

[return to updates](#)

I CALL OUT NELL SCOVELL

AND THOSE AROUND HER AND BEHIND HER



by Miles Mathis

First published November 2, 2019

Just my opinion, as usual, except for data taken from mainstream sites, which is not just my opinion.

One of [today's lead stories](#) was David Letterman's ex-writer Nell Scovell interviewing him for *Vanity Fair* ten years after calling him out for sexism, and him apologizing profusely. I can't tell you how sick I am of this stuff. Not because I doubt Letterman is a jerk or because I think women shouldn't be treated fairly, but because the presentation is so ludicrously one-sided. Every such story in the mainstream for 50 years has been about women's complaints against men. But we almost never hear the other side of it. It would be like a court case with all the time given to the prosecution and none to the defense. Women lead with the equity argument all the time, but in this "discussion" there has been no equity. It is simply that women are right and men are wrong, over and over and over.

The other reason I am sick of it is that it doesn't match my personal experience. Admittedly, I don't work in Hollywood or a corporate setting, but in my world, men aren't wrong all the time. They aren't far bigger assholes than women. That may have been true in the past, but I don't live in the past. I live in the present, and in the present, women are generally more annoying than men. Maybe in the very top echelons, among the very richest people, men are the more obnoxious, but most of us never see that. We never experience it. So we shouldn't have to read about it. That is a problem of the .00001% and they can deal with it.

Also worth noting is that while Scovell is campaigning for more women and people of color to be hired by these shows, she leaves out an even bigger group that is overlooked: people who aren't from rich Jewish families. Scovell is a rich Jewish girl from Harvard whose daddy is the CEO of a big medical

company and whose mother is a . . . **Cohn**. Of course, we could have predicted that. She married Thomas **Tisch**, linking her to the Tisch family, including Thomas' father Laurence, **who just happened to be CEO of CBS at the time**. Letterman was on CBS. CBS was the distributor of *Sabrina the Teenaged Witch*, another major credit of Scovell. There are also many links between CBS and *Vanity Fair* (including the Tina Brown/Harold Evans link). So her claim to being treated unfairly isn't holding much water, is it? Do you think she would have had a shot as a writer on any of these shows if she had been a poor Gentile in Texas? So her argument that these shows should be equal access is pretty much falling apart, isn't it? They may have hired only a few rich Jewish women over the years, but they have hired zero unconnected Gentiles. Have you ever heard anyone lobbying for unconnected Gentiles of either sex or any color? Can you guess why? When TV writing or anything else becomes a meritocracy let me know. I will start resubmitting my work at that time.

So . . . Nell Scovell does run with the .00001%, which means she does have to interact with some of the richest men on the planet. I guess we should pity her for that if nothing else. I can't even imagine how horrible it must be. But then again, they have to run with her. [Also horrible](#).

Anyway, in my world, which I would say is an upper-middle class world of some education and some privilege, a majority of women have been pampered into a state of absolute fantasy, due in part to reading articles like this. They have no idea what cunts they are, since no one has called them on anything for decades. They have lived a life where they are pre-defined winners. So they are basically intolerable, but they don't know it. The only way they would get an inkling of it is by going to a Louis CK or Bill Burr show, but these women don't go to such shows. That might expose them to an opinion that doesn't match their own. They are used to men agreeing with them on every issue, and used to seeing men that don't agree with them beaten down as cavemen in the media.

I am reminded of the video I watched recently of Jordan Peterson being interviewed by some BBC harpy, in which the audience probably expected to hear his opinion on things. Nope. She immediately flipped the "interview", and more than half of it was him having to answer for the fact that there is a 9% pay gap in the UK. So again, the discussion was all about *her* complaints. He was on the defensive the whole time, and got no time to air his ideas. Now, I suspect this was no accident. I suspect he agreed to the format and the script, since I think he is mole for the other side. But you see my point.

I suspect Peterson, because he didn't have to go along with that. As soon as she mentioned the pay gap, he could and should have said, "Hey, who is interviewing who here? Do you want to hear my side of it or not? If not, why I am here? I am not here to be your personal punching bag."

In this way, women are encouraged to constantly overestimate themselves, to a pathological degree. They are incapable of listening to a man. And about every ten words they say something that is so shockingly inapropos, those around them have to block it out as a symptom of cathexis. Men also do this, since it is a sign of Modernity, but women are the masters of it.



Nell Scovell's article provides many examples of this, and I will lead with the largest. About mid-text she has switched her attack from Letterman and Leno to Jim Stafford (above). I remember him as the guy who sang "Spiders and Snakes". They gave him his own variety show in 1975, which lasted a few months, and I guess he later became a TV writer. I always thought he was a pretty funny guy, but then again I was 12. Haven't really followed him since then. Anyway, Scovell is describing a sexual encounter with Stafford in the 80s, where she admits she kissed him and gave him a BJ. She is trying to spin this as sexual assault, but does such a terrible job she just leaves us shaking our heads. Why? **Because she admits she ran her fingers through his hair.** In her mind, this is just another way to hurt him, because she tells us he has on a toupee and he asks her not to dislodge it. The fact that he has on a toupee is supposed to be a big deal, indicating what a loser he is, I guess, but I am not really buying it. Everyone in Hollywood uses wigs and other physical props and makeup, and women generally use far more of this fakery than men. So her punch there doesn't really land. Scovell is now 58: do you think she doesn't color her hair? But that isn't why I mention it. I mention it because **she ran her fingers through his hair.** You don't do that when you don't really like the person, do you? If you are putting out just for a promotion, you don't do something tender like run your fingers through his hair. But Scovell is so self-unaware, she doesn't see she is giving herself away here big-time. She has not only admitted she put out for a promotion, she has admitted she was into it. Which of course undercuts her entire thesis. The whole article sort of collapses around that one admission. Letterman is forced to respond that he is so sorry that happened to her. He says he is sorry *three times*, for something he had nothing to do with.

But why should he be sorry at all? That was her deal. If she didn't want to give Stafford a BJ, all she had to do was walk off. I don't see the big tragedy there. Scovell is selling the tragedy that she couldn't get ahead in the business without responding positively to Stafford's come-on, but that means that her greatest desire was **getting ahead in the business.** She was willing to give Stafford a BJ to do that, so she is therefore slimy. Stafford may have been equally slimy, or moreso, but who cares? Slimy is slimy. Pardon me if I don't feel sorry for slimy people, or feel like saying sorry for their experiences. I am not sorry for her experience. I could personally care less. It sounds like she is sorry, but that is her problem. I don't see how it impacts Letterman at all, or the current story. But the fact that *she thinks it does* is telling. In her mind, her sliminess is always the fault of some man.

That, I would say, is typical. Typical of the entire movement, and of the present course of what now passes for feminism.

This is why I don't buy any of the #MeToo stories. I not only don't believe them all, I don't believe even one. It requires you forget these women have legs, and are fully ambulatory. They also have cars. But

somehow they always find a way to get trapped in some hotel room or secluded office with Bill Cosby or Harvey Weinstein or someone, and can't seem to locate the door. If they had lost all means of locomotion in service of their country in Kuwait or something, the story might begin to make some sense, but as it is it makes none. How does someone get trapped in a bathroom watching Harvey Weinstein shower? I am baffled by the logistics. Does Harvey come in through a secret panel in the rear of the shower, or what? The woman is innocently checking her make-up in the mirror when suddenly the shower curtain is flung back, and Harvey goes BOOYAH?

Besides, Scovell is always passing herself off as someone at the bottom of some hierarchy, who has to please to get ahead. But she isn't. She is an incredibly privileged person who never needed the money or the work. It would have actually been incredibly *easy* for her to tell Stafford to get lost, since with her family connections she could find more work in a heartbeat—as we see was the case from her subsequent resume. In fact, she was *so* privileged and *so* connected, her rank may have caused her problems in these situations, rather than her lack of it. As Laurence Tisch's daughter-in-law, or even as his ex-daughter-in-law, she may have been too big for the group. She may have been like a princess on a softball team: failing to fit in from her own sense of entitlement. It also explains her 2009 article, calling Letterman out. Who but a princess could have written such a thing, gotten it published, and continued to prosper?

In fact, now that I think about it, this may explain Letterman's grovelling before her in this current article. I couldn't figure out why he would feel compelled to do that. He can't need the money. So why shrive himself like this, years after retirement? I can only guess that one of the Tisches or someone like that had some gun to his head. Possibly the same gun that was put to Bill Cosby's head. Join the current project or else. Cosby said no. Letterman said OK.

As usual, with enough digging the senseless begins to make sense. The inexplicable begins to explain itself. For instance, if you think the Tisches don't frighten someone like Letterman, remember that Laurence Tisch fired 20% of CBS news staff when he was there. By the time Westinghouse bought CBS in 1995, Tisch owned 37% of it, netting him \$2 billion. So it is possible the Tisches know of some smellier skeletons in Letterman's closet than this infidelity thing. Or it may just be that they expect people to say “into what mud puddle” when they say “jump”.

The next weird moment is when Scovell compares her encounter with Stafford to a bank robbery. The robber waves a gun and says, “Everybody down”. Who wouldn't *go down*? Scovell thinks this explains why she went down on Stafford, I guess, but the analogy doesn't hold. Stafford didn't have a gun. He just asked her to go down, and she did. So the answer is, “a lot of people wouldn't have gone down”. I wouldn't have, no matter how much I wanted a job. And I have to believe a lot of women wouldn't have, either. But again, the “running her fingers through his hair” is the giveaway here. She claims she was taken advantage of, but she clearly wasn't. She was there because she wanted to be there. The fact that this is so transparent, and that she doesn't *see* that it is transparent, is what makes it so pathetic.

But it beyond pathetic, it is possibly criminal, since Wikipedia now describes this encounter as sexual assault. Despite it just being Scovell's word for it. After having read Scovell's account, I have to say I don't believe it is anything like sexual assault. You don't run your fingers through the hair of someone assaulting you. Her later regret does not equal his assault.

It gets even more transparent, since she admits she didn't get the job even after giving Stafford the job. Clearly, that is what stung her. Sounds like he immediately regretted it as well: does that mean *he* was

assaulted? But she doesn't have to admit any of this here. She could just keep that to herself, and clearly *should*. But she can't, because this is part of her neuroticism. She has been taught that it is OK for her to be this way. That it is OK to let it hang out at *Vanity Fair*, since she is a woman and therefore a goddess and incapable of doing anything wrong. In other words, she has a *right* to be neurotic, and to pretend she isn't being neurotic. Her neuroticism isn't anything clinical or real, after all, it is just bad men putting a false tag on her feelings.

To be fair, this neuroticism is now culture-wide, and it affects men as well as women, though perhaps not as often. I am reminded of Christopher Hitchens' spiral down near the end in this same magazine, saying things similarly pathetic while being pathetically unaware of it.

Also notice that the escalation of this encounter has all been due to Scovell's inability to shut up. In the beginning, only a few people knew of the Stafford thing. But because Scovell was so embarrassed by it, and because she felt these people were important, she couldn't let it drop. She had to justify it to them and herself somehow. So she has talked about it and talked about it since then, putting it prominently in her book, and discussing it in many articles and interviews. So by now millions of people like me think she is a nutcase, instead of just the original handful. But because she has powerful connections, and can get her story in *Vanity Fair* and on Wikipedia, she thinks she has won. She hasn't won. Again, this is typical of the hijacked feminist movement since the 1960s. They are ever noisier and claim victory in ever greater numbers, but they are the only ones who believe it. All sensible people continue to read this stuff and shake their heads in pity and amazement. Those publishing this current article appear to think they are convincing middle America of something, and protecting the hegemony of the very rich against the rest of us, but they are just confirming what we already know: these people are seriously disturbed.

You know, if Scovell really had a sense of humor, she could have diffused this thing years ago. How? By saying something like, "Hey, I finally learned to give a good BJ, just ask Freddie". Cut to Freddie with a big smile. In other words, if you are lousy at something, you don't try for decades to justify your lousiness. You work at it and get better. Either that or you specialize in something else and *shut up*. But these women never learn that basic lesson of life. They prefer to spiral down in some ever-widening neurotic whirlpool.

Another weird moment in the article is when Scovell first meets Dave for the interview. She starts with a joke: "I see one of us shaved". She quickly defends the joke, explaining that though it was a "sexually charged" joke, it wasn't harassment. At first, I wasn't following her here. Most of us over 50 would assume she was teasing him about the big beard, which isn't sexually charged in any way. It could be taken as "I am a woman, so I don't have to shave my face like you". Or it could be implying, "I didn't shave my legs today". Also not sexually charged. But I guess in the Modern world, the implication is that she didn't shave her bush, which is definitely sexually charged. She is giving Dave a visual, which is very inappropriate. Given the subject of the interview, it couldn't possibly be more inappropriate. I wouldn't call it harassment. Most men wouldn't. But we *would* call it gloriously out-of-touch with perceptions. Most importantly, given the situation, it *wasn't funny*. In another setting, it might have been funny. If they were lovers and she was standing there naked, with her bush in full view like his beard, it might have been funny. But in no other situation.

Which leads us to the other problem here: Scovell isn't funny in this article. She may be funny at other times, I don't know. This is the first time I have heard of her. But here she just makes everyone uncomfortable. When she tells us Letterman laughed, we can only imagine it was an uncomfortable laugh, behind which facade he was reminding himself how much he was getting paid for this fake

interview. Which again undercuts the entire article. Scovell is trying to convince us more women should be hired as comedy writers. . . by being uncomfortably *unfunny*. If we think about it, we aren't really surprised Letterman, Leno, and O'Brien weren't hiring women like Scovell.

In [the linked article](#), which is her calling-out of Letterman back in 2009, we see yet more reasons women weren't being hired, funny or not. There she tells us of a subset of sexual harassment called sexual favoritism, which “can lead to a hostile environment”. Sexual favoritism is where the head guy likes some women more than others, or where the head gal likes some men more than others. Don't see how anyone could legislate against that. Are we supposed to be legally required to like all people equally? But if you read between the lines, Scovell appears to be complaining that Dave slept with other girls but not her. Boo hoo. Dave should have either slept with all of them or none. But I think Barbara Walters was right on this one: who Dave is sleeping with is his business. People are always going to be sleeping with each other, or at least one hopes. If you aren't one of the popular girls or guys, you are going to have to deal with that. Scovell obviously can't deal with it, and she shouldn't be surprised people don't want to hire her. To be clear, they don't hire her not because they aren't interested in her sexually—which, yes, would be sexist and sexual discrimination. No, they don't hire her because they don't want to have to deal with her fits when they *don't* sleep with her. If she could just come to the office, be funny, and get her sex somewhere else, that would be fine. But apparently she couldn't.

She tries to shift the 2009 article into being about hiring female writers, but that clearly isn't her main thesis. Her main thesis is that she wasn't treated with respect. But she gives us no example of that. That is her thesis, but she does nothing to support it. She says that other people were sleeping around, including Dave and almost everyone else. Yeah, so exactly how is that disrespecting her as a writer or a female? I still don't see it. There are only two ways I can make sense of her argument: 1) She felt disrespected because she wasn't part of the sex-fest. She felt left out. 2) She felt disrespected because she expected the work environment to be sex-free and all these other folks weren't bowing to her expectations. Neither one really qualifies as disrespect, in my opinion. All I am hearing is that she didn't fit in.

Which brings us to the question of whether work should be a sex-free environment. Not whether people should be having sex at work, on desks and in closets. But whether people should be building sexual relationships there. Since people now spend most of their time at work, how could they not? Barbara Walters also made that point, and it is a good point. I have to stress how strange it is to see this woman [Walters] who grew up in the 1940s and 50s being more sexually progressive than the younger people around her, but that is how it is. And it doesn't really surprise me, since although we are told how sexually liberated we now are, I have never seen any sign of it. Just the reverse. The US becomes more sexually liberated backwards every decade. Yes, there is more sex on TV and in films and on the internet, but that seems to be in inverse proportion to the amount of sex people are actually having.

Dave called himself creepy for sleeping with women he met at work, but I don't see anything creepy about it. I think he was just told to say that by his lawyers, as part of his fake contrition. At least he wasn't doing it for advancement, which IS creepy. I suppose he was doing it because he was attracted to them, and horny. Who isn't? He wanted to and they wanted to, so it happened. End of story. Of course there is the question of Dave's wife, but that is between them. That has nothing to do with Nell Scovell or you or me or anyone else.

I happen to prefer monogamous relationships. I have never slept around (except a little bit in college). I have a hard enough time finding one woman I like, so the question has rarely come up, to be honest.

So it may seem odd to find me defending Dave here—a guy I don't even like, honestly. But I feel compelled to defend the male position for my own sake nonetheless, since I have been attacked many times with similar flimsy arguments. Specifically, my art has been attacked as being sexist and reactionary, simply because I paint beautiful women. Many have tried to shame me, or pigeonhole me as irrelevant, anti-intellectual, or shallow. With no success, of course. Almost all of those who have attacked me in this way have been women. Which just means to me that they don't understand either men or art, and have no desire to. Which is fine. We all have our specific interests, and I have no desire to legislate theirs. They don't have to like men or art: I don't care one way or another. But when they get in my face that is another matter. And when they try to destroy both art and masculinity as part of their “feminist” agenda, I really get mad. Real feminism has nothing to do with either one. Real feminism has always been a battle for fairness, not a battle against men.

The #Metoo movement is the ever more strident attempt to legislate or moralize sexuality, which will never work. Does anyone think this movement or any other is going to stop women from being attracted to rich guys, or prevent men from being attracted to pretty girls? You might as well try to legislate the rising of the Sun or moralize the tide. Women are almost never shamed for liking who they like, so why should men? This is the lead story of gay rights, you know: gays should be allowed to like who they like, since they can't do otherwise anyway. But amazingly that doesn't apply to straight men. Straight men should like only those women who have been pre-approved by the ladies' club. All men are creepy until and unless they have allowed their desires to be molded and rubberstamped by their town's bossiest females.

So on one level, this seems to me to be about women who can't get laid making sure no one else gets laid either. But of course there is a deeper level. These women like Scovell are obviously being used as part of a far larger project—that of splitting the sexes. The governors don't have to promote these ladies, and for decades they didn't. So why has this been such big business since the 1970s? Why this constant battle of the sexes, with women apparently winning every round, and guys having no voice at all? Because those who run the economy figured out that frigid sexless people spend far more money. That's it. They want you alone and miserable. Think of the baby monkey hugging his cloth surrogate:



That's where they want you. Alone and frightened and clinging desperately to some plastic and velour doll. Because if that little guy had a credit card, he would never stop buying stuff. He would buy a gym membership, a shampoo and set, a new wardrobe, a car, a watch, a hundred pairs of shoes, an iphone, a swanky apartment, a giant TV, and a lifetime subscription to pornmonkey.

Back when society was more male-dominated (and it was, I am not denying it), men didn't try to force women to be like them. Just the opposite, in fact. Men were quite happy with women looking and acting completely different from them. So now that women have more power, it is strange to see them trying to emasculate the world. Everything feminine is now a virtue and everything masculine a fault. Women aren't just trying to equalize opportunity, they are trying to equalize how we look and act. We should ask why that is happening. Or, if it isn't women causing this, but the governors again, the question still pertains. Why do the superwealthy want us all to be the same? I would suggest it is because if men become like women, they will be less dangerous. They won't revolt. So it actually has nothing to do with equal opportunity. The governors want us all to have very little opportunity, and to be satisfied with that. But they want men to be psychologically and hormonally feminized.

So although I don't buy these mainstream stories of male turpitude and despise the sexual politics being sold, I do feel some compassion for all involved, male and female. We are all living in a fucked up world, one that has been fucked up on purpose. And though I don't accept Scovell as the victim of Stafford or Letterman, I do think she is a victim. We all are. Scovell just hasn't fingered the right ogres here. She may be confused or she may know exactly what she is doing—it is impossible for me to say. But most of us are just confused. We have been fed so much contradictory information we no longer know up from down. Our sexualities have been stunted and perverted on purpose, for the greater profit of a few malevolent and greedy families. We really are like the little monkey above. I wouldn't torture that little fellow for scientific gain or any other sort of gain, and you probably wouldn't either. But there are people who would, and did. And do. Those immoral experiments on animals continue to this day, as you know. And the immoral experiments aren't limited to animals. If they will do it to cute baby animals, you can be sure they have no problem doing it to you or me.

They push this fake sexual morality via the #Metoo movement and many other movements, but that is just a raw sale. They have no morality themselves. They will torture and murder baby animals for profit, and they will torture you for profit with as little remorse. You and I don't comprehend such things, because we think they would have to justify it somehow to themselves. But I have met these people and they don't. These things are beyond any possible justification, so they don't even try. They just cut that part of themselves out and leave it lying in the road. To say it another way: they don't allow themselves to think about it. It never comes up, so no justification is necessary. These things only visit them in their dreams, which is why they rarely sleep. It is why they have huge bags under their eyes after they pass 40. They sleep very little, and when they do they have bad dreams. The only way they can sleep is when they are dead drunk or full of pills.

Which is the final irony here. Their primary project now, Job One, is making the world miserable for profit. And is working. We are miserable and they are unbelievably rich. But because in order to achieve this they have had to excise a large part of their own humanity, *they* are the most miserable of all. They have turned us into pathetic little monkeys, but they have simultaneously turned themselves into monsters.

Postscript: at the end of Scovell's 2009 article, she says she created the TV series *Sabrina, the Teenage Witch*. I am trying to figure out what that means. In her “career” section at Wikipedia, there is no

mention of her being a writer on the show. At IMDB, in the writers section, we are told Sheldon Bull was the “written by” writer, which I guess means he was head writer. Jonathan Schmock was the “developed by” writer, which means, I guess, that he wrote the pilot or some early drafts. Nell Scovell is the “created by” writer, which means. . . what? She didn't create the characters, since the TV show was based on comic book characters created by George Gladir and Dan DeCarlo. But the reason I added this postscript is that I went to the Wiki page for Sabrina, trying to learn more. I have never seen the show. What I found is, as usual, astonishing. For one thing, I didn't know the show took place in Westbridge, at 133 Collins Road. Sabrina has a housemate named. . . Miles. Whoa. But here is the biggie: Zelda tells Sabrina **the Salem Witch Hunts were not hunts for real witches**. You may yawn at that, taking it to mean that that the trials were signs of mass hysteria, with the convictions and hangings just some sort of grand mistake. But I read it another way. The writers are admitting the whole event was a fake from the ground up. The people involved didn't even think they were hunting real witches. We are also told in episode 1 that for two months a bunny ruled all of England, causing the witches council to turn back time. I am trying to figure that one out. Could just be bad joke, but I intuit they are again telling us something there, in code. I think they are referring to Edward V, who ruled for two months. We have seen that Thomas Stanley, the kingmaker at the time, locked Edward and his brother in the Tower, preferring Richard III to be King. But in what sense Edward V was a bunny, I don't know. My guess is “bunny” means Gentile, and Edward V may have had too little Jewish blood, due to his mother not really being Elizabeth Woodville, or to Woodville not being who we are told she was. Which would make Stanley the “witches council” in this story. That is pretty easy to accept, since we have seen in [many previous papers](#) that “witches” is code for “Jewish agents”.