

4TH OF JULY PROPAGANDA

by Miles Mathis

At first I just added this to my previous paper, but it got too long for that so I clipped it. Murray Rothbard at Mises.org [is being reprinted by Infowars today](#) as part of July 4 propaganda. My readers will recognize it as Alex Jones using Rothbard to answer my recent papers on the founding fathers, [especially Thomas Jefferson](#). He is also responding to my papers where I explain that I am a liberal. Rothbard is reselling the old kool-aid like this:

For the American colonies were free of the feudal land monopoly and aristocratic ruling caste that was entrenched in Europe; in America, the rulers were British colonial officials and a handful of privileged merchants, who were relatively easy to sweep aside when the Revolution came and the British government was overthrown.

You really have to laugh. The naivete of that paragraph is astounding. Did Rothbard believe any educated person in the 20th century would buy that? When exactly were the rulers and merchants swept aside? The founding fathers WERE these rulers and merchants, and I don't remember them sweeping themselves aside. The East India Company ran everything then *and still does*, under other names. Rothbard was a famous promoter of historical revisionism, but that is just supposed to be *re-interpretations* of history. But as we see, Rothbard, like other fake historians, was actually promoting a 1984-style *rewriting* of history. Not re-interpretation, but just making up facts or ignoring them. Here's another example:

During the nineteenth century, however, the libertarian impetus continued. The Jeffersonian and Jacksonian movements, the Democratic-Republican and then the Democratic parties, explicitly strived for the virtual elimination of government from American life.

Again, who could believe that? Rothbard is just repeating the baldest mainstream propaganda. Yes, this is the history we have always been sold, roughly, but all evidence is to the contrary. Government was smaller back then, sure, but that is because the country itself was very small in population and services. But even then democracy was just a word, since everything was being decided by the bankers and their frontmen, as now. There was less institutionalized theft back then only because there was less to steal. Most of what was being stolen at the time was land and natural resources—minerals, timber, game—and that could be done with very little bureaucracy. The Natives were the top victims, making that part of government seems to disappear. Later the Phoenicians had to find other victims: you.

Rothbard then admits the imperialist and statist drive was always ascendant, even during the terms of Jefferson, but tries to blame it on the Federalists. Trusting in your infinite gullibility, he then tries to sell the Jackson/Van Buren years as a return to classical liberalism and small government, when the central bank was “destroyed”. Once again he admits this was mostly a failure, but tries to blame slavery for the crash of liberalism. This is all the usual smokescreen, since Jackson and Van Buren were fascists from the same families as the rest, and slavery was only one of many examples of that. As with Jefferson, Jackson's stance against the banks was just a pose, and not one of these people was ever opposed to slavery in principle. They were only opposed to it when it benefitted their enemies more than it did them, as we saw later in the Civil War. Same with the central bank, which was

opposed only when it was owned by the opposition. This was never a battle *against* a central and private bank, it was a battle *for* control of it.

Then Rothbard says this:

We have seen how America came to have the deepest libertarian tradition, a tradition that still remains in much of our political rhetoric, and is still reflected in a feisty and individualistic attitude toward government by much of the American people.

I love the way he states that: it remains in “our political rhetoric”. He's tipping his hand to us there, though maybe not intentionally. America's liberal tradition has rarely been more than rhetoric—ie empty words and false history—but currently that tradition is all but extinct. And the past year and a half under Covid has disproved any “feisty individualism” here. We have seen the great majority of Americans, and especially Rothbard's vaunted Democratic Party, utterly cave to fascism. Pushback has been minimal. All the “question authority” bumper stickers are off the cars, never to return.

I saw continued proof of that just today, as Taos closed the main public park on the busiest day of the year. Finally, after 4pm they started letting in select people through heavy security at the front gates. This is because they had scheduled a free concert there, but required you get a ticket for it, and the tickets were limited. A ticket for a free concert in a public park! Did that have something to do with Covid? No one would say, but it had the appearance of just more needless red tape and a big planned hassle. And here's the clincher: this is a huge public park, and the main stage is just the front part of it. Behind are extensive ball parks, including two baseball fields, basketball courts, volleyball courts and Kit Carson cemetery. My volleyball team had planned to play today, and there is entry to the park from the back in many places. These entries were open, but none of the free thinkers of Taos could figure that out. None of them, including my teammates, came in from the back. I was *by myself* in this huge park in the middle of the afternoon on July 4, in perfect weather, practicing alone because my teammates didn't have the gumption to come in from the back. I didn't have my phone, but when I got home there was a text from one of them saying that he had talked to a security guard who told him the courts were closed. They weren't, since no guard bothered me. But this is what I am dealing with constantly: people who can't think for themselves. Here's a basic rule for you: never ask a security guard anything, and if one tells you anything, tell him to get stuffed.

I will be so glad to get out of Taos, though I suspect it isn't any better anywhere else. Just lemmings and sheep everywhere, waving flags and thinking they are free. They aren't even free to attend a free concert in a fucking public park on Independence Day! How many ironies are stacked there? They aren't even free to walk in open gates from the back, on their own initiative, since they have no initiative.

Next, Rothbard says the Libertarian Party grew swiftly in the 1970s. Not really true, but the extent it did see some small growth was only due to the fact that it had been taken over by the CIA to push it right, like everything else in those years. Liberalism was infiltrated, coopted, and renamed Libertarianism as the usual misdirection, and was part of the long push to make you think you were a conservative. Even Ron Paul, the alleged libertarian, was a Republican member of Congress and ran for President as a Republican. Rothbard doesn't tell you how that fits into his assignment, of course. When he does take a weak stab at it, he makes a risible mess of it:

And so, in the late nineteenth century, statism and Big Government returned [as conservatism], but this time displaying a pro-industrial and pro-general-welfare face. The Old Order returned, but this

time the beneficiaries were shuffled a bit; they were not so much the nobility, the feudal landlords, the army, the bureaucracy, and privileged merchants as they were the army, the bureaucracy, the weakened feudal landlords, and especially the privileged manufacturers.

Hah! Read that again closely. His bit of “shuffling” is no more than changing the order of the words. The old world order, according to him, was

nobility, the feudal landlords, the army, the bureaucracy, and privileged merchants

The new world order was

the weakened feudal landlords, the army, the bureaucracy, and privileged manufacturers

Am I missing something? Isn't that the same list? Isn't a manufacturer a merchant? The only difference is he dropped the nobility, but I have shown you they are still at the top of the list as well. They were forced to drop their titles in the US and hide, but it is the same people from the same families.

I also draw your attention to what is conspicuously missing in Rothbard's historical analysis in this Independence Day article: no mention of Intelligence, no mention of the Phoenician Navy (by any name), no mention of the fact that none of the things he glosses happened naturally. He wants you to think liberalism collapsed from the bad decisions of its leaders—embracing utilitarianism, empire, and militarism. Never once does he consider the possibility the left was infiltrated, turned, and detooped on purpose. He glosses the rise of Socialism, but misses what I have shown you: Socialism was created by the fascists specifically to target and replace Liberalism. It was manufactured from the ground up by the Phoenician Navy for that purpose.

As far as Intelligence goes, Alex Jones does pretty much the same hiding of it. His last poll was on which Intel agency you thought should be abolished first. A joke, since of course none of them will ever be abolished. But it was a test of his audience, to see how much of the current story they were buying. If they were watching Tucker Carlson, they should be thinking the FBI was behind the January 6 Insurrection. And indeed, the numbers bore that out, with 38% saying the FBI should be abolished first, beating CIA in second place with 30%. FBI may have had some part in that event, [but I showed it](#) was run out of the Pentagon, especially the Air Force. The FBI is actually the least powerful part of Intel now, the CIA having taken over all its sexiest duties after Watergate. So FBI is the perfect fall guy, used to draw your attention away from the real action.

As for the Democratic Party, Rothbard explains its demise in one sentence as due to the influence of the Bryan forces in 1896. You have to be kidding me. Like all other parties, the Dems were never anything more than another front for one arm of the East India Company or another. All parties were run from the beginning by cloaked nobles and still are, and they never had any interest in democracy or liberalism. If they had, we would not be where we are now. The only interest any party had in liberalism was in appealing to voters, back when they had to count actual votes. During certain decades, the fascists felt cloaking their tyranny was their best bet, since it allowed for a cheaper and easier control. Obviously we are not living through one of those decades. The tyranny now is in-your-face, belying once again any “individualism” inherent in the American populace. The only individualism Americans retain is their Nike “Just Do It” t-shirts and their \$40,000 Harleys—which say they are free to make noise, waste money, and look like fake tough guys.

I have argued against Rothbard here via his words, but we could dispense with him much more quickly through his bio, which proves he was Phoenician Navy himself. So how could he be arguing against it? He is obviously controlled opposition, telling you some truth to hook you and then spinning you off out into the bushes to keep the bigger truths hidden. Just look at his full name: Murray Newton Rothbard. They admit he was a Russian/Polish Jew, but we know that is partial misdirection by his first two names, which are English. These people only have surnames, so we may assume he was also a Murray and a Newton. Murray is the same as Stanley, and they were Komnenes. So Rothbard is a Cohen, as usual. He was connected to the Cato Institute, previously the Koch Institute, founded by the Kochs, and if you believe they had or have any interest in liberalism or libertarianism, you need to lower your dosages. The only way the Cato Institute can be said to be libertarian or interested in limited government is that they don't want to be regulated. They want to be as free as possible to steal, lie, gouge and manipulate. Any of these people, including Rothbard, nodding to classical liberalism couldn't be more perverse and upside-down, since if you ignore their words and look only at their deeds, they are stridently *anti-liberal*. They want you to think they support civil liberties, but that is just another smokescreen, since although they may be for "liberal" immigration policies, drug policies, and sexual mores, they are otherwise strictly old world order in their work for the chosen. Only their own are promoted and the rest are for fleecing. Plus, I beg you to notice how obvious the examples listed in the encyclopedias have become: we are told Cato is a libertarian thinktank due to its support of "liberal" immigration policies, drug policies, and sexual mores. But the past couple of years have shown what is really going on there, even to those who hadn't figured it out before. Flooding the borders with immigrants is hardly liberal, since it is being used by the fascists not only for cheap labor, but to further dumb-down the American populace. It just proves these people don't want a well educated and self-sufficient citizenry, they want a citizenry of uneducated semi-slaves, incapable of revolt. In the same way and for the same reason, they are happy to see us addicted to every drug on the market. Ditto for sex: the more sexual problems we have, the better they like it. What better way to create chaos than to have everyone monumentally confused by an all-enveloping sexual free-for-all? None of that is libertarian, much less liberal. Strictly the reverse, since it benefits the rulers and disempowers the people.

And of course this is another way we know where Alex Jones is really coming from. He keeps republishing these articles from Mises.org, so we know there is some connection there. As I have just proved, Jones is only a couple of short degrees of separation from the Kochs. This might also explain why Infowars is always publishing the latest fake science promotion with no commentary. Why is Infowars a mouthpiece for all that? It can only be because those behind him are invested in it.

Well, if Jones is a cat's paw of the Kochs or others like that, why would he tell so much truth about Covid and other things? Same reason Tucker Carlson does: we must assume the Kochs and Murdochs and Kennedys aren't full allies of Gates/Fauci/Rockefeller etc in this go-round. Big Pharma is powerful, but it apparently has some powerful enemies. We are seeing a sort of Clash of the Titans, which has been playing out and accelerating since 911. I have shown you many splits, including the CIA/DHS split, but there are others. In my history papers, we saw the Komnenes v. the Medicis, and more recently the Dutch East India Company v. the English East India Company. These old rivalries still exist, though of course they have morphed over the centuries. Currently they proceed as wars of the major investment groups, making the family names even harder to trace directly. We can't trace them via financial statements, and can only glean them like this: by seeing who is saying what, publishing what, and doing what. One thing is for sure: no one on either side of this split is liberal.

That said, Rothbard does confirm one of my central contentions on this issue: the Old World Order was *conservative*. The nobles, merchants, bankers, and peers were and are conservative. Conservative

doesn't mean what you now think it does. Rothbard at least knows enough of history to admit that. There is nothing conservative about being anti-government, anti-tyranny, or anti-Deep State. The Deep State is profoundly and viciously conservative, and you cannot resist it by being conservative or joining the Republican Party. The Republican Party has always been conservative in the worst sense, and that has not changed, no matter what Trump or Tucker or Alex or anyone else is telling you. The Dems are being blackwashed to push you into the waiting arms of the Reps, but don't fall for it. That isn't the way forward. Neither is the Democratic Party, under any stated platform. The Dems are not liberal, either, in the sense of Rothbard's article or mine. They are not anti-statist, anti-military, or anti-Deep State. They are not populist or progressive and never have been, all the way back to the beginning. Meaning, they don't care about you. The very wealthy own both parties and always have, and their only interest is in maintaining their hegemony. Their continued preferment depends on your continued oppression. Can I say it any more clearly?

Well, I could add this: the Green Party and Bernie Sanders aren't your savior either. You should not expect any set of wealthy Jews to ever represent you or lobby for you or fight for your rights. It will never happen. Ever. Only you can defend your rights, by definition, and you will always be defending yourself *against* these people. Also remember that these people are proven liars. This is the primary way they control you: through a long history of fantastic falsehoods. We saw it with Rothbard above and we have seen it with all the rest of them. So be on the alert. Everything they say is topsy-turvy, since they rely on you riding through life stirred and inverted. That is my Independence Day lesson for you.