

We are already Living in the Matrix

by Miles Mathis

First published June 26, 2024

[Five days ago the Supreme Court ruled that criminal convictions must be unanimous](#), overruling two states, Louisiana and Oregon, which allowed convictions on divided votes. As it says at NBC

By a 6-3 vote, the court said the Sixth Amendment right to a jury trial requires unanimous verdicts. The majority opinion by Justice Neil Gorsuch traced the requirement back to English common law. He said the nation's founders believed verdicts must be unanimous and noted that the Supreme Court recognized the requirement as early as 1898.

Well, if the Supreme Court already ruled on this in 1898, why are they having to rule on it again in 2024? In a rational universe, the Justice Department would have just sent Louisiana and Oregon a note back when their legislatures first tried to allow divided jury votes, reminding them of the 1898 ruling, saying this is unConstitutional and therefore will not be allowed. It is beyond belief this would even be coming up 250 years after founding this nation and 800 years after being set in stone in England.

In any case, this newer ruling *automatically* overturns the convictions of many people in those states convicted with divided juries. In other words, those people don't have to refile anything. The Supreme Court just voided their convictions, **even the ones that weren't party to this suit**. That is how Supreme Court rulings have always worked and still work. The decision is not just for those who filed the lawsuit, the decision strikes down a law, and the loss of that law automatically voids a certain class of similar events, *in all states*.

[**Hours later**: But what is weird is that the Court ruled on pretty much the same thing in 2020. In fact, the case I quote above from NBC is from 2020, and this newer case is *Erlinger v. US*, which hit the same topics last week, again quoting the 5th and 6th amendments. They are being mixed up online and you can see why. So again, why does the Supreme Court need to rule on the same topic every two years, while admitting it was already decided in 1898 or before?]

But what is weirder is that no one in the mainstream is applying this to the Trump conviction that allegedly made him a felon. There, part of jury instructions included this

In determining whether the defendant conspired to promote or prevent the election of any person to a public office by unlawful means, you may consider the following unlawful means: (1) violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act otherwise known as FECA; (2) the falsification of other business records; or (3) violation of tax laws.

If you search on this, Snopes and all the other “fact-checking” CIA front sites (which lead all searches) tell us that doesn't mean this decision wasn't unanimous, since *after* that bundling the jury found him guilty unanimously. In other words, they unanimously found him guilty of SOMETHING, we just don't know what. Those three charges are treated as equivalent, but obviously they aren't. They are three separate laws and three separate illegalities, so Trump or anyone else would have to be charged with each one separately, the jury deciding each one separately. You can't bundle and then claim unanimity. It is beyond absurd that they would even try it, and the only reason they did is that this is a

fake trial in a CIA dummy court, one run to keep your eyes off other things, namely the vaccine genocide and the complete corporate coup that has taken over this country.

If our country were running on the rules it had just 50 years ago, this 2020 Supreme Court case would automatically apply here, with the Trump result being tossed along with all those from Louisiana and Oregon. Trump would no longer be a felon as of June 21, and when I read the ruling that is what I assumed. Because I am a rational being. But if you do a general search, you find that isn't the case. Only Infowars and Jack Posobiec are making the connection, and Google has delisted them both. They don't come up on the search. This paper will also be delisted and illegally censored. The Supreme Court itself does not link the finding to the Trump case, which is beyond belief. Maybe they weren't aware of it? You have to laugh this is so Twilight Zone.

My assumption now is that the Supreme Court is not linking to the Trump case because they know the Trump case is fake. They have no desire to get involved in that CIA vaudeville, and won't until CIA orders them to and pays them the required fees.