

[Return to updates](#)

# THE FILM *MAGNOLIA* IS PROPAGANDA



by Miles Mathis

First published October 4, 2016

As usual, this is just my opinion.

For some reason, I watched the opening minutes of *Magnolia* just now. Probably because I recently watched *Inherent Vice*, another Paul Thomas Anderson movie. I watched that one in preparation for a [paper on Thomas Pynchon](#).

This isn't the first time I have watched the opening of *Magnolia*. I watched it back in 1999 when it came out, but couldn't get past the first ten minutes without getting nauseous. Back then, however, I had no way to read the opening sequence. I didn't quit because I understood I was being spun. I quit because—well, I can't really say. I just got a bad feeling. I trusted my intuition back then, but I didn't research things.

[I just watched minute 5 through 8 again, and now I remember. It was all the fast cuts of people snorting coke and screwing while Aimee Mann did her annoying cover of *One*—so loud you couldn't hear the dialog underneath. I thought: do I want to watch three hours of this? Or would I rather shave my head with a cheese grater while chewing on tinfoil?]

This time, the whole thing was completely transparent to me, which is why I am here on this page. I am here to tell you how to read it. *Magnolia* is sold as an exposition “that forces greater than chance play important roles in life”. Several fictional stories are interwoven to show you how that works. But before moving into that weaving, Anderson tells you of three real-life stories where coincidence seems to be at work, suggesting that more than chance is at play. The way he glosses the stories makes you

think Fate is at work, or something like that.

But it isn't Fate. In all three real-life stories there is a more mundane explanation: *they were all faked*. The first is the story of Edmund Berry Godfrey. You can read about it on Wikipedia. Anderson changes the story in many ways, bringing it from 1678 to November 26, 1911. Note the date: 11/26/11. 2+6=8, and then all the ones. Aces and eights, dead man's hand. He tells us Godfrey was murdered for money, which he wasn't. He still had his money and his rings when the body was allegedly found. The coincidence is that the murder was supposed to have taken place on Greenberry Hill, while the convicted murderers were named Green, Berry, and Hill. Wow, spooky, right? No, since Anderson changed that, too. The spot was *later* renamed Greenberry Hill, for the murders. So there was no coincidence at all.

I could quit there with that story, but I won't since there is a lot more to say. This alleged murder of Godfrey is a famous old unsolved mystery, but it itself is propaganda. That is probably why Anderson refers to it. Although they allegedly hanged three men for it, most agree it was never solved. The "great" philosopher David Hume said it was insoluble. A lot of detritus was later piled on top of it, as usual, by a lot of fake academicians, philosophers and historians, in order to muddy it up. But Sherlock Holmes would have cut through it in about 30 seconds. I will do the same.

The biggest clue you have already seen. Did you catch it? Probably not. One of those allegedly hanged was a **Berry**. The victim was named Edmund **Berry** Godfrey. This indicates they were related, and that the fake perpetrator was from the family of the fake victim. We just saw that in [the fake assassination of Abraham Lincoln](#), didn't we, where many of those who took part in the hoax were related to Abe through his wife. Mary Todd was related to the Surratts, the Booths, and the Rathbones. She was even related to the drunken policeman John Parker, who—we are told—went next door to the pub to get drunk instead of guard Abe in the theater. Mary Todd's mother was named Anne Parker.

Curiously, Paul Thomas Anderson changes Edmund Berry Godfrey's name in the film to Edmund *William* Godfrey. Why would he do that? Because if you read the long story at Wikipedia, you won't catch the name Berry twice. But if you listen to a very short synopsis of the story in a film, you might.

Godfrey's fake death was part of the Popish Plot of 1678, which historians now admit was fictitious. It was started by gay priest Titus Oates, who faked his degree from Oxford. He was obviously an agent, since, despite having no degree, he was appointed as a curate by the Bishop of London. He soon fled the priesthood under charges of perjury, but was nonetheless admitted to the Royal Navy as a chaplain. There he was charged with buggery. That was then a capital offense, but he somehow skated. He was arrested in London again the same year for the perjury charges, but again skated. Despite allegedly having two such marks on his record, he was nonetheless hired by the Duke of Norfolk. He then converted to Catholicism. He and Israel Tonge [note the first name] then wrote up a pamphlet accusing the Catholic Church of approving the assassination of King Charles II. What is never explained is why anyone ever believed Oates, given his record. The whole thing was obviously manufactured by crypto-Jews and Anglicans to damage Rome. In fact, historians later admit that, but they usually don't admit that the plot went much deeper than Oates and Tonge. They were just pawns, and those behind Charles knew very well there was no plot. It was a massive false flag.

Despite that, we are told that when it became clear Oates had lied about the whole thing, the King was furious. Oates was supposedly whipped through the streets and sentenced to jail for life. We know that is false because normally he would have had his head lopped. At the end he had denounced the King himself. We also know it is false because they admit he spent no more than three years in jail and was

later granted a pension. Note that, 3 years. For denouncing the King. I can tell you he didn't spend one minute in jail.

Anyway, Godfrey is the one who allegedly verified that the pamphlet created by Oates and Tonge was true. He was Justice of the Peace for Westminster, and Oates and Tonge took their oaths in his presence. This of course indicates he was another paid actor in this play, since no real judge would have authenticated such a thing. He was from huge wealth, his father being a Member of Parliament, and if the pamphlet had been genuine, he would have delivered it directly to the authorities, lest any blame attach to him. He had nothing to gain by getting involved in such a plot.

You will say he wasn't involved in the Popish Plot, he was just involved in publicizing it. But that isn't the story we are told. We are told Godfrey was a member of the Green Ribbon Club, which was accusing the King of trying to make England Catholic again. But again, there is no way Godfrey would have gotten involved in such a thing. The story is absurd from first to last.

Notice how they try to confuse the issue with all these overlapping plots. In the Popish Plot, the Catholics wanted to kill the King. In the Green Ribbon plot, the King *was* a Catholic. It can't really be both ways, can it? But if they get you confused enough, you don't see the truth: both stories were manufactured to blackwash Rome. In both, Rome is plotting to retake England. Although Rome was capable of doing no such thing at the time, these multiple false flags were successful in further diminishing the power of Rome in England.

Godfrey's death was faked to make it look like the Catholics got him. But nobody got him. As usual, the whole thing was just theater. The trials were faked and no one was hanged.

So it very curious to see Paul Thomas Anderson referring to this very old false flag in his 1999 film. Why would he do that? Because this is what Intelligence does: in its newer projects it refers to its own prior projects. This is what it knows.

The second and third stories at the beginning of the movie are not true. The one about the scuba diver is absurd. The intake and outtake holes on a water plane aren't big enough to pass a human being. Besides, they are equipped with filters to keep large fish from getting sucked up and clogging the pumps. Despite that, Anderson makes up a reference for the story, telling us he got it from the *Reno Gazette*, June 1983. He didn't.

The story about the guy committing suicide and getting shot on the way down is taken from law classes. It was made up.

Anderson's narrator tells you these things happen all the time. But we have just seen that they don't. If they did, he could have used three true stories instead of three false ones, right?

Despite that, when someone complained on [a prominent film forum](#) that all three stories sold as true at the beginning of this film are actually false, this is what he was answered by someone hiding behind the moniker SoNowThen:

Anyone not totally taken in by the brilliance of the opening of *Magnolia* is an enemy of cinema and shouldn't be allowed to watch movies.

Really? So movies are only for the most gullible? Good to know. I suggest that rather than wait for

the Thought-Police to *prohibit* you from watching movies, you beat them to the punch and boycott Hollywood. I am not an enemy of cinema, but I am an enemy of propaganda.

But since I took the time to watch the first 8 minutes of this garbage, let's finish it off. Why is Anderson trying to make you think Fate is weaving together all these fantastic stories? Because if you think Fate is doing it, you won't realize it is actually Intelligence doing it.

This is tough for me to say, because I actually believe in Fate. I believe in meaning, karma, whatever you wish to call it. I am not an atheist or agnostic. However, I don't believe in the Fate Hollywood is trying to sell you. You see, they know that when you read history in a book or in the Encyclopedia or at Wikipedia or are taught it in school or on the internet, you will see many "coincidences". You will see lots of pieces that fit together in strange ways. You will see number and name matches like we saw above with Godfrey. Well, they want you think those matches are just the gods having a little jest with you. They don't want you to figure out it isn't the gods jesting, in most cases. In most cases, we have seen it is Intelligence jesting with you, or signalling other agents. Yes, you are being messed with, but not by the gods or aliens. You are being messed with by those manufacturing history.

To take a specific example: I have shown you that Mary Todd Lincoln's mother was named Anne Parker. The drunken policeman who left Abe without a guard at the theater was named John Parker. *Four* of Anne Parker's relatives were named John Parker. Despite that, mainstream historians have never made any connection, and they don't want you to, either. If you asked them, they would tell you it is just a coincidence: these Parkers weren't related. Parker is a common name. You are left thinking the gods are just having a little joke there, right? Serendipity, right?

No. The truth is, these Parkers *were* related, and we know that because it wasn't just the Parkers. It was the Surratts, the Rathbones, the Booths, and all the others. They were *all* related. The whole thing was an inside job.

Which means the film *Magnolia* was purposeful misdirection away from the truth. It was the long and expensive attempt to make you think history is exactly as you have been told: a big mysterious coincidence of names and numbers where there are no connections, no relationships, and no one pulling any strings. There are no conspiracies, just coincidences and chance match-ups. Everything that looks like a clue isn't a clue.

Yes, *Magnolia* is the ultimate anti-conspiracy film. As such, it is the exact opposite of what most people think it is. Most people think it is about connections, but it really about *hiding* connections. Or, it admits the connections, but then misdirects you on the *cause* of those connections. The connections are sold to you as so grand and mysterious and complicated you will never unravel them or understand them: all you can do is marvel at them. In other words, they are sold to as religious. But although life *is* grand and mysterious and complicated, and many things are beyond our comprehension, most of the mysteries of history don't fit into that category. Most of the stories we have been told can be unravelled without that much effort, as I have proved over and over. Which is why the governors have to be constantly shooing us away from doing that. If we aren't kept in a state of idiocy by being fed massive doses of misdirection, we will see through the veils. *Magnolia* is just one veil of many. Hollywood now does almost nothing but produce veils. That is its purpose.

And it isn't only Hollywood that is a veil-maker. So is TV. So are the papers and magazines. So is the internet. So is your entire education. I have shown you that these veils can be penetrated, but it takes some effort. The first order of business is to refuse all the new veils you are offered. The second is to

begin to push the old veils aside. With some work, you may eventually push through all the veils and see something real, as I have.

It isn't scary, I assure you. They want you to think Satan is waiting back there for you, or the Chasm. But that is just another bluff to keep you from looking. The only thing back there is clear daylight.