Why Are DC Police Active on January 6 Committing Suicide?

by Miles Mathis

First published August 3, 2021

In the past seven months, at least four DC police active on January 6 have allegedly killed themselves. Why? Answer: Best guess is they *haven't*. Now that we know that event was faked and managed, we can see these suicides for what they likely are: staged, like the event itself. But again, why?

Why stage these suicides? Am I saying they were murdered instead, to keep them from talking? No. The government doesn't *need* to kill them to keep them from talking, it just needs to say they are dead. That way, if someone claiming to be one of these people shows up in the media blowing the whistle on this event, the government can say he is an impostor, since that person is dead. Dead people tell no tales, even if they are really alive, since no one will listen to them. If the government has faked a death and a death record, you are dead in the media, no matter what your pulse says about the matter.

A check on these people at Instantcheckmate and Intelius confirms my reading, since nothing is known of them. Despite being police, and therefore easily known to the big computers, they have no relatives listed. See for example Gunther Hashida of Woodbridge and Alexandria. No relatives listed. Indicating he and his family have already gone under cover. The name also looks fake, which indicates the same thing. Not only his new name has changed, his old name has as well, to completely cover his tracks. The newest one announced, Kyle deFreytag, fits that as well, since the name looks fake, and no relatives are listed, even at his posted obituary. The comments there are also strange, since most are from strangers. So either these people are being silenced, as I said, or they were CIA to start with—in which case we would have a second scenario. That being that these officer suicides are being manufactured to make it look like something is being covered up. . . which tends to confirm the event. Nothing like mysterious suicides to make an event look real. The main thing against this second scenario is that the first of the four "suicides" occurred on January 10, just four days after it. Howard Liebengood, also with a suspicious name, probably wasn't created or relocated to make the event look real, since it hadn't seriously been called into question, except by me. . . and even my analysis hadn't gotten very far by then. These later fake suicides could be read as damage control, but it is harder to read the earlier ones from January that way.

Just think about it. The Pentagon decides to fake this big event, but even the Pentagon doesn't have control of everyone in DC. The Pentagon *could* pay off every law officer in DC before every event like this, but it figures why bother. It will own and control all the central players, but if other officers show up not knowing the script, they can be dealt with later. And if some Capitol police balk at the script, they can be dealt with as well. They can be ordered to stand down, they can be re-assigned to nearby cities, or—if they stand on principle—their deaths can be faked. This isn't the Feds' first rodeo, you know. They have been running these fake events for centuries. These families have been running them for millennia, so they know how to deal with loose ends.

We have seen in many previous papers why faked deaths are preferable to real ones. They achieve the same thing with far less mess. They don't create martyrs or vigilante family members. They don't

create murderers, bad consciences, guilt, or sin. Fake deaths are almost impossible to prosecute. And since there is no real death, the bad karma is also less. Those involved who believe in God or gods think they are driving around eternal laws as well, though we won't get into whether that is true or not. The point is, a fake beats a real event every time, which is why the world has become a gigantic fiction.

Therefore, whenever you see stories like this, claiming a rash of suicides or suspicious deaths of any kind, your default assumption should be that people are being silenced. But they are being silenced with a faked death, not a real one. Real deaths are not required to silence these people.

I am always asked where these people go. Wouldn't their old colleagues and friends recognize them, giving Intel another group to silence or coerce? But that is normally easy to solve as well, since most people are only known locally. So they don't have to be relocated to South America or anything like that, or have facial reconstruction. They just have to move to another city with a name change. That is enough to solve almost all these problems. Their families can even visit them, which keeps the families from making trouble. Only in the case that the person is famous does anything extraordinary have to be done, and even then we have seen it isn't as hard as you might think. In that case they may have to be relocated to Hawaii or Mexico for a short time, while the event blows over. If they are hiding themselves, like when movie stars fake their deaths, they may wear a wig or sunglasses for a while. But Intel has discovered that very little is required to fool the public, which is not too bright. In my paper on Manson, we saw that Sharon Tate was back in the States almost immediately, and within a few years she was back on TV doing interviews, without even a wig or a change of hair color. She just pretended to be her sister. That's how easy this is, and how little they think of your intelligence.

They have even tried it with me. A general search on my name prominently brings up "Miles Mathis dead" for some reason. Since I am not dead and no one with that name has died recently, why would that result feature so prominently in a search on me? Because someone in the anti-Miles campaign at Langley or on one of the Air Force bases thought that result might stymie a few of my potential readers. They might see that result and conclude I was an impostor. Some have argued I have been replaced, never existed, or that I am a committee hiding behind a fake name. The "Miles Mathis dead" meme is part of that ruse, since it is thought it will confuse a few new readers.

But if that is the case, I will be asked why they don't just fake my death fully, creating a fake death certificate and reporting it in the mainstream? One, because that conflicts with their central response to me, which is pretending I don't exist. So far, they have responded to me mainly by *not* responding to me. That would only give me air time and more notoriety. So the mainstream pretends they have never heard of me. That is the response you see from places like Wikipedia, which has been instructed to keep anyone from creating a page for me. The few places that do respond to me, like RatWiki, have been instructed to make me look like a complete kook from the margins, with no following. So reporting anything about me in the mainstream, even my death, would be counterproductive. That would risk creating a martyr, since reporting either a suicide or a suspicious death would risk creating sympathy and curiosity, bringing more people to my pages. Truth be told, even the RatWiki page has reversed on them in that way, sending more people to my site.

The other reason they don't bother faking my death is that they know it wouldn't stop me. I would ignore it and keep writing, and since my claims don't rely on my actual connection to any events, it wouldn't really matter to my readers whether I had been "replaced" or not. In other words, with these DC policemen, their stories would rely on them being there, as firsthand witnesses. That is why they would be dangerous. But I am not claiming to be a witness to anything, so my identity is almost beside the point. I could be replaced with a new impostor every week and it wouldn't matter. What matters is

my ability to see through events with logic and acumen, and supposing I could be replaced with someone just as smart, incisive, and funny, the site would continue on as before.

Still, I will be told they could kidnap me, put me in a sack, ship me off to Argentina or something, and deny me computer access, claiming I had committed suicide after raping dozens of children, kittens, and cute bunnies. So why don't they? Because, again, it wouldn't work, for the same reason. It is too late for that, because in that case I really *would* be replaced by a group of my readers, who would take over my site and continue it. They might not be able to replace me at 100%, but I already have guest writers who are nearly as good as I am. And in that case, Intel really *would* have created a martyr, since almost no one would believe the mainstream story of my demise. It would just piss off my audience even more, causing it to snowball further. Intel has so far proceeded via containment, and you don't create containment by creating martyrs.

Yes, Intel could respond to that by shutting down the internet and preventing my readers from continuing my site or reposting my papers anywhere. But that would require complete tyranny, a step they have so far hoped to avoid. Under such a system, they wouldn't need to fake protests at the Capitol, would they? They wouldn't need to manufacture compliance with such theater, since they could just force people to comply. The Capitol event was allegedly in response to an election, remember, and in a real tyranny you don't have elections or candidates, do you? So it would appear the controllers still prefer to maintain a semblance of democracy and freedom, for reasons I have previously explained. For one thing, turning the US into a slave colony in the year 2022 would be the height of foolishness, since how much real work are you going to be able to get out of a nation of fat, weak morons. Most Americans wouldn't last five minutes driven by a whip. You will say that is why they are exterminating us with deadly vaccines, but that doesn't work, either, because the governors actually LIKE high populations. China is now paying couples to have children, after decades of one-child policies. Why? Because wealth is generated by high populations and growth. The US is still a growth economy, you know, and you can't get growth by exterminating populations. We have been compared to cattle, and a rancher wants as many cattle as possible. More cattle=more wealth. A cattle rancher isn't going to become richer by exterminating his cattle and dumping them in a ditch.

Does this mean I think the vaccine deaths are fake? No, but they aren't fully intended, either. I assume Big Pharma sees them as collateral damage to the big profits they are taking. They aren't exterminating us, but if some of us die, they don't really give a damn. Even if the number is currently 50,000, as some are saying, that isn't an extermination or even a culling in a population of 330 million. It is murder, and should be prosecuted as such, but it doesn't even signify as population control.

Which is all to say that neither the US nor China wants to become more overtly tyrannical. As I have said many times, the US *should* be reverting to a 1950s model, where trust in government was very high. In which case everything they are doing now is counterproductive. The current models are a disaster for long-term governance. Which is why I don't think Intel has any plans to make a martyr out of me or to fake my death. What they need to do is put the general population back to sleep, and that won't be done with more tyranny. It will be done in the short term with a red-state savior like Ron DeSantis, and some new fake move to conservatism, as with Reagan. Before they reverse you into 1950, they have to reverse you into 1980.

Notice how much the current playbook resembles the Carter-to-Reagan playbook, except that it is now on steroids. Everything now has to be ten times as noisy, to puncture the general stupor. Carter the Democrat made a huge mess of everything (I now think on purpose) and Reagan the Republican rode in to save the day, reinvigorating the Republican Party for 12 years. In that playbook, the Republican

Party was sold heavily as the party of the middle class and even the poor, with downtrodden farmers supporting Reagan, and Southerners, and even minorities. Given hindsight, it now looks like a big joke, but it worked. The entire country was moved hard right, and that move was so successful and so permanent not even Bill Clinton could move it back. He didn't even try, running as a moderate or "conservative" Democrat, remember? The Republican party had moved so far right the Democratic party had to follow it right, and the country has never moved back. You will say Obama was a lefty, but he wasn't. The country had moved so far right by his time that he was actually to the right of Nixon. Obama admitted it. But that still wasn't enough for the Phoenicians, who wanted to move the country further right after Obama. In part, Trump achieved that, but it still wasn't enough. Like Nixon before him, Trump balked at some of his instructions and had to be taken down. So Biden was brought in as Carter-on-laughing gas, to decimate what was left of the left. The American left has been re-crafted once again as a minority of over-educated but clueless ninnies loudly espousing all the most unpopular talking points of modern academia. In a planned fail, all the strangest, least charismatic, and least attractive people have been hired from the furthest reaches of academia and combined with the dregs of Intelligence expressly to call out your "ick" response. The lowest basements of Langley have been dredged for the palest and most wide-eyed on their worst hair days and parked on TV or the internet, told to play it up for all it is worth. All to draw your hate.

So you see, they plan to move you right not with overt tyranny. The overt tyranny will appear to end when DeSantis or whoever rides in to save the day and the country returns to a Trump or Bush level of normalcy. As usual, they are moving you right mainly by tricks. They make the left so unappealing you want to be as far as possible away from those people there. By sliding the scale beneath you, they will eventually have you right where they want you. Like Mike Adams or Alex Jones or one of those people, you will be a revolutionary claiming to be a conservative. Your answer to tyranny will be to move further right. Since tyranny is as far right as you can go, that answer doesn't make any sense. Like everyone else yapping right now, you will be a walking talking contradiction.