

[return to updates](#)

The Fake YouTube *Adpocalypse*



by Miles Mathis

First published July 19, 2017

As usual, this is just my opinion.

Some of my readers have tried to raise my concern for the so-called Youtube adpocalypse. What is that? It is a removal of advertising revenues from videos of “questionable content”. Apparently, we are supposed to believe that until recently Youtube was inserting major advertising pretty much randomly, regardless of content. But since the *Wall Street Journal* blew the whistle on this, big companies have boycotted Youtube, refusing to buy ads on the site. To get them to come back, Youtube has promised them that their ads will no longer appear on channels featuring non-mainstream content.

I am supposed to commiserate with these people, but I don't. Do you think I expect major companies to advertise on my site? No. I guess you know how much advertising money I get: ZERO. I have had companies contact me, wishing to place ads on my site, and I have told them to get lost. I don't want any ads on my site, no matter how much they offer to pay. One, because the ads are an annoyance. I don't want them polluting my site. Two, because I didn't create my site to sell mainstream products. I am not interested in that. Three, because I wanted to avoid just the sort of thing that is going on at Youtube now. If you take advertising money, you have to care what your advertisers think of your content, and I don't. I don't care what anyone thinks of my content, but especially not advertisers.

To be truly independent, you can't work with major companies. That was known before this fake fracas at Youtube, so I don't know why anyone is pretending to be shocked or surprised. Do these people complaining at Youtube think major companies should be forced to underwrite their content? I don't. Advertisers have every right to choose where they advertise. Advertising dollars aren't some sort of fundamental right, guaranteed by the Constitution.

Another thing no one is mentioning is the fact that all major companies are underwriting “questionable content” with every mainstream dollar they spend. When they advertise during the news, they are underwriting the mountain of lies there. When they advertise during primetime, they are underwriting all the propaganda there. They can't even underwrite programs on PBS or NPR with any sense of purity, since those stations have also been inundated with government propaganda and lies. So, again, the reportage of the Youtube adpocalypse is just more misdirection, created to make you think advertisers are staying clean by avoiding KKK or Stormfront channels. While the truth is, the

mainstream is far dirtier than any possible Youtube channel. And besides that, the KKK and Stormfront are CIA fronts themselves, so as usual the argument makes less sense the more you know and the closer you look.

But it is even worse than that, since the content of the mainstream advertisements themselves is also a stinking cesspool. Those pushing this story imply that advertisers have a right to expect some sort of purity in their association, but remind yourself what garbage these advertisers are pushing: dangerous pharmaceuticals, gas-guzzling and polluting cars, unhealthy foods and beverages, plastic appliances that soon end up in landfills, insurance scams, investment scams, and on and on.

Playing the other side of this fake event, the *New York Times* [published an article in April](#), seeming to take the side of the slighted Youtubers. They mentioned the channel of David Pakman, which we are told costs \$20,000 a month to produce. We are told that poor old Pakman is now relying on crowdfunding to continue. Boohoo! This implies that David Pakman is some sort of dangerous guy, threatening the hegemony of major corporations. Right. Pakman is just another mainstream spook, who—on the odd occasion he is not plugging or promoting mainline hoaxes—is simply controlling the opposition with content that appears slightly edgy. . . but isn't. He is no more dangerous to the *status quo* than Stephen Colbert. Both are totally owned subsidiaries of Langley, in my opinion, and worthless as sources of news or entertainment.

The truth is, **it costs nothing to tell the truth.** I have a thousand times more content than David Pakman or any other Youtube channel, and my total yearly cost of production is. . . ZERO. It takes a lot of time and effort, yes, but it costs exactly nothing (provided I bill you nothing for my time). I get a few donations, but at the end of the year the total is almost negligible. I certainly don't rely it to pay rent or buy groceries. But that is OK because I don't do it to make money. I didn't start writing to make money. I didn't build this site to make money. I don't come to the keyboard every week to make money. So when I don't make any, it doesn't surprise me.

The Youtubers are complaining that they are at a great disadvantage to the mainstream press, which is underwritten to the tune of billions of dollars. Yes, that's right, and that isn't going to change. The mainstream will make sure of that. You can't set yourself up against the mainstream and then expect the mainstream to underwrite you. You can't expect a real enemy to sponsor you, can you? Therefore, when I see these people on Youtube crying that their advertising dollars are drying up, I simply read that as a sign they aren't real enemies of the mainstream. No real enemy of the mainstream would expect advertising dollars from mainstream sources. Not only do I not *expect* mainstream money, I wouldn't take it if it were offered. I don't want to be a part of it, which is why I have gone another way.

Which is just to say that you can't fight the system while being a part of the system.

Another thing this fake tragedy at Youtube is meant to sell is the idea that those resisting the mainstream can't exist without funding. Young revolutionaries are supposed to see this Youtube event and give up. They create these outlets on purpose, just so that they can take them away. Those denied the platform will then think they have been silenced. But none of that is true. You don't need Youtube or Facebook or any of these other big sites any more than I need them. You can build your own site for next to nothing, and if it is worth visiting people will visit it. I get a lot of hits with no advertising in or out, no promotion, and almost no funding. All it takes is a few hours at the computer every day. I would be writing for myself even if I weren't publishing, so it isn't a drain on my time at all. It is simply what I choose to do, along with painting, building bicycles, and raising kittens.

Of those things, only the painting is profitable. But even that I don't do just to make money. I paint because I want to. I paint things that interest me, and I turn down projects that don't interest me. I painted before I made any money at it, and I will continue to paint whether I sell or not. So when I hear these Youtube people saying that they are going to quit if they don't get advertising dollars, it simply means they weren't doing it for the right reason to start with. It means to me that they aren't real revolutionaries. You don't ask for funding for a revolution, and you don't quit being a revolutionary just because the mainstream stops underwriting you.

But of course the mainstream wants you to think you should.

They are trying to stall the revolution by infiltrating it and blowing it from the inside, as usual. So they manufacture hundreds of fake revolutionaries, and then have them all quit because Coca Cola and Chase Bank are no longer funding them. You have to laugh.