

[return to updates](#)

BURNING MAN AND MODERN ART



by Miles Mathis

First published September 3, 2021

Some will be glad to see me publishing a paper again with the word “art” in it. I have previously outed Burning Man as a government/military operation in [my paper from early 2016 on Robert Anton Wilson](#). I believe I was the first to out either him or Burning Man. But I just found out that Steve Outtrim of Australia, previously a prominent burner, had decided for whatever reason to switch sides in late 2017 and continue my research, [taking it far beyond where I did](#). I recommend you watch that video, which I found highly entertaining and well researched. Outtrim doesn't mention or reference me, so I don't know if I was the immediate cause of his epiphany, but the timing would lead one to think so.

I did a quick search on Outtrim, and he does have a Wiki page. It of course fails to mention that he has outed Burning Man as a military project. Outtrim is a rich guy who made millions in tech, being the inventor of HotDog among other things. At a glance, I would guess he decided to out these fuckers at Burning Man mainly as revenge for the way he was treated in the early years of the internet, when he was squashed by Bill Gates. Which tells me Bill Gates or his overseers may be behind Burning Man in some capacity, which wouldn't surprise anyone. At any rate, as an insider, Outtrim is privy to a lot of information not available to me. I had to come to my conclusions based on far less evidence, though I would say it is obvious on a first sniff that Burning Man is not what it claims to be. I could see that immediately, before even doing any research. But Outtrim has a six-part video exposé that should convince you if I didn't.

I am not here to report any of his findings: you can get your info straight from him. I am here to make some broader connections, and to extend my previous commentaries based on this new knowledge. Mainly I want to try one more time to explain why I found this event and all like it so distressing, even

before knowing it was another creation of the spooks. Outtrim apparently found Burning Man compelling at some time in the past, but I never did. I avoided it like the plague because I could see that these were not my people.



Why? Well, let me try to gloss it for you, without wasting too much of your time or mine. I have never been to Burning Man, it goes without saying, and until today I had never even watched videos of it. But after listening to Outtrim's research, I felt it would be useful to us if I did. It was pretty much what I thought it was, except that I wasn't aware to what extent it was a light and laser show. Burning Man is a strange mix of high and low tech, and that should have always been a tip-off. There is obviously huge money and technology behind it, which logically should have pointed right at military, and now does. So there is a big layer of this military-circus frosting on an under-layer of home-made craft. I refuse to call it art, since I saw no art there. But there is lot of garage-craft artisanship, and a small part of it is cute or clever. Most of it is purposely grotesque, grunge, or trashy, and the general feel of the event is definitely grunge, from the clothing to the makeshift architecture to the floats and cars. About the only part of Burning Man that appeals to me is the use of bicycles, but since the environs are so dirty, these have to be utilitarian bikes. No one wants to take vintage bikes out there to be clogged with dirt, so the artisan side of the event doesn't extend much into the bikes.

As for the music, it is the same sort of thing, being a stripped-down techno-beat invented mainly for hypnosis and brainwashing. It isn't really music by any sense of the word, unless you want to call a drum machine music. It is noise so devoid of content it makes rap seem relatively rich. But the neo-hippies/grunge monsters are so dumbed down they don't seem to miss anything. They don't realize that music once existed.

And the color schemes at these events are imported from the same psychological dungeons as the music, deep medical cesspools where proto-Nazi therapists first learned that fluorescents and super-saturated hot primaries could induce the same blank minds as the three-note musical compositions. It is just amazing that no one has yet thought to dye the desert itself a hot pink. Look for it in 2022.



Beyond the military connection, none of that may sound too distressing to you. What's wrong with a bunch of people getting together and sharing their garage-craft creations and watching light shows? On the surface, nothing. If this event took place in a culture that still had a top end of art, I don't think it would bother me at all. I am not interested in car shows, but car shows don't distress me. I am not interested in monster trucks, but they don't distress me as an artist. There are a lot of things that I don't participate in or even that I don't really understand that don't distress me. I think of them as things that other people do, and no harm done. But events like Burning Man give me a bad vibe. They always have. I remind you of my paper on the [Taos GlamTrash Fashion Show](#) of many years ago, where I first tried to explain this. That event affected me just like Burning Man, because I think they come from the same place. My fiancée at the time didn't understand my response to that, even after reading that paper, so I guess that is one reason I feel compelled to return to it. I think our disagreement on that was one reason we never got married. She never could understand why that event or those people bothered me so much. She thought I was just a stick-in-the-mud, raining on everyone's parade. My belief remains firm that if she really *understood* where the whole concept came from, she would agree with me. My hope is that maybe by viewing Steve Outtrim's videos, she and others like her could finally comprehend the enormity of this whole project. She could not take my word for it, since we were too close. It is hard to take someone standing right next to you as an authority on anything. Strangely, that seems to require some distance. So the fact that this wealthy insider, who knows these people personally, would come to the same conclusion as me, might mean something.

The basic problem, as I see it, is that we are living in a time utterly devoid of real art. By that I mean art of beauty, subtlety and elevation. Sure, it still exists in museums, but almost nobody alive is now creating it. If they are, nobody cares. What is more, it didn't just die out naturally. It has been killed with malice aforethought by the very people Steve Outtrim is outing: by the billionaires and trillionaires and their hirelings in the military, government, big tech, media, and academia. The death of real art and the rise of Modernism was not an organic fall and rise. It was planned and staged for various reasons which I have enumerated in hundreds of papers over three decades. These include the use of [art in money laundering](#) and the capture of the field for the talentless children of these rich families, who wanted to be artists but were not capable of it.

So someone like me can't help but see Burning Man in that context. It is not just a meeting of grunge

artisans and light show mavens. No, it is sold as a premier art event, drawing far more people and press than any art show in New York. In this sense, it is the low end of art posing as the high end. Since the high end is extinct, almost no one notices. In the screaming artistic void that is the 21st century, the military tries to paper over the vacuum by filling it with fireworks and monstrous metal contraptions. Beneath that it promotes a bevy of marginally talented people—some of them admittedly energetic—far beyond their deserts. All to ensure that high art remains in the grave.

I remember that after I published that old paper on Glam/Trash saying basically the same thing, one person wrote in and said, “Dude, everything isn't about you.” You may laugh, since that *is* rather pithy, but of course it misses the point, probably on purpose. The problem, you see, is that NOTHING is about me, or any like me. Yes, if I were rich and famous, a beneficiary of my own promotion, respected by the mainstream, then my complaining about Burning Man or anything else would just look ungenerous and egocentric. It could perhaps rightly be dismissed as haughty, snobbish, or aristocratic. But that is opposite to the facts. Many of my best paintings have never even been exhibited. They have never been in a gallery or museum, and almost no one has seen them. Traditional art has not only failed to be promoted for the past century, it has been vilified, viciously slandered, and all but outlawed. Most people don't know that, and—miseducated or misdirected by mainstream academics and writers—they may think we arrived at this point due to some sort of organic or democratic or meritocratic process. We didn't. We got here because people like the Rockefellers wanted complete control of art, and artists like me back in the 1920s wouldn't do what we were told. So the Rockefellers pushed us all out of the field, redefined art, and hired their own hack artists, who *would* do what they are told. This is no longer in doubt. A few mainstream writers have gone AWOL, admitting precisely that. See [Frances Stonor Saunders](#), for example.

I moved to Taos, NM, in 2007 because it was one of the last gallery towns that specialized in realist art. It had a tiny market back in the 1990s, but it was still viable at that time. But soon after I arrived, [Dennis Hopper and the Moderns came in](#) and purposely destroyed what was left of that market. They wanted to take it over for Modernism, and said so. So they coopted the town museum and the newspaper and ran symposiums, slandering people like me with all the same old lies. We were dismissed as provincial and out-of-touch and backward for not keeping up with the patter from the big cities and the universities. We hadn't yet bowed before the great Moloch of Modernism, chanting that art must now be about some promoted headline or social relevance. Hopper and his people failed, since no one wanted their fake art, but they did succeed in destroying what was left of the local market. Their promotion, along with the financial crash in 2007, caused by the greed of the same people, turned out to be the death knell of the Taos market. I lived there for fourteen years and never exhibited once, except in my own house. And it isn't because the local administrators didn't know I was there. They did. But orders had come down from above that all local promotion would go to Moderns. Meow Wolf arose in nearby Santa Fe while I was there, making sure that sort of stunted creativity, of the Burning Man sort, got all the media attention and resources. Paseo, an adjunct of Meow Wolf, was promoted at the same time in Taos, but like Hopper it went nowhere. The locals and art buyers aren't interested in that stuff, and it exists only due to a constant underwriting from industry and military. So it has no real effect in towns like Taos except the side-effect of making sure traditional art remains invisible by neglect.

I think you can see why I always had mixed feelings about Taos. The mountains and clouds there are gorgeous, but as a social construct, the place is a shithole. Actually, you could say that about any town or city in America, large or small. The entire social fabric of the country (and world) has been purposely obliterated. Taos—standing for everywhere else here—not only has no art scene, it has no scene period. It is a cultural and spiritual void. Even before the faux-pandemic, the place was an

intellectual desert, inhabited by no one but paid shills and narcs and the occasional independent dupe. Now it is like a bomb crater, with people crawling through the dust in some dark and stunted form, trailing ooze. This is what the post-apocalypse looks like, literally. We are already there in spirit, and the only thing left is for the tidal wave to come in and take us out to sea.

Is there any rebounding from such a thing? Possibly. But certainly not without admitting we are in the belly of the whale, that there *is* a whale, and that, [like Monstro](#), he must die.



People talk of a zombie apocalypse, not realizing *they* are the zombies. The US was a zombie world long before the fake pandemic arrived. Many seem to think they can drug themselves out of this stupor, but the opposite is true: it is going to take a mass intervention, a mass cold-turkey dry-out decades in length. It will require a complete re-education from the ground up, a sort of anti-brainwashing. All the effluent fed into people's heads since the First World War will have to be flushed out and replaced by real information. All the hosepipes of disinformation will have to be cut and wrapped around the throats of millions of propagandists. Several generations of liars will have to be permanently jettisoned from society, reinstalled as toll booth operators or sandwich wrappers, where they can't do any harm. Thousands of top names will have to be excised from the history books, except as examples of what NOT to do. Every last trace of Modernism will have to be purged from the syllabus, lest it reinfect us and drive us once again to the verge of insanity and collapse.

There has been a lot of unnecessary hysteria concerning viruses in the past year, but Modernism has been the real virus in a pandemic lasting 140 years now. What began as a minor cough around 1880 has now spread throughout the entire body, and culture is now filled with bloodclots and spike proteins, bleeding from the eyes.

Even my allies tell me there is no going back, but there is. The “move on” mantra is part of Modernism and has to be thrown out with it. Computers are fixed or fix themselves every day by going back. One of the programs is actually called GoBack. You revert to a previous time, thereby erasing the viruses and other glitches that got you into your previous mess. By suggesting that we go back to the 1880s or 1950s in some ways is not to suggest we relive those times, or go back in all ways. It is simply to suggest that we can easily revert to schemes that worked very well before. We revert in some ways but not others. To go back to the computer analogy, we revert to a working point in the history, then reinstall the clean programs that are already known to work. So, for instance, we might revert to a

1950s level of wealth distribution, without the huge disparities that have since arisen, but then install more contemporary programs of racial and sexual fairness, so that blacks and women don't have to relive the disparities of those times. That's the great thing about going back: you can pick and choose what to keep and what to lose. It is called learning from history, and it is not only possible, it is the only way to make real progress. If we were more right about some things in the 1950s or the 1880s, it is silly and stupid to claim we can't go back. We can very easily do what our ancestors did, and we can do it even better since we have hindsight they didn't. We can do it even better the second time.

You may say that is all theoretical, but it isn't. Societies have already done it many times. What do you think the Renaissance was? It was the premeditated return to Greek ideals after many centuries of admitted failures and dead ends called the dark ages or Middle Ages. Society reformed itself at that time, and in many cases it did so very self-consciously, looking to the past for help. Especially in the case of art, the field was reconstituted from almost nothing by studying Greek classical sculpture, some of which had recently been unearthed. Literally dug up from the ground. The period from 1450 to 1880 was the most fertile in recorded history, in all fields, from art to science to literature, and it was due primarily to a conscious reversion to Greek and Roman examples and a jettisoning of narrow and misguided ideas that had ruled up to that time.

The analogy is even closer, since although the Middle Ages weren't much like the Modern Age in many ways, they were similar in the levels of control and propaganda. Fascism was in full bloom then, though it was a church/state fascism rather than an industry/state fascism. Still, it amounted to much the same thing, given that the church was the industry and media of the time. We have been taught that Modernism is about freedom, but nothing could be further from the truth, or more proof of the ascendancy of propaganda. That people could have believed Modernism had anything to do with freedom was a testament to the power of the propaganda, and the gullibility of the people. Modernism has been the most fascist and tyrannical top-down control wielded by any group since the Middle Ages. It has demanded fealty and punished miscreants with an iron fist, by using an army of academic, governmental, and military enforcers in no way inferior to any ecclesiastical courts of the 12th century. As I have said before, even the Nazis were no match for it, both because they were far kinder to traditional art, and because they themselves fell to it. The Nazis lasted only a few years, while Modernism has been ascendant for almost a century and a half. Even in the years 1933 to 1944, outside Germany Modernism was never threatened in the least by the Nazis, and once the Nazis fell they were simply used by the Moderns as another example to point to. The Moderns used the Nazis as further examples of the dangers of an "aristocratic" art, further burying classicism under the big lie.

But as we now know, it was actually Modernism that was the more aristocratic, since traditional painting before the Modern period was becoming more grassroots and mainstream every decade. That is what Impressionism was all about, remember? That is what Van Gogh was all about, remember? That's exactly why traditional art had to be destroyed and replaced by Modernism, an art invented by the bankers and their minions to make sure it never became an art of the people. The new art was immediately drained of all form and content: do you think that was just an accident? We are told that was to purify it, but did it become pure? No, it just became extinct. Art wasn't purified, it was replaced by non-art, on purpose. It was replaced by urinals and blank canvases and cans of excrement, to what end? Did any of that do the common man any good? How was that democratic, much less artistic? I say it was aristocratic because it benefitted only the wealthy. The only content of art after that time was financial, so only the financiers had any use for it. The only interest in any report from Sotheby's or Christie's or MOMA was a report of dollar signs. There was no art to speak of. All the rest, all the critical blather from a million fetid pens, was only cover for that. Robert Hughes, perhaps the top Modern art critic in the 1970s and 80s, was finally forced to admit that. He firebombed the entire field

on his way out, sort of like what Richard Feynman did in the field of physics, and what Outtrim is doing to Burning Man above. A pre-meditated and purposeful burning of all bridges, since they are bridges to nowhere.

Some have criticized me for creating aristocratic art, and as we saw above some have criticized me for having a snobbish view of Burning Man and Glam/Trash fashion shows and the like. But that is also mostly inverted. I have found by long experience that normal and average people are far more likely to view my art favorably than Modern art. The masses detest Modernism and always have. Everyone knows that. Modernism is created, sold, promoted, and defended by the very wealthy, most of them lily white. Those same people are the ones most likely to dismiss realism as regressive, outdated, or anti-intellectual. Imagine accusing me of being anti-intellectual. I'm anti-intellectual and aristocratic at the same time—how does that work? But as I have proven, the reason I have to be attacked and squashed has nothing to do with me being anti-intellectual, aristocratic, or outdated. I have to be neglected and slandered simply because I can paint and draw and sculpt. It is sort of like slandering an NBA player because he is tall and a good shooter, but there it is. That is how the Modern world works. I am the primary danger to all those claiming to be artists, but who can't draw, paint, or sculpt. So I have to be kept out of the field. If anyone should exhibit my work next to theirs, and ask basic questions, Modernism would collapse overnight.

So what use did those like the Rockefellers see for art, beyond as a chip for money laundering? Well, you will not be surprised they saw a military use for it, which ties us back to Burning Man. These people don't have an artistic bone in their bodies, so killing art meant nothing to them. But they saw the military spin to this from the beginning. In what way? Well, one of the most interesting things Outtrim pointed me to in the video above was the [First Earth Battalion](#), which I had never heard of. Wikipedia ties it to the whole staring-at-goats story, but that is just cover. It wasn't about that. Nor was it about an allegiance to planet Earth. That too was just another shibboleth to fool the hippies. In fact, it was a direct pointer to events like Burning Man, since the battalion was the brainchild of **Lt. Col. Jim Channon**, whose idea was to redirect the military into social engagement with civilians, precisely of the sort we see in Nevada on Labor Day. It was a sort of bread-and-circuses, grassroots engagement with swords sheathed, for the point of spying, propagandizing, and general destabilization. Hence the fireworks, the light shows, the phony art, the fake bows to Gaea, the wrapping themselves in counterculture, and the ubiquitous drug pushing. This explains at least one of the ties between Burning Man and the Esalen Institute, since Esalen had been funded directly or indirectly by military and Intelligence from the beginning, and Channon was explicitly tied to Esalen through the misnamed Human Potential Movement. Channon, like the rest of these people, was an obvious phony, since he went on to work for AT&T, Dupont, and Whirlpool as a “corporate shaman”.

Another thing Outtrim confirms from my 2016 paper is that there I had said that it was very important the burned effigy was a man, suggesting they were figuratively castrating all the men in the audience, and that they might as well check their balls at the gate. As it turns out, one of the founders had implied the same thing, and in one of the early burnings they did add testicles to the wicker man.

One of the many things Outtrim discovered that I didn't is where the term Burning Man came from. It might seem self-evident, but as I pointed out, they don't call it that in the UK. They have a similar event over there, but they call him the Wicker Man. Outtrim points out that none of the founders wished to claim the coining of the term, though it would seem to be a point of honor. As it turns out, the term was found in a later document post [2017] by the CIA, on its own site. A “burn man” is someone with the proper security clearance to destroy documents. And in 1989 at the first event dubbed Burning Man, the Cacophony Society was involved with Oliver North and shredding (or

burning?) documents [see minute 1:02:00 of the linked video above].

Soon after that we get a connection between the Rothschilds and Burning Man, since David de Rothschild is a big burner. A Rothschild is not the first person you think of when you think of grunge, counterculture, garage art, or windy deserts in Nevada. I don't see the counterculture connection, so it must be a military connection. Rothschild is sold as a great explorer and environmentalist, but it wouldn't be the first time a billionaire used exploring or environmentalism as cover for something else. So it is very hard to take this guy seriously. Regardless, the link between them does neither one any good. If Rothschild doesn't taint Burning Man, we now know that Burning Man taints Rothschild.

At minute 1:37:00, I can fill in a hole for them in the video. Outtrim points out that the head of the Burning Man effigy is built on a double cross. He asks Jan Irvin if that is Satanic. At first Irvin claims he can't see it, then says it is Orthodox. It isn't. It is a **Cross of Lorraine**, which I have previously shown is a favorite of the current spooks, since it points back at the Phoenicians in the clearest possible manner. Other than the Maltese Cross, it is probably the most-used signal at the current time for these types of propaganda events. It was used by the Free French forces. We also saw it used in Magnum PI as a rather obvious signal. It points at the Phoenicians very obviously in two lines, both the Lorraine lines of France which hale from Charlemagne and the Arpad lines of Hungary, which point forward to the Jagiellons and back to the Komnenes.

Another thing they miss is the aces and eights in the previous segment, when they are analyzing Michael Mikel's Dr. Danger and his time traveling Medicine Show [minute 1:31:00]. Outtrim correctly points out that Mikel is famous for bringing the first shipping container to the desert, and it just happens to be a special military container. The front door is covered in military camouflage, over which is posted an old-timey medicine show banner, stuffed with symbology and numerology. But they miss both the eight-pointed sun and the **aces and eights** in a poker hand, which I have shown is the premier signal of the Jews/Phoenicians, standing for **Chai**, an important number in Hebrew and Kabbalistic mysticism.

At minute 1:44:40, we see something that confirms Outtrim's claim this festival is really Satanic. Co-founder Will Roger is driving in the Golden Spike for the opening ceremony, and he says that it will mark the "cauldron that will cook their souls", referring to the 60,000 burners expected to arrive. The cauldron is named El Diabla. The Devil. Wow. If you don't think that sounds spooky, you aren't awake. It sounds very much like a spell is or is about to be cast upon all who enter that area, just as I foretold in my 2016 paper. Some may have enough white light to dodge that spell, but what of the others?

At minute 1:52:30, organizer Crimson Rose says that

Burning Man represents all of us. He's the collector of all the imagination and energy and he consumes it all year long, so that he can literally burn up like a Phoenix.

So they are admitting that some entity is feeding on the imagination and energy of those attending, not figuratively but *literally*. Not as a bit of poetry, but in actual fact. So if you are a burner, you aren't there to be energized or educated or empowered. You are there to be fed upon. To have your energy *taken*. Who is taking it? Not that wicker effigy, since he is just a symbol. But Rose tells you that as well: the Phoenix is taking it, ie the Phoenicians. They have you there under the usual spell, but in their special time and place, with their special wands and chants and tokens and numbers. The propaganda can be turned up to ten via the hypnotic music, the drugs, the beating sun, the chosen

colors, and most likely by invisible electric currents. At which time the great fire can sear the given message into your soul like a brand, knocking out any last resistance and taking what it wants.

At minute 1:59:00, in the section on Burning Man propaganda minister Stuart Mangrum, Outtrim tells us University of Maryland is the spookiest school in the country, based on explicit military presence. That seems like misdirection to me, since it has never once come up in my research. Visible military presence should not be the main factor there, and many colleges are more central to the spook project, including, I would say, Berkeley, Harvard, Columbia, UPenn, UMich, Stanford, Princeton, Yale, and the small colleges like Evergreen, UCSantaCruz, Bennington, Hampshire, Naropa, etc. Also of interest: Mangrum admits to coming out of Air Force Intelligence. He was the propaganda minister (Director of Communications) of Burning Man. I don't see a weak link there. That is proof of military control of Burning Man, back to 1993. Mangrum claimed he was no longer Air Force intelligence after 1988, but that's all as maybe. My assumption is he was Air Force intelligence all along, and that Burning Man is on the border of an unlisted Air Force Base. Outtrim shows indirect evidence of that, since part of Mangrum's time in the military overlapped his time at University of Maryland. The Air Force apparently sent him back to school for four years, but soon after graduation we are supposed to believe he left the military for the civilian world. That makes no sense, because the Air Force would expect a return on its investment.

Outtrim shows military connections for just about all the top dogs at Burning Man, and Marion Goodell, now CEO, admits at CNNMoney she came out of the Department of Defense. So, again, no weak link there. They admit Burning Man came out of the military.

Head of Media Operations for many years at Burning Man was Jim Graham, who had previously been Head of Media Operations for Lockheed Martin. OK, so that's Air Force again, confirming that Burning Man is just a product of Air Force intelligence.

Which leaves us with one basic question: is Burning Man really Satanic as Outtrim claims or are the Phoenicians just hiding behind Satanism? We saw that Outtrim and Irvin seemed to be spinning away from the Phoenicians (although Outtrim does mention the Jews several times), substituting the Satanists. There is no doubt that the Phoenicians have embraced these Satanic rituals and symbols, and they didn't do it recently. The connection has been there all along. But in that case we could just call these rituals Phoenician instead of Satanic. This is what the Phoenicians have always done. But at some point in the distant past they connected these rituals to the Satan of the Bible, in order to rebrand them and cause confusion.

And if that is true, the question then becomes "is Satan or anyone like that really responding?" Even if we dump Satan as post-Phoenician, we can substitute Moloch or Ba'al or El or anyone you like. The Phoenicians can be calling up any god they like, but if no god is showing up, then none of this is really Satanic. Like the light and fire shows, it is just theater. As I have said before, I don't think any real god or power is there. It is the famous Phoenician bluff. In my opinion, the hegemony of the Phoenicians/Jews doesn't come from gods of discordia, it comes from the fact that they have owned banking, shipping, textiles, and most other industry for 4000 years or more. If you own all the means of production and trade, you don't need evil gods to explain your success, do you? The other thing that has allowed the Phoenicians to prosper is the lie. They have no concern for the truth, which has allowed them to spin ever-expanding webs since the beginning. But, again, do we need an evil god to explain that? Is El or Satan doing the lying for them, or teaching them to lie? No. Humans are fully capable of lying on their own authority.

So it looks to me like the Phoenicians have created a lot of rituals worshipping themselves. They worship the liar and the trickster and set him up as a god, but they are really just making homages to their own former selves. They understand why they have advanced, and so they have created an entire Pantheon based on their own flaws and shortcomings, in the attempt to convince themselves those things are good. I can see this better than most because I know how they work. I have seen it in Modern art, where they define bad art as good art, simply because that is what they are capable of. Whatever they can do is “talent”, an example of “the highest good”, and whatever they cannot do is ignored or slandered. I have seen the same in science, where the science they are capable is “the only science” and “not to be questioned”, while the science they cannot do is dismissed or forbidden. [See my papers](#) on the Copenhagen Interpretation, where this is very clear. The Jewish scientists like Bohr, Heisenberg, Pauli, and Dirac, were terrible at visualization, so they denigrated and eventually outlawed it. All diagrams other than flow charts were forbidden. Anyone who tried to visualize anything or come up with a intuitive physical understanding of it was drummed out of the field as a draftsman. As if a draftsman was the worst thing a scientist could possibly be called. Ironically, it was this refusal to visualize or draw that prevented them from solving all the most interesting physical problems of the 20th century, and which allowed an outsider like me to waltz in and solve them with very little effort, making them look very sad, confused, and decidedly *unmagical*.

I will close with one last observation: in my travels in the arts and sciences I have met, talked to, or analyzed many of these people, and in my opinion they are some of the least magical or mystical entities it is possible to imagine. I suppose some of their cousins in entertainment may be a bit more charismatic, but my guess is that too is mostly staging, lighting, scripting and promotion. But in the arts and sciences, it is a wasteland as far as any magic or panache goes. You can see this in interviews, whether it is on TV or Youtube: they come across as wooden, zero-dimensional, and completely spiritless. They might as well be talking through a computer program like the Hawking imposter, as far as any thrill of listening to them goes. One drone is as bad as the other. So if they are stealing spirit in places like Burning Man, I don't know where it is going. I don't see any evidence of it in their vicinity.