

[return to updates](#)

THE TRIAL OF THE CHICAGO 7



a review by Miles Mathis

First published November 1, 2020

As you may know, Netflix just released an Aaron Sorkin film on the Chicago 7 or 8 starring Sacha Baron Cohen as Abbie Hoffman. Given that I know Netflix is an Intel front (of some sort), I wondered how they planned to whitewash Hoffman while maintaining the original project of blackwashing hippies. We just saw Quentin Tarantino try to blackwash the hippies last year with *Once Upon a Time in Hollywood*, though he did a very poor job of it. You will say he did a poor job on purpose, but I don't really think so. I have seen his film twice now, trying to unwind it fully, and that is the last thing I think he was doing.

So I have to admit I was extremely surprised while watching *The Trial of the Chicago 7*. It was nothing like what I expected it to be. Of course the film has many levels, like anything else, but the top level—which most people will be affected by the most, I think—is pro-hippie, anti-police, anti-government, anti-fratboy, pro-black, anti-judge, anti-FBI and anti-war. In selling that cocktail, the filmmakers also have to sell the Black Panthers and the Yippies and the trials as real, which I imagine was job one. . . but still. Perhaps the biggest surprise was seeing Michael Keaton as retired Attorney General Ramsey Clark admit in sworn testimony the riots in Chicago were caused by the Chicago police. For me, that sort of trumps everything else in the film. I don't know that it absolves Keaton of his previous crimes against humanity, [including his work in *Spotlight*](#), but it is worth noting. We should at least consider the possibility Keaton and these others have seen some light in the past year or two, and have made an about-face. For now, I am not naive enough to believe it myself, but the possibility exists.

I remind you that Ramsey Clark and his Intel apparatus weren't the only ones who thought the riots in Chicago were caused by police. It was admitted at the time that it was the police who rioted and who acted in a grossly illegal manner, and it is still admitted by the mainstream. See Wikipedia for just one

example. Also see the US National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, which convened after the riots, and came to the conclusion it was the police who rioted, not the protestors. A federal grand jury was seated, and though it was controlled, it too found police culpability. That said, I remind you that these police were not self-propelled. They were acting under orders. Therefore, it should not have been the police in the spotlight, it should have been those controlling the police, whoever they were. They remained in the shadows.

I also remind you that it is even deeper than that, because—like the current BLM and other riots—*these riots in Chicago were staged*. You should have always known that, because if police had really clubbed hundreds or thousands of innocent and unarmed people, including reporters and cameramen, the town of Chicago would have gone bankrupt from paying settlements. Thousands of lawsuits would have been filed, and—given that the Feds were admitting police misconduct—those lawsuits would have been won by those injured. That did not happen. What also would have happened is that it would have been discovered in those lawsuits who ordered the police to attack. Many very high officials would have lost their jobs and gone to jail. That also did not happen.

You will say they couldn't stage an event that large, either the 1968 protests or the current BLM riots and clashes with police. But they can and do. They have been capable of such things for a long time, and they admit it. They admit that Leni Riefenstahl had 30,000 extras to work with in her Nazi films, and *Ben Hur* had over 10,000. In the films from Chicago, we never see more than a few thousand total. Same for the current riots, where we only see limited areas of action. [I have already pointed out](#) that the current riots disprove themselves, since canisters of tear gas and pepper spray are being shot off all over the place, but no one is responding to them in a logical manner. Protestors and unmasked police alike just ignore clouds of fake pepper spray, proving this is all theater. It was the same thing back in 1968.

Why fake such horrific police brutality in 1968? Easy: to scare real protestors off the streets. By August 1968, there was a lot of very real opposition to the Vietnam War, not only as matter of lost lives, but as a matter of incredible defense bills being posted on the American people. That is why I mentioned the Chicago 7 trials in my paper on the Manson event: both were manufactured to create fear and drive people into their houses. Just like now. This is how the government decided to deal with war opposition. It faked events to blackwash the hippies and other protestors, and it faked police brutality to prevent more protestors from taking the streets. [Kent State was part of that project](#), as I have shown.

Another way we know this was all fake, including the trial, is that in the film they try to make you think Ramsey Clark couldn't testify because his knowledge gained as Attorney General was classified or otherwise sealed. But that is a dodge, because Kunstler, the attorney for the defense, didn't even need Clark's testimony. The Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence filed its final report in December 1969, and all that information was public. The Chicago 7 trial didn't end until February 18, 1970. All Kunstler had to do is read the findings of the Commission into the court records, and the jury would have had to acquit based on the government's own published findings. The Commission was forced to admit most of what Clark said on the stand in the film, and that is because that information came from intelligence gathered by the FBI and CIA and given to the Justice Department and the Attorney General. That is both where Clark got his information and where the Commission got its information. So the pretense that Judge Hoffman could block this information from sequestered jurors based on his own authority is preposterous.

Judge Julius Hoffman has previously been the subject of various exposés, but this is by far the most

brutal. His ghost was pummeled unmercifully by Sorkin and the scriptwriters. I was glad to see it, but very surprised. They also take the time to deny Hoffman the judge and Hoffman the defendant were related, which means they were. Not as father and son, as Baron-Cohen jokes, but maybe as great uncle or something. Someday they will have to rehabilitate Julius Hoffman, but for now they had to pick one Hoffman and let the other dangle. It was Abbie's time to shine this year.

Tom Hayden also didn't look very good, which I never expected. He lost every exchange in the film with Hoffman. Since I believe both he and Hoffman were just agents hired to be actors here, I don't think any of these exchanges actually happened, so we have to wonder what the point was of blackwashing Hayden. Was it just to make Hoffman look good? Hoffman needed another foil? Maybe, but I intuit it was more than that. Perhaps it comes down to the fact that Hayden died in 2016, and Hoffman may still be around. Yes, I know that Hoffman allegedly killed himself back in 1989, but I don't believe it for a second. He would be 83 now, and my reading of this is that Hoffman was always of far higher rank than we knew. This film was mostly for him, and I suspect he consulted on it. He may even have funded it.

Remember, they always get around to cleansing their top agents, and they often do it in film. We saw it with [John Reed](#) in *Reds*, with [John Forbes Nash](#) in *A Beautiful Mind*, and in many other cases.

In support of that, I point to the fact his real name is [Abbot Howard Hoffman](#). If we read all those names as surnames, as I have shown you many times we should, suddenly Hoffman no longer becomes the most important name. Even stranger, when he first was put on the stand, Abbie Hoffman denied in sworn testimony that his real name was Hoffman. [He stated for the record](#) his real name was [Abbot Howard](#) (see p. 49). The names Abbot and Howard taken together indicate a probable link to the Howards of the peerage we have seen in many recent papers, including my papers on the [English Revolution](#), the [Ridolfi Plot](#), and [Thomas Jefferson](#). If you will remember, the Howards were the Earls of Arundel and Dukes of Norfolk—the highest ranking dukes in the British peerage. Any proof that Hoffman is related to them? Well, Hoffman is very well scrubbed at both Geni and Wikitree, especially on his mother's side. He has no page at Geneanet, which is surprising. No clue at Geni where the name Howard comes from, **and it is not a Jewish name**. All we discover there is that the Hoffmans came from Russia, where they were also Kareveskys (Kanefs). This probably links him first to Irving Kanarek, Manson's fake attorney; and second to the Kings of Europe, including the Romanovs, through the von Heimrods. Luise Hoffmann married the Baron von Heimrod in 1844, and his father was Wilhelm I of Hessen-Kassel. He links us immediately to Frederick V Oldenburg, the King of Denmark, and George II of England. It also links us to the von Sachsen-Zeitz, the von Brandenburgs, and so on. We also find Charlotte Hoffman of the peerage marrying a Robertson, Chief of Clan Donnachaidh, whose mother was a Stewart of Fincastle. We also find the Hoffmans of Baltimore related to the van Cortlands as well as to Francis Scott Key. The Hoffmans of New York married the [Villiers](#) la Touche Hattons, linking us immediately to the Seymour-Conways, Marquesses of Hertford. This links us then to the Fitzroys, Dukes of Grafton, who were actually Stuarts, sons of Charles II. It also links us to the Somersets and Bennetts, and [Howards](#). The Hoffmans of the peerage are also related to the Reagans. Yes, those Reagans.

One buried clue is that Hoffman was from Worcester, MA, and the Abbots were from nearby Andover, MA. These Abbots helped found Andover in the 1640s, and before that they were moneylenders in London. See Robert Abbott and his son Jasper, who were merchants and bankers in Smyrna and Constantinople. Their descendants became British generals, and one was Consul General in Odessa. Abbottabad in Pakistan was named after General Sir James Abbott of this family. He was also a [Hamilton](#), a D'Alton, a Montmorency, and an Eyre. One of his uncles was the Viscount

Montmorency, and a previous one was Viscount Mountmorres. Through him we link to Brabazon Ponsonby, Earl of Bessborough. The Brabazons, Earls of Meath, take us to the **Villiers**, whom we just saw above, linking us to the Stuarts again.

Since Abbie Hoffman's genealogy is scrubbed, we cannot definitely link him to any of those lines, but I think you will admit my research is suggestive. Even more suggestive is that the names Abbot(t) and Howard go together. They are both closely related to the Stuarts. See the Abbots, Barons of Colchester, who are also Elphinstones, who are also Stuarts, Earls of Bute. The Howards are also Stuarts, being another name for the same family. All the dukes in England are originally Stuarts.

But back to Hayden. You would think now that he is dead, Wikipedia would be publishing an old picture of him, back in his Jane Fonda days when he was looking somewhat presentable. Instead, they lead with a picture of him looking like an old withered Jew.



They have no other pictures of him on the page. That too is somewhat surprising to me. Of course he always had a big nose and a pockmarked face, so maybe they figured why bother, but it still surprises me.

Honestly, I think the real reason they are blackwashing Hayden in 2020 has to do with his being a Democrat. It is that simple. They have been ordered to blackwash the Democratic party for a very basic reason, one I have shown you before: it has gotten too strong. By about 2010, the Republican party had all but collapsed, drawing only about a real 20% in Presidential elections. Of course they no longer count *any* of the vote, just using computers to make up whatever numbers they want, but the continued charade depends upon your believing the two parties are about equal. Just think about it: if they had allowed the Republican party to die a (semi)natural death, there would be no contests and no reason to vote. The Democrats would be guaranteed winners every time.* So they could no longer use voting to make you feel included. They need that fiction now more than ever, as we see in the current election cycle, where TIME magazine just changed its name to VOTE. They need the mirage of voting to cover up the fact you are now living in a de facto tyranny. With Covid and the long slate of fascist and illegal orders from governors, cities, the CDC, and OSHA, that fact is pretty hard to cover, but they are doing their best.

That is why they are pushing everyone to being “conservatives” now. Yes, they are still blackwashing Trump all the time, to create the necessary dissonance and keep your eyes off bigger things, but in general they want anyone dissatisfied with government or media to think of themselves as conservative. The media and Hollywood and the Democrats are called liberal (although they aren't), and if you are against them you are therefore conservative. I have tried to explain what they are doing

[there before](#), but I will not go into it all again here. In short, they want to move the country to the right simply by changing the definitions of words. This will strengthen the Republican party and bring parity to the pantomime they call voting.

Notice that the Democratic party is also blackwashed directly in the film, since the protests are at the *Democratic* National Convention. They are protesting the nomination of Humphrey, who they admit was just as big a fascist as Nixon, and also pro-Vietnam war. They actually spend as much time blackwashing the Democrats in the movie as the Republicans, which is pretty amazing seeing that Nixon's AG Mitchell is the one that pushed the prosecution. Yes, Ramsey Clark comes off smelling like a rose, but as with Hoffman, that is probably more for personal reasons than the fact he came out of the Johnson administration. Clark is still alive, being 92, and my guess is he also consulted on this film. This was an homage for him and Hoffman, before they kick off.

It was also an homage to attorney William Kunstler, though he died back in 1995, probably for real. Like many others we have seen (Bugliosi, Clark, Clarke, Darrow, Dershowitz, etc), Kunstler was a CIA attorney. He came right out of the army, where he was a major and a cryptographer. Cryptography is part of Intelligence. He defended the fake Freedom Riders, then became director of the ACLU from 1964 to 1972. We know [what to think of that](#). Like everyone else involved in this theater, he was Jewish. Kunstler defended Jack Ruby in 1964, and [we also know what to think of that](#). Kunstler later defended AIM (American Indian Movement) actors from Wounded Knee, telling us that was also faked. I don't like saying that, since I always supported AIM, though I was aware of certain anomalies in the stories. One of them being that Peter Matthiessen, who wrote *In the Spirit of Crazy Horse*, was later outed as a CIA agent. I still support the Natives, and know some of them here in Taos, but now believe the whole history of AIM was managed, to prevent more serious revolutions from developing. I have stated the same thing about the Black Panthers.

In the same way and for the same reason, we can now dismiss the Attica Prison Riot as a fake. Anything Kunstler had anything to do with should now be seen as a hoax. Of course this includes his defense of the Blind Sheik who bombed the WTC in 1993. You always knew that was a fake, and this just proves it once again. So as you see Kunstler being sold as some sort of hero in the current film, just remember all this. He was no hero.

Regardless, the film makes it clear that the trial was a joke and a fraud, not only from the side of the defendants and their attorneys, but even more from the side of the government. Like other trials we have studied, it made no legal sense. Had Judge Hoffman done the things he is said to have done in that courtroom, the appeals court would have brought him up on charges of gross corruption, removing him from office and possibly jailing him. To put it bluntly, top judges are not allowed to act like that, especially in a high profile case being reported nationally and daily. Like the rest of us, judges are not allowed to flout the law. They are expected to follow the laws as they decide on them, and they are not free to try people without counsel, jail attorneys without cause, exclude witnesses for the defense without cause, or physically beat, bind and gag defendants in the courtroom. They are not allowed to sequester juries on trumped-up causes, or to dismiss jurors on trumped-up causes. No real attorney would believe the case as presented in this film. You will say that is because the film made stuff up and exaggerated things. Nope. In an odd reversal, the film actually toned down the absurdity of the event. Judge Hoffman actually did all those things and more, and Abbie Hoffman and his buddies caused a far greater ruckus in the courtroom than is shown in the film. Abbie, as played by comedian Baron-Cohen, comes off as tall, funny and charming, but that wasn't his role in the "real" trial. In that project, he was instructed to be as annoying and *un*-charming as humanly possible, since in the original fiction the hippies were being blackwashed. Which makes it that much more surprising they are being

whitewashed this time around.

In support of all that, it is admitted [the appeals court not only agreed](#) that many mistakes were made by the judge and the prosecution, but that the trial was so outrageous that the defendants' civil and Constitutional rights had been violated, in that they were denied a fair trial. This opened up the State of Illinois and the judge to countersuits by the defendants, but curiously none were ever filed. No retrial was ever pursued by the government, but even stranger no suits were filed by the defendants for harassment or Civil Rights violations. The appeals court had offered them that possibility on a silver tray, but curiously Kunstler and Weinglass didn't bite.

Also remind yourself that there was a jury present, so Judge Hoffman wasn't deciding anything on his own. In a real trial, all of the judge's strange behavior would have guaranteed an acquittal, so you may want to ask yourself how this jury found against Hoffman and the others. They were found guilty of inciting a riot and given five year sentences. But the jury saw everything you and I did in the movie. They saw the judge acting like a senile dictator. So are we supposed to believe they were dead asleep? They try to address this in the film by showing two sympathetic jurors were dismissed. But there were twelve other jurors allegedly watching this farce. Do you really think they could be convinced to take any of this seriously, or to vote for conviction? Only if they were paid by the CIA.

Another strange thing is that the Seven—excluding Seale—weren't in custody during the trials. Between hearings, we see them going home or to the bars or to the Conspiracy commune. We even see them doing TV interviews during the trials, talking about things going on there. That isn't allowed. About half the things the defendants are said to have done during the trials should have caused a mistrial. And I don't just mean things they did in the film: I mean things it is admitted they did in the “real” trial. All this is just more proof this wasn't a real trial. It was another in a string of very high profile CIA mock trials, sold as real.

You should also have found it curious that the government decided to prosecute 7 guys out of thousands, and they all just happened to be Jews from rich families. Hoffman and Rubin they admit. Lee Weiner's name speaks for itself. He studied at Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Hayden was supposed to be a Catholic, but just study pictures of him. He couldn't look more Jewish if he had a star of David tattooed on his forehead.



That guy is supposed to be an Irish Catholic? Get real. He looks no more Irish than Abbie Hoffman. In fact, he could be a brother of Dustin Hoffman, based only on looks. His genealogy admits he is an Owen and a Clinton on his mother's side, in the Garrity line. On his paternal side, he is a Murray, a Ducey, and a Foley. His lines are very scrubbed on both sides, especially the maternal, indicating that although some of them were from Ireland, they were Jewish nonetheless. His first wife was a Cason,

daughter of a Weisiger, indicating she was Jewish. The Weisigers link us to the Reeds, Callenders, Russells, Kings, Kelloggs, Nobles, Pratts, Minots, Roots, Masons, Ewens, Talbots, Adams, Randolphins, Bancrofts, Beldens, Ropers, Harrisons, Deweys, Jeffersons, Hamiltons, Armstrongs, and Geistmans. The Kelloggs are in the line of Tim Dowling at Geneanet, telling us we are in the lines of the Stuart kings. This list also links us directly to Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, the Harrison Presidents, and many others. Hayden's third wife Barbara had previously been married to Nick Mancuso (the actor and producer), and he had been married to a Capone and a Pelham. Jewish again.

Of course his second wife Jane Fonda is a Ford, a Latham, a Pratt, a de Villers, a Douw (Dow) an Edson (Edison), a Hilton, a McNeill, and a Seymour. Also related to Keiths, Bowers, Kennedys, Coolidges, Stanleys, Copelands, Websters, and Howards. In the Jaynes line she is a Jacobs and a Fiske. In her Bosch line she [is related to Hoffmans](#) as well as Bogarts and Rickmans. The surname Bower may link her to Charles Manson. She is a direct descendant of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset, brother of Jane Seymour, Queen of King Henry VIII. He was Lord High Treasurer and Lord Protector of the Realm—meaning he ran England for the young Edward VI. Jane's mother Francis had previously been married to a Brokaw (think Tom Brodow), son of **Gould**. Jane's first husband was Roger Vadim, real name Plemiannikov, a Russian Jew of noble lines. His father was Vice Consul of France in Egypt.

I also beg you to notice they give us a clue we can use in my other papers: Tom Hayden was a pallbearer at Robert Kennedy's funeral. Why would this 28-year-old be one of RFK's pallbearers? The *Los Angeles Times* told us it was because the Kennedy family thought this anti-war protestor embodied hope for the future, or some such nonsense, but pallbearers are normally close family members, not propaganda flags. I see this fact as cutting both ways: [it proves RFK's funeral was fake](#), and it proves Hayden was an agent who needed promotion.

Rennard Cordon Davis' father was Chief of Staff to the Council of Economic Advisors to Truman. The CEA was established in 1946, simultaneously with the CIA, which is not a coincidence. Rennie was already with the SDS in his early 20s, and the SDS was always a CIA front. Rennie has no genealogy posted, but his grandfather is listed at Ancestry.com as [James Cordon Davis](#), son of Mary **Stuart**. That's right. Mary Stuart. Rennie's mother was also Mary. The Davises were **cotton merchants** in Wilson, NC. We also find the names Telfair, Mershon and Stith there. Mershon is a Jewish name. Telfair is a variant of Telfer, and also indicates links to noble lines. Matt Damon is a Telfer. John Stith Pemberton invented Coca-Cola, and his early partner was Joseph **Jacobs**, who had an exclusive right to sell it. After the Chicago trial, Rennie Davis was assigned the promotion of Guru Maharaj Ji, as a continuation of the old Theosophy project. This guru was really a Singh, and of course part Jewish himself. He made his western debut at Glastonbury Fair, which was an MI6 front even then. Davis later became a venture capitalist, though we aren't told where he got his capital.

David Dellinger's father was a friend of Calvin Coolidge, being prominent in the **Republican Party**. Dellinger's mother was a Fiske and a Bird, from very wealthy and prominent families in Massachusetts. The Fiskes link him to Jane Fonda. So does the name Coolidge. He was 53 at the time of the protests. Like Hemingway and others we have studied, he had supposedly driven an ambulance during the Spanish Civil War. He was on the executive committee of the Socialist Party of America until 1943, proving he was a spook. Along with Dorothy Day and A. J. Muste he founded the magazine *Liberation* in 1956, another CIA-front publication. Muste is sold as a Congregationalist minister, but his wife was Anne Huizenga, a Jewish name. See billionaire Wayne Huizenga, admitted to be Jewish.

John Froines has no genealogy posted and no parents given, [but the Froines are related](#) to the

Livingstons, Ives, Gilkeys, Scotts, Vests, and Rohrboughs. Froines is a French name, but is probably also Jewish.

Even Bobby Seale is related to these people. I did his genealogy in my paper on the Panthers, and he was from the lines of the Traylors, Fullers, Phelps, Powells, Cunninghams, Reeds, Fords, Phipps, Bowers, Dunaways, Clarkes, Rogers, Riccis, Copelands, Chaneys, Chevaliers, Coffeys, Vaughns, Frickes, Prybylskis, Morgans, Valentines, Walkers, Millers, Gates, Astons, Blairs, Grays, Townshends, Webbs, Pearcys, Co(h)ans, Adams, Gibbs, Randolphs, Pascals, Websters, Barclays, Heifners (Hefners), Hammonds, Miltons, Reinbolds, Dietz, Potters, Allens, Shepherds, Carpenters, and Saunders. I have yellowed the names we have already seen. Seale was related to Jane Fonda in many lines, as you see.

But what was it all about? Even admitting the film was an homage to Hoffman and Clark, how can it benefit the governors to promote revolutionaries in 2020? How can it benefit them to show cops whacking innocent women on the head, beating unarmed protestors, beating handcuffed blacks, murdering Fred Hampton, and then admitting that the riots were known by Intelligence sources to have been started by the City of Chicago? Yes, the murder of Fred Hampton was more theater, and never happened, but that isn't the point here. The point is the film sells it as real and then puts the audience on the side of Hampton and the Panthers. Just the opposite of the original project. The Panthers were created to blackwash the black movement, [as I show here](#). But now, fifty years later, the Panthers are being spun positive by Netflix. I am fine with that, understand, but I am just trying to make sense of it. I don't see how it benefits the Phoenician Navy.

You will say it controls the opposition, making us think someone is now on our side. It makes us think Hollywood really is liberal (in a good way) and that they are on the case. It makes us think Sorkin and Baron-Cohen and all the rest are on the side of justice, and that those families have learned something since the 1960s. But if we look around, we see nothing but evidence to the contrary. The governors haven't learned anything since the 60s except how to increase the fascism, the police state, income disparity, and unfairness. The world is now one gigantic lie, so what have these people learned?

Does Aaron Sorkin's career give us a clue here, one way or another? Yes, since he wrote the script for *Charlie Wilson's War*—which was the usual advertisement for the military and promotion for the military's huge budget expansion in Afghanistan and for the Reagan Doctrine—and he also wrote *The Social Network* and *Steve Jobs*. Although both Jobs and Zuckerberg are agents, fronting big CIA projects, Sorkin nonetheless refuses to promote them in those films. He makes them both look pretty bad, which should have surprised you. This tends to confirm Sorkin is on the military side of the split, attacking the Wall Street side, which would appear to include Silicon Valley. Sorkin also wrote and directed *The West Wing*, which promoted the ridiculous idea that the government in Washington, and especially the Executive Branch, was still a functioning entity, rather than just a gaggle of actors and agents specializing in misdirection, and hiding all the real centers of power. This confirms Sorkin as Phoenician Navy, while also confirming him as a military asset. It also plays into my theory about the Democratic Party, since although Sorkin obviously promoted the Dems during the BushII years with *The West Wing*, his project had to be turned 180 degrees just a decade later. It would appear he and his comrades were way too successful in promoting the Dems, and they may not have foreseen the consequences of one party becoming too dominating.

So, although I think controlling the opposition is part of the answer, it still doesn't make much sense to glorify revolutionaries at a time like this, not if you are among the ruling families. If the ruling families are really solidifying their control grid, as it appears they are, stirring up revolutionary spirit or telling any truth must be counterproductive. So to me this film on the Chicago 7 looks either like a big

miscalculation and another foot-shooting, or like a further sign of the split. I still read many of the signs now—this among them—as pointing toward a hidden civil war between factions of the Phoenician Navy. Not as a civil war coming up, but as one that has been going on out of sight of most of us for decades. It has swiftly escalated in 2020, but it began in earnest way back in 2001, and has its roots even earlier. Remember, *The West Wing* started in 1999, two years *before* 2001, so the military must have seen the whole PNAC, DHS, Cheney/Rumsfeld thing coming even before it fully blossomed.

I told you in previous papers we plebes wouldn't be part of this war. I now think that part of the Covid project of self-isolation is to keep people indoors, where they are less likely to see overt signs of this civil war. Since the media has been ordered not to report on it, the only way we could know of it is to witness firsthand signs, like dust clouds from bombings or loud booms. Even the forest fires may be used as cover for this, and some of those clouds of ash may not be from forest fires at all. Same for the riots. We know the riots have been staged, but possibly they were staged to cover real events in certain areas.

Does this mean I think the top Phoenicians are really shooting and bombing one another in 2020? It means I think it is a possibility. I have said before that the Phoenician Godfather may have found it necessary to move against nephews or cousins in the Family who have gone rogue or have otherwise disobeyed orders. I assume his central faction controls the military, which makes it the final arbiter. For decades he has overlooked major indiscretions from within the top ranks of the Family, but as these indiscretions (crimes) have gotten more and more extreme, threatening the stability of the entire edifice, something had to be done. Possibly is it being done now. Possibly the Epstein, Weinstein, Cosby, and other stories can be read as part of this war.

If the Gates Foundation bites the dust in spectacular fashion, I will read that as confirmation of my thesis. But if 2021 is even worse than 2020, either I was wrong about the split, or the bad guys won the civil war.

For now, I assume the bad guys haven't yet won, because I don't think they would allow Aaron Sorkin or anyone else to blackwash the police, the courts, the justice system, or the political parties, not as an homage to a Hoffman or a Howard or a Stuart or anyone else. Such a blackwash only makes sense coming from some faction that is about to do a major housecleaning. . . or make you think they are. I am not saying they are going to clean up the system, necessarily, or drain the swamp. But I do think they may be about to jettison an entire sub-family of pondscum. They seem to be prepping the audience for that outcome. If they do, it will be highly cathartic. Whether it will have any lasting effect is another question entirely.

*At that last link, you will also be reminded that the Democrats won rare supermajorities in the elections of 2012, including in the California legislature. So they were admitting the Democrats were at or near 70% in many elections: a kiss of death for the two-party system.