

# 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Clause Found to Justify an Infinite Debt

*by Miles Mathis*

*First published May 22, 2023*

I want to open this one by sharing a nice email I got yesterday:

I've been an avid reader of your history/current events essays for several years now, so I thought I'd like to share a story with you about how you became a minor celebrity at a high school in X.

A few months ago, my daughter who attends an independent high school in X came home and told me that she had a homework assignment to write a report about "real news" vs "fake news", undoubtedly given to her by her woke English teacher. She was given a list of criteria to look out for which would distinguish "fake news" from "real news" and so she set out looking all over the internet. After a few hours of searching on social media sites like Gab and others she asked me if I can point her in the direction of more conspiracy related content knowing that my first response to anything in mainstream media is disbelief, mostly thanks to your essays. I directed her to your site with the disclaimer that while her teacher may consider your content as conspiratorial, she may just find more than she bargained for there.

After reading a few of your essays, and sharing it with her friends who had similar difficulty finding fake news, they all came to the conclusion that your essays didn't contain any of the fake news criteria they were told to look out for, which left them at a loss on how to define it within the narrow parameters of "real vs fake" news. In the process though, all of them and their teacher got exposed to your writing and the teacher even had to concede that your articles are difficult, if not impossible to argue with.

A few weeks ago, my daughter informed me that a group of them now regularly read your work and discuss how the history they've been taught has been corrupted. There just may be hope that generation yet.

---

---

Now for today's stories. The gaslighting continues as major news outlets report Biden may use the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to force Congress to raise the debt ceiling for the millionth time. The problem? No one has apparently read the Constitution since 1868, because the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment has nothing to do with that. Here is the first sentence of section 4, which is the only section that mentions debt at all:

**The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned.**

So you can see for yourself this has nothing to do with raising the debt ceiling or giving the President authority to raise it to any number he likes, just to suit his friends the bankers.

Biden might as well claim he is getting his authority from a lost clause in *Archie* comics, season 12, episode 57.

If the daffy reading of the bankers were to stand, which is that the public debt shall not be questioned under any circumstances, that would mean Congress would have to bow before any debt the Federal Reserve came up with, including a debt of infinity. Which, come to think of it, they pretty much already have. The debt is already so high it couldn't be paid off in a thousand years, which is just the way the bankers want it—since they are earning interest on it. More debt=more interest on the debt=richer bankers and other rich people. It is outright theft from the public coffers, theft from the middle classes by the rich, and it is being covered over with these make-believe arguments about the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment and so on. They even manufacture fake polls, telling us that a large percentage of us are OK with raising the debt ceiling again. Because that makes sense, right? The American people are OK with being robbed blind by rich bankers every year, since that is the American system. It has worked for 250 years, so why change now?

If anything, that clause in the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment says the opposite of what they are claiming, due to the “authorized by law” phrase. The public debt is authorized by law, and who makes laws? Congress makes laws. The President does not make laws, does he? The Federal Reserve does not make laws, does it? Only the Congress can create a valid public debt according to this clause, so everyone else *cannot question them*, including the President, the Federal Reserve, and the Supreme Court. The only way the President can question laws, Constitutionally, is by vetoing specific laws. But a veto is strictly a negative power. The President has no authority to override Congress and raise a debt ceiling.

However, the problem is far greater than that, as you now see. Since it is clear Congress is owned by the bankers, We the People are in quite a pickle. The bankers are now stealing with impunity from us, with the full alliance of Congress, the President, the Pentagon and the media. If you are OK with that, fine, go on as before. But I don't think you are.

---

---

Speaking of fake polls, another one came out today and everyone is talking about it. Problem is, no one on either side is talking sense, since no one is stating the obvious: it is another fake poll. That is the [Harvard/Harris poll](#) of May 18. We should be suspicious of the poll from the first word, since it comes out of the Center for American Political Studies at Harvard, a government front, and HarrisX, ditto. HarrisX was born in 2017 when Nielsen was bought out by the Stagwell Group. HarrisX calls itself a “**disruptive** solutions/service company”. How's that for a red flag? It already looks like a CIA front, doesn't it? Stagwell was created by Mark Penn, formerly a chief strategy officer for Microsoft and CEO of **Burson-Marsteller**. Two of the most evil companies in the world. So do you still trust HarrisX to give you uncooked polling? This is straight from Wikipedia:

**Together with Douglas Schoen, Penn was co-founder of the polling firm PSB Research, whose clients included President Bill Clinton, British prime minister Tony Blair, and Bill Gates. Penn was a chief strategist and pollster in the Hillary Clinton 2008 presidential campaign. Penn is the author of the books *Microtrends* (2007) and *Microtrends Squared* (2018).[6]**

**The company's major corporate clients have included AT&T, Ford, McDonald's, Citibank, Facebook, and Microsoft.[38][39]**

So it just keeps getting worse, doesn't it? Penn's wife is Nancy Jacobsen, founder of *No Labels*, which has been backed by a group of evil billionaires including Michael Bloomberg and Andrew Tisch. Charles Black is a current director, meaning this group is another offshoot of Burson-Marsteller (now Burson Cohn and Wolfe, making it even easier to peg). This means the big lobbying groups like Burson have taken over polling, turning it completely to crud. And this means HarrisX is just the American counterpart of the [UK's YouGov fake polling, that I blew the cover of just two months ago](#).

It is the same thing here, and is just as easy to blow. They admit the number polled is very small, being

about 2,000; and then this:

**Results were weighted for age within gender, region, race/ethnicity, marital status, household size, income, employment, education, political party, and political ideology where necessary to align them with their actual proportions in the population. Propensity score weighting was also used to adjust for respondents' propensity to be online.**

So they are just telling you how they pushed this, though we can be sure there are other ways they aren't telling you.

However, the easiest way to tell this is all faked is just by looking at the reported numbers. The main reason this poll came out is for its Biden approval graph, in which we are told "BIDEN'S APPROVAL HAS STAYED LEVEL AT JUST ABOVE 40% FOR THE PAST SEVERAL MONTHS". The graph shows 42% support for May. To be clear, that isn't approval among Democrats, that is approval among all voters. [But I have shown you why that can't be true.](#) Democrats aren't even 42% of all voters anymore. So even if 100% of Democratic voters still supported Biden, his overall approval rating wouldn't be 42%. Averaging many recent mainstream polls, the country now breaks down about like this:

Democrat	39%
Republican	44%
Independent/other	17%

No Republicans approve of Biden, and almost no Independents do, either. That is why they are Independent in the first place: they don't want to identify as Democrats anymore, precisely because of the Biden debacle. So it is statistically impossible for Biden to be polling at 42% right now. Besides, many other mainstream polls show Biden falling during 2023. So how did this poll miss that? It missed it because it was paid to miss it.

Other recent polls have shown very little Democratic support for Biden running again, which also contradicts these approval ratings. Only 23% of Democrats support him for re-election, so how is that over 100% approve of him? They approve of him but don't want him to run again? Does that make any sense? No, it simply proves these numbers don't jive. They are being fudged. And fudged by A LOT. I did my own math, using mainstream poll numbers, and found Biden's real approval rating was likely **below 10% of all voters.** See the links above.

Equally fishy is their report that Congress has an overall approval rating of 36%. No only is that wildly counterintuitive, it contradicts many other mainstream polls, which have it *much* lower. I mean, just think about it: how could anyone approve of Congress right now, when they are spending like a coked-up maniac during a time of unfathomable losses across the board? Everyone is getting laid off or going broke or committing suicide, so where are these trillions they are spending coming from? They aren't coming from rich people or from corporations. They are just borrowing from the future, which is the same as saying they are stealing it from you and your children and grandchildren. Who approves of that, exactly? I would like to meet him.

Then we get a section on favorable institutions, which is again wildly counterintuitive. We are supposed to believe the American public looks very favorably on NATO, the FBI, Facebook, the CDC, the US Military, and most of all Google. We are supposed to believe Google has a 75 to 16% approval rating. Of course it does, since Google is owned by the same people that own the pollers. Burson and Google are joined at the hip, along with the military, FBI, CDC, and so on. But how could Google

have a positive rating, when the search engine doesn't even work anymore? Are we supposed to believe no one has noticed that? No one has noticed that the search function mysteriously fails whenever you are looking for anything other than porn or pharmacies?

---

Finally, as a tack-on, I want to mention a movie I just watched, out of sheer boredom. *Fight Club*. I have previously noted this as an obvious CIA movie, but I said that just based on the people involved, including director David Fincher and writer Chuck Palahniuk. At Wikipedia, they tell us Palahniuk grew up in a mobile home and is a “distant nephew of Jack Palance (born Palahniuk)”. Really? What



is a “distant nephew”? That is sort of like a distant brother or a distant mother. Do they mean the Palance mansion in Beverly Hills was a long way away from that mobile home? They admit Palance and the other Palahniuks are from Lviv, Ukraine, so probably bankers, not coal miners. They also admit Jack Palance was Walter Polanski while in the US Air Force. So I guess Roman Polanski is another “distant cousin” of these people.

Palahniuk is obviously another rich Jewish guy promoted by his cousins, and it looks like the name is fake since Instantcheckmate tells us he isn't related to anyone named Palahniuk. He isn't related to his own parents. Wiki says his father is Fred Palahniuk, but the only one in the computer is the same age as Chuck, and he doesn't have Pasco (where Chuck was born) on his list. He does have Fairchild Air Force Base on his list. His only listed relative is Rita Aris. Maybe Chuck's stepmother? Impossible to say.

Wiki says his mother is Carol Tallent, but she is not listed that way. She is Carol Meader, and if we search on her we find she is aka Palahniuk, but all relatives have been scrubbed. Why? We also find Chuck linked to DC, though it isn't mentioned in his Wiki bio. Chuck is also related to Maureen Keefe Wiseman, who may be a sister. But she too is not aka Palahniuk. She is linked only to Polci, Timms, and Ruggeroli. Chuck is related to two other Keefes, leading us to guess he is also a Keefe. So we search on Michael Keefe on his list, who turns out to be the same age as Chuck, 61, with many of the same locations. He has a middle initial of C., which may stand for Charles. And unlike these other people, he does have Charles Palahniuk on his relatives list. Also, we find that Charles Palahniuk has a middle initial M., which is probably Michael. Also has Salem, MA, on his list, always a red flag. So I think we have our man.

I even found more of Chuck's aliases. If we search on those Timms, we find a Kenneth Timms, same age as Chuck and Michael, and aka Michael Keefe. Aka Michael Liske, Michael O'Keefe, Michael

Dearaujo, and Michael Timms. Locations include Nevada, Georgia, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Kentucky.

**Kenneth M. Timms**


aka: Kenneth M. Timms, Kenneth L. Timms, Michael A. Timms, Michael K. Timms, M.A. Keefe, Michael A. Keefe, Michael Liske, M Dearaujo, Michael Dearaujo, Michael O. Keefe, Kenneth M. Timms, Michael E. Keefe, Michael F. Keefe

61

\*\*\*\*\*t St Apt 2, Miami Shores, FL

Miami Shores, FL  
Fort Lauderdale, FL  
Carrollton, GA  
Temple, GA  
Miami Beach, FL  
Old Saybrook, CT  
Boca Raton, FL  
Newport, RI  
Pompano Beach, FL  
Ridgefield, CT  
Boston, MA  
Atlanta, GA  
West Roxbury, MA  
Lithia Springs, GA  
Louisville, KY

Maria Dearaujo  
Kate Keefe  
Michael Keefe  
Sharon Keefe  
William Keefe  
Rosa Larralde  
Dean Liske  
Michael Okeefe  
Judy Timms  
Kenneth Timms  
Maureen Wiseman



Palahniuk is gay. And he is a member of the Cacophony Society, outing him as an agent if nothing else does. They organized [Burning Man, which I have already outed as a CIA front](#).

Anyway, what got me writing was the fight scenes in *Fight Club*, which are not only gay, but are absolutely ridiculous. In one, a big black guy is bashing little skinny Ed Norton's head on the pavement. He would be dead. Real men don't fight like that. Even the brutal Ultimate fights aren't like that, since they aren't on concrete. And they say those Ultimate fights have no rules, but they actually have tons of rules. One of the rules of *Fight Club* is to stop if the other guy says stop or taps out, but you can't tap out if you are unconscious, can you? So there is no way bashing some guy's head on the pavement would be allowed. You would have multiple murders every night.

In another scene, Brad Pitt is punching a guy right in the dick. Again, real men don't fight like that, because you would be maimed for life from that. Groin attacks are illegal in all fights, including UFC and MMA, but those guys wear thick protection anyway from accidental hits. But in *Fight Club* those guys are in dress pants.

So to see these gay writers and directors staging fights like that for the film really undercuts the entire story. The whole point of the movie (and book, I guess, I haven't read it and have no plans to) is the absurdity of modern existence, with its IKEA catalogs and airport security and buzzing dildos and support groups, but then we are sold this fight club that only someone who had never been in a fight would buy. We are supposed to believe these sissy boys graduate straight from pussydom to vicious and deadly bare-knuckle no-rules street fighting, with no stop-over in gloved boxing or padded karate or anything. So I guess you see what that means: the only ones watching this and believing it are women and sissy boys. They get some sort of perverted thrill from it, I suppose.

I'm no street fighter, obviously, but I felt mildly soiled by watching this and being treated like part of its target audience. I have been in enough real fights to know they don't proceed like this. Real people try to stay out of fights if they can, and they normally get into them by being blindingly angry. That's how I got into them, anyway. I once hit a guy for littering. I punched a guy in the face for talking on the phone too long. So that's how stupid I can get. But we are supposed to believe these guys in *Fight Club* wanted to get beat senseless, for the fun of it. That isn't the way it works. No one wants to get beat senseless. And no one wants to smash some skinny guy's head on the ground, either. That isn't empowering. Winning against a bully is empowering, but that almost never happens except in movies. And it certainly doesn't happen by some sissy IKEA shopper beating a larger guy.

