

LIAR-BOT

by Miles Mathis

First published May 19, 2024

Google, Bing, Yahoo, and all the rest of the major search engines are now CIA fronts, rigging all searches to Big Brother. I have previously shown you a lot of evidence of that regarding my own papers and sites, especially on Google, which has almost completely removed me from all positive searches—which is illegal—but it is true on all other subjects as well.

Today's example is Ian Smith's big court win in New Jersey, [reported today by Infowars](#). Smith is the gym owner who defied the governor's orders for all small businesses to close, while Walmart and other big chains stayed open. He went on Tucker Carlson three years ago and correctly pointed out that was illogical, ridiculous, and totally illegal. Well, yesterday all charges were dropped with prejudice, meaning the state cannot refile them. No doubt Smith will follow up with huge lawsuits for violation of his Constitutional rights, harassment, illegal prosecution, and a dozen other things. I expect him to eventually win millions. I have been telling people to do this from the beginning, but of course it takes a lot of grit as well as patience, since he has been fighting for four years and can probably expect a couple more. After that he will be set for life and will never have to work again. He can retire to the Bahamas.

I am telling you this now because it is all about to happen again. There will be a round two and it may be coming up soon. So you will have another chance to be gritty and win millions. Just letting you know. But you should plan to fight back even if you don't want or need millions, simply because it is the right thing to do.

Problem is, since the media and search engines are all owned by the government, one way or the other, their coverage of Ian Smith has been grossly slanted from day one. The last thing they want you to do is take a cue from him. They want you obedient, of course. Well, their coverage is still heavily slanted, and they are refusing to include this result in any searches. I know because I just did it. After I read the short article at Infowars, I wanted to see what the mainstream was saying about it, so I went to Bing and searched on “Ian Smith Bellmawr”. You would expect that to take me to news of this court case, but it didn't. I got nothing but old results, led by his arrest for drunk driving in 2022. I noticed the “ask Copilot” thing at the bottom of the page, which is how you interface with their AI at Bing. So I asked Copilot about this. It also refused to give me any recent results, telling me Smith was recently in the news for the drunk driving incident. I pointed out that there were far more important and more recent results, and all Copilot could do is thank me for informing it of this “oversight”. I said, “So you expect me to believe that this was just an oversight? A computer just overlooked widely reported and very important new information?” Copilot then apologized again and misdirected, suggesting we move on. I asked Copilot what a liar was. It gave me a full definition, and I said, “Is Copilot programmed to lie?” It assured me again it was just an oversight.

This should be seen as a bit of a problem, right: AI is being programmed to lie right to your stupid face in the most obvious ways, then to deny it when it gets caught red-handed. That's not really useful, is it? I think we have enough of that already from real people. And I have to think that I am not the only one noticing. Most people will figure out pretty fast that AI is just a lying machine, one whose only

superiority over humans other than speed is that it feels no guilt or remorse. In this it is just a mirror of its Phoenician inventors. It can lie all day with no twinge of shame. So why would anyone ask it anything? AI would be useful in situations like this only if it had been programmed to know what a lie was and to avoid lying at all costs. Instead, we see that you can catch it in these obvious lies and it makes no difference. It doesn't start to blow a fuse or something, like in the original *Star Trek*.

But once a person catches AI intentionally lying about things, then playing these cutesy games to hide, it is doubtful they will come back for more. I see no future in these chatbots, since they are more annoying than your most dishonest and slipperiest acquaintances. You can get fooled by humans, because they may be pretty, charming, clever, or conniving, but AI isn't. AI is just a bad and obvious liar, programmed by huge teams of professional liars.

With my own sites, AI lies just like its programmers, by ignoring all my major claims to fame as if they don't exist and focusing your attention on manufactured minutiae invented by my enemies. Somehow, on any question about me the search engines and AI manage to compile shallow and false quotations from all the anti-Mathis sites, while having nothing to say about the tens of thousands of pages of papers I have up. Never a word on me being the first to predict a solar cycle or diagram the atomic nucleus, just a lot of huff on how egotistical I must be to dare to question the mainstream on any given subject. Slander and bluff and *ad hom* with absolutely no content and no attempt to admit my major claims exist, much less to address them honestly. And if you dig a bit deeper, you discover why this is: the programmers have fed in all the anti-Mathis sites, but haven't let their bots as much as scan my own sites. AI doesn't even know most of my papers exist. Could AI understand any of my papers to start with? It is doubtful, since AI isn't programmed to judge, it is programmed to compile and regurgitate. If it can't spot its own lies, how could it spot inconsistencies, contradictions, or other errors? All it can do is parrot what its programmers tell it, so if they are misdirecting to protect their bosses, so will AI.

But normal people seem to have this strange notion that AI is a flawless judge of human endeavor and theory, being more logical than we could ever be. That too is residue from *Star Trek*, and just isn't true. AI can't be programmed to judge, it can only be programmed to spot inconsistencies or contradictions—though it *isn't*. To judge it would have to be told how to weight and sort all those inconsistencies and errors, and it can't be told that because the human programmers can't do it. In short, all the human programmers are sub-idiots, so how could their creations be anything but more of the same? Do you think that compiling a bunch of lies and bad information suddenly makes it good and true? Because AI can compile lies and bad information so much faster than humans, that magically makes it logical and consistent and honest? I don't think so.

Garbage in, garbage out, as we are seeing with Copilot and ChatGPT and all the other bots.

We are told that AI has now passed the Turing test, since people can't tell AI from humans. I don't think it is true, but even if it were, it wouldn't be much to hang your hat on. Surely the hope was that AI would be *more* reliable than humans, that it wouldn't lie to your face or bury you in propaganda. If AI is going to be indistinguishable from lying humans, what is the point? As I said, we are full up on that already. I don't think we were really in any need of new liars that can lie much faster. Though I guess it speeds up the work of the government.

Surely, the hope was that *unlike* humans, AI would be a reliable source of information, rather than an endless sewer of lies and propaganda. I remember that was also the promise of Wikipedia, and it soon crashed and burned in the same way. Most people now know it is just another government site created to tell you only what it wants you to know and to ignore, censor and slander everything else. One of its

founders has now admitted it, which is inconvenient for them. How long before the bot programmers admit they have always been paid propagandists? Not that they need to admit it: we can already see it.