

Twelve Lost Generations



by Miles Mathis

January 15, 2026

[A few hours after publication, and this paper is already ranked #1 at Yandex on the search “Lost Generation Savage”, ahead of Savage's own paper, which I am commenting on. But of course Google was onto me immediately, delisting me completely. But I noticed something else in that comparison. Yandex only lists me, Savage, and Eugyppius.com, with all other tops results being on Hemingway's Lost Generation. But at Google, we find Savage listed #1, Reddit #2, Matt Taibbi at RacketNews #3, then Matt Breunig at PeoplesPolicyProject, followed by DennyBurk at X. Substack then chimes in with Tara Henley and then Chris Rufo, and then we find Jacob Wright at Facebook. On a second look, I see that Breunig is listed at Yandex, but all these other places are not on the top five pages of results. Which means? Well, since Yandex is reporting just based on hits (as it should and as the other search engines used to do), it means these other sites and people like Taibbi, Wright, Burk, Rufo and Henley are being promoted and boosted by Google. Bing currently lists me at #11, though I think that is just an oversight. I expect them to delist me. Yahoo already has.]

Today I want to comment on Jacob Savage's article [from last month entitled “The Lost Generation”](#). I know I am a bit late, since everyone and his sister has already chimed in, but that is how it goes over here. I don't know anything about stuff like this until some reader nudges me, because I normally have better things to do than be pushed around by the algorithms that are clearly promoting this. And why would the algorithms be promoting this article that seems to be against-the-mainstream on DEI? **Because it is cloaked misdirection**, as usual. Yes, I have a different reading here than any other you will find. Otherwise I wouldn't bother.

We start with some weirdness, since AI won't run the search for me, telling me regarding "Lost Generation Savage", that

I can't answer this request. My responses are designed to be safe, respectful, and compliant with ethical principles. You may ask another question.

So that's how useful AI is: it can't even judge a search, just locking down on "safety" issues on a large percentage of searches. Its programmers are so scared a search might take you to an unvetted source, they default to censorship at the mention of the word "savage", I guess.

Savage's title is also strange, since he doesn't seem to be aware he is re-using a Hemingway title, or that there was a previous Lost Generation more than a century earlier. I myself beat him to the punch in 2013, with my much superior article "[The Stolen Century](#)" on this subject, or a related one, where I showed it wasn't a generation stolen, but an entire century. You can read that once you finish here.

Savage is, by his own admission, a 40-year-old liberal white male failed scriptwriter from Hollywood, Jewish I assume, and he is a good writer, if by good you mean chatty, polished, and having the appearance of openness. But if you want some real information, you won't get it because that isn't why he is here. Like AI, he blinks out in the presence of any truth, though he diverts rather than fading to black. That is because he and I are completely different types of writers, despite both of us calling ourselves liberal. I am a very old-school liberal—you might say nearly extinct liberal—because I use the 18th century definition of liberal. That was when liberal and meritocratic meant the same thing, since they both meant you were against aristocrats and old families getting all the jobs, money, resources, promotion, and other preferment. Meritocracy would allow the talent to rise, no matter where it came from: any sex, any color. That was once not just liberal, it was revolutionary. But Savage obviously isn't that sort of liberal. He is a Modern faux-liberal, having bought into the various post-War projects of dissolution posing as progressive. Destruction of the family posing as progressive, destruction of the male posing as progressive, and so on.

We know Savage is coming from there because he stays away from those questions like they are radioactive—which they are. His article is sold as hard-hitting, but it is squishy in the extreme, keeping you far far away from any reality. Here is his opening to part 1:

It may be hard to remember now, but a decade ago the prevailing [critique](#) of American journalism was that it was woefully lacking in gender and racial diversity.

What? I think I can remember back to 2015, and nothing, *especially* journalism, was old-school then. The CIA had completely taken over all media by the 1970s with Operation Mockingbird, and they had been pushing multiculturalism since then, by one name or another. Everyone knows that, so Savage must just be talking to people on ventilators, or too fried from their boosters to call him on anything. It is beyond belief he would say something like and expect it to stand. I guess because he is pretending to defend Millennials, he thinks only Millennials are reading and that they are idiots who will believe anything. Hard for them to remember back to the old days, you know, 2015, almost back to the dinosaurs.

Five sentences later, he says,

At *FiveThirtyEight*, Nate Silver [complained](#) about a gender gap so severe that only 15

percent of applications were from women.

But wait, how do **applications** indicate anything about diversity or equity? Is it anyone's fault 15% were from women, other than the women applying or not applying? Women were free to do whatever they wished in 2015, so if they weren't applying it must mean they didn't want to work there. Should we create a DEI program to *force* them to work there? No, this statistic proves the opposite of what Savage intends: it proves that this had nothing to do with fairness, equity, diversity, or inclusion. Assuming all qualifications were equal, fairness and inclusion would demand 15% of hires be women, right? But about 50% were women (I guess, hard to tell), meaning it was men who were in need of DEI even then.

Then Savage tells us the story of Andrew:

“In any progressive space, there was always at least some concern about representation,” he [Andrew] explained. “I did not see that in any way impeding my advancement for ... the first six or seven years of my career.”

Why would he be worried about being impeded, when “fair representation” demanded 85% hiring of men, because 85% were applying? But Savage misses that logic, of course, standing it on its head. He had to, because Andrew's boss at *New York Magazine*, David Haskell, also pretended to miss it. His job was not “fair representation”, it was getting the percentage of white men down as far as possible. Crushing white men and pretending it had something to do with diversity. So to begin to unwind this, let's look a bit closer at Haskell. He comes out of Queen's College, Cambridge, indicating a spook in training—especially for an American. He was placed in *New York Magazine* almost immediately, in 2007 at age 27, and I remind you that mag was always spooky, but especially after 2004 when it was bought by Bruce Wasserstein, CEO of Lazard, at which point it just became a subsidiary of the banks. At that time Wasserstein brought in Adam Moss as the new editor, Moss coming from *Esquire* magazine, which had been nothing but a CIA front for years. In 2019 it got even worse, as *New York* was bought by Vox, which doesn't even try to hide it is CIA, Vox being one of their imprints and favorite words, like Apple. Since then, *New York* incorporated the websites *Intelligencer*, *The Cut*, *Vulture*, *The Strategist*, *Curbed*, and *Grub Street*. I trust you can see all the markers there without my help. If not, look up what intelligencer means.

Savage continues:

In the aftermath of George Floyd’s death, newsrooms tripped over themselves to stage a “reckoning.” *The New York Times* solemnly promised “sweeping” reforms—on top of the sweeping reforms it had already promised. *The Washington Post* declared it would become “the most diverse and inclusive newsroom in the country.” CNN pledged a “sustained commitment” to race coverage ...

Well, they would, wouldn't they, since they are all mastheads of the CIA. *The Washington Post* has long been known as the CIA's hometown newspaper, and CNN was built from the ground up from the offices in Langley, same as *USA Today*.

Next Savage admits that by 2021, 78% of new hires at NPR were people of color. Which means 22% were white and most of those were women. So, what, maybe 5% white males, and all those are gay? Since 62% of the US is white, 5 times more than it is black, that means men were under-represented at NPR by 6 times. Not 6%, but **6 times**. You may want to ask how that is fair representation in an organization that claims to be National and Public and that is underwritten by taxes. It not only isn't

fair representation, it is grossly illegal. One place that Trump is right by the way, so why isn't his Justice Department prosecuting these people for major Civil Rights violations? Shutting them down isn't enough: fairness demands they be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

In 2024, *The Atlantic* announced that three-quarters of editorial hires in the past year had been women and 69 percent people of color.

So, about 7% white men, and we may again assume a large percentage of those are gay. And the *Atlantic* wonders why its readership has crashed. No men are reading it. They lost 30% of any potential readership off the top. I assume no men of color are reading it, either, so make that 49%. But it is even worse than that, since this magazine was originally for professional urban whites, trending liberal, sure, but still white and relatively rich. So you now have a lot of black women, many of them gay, writing for that crowd, which is a guaranteed miss. They have lost their white female readership with the male; and most black folks aren't reading the *Atlantic*, either, and never will. So they are left with nothing but a paycheck from the CIA and faked subscription numbers. And just because this magazine is private doesn't mean it is immune from prosecution for Civil Rights violations. Private companies are *not* allowed to hire whomever they wish, flouting all laws against discrimination that have long been on the books.

But let's dive even deeper. To get right to the nut, notice how Savage avoids asking *why* these white men that ran academia and Hollywood and Big Business and so on suddenly quit hiring white men and began hiring anything but white men, **ignoring all laws to do it**. How is that even possible, given that we are supposed to be a country based on laws? The article begs that question from the first sentence, but Savage steers you in a beeline *away* from it, tacitly assuming they did it as a nod to fairness. They just couldn't stand the Old World anymore, especially after the George Floyd incident. But you should have stopped right there, because no rational person would assume that. It goes against expectation and all history, so it requires more than just a tacit assumption or a one-line bald assertion. For one thing, many of these men weren't and aren't liberal, despite running these big companies or academic departments. Some may pretend to be, but on a closer look most come from these same old families I have been outing for two decades, as we just saw with Haskell. So it would be naive to let pass the argument they were suddenly so concerned with this sort of fairness, especially when there is no argument made.

Savage gives you proof of my thesis, not his, though he passes by it at speed:

As for Richard Locke, the provost who spearheaded Brown's Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan? In 2022, Locke left to accept a sinecure as dean of Apple University, Apple's in-house personnel training facility. "In all searches, there has been consistent attention to diversity and inclusion," he bragged in a valedictory [interview](#). His replacement at Brown was—who else?—another 60-year-old white man.

What Savage doesn't mention is that Locke is also CFR, ILO, and IFC, proving my point. Not liberal; ultra-conservative or fascist. Locke also divorced a woman and married a man in 2014, Zairo Borges Cheibub, who came out of the rug industry (textiles, you know) but somehow ended up as a Senior Fellow at Brown and then a Specialist at the MIT Center for International Studies.



I say “somehow”, but I know how: **Borges=Borgia**, so Cheibub is Phoenician Navy, like his husband Locke. These assholes weren’t hired by the universities to promote minorities, moving up the academic ranks in natural ways, they were **installed** by CIA or CFR or the Pentagon to advance much larger projects. Which of course explains how they could ignore all laws: laws don’t apply to CIA or the Pentagon.

The reason these projects have now reached fulfillment and saturation is precisely because CIA has achieved such penetration of society, including the universities, where they now run things from the top. You are looking at a Matrix, a full-spectrum onslaught 24/7 from all sides, in all quarters. Everyone you see has been bought off. And Savage has been bought off to keep your eyes off that. Via his style of Mesmerism, you are supposed to think that DEI arose naturally out of progressive politics, building from grassroots movements of the 1960s or something and finally taking over boardrooms at Budweiser and Apple and Boeing, the CEOs and shareholders deciding equity couldn’t wait another day, profits be damned.

Well, what else could it be, Savage will answer. Well, my readers know, because I have been telling them for thirty years or more: it is Operation Chaos, or its continuation or acceleration, and it didn’t start in 2014. That’s just Savage’s second biggest feint here: pretend this started just a decade ago, when it started way back in the 1800s, jumped in the 1920s, jumped again after WWII, and then went into overdrive in the 1980s, going more and more vertical since then. I am 62, certainly not one of his Millennials in this current Lost Generation, but I have been feeling this all my life. I was born into it, steeped in it as a boy, dunked head-first in it in college, and then fully hatched into it after graduation, where I found all doors in creative or academic fields closed to me not only because I was white and male and straight, but also because I was not Modern. Despite being liberal and generally pro-woman and pro-black and so on, I was fiercely anti-Modern in all other ways, meaning I had no use for Modern art, Modern science, Modern literature, or anything else. And not because they included women or blacks or other minorities, but because they were garbage and I had no desire to create garbage and pass it off as art or science. I was determined to do the real thing and let the world hang . . . which, as you know, I did. Savage admits he is a failed scriptwriter, but I consider myself a wildly successful artist and scientist, despite gaining very little money or fame for either of them. I have done far MORE than I ever hoped or dreamed I would when I chose this path in my twenties. But that’s just another way I am not Modern: I don’t value myself or anyone else by how much money they make or

how famous they are or how many awards they have. I value them by their achievements.

Savage's next feint is the pretense this had something to do with the George Floyd event, but it can't have had anything to do with that, because that was faked by the CIA or some other entity. He wants you to believe all the universities, corporations, and Hollywood took the Floyd death very hard, changing all their policies in answer to it, but that is absurd. Obviously, the event was manufactured expressly to be used to accelerate projects already in place, and Savage uses it in the same way, taking it as the tocsin for his DEI revolution. But in reality, nothing really changed then. The old project bumped up another notch, yes, but since it had already been on full volume for decades, it was hard for most to notice.

You will say, "OK, that's true, but I still don't get it. These old white guys couldn't have done this because they were so in love with fairness, or because they felt obligated to minorities, but why would they stop promoting their own, after decades or centuries of doing it?" **Because they were ordered to.** They were company men, and this is what the company decided to do, long long ago. Why? I have told you that many times: in the New World Order, men are seen as dangerous, and straight white men most of all. Big things were being planned, and the governors were worried about revolution or pushback. They saw some of that pushback before the World Wars, and even more after the wars, as men from their own class stood on principle against the anti-democratic schemes of the day. These men were the most forceful writers and speakers and they were considered a very real danger. That is also admitted in Savage's article:

Jeffrey Goldberg, the editor-in-chief, was candid about another, less comfortable reality. "It's really, really hard to write a 10,000-word cover story," he said in that same interview. "There are not a lot of journalists in America who can do it. The journalists in America who do it are almost exclusively white males."

Huge centralized projects were put into place to push as many of those men into line with the government, and to crush the rest. This became the new main domestic goal of (parts of) the military, Intelligence, and academia, each targeted to corralling their specific type of white male. All three tried to recruit me, but I slipped their nets.

So the crushing of white men was not a side-effect of DEI, as Savage implies. He takes it as given that DEI was about promoting women, blacks, and other minorities. But it wasn't, which is why the drop in standards didn't really concern anyone. They never thought diversity would lead to better work, and knew it wouldn't, but that didn't matter because it was a write-off. The goal was the marginalization of males, and especially white males, and especially intellectual or liberal or intelligent white males. This would save the governors from revolution, and it has. So far.

For that's the third major feint of Savage: he never asks where all these men went. He talks about us only as percentages, or as a handful of first-name examples. He admits that he himself gets by only by scalping tickets, which is bad enough. His other examples also got by, "Andrew" by becoming a senior reporter and then taking a buy-out at 40. But his percentages beg a huge question: this represents tens of millions of white men, and he admits they had nowhere to turn since DEI took over all professional fields at the same time, so where did they all go?

The white men shut out of the culture industries didn't surge into other high-status fields.

That is one of his bullet points, printed in big letters. He says some ended up on Substack. Yeah, maybe a hundred. Others went into crypto or computers or podcasts. But again, that's just a few. So why doesn't Savage ask that question? Why does he very conspicuously dodge it? Because it is so unbelievably tragic, it can't be addressed without exploding his whole paper: it is a genocide unto itself, existing completely in the shadows even after his "ground-breaking" paper. Ten of thousands of suicides, tens of thousands of slow deaths by Fentanyl or other drugs, tens of thousands drugged up on anti-depressants by their own "doctors", tens of thousands thrown on the streets, tens of thousands forced to live in their parents' basements, never to arise again. While the "tragedy" of a trans-swimmer having to return a medal makes the front pages nationwide, this male genocide passes without comment or report. We had it coming, you know, as payback for . . . history.

Near the end, Savage says

The DEI departments have mostly shut down or quietly rebranded. The mountains of reports and glossy PDFs have been quietly scrubbed, as if to hide the evidence. What was the justification for gutting the American meritocracy? No one seems to know.

More misdirection. They haven't shut down, they have just gone into hiding until Trump moves on, at which point they will re-coalesce in even more virulent forms. Trump will just be the excuse for a huge "backlash", which will be a further acceleration of the program. And notice that Savage does just what I told you he was doing: pretends no one knows why any of this happened. **It's a big mystery!**

[Even that "American meritocracy" is misdirection and hypnosis, since America was never a meritocracy. It just went from a plutocracy cloaked by a republic to a plutocracy cloaked by a manufactured socialist vaudeville, but the most qualified white men were never running anything, back to the beginning. Only the most rapacious and criminal men from the same old families were running the world, back to the time of Adam, and they still are.]

Here's all the outrage Savage can muster in his conclusion:

Mostly I'm annoyed at myself. Because instead of settling down, proposing to my then-girlfriend (now wife), and earning a steady income that might support a family, I spent a decade insisting the world treat me fairly, when the world was loudly telling me it had no intention of doing so.

Ah, so *he blames himself*. Not the minorities who took the jobs they weren't qualified for and then made a hash of, not the fascist old white men who destroyed the entire culture on orders from their cousins above them, and certainly not from the hidden Phoenician Navy overlords who crafted this project to protect themselves from revolution. No, it was his own fault for expecting to get a job anywhere but McDonalds or Walmart or Home Depot.

So now you see why Savage's article was promoted. He was hired by his fascist cousins to do their dirty work, since at least he can still write. And because he is so desperate for money and so devoid of all remaining scruples, he will write whatever he is told. It's better than being a scalper, right? Don't believe me? Well, where was this article published? Compactmag.com, which I have never heard of so I researched it. Came out in 2022, with glowing blurbs from *Vanity Fair* and *The New York Times*. Oof, not sounding too good, is it? It doesn't get any better, as you can see from their "[Who we are](#)" [page](#). The editors are a bunch of Harvard and Princeton people, writers for the major mags, one of whom specializes in queer theory. So not exactly the opposition in this DEI question. Proving this

article is simply another example of controlling the opposition, as I have told you it was.

You know who else is controlling the opposition? Well, pretty much everyone on both sides, including so-called conservatives like the Jewish Ben Shapiro in his yarmulke here:



What is he saying [here, at Youtube?](#)

The grievances of white men are not justified. “Here are things you can do: finish highschool, get a job, get married, have kids, go to church. All those things are under your control. You pretending those things are not under your control are grievance-culture bullshit”.

So again, as a white male who expects the world not to crush him, [you are to blame](#). Having any expectations is bullshit. Take whatever job is offered to you, even if it is driving a garbage truck, and get on with it you pansy. Sure, Jacob Savage has admitted there are no white collar jobs for white males, and that this has been done on purpose, but don't imagine that there is any conspiracy, since that is just a hallucination. Marry a rich girl or convert to Judaism and you will be fine. Oh, and Langley is hiring.

Besides, what would Shapiro know about getting a job? He was promoted by his cousins by the time he was in kneepants, having a nationally syndicated column as a freshman in college at age 17 and his first book accepted at 19. Based on what qualifications? He was just that good? No. No 17-year-old has anything to say that anyone would want to hear, especially concerning politics, and his “work” has always borne that out . . . and still does. He has always just been a fast talker selling scripts, one side of the promoted schism, which doesn't really qualify as a job. It is just yapping. No one likes this guy, not even his “allies”, but they can't not promote him, I guess because he is a Cohen. They are conspicuously hiding his parents at Wiki, and [his Geni page is recently 404ed](#). Ethnicelebs also hides his maternal line, though they have some info on his paternal, who are a bunch of rabbis. So it may be even worse than Cohen, being Hiller or something.

Shapiro slurs over another thing, of course: like getting a job, getting a wife is not so easy anymore, either, because that was part of the same program. How to crush a straight white male? Take his job and his wife (and his religion) away from him. Strip him of everything. I remind you they closed the

churches during Covid, which had nothing to do with Covid, it being just a further turn of the screw here. But that is nothing compared to the loss of wife. As in everything else, the white marriage was targeted above all others, especially the urban, professional marriage, and even more the liberal urban professional marriage, which hardly exists anymore. That was exploded down to constituent pieces decades ago, and has been little more than a mist since then. So I am not sure who Shapiro is talking to. Yes, working class or blue-collar men can still get married, and some do, and some conservative professional men find wives, for a time, but everyone else has gone gay or celibate. This was done on purpose to crush old-style liberalism, meaning opposition to the ruling class. Everyone not onboard with the military-industrial complex, corporate America, and the propaganda state was targeted for extinction, and the extinction event was centered on the white male.

So Savage's article is just a continuation of the project: avoiding revolution by men by trying to keep your eyes off the enormity of their crimes against you. According to him, this is just a natural movement of history, and it's your fault anyway for not getting a job and a wife—although no one offered you a job and no woman said yes—she was too busy being crushed and going insane for her own reasons. He wants you to believe this wasn't a longterm project, that it was an organic progression, propelled by evermore savvy minorities and evermore successful organizing by special interests. Though it obviously wasn't. Why were these minorities so much more successful after 1980, when they had never been successful before? Well, we now know it is because they were promoted by CIA and other government and institutions, so you should ask why they were promoted that way? The CIA and CFR just love diversity, equity and inclusion? Since when? When did the rulers—who are still ruling—ever give a fig for diversity, equity, or inclusion? Do we have any evidence they saw the light there? Do we have any evidence they now value woman more than ever before, for instance? Is that why they are trying to define her away? These DEI leaders pretend they don't even know what a woman is, so how could they value her?

No, the truth is, they don't value women any more than they value men, or value blacks any more than they value whites. They only value people who will do what they are told. They value grovelers and lickspittles, with everyone else targeted for extinction. They have been under the impression women are more likely to do what they are told, though I am not sure where that idea came from. Must have come from a gay man. But that is why they have favored women so far. Also why they favor gays. Also why they favor other minorities, who they think will be happy to get what they can. Which explains replacement theory even better than the voting argument, as you see. They prefer powerless people, and these sad immigrants are mostly powerless.

Oh, and by the way, often mentioned now in the same breath as Savage's article is Jeremy Carl's book *The Unprotected Class*, covering the same topic in the same way, but at greater length. What you need to know there? Well, other than that it was promoted by Charlie Kirk before his faked death? Carl is Jewish and was a research fellow at the Hoover Institution, now being at the equally fascist Claremont Institute. He was Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior in Trump's first term. The book was published by Regnery, an imprint of Skyhorse, formerly Salem Media Group, and Skyhorse is run by Tony Lyons. Wow, how many red flags just popped up there? The current King is a Lyons through his grandmother. So if you thought Carl might be on your side here, think again. Claremont was founded by students of superspook Harry Jaffa, Jewish of course, and almost certainly CIA. Jaffa was close friends with Bill Buckley, since outed as CIA. But who wasn't? So Carl is running the same eyes-off misdirection Savage is, admitting the facts to some extent, but diverting you away from the real crime or the real criminals.

I said above that they have so far avoided revolution, and that is mostly true. But not entirely true.

There is a revolution going on mostly hidden from you, though we have seen signs of it occasionally. Strange events in the news that pass quickly, aren't explained, and have no updates. Fires, explosions, unexplained deaths. They can't tell you what really happened since they don't want to give you any ideas. Instead, they manufacture a bunch of senseless events by white male "incels" and sell you those as real, to make you think white males really are the worst of the worst, and therefore not worth defending. What I call the Men-are-Pigs project. Led by guys shooting children in the face for no reason, which would never happen. Kids are the last people that would be targeted by white men crushed by this project, or by anyone else. Only CIA would think to do it, and they chose the fake target simply because it creates the greatest outrage. Couldn't be more obvious.

That said, men are fighting back in a variety of ways, and they will do so more and more. But I am not here to give you advice on that, since I have no desire to be arrested for incitement. I am here to tell you how things really are, and to despin the misdirection of people like Savage, Carl, and Shapiro.

Postscript: Oh, and if you think I am wrong about this, and that CIA doesn't have anything to do with this project, you will have to explain why CIA finds it necessary to break many of the links in my papers, including all links that link back to them. See for example my paper above on the Stolen Century, where I out Hemingway as a CIA and FBI and KGB agent, with a direct link to CIA.gov where they admit it. They soon deleted that link and that page, and I was forced to take a screenshot at the Wayback Machine and add it to my paper. They should have scrubbed the Wayback, and they often do, but they missed it that time.