

# Tucker interviews Tate



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published July 12, 2023*

Why? What has Andrew Tate ever done? As with the Kardashians, I can't figure out why he is famous. He is a former kickboxer who was kicked off Big Brother for being an asshole. Not much of a resume. Doesn't meet anyone's qualifications for a guru or an influencer. Tucker says Tate is the most Googled person in the world. Nah, don't believe it. Google can make up any numbers it wants, and often does. Google has been lying about my numbers on the low end for years now, and they can lie on the high end just as easily. They suppress some and promote others: that is what they do. It is why the internet was invented.

But again, why would Tucker promote this guy? The only answer is “because he was ordered to”. That is what Tucker does as well: he promotes certain people, ideas, and themes. I agree that he is on the right side on some issues now, and that he and Tate are generally on the right side of this one: promoting masculinity, protecting boys, and pushing back against the New World Order. I just don't like them using Tate to do it. He isn't a good spokesman for the cause, and I can tell he wasn't chosen to benefit the cause but to promote himself. He was inserted into this argument to use this popular theme as a vehicle for his advancement. Like Tucker, he will be given a winning script for a few years to build his street cred, and he will use that to jump off into something bigger. In the meantime, he will continue to sully everything he touches, maybe on purpose.

Just study that picture from the interview. It is very strange, isn't it? Tate is supposed to be under house arrest in his own mansion in Bucharest, Romania, after spending 90 days in a real jail. Again, I am not buying any of it. It looks to me like just another story they made up, to give Tate street cred. They are remolding him in the mold of Assange, Snowden, and those guys, making him seem important and sinned-against by the powers that be. An outsider like you. Although he is actually a

huge insider. He is another rich kid from the families desperate for attention, buying himself into the media every week with some new fake or fraud. I don't believe he was ever in jail for a second. And why does he have a mansion in Romania? In his own words, it is because Romania is corrupt. Where I come from, only criminals like living in corrupt places, so again, why is Tucker interviewing this person?

The picture above is weird for another reason: what's with the gorilla on a pedestal, placed in the most prominent position? I guess that is the most prized possession in Tate's art collection. I thought at first it might be a Jeff Koons, but I couldn't find it on a quick search. May be one-of-a-kind. The rest of the art in the room appears to be Modern, or minimally carved wood. Nothing that would interest a person like me as a work of high art. Why does it matter? Because, along with some others things, it reads wrong. Both guys are wearing loafers without socks, and they have the same color theme, dark on top and pale chinos below. Did they coordinate? Showing off your tan ankles that way has been a gay thing since the time of Cary Grant, and both guys give off a gay vibe. The no socks thing with loafers is not a straight thing, last time I checked. . . though I have to admit the last time I checked was about 1980. I don't keep up, on purpose. But no matter what else it is, it is strange being lectured to on masculinity by two guys wearing expensive blazers and high-dollar loafers without socks, in front of a gilded gorilla.

Nothing wrong with being gay, but personally I don't go to gays for advice on masculinity. I also don't go to guys who wear Weejuns without socks. If you do, that's your call.

Remember, Tate liked getting naked and sweaty with guys in the ring. He is famous for saying misogynistic things, but gays can also be misogynists. They don't have much use for women, so offending them is easy, with no repercussions. Tate's schtick has never been convincing, and I think that is why: it's all an act. I don't think Tate gives a crap about women one way or the other. Which is why I keyed on the gorilla. Jeff Koons' art is gay and appeals mainly to gays with no taste. It has no real artistic qualities and certainly no masculine qualities. I have never seen Tate exhibit any real masculine qualities, just the sad pretense of such.



If Tate were really a big ladies' man like he claims, you would expect to see some top quality nudes on his walls. Or at least some pretty women in nice clothes. For myself, I like to be surrounded by pretty women at all times, which is why I have them on every wall.



It keeps my spirits up. I can pretend the world is a lovely place even when it isn't. But you don't see anything like that in Tate's mansion. Not only no appreciation of the female body, but no appreciation of beauty at all. That room is mostly black and stark. No warmth or color. I find it frightening.

Here's another problem: Tate says in the opening section he is being charged with setting up young women with Tiktok accounts and taking most of their money. But that's not even true. [Forbes reported he and his accomplices were charged with rape.](#) We are told the women were also arrested and charged, which makes no sense. Why would Romania detain and charge the victims? But Tucker couldn't do a basic ten-minute websearch in preparation for this interview? If it had been you or me, we would have said, "Wait, Andrew, according to the mainstream in the US, you have been charged with rape. Is that false? Did *Forbes* get it wrong? If so, do you plan to sue *Forbes* for libel?"

So you see, they can't even get their story straight here, indicating it is all fiction.

Here's another problem: Tate and his brother were first arrested on these charges in Romania in April of 2022. They were interrogated and released. That itself makes no sense. They weren't detained again until late December, meaning they had eight months to leave the country. Bucharest is a hole and Tate has homes all over the world, so why did he stick around to face these charges? There are many places he could have gone that wouldn't have deported him back to Romania. So it looks like he *wanted* to get arrested and have this continue. As I say, it looks like this was all manufactured to put him in the papers. And, being in Bucharest, it is harder to verify or question. Even if the Romanian authorities confirm it, that means nothing: Tate can pay them off to verify it. That is why he is there, remember: because the place is completely corrupt. Meaning, he can pay off anyone to do anything. Same as here, but moreso.

And yet another problem: [as with the NXIVM fake](#), the charges as described by Tate wouldn't even be illegal. The story is he set up some young women with OnlyFans accounts or something, then took a percentage. How is that illegal? As long as they are of-age, there is nothing illegal about it. Even porn

is legal, under most circumstances. Tens of thousands of porn producers are taking advantage of young women (and men), many no doubt paying a tiny fraction of profits to performers too stupid to do an audit. Perhaps it should be illegal, but it isn't, and it can't be enforced anyway. So unless they can prove rape, I don't see what charges are being enforced here. Making OnlyFans pages isn't human trafficking, and neither is most porn. Neither is “buffaloing women with loverboy tricks”. So none of this makes a lick of sense from a legal standpoint.

But even if this stuff in Romania is real and Tate is innocent, it still doesn't provide us a good reason for Tucker to interview him. Tate has admitted he is sexist and misogynistic, and that he thinks women should have no rights. Basically he is promoting the old-fashioned Arabic view of women as second-class citizens, or worse, chattel. Tucker hasn't explained to us how that fits in with the conservative, MAGA viewpoint he is now promoting. Will Tucker be interviewing and promoting the Klan next?

I don't see how this helps the movement or the revolution. In fact, it obviously plays into the left's critique of the right, trying to paint all opposition to the mainstream as reactionary and backwards. How does Tucker plan to prove the right *isn't* sexist by promoting a guy on the right who admits he *is* sexist?

In order to promote masculinity and protect boys, we don't need to put women in burqas and keep them in the house. We need to quit promoting division, but that doesn't suit the governors. They want us at eachother's throats. Tate is promoting division, and by promoting Tate, Tucker is also promoting division. Tucker is taking the side of men, yes, but in doing so he is continuing the battle of the sexes. By using Tate as his point guard, he is guaranteeing there will be no de-escalation of tensions. Exactly what the governors want. They want us all focused on eachother, so we don't come after them. The oldest trick in the book.

If the Phoenicians can keep you focused on race wars, sex wars, trannies, red/blue wars, Ukraine, fake Nazis, serial killers and mass murderers, and a thousand other things, they can perhaps save their own hides one more time. But I remind you again of the real world: the millions of people—including your own mothers and fathers, sons and daughters—they just killed with their fake vaccines. The trillions they have stolen from you for fake wars, fake science, fake art, fake medicine, and fake history. The trillions of dollars of fake debt piled on your head by Congress and the Federal Reserve, which will only continue to enrich fake bankers and impoverish your children. The pollution of everything you touch, include your food, water, air, and soil. And the ever-increasing police/military state you inhabit, where you are lied to, propagandized, and censored 24/7, often by these “troops” you so foolishly support.\*

---

---

And in other fake news today, [check out this headline](#):

**J6er Brian Mock Exposes Rosanne Boyland's Killing and Forces Prosecutor Acknowledgement of Police Brutality in Closing Arguments of DC Bench Trial – Verdict Expected Tomorrow.**

You have to laugh. The guy's name is **Mock** and his trial is a bench trial. I'll tell you a little secret: this Mock had a right to a jury trial for these charges, so he would have had to waive his rights to get a bench trial. A bench trial means it is in front of a judge only, with no jury. But Mock has a right to be judged by his peers. No one but an idiot would waive that right, especially in a case like this. So this

wasn't a bench trial, it was a mock trial. A pretend trial.

Equally stupid: Mock is representing himself. I guess he didn't know how to start a GoFundMe page so he could hire a lawyer. He was supposedly in jail for a full year before his case came up. Right. Again illegal, since you can't hold people that long without charges. That is why none of these DC detentions are believable. All the stuff about long terms in solitary is just hooey. No real lawyer would believe it. It doesn't happen.

According to this story, Mock brought in a witness who testified he saw officer Lila Morris kill Rosalind Boyland. Pictures were shown in court and video was referenced, at which point Judge Boasberg said, "I'm not going to indulge in this make-believe".

Ah, but you already did judge, since this whole trial is make-believe. No real judge would ever say anything like that in a real court, since all statements are recorded. Calling testimony make-believe with no proof it would be seen as extreme prejudice by an appeals court, setting up judge Boasberg for censure or worse. A judge is expected to soberly weigh all testimony, and if he finds that testimony unconvincing, he is free to dismiss it. But he must give a reason for dismissal in his finding. He cannot just throw up his hands and dismiss it as make-believe in front of the witness, because that may deter the witness from further testimony.

Next we have to read about Mock's son A. J. taking the stand. Except even that is a clue, since they don't use initials in court. He wouldn't be referred to as A. J., he would be referred to as Alan James, say, or at least Alan. We are told A. J. was asked if he would lie on the stand. You aren't allowed to ask that, since it is assumed you won't, since it is against the law. What is he going to say, yes? It is like the guys in customs asking if you have anything illegal in your suitcase. The question is stupid, since everyone, innocent and guilty, will say no. It is just a waste of everyone's time. Some in customs may not be smart enough to figure that out, but in a court of law they should be a little brighter than that. So we know this story is being made up by the usual retardos in Langley, goofed on skunkweed or bad vaccines.

Next, we find this

In rebuttal, US Attorney Michael Gordon begrudgingly acknowledged police brutality but shifted focus back to Mock's social media posts and use of the Virginia State Motto, 'Sic Semper Tyrannis.'

"Although violent acts occurred, Mock didn't act to stop those specific crimes, so he is still guilty," US Attorney Michael Gordon said.

Again, that makes no legal sense, since it is not illegal to say or post *sic semper tyrannis*. That just means "such always (happens) to tyrants". If it were illegal, could Virginia use it as the state motto? So why would a US Attorney be focusing on it? Nor is it up to anyone, *except police*, to stop specific crimes. Amateur crime-stopping is called vigilantism, *and is itself illegal*. So why would a US Attorney be saying such stupid things, and why would the judge allow it? This would be the time for the judge to throw up his hands and instruct Gordon to either start making sense or retire his side. Also note the name [Gordon](#). A top peerage name and probably another clue here. Another legal actor from Langley, saying stupid things on purpose to create chaos.

---

---

And finally, the mainstream and alternative presses have joined together [to promote Taylor Taranto](#). Who is he? He is the crazy guy allegedly arrested at Obama's estate in June, but not charged with anything related to that—despite supposedly having a vanful of weapons and ammunition. Instead, they are charging him with **misdemeanors** for actions at the Capitol on January 6. Despite these charges being misdemeanors, we are supposed to believe he is now in prison in DC with the rest of those dangerous people. They don't normally throw you in the gulag for misdemeanors, do they, so what is really going on here? I will tell you. First note his fake name, **Taranto**, which means “spider”. Then note that some are admitting he has Intel markers on him. He is being accused of infiltrating the patriots in the DC prison. You have to laugh, because although he is obviously an agent, he is not infiltrating those patriots there. . . since *none of them are there*. They too are agents and the whole thing is fiction. No, the reason he was brought in was to blackwash [my paper on January 6](#) from more than two years ago. Remember, I spent the most time there proving Ashli Babbitt was not who we were told, instead being an agent of Air Force Intelligence who faked her death. They admit she was a 16-year veteran of Air Force and there is no indication she was retired. Also no indication she was killed except the word of the mainstream press, which is worthless. No report was filed by the guy who shot her, and her body was quickly cremated—which is against the law in such situations. In a homicide the body must be kept for a minimum amount of time, in case of investigation or lawsuit. It is a piece of evidence and you don't prematurely cremate evidence in a homicide. Everyone knows that. But because I have gotten so much traction with that paper, Intel finally had to respond by manufacturing this crazy guy and having him agree with me. You see how it works: he agrees with me then acts as crazy as possible, making you think I must be crazy, too. Standard smear by association. If they had been smart, they would have tapped an agent who also looks like me, with curly blond hair. But they didn't have anyone like that on hand, I guess. Daniel Penny had already been assigned.

This is more proof the alternative press is not really alternative. Not only because they won't touch any of my research, but because they constantly undercut it, as here. The alternative sites want you to believe the Ashli Babbitt story just as much as the mainstream does. Why is that? Same reason they want you to believe we are in danger of a nuclear war. Same reason they want you to believe in serial killers and mass murderers. Same reason they want you to believe four Presidents have been assassinated. Same reason they are happy to perpetuate the battle of the sexes. Same reason they talk about Trump and Biden constantly. Same reason they report on Congress, though Congress has been defunct for many decades. Same reason they want you to believe the Sun is about to explode or the Earth is about to flip or the Moon is a hologram. They need to create a constant fear and confusion, to keep your eyes off the real world and prevent your brain from functioning properly. They need you in a never-ending PTSD state, just short of a nervous breakdown, because only in that state can they continue to fool you with their fake world.

\*China and Russia spend about 1/10<sup>th</sup> what we do on “defense”, and no one is attacking them, are they? Since we have ten times the military they do, we should be able to take them anytime we want. Why don't we? Because we don't want them. We have enough to do governing ourselves, and don't need another 1.5 billion people to worry about. So “defense” is mainly another conjob. The same people own Russia and China that own us, so there would be no point in us taking them or them taking us anyway. We could cut our “defense” by 90% and nothing would change. Except that your taxes would go WAY down. But you don't want that, do you? You don't need the money. Anyway, let me know when that happens and I will start supporting *those* troops.

