

[return to updates](#)

What I Finally Understood



by Miles Mathis

I am now almost 51, and it took me this long to figure out how the world really works. This time last year, I didn't know.

The truth is, I didn't work on the question much for the first 40 years of my life, so it isn't really surprising I didn't discover this sooner.

I am not claiming to understand how ALL of life works. Just this one thing.

This is what I finally understood: all famous people are there to misdirect you. ALL OF THEM. They didn't accidentally get famous. They don't accidentally get on TV or in movies or in books or on CDs or on the internet. And they certainly don't earn their way into these positions, as is now clear. So how did they get there? Why do you have to see them and hear them all the time? Why do you know who they are? Because they were placed there. They were chosen to fill that position, and they were chosen in order to misdirect you from the truth.

You will say, "C'mon, Miles, that can't be true. All of them? I mean, they disagree with each other. How can they all be placed there?"

Look at it this way: say you wanted to control everyone in the world. Well, people are at different levels. They have different interests and beliefs and levels of intelligence. So if you want to control everyone, you have to place your guys at all these levels, on all possible paths.

If you are a football coach setting up a defense on the field, you don't put all your tacklers in the middle of the field, or all on one side. You spread them out. You want to block all possible paths to the goal. You have to defend against the run and the pass, the short ball and the long ball.

It is the same with government. If you want to govern people, you have to keep them on the path you have chosen for them. That is how the governors understand government. You may think government is about keeping people employed and building highways and educating children, but it isn't. It is about “governing” them. *Moving them around at will.* Think of a governess. She keeps the kids out of trouble and molds them into the sort of adults her employer or her society requires. Same thing with the governors. They keep you from troubling them and mold you into someone who can make them richer. That is what our society requires, and very little else.

With that goal in mind, the last thing the governors want is “enlightened” people or “self-actualized” people. Those people might make money for themselves, think for themselves, and govern themselves. People like that make very poor clients. People like that are just trouble. So the governors have to head them off.

Since people take many different paths, the governors have to place their blockers and tacklers everywhere. They have to have blockers for smart people and dumb people, lazy people and ambitious people, caring people and uncaring people, progressive people and conservative people, men and women, young and old.

And they have to have blockers and tacklers up and down the field, on the fifty-yard line as well as on the five-yard line. If you get past one line of tacklers, they have to have another line ready for you.

To switch the visualization, no matter how high up the mountain you climb, they have to have some guru on a goat-ledge positioned there to shunt you off on the wrong path.



No matter how deep down the rabbit hole you have climbed, they have to have some bearded caterpillar waiting for you to give you bad advice in solemn tones, recommending you eat the wrong cake or try the wrong door.

I admit it took me a while to figure this out. Over the past decade I have lost more and more of my old heroes. I got around them and moved on up the mountain. But then I came to another set of heroes perched up there, and instead of learning from my past mistakes and looking at these heroes with suspicion, I instead protected them from questions like that. I didn't want to lose them, so I didn't look closely at them. I nodded politely in the old ways and knelt down for the next lesson.

But eventually they said something that didn't fit the script, and the curtain was torn. I then felt like Jim Carrey in *The Truman Show*, when his car radio accidentally picks up the director's channel. I was forced to pick up my bamboo mat and kettle of fish and move further up the mountain.

No matter how high I got, I was always met by a new expert, pointing sideways along a path and smiling knowingly.

Finally, I figured out the game. I figured it out by noticing that all these guys popped up there like jack-in-the-boxes, rising up from underground tunnels dug centuries earlier by an army of evil moles. They knew I would come eventually—me or someone like me—and they had made plans. The entire mountain and rabbit hole had been trapped and mined, and I began to look around for David Bowie in the Labyrinth. Like Bowie, these pretend sorcerers gave themselves away to a keen eye, since they got more desperate the nearer you got to the truth. The longer I stayed on the right path, the less likely I was to be fooled by the next trap, and they knew that.

That doesn't mean any of this is easy. Maybe the hardest part is that you have to pass through a treacherous middle level on the mountain. Once you pass the halfway point on the mountain, the gurus get more clever. You already know a lot by that time, so they have to take that into account. They have to lead the lesson by re-teaching you a lot you already know. This makes you trust them. One of their greatest tricks is unmasking gurus on lower levels, although those gurus are really their colleagues. They say, "Oh, by the way, you know that the gurus at level 42, 43, and 44 are working for the man, right? They were trying to keep you from climbing up to this level, because they are jealous of the view I have from here. Beautiful, isn't it?" Guru 45 then subtly suggests his view is superior to views from even higher, and that you have no need to climb up further. He has to say that in just the right way, though, at the right speed, with the right inflections, or you remember that guru 44 just told you pretty much the same thing.

You hit another hard part when you realize all the gurus are planted. As soon as that sinks in fully, they stop sending you gurus. The jack-in-the-boxes stop popping up from the mountain ledges, and you find yourself alone with the birds and the bears. That is scary not only because you have no one to talk to, but even more because your trick of doing the opposite of what you were told no longer works. You can no longer wait for the guru to point left and then move right. You have to decide on your own, without the help of negative evidence.

I know some of you are laughing, but do you understand how hard that is? If you are a good ways up the mountain, just think how many of your decisions were decisions of avoidance. Compare the number of paths you refused because they looked *bad* to the number of paths you chose because they looked *good*. If you are like me, most of your progress has been due to the former. Given ten paths, you chose number 7 because 1-6 and 8-10 all stank. And they all stank because you could see lots of stinky people clogging up those paths. The choice was easy.

But once you get past the gurus, you no longer have stinky people showing you how *not* to live. Up above you are only empty paths, none of them either beckoning you or offending you. All is silent. With the mountaintop draped in cloud, how do you know which way to go?

Let us transport ourselves back down the mountain some ways, where the gurus are as thick as flies on a summer dunghill. At this level, I will not find many who wish to learn my lesson. The students are in thrall to the teachers, and do not wish to fall out of thrall. These students will tell me that one side or the other must be right. Given a certain question, they can't all be wrong, can they?



Well, if they are all paid to be wrong, they can. This is easiest to see from the so-called debates we watch on TV. Whether it is political debates between candidates or manufactured debates on news programs, we always see the question divided two ways, and the people on both sides speaking nonsense. The truth is always avoided by both sides, as if it is a virus. Let's take a topic, say, gun control. This is probably the hottest topic of the past two years. My knee-jerk reaction is to be against gun control, if only because the governors are for it. If the government is trying this hard to sell me something, I know it is not worth buying. The government has proven over and over it can't be trusted, so I do the logical thing and refuse to trust it. But that doesn't mean I have gone out and bought a gun. I am not a hunter so I have no use for a gun. I don't really think a gun is going to even my chances against the government. But this is exactly what the pro-gun side seems to be arguing. And it seems to be what the audience is hearing, since the audience is going out and buying guns like they are about to be discontinued.


Here is what you never hear in the gun control debate from either side. This is what I would say to the government when it sent in some stuffed shirt to promote gun control:

Look, I have no need for guns. Most of my neighbors have no need for guns, unless they are hunters. If you want us to quit buying guns and ammunition in such outrageous numbers, why don't you quit scaring the shit out of us with all these faked murders like Sandy Hook and the Boston Marathon? Why don't you quit arming the police with tanks and machine guns? Why don't you quit using the army and National Guard to run suspicionless checkpoints? Why don't you quit running drills in schools and small towns, with black helicopters and live ammunition? Why don't you quit tasing people to death for minor infractions? Why don't you quit building private jails to house people who have done next to nothing? Why don't you quit turning the DHS into a Gestapo? Maybe if you guys quit acting like Nazis, we would quit buying so many guns. Has that ever occurred to you?

But you never hear that. You often hear some variation of the argument that the Constitution gives people the right to have arsenals of AR-15's, to protect themselves from the government. That isn't any more sensible than the government line. If we are going to debate the topic (rather than just allow that what is, is what must be), we might want to make some rational suggestions, such as that it isn't necessary for the government to be at war with its own people. We got along fine as a country for 225 years without a Department of Homeland Security, and it wouldn't be that hard to turn back the clock just 14 years, to before 2001. None of this is necessary, neither the arming of the citizenry nor the militarizing of the police force. If we got rid of a few bad people at the top, it would all end tomorrow.

As it goes with that topic, it goes with most others. Neither side is ever telling you the truth, because they are both trying to make a buck off of you. The gun control people are trying to get more taxes for "Homeland Security," while the gun advocates are hoping to sell you a gun. Just imagine the total market for domestic arms sales in the past five years. It boggles the mind. Which means the government is probably playing both sides, as usual. I would be willing to bet that most of the money spent on guns in the US since Obama took office has gone into the pockets of the same billionaires who are profiting from Homeland Security. It is doubtful that most folks have ever thought of that.

Those who haven't should study the recent history of [Smith&Wesson](#). Did you know that Smith&Wesson was bought out in a hostile takeover in 2001, and that the government was involved? Remember, 2001 was also year one of DHS. Coincidence? Did you know that the \$200 million company was bought for \$15 million, and that this rock-bottom price was due to fire-arm regulation by President Clinton? Did you know that after an initial plunge due to the Clinton regulation, their sales have since skyrocketed?



Just a coincidence, right? Did you know that the buyer of Smith&Wesson was a start-up company named Saf-T-Hammer? We are told it was a maker of gun locks, but it wasn't. It was a *start-up* company with no history of making anything. "Saf-T-Hammer never manufactured that lock independently before buying out S&W, and does not now manufacture it separately from the guns." This brings up the question of who *does* own Saf-T-Hammer. Well the company changed names to Smith and Wesson Holding Group, [which now has 83% Institutional Ownership](#). What does that mean? It means the company is owned by institutions, mainly investment firms and banks. The two biggest owners are the Vanguard Group and Fidelity Investments, but other owners include the Royal Bank of Canada, ING, and Barclays. So my suspicion is proved true once again. The billionaire investors are making money off you both ways: they tax you for Homeland Security, which scares you into buying guns, and the money you spend on guns also goes to them.

This list of institutional investors of Smith&Wesson rings a bell, since the top two appear on [Project Censored's 2013 list](#) of the world's top investment firms:

- 1 BlackRock US \$3.560 trillion
- 2 UBS Switzerland \$2.280 trillion
- 3 Allianz Germany \$2.213 trillion
- 4 Vanguard Group US \$2.080 trillion

- 5 State Street Global Advisors (SSgA) US \$1.908
- 6 PIMCO (Pacific Investment Management Company) US \$1.820 trillion
- 7 Fidelity Investments US \$1.576 trillion
- 8 AXA Group France \$1.393 trillion
- 9 JPMorgan Asset Management US \$1.347 trillion
- 10 Credit Suisse Switzerland \$1.279 trillion
- 11 BNY Mellon Asset Management US \$1.299 trillion
- 12 HSBC UK \$1.230 trillion
- 13 Deutsche Bank Germany \$1.227 trillion

The number is managed funds. Notice that Vanguard and Fidelity are high on the list. Blackrock bought out Barclays Investments in 2009, but Barclays still has company assets of over 2 trillion. Note, that is *company assets* for Barclays, not managed funds.

Beyond that, all of these companies have been caught up in illegal activities in the past decade, including the gigantic LIBOR and ISDAfix scandals, in which these people were caught fixing the prices of just about everything. Many of them have been fined hundreds of millions of dollars, but they still refuse to obey the laws. Most of them have been caught laundering huge amounts of money, but again, they have just been slapped on the wrist and gone on as before. Vanguard was prosecuted by the government under the RICO Act for illegally investing clients' monies in offshore gambling sites. They bought off the court.


You might also be interested to know that Vanguard and Blackrock are invested in Sturm, Ruger & Co., a competitor of Smith&Wesson. No matter what brand of gun you buy, they are raking in the money.

The gurus are screwing you from both ends. The people they are hiring to debate gun control in the media on both sides are working for the banks. The escalation benefits them from all directions.

So make a list of all the famous people selling both sides of this argument. No, really. Make an actual list. Write down all the people you love to hate who are on the other side. Then write down all the people that you think are on your side. Then ask yourself, "Are *any* of them speaking any sense?" Or are they all promoting this escalation one way or the other?

This is how it goes, on all topics.

So what pushed me over the edge on the greater question of famous people? What was the AHA moment? You may laugh, but it was Lyndon LaRouche. Someone said to me recently, "You know, what is weird is how right Lyndon LaRouche was." And I got to thinking. Yes, he was right about a lot of things, and he was even right about the "out there" stuff, like the government pushing drugs [see *Dope, Inc.*], laundering money, fluoride, the financial meltdown, [pedophilia](#), and so on. So I went back and studied his writings across the board. Do you know what I found? A higher-level guru, placed fairly far up the mountain to misdirect the most *avant* of the *avant garde* conspiracy theorists. I found he was a Marxist until he was almost 60, which of course I saw as a red flag. No one over thirty was still a Marxist in the US in 1970, except a few dupes and a few small-time spooks working the campuses. No true intellectual could stomach Marx's prose, much less his theory.



I say that not as a champion of capitalism or of the US system in general, but only as a champion of reason. It should now be clear that Marxism was never anything else but a disguised replacement for Republicanism, created to appeal to the idealistic youth of the West who were disenchanted with their own failed institutions. That is, Socialism was dressed from the beginning to look like a fairer sister of Democracy/Republicanism, but it was actually a crone in poor make-up. It was purposely created to break down immediately into fascism, the way plastic is now made to break down when exposed to light. Marxism borrowed the egalitarian platitudes of Republicanism, and even outdid it in its flattering of the lower classes; but the theorists conveniently left out any of the hard facts of government, like constitutions or courts *or human nature*. And by resting the whole theory on the workers, Marx and his buddies knowingly built their edifice on sand. Though top-down governance is often or usually predatory, bottom-up governance is simply a contradiction in terms. You are just as likely to successfully run a country from workers' cooperatives as you are to run your house from the kids' bedroom.

I am all in favor of trade unions and worker-owned companies; but at the same time I would not like to see a co-op of Walmart, McDonald's, and USPS employees running the country. While the system we have doesn't put the best people at the top, Marxism wouldn't either.

But there were many other red flags with LaRouche, including his promotion of Leibniz, Abe Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt, John Kennedy, NAWAPA, SDI, and so on. It may seem strange to say it, but LaRouche was a gatekeeper like Chomsky, placed pretty far down the road to catch those who got too far ahead. Like Chomsky, LaRouche was instructed to admit to a large percentage of US and British crimes, to appeal to progressives and good researchers who had already discovered them. And also like Chomsky, LaRouche was there to prevent deeper truths from being discovered. Ironically, perhaps, LaRouche was—in most ways—positioned further up the mountain than Chomsky. LaRouche could admit to 911 where Chomsky couldn't. LaRouche could talk about *outré* crimes that wouldn't appeal to Chomsky's audience. And they were instructed to blow a very different smoke regarding Kennedy. While Chomsky pretended to be above the whole discussion, LaRouche was instructed to tell [a new variant](#) of the Oliver Stone story, intellectualizing it with the Yalta system and a new player, Mortimer Bloomfield. Notice in that link that LaRouche suggests Kennedy was killed for believing the US could win a war [“war-winning capability”] with the USSR. You have to be kidding me! Talk about muddying the waters with an absurdity. Do you really believe a US President could be too hawkish for the financiers behind him? This should only serve to remind us that LaRouche is himself a hawk, even hungrier for confrontation and new weapons systems than his colleague (I mean archenemy) Kissinger.

Which brings up LaRouche's web of contacts. We are told that LaRouche traveled the world, having

meetings with top people in many countries, including the Soviet Union. So how did he manage that? In 1967, at age 45, we are told he was teaching at New York City's Free School, but there is no listing anywhere for that. We are told a group of students from Columbia and City College came to his classes and suddenly the National Caucus of Labor Committees was born. But if LaRouche was charismatic enough to start this movement on his own, why didn't he start it earlier? Why did he wait until 1968, when he was 46? We must ask not just *why* his movement caught fire then, but *how*. How were all the magazines and books and travel funded? How did LaRouche manage to schedule meetings with important people, seeing that up to 1968 he was not one and had no contacts? Some would say I have some far-out ideas like LaRouche had in the 1970's. Do you think I can use those ideas to schedule meetings with the heads of state in Europe, Russia and Asia? Of course not. Revolutionary or non-mainstream ideas are precisely what *prevent* one from doing that. LaRouche's entire biography is a contradiction, since we are being sold the idea that he was attacking the mainstream leaders viciously, while at the same time taking meetings with them.

You will say I am implying that SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) or parts of it were infiltrated by the government, but LaRouche himself tells us that. His NCLC was originally a faction of SDS, and although "[it was originally a New Left organization](#) influenced by Trotskyist ideas," it was "opposed to other New Left organizations which LaRouche said were dominated by the Ford Foundation, Institute for Policy Studies and Herbert Marcuse." If you can accept what he says—that *other* New Left organizations were dominated by these government think-tanks and foundations—why not his NCLC? LaRouche's organization has all the earmarks of late 1960's government programs, including brainwashing, violence, cultism, and created confusion, so why not ask the question?

"LaRouche writes in his autobiography that in 1971 the NCLC formed 'intelligence units', and the following year started training members in paramilitary tactics." Intelligence units? Does that sound like the language of a Marxist professor, or of a CIA agent?

So if he is an agent, why did they later throw him in jail? Are you sure they did? I have shown you in recent papers that several famous people you thought were in jail probably never were, including Ezra Pound and Charles Manson. LaRouche's alleged time in jail simply glosses up his resume even more in the eyes of those who would follow him.

Notice that LaRouche has always been encouraging confrontation. In the early years we are told his followers beat their Marxist foes with pipes and bats. I think it is just another planted story, but the form of the story is crucial. They want you to *think* there is a lot of political violence going on, even though there isn't; just as now they want you to think there are mass murders every month, although there aren't. The billionaires love a manufactured world of fear and chaos, because fear and chaos keep all markets brisk. In a world of love and satisfaction, all sales would plummet.

This is why we saw George Bush telling people to go out and buy stuff after 911. They found that they had overplayed that one by a tad, and that people were so shocked they had stopped buying. You want to scare people just enough to make them buy stuff to decorate the bunker, but not enough to send them down into it. They learned their lesson there, and they keep the security level at a constant bright orange now, instead of blinking red. At orange, most people will be at Walmart every other day stocking up on toilet paper, baking soda, and camouflage pants; at red they will have pad-locked the shutters, armed the booby traps, and lit the candles.

Some will say, “What about you? How do we know you aren't another posted guru, planted to misdirect us?” Well, I'm not famous, am I? I am not on TV, am I? I am not promoted by some studio or consortium or publisher or think-tank. No one is sending you here: if you got to these pages you got here on your own, probably by lucking out in a websearch. That is another difference between me and someone like LaRouche. Although most of the US articles about him over the years have been negative, they still wrote about him. You should find that curious in itself. Coverage is coverage, you know, positive or negative. As they say, all press is good press as long as they spell your name right.

None of the articles on LaRouche over the years made any sense, because if LaRouche really were what the articles were claiming—a crazy cultist out to defame America and England—why were they writing about him? Why would the mainstream give someone like that the publicity? Remember, LaRouche was right about some things, and one of the things he was right about was the CIA's total control of the press. We didn't need him to tell us that, since we got proof of it from the Senate hearings in the late 1970's (see the Church Committee hearings). Well, given that, why would this controlled press want to publicize LaRouche at all? Why not just ignore him completely? That's what they do to people they really wish to bury, like me for instance.

I don't even have a Wikipedia page. Go try to build a Wiki page for me, and see how long it lasts. By contrast, study LaRouche's Wikipedia page. Not only is it extremely long, it is not nearly as black as you might think it would be, given his professed stance against the mainstream. Normally, Wikipedia blackwashes people it doesn't like unmercifully. Although we see large parts of his page spun negative, we see surprisingly large parts spun positive. You will say those parts were written by his acolytes, but that is to ignore how Wikipedia normally works. Normally, if you go on a page of someone the institutions hate, you will find a complete blackwash. If you try to add any positive remarks or correct the negative ones, your comments will be deleted immediately. But we don't see that with LaRouche. That in itself is a sign I am right about him.

I am not saying you should trust me. You shouldn't trust anyone, especially someone you haven't met in person. You should read everything closely and make a decision based on continuity and logic, not on trust.

So how far back does this rule go, you will ask. Is every famous person in history a plant, or just the living ones? I intend the rule to apply to only the living ones, and the recently dead. I have shown in recent papers that we can take the rule back to the Civil War, but the further back we go the more exceptions there will be. My research is limited, of course, so I can't address every famous person who ever lived. But any famous person from the past who is still promoted heavily should immediately fall into your bag and ring a bell. I saw Alan Watts being promoted in strange ways in the film *Her* recently, and had I not already known he was an agent, I would have been alerted to him in that way. Going further back, I showed in a recent paper that Walt Whitman was being promoted in the film *Kill Your Darlings*. This was one of the red flags that outed him for me.

Since the broad control of media didn't take effect until recently, there will no doubt be many exceptions to the rule even in the late 19th century and early 20th century. There may be some few exceptions still. But don't make the mistake of assuming that just because you have gone back before 1947 that the control no longer exists. It was less perfect and less broad, but it has existed for many

centuries, and perhaps forever.