

# Is Phil Mickelson a Cad or has the World Gone Mad?



*by Miles Mathis*

*July 4, 2026*

I noticed that Phil's youtube channel was dormant and that he wasn't making any appearances with Grant Horvat or others, so I looked into it. Turns out he was banned from his country club in San Diego for inappropriate contact with a woman and the world is now trying to ruin his life for it. Dozens of videos have been planted on youtube and elsewhere frying him for it, though I don't know why they would be unless CIA has it in for him for some reason.

There is a lot of evidence Mickelson is a crook, having stolen almost a million dollars in insider trading. That is admitted: he had to pay it back to the Feds, though he otherwise skated. And I have shown he is a cheater as well, throwing tournaments for people like Payne Stewart. [We caught him on tape doing that.](#) But his country club buddies were fine with all that, since they are the same sort of people. Rich American businessmen, ie cheaters and thieves who will do anything for a buck.

But in talking to a woman who wasn't his wife, he went too far. Was she the wife of the club President? No, she was apparently an unmarried employee, though Mickelson is married. We are told there was unwonted touching. What does that mean? Do you think he was putting his hand up her skirt in the dining room? No, most likely he touched her arm or something. Mickelson's attorney is claiming there is video showing it was along those lines: nothing criminal. My assumption is he hit on her, but as little as I think of him, I am not ready to fry him for it. I am more concerned about the sexual politics on display here than I am anything else. Because my suspicion is that this is just one more (perhaps staged) play in the long effort to split the sexes, by making all contact between them almost impossible.

You already know why I think that, since I have written about it extensively. You can get in serious

trouble for just talking to a girl or woman these days, even if you aren't hitting on her. She may report you to the police for “grooming” just for saying hi. I was on a bike ride yesterday and asked a couple of teenaged girls in the neighborhood if they knew anyone who needed kittens, and I was somewhat worried afterwards their father would see it and hunt me down as a predator. It happens. That is where we are at as a society right now. I have had old ladies call the police on me for giving away kittens, so I know how the world is.

Young men aren't approaching young women anymore in person, letting the women contact them on Tinder. This is admitted in the mainstream and there have been many articles about it, so I am not making stuff up. At dances or raves the boys don't ask girls to dance anymore. The girls mainly dance with each other, or alone. All very sad, but this is how the governors want it. It hasn't happened by accident. It is population control, among other things.

What does this have to do with the Mickelson event, you may ask. Everything, since it gives us context for reading the event. Given the state of society and the male/female relationship right now, I would say it makes it much more likely Mickelson is fairly innocent. Yes, I think he hit on her, but that isn't a crime. This is Southern California: do you think it is the first time a married guy has hit on a woman? If she wasn't interested in him, all she had to do is say no. That is what would have happened 30 years ago. So why is it now a world-ending event? In my experience, women can generally take care of themselves in such situations, and men are in no position to press, since pressing really is a crime now and they know that. The rule is you are allowed to ask once, but twice is harassment. Did he ask twice? I doubt it, because by the new rules asking once is now enough to ruin your life. Crime or not, all of society will come down on you in unison and post it on youtube if you ask once.

And it may be even worse than that, because guys have been fried with completely false accusations. For all we know, this woman hit on Mickelson, got mad when she was rejected, and made up this story. You will say a woman wouldn't do that, but a woman *would* do that, and has, many times. It is not just the modern man who is a cad, it is the modern woman. He shouldn't be trusted but neither should she.

Another reason I am reading it this way is that if Mickelson had a long history of bad behavior, getting warned many times, the club would have said so. That would be the easiest way to justify his banning by the club: they would say it had happened many times before and Mickelson was known for getting drunk and pestering women in gross ways. But they didn't say that. As it is, it looks like a one-time deal with no proof, and no attempt to justify it from the club, which is very strange, since it would be so easy for them to say that. They must have video or dozens of witnesses, and should have records of previous warnings. But we don't have any of that. Just a one-time she-said event and an apparent huge over-reaction. Which makes the whole story very suspicious. It makes me think the event was either staged by all sides, with Mickelson's cooperation, him helping the CIA with their dirty work in exchange for immunity in other cases; or it was made up by the CIA or some other entity to blackwash Mickelson, for not agreeing to play ball on some other project. Both those scenarios are far more probable than the one that has been reported.

You will say Mickelson is just a golfer: he isn't political enough to get involved in shenanigans like that, either way. But he is. [He got involved in the Charlie Kirk fake](#), loudly taking a side there though there was no reason for him to.

Anyway, the first of those two scenarios is the most likely, since it would make this just one in a long line of Men-are-Pigs stories, which have littered the mainstream press over the past thirty years, going into overdrive with the fake Me-Too Movement. I have shown you a lot of evidence this project was

manufactured by the CIA, with the cooperation of hundreds of famous women and men, starting in earnest with [O. J. Simpson in 1994](#) and Marv Albert in 1997 but later including almost every famous man on the planet, think [Bill Cosby](#), Harvey Weinstein, [Trump](#), [Tiger Woods](#), Charlie Sheen, Gary Glitter, [R. Kelly](#), and on and on. I haven't hit Albert before, so I remind you of this:

**Albert pleaded guilty to misdemeanor assault and battery charges, while a felony charge of forcible sodomy was dropped.[46][47] He was given a 12-month suspended sentence.[48] The conviction was expunged from his record a year later, in accordance with the terms of his sentencing.[49] In an interview with Barbara Walters, Albert maintained that his accuser had requested he bite her. He also denied her accusation that he had requested she bring another man into their sexual affair. He described her recorded conversation with the police on the night of the incident as "an Academy Award performance".[42]**

That's from Wikipedia. Note that, like the other fakes we have uncovered, Albert's record was clean. He was supposedly convicted but that conviction was soon wiped. Also note what he says about an Academy Award performance. Indicating it was all an act. All fiction.

Why? To make women hate men and destroy the heterosexual relationship on purpose. That achieves many things for the governors: it addresses population control but it also creates a lot of miserable people who will then buy a mountain of compensatory products, starting with anti-depressants and a thousand other drugs, but also including gym memberships, comfort food, body alteration, security systems, prepper gear, and ever more police and military as protection.

Yeah, it's all coming back to you now, isn't it? So you see why I am not reading this Mickelson event like everyone else. Which means that the answer to our question in the title probably is: NEITHER. The world hasn't gone mad, it has been *driven* mad on purpose by CIA projects designed to split us, confuse us, and ultimately destroy us. And the problem isn't men talking to women. The problem is men NOT talking to women anymore, and the reverse, except to scream and fight. Which leads us to the final use of this project to the governors: they want men fighting women, blacks fighting whites, gays fighting straights, and all other factionalism, because if we are fighting one another our eyes are off them. Far better from their point of view to start and maintain a constant civil war, than to face a revolution.

---

---

As a tack-on, I want to hit something related called [Vocal Fry](#), which the mainstream has finally noticed. I have been talking about it for thirty years, but I guess people are just now catching up to me. It is that women's voices have changed since the 1990s, becoming louder, buzzier, and more annoying. I called it quacking, because it has a sharp, penetrating edge like a duck quacking or a donkey braying. In the current explanations, it is described as mostly being about a descending ending to sentences, with a bit of gravel at the end. But it is much more than that, since it affects the entire speech, not just the endings. And as you see from that link, it includes eye movements, head movements, and hand movements, all maximized to annoy.

In the distant past, most women who got out of the house tried to have a pleasant, soft, flutey voice, since it was pleasing to the ear and ingratiated them to both men and women. Think Grace Kelly or Audrey Hepburn. After all, why would anyone of either sex wish to have an unpleasant voice? But after militant feminism arose big-time in the 1970s, all that was out the window. A certain segment of women no longer cared about being pleasant or attractive, they cared mostly for being heard, and a sharp buzzy penetrating voice does that best. If it is unpleasant, so much the better: it guarantees you

are noticed, if nothing else. It cuts through a room like a buzzsaw. The closet man-hater and lesbian Katharine Hepburn had already perfected it in the 1950s, but her example wasn't widely copied and expanded until decades later.

By the 2000s it had already degenerated further: women now tried to one-up each other in unpleasantness in look and in sound, to show how independent they were and how little they needed men. By then the vocal fry had already infiltrated the newsrooms and Hollywood, with major actresses and female anchors quacking away loudly and aggressively, sending all men scurrying from the room. This is just one more reason mainstream news and Hollywood have gone down the tubes: all straight men left long ago, since they can't bear the timbre.

And except for that unforeseen side-effect, all this has been planned as well, just like the Men-are-Pigs project, being a subset of it. This voice was purposely pushed and perfected by CIA and Hollywood and media to split the sexes. CNN and Fox and all the rest didn't have to hire all these noisy, unattractive people, male and female, but they did and it was no accident or greater movement of history. It was part of the long project. It is no accident the Kardashians are the most famous pushers of vocal fry (though far from the worst examples), since they have always been a CIA project. You should have always asked yourself where these people came from: what were their skills, their resumes, their prior achievements, their claims to fame? There is none of that, just promotion of rich people because they are rich and annoying and divisive. They set wildly bad examples for young women, so they are perfect for the project.