

# THE WRONG MAN

by Miles Mathis

*First published March 17, 2022*

I got into this in my usual serendipitous way, and I will lead you in the same way I got in. I was looking for an old movie to decompress with, when I noticed a Hitchcock film I hadn't seen before: *The Wrong Man*, starring Henry Fonda. I thought I would give it a shot. I only got about a third of the way in, since it was so slow and since I was seeing heavy propaganda. It is 1950's fear porn, meant to scare everyone straight with a fear of jail. Even if you were innocent, you might be falsely identified by a group of hysterical women, so you should probably be anxious 24/7, especially around women. You should keep your hands visible at all times and never look uneasy or anxious. Be anxious, but don't dare look it.

Hitchcock narrated a short lead-in assuring this was a true story, which I have no trouble believing. Women are notorious for misidentifying people, and we saw just one recent example of that with [Alice Sebold](#). Her bad eyes cost an innocent black man sixteen years in jail. Of course we have seen it goes way beyond that, and men aren't too good at identifying people either. Recent history is made of a million fake photos, and apparently no one before me ever realized that. Which shouldn't give you much confidence in anything, least of the visual abilities of human beings. But women are generally the worst, and I have seen it myself. My girlfriends were always misidentifying people onscreen, mistaking one actor for another, even when they looked very little alike. And I get it in email on a daily basis, as readers—male and female—send me matches that aren't matches. But mainly female. If you don't believe me, ask anyone who works in law enforcement or the courts, whether it is police officers, attorneys, or judges. They will confirm that women are notoriously bad as eyewitnesses, very often being proved wrong. That is not prejudice or misogyny, it is simply a fact. Women need to know this about themselves, since it may prevent further miscarriages of justice.

[**Added March 21:** If you don't believe me, see [this 2019 interview](#) with Brad Pitt, Leo DiCaprio, and Margot Robbie, where they admit they are mistaken for other stars all the time. Margot says she was once mistaken for Emma Mackey of *Sex Education*, and that is actually understandable, since they do look a lot alike—at least when Mackey has blonde hair. Their eyes are very similar.\* But then we hear from Brad Pitt, who says he is mistaken for Leo and Matt Damon and others. He says he has signed autographs as Matt Damon. Leo admits he has also been often mistaken for other stars, including Matt. That's pretty hard to believe, since Brad and Leo have very distinctive looks, and look nothing like Matt. They are all blond pretty boys, but other than that they don't look much alike. And their voices and personalities are completely different, so if you were asking for an autograph you would hear that. And yet we see that people can't tell them apart, even in person. My guess is those people are women.]

But that is not why I am here. It only got me in to even larger issues. I got to thinking how this very much undermines our entire criminal justice system. If people have such poor eyesight and poor judgment, how can courts possibly work? Jurors are instructed to make their decisions “beyond a reasonable doubt”, but since people aren't reasonable to start with, that instruction can't even get off the ground. People also don't tend to doubt themselves, no matter how bad their judgment has been in the past. They always dig in and swear they are right. So juries must already be compromised.

But then I realized it was far worse than that. Jury selection is a farce, though I have never seen anyone admit it. It looks to me like the entire process was undermined from the beginning on purpose, to ensure that juries were completely marginalized. This would allow lawyers and judges to control the process, making juries just another puppet. Just ask yourself if this process makes any sense. You need twelve very perspicacious and honest people to make a life or death decision, so you start by going randomly through the phonebook. You call up a group of people based on their zip codes, and once they are in court you begin filtering out anyone who knows anything about anything. Both sides question them, and if they know anything but their own names and addresses they are thrown out on cause. So you are left with twelve absolute morons who will do whatever the judge tells them to, or whatever the prosecuting attorney suggests.

So, as with voting, the public thinks it is involved in this important process, but actually isn't. It is just another sham. Jury duty, like voting, is yet another fake process invented to make you think are important when you aren't. If you were important, they would pay you for your time, right? Do the judges and lawyers work *pro bono*, because this "is a duty of all good citizens"? No, of course not. So juries are paid exactly what they are worth.

So after the upcoming revolution, this is one more thing to overhaul. We have to throw the entire current system in the garbage and start over. We need a national set of professional jurors chosen on high merit. They should be the smartest and most honest people alive and should be paid accordingly. Their judgments should be monitored closely, and any that begin showing signs of corruption should be immediately bounced.

I have said that there are very few jobs left for smart and honest people, and there is a reason for that: they aren't wanted. In the current system they would only cause havoc. But in a logical system, there would be a lot of jobs for them. This is just one of them.

Our method of selecting judges is also illogical. They should never be appointed, since that just encourages cronyism. Like jurors, they should be selected on merit alone, but they never have been, all the way back to the beginning. American history is littered with extravagantly corrupt judges, and not just in small Southern towns. That is becoming more obvious right now, as Biden tries to appoint the latest Supreme Court judge based on her sex and skin color. But that is just the worst example so far, since we have been sliding into this morass for decades, choosing judges based on color, sex, and political affiliation. If it were up to me, I would disqualify any candidate who had any truck with *either* political party, as a definite sign of corruption. Both parties are corrupt down to the ground, and must be jettisoned in the revolution.

Of course we are quickly approaching the old bottleneck: if our leaders and judges can't be chosen by appointments or voting, how are they ever going to get selected, and by whom? It is indeed a conundrum, since we have to start with some group of honest people and work out from there. But if your average voter can't tell an honest person from a dishonest one, we seem to be up against the wall. If we have a new Constitutional Convention, for instance, where do the people running it come from? We can't allow them to come from the usual places: the Phoenicians and their institutions, or the American aristocracy.

We could overcomplicate this very fast, so let me just tell you one way it could be done. The two main qualifications for jurors or conventioners are intelligence and honesty, the second being far rarer. So we start with the top 1%, based on the best tests we have for such things—not just IQ tests. Based on

tests, based on prior achievement, based on interviews. Then we start whittling that down. First we jettison anyone with any connection to the prior power structures. We disqualify all the top Phoenician families, which we now know due to my research. This is to ensure that the Phoenix does not rise again. We should err on the side of caution, and if we seem to go too far at first that can be called reasonable under the circumstances. That was tough enough, but now comes the hard part: figuring out who is honest and who isn't.

Which brings us to another problem: who is WE above? Who is interviewing these people and making decisions? Doesn't that imply a previous choice? How were *these* people chosen? The font of honesty has to start somewhere, and it can't create itself, can it? The only solution I can see is the natural one: the revolution will already have its leaders, promoted by emergency or luck or fate or most likely by themselves. Some of them may be honest, the majority may not be. Probably they will be more honest than the people they overthrew, beyond that we cannot say. As a first step post-revolution, these people should all be brought together, several thousand of them. Each of them should be told to appoint a lieutenant, and to choose that lieutenant not on personal loyalty but on honesty and selflessness alone. All those people should then get to know each other over a matter of several weeks, in order to vet the group. They should then vote out their hundred most ambitious (ambitious in the sense of self-promoting, not as in ambitious for the country) leaders. Then, all the remaining lieutenants should be got together and instructed to appoint sub-lieutenants from their constituencies, again based only on honesty. That set of lieutenants and sub-lieutenants would then meet and vet one another, again jettisoning their 50 or 100 most ambitious members. If it is agreed by all that none are ambitious, this purge can perhaps be skipped. Only after this last purge should this group begin vetting the 1%.

At any rate, you see what I am doing. I am creating a series of buffers. Not only are these groups buffering themselves based on very clearly established criteria, once that group has been buffered it still isn't judging itself. It was only chosen to judge a *second* group chosen by a completely different set of criteria. We now have the honest judging the intelligent, and thereby buffering them.

And that isn't the end of buffers. Once the jurors are chosen by the lieutenants, the process isn't over. The jurors have to be monitored themselves, so we have to create another group with limited oversight. They would be empowered to remove jurors for corruption.

Already you are seeing that one of the main differences between this new government and the old is the idea of "enlightened self-interest". That never really worked out, did it? Why? Because self-interest isn't enlightened. It is a contradiction in terms. Self interest is narrow and pinched, and is antithetical to the idea of government. We have seen what self-interested governors look like and it ain't pretty. Government is about being civic-interested, not self-interested.

Some will say I am trying to build some new-fangled socialism, but I'm not. This isn't socialism, it is republicanism. It is what the Enlightenment was trying to give us before Marx—the agent of the aristocracy—showed up and began undermining republicanism on purpose with his fake ideals. He was selling you a bottom-up "dictatorship of the proletariat", where the state provided everything. I am not selling that at all. What I am talking about is both meritocratic and hierarchical, so it isn't socialist at all. It is top-down, but with a completely different top. And it is a minimal government, not a maximal. All these buffers shouldn't be seen as a bureaucracy, since they aren't. Any government worthy of the name is going to have regulation, including regulation of itself, but with an honest government that regulation will benefit the little guy, not prey on him further or waste his time and money.

The trick, as you see, is how to get an honest government installed, even after a positive revolution. The current scheme doesn't have too much self-regulation, but far too little. Yes, in some ways we need a far smaller government, but we need a far beefier Constitution and far *more* buffers than we currently have. The tripartite government may have been a barebones start in that direction, with the attempt at a balancing of powers, but it quickly failed and has failed more with each passing decade. The solution to that is a larger, clearer, and more powerful Constitution, as just the first step in fighting tyranny and cooption. It is to give the people far more power, and the military and banks and other companies far less. To achieve that, we also have to quit glorifying self interest, instead glorifying honesty, integrity, truth, and real health.

We have to get past the idea that all forms of government have been tried and that we are locked in to what we have as the best possible. They teach us that we are in the final stages of history, or are even “post-historical” (see Baudrillard, for instance). But we aren't. Civilization is in its infancy, and we have so far done almost nothing. What we know about government—like what we know about science—is almost nil. Most of actual civilization is in the future, and our job is to continue to experiment and try new things—not for the sake of novelty but in search for a better way. We have to quit glorifying ourselves and admit that history has so far been an abject failure in most ways. Yes, we have some things to point to with pride and should not be discouraged. But we should be energized knowing how much is left to do. We have only touched the first rungs of the ladder.

This is why our attitude toward history is so important. If we believe everything has been done many times and that “there is nothing new under the sun”, we can only rot. But if we see and admit we have so far done almost nothing, the future re-appears as the vast open horizon it actually is. You are taught that you are locked in by your past and by your fellow men, but that is the opposite of the truth. You were taught it only to control you and keep you down. That is one of the main things we are rebelling against. The truth is just the opposite. The past is only a measure of what we have so far not accomplished, and a hint to what we can accomplish. And our fellow men and women should never limit us. If they do, we should walk around them as nuisances with all speed.

---

---

And now a tack-on about Lia Thomas, the dude beating women this week in the NCAA pool. This is what no one else is telling you: here is what real swimmers are saying. He just won the 500m free, but by only 1.75 seconds, which isn't much in a long race like that. The headlines are saying he “dominated the field”, but he actually didn't. The girl he beat, Emma Weyant, improved her semifinal time by 2.26 and almost caught him, even though he also went under his semi time. But also notice that he was nowhere near any records in the event. He was 2.5 seconds off the pool record, and almost 9 seconds off Katie Ledecky's American record. Not too good, considering “Lia” is a head taller and about 50 pounds heavier than his competitors. If he were competing against the guys, he wouldn't even qualify. He's 27 seconds over the American men's record. That's an entire length of the pool slower. He would literally be lapped by the guys.

The father of one of the girls he was swimming against said it wasn't Lia's fault. I beg to differ. It isn't *only* his fault, but he is definitely to blame. No one with any integrity would compete in such a race, or accept an award for it. He will never outlive the infamy of it. That is the truth, and things like this can only happen in a culture that has utterly lost any sense of personal responsibility and integrity. A

culture that refuses to see the truth and state it in clear terms. A culture that slips and slides and sashays around, expecting nothing of its citizens or leaders. Letting everything pass as a cost of “getting along”. All I can say is, it isn't working. We aren't getting along, are we? We got along a lot better when we demanded much more of one another.

\*I looked into this further, and it takes us down another rabbit hole. They have [published a split face at Elle](#) which, if real, indicates these two ladies are closely related and are putting us on.



The facial match is exact, as you see. You can't even tell it is a split screen without looking a second time. The eyes are absolutely identical, down to the eye color (grey) and the choice of makeup. They do their eyebrows the same. The nose and lips are also exactly the same, as well as the distinctive jaw. The hair is the same length and the same cut and the same thickness and the same fullness and the same dryness. Even the light is coming from the same direction, as you can see from the shadow below the chin. It is possible someone is gaslighting us with this composite, but if not it is highly spooky. So when Mackey says she and those close to her can't see the resemblance, they are lying. The match is startling once you look closer. Plus, Robbie isn't a natural blonde, either. In the split, you can see her roots are exactly the same color as Mackey. They speak on the same note and have similar accents, one allegedly being Aussie (but not sounding it), and the other being British. Both accents are more mid-Atlantic, meaning shaved off London accents that are still hoity but are slightly flattened into aristo Eastern American accents. I haven't seen much of either woman and I wasn't sure they weren't the same until I saw Mackey walk. She is more knock-kneed than Robbie. Also a few years younger. Also different teeth, but not much different.

But I added this footnote because the facial match indicates a close relationship. That doesn't just happen. You don't just get accidental twins like this. We know all famous actors are closely related, so Robbie and Mackey must be even more closely related than usual. Robbie's mother is a Kessler, indicating the Jewish roots we expected. She is also a Kowald, Bange, Paech, Mibus, Mirtschin, Israel, and Hempel. Her great-grandfather was Carl August Leberecht Israel, indicating an ennobled Jew. These ancestors were from Sachsen, telling us they may have been bankers for the Sachs, or Sachs themselves. This by itself tells us the reason for Robbie's preference in Hollywood, beyond her looks. Mackey's genealogy is not posted, with her parents even being

hidden at Wikipedia and Ethnicelebs. But her full last name is Tachard-Mackey, so her parents are probably Philippe Tachard and Rachel Mackey. Mackey is of course a Jewish name and we have seen it many times before, linking us to Whole Foods and many other things. This likely makes her from the peerage Mackeys, linking her straight to the Stuarts. See John Sinclair Mackey who married Winifred Stuart in 1950. This links us to the Maces of Australia. Robbie is scrubbed on her father's side, so a good guess would be that the Maces are related to the Robbies. If that's the case, these ladies could even be first cousins.

But this match is so exact it begs other questions. Like, were test tubes involved here? That match is so exact it goes beyond uncanny and moves into the spooky realm. Cousins and even twins don't look this much alike. This is in the realm of cloning. Either that or they really are twins, with Mackey's bio faked. Emma's middle name is Margaret, close to Margot, so that may be a clue as well. Emma Margaret Marie Tachard-Mackey. Most normal people don't have five names.