

[return to updates](#)

The Earth is not Flat

by Miles Mathis

First published June 6, 2015

I am getting so many emails on this one, I felt pressured to write this brief response. Very few of my science readers are asking me about this, but many of those reading my history papers are. I think that is because the spooks are running a very visible disinfo campaign on the Flat Earth, and a lot of people are being snared by it. I am not sure why the Flat Earth is getting so much “alternative” press right now, but I have my suspicions.

My suspicion is that the campaign is being run specifically to target my readers and the readers of other people trying to tell the truth right now. They are trying to muddy the waters. I have shown my readers that they are being lied to about everything, so those that are lying about everything have come up with some ways to undercut that idea. We have seen that one way they have chosen do that is to create and promote people like Ed Chiarini. Chiarini has manufactured a huge amount of bad photo and facial analysis. Once you figure out that all his research is wrong,* you are more likely to dismiss my research as well. They want you to flush the good with the bad, you see. In a similar way, they are planting all these Flat Earth arguments. First, they get you to buy the Flat Earth idea somehow, anyhow. After they have snared all the people they can snare, they plan to rip the rug out from under you. Sometime next year or the year after, these same people will flip, admitting it was all a joke manufactured by some academics. Or they will do a reversal on you in a different way, I don't know. At any rate, they will convince you you were wrong about the Flat Earth. You will feel like an idiot. This will cause you to look again at all the other things you have been convinced of recently—such as my papers. You won't remember all the proof I offered. You won't remember that my papers are 100 pages of strong arguments, say, next to their 5-minute Youtube videos. You will only remember the egg on your face from the Flat-Earth flap, and you will race back to the waiting arms of the mainstream with tears in your eyes. You will lump me in with the Flat Earthers, and that is exactly what they want.

We have seen them do this already with others, like Simon Shack. Jim Fetzer (formerly of *Veteran's Today*) and Simon Shack got into a flamewar over specifics of the 911 event. Shack had gotten beyond Fetzer in some of his theories of the event, and Fetzer began to accuse Shack of being a Flat Earther. I am not aware that Shack has ever promoted the Flat Earth, but that doesn't stop anyone from saying he has. I am not actually up-to-date on that whole fracas. I only use it as an example of how an opponent can misdirect rational discussion on a topic by forcing it off-topic, and making that new detour the main focus of attention.

In my case, they know they are going to have a hard time linking me to Flat Earthers directly, due to my vast physics and math site, where I never once mention the Flat Earth. In fact, in my various arguments against mainstream science, I use mainstream data all the time. I use their own data and equations against them, as any of my real readers know. Among the thousands of numbers I use all the time from the mainstream is a little datum called the radius of Earth. Flat Earthers don't use a radius of the Earth, because they don't believe in it. That number I use in many of my equations is a radius *of*

the sphere, you see. I am into spheres in all my theories, and base my theory of gravitation on the sphere. I also base my theory of light on stacked spins on a *spherical* photon. So I would hardly be one to accuse of supporting a Flat Earth theory.

However, I predict that won't stop them. Neither will this paper, the title of which couldn't be much clearer. They will say I am a closet Flat Earther, promoting the Flat Earth via osmosis or hypnosis or subliminal messages. They will play my website backwards on a phonograph and claim it says "BELIEVE IN THE FLAT EARTH" in low Satanic tones.

That is all I am going to say here, although many readers will complain that I offer no arguments for the spherical Earth. No, I don't, and there is a reason for that, too. It is because I think they have yet another reason for pushing this Flat Earth campaign so hard right now: to waste my time. Those promoting this Flat Earth campaign want people like me to spend many hours debating this topic with them. They want me to do that because if I am doing that I am not inconveniencing them with other new papers. They don't want me exposing any more of their agents or campaigns, they don't want me showing their art and physics is an embarrassment and a fraud, and they don't want me making them look bad in any other ways. But they would love to see me wasting hours trying to convince you the Earth is spherical. They don't even really care if I win in the end, because—remember—that would just be further solidifying a mainstream position.

But I am not going to fall for it. If any readers send me emails after this asking about a Flat Earth, I am not going to answer them, not even briefly. I am going to assume the emails are from trolls, even if they aren't. If you think you have legitimate questions or doubts about the Flat Earth, fine, do your own research. But you are going to have to do it without me on this one. And just remember I warned you: it looks like another psy-op to me. You asked for my opinion, and that is my opinion.


Don't miss the footnote.

*Free Radio Revolution [has a video on youtube](#) exposing Chiarini. He doesn't do much to expose him other than to repost Chiarini's people matches, saying "thanks for the joke." But, despite that, the reposting did achieve something, since it allowed me to spot something I hadn't spotted before. Here is what I saw:



That is at minute 1:57. No ear analysis needed there, since Ed really hit a home run, right? It is obvious that is the same guy in both pictures. The problem? That is just two pictures of Calvin Coolidge.

Here is a picture of Coolidge with Rockefeller, Jr., [straight from the library of Congress](#).



Rockefeller is the short guy in front, Coolidge is the tall guy. As you can see, they look nothing alike.

I will be told Chiarini just got his photos mixed up. But even if we accept that, it doesn't explain how Rockefeller/Coolidge managed to get this photo of himself with himself.

Hint to Ed: how did you miss that that is Henry Kissinger in the background, between the two men? [Sarcasm!]