about anything could be on that list, but at the top would be Newton's *Principia*, Maxwell's books, Planck's books, Einstein's books, and Schrodinger's books. Those are at the top because they are the least wrong and because they are mostly sensible. You continue to feel like a real scientist while you are reading them, instead of like some modern impostor. You should also read Euclid and Archimedes and Galileo and all the other old guys in the original texts. I don't mean you have to read them in Greek or Latin, I just mean read their own treatises instead of commentary on them.

Other books on the list, but lower down, include Feynman's books, Born's books, Hawking's books, and so on. But these are on the list for a different reason. They are on the list to show you what not to do. They are wrong at most points, and are what you might call fundamentally wrong—since they display an anti-scientific attitude from beginning to end. Below them are the rest of the physics books, which are mainly pulp. Pretty much every mainstream physics book published since 1930 is fit only for lining a birdcage. I would say this applies to all the popular ones, and only a few “marginal” publications contain any useful information. In this last category I would include Eric Lerner's *The Big Bang Never Happened*, which contains some good physics, but which is even more important for what it tells you about science politics. It has been suppressed and is hard to find. That is a sign you should look for. If a book has been heavily promoted, it is probably worthless. If it is hard to find, out of print, slammed at Amazon or in physics forums, it may be worth something.

Arthur Koestler's *The Case of the Midwife Toad* is also worth reading, although it has nothing to do with physics. It is an early science “conspiracy theory” book, and from it you will learn how science works in the real world. This is important to understand when judging new science.

Beyond a few marginal examples like that, you have to avoid the bulk of contemporary science, in both books and journals. Especially in physics, where almost all of it is propaganda. It has all been filtered, it has been approved, and it has been whitewashed. It is therefore worth avoiding for many reasons. I am not saying you shouldn't read it, but you have to read it with your own reverse filters on. I have been able to find some good data in reading contemporary science, which I can use to my own purposes, but this data is always buried in giant slagheaps of propaganda and terrible theory. Like everything else, science now arrives heavily spun, and often it is nothing but spin. To find anything useful in it, you have to hose it down until the stink begins to dissipate. Then you can collect your few crumbs or nuggets and move on. Or you can just boycott it all as basically worthless. If you aren't building your own new theory like I am, contemporary physics won't be worth your time.

In art, you have to go back many decades as well. Boycott everything new and most things old. The few things worth keeping include Whistler's *Gentle Art of Making Enemies*, Van Gogh's *Letters*, Tolstoi's *What is Art*, and Rodin's *L'Art*. John Ruskin is well worth reading, but his books on art are actually his least useful, in my opinion. He is much more penetrating and correct as a social critic. Try
“Traffic” for instance, which appears in *Crown of Wild Olive*.

Which takes us beyond art and physics. Along with Ruskin, I recommend Carlyle, Emerson, Michelet, and Thoreau. Michelet was Van Gogh's favorite author, which is reason enough to take a look. Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus* is now mostly unknown, but still charming. Emerson and Thoreau you probably already know, but look beyond *Walden* and “Self Reliance.” Moving back a bit, I recommend Goethe. Again, go beyond *Faust*, which is great but which is not all there is. *Werther* is entertaining and is required in order to understand Romanticism. His *Theory of Color* is also greater than we are taught. Moving ahead, I recommend Nietzsche, who is both the most important and most misinterpreted author since the 1880's. The most useful for my purposes has been *The Case of Wagner*, although all his books are worth reading many times.

Moving almost to our own time, I recommend Wendell Berry's *The Unsettling of America*, published in 1977. Berry has been called a contemporary Thoreau, and that is apt. Deborah Davis' *Katharine the Great* is important to read as well. This book was suppressed after publication by the government, and that alone should recommend it. Look to see who the mainstream is attacking most viciously, and you are likely to have found someone trying to tell the truth. That is not always true, since the CIA now sometimes attacks itself in order to fool you, but it is still a good general rule to follow.

But back to the boycott of everything. I have given you a few exceptions, but let us return to the rule. A good rule is to avoid anything that is promoted. A similar rule is to make a list of all the things you see advertised, and then don't buy any of them. You can start with all the Fortune 500 companies, the multinationals, the conglomerates, and so on. Boycott 'em all. In a recent paper on organic foods, I recommended you boycott all the big brands. At a normal grocery store, that means you have to boycott about 90% of the store. But even at a health food store like Whole Foods, you still have to boycott more than half the products, since many organic brands have been bought out by major brands and conglomerates like Nestle, Coca Cola, Pepsico, Unilever, General Mills, Purina, Johnson & Johnson and so on. Go here to find out which ones.

When it comes to clothing, I again boycott them all. I don't go to the mall or any big box stores. I get my clothing second hand on eBay, for the most part. I buy the oldest vintage clothes and shoes I can find, in hopes of predating the sweatshop age as much as possible. I avoid Nike and other big brands, even in used clothing.

I have been boycotting new movies for years, but originally I did that only because I always hated them. I can't tell you how many times I have walked out of movies. And when they started running ads before the movies, I quit for good. I remember standing up in a theater in around 1995 in Austin, yelling “we paid to see this movie—why are we watching fucking ads?” Since 1985, I probably haven't seen a dozen movies I would recommend. Every decade the CIA's control of Hollywood becomes more transparent, and now they just make movies about themselves. Even if you can't boycott them all, please consider boycotting the most obvious offenders like George Clooney, Matt Damon, Ben Affleck, Angelina Jolie, Brad Pitt, James Franco, and so on. Go to IMDB, make a list of anyone involved in *Zero Dark Thirty*, *Argo*, *Syriana*, or any similar movies, and boycott them for life.

Now that I understand why I hate new movies, I am being forced to extend my boycott backwards in time, to include many older movies. I begin to see the government's influence on many old movies, including the classics. Except for the period pieces that stick strictly to the original books, I may have to quit watching movies altogether.
The same applies to music. Except for a handful of exceptions (Keane, for example), I haven't listened to new music since around 1990. But my research has begun to affect my appreciation of all radio music since about 1950, and I am now suspicious of everything. Fortunately, I have found that I can still enjoy most of the music, since the older bands are good even when they are propagandizing me. I have to learn to look at most high-profile 60's and 70's music the way I have always looked at Sinatra. Sure, he was a mobster and an agent, but so what? At least he could sing, and he had a good orchestra behind him. I have always been able to block out the words of songs, and that talent is handier with each passing year. The CIA used to have some babies in its bathwater, and I am not sure it is best to let them go with it. But that opinion may change. I may have to throw out all my old records some day. And if you find the lyrics lodging in your head, causing damage, I recommend you boycott everything back to Beethoven.

The mainstream has convinced most people that they have to accept all change gracefully, as a part of “growing up,” but that is just more propaganda. They tell you there is no going back, but that is also false. All things are possible in a society, including refusing novelties that simply aren't beneficial. Once we discovered Thalidomide caused mutations, we didn't keep using it, did we? No, we went back. We refused it. Many other chemicals and products have since been banned, so to say we have to keep buying whatever is being sold simply isn't true. We can refuse to buy any and all things that are not beneficial, and should. A majority of things now being sold are not beneficial. In fact, a large majority of things now being sold are demonstrably harmful, and you are far better off without them. The number of things a sane person needs in this world is actually quite small, and none of them need to be toxic to any degree.

You have been sold the idea that the world is a dangerous place, full of risks and side effects, but for the most part that is simply not true. Most of the risks and side effects have been created by people hawking products, who then ignore the risks and side effects they have created. Most of the dangers to humans in this world have been manufactured, and are easily avoidable. They would disappear the moment they were no longer manufactured, and this applies to the poisoning of the air, water, soil, food, airwaves, media, science, politics, education, and everything else. It is all being poisoned, and usually it is being poisoned on purpose—to benefit whoever is doing the poisoning. But if you and everyone else stops buying the poison, the market dries up immediately. So boycott all the poison.

I will finish by making a list of things I do without. This is a list of things I don't have and do not wish to have. Even if I had a billion dollars, I wouldn't buy them.

Car
Insurance
Cell phone
Drugs (not including high quality vitamins and herbs)
Ipod, Ipad, Blackberry, Kindle, or any other mobile device
Vaccines
Facebook, Twitter, youtube or any other CIA account
Extra keys. I have two keys on my keychain, and one is my bicycle lock key.
Magazine or newspaper subscriptions
Cable TV, satellite TV, or any TV subscription. I currently have no TV reception
A doctor. I have no doctor, no therapist, no psychologist, no medical plan, and no emergency numbers. I do not get checkups. I get my teeth cleaned about once every five years and have no problems. I do not use a fluoride toothpaste and I do not drink fluoridated water. I do not get X-rays. I don't even have a barber. I cut my own hair.
A pension, retirement plan, savings, or any money set aside to bury myself. Like Thoreau, I feel a man isn't required to bury himself. If I can't afford to pay for embalming, maybe they won't bother. Maybe they will just throw me in a ditch and shovel some dirt on, which is what I would prefer. A man also isn't required to worry about what he will do when he is old. I have enough to do living in the present. As for a pension, that is just another pile for thieves to steal (as we are seeing now in Greece and Detroit).

A lawn. What's the point? Grass can take care of itself.

A gym membership


Investments. “Investing” is a scam created by thieves. No one makes money from investments except thieves and their accomplices. And even if investing made money, who cares? I make all the money I need from a few hours work each month doing things that need to be done. That is much more satisfying than making money from investing in companies doing things that don't need to be done.

Balancing my checkbook. I don't even have a checkbook. The credits and debits that pass through my hands in a given month are so few and so small I can keep track of them in my head. Since I live day to day, all my accounts could be stolen by the banks and I would be out almost nothing.

Licenses. I have no licenses. They tell you licensing is a primary means of regulation, but it is actually just a primary means of theft by the government. I am in favor of regulation, but licensing has nothing to do with regulation. Take a fishing license, for example. They can regulate how many fish you catch without collecting a fee from you, right? They just look in your creel. You will say the fee pays for the regulators, but we already pay federal taxes that could go to things like that. Federal lands already have regulators on them, fishing or no fishing. The only reason they need to collect a fee for fishing is that they have already given all the federal taxes to the military, the bankers, and the spies. If those thieves hadn't already gobbled up all the money that could go to useful things, they wouldn't have to license you to death for things you should have already paid for.

Memberships. I don't have any memberships. I wouldn't be in any club that would admit people who needed to be a member of club. Clubs are for people who need constant confirmation, and people who need constant confirmation never get anything important done.

Any more degrees. My friends of all ages are always talking about going back to school for more degrees. I always recommend they just buy a few books and learn what they wish to know. It is much cheaper and far more efficient. The university has always been an overgrowth of its own library, and the modern university now is related to its own library like a host of locusts is related to a field of grain. It has engulfed and digested all old knowledge, depositing in the classrooms only piles of frass and some squirming larvae.

In conclusion, I will repeat that the word boycott is imprecise in regard to most of the things I do. You boycott something that you would normally do or buy, to make a point to the seller. What I am recommending is more than a boycott, since—as I said—there is nothing the salesmen could do to make me start buying again. I am not boycotting cars, for instance, until they build a better car. I am boycotting the whole idea of cars. There is no way they could make a car that didn't pollute, kill people and animals, speed up the world, and stink from its components. I do not expect they will ever make a car out of dirt and grass, one that requires no road on the earth or sky—one that goes slowly and is no danger to children, cats, or turtles. What we need is not more efficient or more organic gadgets. What
we need is less of just about everything. What we need is copious and advanced levels of restraint. We need fewer products and fewer salesmen. We need to sleep, relax, and quit buying. If we don't, Nature is going to put us all to sleep permanently.