

[return to updates](#)

Henry Thoreau *and the* Modern Magazine



by Miles Mathis

First published October 21, 2015

The only time I come in contact anymore with the modern magazine is when I accidentally see a headline out of the corner of my eye in the market checkout line. Otherwise I successfully avoid this propaganda completely. I don't think anyone has ever analyzed the curious placement of these magazine (and newspaper) wrecks, I mean racks. Logically, the store should put the most popular items nearest the checkout lines, but magazines are the *least* popular items on all the shelves. If you don't believe me, go to that aisle in the supermarket where the magazines are shelved, other than near the checkout. No one is ever there. You could have sex in front of those magazines, the aisle is so deserted. The nasty little secret is, hardly anyone buys magazines or newspapers these days. I encourage you to test that claim yourself, by watching those around you next time you go through the line. No one is ever purchasing a magazine. I don't think I have ever seen anyone do it.

You will tell me the subscription numbers are quite high for some of the magazines, but—like everything else—I don't believe it. We now know they are faking the numbers for just about everything, so why should we believe subscription numbers self-reported by the magazines?

Since no one ever buys these magazines, we must assume the supermarkets are paid handsomely to use up precious floor space for their gaudy display. Which means the CIA has a presence even at your supermarket. It has a presence even at your precious Whole Foods or other organic market, since these places also display and promote the government propaganda. You will say your organic store doesn't display *National Enquirer* or TIME magazine, but it doesn't make any difference. *Mother Jones* and

Atlantic and the *Nation* and all the other so-called progressive magazines were taken over decades ago. Just today I saw the *Atlantic* promoting Bill Gates on the cover as a progressive. That is the world you are now living in. I assume even the yoga and astrology magazines are fronts for Intelligence.

My organic food market had three different issues of the *New Yorker* on display today, which I found odd. It looks like the *New Yorker* is being pushed on the diminishing segment of college-educated readers who can actually read, in some last-ditch effort to brainwash them. Most of its content is now given away for free online, and I wouldn't be surprised to find the print magazines given away for free next month or the next, along with a free bar of chocolate and a coupon for a free massage. Anything to force the propaganda down your throat. But for most people, even that won't suffice. The CIA needs to hire personal readers to read the magazines to people, and then to tell what they are supposed to think about it. That is what TV is for, of course, but they need to synch them up even more closely, with programs specifically addressing magazine articles. They do that with newspaper headlines, so look for them to do it with magazine articles as well.



One of the articles in this week's *New Yorker* was another in a long line of hatchet pieces on Thoreau, called "Pond Scum". I found a couple of tepid responses to the article online, but what these academics didn't seem to realize was that the writer, Kathryn Schulz (above), shouldn't be taken seriously. From the first word you could tell she was just another soulless hack that had been hired to do her masters' dirty work, trying once again to cleanse US history of its last few real people so that the plastic people stealing your future could do so in a unilateral field of vileness and lies. They don't want you comparing Modern podpeople to pre-Modern human beings of flesh and blood, because you might then begin to see the wiring, circuitry and unnatural eye movements.

To state it a little less provocatively, the reason they are attacking Thoreau is because the "they" is merchants. Financiers. Plutocrats. The very wealthy who got their money from trade. These are the people paying the Kathryn Schulzes of the world to twist your mind into knots. They are the ones funding these magazines and newspapers and TV programs that are selling you an inverted world where black is white and day is night.

Why are they attacking Thoreau? Because he said this:

But I have since learned that trade curses everything it handles; and though you trade in messages from heaven, the whole curse of trade attaches to the business.

Though the entire 20th century was tall proof of that assertion, the traders don't want you to recognize it. They are selling the opposite kool-aid, and so of course want to shut Thoreau's ice-tea stand down.

They have been teaching you that trade *sanctifies* everything it touches. I have shown you many examples of that directly in my art papers, where we have seen the art critics saying it in pretty much those words: the joy of the art market is not the art but *the market*. The important thing isn't that art is being produced, it is that art is being *sold*. The artifact is nothing next to the sale. Every issue of *Art Forum* or *Art in America* (which are on the stands of Whole Foods) says that explicitly or implicitly on every page every month. And this is true not just of the art market, but of all markets. Science isn't about science anymore, it is about *selling* science. Education isn't about education, it is about selling education. History isn't about history, it is about selling history. And the truth isn't about the truth anymore, it is about inverting the truth and selling the lie as the truth. All of life has been turned inside out so that someone can profit from the reversal.

Like me, you may have noticed that Schulz appears to be speaking at a TED conference in that picture above. That is the revolting TED background that looks like an old Windows curtain. Well, that is just more confirmation of my reading here. TED is sponsored by Bill Gates, one of the plastic billionaire podpeople trying to control your future. No one speaks at TED except spooks, and I have learned to spot spooks with nothing but a TED appearance. I have outed so many TED speakers I can now use a TED appearance as a first red flag, working back from there. I have found it a fool-proof method.

Not only was Schulz's *New Yorker* piece on Thoreau a transparent hatchet job, it was also a copy job. If it avoiding plagiarizing Richard Bridgman's 1982 book *Dark Thoreau*, it did so only fractionally. To seek proof of my thesis above, the best thing we can do is study [Bridgman's bio](#), as posted at Berkeley. I encourage you to read it, since it is surpassingly odd and yet extremely revealing. Already we have the first red flag, and we aren't even into the body of the bio. UC Berkeley is a red flag itself, being a premier spook college. For more on that consult my recent papers on Ted Kaczynski [the unabomber](#) and [on Patty Hearst](#) and [on the Zodiac](#). Bridgman received his BA, MA, and PhD from Berkeley in the late 50's. His specialties were Walt Whitman and Gertrude Stein. Of course they were. See my papers [on Whitman](#) and on the [Paris Salon](#) to see them both outed as spooks. But there's more. Bridgman had been in the Navy. He had been in the Merchant Marine (see my paper [on the Beat Poets](#), where we find those guys in the Merchant Marine). He had been in Paris, where he was associated with the Gurdjieff Institute. He taught American Literature courses in Moscow as a Fulbright Scholar, where he became fluent in Russian. He had worked at TWA.* He was both a Woodrow Wilson fellow and a Guggenheim fellow, both spook awards. He retired early (age 61), and we keep expecting his biographer to tell us why. He lived another 17 years. The whole bio seems to be leading up to it. . . but then we get nothing except another red flag. As he was driving out of town his house burned down, conveniently destroying all his papers. He took only two things with him: the manuscript he was working on and the plans of the house. Wait, *the plans of the house*? Do you have the plans to your house lying around at arm's length? Is that one of two things you would grab in a fire? Other than that, we learn nothing about his last 17 years. Can we guess what it was he was doing? Well, he retired in 1988, when ex-CIA director George Bush was being elevated to President. I suggest Bush and his people felt agent Bridgman—with all his talents—was being wasted in academia, writing these books no one was reading. So they found a sexier job, perhaps as a professor emeritus-spy in Russia or Eastern Europe. This is what Bridgman's biographer seems to be leading up to in the bio, although the punchline appears to have been censored.

I think you can now begin to intuit what Bridgman was up to in his extended hatchet job on Thoreau. Like Schulz, it appears he was hired to try to bring Thoreau down a notch. As support of that, we see Bridgman in that same book also being hired to attack John Brown, who was one of the only ones in history to forcibly resist the US government. You can see why the governors would wish to continue blackwashing him. Thoreau saw Brown as a hero, but the US Government doesn't want you to think

that.

Bridgman's assignment in those years was to whitewash Whitman and blackwash Thoreau. This plays right into my thesis in my paper on Whitman, where I showed you the US Government hijacked the Transcendentalist movement on purpose in the 1850s, replacing the reality of Thoreau with the fake Whitman. Whitman was manufactured by early Military Intelligence from the ground up, expressly to subvert growing Republican and revolutionary sentiment before the Civil War. While Karl Marx was sent in to subvert the unions and the politics in general, almost simultaneously Whitman was sent in (with others) to subvert those movements in literature. Charles Dickens was heavily blackwashed in those years, and he still is by the same people for the same reasons.

Bridgman was also hired to do a hatchet job on Mark Twain, but did such a poor job the book is now out of print. This is informative, because it tells us what to think of Twain, provided we didn't already know. Bridgman's attack on him is confirmation of his reality. I had wondered in previous papers why Twain wasn't exposing these early Intel projects, but maybe he just didn't know about them. Bridgman's attacks on him go a long way to clearing any doubts I had about Twain.

In the same way, we can judge Kathryn Schulz. Since she is regurgitating the indigestible prose of Bridgman, we must assume she is the same sort of spook. We have more evidence of that everywhere we look. If we google on her blog at *Slate*, the first thing that comes up is a 2010 interview with a kid who enlisted in the Iraq war and then became a conscientious objector to get out. It is total misdirection as usual, since it starts off by mentioning 911 but questions that event not one jot. It takes the mainstream story as given, which was the point of the whole article.

In the same blog, Schulz invites Alan Dershowitz for a nauseating interview. The interview is introduced by listing Dershowitz' various trials: O. J. Simpson, Patty Hearst, etc., taking them as given. And once again the most important misdirection is in the introduction, since I have shown [all those trials were faked](#). Compared to that, the interview itself is just frosting. In it, we keep expecting Schulz to ask Dershowitz a hard question, but she never does. It is more like a talk show where Dershowitz can preen and sell his various tonics. This just reminds us that Schulz is a Jewish lesbian, and leads me to believe she has been instructed to throw softballs to Dershowitz for that (Jewish) reason. Although Schulz is sold at places like *The Nation* as progressive, mostly *because* she is Jewish and lesbian, we never actually find her *being* progressive, except in tangential and mostly unimportant ways. For instance, is being a lesbian really progressive in any way? No, not anymore than being heterosexual is progressive. It is just a sexual bent or choice and therefore politically neutral. Instead of being progressive, what we normally find her doing is building little pulpits for people like Dershowitz, where he can call Norman Finkelstein "evil" and claim Noam Chomsky is doing what he is doing just to look cool to his pals. In other words, she is either supporting fascists or rowing them through little channels of misdirection. Her appearance at TED is perfect proof of that, since what is Bill Gates? A progressive? No, he's a premier technofascist, allied behind the scenes to all the Dershowitzes and Rockefellers and Kissingers of the world, planning your next bleeding.

In nothing I read of Schulz did I get any evidence of a real person, by either of two definitions of real. Firstly, I got no idea of a real person in the sense I used above: a real person like Thoreau or Twain has opinions that are his, based on his experience and emotion; a fake person like Whitman has opinions because he is paid to have them. Bridgman and Schulz definitely impress me as the latter. But it goes beyond even that, because I got no feeling Schulz even existed as a writer. All these contemporary magazine and newspaper articles (not just those of Schulz) look to me like they could have been written by a committee in Langley, and in previous papers I have shown you evidence *they are*. So I

suggest these new writers aren't hired as writers, they are hired as faces to front the writing committees.

With Schulz, I have no *proof* of that. How could I, short of living in her house or working in Langley? The evidence is all circumstantial, and all I have to point to are the articles and interviews themselves. But I encourage you to open your mind to that possibility. Read the articles with that question in your head and you may begin to see the same evidence for it that I do. Mostly it is an inhuman chill in the sentence structure, which betrays either a committee or a computer program, and probably both. But there is also a glaring inconsistency in them that goes beyond the inherent inconsistency of the human mind. Most humans are muddled to some extent, but writing by committee and computer program allows a wide-ranging inconsistency that isn't even consistent with its own inconsistency. That is to say, a real person is normally inconsistent in a consistent way, and as a fellow human you can spot the patterns in that person fairly quickly. But a committee won't have those tight patterns of inconsistency. A committee will be inconsistent *with itself*. There are personal contradictions and then there are committee contradictions, and to my eye most new writing betrays committee contradictions. It betrays some sort of imperfect program. [See [my paper on Andrew Solomon](#) for more on that.] Some conspiracy theorists have proposed that these individuals *are* programmed, but the more likely answer is that most of what we read is written by committees, and the committees are *following a program*. So you get the programming without the mind-control theory. You don't need to mind-control a committee sitting around a table. You just hire people who will write what they are told and then pass around a program on a sheet of paper. Very old school, requiring no tech at all.

You will say Schulz must be a real person if they can photograph her at TED and film her speaking sentences. But you are missing my point. I am not claiming she isn't real in that way. As I said, she is hired to be the face of some Langley committee. As part of that front, she and some others who can read Teleprompters or repeat what the tapeworm in their ears is saying also get caught speaking in short bursts at TED or on talkshows. What you don't normally hear them doing is taking extended substantive questioning from an audience of professionals, since they wouldn't be able to do it. Most of them aren't experts on anything, not even writing or contemporary politics. To see what I mean, go to the NASA press conference on the Mars rover (youtube.com), where we find guys sold to us as scientists unable to answer simple questions from the audience. We find the same sort of question dodging anytime those in the mainstream are foolish enough to open any lecture on any topic to questions from the audience. The whole charade immediately breaks down and you can see you are watching puppets.

[In a previous paper](#) I have already deconstructed Lee Smolin's TED lecture, and it wasn't hard to do since all these TED lectures are short, informal, and as empty of content as possible. I also deflated [Elizabeth Gilbert's 2009 lecture](#). [Schulz's lecture](#) is just as easy to dispose of, since it comes off as a 15-minute comedy routine that bombs. The thing that jumps out most in the opening moments is not anything she says, it is her age. She is just 36 in the lecture and looks even younger. They take some pains to herd you around this realization, since her birthdate is very hard to find online. It isn't listed in her TED bio and isn't even listed at her Wikipedia page, which almost always gives you a birthdate. I had to do a people search on her to find it. There may be a reason for this, seeing that her career is said to have started in 1995 at *Feed* magazine. She was only 20 then. She won the PEW fellowship in 2004, when she was only 29. This leads us to ask what she won it *for*. She was the online editor for the environmental magazine *Grist* from 2001-2006, which doesn't sound that prizeworthy. It also doesn't sound like the sort of work PEW would be giving a fellowship for, since PEW was founded by fascist Sun Oil conservatives who don't give a rat's ass about the environment. More red flags wave when we find out *Grist* was founded by Chip Giller, who was called a hero of the environment by TIME magazine. That is sort of like being called a hero of the force by *Dark Side* magazine. Giller is

also a recipient of the Heinz award, another red flag. First given in 1995, it is yet another fascist/spook award like the PEW fellowship, created to further whitewash the various MATRIX projects. It was given in 2000 to Peter Matthiessen, who has since been forced to admit he was a CIA agent. He was the co-founder and editor of the *Paris Review* back to 1953, which he has admitted was his “cover”. If you aren't up-to-date on that, I encourage you to become so. Matthiessen also promoted Buddhism and LSD, two other things I have recently outed as CIA covers. He was a Nepalese Buddhist priest, which he said “evolved fairly naturally from my drug experiences”. I was a big fan of some of Matthiessen's books back in the day (before I figured all this out), and along with Noam Chomsky he was among the hardest for me to let go.

Carol Gilligan is another recipient of the Heinz award, and I remember her for faking numbers to support inflated rape statistics. She was caught doing this by Christina Hoff Sommers, and the proof is in Sommers' book *The War Against Boys*. [You can read chapter one online](#). You may have trouble finding it at your local library, since the fascists have also taken over many of those. At my local library, that book was deleted from the shelves and lists by spooks posing as feminists. You can't even find it in the library computers anymore as unavailable. They don't want you to know it exists.

Another recipient of the Heinz award is Michael Oppenheimer, whose name alone is a red flag. See the Oppenheimer diamond family of South Africa. Notice that Oppenheimer's online bios do not include an “early life” section where we are told his parents. At Geni (genealogy site) the recent Oppenheimer bios are all scrubbed. However, I was able to discover that Michael is the nephew of Robert Oppenheimer of Los Alamos and atomic bomb fame. We are told the bomb Oppenheimers are not related to the diamond Oppenheimers, but I find it curious both families have Michaels and Emils in them. Emil is not a common name, *especially* in Jewish families, so I suspect the links between the families have been scrubbed. Emil is now a common name in Norway, said to be the second most popular name in the country, but of course there are precious few Jews in Norway. Wikipedia tells us there are only 1,500 in the entire country right now. Finding Emils in both Oppenheimer families in the same generations is therefore a big clue. It appears to be a family name, which would mean the families *are* related. Another thing that leads us in this direction is that Ernest Oppenheimer's family is said to be from Germany, but his father and mother are named Eduard and Nanette. Those are French names, not German names. Which reminds us that [Mayer Rothschild got his start in an Oppenheimer bank](#) in France at the end of the 18th century [see listing for Jakob Oppenheimer in that link]. What we know for sure about Michael Oppenheimer is that before he joined the Environmental Defense Fund as its chief scientist and manager he was Atomic and Molecular Astrophysicist at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysicists. You might start by asking how that qualified him to be an environmental defense expert. For myself, I don't see the link. He later became the lead author of the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) fourth and fifth assessment reports. The fourth came out in 2007 and used some of the finessed and compromised data that was divulged in Climategate in 2009. See [this mainstream report](#) as just one example. In short, the IPCC has long been selling Global Warming as another tax-and-spend scheme, despite much greater environmental problems like pollution and food degradation. So finding Oppenheimer on the Heinz award list is just another black mark for them both.

I could go on for hours outing the recipients of the Heinz awards, but you can do that yourself. The point was that it told us a lot about this “environmental” magazine *Grist* Kathryn Schulz was working for. I have shown you evidence it is another fake environmental magazine, part of the hijacked environmental movement which goes back to at least the first Earth Day in 1970. The real environmental movement was infiltrated at that time by various corporate sponsors, who immediately flipped it. To read more about that, see [my paper on the Hippie Matrix](#).

As another possibility for why Schulz received a PEW fellowship (beyond her time at *Grist*), we are told she worked for the *Santiago Times* in Chile “before that”, again doing environmental and human rights stuff. Before that *when*? Shouldn't bios be a bit more specific that “before that”? But hold on to your hat, because if you try to go to the *Santiago Times* website, you find **it doesn't exist**. You reach an empty website with an “account suspended” tag. Even according to the stubs, it was an English language newspaper that wasn't incorporated until 1995 (year one of Kathryn Schulz's career remember?) That's a little bit suspicious, wouldn't you say? It begins to look like Schulz was either awarded her PEW fellowship for working at a temporary spook newspaper, or she got it for. . . well, nothing at all. She got it because we are *told* she got it. As with Richard Bridgman's house and files above, I expect to be told the files at the *Santiago Times* were lost in some fire.

I planned for this paper to be short, hitting the Thoreau connection quickly and then wrapping it up. Every paragraph I think I am finished, only to find another rabbit hole. If I didn't have to eat or sleep, no doubt I could keep writing this paper the rest of my life, continuing to find links between all these spooks indefinitely. For now, I want to use what we have learned so far to return to Schulz' TED lecture. That's what I did, and I saw something I didn't see before. Notice she is wearing a headset. Most people will assume that is just to mic her, but I listened closely to the cadence of her lecture, and I think the headset is being used to feed her the lines. I encourage you to notice how she pauses long and unnaturally, and speaks slowly. This is the main reason her jokes bomb: she has no timing. It would be like trying to read jokes from cue cards: you have no natural pacing and the audience can sense it. As more evidence of that, notice that her eyes aren't really focused on the audience. She seems to be focused internally, which she *is* because she is focused on listening to the lines being fed her.

Another thing I noticed is the way she clips her final words of a sentence, in precisely the same way Obama does. Look for it and you will hear it, too. You will laugh when you first hear it. I suggest this is a modern quirk, one caused by the technology involved. Since if you are being fed lines, you are just repeating sentences as they are being fed to you, and your brain begins to see the trick as a game. Unconsciously, you begin clipping the sentences so that they at least *sound* a little different than the ones you are being fed. Your psyche doesn't like thinking of itself as a simple robot, so it asserts its independence in this minor way.

I particularly send you to minute 5:00, where she is talking about the Coyote and Roadrunner cartoons. Watching Schulz is like watching a computer tell you about the cartoons—a computer that has never actually seen the cartoons but only had secondary data input on them. Schulz says that in every episode, “the Roadrunner runs off a cliff, which is fine, he's a bird, he can fly”. She then says the Coyote follows the Roadrunner off the cliff, but he is alright, too. But wait, that isn't what happens in *any* of those cartoons, is it? In fact, the Roadrunner *never* runs off a cliff. And we never see him flying, because *roadrunners don't fly*. Although real roadrunners sometimes fly low off the ground for short bursts, they never fly off cliffs or up into the sky. And in the cartoons, roadrunners only run. The Roadrunner always tricks the Coyote off the cliff, and the Coyote isn't alright at all. He is normally squashed into a pancake or an accordion or something. If Schulz was going to choose to give us a vivid example to punctuate her points, shouldn't she have mentioned something she was familiar with? Would you talk about a cartoon you never watched to illustrate a point in an important lecture? I wouldn't. To me, this indicates the Roadrunner story wasn't Schulz's idea or choice. It was fed to her. Ironically, it was fed to her by someone who *also* never actually watched the cartoons. Maybe she is being fed lines by a HAL9000 computer.

I think the audience at TED has sensed something is wrong as well by this point in the lecture, since

they are very quiet. Schulz is not only bombing, she is bombing in a weird way. She is so cut off from her environment, she doesn't even seem to be aware she is bombing. She has no look of, "Oh my god, I'm bombing on TED, the biggest stage in the world!" No, she just keeps repeating the lines in her head, with the look of a smug 30-something Jewish lesbian robot. And it is all the more creepy since she is talking about being wrong while apparently being unaware how wrong it is to propagandize an audience via an internal prompter.

That's right, the subject of her little lecture is "being wrong". So she is posing as some sort of moral authority while being the yapping face of amoral or immoral fascists feeding her lines through a wire. The ironies here, intended and unintended, stack to the moon.

But keep watching, because they keep coming. She jokes that she is talking to a room of "CFO, astrophysicist ultra-marathoners", i.e. overachievers, and finally gets a minor response—a response that the guys in her headphones obviously hear, since they prompt her to repeat those lines. But this just acts to remind us that we are supposed to believe these CFO, astrophysicist ultra-marathoners have allegedly paid \$6,000 apiece to be lectured to in slow kindergarten sentences and ideas by a 30-something nobody. She didn't even join the staff at the *New Yorker* until this year, and in 2011 she was just a blogger for *Slate*. Why would any real overachievers show up to listen to this garbage? I have learned more about morality from a single episode of *Sesame Street* than I learned from her TED lecture. As usual with TED lectures, it was 15 minutes of static, an intellectual nullity that wouldn't interest a precocious 10 year old.

But what's it all about? What is the intended reversal of Schulz's lecture? There must be some reason she is up there, even if it is just to propagandize and brainwash a few tens of thousands of the analytically impaired and challenged at youtube. We find out at minute 9:00, with her Beth Israel story. She tells you another boring anecdote in android tones, the gist of which is to *not* to trust your feelings. She has become the anti-Obi-Wan Kenobi. Don't trust the force or your internal barometer of right and wrong. She says if you do, the next thing you know you will have dumped 200 million gallons of oil into the Gulf of Mexico or torpedoed the global economy.

What? You really have to watch that minute of her lecture to believe the absurdity of what she just said. You can't get it from reading about it from me. Is she implying that any of us except the executives at British Petroleum or the guys on the rigs had anything to do with the oil spill? Is she suggesting British Petroleum dumped 200 million gallons of oil into the Gulf because "it felt right"? Is she suggesting someone in her audience torpedoed the global economy on a hunch? Her lecture had till then been listing wildly to the port side, but with that she jumped the shark and capsized. No one with any sense could have listened to another word, and we now have proof the audience was planted. A real audience of real people would have gotten up and left by that point.

But of course that doesn't faze Schulz, who has the amazing ability to deliver any lines fed to her without realizing they have any meaning in the English language. For she continues to sell her thesis of *not trusting yourself*.

If you still don't see why the little men in her head are selling that kool-aid, it is because if you no longer trust your internal sense of right and wrong, the only thing you have to go on is the mainstream story. You can't rely on your learning or instincts, so trust them to tell you what to do and how to think.

And there is more. We get to it at minute 11:00, when Schulz talks about dealing with people who disagree with us. She says many people label those who disagree with them as "evil", or as "distorting

the truth for their own malevolent purposes". She says we shouldn't do that. The trite message is: just because they disagree with you doesn't make them malevolent.

Some will say she is selling moral relativism, but it is actually worse than that. She isn't selling moral relativism, she is actively shielding bad people from prosecution. Given her kindergarten simplification, we would never prosecute anyone, since maybe they just disagree with us. If they think destroying the world for profit is the thing to do, who are we to say no? If they think lying about everything all the time is the thing to do, who are we to say no? It is just a disagreement and we shouldn't force our opinions on others.

As you see, she has once again flipped the world on you, at the bidding of her masters. They don't want you to think bad people are bad, they want you to think *you* are bad for thinking those bad people are bad. If we discover some people *did* torpedo the world economy for profit, for instance, it isn't their action that is wrong; it is *you* who are wrong for judging them. That is where her little lecture is leading.

You see how she is taking all moral ground away from you, by creating her own pretend morality. In the world her masters are trying to create, the greatest wrong is *judging* other people and their actions. You *shouldn't* do that, because if you do you are old-fashioned, authoritarian, self-centered, and tyrannical.

Unfortunately, that would leave all law out the window, since that is what judges do every day. People do bad things all the time *on purpose*, and we know that. Major government and corporate crimes are now admitted by the mainstream, and these crimes didn't just happen. They weren't accidents. The people involved didn't just disagree with you or with the laws of the land. They broke those laws *for their own malevolent purposes*. That isn't my opinion or my feeling, that is the fact, admitted now by both sides and all sides. All those involved may not admit *malevolence*, since they don't see profiting obscenely from other people's losses as malevolent, but they admit they did what they did.

To say it another way, I don't think they are malevolent *because they disagree with me*, they are malevolent because they did very bad things that hurt a lot of other people, and they did them on purpose with no regard for the consequences.

I am not talking about all the fakes and hoaxes I have uncovered in recent papers, mind you, I am talking about declassified projects the government now admits to**, as well as more recent events like LIBOR and other scams, in which the banks and other entities have pleaded no contest and paid huge fines for gigantic crimes. Everyone now knows the scams have been colossal, so for Schulz to pretend that this is all just a matter of disagreement is mind-blowing. She wants you to think that the bankers who just stole your grandmother's retirement did it because they simply disagree with you, or maybe that they did it for a *benevolent* purpose.

At minute 11:15, Schulz says that the need to be right is what causes us to treat one another terribly. Is that true? No. The major crimes of the past decade and century weren't caused by anything like that. The major crimes have been financial: the billionaires and trillionaires moving huge piles of wealth out of society and into their own pockets, creating personal, cultural, and environmental ruin. That devastation wasn't caused by their need to be right. It was caused by their need to steal everything of value and to ignore all the consequences, even to themselves. It was caused not by their belief that they were right, but by their belief that they *had the right* to lie to us about anything and everything to hide their thefts. Schulz' TED lecture is just one more lie in that series.

Which brings us back to Schulz's *New Yorker* article on Thoreau. The one she titled “Pond Scum”, remember? Have you seen the inconsistency, or do I need to spell it out? According to her TED lecture, it is not alright for *you* to think you are right, trust your feelings, or state your case with any self-assurance. That isn't nice. It is just “treating others terribly”. But it is alright for her to think she is right, trust her feelings (or the feelings of her masters), and attack Thoreau viciously and with obvious bias. If *you* wish to control the world, even to the extent of expecting others to obey sensible laws against theft and graft, you are a self-deluded pig; but if they wish to control the world, well, that is their birthright, isn't it?

This is what these people do: they are always promoting the unilateral ceasefire. Although they have been attacking you and yours for decades or centuries, the moment you fire back you are exhibiting ego or intolerance or moral solipsism or something. “Turning the other cheek” is always recommended to *you*, but is never practiced by them. You are supposed to be infinitely self-reflective and self-monitoring and self-effacing, while they are allowed to be infinitely oblivious to anything but their own infinite privilege.

How else to explain the performance of Schulz at TED, where no one seemed even momentarily aware of the towering hypocrisy of the whole event? How completely self-absorbed do you have to be, to bomb like that and apparently have no least clue of it? Any normal person would have crawled offstage shedding a puddle of tears after a performance like that, but the robots of TED never do. They float out of the arena just as they floated in: completely unaware of any world beyond the Teleprompter or script.

I will be told that is an indication of brainwashing or mind control, and maybe it is. After watching Schulz's TED lecture, I am less convinced these automatons are just bought off or prompted. Her emotionless glassy-eyed delivery was nothing like what I had seen with Elizabeth Gilbert in 2009. Gilbert was annoying, but nothing like this. Schulz wasn't annoying, she was disturbing. By minute 12 my stomach was literally turning inside out, and I honestly couldn't go on. Part of me feared that a xenomorph might explode from her chest and go running off through the audience, or that someone might climb down from the rafters, knock her head off with a crowbar, and I would have to watch white android-fluid erupt from her neck and ears. I really didn't want to see that.



*Agents often work at airlines, where they get training in bag handling—i.e. planting things in bags and smuggling contraband. In [my Tate/Manson paper](#), we saw Charles Tex Watson working for Braniff airlines in 1968 as a bag handler while in college in Denton, TX.

**If you are still refusing to admit what I know you know, here is one to start you off: the [Tuskegee syphilis experiment](#). Amazingly, Wikipedia still describes that experiment on its search page as “a controversial clinical study”. Is it now controversial? No, there is no controversy: absolutely everyone admits it was wrong for the US Public Health Service to withhold penicillin from black men known to be infected with syphilis, and to watch them die of it, while they were being told they were receiving free health care. This is just one example of thousands, where there is no way to argue there wasn't some level of malevolence involved.