

[return to updates](#)

# THE TRANNIES PSYOP



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published March 23, 2017*

Man, it just keeps getting weirder, doesn't it?

I file this one under Flat Earth. Pizzagate is in the same file. The more real hoaxes I uncover, the more fakes one they have to come up with to keep you diverted. Who wants to slog through Hitler's genealogy when they can look at trannies instead?

As with Flat Earth and Pizzagate, I am not going to be pulled into this one. I am just here to tell you (briefly) that Taylor Swift (above, 2<sup>nd</sup> from left) is not a tranny. Neither are any of her three friends.\* I would be willing to prove that by playing doctor with any one of them, or all four together, right now. I will go over them all with a magnifying glass and a finetooth comb and report back to you.

I have shown Swift is a project, but she is not a tranny. Funny, isn't it, that all the people they are saying are trannies are people I have written about? Bob Dylan is supposed to be a tranny now too, as of about a month ago. Like Swift, I have written about him recently. Jennifer Aniston and Brad Pitt. I have also written about them.

In short, they are trying to sully my research by surrounding it with all this crap. They want to get you so lost and confused in an excess of contradictory information you can't tell real research from fake research. Eventually, they hope, you will just give up and run back to the safety of the old mainstream story you grew up on.

For instance, if you search on "Taylor Swift tranny or trannie", thousands of things come up even though this project on her just started. No one thought Swift was a tranny a year ago, but after I wrote my paper on her, all of a sudden we got all this weird stuff on her and everyone else. The first video listed on a search is [this one](#). But he gives no evidence. Zero. His argument is that she wears a lot of makeup, therefore she is tranny. He shows a lot of pictures of her and says, "That is a dude". That isn't evidence. That isn't an argument. It doesn't resemble my method at all, which is so heavy with research most people can't get through it. I give you an 80-page pdf, for instance, while these people

give you a 5-minute video with nothing in it but empty speech and a few snide laughs. Whenever I tell you something, I show you how I got there. I show you lots of evidence of many types, and footnote it all (or link it). So you can come to your own conclusion from all the same things I looked at. But this guy gives you nothing. Just a raw opinion backed up by nada.

They are hoping to snare me with this tar-baby, but it ain't gonna happen. They are hoping I will confirm some small part of it, at which point they can say I was pushing trannies. But I'm not. I don't confirm any of it. Yes, *they* are using admitted trannies like Jenner and the Wachowskis to mess with our sexuality, but that isn't the same thing. I confirm that—although there is nothing for me to confirm—but that isn't the same thing. I do not confirm the rest of this ridiculous psyop, since I have better things to do. People are writing in telling me Jessica Alba is a tranny. What? I say, “Are you blind? Did you just get here? Have you never *seen* Jessica Alba?” Not only is she not a man or even an androgyne, she is extremely feminine. She is on the feminine end of femininity. If you can't see that, I can't help you.



If you think that is a tranny, you need to buy a dick somewhere. You don't know who to get it up for.

As with Swift, I looked at the “evidence” that Alba is a tranny. It didn't take long, because there is none. It seems to consist of one joke she made, saying she was a man. I watched the actual footage, and she is obviously joking, so that isn't evidence. Ditto with Megan Fox, who joked about being a tranny on the red carpet. That isn't evidence. One joke isn't evidence, I'm sorry. Since this tranny stuff is a big joke, it isn't surprising to see people joking about it. Millions of people are joking about trannies right now, since it is a hot topic. It was planted to be a hot topic, so of course it is one. Some of your friends may have joked about trannies, including jokes about being one or thinking X is one. Is that evidence of anything? No. It is just people blabbing.

But I assume most of these people selling trannies—including people emailing me with questions—don't really believe it. This is just a grand chain-yanking. It is part of Project Chaos, and is one of the most obvious instances of that project I have ever seen. I assume they use examples like Swift and Alba on purpose, because most straight guys will see this project and walk the other way. They will say, “Dude, you have to be kidding me!” And as they walk off, it is hoped they will dump all my

research at the same time. It is hoped they will lump all non-standard research as coming from the same place this tranny research came from, and flush it all together. That is what is going on here.

I guess the next thing these youtube channels will be pushing is research showing this is really a dog:



That may look like a cat to you, but it is amazing what they can do with drugs and surgery.

And this is not the Sun:



They have been lying to you. That is really the Moon. But they painted the Moon to look like the Sun, and vice versa. Oh, and the Moon and Sun aren't spheres, either. They aren't even circles. They are actually squares.

Again, it is all about surrounding real research with noise. They started out with DallasGoldBug and his fake ear-match research, which looked vaguely like what I was doing. Except that they hired him to find many false matches on ears that were obviously different. They hoped this would sully facial

research in general. But it didn't. Most of my readers could tell the difference between my research and his. Why? Because they have eyes and they aren't stupid.

Because that didn't work, they have to turn up the volume. They can't come up with better projects, so they just come up with more of them more often. Flat Earth, Pizzagate, and a thousand others. Because if you are reading or watching that stuff, you aren't reading my papers. Anything to keep you off my papers. Anything to make you look at my papers suspiciously. As usual, ANYTHING BUT THE TRUTH.

If you want to believe in all these trannies, go ahead. I can't stop you. But just remember this: I warned you. Yes, there are trannies out there, and some of them are hidden. But almost none of these people now being outed as trannies are trannies. Many of them are spooks, or are involved in projects, but they aren't trannies. But they would much rather you be asking yourself if they are trannies than figuring out what they are really up to. It is called MISDIRECTION. ANYTHING BUT THE TRUTH.

Jessica Alba is an actress, so I don't trust her any farther than I can throw her. I am not *defending* her or any of these people. I am just saying she isn't a tranny. I am defending my own eyes and my own sanity.

Plus, if they actually get straight guys like me second-guessing their dicks, oh the chaos that can be created! If I really start wondering if Swift or Alba is a man, my sexuality is destroyed. I will have to compensate for that destruction **how**? By buying things, of course! Starting with a new gay wardrobe. Oh what a consumer I will be once my natural sexuality is obliterated.

Just think about it. If they can convince me Swift or Alba is a man, then I am as good as gay. If I have ever jacked off to them or *anyone who looks like them*, I must be gay, right? Nothing wrong with being gay, you will say, but you are missing my point. I have always identified straight, in my own mind. And millions of other guys are the same way. Most of us have never questioned our sexuality for a second. But if the bug is successfully planted in our heads that Swift or Fox or Alba is a man, our surety begins to crumble. Confusion is created. Nothing wrong with being gay, but there *is* something wrong with thinking you might be gay when you aren't. There *is* something wrong with second-guessing yourself when there is no reason to. There *is* something wrong with creating confusion with these lies.

I recommend you don't fall for it. For myself, I have had a lot of firsthand experience with girls that look like Swift, Alba, and Fox, either as girlfriends or models, and believe me I have studied them as closely as I could. I have never seen the slightest indication of any of them being trannies. My second hand experience is even greater, since I have looked at millions of photographs of beautiful women. As you may know, many of the photos on the web don't leave a lot to the imagination. Again, never the slightest indication any of them were trannies. Yes, there are pages I don't visit filled with trannies, but I don't visit them for a reason: they don't *look* like the girls I like to look at. Trannies aren't that hard to spot, especially naked. Everybody knows that, or should. So stick with your old ideas and trust your eyes. In this case, the old information was better than the new. The tranny project isn't coming from Truthers, it is coming from Langley or somewhere like that. Don't buy it. I don't.

With that, I am going to stop. The gang at Langley will be cheering that they wasted my time for four pages. That was job one. But they may need to reread: I just made them look like idiots again, and was given the opportunity to cement my readership as well as extend it. This paper won't hurt me and

it won't help them. Nothing I do is a waste of time and everything they do is a waste of time. That is who I am and that is who they are. Those who pursue truth and beauty win even when they lose, while those who sow lies and discord lose even when they win. That is the way it is and the way it always will be.

---

---

Bonus from my mailbag today. Someone sent me forum comments on my Tate/Manson paper. Without reading them, I told him, "I am not interested in comments. Don't send me any more." Huffily, he replied, "No, of course not. Because you have already made up your mind." I replied, "That's right". But then I thought how strange that exchange was. Clearly, he was trying to shame me for my lack of an open mind. How could that work? He was not talking to someone else who had just read the paper, he was talking to the guy *who researched and wrote* all 80-plus PDF pages of it. Is he suggesting that after I discover the truth, I should still have an open mind about the lies? Is he suggesting I should have an open mind about someone commenting who had clearly been hired to lie *about me*? Was I expected to have an open mind about my own slandering? Was I supposed to seriously consider the possibility I myself was some sort of agent or dupe? Wouldn't I already *know*, one way or the other? Did the guy commenting or the guy emailing me the comments think I was going to be convinced I was mistaken from a few lame *ad hominem*s? Did they think I was going to take their word for it, against my own research? I think they actually just wanted to get me involved in the argument, since that would waste my time and keep me from writing more papers like that. Sorry guys, didn't work. Yes, it caused me to write this paragraph, which I timed. It took two minutes. Was it worth it? I wasn't working on a paper tonight, just lolling around on ebay. This paragraph (and the next) were more interesting than that. Thanks guys. My readers thank you.

I will spin this into something even more interesting and poignant, further exasperating my enemies. For we can expand what we just learned in the previous paragraph, applying it more broadly. Your teachers and governors are always cramming into your head the importance of having an open mind. Have you ever asked why they do that? Is an open mind really the greatest good? No. Yes, when you approach a *new* problem or question, it is best to have an open mind, so that you can get data from all directions. But *after* you have done the research, your mind is of course less open than it was, since hopefully you will have *learned* some things. You will have discovered that some things are not true, that some things are lies; and, if you are lucky, you will have discovered that **some things are true**. You may not know everything there is to know about that subject, but you will know enough not to endlessly debate the lies.

But your teachers and governors pushing this open-mind idea seem to want to keep you endlessly debating the lies. If you aren't willing to do that, they call you an autocrat or a tyrant or a stick-in-the-mud. Anything to embarrass you from having any firm knowledge. In short, they want to keep you permanently in a state just beyond idiocy. This keeps you disempowered.

Curiously, they do not apply these same criteria to themselves. Their minds are not open in the least, but that doesn't seem to concern them. They are only concerned that *your* mind be kept permanently open and empty. If their minds were open, then they would have read my papers in the light they were written, coming away with new-found knowledge. Although they have proven themselves incapable of that, it never occurs to them to apply their requirements to themselves. It never occurs to them to comment on their own narrow minds. Why? Because that would be pointless, wouldn't it? Like me, they know why they do what they do. I tell the truth because I was born to it. They tell the lies

because they were born to it. Which of course confirms again my previous summation. Even when “wasting time” responding to people I know are trolls, I still can't waste time. I still manage to say something to the point. Conversely, even while hired and paid and led by someone else, told what to do, these guys do nothing but waste their own lives. Is slandering me a worthwhile occupation? Is it getting them anywhere? Is the project even advancing? Or is it backfiring at every turn?

\*Her three friends may be sisters. Not *her* sisters, but sisters of one another. Look at their mouths. So I researched that. And it got weird. Because those girls are supposed to be the band Haim. Which I had never heard of. But apparently I am the last to hear of them. Anyway, so they *are* sisters. So why is it weird? Because the Haim sisters don't look like that. Those three girls above are the same size, but the sisters Haim are three *different* sizes. Those three girls above have the same mouth, but the sisters Haim do not. So the photo above now looks like a photoshop paste-up of some sort. It may be Swift with the same girl three times, which is why the three girls looked so similar to me. There is also some weirdness about Swift's belly button in the literature, but I wasn't able to get to the bottom of it in my allotted thirty seconds of giving a damn, so I can't solve that one for you. My guess is she has an appendectomy scar or something and likes to hide it. It may have been retouched in the photo above.

I was just about to publish, when I noticed something else about the photo. You are going to love this. I saw *proof* it was the same girl three times. If you want to play along, study the photo and then come back. I will tell you in the next paragraph.

Study the polish on the hands. For some reason, this girl they have used three times has fingernail polish on one hand but not the other. Start with the girl in the striped swimsuit. She has red fingernail polish on her left hand but not her right hand. Curious. Even more curious, we can say the same about the girl in the red swimsuit. Red fingernail polish on her left hand, but not her right. You will say that is Swift's hand on the shoulder of striped girl, and that may be. It could go either way. But in that case we are missing an arm and a hand. Where is red girl's right arm and hand? She is leaning a lot, so she would need support. She doesn't seem supported by Swift's back, so her right hand should be on the railing or on Swift's shoulder—as we see it. Still, the best evidence for me is their mouths. What are the odds that three girls—even sisters—would have the exact same type of pursed lips in exactly the same expression? All three are doing the exact same “tough-girl” expression with their mouths (while Swift isn't). This alone tells us we have the same girl three times.

Want more? Having fun? Girl one and girl four both have the same bracelets on their left hands. Girl one and girl four have on different sunglasses, but they have the same part in their hair. And I saved the best for last. Girl one has a necklace, right? May be a butterfly, or something like that. They erased it from girl four, *but not very well*. Look closely, and you can see the chain. They removed the butterfly, but not the chain! You can see the right part of the chain coming down. And they probably borrowed Swift's belly button from the other girl, since it is exactly the same.

Even the background is distorted. Why does the railing bend in a strange manner? Even the mountains behind bend in a strange manner. Look at the photo to your right. Everything is wumpus. Compare the shadow on the railing to the right to the same shadow to your left. Doesn't match. The railing to your left is white along the top, right? So why don't you see the same thing to the right? Busted!