

The *USS Indianapolis* looks like another fake (and so does Iwo Jima)



by Miles Mathis

January 3, 2020

I never considered the possibility this sinking was faked until today. Why today? Well, I was watching *Jaws* for about the tenth time, and got to the part where Robert Shaw as Quint is describing the sinking of the ship. He does a hell of a job I have to admit, selling the story even better than the real survivors. But I guess that is what we would expect of a professional actor. It may be his telling that kept me from questioning the story before now, since that is how I first learned of it. Anyway, I finally put two and two together, asking myself why they would include this story in an action picture like *Jaws*. It's a famous shark tale, sure, but still. And we have seen that Hollywood loves to include historical propaganda anytime it can, in any way it can. This was just one the most seamless and successful inclusions ever. It very subtly sells the bombing of Japan, without you even realizing that is what is happening.

In *The Making of Jaws*, we find out exactly who included this scene in the movie. It was written by John Milius, who wrote no other part of the script. Spielberg says he asked Milius specifically to expand a one-line comment already in the script into a full story, though he doesn't tell us why Milius was there or why he was chosen to do it. But that is also a clue, since Milius is a major spook who we have looked at before. See [my paper on Apocalypse Now](#), where we see Milius also behind that film, and all the propaganda spewing out of it. It is admitted Milius was ROTC and applied to the Marines, though we are supposed to believe he was refused for mild asthma. Right. My assumption is that he was *not* refused, and that he has had military connections from the beginning. His father was supposed to be a cobbler, but that is ridiculous. There were no private shoemakers in the 1940s: cobbling had gone out with the 19th century. More likely his father was also Marines. Milius is of course Jewish. He is also a Rice, a Neumann, a Stix, and. . . [a Cohen](#). Surely you saw that coming. His 2g-grandfather was Rabbi Aaron Cohen of Dusseldorf. Milius went to the USC School of Cinema-Television, which he admits was "an elitist school". An elitist school for the children of shoemakers. It has a 2% acceptance rate and is private, but I guess they have an outreach program for cobblers' sons.

But back to *Jaws*. What really flipped me was the full realization that this ship was allegedly carrying enriched uranium for the bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima. It had just left Tinian island, where it had delivered the material for Little Boy. Since I now know [that bombing never happened](#), I was of course suspicious of any story that seemed to sell it as real. What better way to sell the bombing as real

than to connect it to a famous ship sinking? Each fake tragedy would help promote the other.

So I reread the history, but this time I read looking for red flags. Oh boy did I find them. I will lead this time with the biggest, to immediately quash your skepticism. I know many will be thinking, “It can't be. They wouldn't and couldn't fake the deaths of almost 900 crew and the loss of a heavy cruiser.” Except that we have seen them fake much larger things. Like for instance, the *Titanic*. If you haven't [read that paper](#), you may want to do so before continuing here. There are many parallels.

Anyway, back to red flag number one. That would be the captain of the *Indianapolis*, Charles B. **McVay** III. First of all, that reminds us of Tim McVeigh, spelled differently but pronounced the same. McVeigh's genealogy is mostly scrubbed and looks fake, so I leave open the possibility they changed the spelling of his last name to break the link here. In support of that hypothesis, I did a people search on Timothy McVeigh at Intelius. He is listed, but surprisingly the big computers don't know he was ever in Terre Haute, IN. That location isn't on his list. Given that he allegedly died there of lethal injection, and given that prison records should be some of the easiest for these computers to pull up, that is unexplainable. As is the mysterious missing listing for Colorado Springs or Florence, CO, where McVeigh allegedly spent time at ADX Supermax. I have shown you many times that facility is a big red flag, since it faux-houses many other fake inmates, including the Unabomber, the Underwear Bomber, and the Shoe Bomber. In fact, it houses every fake inmate except the condom bomber. Other things you may like to know: McVeigh was indicted on **August 10, aces and eights, Chai**. Although he had an IQ of about 130 and had been selected for Special Forces, he was allegedly arrested while driving without a license plate. He might as well have had an “arrest me” bumpersticker. But I will have to save more on McVeigh for another time: unwinding his fake would swamp this current paper.

Captain Charles McVay III is a gigantic red flag even without being connected to Tim McVeigh, since Charles' dad Charles McVay, Jr., was a four-star admiral and head of the Asiatic Fleet in the 1930s. As if that isn't suspicious enough, we find Captain Charles III just happened to be Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee (JIC) of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. This was the highest Intelligence Unit of the Allies in WWII, making McVay **the highest ranking spook in the world at that time**. So why was the head of Allied Intelligence in WWII acting as the captain of this little cruiser? You will say it is because it was carrying that uranium, but that still doesn't explain it. The Chairman of JIC during the war would be expected to remain in a protected place. He wouldn't be out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean on a smallish ship with no escort on a secret mission. And if he were, he certainly wouldn't be out there with no radio contact, no distress orders, and no plan of rescue. As a VIP, he would have been protected at all times.

Remember, the story we are fed to this day—from actors like Robert Shaw—is that because the mission was secret no distress signal was sent. That was the official story for decades. But they now admit *that isn't true*. They have changed the story, and it is now admitted that records have been declassified showing that SOS was heard at three different places, but they all ignored it. “One commander was drunk, another had ordered his men not to disturb him, and a third thought it was a Japanese trap”. Yep, that is what they have decided to go with in encyclopedia entries now. They should have stuck with the first story, since only a moron would believe any of these new stories. A fourth story is floated for the equally gullible: a Lt. **Stuart Gibson** was tracking the ship, knew she hadn't arrived, but failed to log it or report it. He supposedly got a letter of reprimand, and his superior got a letter of admonition. You have to laugh. All these people allegedly ignored signs of danger to this ship, though the head of Allied Intelligence was onboard. If you find any of that believable, you need serious help.

You might also want to ask yourself why they would ship this uranium to Tinian when they could just fly it in with the plane. It was actually much safer, and *very much* faster, to fly it in. You will say it was to avoid a plane crash, but then as now, planes were much safer than ground or sea transport. Remember, at Tinian they were far nearer to Japan than they were to the US, and were actually in Japanese waters. Tinian had been Japanese up to 1944 (and probably still was). Japan was known to be submarining heavily in those waters, and that is now admitted (as part of the explanation for the fake sinking).


Here's another part of the story that makes no sense: we are told that McVay requested a destroyer escort from the Navy but it was denied because the priority for destroyers was escorting transports to Okinawa to pick up downed pilots. Right: a few downed pilots was higher priority than transporting uranium for the atomic bombs. Besides, you are forgetting McVay's real rank: as head of Allied Intelligence, he didn't need to *request* anything from the Navy. **He could have just ordered it.**

And this: we are told most destroyers were equipped with submarine-detecting radar, but the *Indianapolis* wasn't. So, let me see if I have this straight: McVay, head of Allied Intelligence, decided ship transport was safer than air transport, so he purposely picked an old outdated cruiser with no sub detection and decided to captain it himself. When the navy refused his request for escort, he was fine with that, deciding to go anyway. I don't know why the heroic McVay didn't just *swim* the effing uranium over with floaties on his arms. That would have been the safest thing, right? Torpedoes can't target swimmers, as long as they aren't wearing metal shorts or something.

Also remember that up until 1944, the *Indianapolis* was allegedly the flagship of Admiral Raymond Spruance, commander of the entire Fifth Fleet. Do you really think the admiral's own ship was this outdated hunk of junk with no submarine radar?

Sorry, but this is all so stupid I can't take it seriously.

Here's the next absurdity, and the next proof this is all a horrible fake. In 2017, Microsoft co-founder **Paul Allen** funded a project to find the wreckage, and it was allegedly located on August 19 at a depth of 18,000 ft. Yep, aces and eights again. And yes, that was Paul Allen, who you shouldn't trust to tell you the correct time. 18,000 feet is almost three and half miles down, another mile deeper than the *Titanic*. We have already seen they faked the *Titanic* wreckage, and they have done it again here, using CGI and lake sets.



That's one of the first images that comes up on a search. Could that look any faker? It has allegedly been on the bottom of the Pacific for 72 years, but it conveniently buried itself upright, with the words *US Indianapolis* at the top and level to the seafloor, just so we at home wouldn't have to strain to read it. That's some kind of paint job, right, that resists salt water for 72 years at a pressure of 500 atmospheres. And good to know the bottom of the Pacific looks just like a sandy lake bed. God, do they think we are stupid.

Here's another image that comes up:



Didn't realize the sun rose down there. You will say that shadow is from floods to the side, but to cast a shadow like that, it would have to be one single superbright flood at a great distance. Multiple floods would cause multiple shadows, and a near flood would cause spreading in the shadow. The problem is, no such light source was available down there. No single flood could possibly be bright enough to light the scene like that, especially at that depth. We should see the scene lit by lights on the submersible, which would be coming down from above. So the shadow disproves this by itself. We are clearly looking at a tiny model, and the blurring is necessary to prevent us from seeing that right off.

They also forgot to match the model to the ship we see in pictures, since the bow is supposed to have been shot off, which means it is to the bottom of that photo. The circles are where the big guns were attached. So the first tall spot in the shadows is meant to be the bridge. But we see the second tall spot in the shadows much larger and higher, which is no match.



That picture is tagged July 10, just before the ship left port at Mare Island. So we can compare it to the shadow above. I will be told the ground under the shadow is lower, making the shadow longer on the rear prominence. Possibly, but that doesn't explain why the shadow is *solid* while the ship is just masts and open ironwork there. If you are thinking the shadow might have blurred together, think again, since the image disproves that. The light is able to cast a clearly visible shadow of the very thin mast over the bridge, which indicates to us the detail we should be seeing in the second tall shadow. We should see the ironwork, not just a solid blob. So the shadow was either drawn in by hand, or the model was built without detail in that area, being solid.

We can tell what really happened to the *Indianapolis* by just comparing the two pictures of her above. She was launched in 1931 and still looked sleek and white in 1939, in the picture under title. But by 1945 she had been through many major battles, and was now taken to port, where we are told she was refitted and overhauled. She looks very different, besides being old and gray. I notice her number 35 is painted on the side, while it wasn't in 1939. I would guess this is a sign of her retirement. By July, the war was effectively over, with Germany beaten on April 30. The day after *Indianapolis'* picture was last taken, July 11, the Allied leaders met in Potsdam, demanding the unconditional surrender of Japan. Except that Japan was already beaten as well. How and when they surrendered was meaningless. There was no reason to fire another shot, much less nuke them. So we can be sure the *Indianapolis* never left Mare Island. That picture was taken as her final inventory shot. I doubt she was ever refitted or overhauled, and parts of that picture looked tampered with. It may not even be the same ship, since the bridge looks completely different. Are we supposed to believe they completely rebuilt the bridge in this refitting? Even the sides of the ship don't match, since all of the lower portholes have disappeared. Did they just fill them in?

Besides, we are told the *Indianapolis* had already been overhauled in early 1945, before its relaunch in February. So we are supposed to believe it was overhauled twice in the same year—the July overhaul being just five months after its previous overhaul? That makes no sense. And why would carrying one little canister of uranium require a major refitting and a rebuild of the entire bridge?

The *Indianapolis*' earlier history is equally fishy. After being refitted in February 1945, she was part of the attack on Tokyo, which supposedly snuck up on the Japanese on the 16th under the cover of bad weather. Right, because the Japanese didn't have radar, sonar, or any other reconnaissance except sight. It reminds me of *Groundhog Day*, where Bill Murray said, "Is it snowing in space?" Because it makes me want to ask, was there fog under the water, too, keeping the Japanese subs from spotting this fleet approaching their own mainland? C'mon!

In this battle on the enemy's home turf, the US allegedly shot down 499 planes while losing only 49. Wow, those Japanese Zeroes must have been a lot like TIE fighters and Imperial Stormtroopers, with absolutely terrible aim. Either that, or our own planes must have had Millennium Falcon-like rear deflector shields that could absorb an infinite number of direct hits. After destroying a large part of the Japanese defense in just two days, this fleet "raced" to Iwo Jima to support the landings there on February 19, then raced back to Japan to attack Tokyo again on the 25th.




Do you want to guess how many kilometers of tunnels the Japanese had at Iwo Jima? Go ahead, make my day. 18. They are sure to tell us that at Wikipedia, though it doesn't seem like primary information to me. There were allegedly 21,000 Japanese soldiers defending the island, and we killed 20,784, capturing the rest. So those tunnels didn't do them much good, did they? Waste of time digging them. You are supposed to believe that we attacked this tiny island with over 500 ships and 110,000 men, losing only 6,800 men and one ship. That's completely unbelievable on the face of it, since what would you do if you were the Japanese general in charge and you saw a force that large landing on the island? You would surrender immediately, right? Plus, the US didn't need to fight them at all. We could have avoided all casualties by simply blockading them. They would have surrendered from starvation in short order. On Gen. Kuribayashi's Wiki page, they admit the Japanese were already starving and drinking rainwater and seawater even before we arrived. They were allegedly emaciated, weighing 30kg. That's less than 70 pounds, so let that sink in. [That is what they actually tell you.](#)

I don't know why anyone thinks this battle was heroic on our side, since if you believe the mainstream story, we just butchered a starving enemy we outnumbered five to one. But for myself, I don't believe this story at all. I think we have discovered yet another famous manufactured battle of history.

It is now fairly well known that Pearl Harbor was manufactured, so add Iwo Jima to that. But if Iwo Jima and the sinking of the USS *Indianapolis* were manufactured, that means the Japanese must have been in on it. Which implies the entire war in the Pacific was faked to spend taxdollars.

If you are having a hard time with that idea, I encourage you to take a look at General Obata, commander of the Japanese 31st army responsible for defense of these Pacific Islands. He had been **military attache to the United Kingdom** up to 1934, living in London. He was conveniently away from his post in Saipan when the US first attacked in 1944, restationing himself on Guam. After that massacre, he committed harakiri on what day? Go ahead, you know it. **August 11**, 1944. Aces and eights, Chai.

He was replaced by General Kuribayashi, who was a haiku poet and former military attache to the US, living in Washington, DC. He studied at Harvard. We even have the requisite fake picture of him from those years:



That's the usual poor paste-job, with his head pasted in the wrong place. See how the head is too far to your right? Makes me want to slide it to the left a bit to correct it.

I encourage you to study his page at Wikipedia, especially the section on his activities in WWII . . . which are almost non-existent. In 1943 he was promoted to Lt. General and made commander of the 2nd Imperial Guards, a **reserve** division. In May 1944 he was made commander of the 109th division, and two weeks later assigned the defense of Iwo Jima. None of that makes any sense, since a battle commander doesn't come out of nowhere like that. You don't become a Lt. General during a World War with no military experience.

And who was the head of American forces? One of them was Marine General **Graves Erskine**. I suppose you recognize that last name? We have seen it in many papers, including the ones on the Dunblane event, the Christchurch event, and the Port Arthur event. As a reminder, Andy Murray's mother is an Erskine. They are closely related to the top peers of Scotland, including the Grahams, Hamiltons, Campbells, and Stuarts. Up until late 1943, Erskine was parked in Alaska. Finally, in 1944 he was promoted to Brigadier General and took part at Saipan and Tinian. He was then promoted to Major General in September and sent to Iwo Jima. So he too came out of nowhere. In the sidebar on his page, they claim he was at Pearl Harbor, but it is not mentioned in the text. More indication he was a major spook is that after the war he was advanced to four-star rank for no apparent reason and became Director of Special Operations. He held that post until **Halloween**, 1961.

But back to Iwo Jima. Although the writer general Kuribayashi felt he would surely die at Iwo Jima, and wrote that over and over and over *ad nauseum*, his body was never discovered. The story is he had fellow soldiers bury him somewhere secretly, to avoid detection by the enemy. And that fresh grave was never found by the tens of thousands of US soldiers blanketing the tiny island? Obviously, he faked his death. He was never on Iwo Jima, which made that very easy to do. I now think no one was on Iwo Jima, except some of our camera crews. The whole thing was as real as *Tora! Tora! Tora!*

If you don't believe that, I encourage you to do your own research. Go read the Wikipedia page of Gen. Kuribayashi and tell me it doesn't give you a sinking feeling. Now that I have opened your eyes, go read any mainstream account of these battles in the Pacific and let me know if it doesn't leave you screaming at the page.