

# Scientific American adds to the Fear Porn

*by Miles Mathis*

*First written October 3, 2022; published November 2.*

To make sure you were cowering under the bed, *Scientific American* did its part last month to be a cog of the media-wide scare-fest, peppering you with pictures of fake mushroom clouds from all points on the compass. [One of its lead articles](#) is called “See the Facility that Tests whether Nuclear Weapons Work”. It is bullshit, as expected, being very brief, written for morons, and consisting mostly of interior pictures of computer rooms and computers. The pictures could just have easily been taken at Google, and we have no proof they weren't. But we know how it is going to go just from the subtitle:

**Gargantuan lasers induce a fusion reaction to test the U.S. nuclear stockpile.**

You might ask yourself how firing lasers to create “mini” fusion events tests our nuclear stockpile. **Considering that our nuclear stockpile isn't ignited by lasers and isn't fusion.** It is ignited by chemical explosions and is fission. All you have to do is a Google search on that question, the first result of which takes you [here](#), where it is admitted that all nuclear devices are primarily fission. Yes, so-called hydrogen bombs are fusion in the last step, but they require fission to allegedly ignite fusion. So firing lasers to directly induce fusion isn't to the point, is it? It can tell us nothing about whether nuclear weapons that have been sitting around in silos since the 1980s work or don't work.

This proves several things. One, it proves they ran this article just to scare you into thinking Russia is about to nuke us or Europe. Two, it proves the editors at *Scientific American* know their audience knows almost nothing about anything. As elsewhere, neatness doesn't count because they know you will believe anything and won't fact-check it yourself. Most people's idea of a fact-check is to ask someone to fact-check it for them, like Snopes. But if Snopes is owned, and it is, that won't work, will it? No, a real fact-check requires you go to **primary sources** and *cross-check them* for inconsistencies, as I do. As I did above by going to ucsusa, not Snopes.\* Three, it proves these bastards are reading me, and that they know they needed to drive home the old nails that I have been prying out of the sheetrock. They know that I have been telling my readers the nuclear scare is just the old bluff trotted out again, the same duck-and-cover crap from the 1950s sold as new and improved. Both the war in Ukraine and the nuclear threat are fake and always have been. The nuclear fake is now being used to cover up the vaccine genocide and to try to protect Pfizer and other parties from a lynching. They are pulling out all the stops to misdirect from that, but it isn't working. Millions of people keeling over from heart attacks and blood clots and strokes is impossible to cover up just by turning the TV volume up and censoring anyone pointing the finger. It is getting so bad, people don't need secondhand information about the genocide or reports from the media: they have seen it with their own eyes. Almost all of us already know of multiple people dead or seriously injured by the vaccines. I do. So the ropes and pitchforks are just around the corner. I am just surprised these people are still visible: that they haven't gone down into their bunkers yet or flown off to their islands. Bill Gates is now predicting a hung election and a civil war, but he should be predicting a lynching. It isn't the election that will be hung.

If you are living in fear of nuclear war right now, I have some reading material to bring you down from that tree:

<http://mileswmathis.com/bikini.pdf>

<http://mileswmathis.com/trinity.pdf>

<http://mileswmathis.com/caes.pdf>

\*Yes, UCS is also owned, but it exists at a more basic level than Snopes. You could call it a primary source of propaganda, rather than a secondary spreader or protector. Note that I am not trusting what I am told at UCS, either. I am using it as a cross-check. I am showing the inconsistency between one arm of the Families and another. *Scientific American*, one arm of mainstream science, is contradicting what another arm—UCS—is saying. They aren't even bothering to keep the story straight.