

[return to updates](#)

THE SILENCING OF RON PAUL



by Miles Mathis

The Ron Paul campaign has been rocked by a one-two punch this week, in the form of Ron Paul conceding the nomination to Romney and Rand Paul actually endorsing Romney on Sean Hannity's Fox News show. The timing of all this could not be more suspicious, in that the mainstream media had finally begun reporting on the quick rise of Ron Paul just two weeks earlier. They had been forced to admit—after months of lying—that Paul had won the most delegates from at least a dozen states, including Iowa. Even from reading [only mainstream sources](#), a lazy reader would have begun to get the idea that Paul had at least 500 delegates, enough to make Romney very uncomfortable at the convention and maybe enough to throw the vote into a second ballot. But a not-so-lazy reader might get the impression that things were even worse for Romney and the Republican establishment, since it had also been reported that the Ron Paul campaign had completely taken over many state parties. They had even taken over Massachusetts, Romney's own state where he was governor. Since we are still months away from the National Convention in Tampa, a not-so-lazy reader might get the impression that the Ron Paul campaign might do the same thing in later states like Texas and California. If Paul could flip Iowa and Minnesota given a month or two, why not Texas or California? And if that happened, Romney would be dead in the water. If Romney, then Obama.

Strangely, as soon as all this great news began to hit the mainstream press, Ron Paul gave up. Despite the fact that he had been saying all year that he was going all the way to the convention no matter what and that he had no plans of endorsing Romney, as soon as it began to look like he might win, he quit. That is very, very, very suspicious, as I think anyone will admit.

Any rational person would come to perhaps two possible conclusions about this. 1) Paul never thought he could actually win, and when it began to appear he might win, he got scared. He saw the whole thing as a sort of game, in which he could be a voice from the sidelines, influencing the outcome. But President? Wow, I don't know. He might as well put a target on his head. 2) Once all the other vote stealing schemes failed, the establishment was forced to send in the spooks. If Paul can't be made to quit by the normal means, we will move to phase two. Intimidation. Send in the boys in black

sunglasses to tell Paul they know where his wife shops. Tell him if he continues, all his supporters are going to be in grave physical danger. If he wants to save lives, he needs to be a good little man and fade away.



Personally, I don't think 1) holds any water. You don't run for President without any idea you might actually win. You don't run for President and raise millions of dollars in order to lose or so that you can talk about the Federal Reserve. You run for President in hopes of becoming President.

Besides, we know the spooks are active and that they do stuff like this all the time. This isn't a scene out of a movie. It is well known that the secret agencies are active domestically and that they have grown exponentially since 1980. Beyond that, [the Bilderbergers have said](#) they would like Ron Paul and all his supporters dead. They don't want democracy getting in the way of their plans to rule the world as they see fit. Goldman Sachs and the Federal Reserve can't risk having Paul in the White House. Sure, they could keep him bottled up with politics as usual, but they couldn't bottle up the people who voted Paul in. Any real success by Paul risks a groundswell that frightens even Goldman Sachs and the Bilderbergers. These rich people are psychotic and poorly educated, but they know enough of history to remember the French and Russian Revolutions.



Paul could have countered this threat by going public with it immediately. He could have gone on CNN and announced that he had just been visited by men in black, threatening his family and his supporters. He could have said, "If I, anyone in my family, or any of my supporters die between now and November, do not believe that it was suicide or a leaky gas line in the airplane or bad brakes in the car. And if I am murdered, I encourage someone to take my place and carry the torch. I encourage my voters to vote for whoever continues the fight I have begun. They can't kill us all."

Ron and Rand didn't have the balls to do that. They have talked the talk, but they won't walk the walk. I suppose I can understand. Even Jesse Ventura is afraid to walk that walk. No one wants to die. But

that is the only proper response.

Infowars had a [column by Mike Adams](#) at Natural News up for one day, and then took it down. I like Mike Adams. I think he is good guy and a smart guy, but I think Alex Jones took his article down because Mike suggested that Rand might be a double agent. That is pretty foolish, and Mike appears to be grasping at straws. Like many others, Mike is trying to make excuses for the Pauls, or trying to make sense of something that is hard to handle. But Mike's first guess—that the Pauls have been threatened—was the right guess, and this stuff about double agents is just silly. Mike's analysis of Rand's voice and gestures during his interview on Fox is very good, indicating that Rand doesn't believe what he is saying. But that indicates coercion, not a double agent. If Rand were planning to infiltrate the Romney campaign, he is doing a poor job of it. He is a poor actor, and double agents succeed only by perfect acting. Besides, Mike's outing of him would not help a double agent, supposing that's what is going on.

[Paul Joseph Watson published](#) a Paul Hunter video today from the Ron Paul campaign website, suggesting that Rand Paul had endorsed Romney as a good political move, setting Rand up for a 2016 bid for President. But this is even worse excuse making and storytelling. In it, Hunter suggests that Rand could not succeed with the Republican establishment in 2016 without bowing to Romney now. The problem with that argument? Ron Paul never endorsed McCain in 2008, and yet was doing very well this time. He didn't need the Republican establishment, and was better off without it. If the spooks hadn't threatened Paul, he might have won the nomination in 2012. The other problem is that if Romney wins in 2012, Romney will be the candidate again in 2016, not Rand Paul. Rand is supposed to be endorsing Romney while assuming Obama will win. Why would you endorse someone you think will lose? Isn't the whole point of nominating a candidate finding one who you think will *win*?

An even greater problem with that argument is that it assumes a 2016 run by Rand would be any different than a 2012 run by Ron. If Ron cannot get by the voting machines in 2012, Rand certainly won't in 2016. If Ron's platform is anathema to the powers-that-be in 2012, how can Rand's platform in 2016 get by them? Unless Rand plans to sell out much much further.

You can be sure that most of the states not now controlled by Paulites will firm up their walls against democracy and independent candidates, getting rid of caucuses or loading them down with anti-democratic rules. The establishment will have learned from this close call with Ron Paul, and the next time it will be that much harder for any anti-establishment candidate. I predict the computers will get into the caucuses, if nothing else, detoothing them just like the primaries. For this reason, talking about Rand Paul in 2016 is just another fairy tale. It is the effort to get your mind off the present and into the future, where you are truly powerless. I suggest that at the very moment the spooks were twisting Ron Paul's arm in some dark room, the propagandists were infiltrating party headquarters. In other words, Paul Hunter is a CIA operative himself. This is classic destabilization and decompression.

Now, what can you do about it? Some Paul supporters are talking about going on to the convention anyway, writing in Paul, or things like that. I don't recommend it. As long as Paul was standing on his own legs, I was planning to write him in. But I am not now. There is no point in voting for someone who has conceded. There is no point in writing someone in who has been silenced by the spooks. Even if the write-in succeeded, he wouldn't show up to fill the office.

The Ron Paul delegates should simply leave the party. There should be 500 empty seats at the

convention. Then they should walk over and join Gary Johnson, Jill Stein, or Rosanne Barr. Back to the Green Party for me. But while they are doing that, they should remind themselves that the vote is now stolen by computers. The general election is like the primaries, not like the caucuses. It is done primarily on hackable computers and tabulators, and the vote will be determined by software. Therefore, job one was always getting rid of these computers. Even if Paul had stayed and won the nomination, he could not have won the general election. There will be no democracy with any candidate until the machines are removed. With the Ron Paul campaign controlling the party in some states, they might have removed the computers before the election—and in a couple of states or precincts that may still happen. But with the silencing of Ron Paul, the spooks may have short-circuited that solution as well. The only solution now may be a general strike and popular uprising, where the machines are physically removed from the precincts and smashed in the streets.



To continue studying, I send you to [this page on the Luddites](#). I also recommend you to [this essay](#) by Thomas Pynchon in the 1984 *New York Times* Review of Books.