

[return to updates](#)

# The ORLANDO PULSE Shooting was another HOAX



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published July 7, 2016*

*As usual, this is just my opinion, arrived at by private research*

I don't rush to write about these current events, as you may have noticed. I let the youtube people compile evidence for me, then sift through it after it has reached a certain weight. Plus, after all the similar hoaxes we have seen since 2001, I think you should now just assume any new mass shooting is faked. These events like Orlando aren't even that interesting: they are too easy. Which is why I concentrate on older larger events like the Russian Revolution and so on. Most people with their eyes open now know or intuit that events like Orlando are faked, but even the savviest of those may not have considered the possibility that the Russian Revolution was faked, or that the Manson Murders were faked, or that Ernest Hemingway was an agent. I like to tell you something you don't already know, or can't get at youtube.

Anyway, the Orlando event continues the trend of these events getting sloppier and sloppier. They are testing you. For instance, the name of the nightclub is PULSE. They are taking your pulse. They are offering you an obviously fake event and seeing how you react. They are interested in knowing what percentage of people are seeing the clues. They are also interested in knowing what those people are going to do about it. That is why they run these public memorials afterwards: they want to see if someone will stand up and yell that it is a hoax; and if someone does, they want to see if the crowd boos him or backs him. Of course that would be easier for them to do if they hadn't already stacked most of these crowds with paid mourners and patsies, but that hasn't occurred to them. I guess they want to know if real people outnumber their paid actors yet, and will stand up to them. So far the answer is they don't and won't.

Anyway, if you are one of those on the fence, here is what you should know about this event:

- 1) The father of the alleged shooter Omar Mateen is named Seddique mir Mateen. [He ran for President of Afghanistan](#) in the most recent election. That is from mainstream sources. Just a coincidence, right? A few weeks before the fake shooting, he was in Washington taking meetings with Congress. But that's not suspicious, is it? You will think this means the Mateen family is a family of terrorists, but Afghanistan is now controlled by us, remember. We took it over after 911. So anyone running for President in Afghanistan is now our stooge. Just yesterday, we got [this headline story](#) telling us Obama is leaving more troops in Afghanistan than planned. But that is also a coincidence, right? That announcement just *happened* to come out three weeks after Orlando.
- 2) Although Omar Mateen was sold to us as a homophobe, allegedly set off on his rampage by seeing two guys kissing, [he is actually gay himself](#). Again, that is from mainstream sources. Many gays have come forward, testifying that they had seen Mateen in various gay bars, hitting on men, or that he had been in online gay chatrooms. That pretty much destroys the homophobe angle of the event.
- 3) In the days after the shooting, it was sold with two huge emotional subtexts, one being as a hate crime against gays and the other being as an ISIS attack. We are told ISIS had taken credit for it. But wait, it has to be one or the other, right? ISIS is allegedly a Middle East terrorist organization, not a club of homophobes. But this is what they try to do with events like this: use them as tarbabies for every group they wish to discredit. If Ron Paul were running for President, they would have connected him to the shooter as well.\*
- 4) Since ISIS is also a CIA front, having no real existence except in the media, that angle is also a mirage.
- 5) In 1) and 2) above, we saw prominent mainstream media sources blowing the cover of this event. *The DailyMail* in London is a mainstream newspaper, owned by the billionaires. Therefore, we can see the government blowing its own cover. And so we know this is either an Intel turf war, with one faction blowing the cover of the other faction; or it is simply a test of your intelligence.



- 6) Although crisis actors have been used in all previous hoaxes, the Orlando event made it even easier to uncloak them than ever before, since several are listed at the Internet Movie Database IMDB. I think Luis Burbano was the first to be discovered. He was one of the talking heads seen on TV right after the event, giving you the spin from inside the club. Well, [here is his IMBD page](#). He has had a minor part in several recent movies, including playing a **security guard** in *Burn Notice*. Note that: a security guard. Here is your notice: you have been burned.
- 7) To feel the burn even hotter, you can go [here](#), where it is shown that Burbano removed his latest

credit from IMDB. It was a 2015 short called. . . are you ready? . . . *Spirit of Orlando: Shooting Up*. No really. There is a screen shot at that link showing it on his IMDB page earlier this year. You will ask, “What? Was that a movie about the shooting before it happened?” No, the “shooting” refers to drug use in Orlando. It is supposed to just be a coincidence that his last movie credit had that name. But since no one was buying that explanation, IMDB had to take the credit down. What really happened is that this was one of their clues. But they decided after the fact that the clue was too easy to read. The clue planters had gone too far. So they removed this clue. But due to their own Wayback Machine it was found anyway.

- 8) Alleged victim Patience Carter, also an actress, didn't know her own best friend's first name. When recounting the events, she repeatedly called the girl Kiara. Her name is Akyra (sometimes spelled Akira) Murray. See minute 23:30 of [this youtube video](#), which contains the footage as well as much more good analysis. In that same video, Patience is caught in a huge lie. She claims the police punched through the wall of the women's bathroom where she was hiding. They didn't. All holes were punched in the men's bathroom, 25 feet away.
- 9) But there's an even bigger problem. According to the computers, no such person as Akyra or Akira Murray, age 18, exists. No one 18 in Florida, but no one of that name and age in any state. There is only one Akira Murray in the whole US, and she lives in New York. She is 25. Akira Noel Murray, still alive according to the computers.
- 10) For more proof this was staged, you can go [here](#) to see photos of the staging area, taken the day of the event.



That is a photo released by WFTV9 about 150 yards from the Pulse, in the area where the alleged injured people were carried from a few hours later (or earlier?—this isn't time stamped, so we don't know when it was taken). But where we would expect to see nothing, or maybe a clean-up crew, we instead see multiple large, expensive Hollywood-style location trailers. Are those [Star Waggon](#)s? Just so you understand, those trailers aren't parked in front on the Pulse. They are 150 yards or a block away in the staging area. So if you tell me those are catering vans or something for the crew mopping all the blood up at the Pulse, you are off by about a football field. I suggest this was the afternoon before the event and that these are star waggons for the actors.

For more indication of that, if you take the link before the last, you will see a close up of this image,

showing they also brought their own staging lights. That little red cart you see is actually the generator for a bank of powerful stage lights. If this was not a staged event, why would they need to bring their own stage lights? And as with other similar events, we see these people on the ground are wearing ID tags as necklaces, just as on a Hollywood set.



We also find that image in the set from ABC affiliate WFTV9. Looks like a very impressive robotic camera, almost like a little Mars Rover. Why would that be parked near the Pulse? Do you think the local TV station has that kind of tech? Doubtful. This is just another indication the big boys were there with all their toys before the event, ready to capture it for your entertainment and amusement. The long shadows indicate either early morning or late evening. But why would that piece of equipment be sitting in a parking lot the next morning? I suggest it was the evening before, which of course indicates prior knowledge.

- 11) With that under you belt, you can go back to the shooter, Omar Mateen. [He also has an IMDB page.](#) [He is also an admitted actor.](#) And like Burbano, his page has been scrubbed since the event. If you go [here](#), you can see a screenshot of his page from a month ago, which tells us he was in *The Big Fix*. Did you get that clue? The Big Fix. Hmmmm. And yes, that's the 2012 film with Peter Fonda. It also stars Bernie Sanders as himself. I suggest you use this information to add to your list of outed agents. I suggest everyone in this film may be a spook, including Tim Robbins, Darius Fisher, Rebecca Tickell, Jason Mraz, Jean-Michel Cousteau, Kevin Curole, Margaret Curole, Gregory Funk, Jeff Goodell, Nomi Prins, Amy Smart, Paul Templett, Ed Overton, Greg Palast, Chris Hedges, Bobby Jindal, David Korten, Jim McDermott, Joshua Tickell, and John Perkins. But wait, you will say, that film was a hardhitting expose of the Gulf Oil Spill and the oil industry. Was it? That is what it *seemed* to be on the surface, but the same thing was said of the slick 2011 documentary *Inside Job*, which [I showed](#) was nothing more than misdirection. This is another way they control the opposition: they admit all the crimes you already know, but then misdirect you into the wrong solution. You can judge these fake documentaries just by the list of outlets that praise them. *The Big Fix* was given rave reviews from the *New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Washington Post*, etc. All of those papers are owned by Intel. So the film might as well have gotten two thumbs up from Langley. Do you imagine these mainstream newspapers really want to blow the whistle on the oil industry?



Actually, Tickell, the producer of *The Big Fix*, admits in the opening montage that his family got its money by leasing its lands in Louisiana to the oil companies. That doesn't make you suspicious? The film then whitewashes Huey Long, calling him a populist and ally of the little guy. That doesn't make you suspicious? Like all other politicians, Long was a fat sack of manure whose only job was to front the billionaires. Both his genealogy and his wife's have been scrubbed, although his mother was a Tyson. Long became a lawyer without going to law school. This indicates he was a spook. He went to work immediately for Standard Oil, being their manufactured opposition. Although sold as a populist, Long got elected due to his wealthy connections, including his cousin by marriage Swords Lee, a wealthy timber magnate. So although Rose Long's genealogy is scrubbed, we know she was related to the Lees, including Robert E. Lee. Long's campaign manager was Harvey Peltier, Sr., *an oilman*, banker, and sugar magnate.\*\* But that isn't suspicious, is it, given Long's alleged opposition to big oil and his claim to be a populist. Aren't all populists underwritten by millionaires and billionaires?

When Long won the governorship in 1928, the other two candidates in the primary election declined to continue into a runoff, although they had earned it. That's not suspicious, is it? Have you ever heard of two candidates simply quitting before a run-off? I haven't. Although we are told Long initiated a lot of social programs, that is about all he did: initiate them. He didn't see any of them through since he began running for US Senate in 1930. That was part of the smokescreen. We are supposed to think Louisiana went from rags to riches in just two years due to small taxes on oil, but nothing much changed. Louisiana was the same backwater during and after Long as it was before.

Long won the Senate race and was supposed to be seated in Washington in March of 1931, but didn't show up until February of 1932, almost a year later. He finished out his term as governor instead. What? And the Senate was fine with that? They didn't impeach him for non-appearance? Why would they do that? Probably because Standard Oil owned the Senate and was perfectly happy to have seats empty. The rest of the Senators were just their puppets anyway, so it didn't much matter if the seats were filled with puppets or were unfilled: it was all the same.



But let's skip ahead to the punchline: like the rest, Long's assassination in 1935 was faked. He was allegedly shot on the Capitol floor in Louisiana by Dr. Carl Weiss [above], a wealthy and prominent person. His genealogy is non-existent, but I assume from his name and bio he was Jewish. He went to medical school in Vienna and also did his internship there. He was President of the Louisiana Medical Society in 1933 (note the date) and was a member of Kiwanis. I assume Kiwanis is an unadmitted branch of the Freemasons. Weiss' wife was a Pavy, and her grandmother was a Rentrop, both possibly Jewish names. See Petra Rentrop, Holocaust historian. Frank Weltner at JewWatch believes Weiss was

a Mossad assassin, but that theory makes as little sense as the mainstream theory. They don't put highly trained rich doctors on suicide missions. If anyone had wanted to kill Long, they could have done it in a thousand easier ways. Rather, Long's ridiculous assassination looks like the planned end of a managed story. The great populist, pushing for a cap on wealth, had to appear to die young by an assassin's bullet, didn't he? His faked death would prevent any real person from seriously proposing the same thing for decades.

We can also tell this was a fake by its location. Guns aren't allowed in State Houses now and they weren't then, for obvious reasons. Plus, we are told Long's guards put 62 bullets in Weiss after the first shots. Wait, let's do some math. Say Long was allowed two armed guards. Each one has a pistol. Each pistol fires from 6 to 10 shots, say (the Colt Police Positive was the most common guard pistol of the time, which had only 6 rounds). So each of two guards would have to reload from 3 to 5 times, emptying from 4 to 6 clips into an already dead man. I don't see why Long would be allowed more than two armed guards in a crowded State House, but say he had three. Even then, each guard would have to reload 2 to 3 times, emptying 3 to 4 clips into an already dead man. Is that believable? Not in the least. So why did they choose the number 62? Because it adds to eight.  $6+2=8$ . Weiss' remains were allegedly exhumed from Baton Rouge and their whereabouts are now unknown. That's convenient, since it wasn't him.

You can see I was bored by the Orlando story, and had to find something more interesting to uncover. It wasn't hard, since all these stories are linked. If you get bored with one you can always segue into another. I may cover Long in more detail later, but I have given you the biggest clues already. You can probably fill in the blanks yourself.

I will get back to *The Big Fix*, but first I discovered some things about Frank Weltner at JewWatch. I have tripped across that strange site a couple of times recently, and have found the spin he puts on things curious. Some will think I consider him an ally, but I definitely do not. Then I noticed the name Weltner. That may be Jewish itself. In searching on that, I found several claims that Weltner had co-owned a house with a gay Jewish man and might be gay himself. Most of those claims came from Stormfront, which is also curious. Why would Stormfront be outing someone who should be their best ally? I can't say. I also must admit that the mainstream links listed at Stormfront were all to pages that had since been memory-holed. For instance, one successfully linked to the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, but the page was gone. And at DavidIcke.com, we are told Weltner was arrested for child porn in 2010. However, once again, the link to the *St. Louis Today* goes to an empty page. I did find an interview with Weltner in 2015 on youtube, which would seem to indicate he beat that rap, but I could find no other update on the story. There is actually a blogspot dedicated to that arrest, but no updates or comments exist after 2010. The youtube interview has only a still photo of him, so I guess there is no proof the voice is his. He could be a photo front for a writing committee for all we know. None of this is proof of anything about Weltner, but I take it as a red flag. It helps me understand what JewWatch may be about. I suspect both JewWatch and Stormfront of being Intel fronts, and these outings and page scrubblings are just more signs of the split in Intel. Both places may contain some true information, but it looks heavily spun. It takes a lot of work to sift it and despin it.

OK, back to *The Big Fix*. At minute 14, enter Peter Fonda. To introduce him, Tickle—I mean Tickell—plays a clip from *Easy Rider*. That may impress you, but it didn't impress me. [See my paper](#) on the movie, exposing both Fonda and Hopper as probable agents. Tickell tells us Fonda took the oil spill as a personal insult, but does not tell why. Just because he is such a patriot, I guess. We are supposed to imagine he is a great progressive. But if you check his Wiki page, in the paragraph labeled “politics”, this movie is the first and only political thing he has ever done. Apparently he has been hired in the last

decade to make liberals look bad, peaking in 2011 by calling Obama “a fucking traitor”. But Wiki doesn't mention that. In making liberals look bad, he is taking up where his sister Jane left off. She was hired as opposition control back in the late 60s, you will remember, pretending to be a liberal. But you have to remember that their family was always Republican. [They now admit that](#). Yes, Peter now admits in interviews that his father Henry was a Republican and a conservative. But that must look strange to any of you over 50, and especially those of you over 70, since Henry—like Jane and Peter now—was sold back in the day as a liberal and a progressive. It also conflicts with Henry's Wikipedia page, which is *still* selling him as a Democrat. He appeared in a campaign commercial for JFK in 1960. How to read that?: neither one were really Democrats or Republicans, they were both from **fascist** old families that had always ruled the country. . . and still are. They rule it through a thick fog of fantastic lies.



Next we find Amy Smart coming onboard *The Big Fix*. She looks great, but don't let that fool you. Her last name isn't really Smart, it is Werts. Her father is John Nash Werts. Do those first two names look familiar? See [my recent paper on John Nash](#). You may think that is just a coincidence, but don't you believe it. Amy's grandmother is Mary Jane Boden, and *her* mother was Mary Agnes Nash (married to John Bodenschatz). To start with, Bodenschatz may be Jewish. See Johann Bodenschatz, a German vicar but probably a crypto-Jew. His specialty was Jewish history and ceremonial, which he wrote exhaustively about in his famous books. But now for the Nash link. If you go to Ancestry.com, you find [this page](#), which tells you Mary Agnes Nash was the daughter of Eliot Elisha Nash, son of Lester Nash, son of Elisha Lewis Nash, son of John Nash. These Nashes were also linked by marriage to the Paynes in the mid-1800s, which links us to my expose of Payne Stewart in [my paper on Tiger Woods](#). As I have said before, all these families are linked. Also to the Clarks, who I linked in the same paper. Anyway, John Nash's father was Ezra and his father was Abraham. Abraham was married to Rhoda Keeler, and her mom was Rhoda Hoyt. Her mom was Hannah Knapp. All these names are Jewish, of course. Hannah's husband was named Zerubbabel. Although the Nashes are scrubbed before Abraham, we may assume they are related to the Nashes from Massachusetts, who have many of the same family names, including of course John Nash. You will say that isn't much of a match, but they have many others, including the name Elisha, which isn't nearly as common as John. Both lines end in a morass of Jewish names like Moses, Elisha, Rebekah, Ebenezer, Ephraim, and so on.

This means that not only is Amy Smart related to John Forbes Nash, she is also related to Prince and Marshall Field, among many others. See [my recent paper on Prince](#) for more on that; as well as my paper on the [Scopes Monkey Trail](#) where I show Marshall Field's genealogy. On her father's side,

Amy may be related to George Werts, former governor of New Jersey. Although his genealogy is mostly scrubbed, both families have women named Mehitable in them, which is very uncommon. With more digging, [we find George Werts was originally Wirts](#), and that he was the descendant of Rev. John Conrad. This is interesting because with a combing of the genealogies, we find Wirts is a variation of Wirtz. Wirtz is a probable Jewish name, given Amy's other Jewish lines. This would explain all the spelling changes and genealogy scrubblings on Amy's paternal side, and finally the complete and recent name change to Smart. It would indicate that the name Kroenert in Amy's genealogy is also Jewish.

This all goes to say that Amy Smart isn't appearing all over the place now simply due to her pretty eyes. And she isn't appearing in *The Big Fix* because she is an environmentalist. She is appearing because her family is part of *The Even Bigger Fix*.

Then, at minute 36, we get a strange admission from a guard on the beach. He tells us that the greater the disaster, the more money gets made. You should pause on that. The filmmakers don't, but you should. How much did the clean-up cost? We know BP (allegedly) paid billions in fines, but I mean "how much did the US government spend on cleanup, research, litigation, etc.?" Are we sure they billed BP for the entire amount? I could find nothing on that question online. We are assured BP actually paid the fines it was assessed, but we were also assured BP would pay claims against it, and the film admits BP paid only 1 of 90,000 claims against it.

My assumption would be the US treasury was once again looted in this created tragedy. That is normally how "money is made" in these disasters, and that is probably what the guard meant. To me, he seemed to be implying the disaster had been at least partially manufactured or blown up. Is that possible? Of course it is. Remind yourself that the Gulf was already a disaster before the big oil spill. The Gulf has been full of oil for many decades. I know: I grew up in Texas and we sometimes went to the Gulf for vacations—though I don't know why. I remember the dirty oily water, the smell, the tarballs, and the general nastiness of the whole place. I couldn't wait to get out of there, and that was back in the 1970s. Remember, there was a similar spill in 1979, the huge Ixtoc spill (is it just a coincidence that is a scramble of "toxic"?). So the idea that BP destroyed the Gulf with this one big event never took hold with me. That event may have been the *coup de grace*, or not. But watching the film *The Big Fix* certainly didn't answer any questions for me. It only made me more suspicious of the entire story. As usual, it appeared as just one lie in a long series, told by another set of people I couldn't trust to tell me the correct time.

Which is not to say I think the whole tragedy was manufactured, that is to say, faked. I think it was managed, not faked. Which means I think a lot of what they tell you in the film may be true. For instance, I think the Corexit tragedy is likely true. But what they don't ask in the film is why the Corexit was sprayed. They assume it was sprayed negligently by a big company that thought it would work as a dispersant. But I think it was even worse than that. It was sprayed because it was *more profitable* to spray it. All that Corexit had to be **purchased**. BP didn't produce Corexit. So the company that produced it made huge profits. I would assume the profits probably exceeded the fines paid. Which is what I mean by a managed event. According to my research, Corexit is owned by Exxon Mobil. It was developed long ago by Standard Oil (the Rockefellers), which became Exxon. So it is possible the oil companies, taken as a cartel, actually made a profit from the spill. My bet is the profits from the spill exceeded the fines paid, even though they were many billions. If this is true, it means not only is there no incentive not to spill, there is actually an incentive to spill. Which would explain why we see so many spills. I would say the Rockefellers have found a way to profit from oil spills, which means the environment is a goner until the last drop of oil is spilled.



The film provides evidence for that, in fact. Did BP show a loss after the spill? No. It reported 16 billion in profits in 2010 *after* the spill. ExxonMobil had a banner year, with over 30 billion in profits in 2010, a large slice of that being the sale of Corexit. Its second quarter profits in 2010 after the spill were up 75% from 2009.

What is most strange doesn't come from the film, however. It comes from further research. If we check [the yearly revenues of BP from 2005-2015](#), we find a big dip, but it didn't come in 2010. It came in 2009. This is suspicious in the extreme, because it should lead you to ask, "Might the spill in 2010 have come *in response to* the large revenue dip in 2009?" In other words, is it possible the big oil companies have found it is more profitable to spill oil than to deliver it? Remember, in the film we find BP seeming to do everything it could to let this explosion happen on purpose, from ignoring the rig's pressure warning systems (minute 12:50), to sending away a scheduled safety test team on the day of the explosion, to manually disabling the alarms and shutdown systems. Even before considering the possibility all this could have been done on purpose, I found those facts to be curious and suspicious. The film's producers spin that to mean BP was simply greedy and negligent, trying to increase speed, but disabling alarms and shutdown systems wouldn't increase speed or profitability. Rather, I see it as another sign we aren't being told the whole story, either by BP, the mainstream press, or the filmmakers.

In support of that hypothesis, we find ExxonMobil's yearly profits in 2009 were also a huge dip, being 57% lower than 2008, dropping from 45.2 billion in 2008 to 19.3 billion in 2009. Greater support comes from looking at the Exxon Valdez spill in March 1989. If we study [the charts](#), we again find something strange. After hitting a high of almost 51 in September of 1987, Exxon's stock fell to 30.88 the next month and stayed low for all of 1988. Mysteriously, the stock only began to rise *after* the spill, hitting 46.75 that summer of 1989 and 51.63 by the end of the year. Of course, this is the opposite of what one would expect. Exxon paid an undiminished dividend of .1375 in May of 1989 and increased dividends in August and November of .15.

More indication comes from studying the big Mexican spill in the Gulf in 1979 which I mentioned above, the huge Ixtoc spill by PEMEX. If we search on PEMEX 1978, we find some strange things happening in that year. To start with, [huge discoveries in 1977-78 of oil](#) had doubled Mexico's output, leading to an oversupply. Next, [we find recent documents](#) from Wikileaks indicating PEMEX was being investigated in 1978 by the US IRS. So again it is suspicious to find this huge oil dump in the Gulf in 1979. Remember, PEMEX is larger even than ExxonMobil, with total assets of more than \$420 billion. It is said to be state-owned, but I assume that is a cover. Best bet is it is another cover for the Rockefellers, or perhaps another arm of the Octopus.†

The overall story of the spill is also rife with contradictions and anomalies. At Wikipedia, we are told 126 people were aboard the rig. 94 were rescued and 11 were never found. That adds to 105. What happened to the other 21? We are told only 17 of 126 were treated for injuries, but have you seen the footage of the explosion and firefall? See the [BBC5 documentary](#) of the first day. You would have expected most of the 126 to be killed immediately or in the following fires. There was nowhere to go except into the water and that would have required a dive of dozens of meters (150 feet) *in the dark*. In the similar [Piper Alpha rig explosion](#) in 1988, 167 were killed. [No lifeboats got away](#). We are told some went into lifeboats after the BP explosions, but according to my research oil rigs are not supplied with lifeboats to carry 126 people. That would be something like six 20-man lifeboats. This wasn't the *Titanic*, it was a single oil rig. If you search on this question, you will find a recent article about a 70-man sealed boat that can survive a fall of 200 ft., but in the last link you will find no such boats were in use in 2009. I would assume none were in use in 2010 or we would have been shown them in the

various documentaries.

[It is admitted](#) that most of the safety systems on the rig failed in whole or in part, including the blowout preventer, emergency shutdown, alarm system, and power generation. It is admitted there were no escape shuttles or ladders. There were no survival suits issued and the lifeboats had no beacons.

Then there is the matter of the interviews. Rig worker Chris Choy is the first interview, and he says at minute 1:30 that after being awoken by the first explosion, “I didn't know if I was the only person still on the rig”. What? That could mean one of two things, seems to me. One, when he had gone to sleep he had seen the main crew leaving for some reason—vacation, storm warning, or downtime. So he thought very few were onboard. Two, he assumed the explosions had already killed everyone else or thrown them into the water. Neither fit the story we are now told, where at least 94 should have been in sleeping quarters or running around on deck with Choy.

Then there is the matter of the time. The first explosion was around 9:45pm, which explains why Choy was asleep. But in the *The Big Fix* [minute 13:12] we were told that 12 hours earlier there had been a party onboard to celebrate BP's flawless safety record. So they had a party at 9am? Who schedules a party at 9 o'clock in the morning, especially when you would have to fly executives in from hours away?

If we return to the BBC, we next hear from Coast Guard Lt. Nathen Houck [min. 3:37], who tells us that he received a report from “a man” who told him that an entire rig was on fire with over 100 people onboard, and that people were jumping overboard. Really? What man? How did he know *at night* how many people were on the rig? If people were jumping overboard, they were most likely jumping to their deaths, since the fall was 150 ft. at night into a burning ocean. But only 17 were treated for injuries, remember? We are told so many survived because of proper use of lifeboats, but jumping overboard from 150 ft. isn't part of proper use of lifeboats, is it?

We find the Coast Guard choppers who were the first responders took off from a base 115 nautical miles away. Then, “a few minutes later, the crews could see the rig”. Really? So Coast Guard choppers fly at what, Mach2? Chris Choy tells us the Coast Guard arrived 30-45 minutes after he had gotten on the lifeboat. Hmmm. Again, that seems kind of quick. The Sikorsky has a top speed of around 140kn, so it would take 50 minutes of flight time, not including time to suit up, board, and take off. There is no way the Coast Guard could have arrived on the scene in less than an hour, much less 30 minutes.

But curiously, when they get there, we see the rig tenders are already there spraying the rig with water cannons. I say that is curious, because the rig tenders should have been more concerned with the crew. This is what it says at Wiki under the title “tender rig”:

**Tender rigs** act as support platforms for [drilling rigs](#). They are typically equipped with storage facilities, living quarters, power generation facilities, [cranes](#), and [helicopter](#) platforms. Tender rigs are built on [barges](#) or as jackup- or semi-submersible platforms.

If the tenders were there so fast, they should have been able to act as rescue. But the stories utterly ignore that. We are told a rig supply vessel passing by hauls the men from the number 2 lifeboat onboard. But couldn't the rig's own tender ships have done that? No? They were too busy playing with their water cannons?

Then we see the Coast Guard's elite swimmers being lowered on rope ladders down to the supply vessel. But wait, the tender rigs have helicopter platforms. In the documentary, we can see the tenders, and they are quite large, with obvious large flat spaces that could have taken these choppers. So none of this story makes any sense to me.

How about this for absurd: next we hear from Salvage Manager Ray Lord. After Lord telling us that no time can be wasted on the emergency, the narrator chimes in to tell us that the team faces a 400 mile drive from Houston to the Louisiana coast, before they can board a boat out to the rig. Really? You would think that BP, one of the richest companies in the world, would own a few Sikorskys of their own, and that they could *fly* out to the rig. They could land on a tender ship or on a nearby rig. That's why these ships have helicopter platforms, you know. At 140 kts, that would take only a few hours. Instead they decide to drive and boat, which will take them about five times as long.

Maybe they didn't want to fly because no one really knows where this rig was. Wikipedia tells us it was at long 88 21 57.40W. The BBC tells us it was at long 88 23 13W. That is a miss of about 76 seconds. That's about 7,500 ft, or about a mile and a half. Given that we are told the rig was kept in place by GPS, it is surprising we see numbers off by that amount.

A second team was called in from Holland to fight the fire. I guess they were going to drive and boat over as well?

Then we go to fire fighting specialist James Wait [min. 10:36]. He is also coming from Houston. Do they chopper him in directly? No, we see him heading off to Houston airport, where he can wait in line for a flight to New Orleans. He has the right last name, I guess. We actually see him driving on the Houston highways as the narration continues. But remember, these big oil companies have helipads on the tops of downtown buildings, especially in places like Houston. So to see him driving his little Subaru to Houston airport is just the continuation of a joke.

The next segment is equally absurd, as we watch Ray Ford finding a boat to take 42 tons of firefighting equipment out to the rig. It will take them more than 18 hours driving and boating time to get it there. But again, you are being led on some sort of wild goose chase here. The only way to put out the fire is with water or chemicals, and the tenders are already heavily dousing the rig with water. Chemicals could be dropped from the air, like they do with forest fires, so they again could use helicopters. Sikorskis and Chinooks can't carry 42 tons, but they can carry lots of weight. And since the chemical deliverers don't even have to land, slow flying airplanes could be used as well. So all this talk of boating heavy equipment out there is just misdirection. Even if BP didn't own any Chinooks, the military should have been put into action for something like this. You will say this was a private affair, but the Coast Guard was involved, and they are not private. The military rents out equipment and tech to Hollywood, for crying out loud, so why should they not work with big oil? Of course we know they do. So watching this rig burn and sink while BP drives to the airport in a Subaru should look mighty strange to you.

Then we go back to watching the tenders dousing the rig. But again we have a problem. See min. 13:38, where one boat is dousing the other boat, seemingly just for fun. The others are missing the rig completely, hitting nothing but water around it. These guys either have terrible aim, they are all drunk, or they have orders to let her burn.

It is also worth noting that the rig [was outfitted with a deadman's switch](#), which would automatically cut the pipe and seal the well if communication from the platform was lost. Wikipedia tells us it was

unknown whether the switch was activated. What? Such a switch should not have to be activated, it should be automatic, right? If you have to turn it on, it is not a deadman's switch, is it? Can a dead man flip a switch? If the switch had been cut, that would be a very large crime *and* it would indicate the explosion was not an accident. That obvious conclusion is never broached.

When we watch films of the fire in the documentaries, we are told the fire is being fed by the oil coming up from below. But this was not an active well at the time. It is admitted that this was a “planned well”, not an active one.

The planned well was to be drilled to 18,360 feet (5,600 m) below sea level, and was to be plugged and suspended for subsequent completion as a [subsea](#) producer.<sup>[13]</sup> Production [casing](#) was being run and [cemented](#) at the time of the accident. Once the cementing was complete, it was due to be tested for integrity and a cement plug set to temporarily abandon the well.<sup>[15]</sup>

If the fire was not being fed from below as we are told, this throws a big monkey wrench into the mainstream story. What exactly are we watching in the documentaries? Are we even watching real film of the Deepwater Horizon? If you study all the images and mockups, you find we are being sold several rigs that don't match one another. Closer analysis needs to be made of the films, but I would say it is entirely possible they are fake. The ocean didn't look right to me the first time I watched them. You will have to come to your own conclusions, I just give you the clue.



*“The Tickells” with Richard Branson and Michael Howard*

But let us return to *The Big Fix* and finish this off. Next, we find the filmmaker's alleged wife Rebecca Tickell going to the doctor with rashes all over her and a hacking cough. Like much of the rest, this isn't really believable. How stupid are we supposed to think she and her husband are? They are making a movie about the environmental catastrophe in the Gulf, but they forget to wear any protection from it, including shoes? She just *forgot* to wear shoes on the beach, even though they knew beforehand the beaches were covered with toxic Corexit? C'mon! One of the major crimes of BP is supposed to be its hiding the toxicity of Corexit, failing to provide protective clothing and safety manuals to clean-up crews. The Tickells had to have known that, since they are reporting on it; and yet we are supposed to believe they didn't even wear shoes on the beaches, much less protective clothing or respirators? For myself, I don't even buy that these two are married. Listen to his voice: he has a lilt I have never heard from a straight man.

In minute 57, we begin to see the major spin in the film, when it is suggested the oil companies are the big bad guys here. Earlier in the film, we saw the heads of BP as the major villains. But these guys are



not the top of the food chain here, and neither are the oil companies themselves. They are taking orders from someone above them. In other words, the executives *run* the companies, they do not *own* them. We also see the EPA and other politicians made into the bad guys. Yes, they are corrupt, but we should not be stopping at who is getting paid off, we should ask who is *paying* them. These people are small fish, making only tens of thousands of dollars. But wealthy families are making billions. Those families are never outed in these documentaries. In the Huey Long segment, we hear the name Standard Oil a couple of times, but never the name Rockefeller.

They also never ask who owns BP. I will be told it is shareholders, but who are the major shareholders? We don't know because real people aren't listed, only investment groups like Franklin and Vanguard. Why don't the producers of the film suggest as one of their solutions that real people must be listed as shareholders? Instead, they are allowed to hide.

Next, they spend many minutes blaming oil industry lobbyists. But if all Congresspeople weren't corrupt, no amount of lobbying would matter. You can't "lobby" people who are incorruptible, by definition. If you are a Congressman who is going to do the right thing regardless, lobbying is meaningless. Lobbying is actually a misnomer. Why not call it what it is? Institutionalized bribery. We are told lobbying is the second biggest business in Washington, after the Government itself. But, again, that is just smoke. Lobbying isn't a business. It is institutionalized corruption. The definition of "business" is not—or should not be—institutionalized corruption.

You will say this is the message of the film, but it isn't. They take you in that direction but divert you. At minute 105:45, they tell us "Most people who go into government go in because they care about what happens. They are there to change something." The visuals are Obama shaking hands with cheering crowds in 2008. "But the process changes them." BULLSHIT. We have no evidence that is true and huge piles of evidence it is *not* true. Do we have any real evidence Obama ever cared about anything? No. All the evidence that has come down to us indicates Obama was willing to lie to get where he wanted to go. He was used for that reason. We have no evidence he ever cared or that anyone behind him ever cared. Just empty words. So why are we being told this? It is the continuation of a Snow Job. Yes, there is a big fix, and this film is part of it.

Congressman Jim McDermott tells us politicians don't go in corrupt. Right, Jim. And we are supposed to just take your word for that? I would say that if a person is corruptible, they are corrupt. Since they all become corrupt, they must have gone in corruptible. Good people don't become bad just because you throw a little money at them. If they become bad under pressure, they are bad. That is what the words mean. Anyone can be "good" when no pressure is applied to them, but in that case the word has no real meaning.

But the filmmakers use this squishy thinking to lead you to their first solution: limit campaign financing. That is like proposing a band-aid for a decapitation. I will be told it is a step in the right direction, but it is a meaningless baby-step. Is a band-aid for a man just guillotined a step in the right direction? No. Talking about campaign financing after listing such crimes is just meaningless blather. Thousands of people should be prosecuted for treason, and they are talking about campaign financing.

This is also a good time to remind yourself that the main line of corruption in this country has nothing to do with Congress or the President. Those two branches of government are defunct. Neither the President nor the Congress actually does anything or makes any decisions. They only exist to divert your eye away at opportune times like this. It is like a magic trick: which cup is the ball under? The Presidential cup? The Congressional cup? No, neither one. In fact, the ball isn't on the table at all.

Everything is being done under the table out of sight. So talking about the campaign financing of a bunch of scarecrows is meaningless.



One of the most nauseating parts of the film is Chris Hedges telling us at minute 109 that “there is a great deal of antipathy, distrust, even anger towards liberals—and I don't think it is misplaced.” In support of that, he talks about Clinton deregulating the banking system. Obama is then also attacked as a liberal, bowing to oil interests. But as much as I detest both Clinton and Obama, this line of argument could not be more dishonest. To start with, conservatives and Republicans were not against deregulation of banks or bowing to oil interests. They have been very much in favor of the current trend. More importantly, neither Clinton nor Obama are liberal in the way implied. The use of the word liberal in the context of this film should imply an opposition to fascism or plutocracy. Clinton or Obama could only be called liberal on some limited issues beyond the scope or context of the current argument, like gay rights or something like that. So using Clinton's mothballing of Glass-Steagall or Obama's bowing to oil interests as a reason to distrust liberals is the most transparent sophistry imaginable. It is again a diversion into terms like liberal and conservative that have been squashed and flipped: they no longer have any meaning. The truth is, both parties have been bought by the billionaires, and they were bought *long long ago*. Like Congress and the President, the political parties are just scarecrows or fronts. Chris Hedges knows that, so watching his lips flap is just painful. Chris should really look to the mirror: as he has aged his face has become the very definition of “unction”. His handlers should no longer use him on film, since he is no longer convincing in his role.

Of course that could be said of all these people.

At minute 110, we have more proof of my assertion this is all misdirection. A clip is played of Obama saying “I ultimately take responsibility for solving this crisis. I am the President and the buck stops with me.” How did those behind him in shot keep from bursting into laughter? Does anyone above the age of six still believe the President is responsible for anything beyond reading Teleprompters? No, but the producers of this film apparently think the mental age of its audience is five, since they are still feeding you that line from Harry Truman in the 1940s, expecting you to bite on it.

At minute 116 we are told we have to brace ourselves for more disasters like the Gulf Spill. That doesn't sound like much of a solution, guys. Thanks for making your little film and telling us that! They should have said “IF we continue to act like pussies, letting the billionaires rob us blind, we will have to brace ourselves for more disasters.” But we don't have to do that, do we? Since there are what, 7 billion of us now, we could stand up and say *no more*. I agree it doesn't look like happening, but that is the solution. Not weak-kneed waffling like campaign finance reform, but a real stand by real people. If you aren't even going to suggest that as a solution, I don't know why you would bother

making a film. Unless you were paid to make it as more misdirection.

You might also ask yourself why we have to keep hearing from editor of *Rolling Stone* Jeff Goodell in this documentary. Yes, he is one of the most convincing voices, simply due to his demeanor, but remember that *Rolling Stone* has been owned by Intel for decades. It was probably created by them from the ground up, like most other media, but if not, it was taken over in the late 70s, after the Church Committee hearings. There is NO INDEPENDENT MAJOR MEDIA now. Please get that through your skull. Not even the yoga magazines are independent. That is another reason to write off Chris Hedges before he even opens his yap: he was a foreign correspondent for the *New York Times* for 15 years. He is owned and is probably an agent. He doesn't just accidentally look creepy. Most of these people do. Jeff Goodell is one of the rare ones left who gives one any confidence—but again, do not fall for it. If he works for *Rolling Stone* and appears in this film, he is compromised. You can assume that everything he says is spun. He also writes for the *New York Times*, Intel's number one mouthpiece.

If you don't believe me, you can see one of many Intel markers in the film at minute 118:20. Scenes of New Orleans are being displayed, and a large K with the subtext “since 1947” appears prominently on screen. What has been around since 1947? Oh, that's right, the CIA. Right after that, we get a close-up of a detached hand from a large sculpture. How to read that? They are telling you that your ability to act has been destroyed, just as if your hands had been cut off.

The voice-over is telling us the endgame is total economic collapse, but that isn't true, either. Can the oil companies or billionaires sell oil or anything else to people with no money? No. Collapse may be the *outcome*, yes, but it isn't the *endgame*. It may be what Nature wants, that is, but it isn't what the billionaires want. The billionaires will find something else to sell to you after all the oil is dumped or burned. They probably already have some energy source in the wings, ready to sell you for more than it is worth. Which is of course why alternative energy isn't the answer, either. Nature isn't demanding we change to a greener energy source, she is demanding we stop growing and polluting and acting like towering assholes all the time. If the billionaires changed their endgame to something not based on profit and growth and destruction, Nature might back down and leave us be. But again, no suggestion of that from the film.

Instead, we are told this is “a battle we can't win” (minute 125:50). Again, very inspiring. Yes, the film ends by telling us to unite and take a stand, but that is an empty statement after so much misdirection. Take a stand against whom and for what? Against liberals? Against campaign finance? Against Congress? Against lobbyists? Against executives? All of that, like the film itself, is smoke.

But let us return to Orlando and finish this off. This Orlando hoax must be the low point of the gay lobby, although we can't really know the full lay of the land. I assume the gay lobby has been run by Intel for many decades, so we can't blame gays as a whole or even gay activists. We can only blame the gays involved and the agents running them. That said, your average gay person who fell for this really needs to reassess his or her entire political life. I warn them they are just being used by events like this, and the Orlando hoax will be used *against* them, not for them, in the long run. That is part of what the reversal is about, you see. That is why we see mainstream media sources blowing the cover of this event. When it fails, it makes the gay lobby look terrible, you see. Most people won't be as generous or perceptive as I am, and they will use the breaking of this event as an excuse to backlash on gays. I recommend you don't do that. This is just another manufactured war, like the race war they are creating now as well. They want men and women targeting one another, and gays and straights, and whites and blacks. Why? Because if we are fighting each other we aren't fighting them.

MISDIRECTION: that is what it means. They want you mad, but they want to be sure to misdirect your anger. The last thing they want you doing is actually solving this problem. The last thing they want you to do is finger the real perps.

I have just given you a taste of the top clues, but the pile of clues is now extremely large. This is unwinding just as fast and just as fully as Sandy Hook. If you want more evidence, I suggest you go to youtube and browse for a while. Take as much time as you need to study the evidence on both sides and come to your own conclusion.

**PS: added July 9, 2016:** all the race-war shootings in the past three days are also faked. I warned you they were trying to start a race war and it looks like they are ramping it up. It is a sign of desperation, and indicates they are facing increased pressure. They can't have you studying all their crimes, so they have to fake some front-page stuff everyday to keep you diverted.

\*Remember, [they actually did that](#) with Sandy Hook in 2012, connecting fake shooter Adam Lanza to Ron Paul.

\*\*We have seen sugar lords coming up in several of my recent papers, including the ones on John Reed and Napoleon.

†To see an example of the strange stats we are fed on these companies, note that PEMEX is reported to have revenue of 114 billion in 2014, but a net income of only 390 million. Whereas ExxonMobil is said to have a revenue of 267 billion in 2015, but a net income of 22 billion. So PEMEX has 43% of the revenues of ExxonMobil, but only 1.7% of the net income? [We are told](#) that 70% of PEMEX's profit goes to running the Mexican state, but that isn't proper accounting. Supporting the country of Mexico isn't a *business cost* of PEMEX, it is a *use of profit*. So PEMEX's net income should be 70% higher than listed at Wikipedia, making PEMEX's net income 1.3 billion. But that still doesn't add up, because that makes PEMEX's net income only 6% of ExxonMobil's, with 43% of the revenues. Still 7x too low.