

Piece of Mindful

I am posting this note to my readers to let them know I am formally breaking any *percieved* link to the website [Piece of Mindful](#). I have never linked to them, either with a weblink or in any other way, but they have linked themselves to me and some have assumed there is a connection. There isn't and never was. Mark Tokarksi came to my last conference, paying good money to do so, but I knew nothing about him before that. He didn't do anything spooky while here, so I sort of ignored him. Only later did I find out about his website, and even then I lazily ignored it. I don't read other people's blogs because I don't have the time and interest to do so. I figure they can do what they wish. However, I keep getting emails telling me POM is running a disinfo campaign against me, so I finally decided to check in over there. I still don't *know* that they are running a campaign against me, though it is possible. That is not why I am writing this. I am posting this because I don't agree with a lot of their conclusions, and figured I better say so in writing. I didn't read everything on the site, because again I don't have time for that. But several of the things I did read threw up big red flags.

I'll start with the [six-part series on Vermeer](#). To my eye, it looks like that series ties into the whole Hockney project, the purpose of which is to slander the Old Masters and through them all realist art. I have written about that several times before, and if you are interested [you can find those papers](#) on my site. I am not going to take more time to address the series at POM, because I have no indication anyone is actually reading it. I have to choose my battles. I have more than enough to do in attacking all the big names in physics, art, and history, and can't devote time to countering every written word on the web. Some stuff I just have to pass over.

The twins research is also troubling, because I consider the proof posted to be both very slender and completely unconvincing. The method used of superimposing photos on top of one another is slippery in the extreme. If two photos aren't sized perfectly and shot from the same angle, they cannot be compared this way. In my opinion, it is a very bad way to do photo analysis regardless, and I told Mark that while he was here. You can't rely on computer programs to do your work for you: you actually have to be able to spot differences “in the raw” as it were. If you can't, you have no business standing as an authority. I encourage you to notice the difference between my photo analysis and the photo analysis at POM. While POM just superimposes photos (chops), letting that one manipulation stand as proof, I go into each photo and show you several specific things that don't match. I then back up that visual analysis with extensive supporting analysis from the bios, genealogies, and histories.

So while I agree that several famous people have been twins—and I admit that there are many I may have missed—I cannot support the research at POM. The last thing you want to do is start claiming people are twins who aren't, since that just muddies the water. Bad research pollutes good research, and that is what my readers are saying is going on at POM. They are calling POM another WellAware or DallasGoldBug, and they may be right. What I can say for sure is that their proofs haven't convinced me. For example, Aniston or Sinatra may be twins, but until I do the analysis myself I won't confirm it. The analysis at POM is bugged, and I don't trust it. I looked closely at the proof there, and it didn't prove anything to me, other than that Sinatra and Aniston probably *aren't* twins. In other words, the analysis backfired, which is a big red flag. If the analysis backfired in my eyes, it may be backfiring in everyone else's eyes, and that may be the desired outcome.

I am also getting questions about daddieoh, also known as Josh. He is active over there, so does this mean I am flushing him with the rest? I am still on the fence regarding Josh. I read his piece on the Jerusalem Truck Attack, hoping it would finally give me cause to decide. It didn't. He backpedalled on

it being a hoax, which is probably a red flag—but not *definitely* a red flag. He admitted his confusion, and left open the possibility his friend's daughter was still alive or had been killed in some other way. Josh may be spinning, but he may not. It would be unfair to ditch him just because he is Jewish. Some people have claimed I jump to conclusions, but I don't. I require a high level of evidence in everything I look at. Once I get to that level, I can make a fast decision, but I don't proceed on hunches. Like anyone else, I *start* with hunches, but I don't travel on them. I travel on a compilation of facts.

Honestly, Josh is the toughest call I have had to make in my short career as a Truther. He admitted from the start he was in Israel, and my gut reaction was to dump him based only on that. Given what I have been discovering, the odds were very high he was trying to run some sort of confidence trick on me. However, odds don't always pan out. Odds can give you a hunch, but they can't provide a final decision. In Josh's favor he has written two long and well researched papers on Gandhi and Dreyfus, in neither of which could I find any spin. They were good enough to publish, and I published them. You will say he just wanted to write those papers so that I didn't do it myself, and that is possible. But I am still free to research Gandhi and Dreyfus further if I wish. Josh isn't stopping me. He has also provided me with other *bon mots*, rounding out later research I was doing on various topics. For instance, after reading my paper on Hitler's Genealogy, he pointed me to the article in *Der Zeit* where later Hitlers changed their names to Hiller. I found that very useful and added it to the paper. He has also defended me in various forums.

The strongest evidence I have against Josh so far is his connection to POM, but since I am not *sure* POM is compromised, I am not sure Josh is. I think POM is wrong in its analysis, but that means I disagree with them, not that they are all agents. Not everyone I disagree with is perforce an agent. Maybe they just aren't very good at photo analysis.

You will say I have written off DallasGoldBug as a probable agent based on his flawed analysis, so why not POM? Well, it is because I think there is a possibility POM's analysis is an honest mistake, based on trust of computers and a misunderstanding of visuals. I don't think there is a possibility DGB's analysis is an honest mistake. In my eyes, POM's analysis is weird, but it isn't as weird as DGB's. I could tell DGB's analysis was fake in about 10 seconds. I can tell POM's analysis is flawed that fast, but not that it is fake. There is a difference.

You will say Josh is just trying to gain my confidence. Possibly. But I have to admit I am curious to see what happens regardless. I don't think I can be damaged that way. I don't think I am bulletproof, of course, but I think any **project of words** will backfire against me. All previous ones have. Josh is a smart guy and a very good writer, but I am confident of my own abilities in that regard. Beyond that, as at most a loose and temporary ally, I don't see how anything that Josh does could stick to me. Even if he blew himself up in the White House, that would be him, not me. I am just a Truther, telling things as I see them. I am not posing as a guru or a leader of a movement. There is no club I am presidenting. So I can always deny any relationship, to Josh or anyone else. Since there is no relationship, I don't have to worry about the media claiming one. That's exactly why I can tell the truth in the first place: I have nothing to lose. I have already been denied all advancement in art or science, so what are they going to do? Take away my bicycles?

I will be told that all Josh has to do is be a Jew in Israel and claim he is a fan. That will be enough to blackwash me in the eyes of many of my readers. Possibly. That may indeed be the full extent of the con, but if it is I don't really give a damn. If, despite all I have written, they would consider writing me off for that, let them. Let them go do their own research, if they are so far beyond me.

As I have said many times, I didn't get into this line of research to make friends (or enemies). I am not choosing a side or signing up for some war. I am not a Jew or an anti-Semite. I am just a guy who likes to know the truth, about art, about science, and about all other things. I am a pretty good researcher and writer, and I have a lot of time on my hands. I enjoy discovering things, even when they are very unsavory. I embrace the red pill, even when it tastes like moldy iodine. The thrill outpaces the taste, and lasts longer.

I go where the evidence leads me. I admit the evidence has so far led to very rich hoaxing people of old Jewish lines running a series of huge projects through the centuries. But does that mean I should treat every Jewish person I meet as an enemy? No. Not every Jewish person is rich or from those lines. Many appear to be poorer than I am, or at least working shittier jobs. I know of no link between them and the Rockefellers or the Rothschilds, so why should I link them to my research? My research *so far* shows more of a rich/poor split than a Jewish/Gentile split, so if I were going to hate anyone on sight, it would be rich people, not Jews. From what I have discovered, rich people have retained their hegemony not through superior talents or harder work but via a history of fantastic lies. It is still the lies that piss me off more than the Jewish question. Yes, Jews do seem to be *way* overrepresented in these hoaxes, and I have not shied away from admitting that, but I have shown you it is a limited number of old families. I suspect you could say the same thing about Rome or Athens, where top families also maintained their hegemony by deceitful methods. No doubt some readers will write and tell me Caesar and Pericles were also Jews, so what about China and India? Was the Chinese aristocracy Jewish in 2000BC? Do you think they maintained their hegemony by strictly honest methods?

Of course they didn't, which is why some will say I should just shut up. I wasn't born into the families and that is that. Bellyaching about it won't change anything. Probably not. But just as they have the right to promote themselves, I have the right to anti-promote them. If they have the right to lie, I have the right to point out the lies. They claim they are better than me because they were to the manor born, and I say nope. I say let's lay the artifacts out on the lawn and let history decide. In other words, they can squash me, but I don't have to act squashed. They can tell me the lies, but I don't have to believe them. They can deny me all advancement, but I can *advance* anyway, with or without their promotion.