

TIME'S BIGGEST PHONY OF THE YEAR 2023



by Miles Mathis

December 13, 2024

I just became aware that Taylor Swift was Time's person of the year in 2023. I haven't looked at a Time magazine in about 40 years, to be honest, and don't follow this kind of news, and this just confirms my good judgment. My parents took TIME and Newsweek, god knows why, just because everyone else did, I guess, but I had it pegged as a propaganda rag before I went off to college in 1981. As an adult I have never taken any magazines, which is just one more reason my mind is far less cluttered than most.


I was alerted to this Swift thing when Sporcle suggested a game on Time's people of the year, going back to 1927. I guessed 44% of them, just by naming Presidents and other famous people. That beat the average score of 31%. Apparently even the eggheads who hang out at Sporcle can't figure out what Time was up to, even with hindsight. But then I noticed some of the recent ones. Greta Thunberg? Really? Taylor Swift? You have to be kidding me. The Ebola Fighters? What? David Ho? David Who? Andy Grove? Hunh?

Even weirder, I wanted to read some negative commentary, so I did a search on "Taylor Swift Time person worst choice ever" and "Taylor Swift negative commentary". And I did this at Yandex, thinking I was more likely to get around Google that way. Nope. Even Yandex wouldn't give me any negative commentary on Swift. Just pages and pages of glowing reviews. How is that possible? Everyone I know thinks Swift is a stinking rich girl phony, fag-hag, and lipsyncher. So how is it that all the engine spiders can't locate even one negative comment on a blog somewhere?

Well, most of my papers on all subjects go immediately to #1 at Yandex, so we will test that theory

again today. As you see I have top-loaded all negative words, so the engine can't claim it was confused. Hopefully now a search on that will bring up at least one real result. If not you can't say I didn't give it my best.

[Next day: Yep, as I said, it went directly to number one at Yandex on the search “Taylor Swift time negative”.



Then I noticed the CNN article now listed just below mine at #2. I was curious to see what that was about, and maybe you are, too. It is an article by their writer Holly Thomas.



Wow, is she creepy looking. She took that photo herself, by the way. Her article is about how Sam Altman should have won instead of Swift, so she is selling AI, and specifically ChatGPT. That figures. I have already torn [ChatGPT another one](#), and [AI as well](#), if you are interested.]

Actually, I remind myself I already have [two negative papers up](#) on Swift, [including one of Jan. 2023](#). I guess that was before the person-of-the-year blitz. So those should have come up on a search, but didn't. The older one is from 2015, so the spiders may consider it deprecated: this will bring my Swift-hating up-to-date.

But really this is less about Swift and more about Time and the media in general. It is about its quick spiral into irrelevance, along with the New York Times, [UnScientific American](#), and all other outlets and rags. Time's choices for person of the year were always transparent propaganda, and that is clear as a bell in retrospect, as we see with people like Peter Ueberroth and Ted Turner being promoted for no reason. But with each decade it got worse. At least before Swift, Time had never promoted a pop diva, not even Madonna or Cher or Streisand. Yes, they tapped Bono in 2005 as a tack-on third name, but used co-creeps Bill and Melinda Gates to give the award some non-pop ballast. Wow, was that a bad year!

I was surprised to find there were no movie stars or sports figures in the 97-year history of the award, either. Not even a Tiger Woods or Muhammad Ali or Babe Ruth. So you see that—even disregarding my opinion of her or Time—Taylor Swift stands out like a sore thumb, by category. She is the only solo pop icon on the list, and is an extravagant piece of fluff on an already fluffy list.

Then I noticed “the Guardians”, winners in 2018, and “the Silence Breakers”, winners in 2017. Just stinks of fake news and propaganda before you even read it, doesn't it? The guardians are journalists killed or jailed trying to bring you the truth. Right. Cue violins. Because we know that is what mainstream journalism is all about, eh? And it isn't at all self-glorifying for the journalists at Time to be giving their prize to journalists, is it? “Look at us, we're heroes and martyrs! Please keep buying our magazine, lest someone shoot us.”

Also curious that Time chose to title this guardians promotion “the war on truth”. Not the war FOR truth, but the war ON truth. They are just telling you what they are doing.

The very fact Time was promoting this told me all these stories were fake, so I decided to briefly research one of them. The one I grabbed at random was the Capital Gazette Mass Shooting of June 2018 in Annapolis, which I hadn't even heard of. So many of these fakes they get lost in the pile. The first red flag is of course Annapolis, which suggest military involvement off the top. Then we find that a 65-year-old community beat reporter-lady name Wendi Winters decided to charge the shotgun-wielding shooter with just a plastic office trashcan. So he blew her away. That would be tragic were it not so ridiculously fake. I looked her up at Instantcheckmate and the computer there thinks she is still alive, aging naturally. She has no page at Findagrave and no obituary online. She is now 71, with Alexandria, VA, and NYC on her list. She has big military links since her father is [Allan Geimer](#), whose long Findagrave bio tells us he has two purple hearts, having been an F4 Phantom pilot flying highly classified missions in Vietnam. [Later he worked at the Pentagon as advisor to the President](#). That's enough to go on here, I would say.

That was fun and ludicrously easy, so let's do another. Another guardian killed in 2018 was Jamal Khashoggi, and I have already briefly outed that as a fake. But I will hit it again. You can tell just from his name, which reminds us of formerly famous Adnan Khashoggi, from the same family of

hoaxing Phoenicians. Jamal is the nephew of Adnan and the first cousin of Dodi Fayed—who I outed as a fake [in my paper on Princess Diana](#). These people are all billionaire Arabs/crypto Jews, so you should believe nothing you read about them.

Jamal was allegedly assassinated in Istanbul by agents of Saudi Prince **Salman**. Which is another related joke, since of course Salman=Solomon. But no one has eyes. It is too hard to make that very deep connection. Jamal had previously worked for CIA-front *Washington Post*, which is another clincher this was faked. He had also been a member of the Muslim Brotherhood, yet another CIA-front. He interviewed bin Laden several times, proving that once again, since bin Laden was also a CIA-asset. Khashoggi sold the whole 911 pretense as real, including bin Laden as the bad guy. Khashoggi also worked for CIA-front Wikistrat. Khashoggi was living in the US in 2018, so what was he doing in the Saudi consulate in Istanbul in October? He just had a death wish? He had been sold as Saudi dissident number one for years and knew there was a big price on his head, so I guess he thought the best thing he could do is travel to a Saudi consulate in a Muslim country with no security detail. I mean, why not? They tell us he went there personally for documents related to his upcoming marriage. Really? Why not just email them for copies? Why would you have to show up in person for that, and why would the Saudi consulate have these documents and no one else? No answer to that, because it is obviously another stupid cover story, dreamed up by the geniuses at Langley. They then reported that he was not only assassinated, he was dismembered with a bone saw. Really, they have bone saws in consulates in Istanbul? Good to know.

Saudi Arabia's attorney general later admitted Khashoggi had been assassinated in the consulate, which is just a continuation of the farce. International police should have been involved, there should have been a trial, and it should have had to be proved that Khashoggi was murdered. Until then, the Saudis would have admitted nothing. Even stranger, the Saudis then arranged a funeral for Khashoggi in Medina, though they had no body. They claimed to put five officials to death for the murder, but there was no evidence of that since the trial and executions were closed to the public and reporters. Amnesty International admitted the whole thing was a “whitewash” since there was no proof of anything. Including no proof Khashoggi was murdered, or was dead. Finally, on **Halloween**, the chief prosecutor of Istanbul released a statement that he had been strangled as soon as he entered the building. But since no investigation was done, no one was arrested, and no trial occurred, that is meaningless. The law in Turkey mainly ignored the event as if it never happened, since it didn't.

So that's two down, already telling us what to think of Time's choices as guardians.

What about the Silence Breakers in 2017? What was that about? Oh, that was about the fake #Metoo movement, centering on actresses accusing Harvey Weinstein of showering in front of them or something. So more Men-are-Pigs propaganda. [As with the later fake Trump rape trials involving E. Jean Carroll](#), it was all a massive fiction used to splinter heterosexual relations and destroy the very fabric of society. If you want to get huffy and tell me women wouldn't lie about that, you have some explaining to do today of all days, since the woman at the center of the Duke Lacrosse team story just [admitted she made it all up](#). Those boys were found innocent back in 2007, so that one had already blown up, but there are many other similar fakes still standing in the mainstream, including the Glen Ridge fake of 1989 [that I have blown the cover of](#). Plus [all the fake serial killers and rapists of women](#), which were made up for the same reason. Once you know that you can see this Silence Breakers and #Metoo promotion as part of the huge longstanding project to split the sexes. Splitting the sexes achieves multiple goals for the evil governors, including but not limited to population control. That is what the promotion of homosexuality and transsexuality is about as well, of course. But splitting the sexes is also great for business, since it immediately doubles the amount of products that can be sold.

You have to stock two households where before you only had one. It also greatly increases drug consumption, since all these miserable sexless people have to buy their consolation somewhere, usually from a bottle or a vial or a needle. It also drives the massive porn industry, which is also owned by the same evil people, mainly bankers and that ilk. I could go on but my readers already know all this. If you don't you have a lot of catching up to do.