

# JUST A QUICK NOTE

**to be sure you are getting it**

*by Miles Mathis*

*April 22, 2021*

Places like Infowars and Zerohedge are pushing the narrative that states that have opened up and given up masking are showing falling Covid numbers, while states remaining in lockdown are seeing rising numbers. This is supposed to be a knife in the heart of Fauci, which it is, in a way. But as happy as I am that states are opening up and dropping the mandates, I don't believe this narrative.

You see what is happening, right? The states like Texas that are opening up are opening up because they are resisting the storyline they are being fed by the vaccine makers like Bill Gates. Texas isn't resisting that storyline because its governor is a good guy. He isn't. Abbott and others in Texas are resisting because it is an oil and gas state, and it has taken a beating in the past year. Those people are invested in things dropping in value, like oil, and I guess they aren't as heavily invested in drugs and hospitals. But they aren't just resisting that storyline regarding lockdowns and masks, they are resisting the storyline regarding faking the Covid numbers. All the Covid numbers are fake and always have been, but only states like California, Oregon, and New York are still going along with the total fraud. Other states like Texas have backed off, with some locales perhaps reporting as they were before, but other locales dropping the fake altogether and refusing to move numbers from one column to another.

But to counter that move by Texas, Florida and other states, Gates and his minions like Fauci have mailed out new instructions to the remaining states to report a second wave (or third wave or whatever they are up to now). They have probably been instructed to test everyone who comes in with spring allergies, find a positive result, and mark them down as Covid. We already know the old flu has magically disappeared, and that is because every old cold and flu now goes in the Covid column. Add spring allergies to that and you have a new wave you can fake in the charts. This is why Michigan, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Colorado, and New York lead the numbers in the newest reports: they are the most controlled by the current spooks. Do you think it is just a coincidence that Michigan and Pennsylvania also happened to be involved in the top lines of the election steal? Or that Minnesota is involved in the big Floyd fake? No, that isn't an accident. Those places have been the most heavily infiltrated by those running all the current programs.

So that is why the numbers are highest in those states. It isn't because they have the most new cases. There aren't *any* new cases. There weren't any old cases. The pandemic was a total fake from the ground up, where they just named a new strain of the old flu Covid and claimed it was some scary new disease. They inflated the numbers and ran a huge propagand campaign to scare us into thinking overall mortality was skyrocketing, when it wasn't rising at all. The new numbers are rising in some states and countries because those places are the most controlled: they are following the new script dutifully, because they have been paid very well to follow it. I assume all these governors and mayors are dipping deeply into some slushfund, and that fact may come out in the near future.

The resisting Red states are refusing the slushfund, since they are losing more money from oil and other investments than they are getting paid by Gates. I suppose there just wasn't enough money to pay

off all the other rich people and all the politicians all over the world. Though they came pretty close.

I also noticed that BLM is in Oklahoma now, threatening to riot over new voting laws. Looks like after the Floyd fake ended, the CIA bussed all their people from Minnesota to Oklahoma. You know what that means? The Feds are now waging war against the states, through covert CIA ops. Since the Feds are owned by the big corporations, that means the corporatocracy is now waging covert war against the states. If this continues to escalate, we may witness the interesting battle of the National Guard—called up by governors—against the CIA and FBI. Or, since the President can also call up the National Guard, we could see the Guard fighting itself. The regular military could also be called up, though that would have to be in secret. The CIA could put Special Forces on the street, dressed as Antifa or something. For all we know, they already have.

And readers try to tell me there is no Civil War going on, and no split in the Phoenician Navy. There is a very obvious split—that is exactly what we are seeing with Florida and Texas refusing orders. Again, do you think Governor DeSantis of Florida opened Florida because he was a good guy who cared about the people of Florida? Get real. He would dare to go against worldwide orders only with the backing of some very powerful faction, and that faction is not going against the current scheme because they are protecting you from evil. They are going against it because it is not in their financial interest to support it. Either they are losing money when they were assured they would be making it, or—in the best case scenario—they simply no longer believe in the viability of the plan. They had been assured the plan was an airtight win and **they no longer believe it**. After watching the first year of it spin out, many of them probably agree with me: it would be smarter on all counts to return to the old schemes, which generated less profit in the short term, but which were sustainable in the long term. This current scheme is guaranteed to fail in the longterm, and I hope they can see that. If trust in government and media goes to zero, as it is, their only choice will be to move to force, which is expensive to run and will see a drop in profits across the board. They should have been moving Russia and China to an American system—and they were for a while—but these latest creeps, starting with Cheney and Rumsfeld, decided to reverse that, moving the US to a Chinese system. Many are already seeing what a colossal mistake that was, since not even China wants another China. If the Phoenicians really thought China was the way to go, they would be living there. They aren't. They avoid it like the plague. Who wants to live in an orange smog, surrounded by robots? Some of the Phoenicians are seeing that if they turn themselves into Sauron, they are going to have to live in Mordor. Sauron couldn't create Mordor and then live in Rivendell with the elves, could he? Saruman couldn't fortify Isengard with orcs and then go live in Lorien, could he? No, he had to hole up in Orthanc with Wormtongue as his only friend. THAT IS THE WAY IT WORKS.

And in news just in, Trump has now urged his supporters to get the vaccine, proving he is also a puppet of Gates and the others. Proving this is not a red versus blue question. This will come to haunt him and those behind him. It is guaranteed to backfire, and will be just another arrow in the body of this entire current scheme. It will now be impossible to sell Trump as the savior, saving everyone from the evil liberals. When hundreds of thousands are killed or permanently damaged by the vaccines, Trump will not be able to claim innocence. As vaccine deaths rise, the Phoenicians will have to groom a new savior, having him speak out against the vaccines. But who is clean enough now to do that? Not DeSantis or Abbott, who have vaccinated millions. Even Rand Paul has taken the vaccine and recommended it, as a doctor. The Republicans, now supposed to be the protectors of the common man, don't have anyone left to fill those shoes. And the ranking Democrats have already blackwashed themselves beyond any possible restoration.

---

---

And in other news, I just discovered an astonishing statistic. I tripped across some suicide statistics, when I read that suicide rates in the US had dropped in the past year. I don't believe that one. It is completely counter-intuitive, as well as counter to my personal experience. Also, since I have seen most other statistics being faked in 2020-21 (Covid stats, sunspots, etc), I have no confidence in any reported statistics for that period. But in older data, we find consistent reports that white men kill themselves far more than other groups, by a shocking margin. Almost 80% of suicides are male, and around 70% are white males. And that isn't 70% of the 80%, that is 70% of *all* suicides are white males. You hear a lot about the high rate of suicide among Native Americans, but the rate among white males is 15% higher even than them. The age-adjusted suicide rate among white men is **four times** that of white women.

Even more shocking is the mainstream response to this. If you ask why this is happening, the first thing that comes up on the web is [a study from Yale](#), which blesses us with this analysis:

**White men accounted for 7 out of 10 suicides in 2015.1 This is in part because they make up such a large portion of the American population, but also because the rate of suicide among middle-aged white men is so inflated.**

What? So the size of the group explains the relative rate of suicide? By what novel mathematics is that true? Besides, they just admitted that white men commit suicide at a rate four times that of white women, and white women make up an *even larger* group. Women outnumber men, remember? And where has it been shown the rate of suicide of white men is “inflated”? There is nothing in this article about that, or any other article I could find. That would mean the statistic is faked. Where is the data or indication of that. How can you drop that bomb in such an article and then just move on, with no proof? The article as a whole looks cobbled together by a committee or computer program, and has basically no information. So why it is top-listed in a search on this question? You will see why in a moment.

To explain why men succeed at suicide so much more often than women, this report offers the Cultural Script Theory, whereby failing at suicide would be seen as girly. So white men make sure to complete the act, due to cues from Hollywood or something. But of course that doesn't explain why white men succeed more than black men. Is Yale calling black men girly? I didn't think so.

The second article that comes up is from MedicalXpress, and it pretends to take a firm stand on this issue, saying we need to take a hard look at it. But that's it. It then declines to take a hard look at it.



But the third article that comes up is the most shocking. . . I should say disgusting. It is from Colorado [State professor Silvia Canetto](#) (above). An article on men committing suicide by an academic woman in Colorado. If you are expecting the twist of the knife, you will not be disappointed. Canetto says that

**older white men have higher suicide rates, yet fewer burdens associated with aging. For example, they are less likely to experience widowhood and have better physical health and fewer disabilities than older women. They have more economic resources than ethnic minority older men, and than older women across ethnicities. White older men, however, may be less psychologically equipped to deal with the normal challenges of aging, likely because of their privilege up until late adulthood.**

Such amazing levels of caring and compassion, right? It looks like she is the one who came up with the “scripts of masculinity” we saw in the Yale piece. For she continues:

**An important factor in white men’s psychological brittleness and vulnerability to suicide once they reach late life, Canetto says, may be dominant scripts of masculinity, aging and suicide. Particularly pernicious for this group may be the belief that suicide is a masculine response to “the indignities of aging.” This is a script that implicitly justifies, and even glorifies, suicide among men.**

And does Canetto have any data to support this “theory”, or did she just come up with it because it fits her agenda? What do you think? As data, Canetto gives us two—yes two—whole examples. George Eastman, founder of Kodak, killed himself at age 77. Canetto quotes his biographer, who said “he was unprepared and unwilling to face the indignities of old age”. But wait, where did the biographer get that? Did she interview Eastman, or did she just explain it that way, as part of the story? We don't know, since Canetto didn't interview either the biographer or Eastman or anyone in his family. Not much to build such a mean-spirited theory on. Canetto's second example is Hunter S. Thompson, who killed himself at age 67, and was described by friends as having triumphed over “the indignities of aging”. But again, that is friends saying that to have something positive to say. It says nothing about why Thompson actually did it. Canetto could care less about that, apparently, since she is just dredging up a couple of second-hand quotes that support her thesis. Plus, these guys were already old. Killing yourself at 77 doesn't save you from old age. You have already been old for years. Maybe he was terminally ill. Anyone who cared about this issue would look at younger cases. So this is just pathetic.

In fact, the highest rates of suicide of men compared to women aren't among the very old, they are among the middle aged, so Canetto's whole analysis doesn't even address the primary data. She is

misdirecting from the first word.

Somehow Canetto believes that her theory of cultural scripts “offers a new way of understanding and preventing suicide”. Really? Do you really think that theory sounds supportive, or would help any man decide not to kill himself? Just the reverse. That theory would just confirm any man's belief that the deck was stacked against him. And I looked it up: this article isn't just a one-off. Her whole career is based on suicide research and “counseling”. Can you envision Canetto counseling suicidal older men by telling them they are psychologically brittle and privileged? I guess she also brings them hemlock to drink, as an aperitif.

Do you want to guess what her alma mater is. Hebrew University of Jerusalem. That figures. Her larger area of focus is gender studies, meaning promotion of women, so it is no surprise her suicide research is completely polluted by that. Even when she is supposed to be studying men's suicide, she is lobbying for women. An obvious conflict of interest. Promoting her in the field of men's suicide is like hiring the Klan to write a book about the history of Harlem. She couldn't possibly discover why men are suicidal, *because she obviously doesn't care*. Her only interest is in framing men's suicide rates in terms of women's studies: a perversion of science. If anyone should be drummed out of the field and forbidden from speaking on it, it would be her. Instead, she is sold as the brightest light in the field, showered with awards, and given top billing in websearches.

But seriously, reading stuff like this reminds us that many older men may contemplate suicide to get away from older women. I have talked to some suicidal old men who have told me that directly. I haven't done big studies, but I do have personal experience. But what sort of person could publish something like Canetto's theory and think they were being helpful? As you now see, Canetto is a good lead-in to the larger problem here. For we have to ask how someone like her could ever get in a position to spew such subtle venom. If we reverse the roles here, and imagine reading a male professor from Harvard, say, who came up with a theory that women committed suicide because they were brittle and privileged, the sky would fall. He would be fired immediately and his house might be torched. No, it is more than that because we can't imagine that situation at all. No male professor would ever think to write such a thing, much less publish it. The milieu wouldn't even allow him to imagine doing so. The thought literally could not cross his mind. But Canetto not only has no problem proposing it—without making any good argument—her colleagues, department head, dean, president, and publisher never think of pressing her on it, apparently. She is allowed to say whatever she likes, no matter how asinine. Why? I guess because she is a woman in academia. She is above reproach, especially when talking about men's issues. Trashing men is not only allowed in academia, in many circles it is required. The first rule in women's studies is never blame the victim. . . unless it is a man, in which case *always* blame the victim.

But I point out that this isn't feminists debating men in a fair fight. This is a women's studies professor piling on men who have already killed themselves, spitting on their graves. It is so cowardly and despicable it is beneath contempt.

So this is the milieu in which white men find themselves. The only way they can rise above it is to buy themselves out of it. If they are rich or powerful enough, they don't have to put up with this garbage, but there are few who achieve it. And it plays into my comments about academia in recent papers, since the universities are now saturated with outlandishly awful people like Canetto. They have created an environment of hostility and aggression no real man would willingly enter. This effectively removes the ivy tower option for an entire class of men, who no longer have any desire to be a part of it. Like me for instance. As you know, I consider myself a liberal, but I wouldn't waste my time in such

society.

Do you think this might be why some men and boys commit suicide? I do. They still have all the old pressures of work, family, and watching the fake news, but many of them no longer have a wife, children or society that support them. They can no longer find meaningful or rewarding work in academia or a thousand other places they used to be welcome. They only have the new American harpy, ragging on them all day for this that or the other—mansplaining or sexism or the patriarchy or phallocentrism or #Metoo or a thousand other things manufactured by the CIA and then dutifully regurgitated by women and cuckolds all over the first world. They are under constant threat of thinking, doing, or saying something that is not approved by the Ladies Home Journal or the Women's Congressional Committee or the ACLU or the Southern Poverty Law Center or the ADL or the Google censors. Even their own children are turned against them as soon as those children go off to school. The kids are taught by everyone from their teachers to Hollywood to the Simpsons that Daddy is big dope, pre-defined as being wrong about everything, while Mommy is a goddess who can do no wrong. A white male has to start apologizing for being born as soon as he hits the sunlight, following that apology with a constant restitution for the sins of his fathers.

So what is this male privilege Canetto is talking about? Could she cite any examples *from the present*? Yes, white males were privileged in the past. No one denies it. But that never did me any good. I wasn't privileged by my sex, and younger men are even less privileged. If anyone is privileged, it is women like Canetto, who move up the various ladders without ever having any skills or doing any real work. The woman can't write or think, so how did she get where she is? Privilege and preferment. Maybe she is from a prominent Jewish family. Maybe her dad owned the university. Maybe her ex-husband was CIA. Maybe she herself is an agent. I don't know. But she obviously didn't get where she is on merit. Her only use to the world so far has been as an example I could use here, to finally say something on a question no one else has the balls to speak out on. Other than that, she is loss to humanity.

She gives her email at the end of that article. I encourage you to contact and tell her off. Men need to quit killing themselves and push back. This has gone on way too long.

Now that that is done, I wish to talk to suicidal or depressed men directly. Again, I want to be sure you understand what is going on here. I want to be of real use to you. You may find it strange that men won the gender war for all of history, but suddenly began losing big time around 1970, say. You may not be able to make sense of that. How did women turn the tables so decisively? Did they suddenly become better debaters and thinkers? Did they become stronger? No, none of that. We can see that isn't true any time we debate one of them, or read something by them, or listen to one of them talking on TV. If anything, their rational skills have only gotten worse since that time. So have men crashed and burned on their own? Have they been drugged into idiocy? No, though there is a bit of that going on. What happened is that women scored a big ally at that time. An 800-pound gorilla entered the ring in their corner. Or I should say an 8-million-pound gorilla. The CIA. The CIA decided to take the side of women at that time. Why? Because white men had been specifically targeted after the Second War, and that project began accelerating in the 1960s. Again, why? Because a certain subset of white men had become a big thorn in the side of the government. To give just one example, the anti-war movement in the 60s was led by intellectual white men on the left. They had already grown weary of the predation of their class, and the Vietnam War and other events of the 60s were the final straw for them. They were pressing for real revolution, and this threatened the hegemony of Washington, Langley, and the Pentagon. So the CIA was instructed to recruit all the best white men it could, and target those who would not join either the military, intelligence, or industry. This is how the

universities were targeted by the CIA. Men from this class who resisted recruitment had often gone into academia, where there was still some interesting work for them at the time. They would also be protected by tenure and things like that. But once the CIA brought this project to fruition, that was all out the window. They planted their own people in all the highest positions like presidents and deans, then began redefining the universities from the top down. See people like McGeorge Bundy at Harvard. This is when gender studies arose, and this is why. After that, the only men that would be kept is men that would play along. All other men were targeted for extinction.

So it isn't women you are fighting in this so-called gender war. It is the CIA. These women like Canetto are just reading from scripts, like everyone else in the fake news. One-on-one, you could defeat her over breakfast, while cutting your toenails. But as I have shown you, once you understand the score, you can also defeat all these CIA agents, who are no more formidable than Canetto. They are the ones actually producing the dreck she publishes, so we know what they are capable of. One thing you learn in debate is that it isn't really a team sport. In highschool and college, they have debating teams, but I found that in any debate—on campus or off—it always devolved to their best man against me. The rest of the bozos just sit there and watch. And that applies no matter how big the team is. The team could be a committee of five thousand, but that team quickly boils down to its top person. If you can beat him, you can beat the entire committee, because once he taps out, they are toast. This is because you debate from above, and if you can get on top of their top guy, you are automatically above all the rest. Any argument that kills him will kill all of them at the same time.

You will say that is all fine and good, but this isn't a debate. Even if you beat these people in a war of words or thoughts, they still own the universities. The job market is controlled, so you are royally screwed regardless. Not really, since once you comprehend how things stand, you begin to see ways to fight back. When you thought you were fighting women, you had no battle plan, because you couldn't see the field. You didn't even know who to attack, much less how. But once you understand who the enemy is and what he is up to, your wits may clear. Your depression may lift, for one thing, since you understand this isn't your fault and the things being said about you aren't true. You also understand that most women aren't really against you, since this isn't really the gender war it is being sold as. You understand that you can just walk around these confused little sell-outs like Canetto, who are of no consequence. They represent no real block of power, since if you can defeat the gorilla they will fade away immediately. You can also remind yourself that you are still a member of the most powerful army in this country. White men comprise 31% of the population, or over **102 million people**. Although I have shown that Intelligence may comprise 6 million people or more domestically, you still outnumber them 18 to 1. They are white-male heavy, but since all those white males in Intelligence are by definition sell-outs to their category, we know they are not the cream of the crop. The best of us would never agree to be involved in what is now going on. Which is precisely why I mop the floor with them every time we meet, no matter how many of them are on the other end of the line.

And it is even better than that, since this isn't really a white issue or even a male issue. In other words, in this particular battle, your army isn't just white guys. Your natural allies are *all* guys, black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native. They have also been marginalized by this project, and the best of them will join you. Giving you another 15% or so. The only guys you can't count on, apparently, are guys in Intelligence. But that is only about 3% of guys. And it is even better, since a majority of women are also on your side. They aren't in favor of this demasculation of men, since such men are no use to them. About what percentage is that? It is hard to say, but a 2019 [National Geographic/Ipsos poll](#) found that 69% of women refused to identify as feminists. Only 13% of Republican women identified as feminists. And even many feminists will not be in favor of these projects run against men, since they are mainly for fairness and there is nothing fair about this project. Which gives you another 120

million people on your side, or an additional 36%. I encourage you to add those up. It means roughly 82% of adults in the US are on your side. So it is not as bleak as you may have thought. You have to battle only against the other 18%, most of whom also aren't serious opposition. In reality, your enemy is only about 30 million people, most of them in Intelligence or academia. And as I say, the ones in academia will fall with the gorilla, so you can walk around them and focus your fire on the gorilla. That is what I do. The CIA is your real target, not some batty ladies in gender studies.

Doing the math, that means that you have 160 million people you can mobilize, if you do it right. The CIA's only hope is that you don't organize. So their job is to keep you on the couch, drinking beer and kicking the dog. To do that, they have a zillion ways to divide and corral you, squash and confuse you, divert you and drug you into a stupor. The only question is, are you going to continue to let them do it? You can wake up tomorrow and begin fighting back. You can begin organizing locally, talking to other men and planning the resistance. That is what I recommend, since action is the best cure to depression.

As you do, keep your eyes peeled for infiltration. The CIA is a master of infiltration, and they are guaranteed to show up and start sowing dissension. But if you know their tricks, you can spot them. We have looked at that before.

And what specifically can you do once you organize? You can strike, boycott, picket, educate, and organize into ever larger groups, linking up towns first, then states. Once you get everyone on ready, you can plan a big event. Forget a million man march. Think big. How about 100 million people converging on Langley from all directions, shouting "We are onto you! It is over!" That might do it, don't you think?

If you want to start a bit smaller, march on the biggest university in your state and shut it down, like a college sit-in. A sit-in of a million people from all over the state. Or march on the biggest Air Force Base in your state. Tell them you don't believe in their fake events and won't accept any more.

There are thousands of things you could be doing, from small to large, and if you wake up you will think of them ten at a time. But you have to organize and actually move towards doing them immediately. It all starts with talking to your neighbors. They are just as tired of all this as you are.