

[return to updates](#)

Election Night Coverage



by Miles Mathis

Do you see what I see?
Do you hear what I hear?

First published November 9, 2016

As usual, this is just my opinion, formed by using my eyes and my ears, which remain open.

You can be sure I will give you some analysis you haven't heard anywhere else, which is probably why you are here.

If you search on “Donald Trump acceptance speech” right now, the first thing that comes up is a link to [InsideEdition.com](#), and the first thing you see there is a video ad for Xiidra, a drug for dry eyes. You have to watch it before you watch Trump. The first words on the screen in that video are

EYES OPEN?

Coincidence? Not a chance. They have been toying with you this entire election cycle, and although that can be said of every election since George Washington, it has now reached levels that any child could see through. The controllers are saved only by the fact that children—who are the only people left with any sense—aren't watching this stuff. They have better things to do, like eat Play-doh.

The reason I see through it so easily is that I haven't followed this misdirection at all. Last night was the first time I watched even a minute of election coverage, so I haven't been groomed to see only what they wish me to see. But yesterday I was with a friend who wanted to watch Hillary win, so I had to join her for about an hour. Oh, the sights I saw.

Before we get started, let me quell your suicidal fears. As Bill Murray said in *Meatballs*, **It Just Doesn't Matter**. The White House has never been a center of real power in this country, just being a front, but after Watergate it lost the tiny amount of power it once had. Since then, the President has

been nothing more than a reader of the Teleprompter. Beginning with Ford, the President became a cardboard cut-out, propped up only to fool the public into thinking the office still existed in some meaningful way. It doesn't, and they could replace the President with a porpoise swimming in a tank and pushing colored buttons for fish. The effect would be the same.

Besides, you lived through Ronnie and Georgie, Jr. Do you think Trump is any stupider or more obnoxious than Reagan or Bush2? No, he is actually a bit smarter, since he can read from the Teleprompter with marginally fewer speaking errors. He learned that from reading screens on *The Apprentice*.

The only good thing is that maybe all the Hollywood people who threatened to move to Canada really will do so, saving us from having to watch any more of their shite movies. They can become forest rangers or mounties or something, I guess. I hope people like George Clooney, Ben Affleck, and James Franco lead the wagon train out.

To Hillary supporters, I also say this: she was intended to win, so you can take solace in that if you like. More than two years ago when they started pretending to run for President, she was the anointed one. They planned to steal the election for her, and up until a few months ago, that was still the plan. If they had actually counted real votes (which they haven't done in decades), Bernie would have won both the primary and the election. I have confirmation of that from inside sources. But Bernie wasn't intended to win, so he didn't. Of course he knew that going in, so he didn't complain too loudly. This was supposed to be the election won by a woman.

[I don't say any of this as a Hillary or Bernie supporter. I don't like either one of them and didn't vote for either one of them. I also didn't vote for Trump, of course.]

All that went to hell when Hillary got very sick. She may be dying, or not: even now no one can predict things like that. But the fact is she is simply not well enough to make all the appearances and speeches a President is expected to make. She is not healthy enough to be a bad actor. So they had to change the script at the last minute. Instead of giving it to Hillary, they had to give it to Trump. I know that even without inside information, since I can do math. The numbers reported last night were impossible, and everyone in possession of the data knows that.

To start with, they have started doing exit polling again. They quit after the steals in 2000 and 2004, when the exit polls showed up the steals in a spectacular fashion. But in recent years they started doing them again, feeling they were in better control of all the variables. According to all the pre-election polls *and* the exit polls, Hillary should have won by a large margin. Some sources are admitting that today, including some Trump supporters who are arguing exit polls are flawed and should be discontinued. But these planted Trump supporters are flipping the truth, since it is the exit polls that are far more accurate than the numbers reported in the news. The numbers reported last night were simply made up out of thin air by a bunch of guys in a palace somewhere, smoking cigars and drinking expensive whiskey.

I ran the numbers for you in 2012 [in this paper](#), where I showed that the Republican party is dead. According to published mainstream numbers, the Republican party cannot win a Presidential election. It is impossible. They tell us Romney won 48% of the vote in 2012, but I showed you he probably didn't even win 20%. The same applies to Trump, except that I assume it is even worse now. If all the elections weren't determined by computer hacks, Trump would have gotten about 15% of the vote, at best. And that is only because many people wouldn't vote for Hillary against Joseph Stalin or a dry

sack of dust.

At the current moment, they are forecasting Trump will get 306 electoral votes, winning states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Florida. There is zero chance that happened, and indicates an even more audacious steal than the 2000 election. In that election, Bush lost the popular vote but squeaked by in the Electoral College with 271 votes. They are now saying Hillary won the popular vote yesterday by 1.3%, but will lose the election with only 232 electoral votes and 19 states. Again, that is mathematically impossible. They seemed to have understood that yesterday, because when I ran the numbers at almost 3am last night, they were giving the popular vote to Trump. In just a few hours, they have switched that, which is also mathematically impossible. But they should have stuck with the original numbers, in order to match the Electoral College vote and all the states they were giving to him. As it currently stands, it looks like he will win 31 states and lose the popular vote. Does that make any sense to you? I hope not. Check the four mixed elections (by mixed I mean where the popular and electoral votes were opposite) in US history, and you will see this has never happened before. It has never gotten close to happening. It has never happened because it *can't* happen: **it is impossible.**

If you don't believe me, I suggest you study the election of 1876, where Tilden won the popular vote but Hayes won the electoral vote. The electoral vote was 185 to 184, and was of course stolen. But that close margin is what you would expect, even in a stolen election. In the current stolen election, they are saying Trump lost the popular vote, but will win the electoral vote by a large margin. **That is impossible.**

Or study the numbers from 2000. Again, Bush lost the popular vote by .54%, less than half the margin between Trump and Clinton. And won the electoral vote by 2 votes*. While they are telling us Clinton just won the popular vote by 2.4 times as much as Gore did, but will lose the electoral vote by 19 times as much.

But there were many other shenanigans last night you should have caught. They don't fake these things like they used to, and the slop is very obvious. To start with, the Clinton campaign closed up shop more than an hour before they should have. They told their supporters to go home when Trump only had about 240 votes on the board. At that point Hillary could still have easily won. More than an hour later, Pennsylvania still had not been called, and if Hillary had won PA, the election could have gone the other way. Even Google didn't call the election until almost 2am EST. Next, Hillary conceded before any of the mainstream sources had called the election, which is very strange. Only Google had called the election, and we are not sure how they did that 30 minutes before anyone else did. So it appears many people knew how the election could go even before the fake numbers were posted.

And then there is Google. Again, how did Google call the election so soon? Beyond that, why didn't the TV news sources report the Google announcement that Trump had won? I saw CBS report that CNN had called Wisconsin, but neither CBS, CNN, nor the *New York Times* ever ran an update from Google. Google called Pennsylvania 30 minutes before CNN or CBS did, and did the same with the election. When Google called Pennsylvania, CBS was reporting only 97% from the state, with the race too close to call. They showed us a whole panel of experts crunching numbers from every precinct in the state. How is it those guys couldn't do what Google had done 30 minutes earlier?

And then there is that number from CBS, which didn't change for about 30 minutes. CBS couldn't seem to get any updates from PA for a long time, although I got updated numbers online from the state itself. I got tired of looking at that 97% number and went to the state website, where it was reporting

99.24%. Even stranger, CBS went to its reporter live at the Trump room, and he reported 99.24% from PA, even while CBS was still reporting 97%.

Those reports from the Trump room were curious in many ways, not the least of which was that reporter having to *say* that there had just been “an earsplitting cheer” when they were told Hillary had conceded. But we had been watching him the whole time, and we never heard any cheer, ear-splitting or otherwise. The crowd there was obviously planted, and was very poorly directed, since they didn't cheer at the right times. The director seemed to have left the room for coffee at the wrong time, or something.

But let's go back to the TV coverage for a moment. Long before the election had been decided, the talking heads were giving the election to Trump. They weren't *calling* the election, but all the mini-reports were on Clinton supporters crying or what Trump would do first as President, and so on. This was very strange, since at that time they were also admitting the race was too close to call and that Clinton had many possible scenarios for victory (which she did, according to numbers posted on the map). Until Pennsylvania was called by the TV sources at about 2:30am, the election could have easily gone either way, and was basically on a knife's edge. But long before that CBS, CNN and the *New York Times* were prepping the audience for a Clinton defeat. For example, Van Jones came on long before the election had turned and basically congratulated members of the Trump campaign for their win. Very strange. The same sort of thing was going on on Facebook and Twitter. In short, this election steal was extremely poorly managed, and was transparent to anyone paying close attention.

More indication of that was the way Hillary's electoral count was strangely stalled several times, the last time at 215. For instance, although Maine could have been called for Hillary at any time in the last hour, it never was. The same could be said for Minnesota, which they sat on until the end. It was clear to anyone watching that all sources had been instructed to get Trump's number up early, and to sit on Hillary's number. This made it look like Trump had a big lead, when he didn't. It was part of the sale of the election. As I say, in reality, even given the fake numbers we saw last night, the outcome was on a knife's edge until they called Pennsylvania, and it could have gone either way. Looking at the map, I said to my friend that they might be constructing a 269-269 tie, to give everyone ulcers for several more weeks. That was a very real possibility until about 2:30am, when they finally stole PA for Trump.

[Trump's appearance](#) was also strange in many ways. When he walked out, only about two people were clapping. The rest were recording him on their cellphones. They had to play the music very loud to make it look like there was noise in the room. When the music stopped, instead of hearing louds cheers, we hear a few sad whistles and some words that sound like catcalls as much as anything else. When Trump said, “She congratulated *us* on our *victory*”, and paused, you would have expected the room to have erupted in celebration. . . but nothing. Dead silence. Again indicating very poor direction. The guy with the crowd cues must have gone home early. Trump then read from the two visible Teleprompters in a wooden manner, and the crowd was still very quiet. It was the most strange and somber celebration I have ever witnessed. He was up there all alone, with his family and supporters hanging back as if they thought he was an imposter. You would have expected them to be gathered closely around him, hugging him and whooping, but they stood in line way back from him, like Westworld robots.

Which brings us to another problem. Two years ago, Trump had agreed to be the Republican candidate. But he did *not* agree to being the actual President. That is at least a four-year commitment, and compared to other acting jobs Trump has had doesn't pay very well. According to the original script, Trump was supposed to just be the foil to Hillary, making her look good. Since that is very

difficult, Trump had to play his part over-the-top, which explains all the purposely idiotic things he has said. It was all scripted to ensure a Hillary victory, or to ensure you were relieved when she won, at any rate. But when she got sick and the script had to be rewritten, Trump was the only one left in the race. This has put him in a tight spot, and we will see how he gets out of it. To me, he didn't look too thrilled to be President-elect. Pence looked far more thrilled last night, so I would say it is possible they will invent some scenario where Trump retires. I don't know how they would do that without faking his death, but keep your eyes open. We may be in for more hijinx. In the most interesting script, Trump would be assassinated in a fake event, like the Lincoln event. They could then spin that assassination for some political hay. If they had a black do it, it would be a great way to invent a race war. Since we are coming off a black President, it would be doubly potent.

Why would they do that? Because if they invent a race war, they keep you diverted from the real history, the real events, and the real governors. They keep you off chasing ghosts, as usual.

In another scenario, Trump might retire and be replaced by a look-alike. Keep your eyes open for that as well. You will say no one looks like Trump, but that isn't really true. Half the look would be in a matching wig and orange face paint. It is actually easier to match a caricature like Trump than to match some non-descript guy who looks like everyone else, or a handsome guy.

Some will complain that this is all too negative and depressing. It gives you nothing to do. It offers no solution. Hey, there are always solutions, and it is not up to me to tell you what to do. Think of something yourself and do it. I am not stopping you. But if you really need a suggestion, I gave you that back in 2008 in a paper called [“The DIY Ballot”](#). There, I suggested several easy things you could do, with no risk to yourself. Things that would be very effective. But that paper generated very few comments. It sparked not the smallest revolutionary spirit, as far as I know. So when I hear people complain now, I don't take it too seriously. What they seem to be complaining about is that I haven't yet taken over the world based on my superpowers, unseating all the bad guys and solving all the problems singlehandedly.

Well, I'm sorry, but I haven't figured out how to do that yet. When I do, I will get right on it. Until then, I am waiting for some people to join me in these protests. These democratic solutions don't have much effect when just one guy shows up. Protest votes don't mean much when only five real people nationwide are protesting.

But, honestly, I no longer expect to be joined. A majority of people don't do anything and never have. They will sit on the couch 'til the end, which is what the governors rely on. It is why I said above that the race war will have to be “invented”. I guess you understand what I meant by that. There is nothing to fear, because even if they fake Trump's assassination, they will not be able to incite any real race war. Neither blacks nor whites can be induced to do anything, much less fight. They will have to stage the race war, like they stage everything else. They will create it on a movie set and report it to you day by day for months. So you will *think* there is a race war. And you will therefore *act* as if there is a race war, getting scared and buying a lot of stuff you don't need and looking sideways at everyone you meet. Just like now, but a little worse.

So that is another thing you *could* do. You could quit acting like that right now. It would be even easier than a protest vote. You could quit believing all the news you read, you could quit buying all their useless and harmful products and drugs, and you could quit looking sideways at everyone you meet. You could find a lover, end the battle of the sexes, and quit being scared all the time. You could tell the governors to fuck off and laugh in their faces when they look surprised. But my guess is you

aren't up to it. My guess is you are just brave enough to put a Question Authority bumper sticker on your car or to get an ugly tattoo, but not brave enough to actually question authority.

Addendum, November 14: A couple of interesting things have happened since Wednesday afternoon, when I wrote this. One, Hillary's popular vote lead continues to climb, making the Electoral College vote that much more unbelievable. They are trying to misdirect by telling us a lot of those late votes are coming from California, which she already won, but since I don't believe anything I am being told, I don't believe that, either. What it looks like to me is that they have decided to thoroughly wreck your mind on this topic, so that you quit asking for any sense in any future election. They are grooming you to accept this absurd outcome, and even more absurd outcomes in the near future. Not only in elections, but in everything. Remember the Talking Heads album and film "Stop Making Sense"? All part of Operation Chaos, which never ended but continues to accelerate. In just a few more years, groomed in this way, you will accept an election where one candidate wins the popular vote by 70% and the other candidate wins all 50 states in the Electoral College.

In support of that reading of the facts, we find a strange report from the *Washington Post*, dated today. Remember, the *Post* is the CIA's own hometown newspaper. The [title of the article is](#)

Google's top news link for 'final election results' goes to a fake news site with false numbers


And above this title, we find the words **The Fix**.

Hmmm. Why does an article need a supertitle like that? I will tell you. They are admitting the election was fixed right to your stupid face, knowing you are too stupid to figure it out. They are admitting Google is top-ranking a site with fake numbers, knowing you will refuse to ask the question begged: that question being, "**OK, do all the other listings go to fake news sites with false numbers, including the listings for CBS, CNN, and government sites?**" The answer is yes. All the numbers being reported are fake, but they want you think there is some difference between one set of fake numbers and another. Because if they report on *fake* numbers, that seems to imply that some numbers must be *real*. But no numbers are real. You just have the official fake numbers and the non-official fake numbers. Take your pick between fake number 1 and fake number 2. Take your pick between the mainstream lie and the alternative lie.

Also notice that CapitalOne credit card is offering you an "up to" 1% APY in a sidebar ad. Wow, that's a fantastic money market yield right? At a time when the billionaires are making 700% on your own money that they have stolen, they are offering you a 1% yield. Such generous bastards. While they are charging you 25.9% interest, they are offering you up to 1% APY. Such generous bastards.


And in another sidebar ad just below that, MorganStanley says, "We helped Uber raise the capital it needed for a world on the move". What is Uber? It doesn't matter, because the message is subconscious. The word is a reminder of Deutschland *Uber* Alles, Nazis, fascists, etc. etc. It is a reminder that you are living in a poorly hidden Fourth Reich, which has your number at all times. Every page you read, online and off, is a transparent psy-op.

For more indication of that, scroll down the page, where you find this map, entitled "Romney won in 2012".



That makes it look like both Romney and Trump won almost the entire country, based on counties won. But I showed in my 2012 paper Romney's numbers were complete mist. Romney had to steal the primaries from Ron Paul, so there is no chance he had this sort of national support, even among Republicans. Again, the Republican party is a dinosaur. Romney probably didn't pull 20% of the vote totals nationwide, and neither did Trump. Trump was a joke candidate from the start, and most people got the joke—meaning, they didn't vote for him. I am not saying they voted for Hillary, you understand. I am saying they stayed home. The voter turnout is admitted to have been pathetic, but it was inflated nonetheless. Most people stayed home and did something more important, like cut their toenails.

Also indicating a total psy-op is the fact that Googling on “election results” fails to take you to any. I know because I just did it. The front page has no links to any election results. The top result is the one I just commented on, from the *Post*. As you saw, in that one Google is apparently outing itself, by top-listing articles that accuse it of misdirecting you to fake sites. The next nine results link you to articles on “Why we can't accept the election results” at the *Chicago Sun-Times*, where the author reports on people having trouble accepting the results. The next result is on people calling crisis hotlines. The next result is on blaming pollsters. The next result is on stock market responses. And so on. I had to go to the bottom of page three to finally get a link to CNN election results. However, CNN has ditched its running popular vote counter. So has CBS and *The New York Times*. I couldn't find the counters I had been watching last Wednesday. Gone. Finally, I found [an article](#) at *The Atlantic* from yesterday, saying Hillary's lead would grow a lot. But again, no tally, no chart, no nothing. Only this chart on a different subject:



That is from Jonathan Webber's Twitter page, so we may hear later it is also a fake. But it *is* being republished by large mainstream sites. As you see, it contradicts the assumptions of many Trump supporters—including Mike Adams and many of my readers—who are telling us Trump had a lot of support. He didn't, doing even worse than Romney or McCain. That's Mitt Romney, who had [to steal the primaries](#) from non-entity Ron Paul, and John McCain, the man with all the charisma of a pillow full of dust mites.

Anyway, my point was, they are hiding the running vote totals. Why? Well, not because they are worried you will discover she will win by more than 2 million votes and 1.5%, beating Gore's total from 2000 and beating his gap by about 3 times. As I said above, they are fine with that. They want you to get used to accepting it, and accept it you will. No, the reason they are hiding it is they don't want you running numbers like I did, showing up even more glitches in their steal. Who knows, they may wish to flip the popular results a third time, giving it back to Trump, simply to answer this paper.

Many will scream, “Yeah, like they need to respond to one of your papers. Who do you think you are!” Well, they have done it before, and on subjects more important than this asinine election. Wikipedia deleted its entire presentation on tides and started over, in response to criticism of that page by me. The mainstream ditched its first claim of gravity waves and started over, due to one of my papers. It is running new propaganda on O.J. Simpson, John Lennon, Abraham Lincoln, the Salem Witch Trials, and many other subjects, in response to my papers.

Some readers are accusing me of siding with Hillary. But they aren't reading very closely. In recent papers I have outed both Trump and Hillary as crypto-Jews from the ruling families, telling you they are *both* just actors. This would also apply to Bernie and the rest. The entire election is staged to keep your eyes off more important things. It is all bad theater. If you followed any of it you made the cardinal error and fell into the trap, which is why I refuse to spend more time on this. That is what they want me to do. They want me commenting on this absurd election, because if I am doing that I am not commenting on other things.

Other readers have gotten mad, madder than they have gotten over any other paper I have written. Good. That was the point. If you believe anything you have been told by the mainstream (or large “alternative” sites) about this sorry election, you deserve a good slap in the face, to wake you up. Unless you are very young, you have no excuses for your gullibility. It is way past time you unplugged your brain from all the wires and jump started it with some premium gas. Nobody expects you to know everything about how the world works: none of us knows that. But I for one expect you to have realized by now these candidates are phony. People who still take these elections seriously should just

buy a Big Gulp, a box of Twinkies, and go to a WWF wrestling match.



That is a real photo. Not doctored.

Addendum, December 15, 2016: The final popular vote is now in, and Hillary didn't win by 1.5%. She won by 2.1%. That's a very comfortable margin in a Presidential election, and—*based on all past results and prior data*—should have guaranteed an Electoral College win. If we combine that with data from recent polling, including exit polling, we have a slamdunk. Instead, we are told she will get only 43% of the Electoral College votes. That means she will win the popular vote by 2.1%, and lose the Electoral College vote by **14%**. Again, not only has that never happened, *it has never gotten close to happening*. It is so far off the curve and so far outside of any statistical analysis it should be setting off alarms in mathematics departments and statistics departments all over the country. Instead, I am being answered that it was bound to happen. I am being sent manufactured analyses from fake mathematicians, and they are telling me it is not so strange after all. They are finessing numbers to show me it could have been even worse. I say these analyses are manufactured because they always rely on the assumption that one candidate can win selected large states by huge amounts, while the other candidate wins selected large states by tiny amounts. Why can't that happen? Because real elections don't work that way. How do we know? *Because real elections have never worked that way. Even stolen elections have never worked that way.* The fact that it hasn't ever happened or even gotten close to happening should have been the first clue these fake mathematicians were ignoring basic facts.

Since this has never happened and never gotten close to happening, any logical person would assume the odds were very much against it. He or she would then study the numbers to see *why* the odds were very much against it. But no one is doing that, are they? Instead, they are spinning furiously to make it look normal. That by itself gives them away. Instead of asking rational questions of irrational numbers, they are bending over backwards to make those numbers look rational. That is the definition of anti-science. I know because I have been fighting anti-science on my science site for 15 years. I know what it looks like by long acquaintance.

Let me give you some more reasons these numbers should look very unnatural to you. The 2.1% margin in the popular vote was matched in 1976, when Carter beat Ford. That election wasn't considered especially close, since Carter ended up with 297 Electoral votes. That's a 57 vote win. So we should have expected something along those lines for Hillary. We see a 2.1% popular win going with a 10% Electoral win.

What about 1968? Nixon beat Humphrey by .7% in the popular vote, which is exactly three times closer. But he still won the Electoral vote by a huge amount: 56% to 35.5%. So we see a .7% popular win going with a 20% Electoral win.**

We are skipping landslides, so let's go back to 1960. Kennedy beat Nixon by just .17% in the popular vote. But that was still enough to win the Electoral College by a large amount: about 12%.

Before that, we have to go back to 1916 for a close election. Wilson beat Hughes by 3.1% in the popular vote, and won the Electoral vote by only 4%.

What does this historical analysis of real US Presidential elections tell us? It tells us that when the popular vote is close, the candidate who won the popular vote is extremely likely to win the Electoral vote. If he *doesn't* win, he will lose the Electoral vote by a hair. In fact, the only time he didn't win was in 1876, 1888 and 2000, elections almost as fishy as this one.

The 1888 election is the only one that compares to this one at all. There, Harrison lost the popular vote by .8%, but won the Electoral vote by 16%. However, although this one is fishy, it is far less fishy as a matter of statistics than the current one. Why? One, because there were only 401 Electoral votes on the board. The lower the total number, the higher the probability of off-curve results. Two, and more importantly, back then the entire election could swing on one state, and it did. If Cleveland had won New York, he would have won the Electoral vote. The popular margin in New York was about 1%. So the Electoral margin of 16% is deceiving. The Electoral margin was 1% of *one state*.

I will be told the same can be said of the current election, where if Hillary had won Texas, say, it would have reversed the outcome in the Electoral College. True as far as it goes, but it doesn't go anywhere because she wasn't even close in Texas. If we give her enough popular votes to win Texas, her national popular vote gap goes up to around 3.5%. Or, four times larger than the gap in 1888. So, with a pool 26% larger, the 2016 election is about 400% farther off-curve than the election of 1888. Making the current election about five times less likely as a matter of statistics than the 1888 election. Don't get me wrong: I think the 1888 election was also stolen; I am just saying the 2016 election was stolen in a way that was about five times as obvious as the previous record.

To give you something to compare it to, it would be like someone beating Usain Bolt's world record time in the 100 meter dash with a time that was five times greater than the previous gap. He beat his own record by .11 in 2009, so multiply by five to get .55. So it would like someone running a 9.03 100m tomorrow. Would you be suspicious? Well, that's roughly how suspicious I am of the current election.

Those critiquing my analysis above have seized on my use of the word "impossible". They say the current numbers aren't strictly impossible. Well, a 9.03 100m isn't strictly impossible, either, as a matter of pure math. But life isn't pure math. Life generally conforms to previous expectations and results, and when it doesn't we should at least do it the courtesy of being suspicious **and demanding further proof**. Given the current human body, a 9.03 time is *impossible*, so if we see a 9.03 tomorrow, we can assume someone tweaked reality in some way. When I see the current numbers in the election, I assume someone tweaked reality in some way. Those who don't even consider this possibility are the ones you should be looking at sideways, not me.

Addendum addendum: the big news this week is that Russia allegedly hacked the election in favor of

Trump. I told you to be on alert for more hijinx, and they are already arriving. Is there any chance Russia or Putin hacked the US election in any way? No. It is cover for something else. The controllers don't even need to hack actual machines anymore, since they can control the numbers more directly. As I said above, they just make them up out of thin air and then report them via the media. It is all a virtual reality. There is no longer any connection between the voting machines and the numbers reported, so there is nothing for Russia or anyone else to hack. They would have to hack the **report** of the manufactured numbers between Langley and Google, for instance, or between Langley and CBS, in real time. There is no possibility that happened.

So what is this all about? It is difficult to say. If Hillary was sick, maybe she has been cured and they need to flip the results back. So they may be prepping you for that. Or, possibly her illness was faked like everything else, and they had this flip-flop planned from the beginning, just to rock you. They needed a diversion larger than normal, even larger than a Presidential election could provide, so they have something special planned this time. Do I know what it is? No. We will just have to wait and see. The only thing we can be sure of is that it will all be utter BS and that it will be manufactured to keep your eyes off the real action. They want you in these factional political arguments rather than seeing any real truths.

Don't watch the silly puppets. Go find the trillionaire bankers and their investment groups. What sort of tricks are they up to during these months?

*Remember, this Electoral College vote had to be ratified by the Senate, which split 50-50. As President of the Senate, Gore broke the tie, voting against himself. More indication of a fake election and managed outcome.

**These numbers are also highly suspicious, but I won't go there here.