Call for a Counter-Boycott

by Miles Mathis

Let me be the first to call for a counter-boycott of everyone now boycotting Kanye West. I never liked Kanye West and have never listened to one song he wrote. I certainly don't own any of his shoes or clothing. But that doesn't matter. I believe in free speech, even for people I don't like. He has a right to talk about anything he likes, including Jews. I figure he has some inside information on that and may tell us something we don't already know. Or not. But it doesn't matter if he is telling the truth or just making stuff up. What matters is that he not be cancelled for talking.

You know who I like even LESS than Kanye West now? Adidas, Nike, Footlocker, The Gap, CAA, Balenciaga, MRC, UTA, Endeavor, Twitter, Instagram, Google and Facebook. I have never done any business with any of them, but I will avoid them even more assiduously now. I really don't think it is up to shoe companies, talent agencies, or Big Tech to thought-police the world. You know who should be doing that? Only you and me, for ourselves. You should listen to what West has to say and judge it in your own scales. If you think he is wrong, turn him off. If you think he is SO wrong you don't want to buy his stuff, don't buy it. But you don't need Big Brother to turn him off or not buy him for you. That is up to you, not them. You control your brain, not them. Or you should.

You will say I have already proposed that West is just another agent himself, setting himself up for a big fake lawsuit like Alex Jones. Yes, but even so I don't think he should be canceled or shut down by corporate America, because that is just part of the project regardless. If West is real, canceling him is bad. If he is an agent, canceling him is still bad, because it is part of the project. We don't need to watch him being canceled by corporations or Big Tech, since that sets a bad precedent.

However, if you proposed to me that WE THE PEOPLE should cancel all agents, CIA, DHS, FBI, Air Force Intel, and all others, I would be all in for that. That is what I have been pushing for decades. We should stop believing all their lies and fake events and defund them down to bare ground, by refusing to pay taxes for their upkeep.

But doesn't the CIA etc have First Amendment rights to tell their lies? NO! The First Amendment applies to WE THE PEOPLE, it does not apply to corrupt government agents gaslighting us all the livelong day. The Founding Fathers obviously never meant to guarantee the right of government agents to purposely con the American public. Though it has certainly gotten to the point we need to insert specific language into the Constitution on that subject. I have said the Constitution needs to be beefed up considerably, since the rise of the media, Intel, and tech have created problems they couldn't have predicted. If any sort of revolution ever does occur—and it soon may—one of the first things we need to do afterwards is call a new Constitutional Convention, in order to expand and clarify the Constitution we have. That 250-year-old document simply isn't up to the task of limiting modern predation, which has expanded and accelerated every decade since 1776. To battle contemporary corruption, we need a vastly expanded set of legal and moral tools.

I know that some of my readers are anarchists, and they will jump down my throat for saying that. They have already called me a "statist" for proposing these sorts of solutions. But in my opinion, we have already gone way too far down the road to anarchy, with the upper echelons of society *already* being effectively lawless. They do whatever they wish, which is basically anarchy. For that reason, I

have always seen anarchy as just one more con of the man, floated to fool us into dropping the few laws that stand in THEIR way. In that sense it is like deregulation, which has been a massive favor for the ruling class. There is no longer any question of that, since we have all seen what has happened since 1980, and especially since the fall of Glass-Steagall in the late 90s: a free-for-all for the rich and a huge transfer of wealth and power UP the pyramid. Well, anarchy is like deregulation taken to its limit. Anarchists have a strange notion that dismantling government would most benefit the lower or middle classes, but—as with deregulation—the opposite is true. It is the wealthiest people that are always pushing for deregulation and anarchy, since lawlessness most benefits *them*. Again, there is no doubt of that: just read the planks of the Cato Institute, the Aspen Institute, the Trilateral Commission, or any other plutocratic organization. They are all about deregulation and anarchy by other covert means. They despise all Constitutions, laws, morals, and religions. Which is reason enough for you to cling to them. Whatever those people are doing, you should do the opposite. It makes the figuring very easy, I would say, since you don't have to enter long philosophical, economic, or political arguments or discussions. Simply take note of what the plutocrats are doing and oppose it. Block it by any and all means you can come up with.

The only way I agree with my anarchist readers is that many of the laws we have are upside-down to sense and fairness, benefitting only the rich and keeping down the lower classes. That is undeniably true. Probably 90% of the current legal system is schist of that sort, which can all be jettisoned after the revolution. But there is a very big difference between jettisoning bad laws, and jettisoning all laws. The main fair and logical use of laws is to limit the ruling class, and to keep it from preying upon the rest of us. Unfortunately, those are the laws that have been jettisoned in the past 50 years. Laws regulating and limiting banks, corporations, Intelligence, pharma, big tech, media, NGOs, and government in general need to be brought back and expanded *greatly*. I don't see how that is going to happen short of a major revolution, but that is what needs to happen.

Isn't that Socialist? NO! It is Republican. Socialism was invented by the Phoenicians to wean you off Republicanism, but you don't have to fall for that. Limiting the monarchy and aristocracy was the first order of business for the Founding Fathers, or that is what we were taught. That is what I am talking about, not Socialism. What is the difference? Well, in a Republic, there is no forcing to the middle, no quashing of *natural* hierarchies (talent and ability), no purposeful dumbing down, no institutionalized quota system, no attack on the family, no attack on sex, no attack on gender, no attack on the past, no attack on art, no attack on science, and not even any necessary centralization. A Republic doesn't necessarily breed centralization or bureaucracy like Socialism does, since the central tenets of Socialism encourage those things while Republicanism—properly defined—resists them. Additionally, a Republic resists Globalism, while Socialism abets it. Socialism promotes a worldwide sameness and homogeneity, for the convenience of governance and control, while Republicanism promotes local autonomy and pride of place and *differentness*. For instance, Socialism has no use for local traditions of dress or ceremony, as you might have seen in small-town Europe a century ago. It has quashed all that on purpose, or tried to. While Republicanism never had any problem with it. Socialism has no use for pride of place, since they want to create a worldwide factory of slaves. But Republicanism encouraged pride of place. In the same way, Socialism wants to kill all higher forms of expression, which is why classical art and music were destroyed. The Socialists have been anti-Museum as well, see the directors of the Metropolitan in New York admitting they were trying to kill all that on purpose, moving the Met toward MOMA and the Guggenheim. Same thing with the Tate being pushed to the Tate Modern in London. Why? To dumb-down, stupefy, and confuse the masses, to make them all the same, and therefore no threat or competition for the ruling class. But the early Republicans never had any problem with high art, museums, or culture in general. They were trying to raise the common man up to that level, rather than lower the museum down to the common man. Up

until about 1930, the US was pro-museum and generally pro-culture, and has only flipped since the Rockefellers and their cousins took over the Western Hemisphere. Twenty-five years earlier, Teddy Roosevelt—just as big a fascist as the Rockefellers in most ways—still wasn't ready to deny culture to the middle classes and destroy the history of art just so his cousins could launder money. Franklin Roosevelt also wasn't for that, and neither was Truman. But Truman was a nobody front for the trillionaires, so he was ignored, and the rest is history. Culture has been in a manufactured nose-dive since then.

Your grandparents could have resisted this, but they didn't realize what they were up against. They had no clue of the complexity of the matrix around them, for one basic reason: they didn't understand what the CIA was or what it was really up to. They didn't understand its size, its reach, or its basic purpose. They were told it had to do with foreign intelligence, and that it wasn't active domestically. Just the first lie of millions. Almost everything the CIA has done has been done domestically, with only a fraction of big international projects. Yes, the CIA destabilizes and overthrows governments worldwide, but it started with this one, and spends the greater part of its budget making sure you remain overthrown. After the initial overthrow, those other countries have their own local CIAs, but only you have the original and largest, and it has grown like wildfire from its inception. It now determines almost everything you see and hear on a daily basis, excepting only the singing of birds and the sound of the wind.

Therefore—as I keep telling you—the revolution will mainly be against the CIA. If you can find a way to drive around them, you will find the rest of the government just a tinkertoy construction, a papermache model inhabited by ghosts and mannequins. This would seem to make it impossible, since how can you take on the six million invisible superheroes of Intel? Actually, it makes it so much *easier*, since—as you see—the war isn't one of bullets or tanks. It is a war for reality. It is a war of truth against lies, of reality against fiction, of life against theater. The whole thing is a bluff, which you can call anytime you get up the courage.