

[return to updates](#)

## **A Sandy Hook Follow-up**

# THE ANDREW SOLOMON AWARD for Fictional News Reporting



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published March 29, 2014*

*This is an opinion piece and review*

*The New Yorker* has long been a hangout for undercover writers for the CIA and DHS and Council on Foreign Relations and other government agencies, but it gets worse every year. Of course, you could say that about all mainstream publications. All forms of media have been completely engulfed by the MATRIX, and we now live in an increasingly transparent propaganda machine, in which the agents no longer even try to hide their real agenda. You can blow the cover of someone like Solomon with almost no research. Wikipedia blows his cover, and Wikipedia is a whitewashed mainstream source.

In fact, I find I have already blown Solomon's cover before today. In my [recent paper on Wendell Berry](#), I tripped across Solomon as the 2013 recipient of the Dayton Literary Peace Prize Award for non-fiction. Berry won the 2013 Distinguished Achievement Award from the same group, so I was researching the history of it. Concerning Solomon, I found a forest of red flags everywhere I looked. To get us started here, I will just copy what I said in that previous paper:

He attended Horace Mann, Yale, and Jesus College, Cambridge, all and always red flags. He studied with the Lacanian feminist Juliet Mitchell at Cambridge, a huge red flag. Mitchell was on the editorial committee of the *New Left Review* in the 1960's, so she is either a British Intelligence agent or asset, or a dupe. We have seen [in my previous papers](#) that all these fake progressive journals were started or taken over by American or British Intelligence either before or after the war, and their main function was to divert young progressives away from Republicanism. In fact, Marxism has been used for that purpose since before the Civil War, as we saw [in my analysis](#) of the old *New York Tribune* and its editor/agent Charles Dana. But back to Andrew Solomon. All my evidence against Solomon so far could be dismissed as circumstantial, but watch: Solomon's best-known book is *The Noonday Demon: an Atlas of Depression*. It was named a notable book by both the *New York Times* and the American Library Association. It won the National Book Award for nonfiction, and many other awards. It was a finalist for the Pulitzer Prize. What is the book about? It is about Solomon's battle with depression, and his

solution using psychotherapy and antidepressants. So what? you say. The so what is that Solomon's billionaire father is the chairman of Forest Laboratories, a major pharmaceutical manufacturer who just happens to market Celexa, one of the top antidepressant medications. So Solomon's book is mainly an extended ad for Celexa dressed up as non-fiction. That should be so offensive on the face of it no one could look at the book without gagging, but notice that all the major institutions tripped over one another in the rush to give it an award.

I found most of that information at Wikipedia. I didn't have to search through de-classified documents or file freedom of information requests. All I did was put 2 and 2 together. I guess they think no one can count that high anymore. They appear to be checking our doses of microwaves, fluoride, and hypnosis, to see if anyone is still awake.

At any rate, I am back again today because *The New Yorker* just published a cover story on Sandy Hook by Andrew Solomon, entitled "[The Reckoning](#)." It is subtitled "The father of the Sandy Hook killer searches for answers." But the funniest thing about all this is the supertitle: this piece is supposed to be "*from the annals of psychology*." Ho-ho. Well, yes, I suppose brainwashing *is* a species of psychology. But a more accurate supertitle would be "*from the annals of psychological warfare*."

I won't even give *The New Yorker* or Andrew Solomon the courtesy of responding to the article point-for-point, since that would require repeating the absurd story one more time. I will point out some contradictions, but I haven't the inclination or stamina to be diverted by all their ridiculous diversions. Suffice it to say that it has been proven that Adam Lanza never existed, so we know this present story is made up from whole cloth. The Sandy Hook hoax now has the distinction of being the most magnificent propaganda failure of all time. The faked Sandy Hook event makes 911 look relatively seamless and well-scripted. It makes Aurora and the Boston Marathon look almost real. Of all the false flag events in history, the Sandy Hook architecture destroyed the quickest and fullest, leaving no two adjacent stones adhering. Researchers ([including myself](#)) have obliterated every last piece of the story, and nothing is left now but a mile-wide pile of rubble and schist. In that rubble pile are faked photos, faked interviews, faked coroner's reports, faked gatherings, faked tears, faked funerals, faked debunkings, stored Christmas trees, premature *in memorias*, premature fund-drives, and a bull-dozed crime scene.

Since the mainstream writers found they could not possibly debunk or explain all the anomalies discovered at Sandy Hook, they quit trying. As with 911, they found themselves overmatched at all times, and even the professionals of misdirection that were hired to blow smoke couldn't keep up. Everything they said just made the problem worse. The best thing for them to have done at that point would have been to drop all mention of Sandy Hook, letting it die of neglect. Move on to the next manufactured tragedy and try to do better. But some compartmented persons haven't got that memo yet. Their offices are deep under Iron Mountain or something, and they haven't yet been apprised of their no-win situation. Their pumped-in air doesn't include enough oxygen, and they seem to think that the Sandy Hook wreckage is salvageable with one more round of lies. So here we find that they have decided to inflate a Peter Lanza doll, tie strings to his lips, and put him in a chair facing Andrew Solomon. Without addressing any of the evidence or counter-evidence from Sandy Hook, they can just compose another psy-op script, heavy with faux father-son emotions, "prayer shawls, Bibles, Teddy bears, homemade toys," and the other flotsam and jetsam of Psychology 101 for Dummies.

Even before we get into the article itself, we have evidence of propaganda. You would think a magazine like *The New Yorker* would require a subscription to read a cover story online, but that isn't what we find. Although most other online articles are locked, these propaganda pieces are always available for free. These pieces are already paid for, you know, and what is wanted is the widest

possible distribution. We see that again with a more recent propaganda piece at *The New Yorker* on the Waco siege, under the supertitle “annals of religion.” The magazine appears to be required to accept at least one of these articles a week from Langley or wherever. Although all the other feature articles are locked, this one is available in full without a subscription. You should ask yourself how magazines can survive on such a model. How can you make a profit giving away your feature material every month? Well, if you are subsidized by DHS or the CFR, you don't have to be concerned with profit, do you?

I also encourage you to notice that this piece featuring Peter Lanza gives us no new pictures, not even of him. He is supposed to be alive, is supposed to be being interviewed, and Solomon is supposed to be present in Lanza's home in Connecticut, but we get nothing but the old photoshopped fake picture of Adam, blurred out, superimposed with an indiscernible snapshot of two unidentifiable people.



That could be Jimmy Fallon and Haley Joel Osment for all we can tell. The mystery man Peter Lanza is re-surfacing for this exclusive interview with *The New Yorker*, and he somehow still remains as unphotographable as a Yeti? How is that? Without a photo of Peter Lanza with Andrew Solomon, we have no proof this interview took place.

Also curious is that before the interview even starts, Solomon is already hitting us over the head with the conclusion: paragraph five tells us the prime causes of the tragedy are “inadequate gun control and poor mental health care.” That's clunky, don't you think. Couldn't Solomon have at least put those ideas in the mouth of his Peter Lanza doll, moving the strings and nodding his head in a lifelike manner?

To pull apart this fake interview, it is worth looking at one of the first things Solomon does have his Peter Lanza doll seem to utter:

“I want people to be afraid of the fact that this could happen to them,” he said. It took six months after the shootings for a sense of reality to settle on Peter. “But it's real,” he said. “It doesn't have to be understood to be real.”

Again, that is clunky in the extreme. Even if you haven't read *Psych101 for Dummies*, that should look suspicious to you. The only way Solomon could have been any less subtle is if he had swung a watch

in front of your face and told you, “be afraid, be very afraid!” Since a majority or large minority of people now believes news stories are being faked to create fear, it has to be seen as hamhanded for a writer to try to create fear in such an obvious manner. The rest is equally transparent: “It's real. It doesn't have to be understood to be real.” That's basic hypnosis, from page one of the old book *Mesmerism*. Svengali was using those lines on Trilby 120 years ago. Hey, Andrew, time to graduate to some more advanced techniques of hypnosis! Circus clowns fooling six year olds have to be more clever than that now. If the clown says “it's real” and the child says “no it's not,” the clown can't just say, “it's real” again, in a bigger magazine. The clown has to come up with a better story or go home and take off the make-up permanently.

Next Solomon begins making up a fuller history for Adam, but as usual we have no confirmation of it. He says,

A doctor diagnosed sensory-integration disorder, and Adam underwent speech therapy and occupational therapy in kindergarten and first grade. Teachers were told to watch for seizures.

What doctor, what teachers? Where are the files? In an event that has unwound to the extent of Sandy Hook, you can't just make assertions like this without a name and a quote and a source. But of course Solomon can't give you any of that, since he just made it up. And if he manufactures names or dates or posts a picture of a file, he knows that researchers would follow it up. As we have done with everything else, we would pull it apart, showing it was photoshopped, internally inconsistent, or otherwise fraudulent. So everything Solomon says here is vague and unverifiable.

Next, Solomon says,

Adam's brother, Ryan, four years older and now a tax accountant in New York, used to joke about how close Peter and Adam were.

If so, why do no pictures of Ryan and Adam together exist? Solomon says he saw boxes of photos in Peter's house, so why not publish one, to put this to rest? I'll tell you why: there is no Adam. Pictures of Adam are actually old retouched pictures of Ryan. Which gives Ryan's “joke” a new punchline. That's how close Adam and Ryan were: *they were the same person*. That's why Adam was said to be carrying Ryan's ID and why they first thought the shooter was Ryan. Adam had no ID, because he is not a real person.

To see why no new photos or documents were offered with this latest fake history of Adam, we can go to Solomon's next paragraph, where he briefly mentions *The Big Book of Granny*—the last fake document they released to give some ballast to Adam's past. That “book” is supposed to be a compilation of sick jokes Adam and a friend put together in fifth grade. The spooks ghostwrote it to make Adam look troubled from an early age. Unfortunately, the release of the *Book of Granny* fell as flat as everything else they released as evidence. After being released in the summer of 2013, it was quickly demolished by researchers, including hundreds of people at youtube. There is nothing internal to the book that indicates it was actually written by Adam, and it is once again full of anomalies and inconsistencies. Just to start with, Adam would have been 11 in fifth grade, which would have put this event 9 years before Sandy Hook, which was in 2012. That's 2003. But the document wasn't seen by any authorities until 2013. That is the date of the signature at the bottom. At the top of the document, they have given us a date of 2006, but they don't tell us what that is based on. No matter what it is based on, it is three years too late. Either those who wrote the document don't know that fifth graders are 11, or they can't subtract 9 from 12 to get 3.

Perhaps the weirdest thing about the *Book of Granny* is that it includes a plot to kill the Beatles. Granny and her son go back in time and kill the Beatles, and get sentenced to 75 years in jail. That indicates it was written by agents in their 60's. Eleven-year-old boys in 2003 could care less about the Beatles.

Another character mentioned in the book is Dora the Berserker. Two problems there: 1) the character's name is obviously based on Dora the Explorer, but that is a character for little girls under the age of eight. Eleven-year-old boys wouldn't be writing about any character based on Dora the Explorer. They would just as soon be writing about Barbie. 2) Boys that age don't know what a Berserker is. And if they did, they wouldn't make her a girl. This fact, along with the previous one about the Beatles, indicates that the writing of this fake book was assigned to a female agent(s) in her 60's: a real CIA "Granny." Teenage boys don't write about grannies. Only grannies write about grannies.

Another problem is found in a "chapter" where Granny and her son go to a Marine boot camp. Again, boys that age don't fantasize about Marine boot camp. Adam had no experience with the Marines. And in the case that boys *were* making up stories about war, it wouldn't be about bootcamp, the least glamorous part of being a soldier. They would do like the vidgames they play: pretend to be in a foreign country killing terrorists or bad guys. But most likely they would be killing aliens or werewolves, not "assassinating their own soldiers."

So once again, the release of this book just showed that the entire Sandy Hook event had been assigned to some low-ranking department, and that even after the event crashed and burned, the clean-up was *still* not assigned to top agents—ones who knew how to subtract 9 from 12, for instance. In fact, the clean-up—including the months of debunking by CNN, *Salon*, the *Atlantic*, and a hundred other top sources—was so poor it just ended up adding to the suspicion many of us had from early on that this whole thing was blown on purpose, for some larger reason. This article by Solomon is more gasoline on that fire, since it won't convince any doubters, and will give believers more absurd data they have to fit into their heads somehow. Every new inconsistency and absurdity increases the odds that a believer will refuse to go on. In other words, stories like this in *The New Yorker* sixteen months after the fact create no new believers, they just risk creating new non-believers.

One of the most likely new items to cause a believer to quit for good is Solomon's assertion that Adam Lanza became a Ron Paul fan when he was in middle school. You have to be kidding me! It is hard to believe they actually tried to fit this in. Was Adam also a fan of Syria, Iran, the Hezbollah, and Kim Jong-il? To start with, the timeline once again doesn't fit. Let's say Adam was 14, that would put this in 2006. That's about five years too early. Paul didn't become big news until late 2011, and the Ron Paul Revolution didn't really catch fire until early 2012. By then, Adam would be 19, about four years after middle school. I will be told Ron Paul was also big in 2007, but Adam was at least three years short of voting age. Paul was big on the internet then, but not on TV. Unless his father was a big Ron Paul supporter, and unless Peter talked about it a lot with his son, it is very unlikely that a boy that age would have encountered Ron Paul, or be interested. We are told Adam also "liked to argue economic theory." That, along with the Ron Paul thing, is completely unbelievable. How many 14 year olds do you know that like to argue economic theory or that were Ron Paul fans? I was a very precocious middle schooler, but I had no interest in politics or economics, and don't remember a single brainy friend that was, either. This despite the fact that my Mom ran for US Congress and talked politics constantly.

You should remind yourself that this conflicts loudly with other things were are told about Adam. We

have variously been told he had Asperger's or autism, was semi-retarded, was a social outcast, had no friends, etc. But now we are being told he was "very talkative" and so precocious at 14 he was arguing economic theory and following Ron Paul. So basically Adam was Rainman: an autistic savant, arguing economic theory one moment and staring at the wall the next.

The Ron Paul connection is a contradiction in another way. We are supposed to believe Adam was already nuts at 11, drawing cartoons and telling stories about "assassinating our own soldiers." But just three years *later*, Adam is making a hero out of Ron Paul. The contradiction? Ron Paul had more support from our soldiers than any other candidate, both in 2008 and 2012. Paul led all other candidates in both parties in fundraising from on-duty military and ex-military. Solomon is doing his best to slander Paul here, but it isn't working. It is once again both too obvious and too ridiculous.

Another problem is that the whole paragraph in which Ron Paul and the economics quote are buried is a melange of anachronisms. As with the Beatles reference, we have evidence that our story teller is decades too old to get inside of Adam Lanza's head. Andrew Solomon is 50, so keep that in mind as you read the following:

Adam was a fan of Ron Paul, and liked to argue economic theory. He became fascinated with guns and with the Second World War, and showed an interest in joining the military. But he never talked about mass murder, and he wasn't violent at school. He seldom revealed his emotions, but had a sharp sense of humor. When Peter took him to see Bill Cosby live, Adam laughed for an hour straight. He loved reruns of "The Bob Newhart Show" and "Get Smart," which he would watch with his dad.

Strange that Adam didn't like anything from his own time, but instead had the tastes and experiences of a 50-year-old. *Get Smart* was on from 1965-70. The *Bob Newhart Show* was on from 1972-78. Bill Cosby peaked as a stand-up performer from 1970-82. It looks like the spooks should have hired a 20-year-old to tell them what was popular with teen boys in 2003-6.

It was at this point in the article that I scanned down to see when the interview began. It never does. It turns out this isn't an interview, it is a long unbelievable story lightly sprinkled with fake quotes from Peter Lanza.

The bald contradictions continue. We are told several times that "Adam's sense of humor endured." He is said to have sent around a picture of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao, commenting on their beards. He found it "hilarious." Unfortunately, this conflicts with a diagnosis of autism. Autistic people do not have a sense of humor and do not send around jokes, seeking comment or empathy or a common laugh. Apparently, Adam only has autism when the story needs him to. When the story tellers wish to include a joke about Marx or a mention of Bill Cosby, suddenly Adam is not autistic.

Soon afterwards, we get another contradiction. We are told that his parents bought Adam a car in 2009 and that he was a very cautious driver. This conflicts with the earlier debunking, where we were told Adam didn't come up in a people search in 2012 because he was totally off the grid. The computers and spiders didn't know he existed. We were told he was a retarded shut-in, with no license, no social security number, and I suppose no birth certificate. But here, they admit that wasn't true as recently as 2009. And all that information isn't purged after just three years. If the computers knew where he was in 2009, they would still know where he was in 2012. All the various people searches don't just stop working after three years. At worst, they would have information outdated by three years. But they don't. They don't have *any* information. According to the computers, he doesn't exist. According to the computers, everyone else in his family exists except him.

And still another contradiction. We are told that his mother Nancy said, “He has had a bad summer and actually stopped going out.” That was in the fall of 2012! So Adam was still going out up until summer of 2012. But according to older parts of the story, Adam had been a shut-in since at least 2009. We were told in early 2013 that CBS and other mainstream outlets couldn't find any information about Adam after 2009. No one had seen or heard of him since then. So, he was invisible when he went out?

And another contradiction: Peter says that in 2012, “I was doing everything I could.” But we were just told a few paragraphs earlier that Peter hadn't seen Adam in two years, although they lived within easy driving distance. Not seeing your own son for two years is “doing everything I could”? Looks like someone forgot to edit this story for continuity.

And more contradictions: When Solomon asks Peter Lanza what they did about a funeral for Adam, “No one knows that,” Peter said. “And no one ever will.” What? No real parent says that. That is only put into the script in order to play on the fake emotion and mystery. The normal thing to say would be, “Yes, we had a private funeral for my son, and buried him.” If you want to prevent angry people from tampering with the grave, just don't mention the cemetery. The rest of this mystery is unnecessary. Is Peter implying that murderers don't deserve burial? What did he do, feed the body to wolves? Of course, since Adam never existed, there was no reason to have either a funeral or burial. Apparently they didn't wish to be bothered with faking it, so they just resort to this “No one knows that or ever will” dodge. Another sign of lazy event coordinators.

Soon afterwards, Solomon gives us a statistic: **Since 2006, according to a *USA Today* study, there have been two hundred and thirty-two mass killings—meaning, more than four deaths apiece, not including the killer—in the United States.** The question you should ask is, “were *any* of those 232 mass killings real, or were they *all* manufactured by the government to sell this program of fear and control?” We now know that Sandy Hook was fake, Aurora was fake, LAX was fake, the Boston Marathon was fake, and on and on. It looks to me like the government simply budgets for three mass tragedies a month, to keep DHS and TSA expenditures properly inflated. And it looks like some faction of CIA or military is sick of it, and is purposely blowing their cover. That is why it is so easy for researchers like me to compile information. Just as CIA is blowing the cover of NSA via the inflatable doll they call Snowden, some faction of Intelligence is blowing the cover of DHS in this Sandy Hook event.

We may even see evidence of DHS fighting back in this *New Yorker* article. Near the end, Solomon tells us of letters from the public sent to Peter Lanza after the event. One suggests that “Adam had been drugged by the C.I.A. and forced to his acts in order to foment support for gun-control legislation.” You should find it highly curious to find the CIA being blackwashed like this. Although this is closer to what DHS did with the event, they try to pin it on CIA. I predict CIA will not fail to notice, and will return fire. Sandy Hook is now such a sitting duck, it may turn out to be the first false flag event to have its cover fully blown within two years. In other words, CIA may use its links to the mainstream press to open this one completely up.

Remember, when DHS was founded in late 2002 and began faking these events, it had to use a mainstream press that had already been controlled by CIA back to 1947. In fact, military intelligence had been controlling the media back to at least the 1840's, as I have shown in previous papers. So DHS was basically borrowing CIA's primary tool. The thing is, CIA had a long history of faking events, and therefore had some amount of pride in both its track record and in its tool. So when DHS came in and started faking these events like a bunch of amateurs, it naturally pissed off CIA. It is like when you

loan a shovel to your neighbor next door, and he returns it with dirt and rust all over it, and a cracked handle. CIA is concerned that DHS is permanently breaking the tool, so that no one can use it anymore. Once the public becomes suspicious of the media, it is useless as propaganda, you see.

Now, CIA could have loaned their expertise to DHS, and in some instances we must assume they have done that. But in other instances, CIA didn't approve of DHS's events, and left them to coordinate things alone. Since DHS is relatively new at this game, they bungled these events badly. Sandy Hook is just one of these events. Because CIA didn't approve of these events to start with, and because CIA is angry that its primary tool is being sullied, DHS is now in serious trouble. If we add to that the fact that DHS has tried to co-opt some of the sexiest domestic duties of the CIA—doing to CIA what CIA did to FBI back in the 1970's—we have the grounds for a serious turf war.

You have to understand that when DHS was created in 2002, there was actually no room for it in the architecture. The Intelligence community was already overfull, with more agents than there was useful work. Intelligence was already doing a slew of things that didn't really need to be done in the 1990's. As with the Military, its main job was just spending money. But the Cheney/Rumsfeld cabal wanted part of that pie, so they used 911 to finance a huge expansion. They pushed their way into the Intelligence apparatus and almost immediately began trying to take control of it. They took over INS, ICE, FEMA, and the Coast Guard, and created TSA. Although they felt immediate resistance from existing Intelligence, especially CIA, it wasn't until DHS began taking over NSA that CIA felt really threatened.

I beg you to notice that all the agencies reported to be buying ridiculous amounts of ammunition, including hollow point ammunition, are sub-agencies of DHS. From this, we may assume that even the IRS is being taken over by DHS. That would naturally concern CIA as well. This indicates that DHS is not feeling threatened by you or me, they are feeling threatened by push-back from CIA.

We can actually take these ammunition purchases as a sign of hope. It took me a while to understand it, but here is why. If we are witnessing fall-out from a turf war between DHS and CIA, and if push comes to shove, the question will be decided by who controls the actual military, especially the Air Force. Although it appears DHS has taken control of the Department of Defense and possibly the DIA, those are just offices. The Department of Defense is just a cabinet office; it is not the armed forces. Well, if DHS controlled the armed forces, they wouldn't need to be buying ammunition, would they? The armed forces already have ammunition. Therefore, we may assume that someone else still controls the armed forces of the US. This is bad news for DHS, since to thwart DHS, all this someone needs to do is prevent delivery of that ammunition. An order for ammunition is not the same as delivery of ammunition.

Yes, it looks to me like DHS is running scared, which of course indicates that they have not achieved the total co-option of government or military they dreamed of. The only remaining question is why this “someone” has allowed things to devolve as far as they have, and why more decisive action to limit or suppress the decidedly evil aspects of DHS hasn't been taken. If DHS is not in charge, why are they being allowed to run amok?

The unsavory answer would appear to be that we do not have good guy versus bad guy here. This is not a Hollywood movie. What we have is bad guy versus worse guy, DHS being worse guy. Someone is preventing the very worst DHS events, but that someone is not preventing the thousands of lesser events—although it appears they could if they wished to. They are *letting these things happen*, probably because they are profiting from the fear and confusion DHS causes almost as much as DHS



is. The rather sad fact of the matter is that no ruling faction in the world currently wears a white hat or cares for a New World Order. What they seem to care for is a continuation of the Old World Disorder, which they are convinced maximizes profits.

I wish I could convince them otherwise, but that is very difficult to do. They have been tutored from a young age, taught that good and evil are an illusion. In their secret societies, there is only one god, and he is not an example of monotheism. No, their one god is power, which is a monad. There is no opposing force to power. The only opposite to power is lack of power. In this scheme of life, there is no morality, no chance of doing wrong. Everything that leads to more power is right, according to their texts.

But they are wrong, and I don't need Christianity, Islam, or Buddhism to demonstrate it. I can demonstrate it with my own life. Their theory results in their lives, my theory has resulted in my life. Who has more power? For them, it is obvious: they have more money and can therefore order things to be done. This to them is power. They can even order that I be killed. Power. But I see it differently. Let's look at science, for a start. They can and have ordered all sorts of scientists to do all sorts of science, enriching themselves in the process. But as I have shown, all that science—centuries of it—is wrong. So these rich people and their scientists have not had the power to do real science. They have only been capable of vast amounts of fake science. All their money and power have bought them nothing real. I have done real science without any of their funding. To me that is an indication of real power. I can do what they cannot do: *power*. The same applies to art. They can hire any number of artists to create any number of modern works, but none of that is art. It is just a huge pile of expensive non-art. Same with writing. I can out-write them and all their hired hacks put together. The rich people cannot do what I do, and cannot hire anyone to do what I do. Therefore the power is *mine*. Since I am the one that can do these things, I have the power, not them.

This proves you cannot buy power. The only power you can buy is the power to destroy. You can buy bombs and poison and you can hire murderers. But you cannot buy the ability to create. Yes, Donald Rumsfeld has far more power to harm people than I do, but that is not really power. Power is normally understood to be a power to create, not to destroy. Their theory of power is not a theory of power, it is a theory of anti-power. Once you define life as a monad, and throw out the dual nature of Nature, you have lost all ability to create. Either side by itself can only supply anti-power. To create, you must believe in both sides and harness both sides.

So you see, they fail even by their own standards. They define life based on power, but do not have that power. Their power is illusory, for it is based wholly on money. But their money cannot buy the life I have lived. It cannot buy them *ability*.

You will say they can give money to charity, and through those charities they can heal people and save lives. But again, all that is an illusion created by wealthy people. Just as it was possible for me to create art and do science with almost no money, you can heal people and save people's lives with almost no money as well. Healing and saving don't require money, they require *ability*. They require healers and savers, not rich people.

You will say the rich can support the arts and sciences. Yes, rich people could support the arts and sciences, but the fact is *they don't*. Modern rich people enriched by the modern theory of power haven't even supported the arts, as their predecessors did. Instead, they have destroyed the arts, in order to further enrich themselves ([as I have shown](#)). Even when they appear to be supporting the arts, they are only supporting fake new arts which have displaced the real arts of the past. The same can be

said of new science, which isn't really science. It is only a simulacrum of science, propped up to steal money from the treasury to further enrich the rich. We may assume that patronage has changed because the patrons themselves have changed. The old patrons believed in some dual Nature; the new patrons are believers in power only. And so they have gobs of money and anti-power, none of which can buy them anything real.

I could not do what I do existing in or believing in their universe. All my creations arise from a dual Nature, and from my belief in it. That is, true power *requires* a dual universe, and supplication (in some form) to that dual Nature. Nature will not respond to these monad people. It is not because they are Satanists or Luciferians that she will not respond—as many believe—it is because they are monists. They have disempowered themselves via their own sad theories. Their engine will burn but it will not run. They are the one cog spinning the void, but power requires opposing cogs. It requires knowledge and belief in more than just power.

But back to the *New Yorker* article. I honestly can't tell you whether Solomon is blowing this story on purpose, under orders from someone, or whether he is just not up to the task of salvaging the Sandy Hook hoax. If he was assigned the salvage as a straight-up job, I have to feel sorry for him. I don't think anyone is capable of it. I don't think *I* could do it, not for all the money in the world. I can make Solomon and all the Sandy Hook debunkers smell really bad—that is cake—but no amount of clever, incisive, or even inventive writing could make Sandy Hook pass the smell test.