

# More Vaccine Lies

*by Miles Mathis*

First published July 16, 2022

I have been telling my readers for more than a year that they have been lying about the rates of vaccination, and we are now getting proof I was right. We will start with [this article at Breitbart](#) using DOD's own statistics.

**According to the Department of Defense website, at least 268,858 service members as of July 13 are still not in compliance with Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin's August 2021 mandate for every member of the military to be fully vaccinated with two doses of a vaccine. That figure does not count the thousands who have not taken any doses.**

They admit that is about 13% of our 2.1 million force, but there are already a couple of problems. One, that number 2.1 million has been inflated, to lower the 13% number. [According to my research](#), active and reserve military is only about 1.8 million, which takes us up to 15%. Then notice the sentence I have put in yellow: the 269,000 number is just soldiers who have taken one dose and stopped there. How many haven't taken any doses? We don't know, but I assume it would take our number up to *at least* 400,000. Which means we are over 22% already. And it could be even higher. So when we have read mainstream sites claim 97% of Marines are vaxxed, or that 95% of Air Force are vaxxed, they are just lying. Even according to their own numbers, it is more like 78%.

But of course they can't admit that in print, since some soldiers read. If they find out they are not alone, with around a quarter of their fellow soldiers on their side, they are much more likely to stand their ground.

And of course it is likely even worse than that. These are only the fudges we have caught them at. If they have lied to this extent, it is likely they have lied about other things, so I would estimate only about half of soldiers have actually been double vaxxed. That was my initial guess months ago, and I stand by it. People who have refused the vax up to now are not going to change their minds under any pressure. They realize it is a matter of life and death and will take a dishonorable discharge before they take any forced or coerced vaccination from a clearly compromised chain of command owned by Pfizer.

We find the same thing in the general population in the US and in other countries, where they are lying hugely about vax uptake, to make you think you are the last holdout. I have seen claims of 70-95% for the US and other firstworld countries, but they recently admitted the total rate for the US was in the upper 40s. [The BBC just claimed 92% of Brits were vaxxed](#), but according to official statistics, only about 70% are. And I don't believe the 70% figure, either. It may also be below 50.

We have seen wildly fluctuating claims in Australia as well, with major outlets making claims in the 90s, but then other outlets reporting below 50. It depends on what game they are promoting at the time. Usually they want you to think everyone but you has gotten the vax, so they make up a number in the 90s. But in some stories, they are trying to justify new crackdowns, so they have to admit the number is lower than expected or hoped.

And I remind you that most of Africa, and many other countries like Haiti, have refused the vax, having rates around 2%. Have they been absolutely devastated by Covid? No, just the reverse. Refusing to follow the “science”, the countries with the lowest vax uptake are the healthiest, having far lower rates of flu illness as well as far lower rates of vaccine injury like myocarditis and pericarditis. But of course Pfizer will not allow those real statistics to be published in the mainstream. They don't want you to know that the real science is upside down to theirs at all points. The most highly vaccinated countries are also the most decimated and devastated.

This isn't surprising in most ways, at least not to those of us who are still sane, but it is surprising in one way: you would have expected Africa to have been targeted first of all, even above India or China. Why? Because of its high birth rates, as well as the fact it is mainly poor and black. But I guess Bill Gates and the rest of these monsters figured Africa was already targeted in so many other ways, it didn't really matter if the continent refused the vaccine. Gates and his pals would get Africa one way or another, with smart crops, famine, disease . . . the usual. They have been doing it for decades so they hardly needed a new plan there.

But let's return to the US military. Command is talking about purging all unvaxxed soldiers, but do you really think they can purge 400,000 troops? They already can't recruit anyone for this reason, so do you think they can take huge losses? Of course not. It is all another bluff. I think if these soldiers can hold out until November, things are going to change big time. The mid-term slaughter is going to be the greatest in history, and Biden won't just be a lame duck, he will be a dead duck. They will claim he died of old age around Christmas, and Kamala will go down in a fake plane crash about the same time. At which time Kevin McCarthy would be sworn in as President.

Could it really come down to that? I would say the odds are better than at any time in history for the Speaker of the House to become President. It is almost impossible to visualize Biden finishing out his term or Kamala Harris becoming President. So, by default, this Speaker scenario becomes plausible.

What about the claim Trump will be named Speaker of the House? Is that even possible? Legally, it is possible, but nothing like it has ever been done, or ever even been close to being done. I don't see it happening, mainly because it isn't necessary. We are already far enough out on a limb with McCarthy being elevated to President, and if that possibility arose there would be no reason to replace him with Trump. Since McCarthy is a Republican, the Republicans would have already taken the White House without an election, and McCarthy doesn't have the negatives Trump has. The Republicans would be fools to kill such a gift horse by replacing him with Trump. Besides, a lot of Republicans in the House don't like Trump, so it is unlikely they would vote him in as Speaker.

But let's think about this: we know that Biden is a planned fail, and nothing now happening is happening naturally. It is all part of a script. The script since 2020 has been to ramp up all divisions and manufacture as many more as possible. So in that context the return of Trump by the end of the year would fit right in. It would devastate the Dems even more than his return in 2024, and if you think the invective from the left after the fall of Roe was steep, just imagine what it would be if Trump returned by the end of the year. Cataclysmic. So it is not out of the question. Honestly, nothing is out of the question. Anything is possible.

That said, I can't even begin to calculate odds on something like this. I find it impossible to get into the heads of the Phoenicians (thankfully). It is impossible for the sane to predict what the insane will do. It is like angels trying to predict the moves of devils.



And now let's take a look at today's news. That image sort of leapt off the screen at me, and I guess you can see why. Does he look like a Saudi? Why is he so pale and American looking? [You can hear him speak here](#). Doesn't sound like a Saudi. Sounds like an American actor putting on a slight accent. You can see right through this guy! It's pathetic. Just more indication of what I have told you recently: the whole Saudi thing is staged, and has been from the beginning. The entire Saud family is just a CIA front, and with this guy they just got really lazy. They didn't even bother to hire a guy from the region, just pulling in some fool from actor's equity in Television City. Also note the nose: another Jewish actor in a turban. They don't even bother to make up parents for him at Wikipedia, or a believable bio. Most of it takes place in the US, confirming what I just told you.

---

---

And in other news, Congressman and Senate hopeful [Tim Ryan this week said Congress shouldn't have to show up at all](#), an idea I fully endorse. Of course he is talking about remote voting, but since Congress is just a paper moon riding over a cardboard sea, I say take the thing to its logical conclusion. Congress doesn't need to rubberstamp all military and spy budgets, since the media can just report they did and be done with it. It can all be done by a computer, and in most ways already is. They already vote the way they are told to by the monitor, and all the rest is just congressional theater. Congress is no more running this country than Biden is, and they should all just retire and go for ice cream and a bike ride. Robert Reich admitted Congress was defunct—just an emeritus group—30 years ago, so you might want to catch up if you aren't already with us. It is known that Congress was fully controlled by


the CIA by the 70s, and I have shown you it happened long before that. It became obvious after Watergate, but in my papers you have seen that Congresses and Parliaments have been staged and controlled back to the beginning. See my papers on the Stanleys controlling Parliament back to the 1500s.

They might as well disband the entire government, since it is just a sham. We would then know we were being run by the Pentagon and CIA, working for the billionaires and trillionaires, and could act accordingly. And imagine all the money that could be saved by getting rid of this fake middleman. Just think of all the actors' salaries that have to be paid to maintain this fiction of governance.

---

---

Some other things I discovered this week: Alan Rickman is sold to us as Welsh, the son of a Catholic factor worker and his Methodist wife. I remind you what Rickman looked like:



So, a famous actor who looked like that and we are expected to believe he is Welsh Catholic or Methodist? Supposedly from a working class family, he ended up at Chelsea College of Art and Design and then the Royal College of Art. He then ended up at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Arts, where he remained until he was 28. Apparently he didn't need to work for a living, so I am not clear on what *workingclass* means here. He did Shakespeare and minor TV roles until suddenly, at age 42, he landed the lead supporting role in *Die Hard*, coming out of nowhere. So if you thought you hadn't seen him until then, it is because you hadn't—unless you happened to catch him as Tybalt on BBC ten years earlier. I honestly can't imagine him as Tybalt and refuse to try.

Empire voted him #34 on the sexiest stars of all time, being #8 of the males. Really? Yet another reason not to consult Empire on anything. He was a pretty good villain when he got older, but his sex appeal score had to be in negative numbers, even for gays. Which means his promotion was incredible.

Why? Because he was not some nobody son of a Welsh Catholic laborer. He was Jewish peerage, like all the rest of these people in show business. The Rickmans are in the peerage, being East India Company jerks, closely related to the Lithgows, Maitlands, Farquhars, Murrays, and Drummonds. The

Maitlands are our direct link to the Stuarts, since Maitland=Stuart. There are lots of top military men in his family, including the Farquhar admirals. So Rickman was a close cousin of John Lithgow and Jimmy (Maitland) Stewart. Rickman's mother was a Bartlett, probably linking us to the Bartlett Baronets, including Lt. Col. Sir Basil Bartlett, Intelligence Corps, and his brother Lt. Col. Sir Henry Bartlett. These Bartletts founded the school of engineering at University College of London, being Freeman, city of London. Sir Basil Bartlett just happened to be an actor himself, and in the 1950s he was head of the BBC's script department. So you begin to see what Alan Rickman's connections were. Also remind yourself that this head of BBC's scripts was. . . a Lt. Col. Intelligence Corps.

Another one I briefly researched is Kenneth Branagh, since I had the misfortune to pull up *Dead Again* in a recommendation. I saw Derek Jacobi [*I, Claudius*] on the list of actors and thought it might be worth watching. Nope. It was amateurish in the extreme, especially in the direction and screenplay, being little more than a vehicle for Branagh and Emma Thompson to practice their American. Though Jacobi was good, no surprise there. The lipless Branagh rubbed me raw as usual, so I looked him up. Like Rickman, he is sold to us as a poor Irishman from Belfast, son of a plumber. The things they expect us to believe. He and his family soon ended up at Reading "to avoid the Troubles", where he "acquired received pronunciation to avoid bullying". That is to explain why he doesn't have an Irish accent.

He apparently flunked his A-levels, but, being a Phoenician, he was always welcome at RADA, and by age 19 he was giving soliloquies to the Queen. At age 21 he played Judd in *Another Country*, giving us our next clue. Meaning? He's Jewish, of course. We are supposed to believe he was some kind of acting phenom, but I have seen him act. He was awful in *Henry V*, his break-out. He was awful in *Dead Again*. He was awful in *Frankenstein*. The only time he was passable was in *Othello*, playing someone you were supposed to hate [Iago]. Branagh had already written his autobiography by the time he was 29, telling us exactly what sort of person he is. Plumber's sons don't do that.

Branagh's bio is extremely well scrubbed, even by the standards we have come to expect. No page at Geneanet, and an empty page at Geni. His maternal line is blank at Ethnicelebs, and the paternal line looks fake. Branagh should have claimed to be Welsh, like Rickman, since the name literally means Welshman. But he didn't. All this hiding means to me they are hiding something big, and the solo performance for the Queen at age 19 is the clue we want. It tells me he is related to the Queen very closely. Through his mother the fake Harper? Maybe, but I intuit it is even bigger and more direct. A little digging at thepeerage.com leads us to something VERY interesting. We find no Branaghs, but we do find a Brana, pronounced the same. So I suggest Kenneth is a Brana. But there happens to be only one Brana in the peerage, and we have to look very closely. That would be Nikolai Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, Prince of Romania, whose mother was Marie Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, Princess of Edinburgh and granddaughter of Queen Victoria. Marie's mother was Marya Romanov, Grand Duchess of Russia, daughter of Alexander II. Anyway, this Nikolai Hohenzollern later changed his name to Nikolai Brana. Intrigued? You should be, because thepeerage.com is the only place you will find this information. Wikipedia has a page on this Prince of Romania, but neglects to mention he changed his name to Nikolai Brana. Wiki tells us he was married twice with no children, but thepeerage.com admits he was married a third time, though we aren't told to whom. I suggest a cover-up at this point, to hide his son from us. Yes, I think Kenneth Branagh/Brana is his grandson. Which would make [Branagh a close cousin of Natalie Wood](#) through the Romanovs.

We have another indication of this other marriage in the fact that Nikolai was deprived of all titles by his brother King Carol II in 1937. But he is supposed to have married his first wife Joana Dumitrescu-Dolete, daughter of the Princess Tchkotoua, in 1931, and she became Princess Hohenzollern in 1945.

So she can't be the one he lost his titles for. So he must have married someone from the British Isles in 1931, Kenneth's grandmother, being forced to divorce her in 1937, then married this Princess Dolete. The male child from this first marriage was obviously hidden in England, who, despite that, remained the 2g-grandson of Queen Victoria and Alexander II.

In my opinion, only that could explain why Branagh, an annoying kid with no lips, helmet hair, and negative charisma, would be performing Shakespeare solo for Queen Elizabeth in 1980.

---

---

And what's with the Allstate commercials? Those things have been running for years now with that same jerk. They *are* aware no one thinks he is funny and that the commercials must have a negative sales impact, right? Don't they do audience tests anymore? The guy has less than zero charisma. My response when first seeing it is that he must be the son of the owner of Allstate or something, or some CEO who mistakenly thought he was cute. That is the way it comes off. An utter fail. And yet the series has gone on for years.

---

---

And finally, I watched TV for the first time in a long time today, when it was on at a bar I was at with friends. Oh my god, the Pharma commercials just get worse, they blanket all stations and seem to account for about 75% of all top-level advertising. I guess everyone realizes how shocking this would be to someone arriving here from the past or future, or from some sane planet? We are apparently a nation of drug addicts. I wish I could blame just Pfizer or big Pharma, but everyone is complicit. They couldn't sell drugs to people who wouldn't buy them. . . like me. If everyone were like me, the drug companies would all be bankrupt from lack of a clientele. I hate to sound like a just-say-no ad, but come on! If your doctor is recommending this crap, maybe you need to find a real doctor, or try something new *like taking care of yourself*. It isn't that hard.

I feel the same way about the Fentanyl crisis. My question always is, "Why is anyone taking this shit?" Do they honestly think it is going to make them feel better? I just don't get it. How can anyone think a pill is going to solve any of their problems, especially at this point in history? They must know millions are dying of it, so it is equivalent to taking a known poison. Is it just soft suicide? That is the only thing I can figure. Except that it isn't soft. A bullet would be quicker and less painful, or jumping off a cliff or something. And it wouldn't be making these rich murdering families any richer. If everyone killing themselves this way would instead figure out a way to take one rich murderer with him, this problem would be solved in short order.