

[return to updates](#)

THE CASE FOR REALITY

and against the mainstream media



by Miles Mathis

First published May 7, 2106

That's Donald Hoffman above. We aren't told if he is related to Abbie, Dustin, Phillip Seymour, Michael, Charles, Charlie, Jacob, Elisha or Calvin. He looks creepy, doesn't he? I wouldn't normally lead with how someone looks, but in this case he *is* creepy, as you will see. Besides, as a portrait painter and photographer, I can tell you they purposely lit him and posed him for maximum creep, so don't blame me for noticing. They could have made him look much less like a reptile, so why didn't they? You really need to ask yourself that. To me, his eyes and his arguments seem to come from the same place. I don't know where that place is, and I don't really wish to know. I only wish to avoid it. I recommend you do the same.

Donald Hoffman is a professor of cognitive science at University of California, Irvine, we are told. He is featured this week [in an article at *The Atlantic*](#). The title is, “The Case against Reality”. Hoffman and the editors at *The Atlantic* want to convince you the reality you believe in doesn't really exist.

OK. So I guess that means Hoffman may or may not be a professor of cognitive science. He may just be a CIA agent posing as a professor of cognitive science, a sim, or some photo they pulled out of the files. And we can say the same of *The Atlantic*. It may not even be a magazine anymore. Maybe it is just a CIA front, a computer hack, or a vicious hologram.

We will come back to that. But the reason I am here is that one of my readers sent me this link. Otherwise I would know nothing of it. I don't read magazines anymore, and this is why. However, this article is such a transparent example of the “reality is an illusion” project I have drawn your attention to many times—both here and [on my science site](#)—I have taken the time to respond to it. That, and it is

so easy. If I didn't believe in reality, I might think the aliens manipulating my brain in a tank are creating these articles to set me up for easy scores.

Although an alleged progressor of cognitive science [typos, but I like it, so stet], Hoffman immediately nods to quantum physics for his main proof that reality doesn't exist. In the introduction, we find

Experiment after experiment has shown—defying common sense—that if we assume that the particles that make up ordinary objects have an objective, observer-independent existence, we get the wrong answers. The central lesson of quantum physics is clear: There are no public objects sitting out there in some preexisting space.

That is not even close to being true. The truth is, there are some physics experiments that have yielded outcomes seemingly unexplainable using “classical assumptions”. See superposition and entanglement, for example. The old guys (this goes back to the 1920s and before) couldn't come up with a reasonable explanation, so they gave up. They assumed that if there were a rational explanation, they would have found it pretty fast—since they assumed they were so brilliant—so the fact they didn't find it pretty fast meant it didn't exist. To fill the hole, they gave up on rational explanations and substituted irrational “explanations” at the quantum level. Since they promoted these irrational explanations—and got famous for them—they had to make sure no one came along later with a rational explanation, so what did they do? They *outlawed* rational explanations. That's right. They forbade their students from asking the old questions or pursuing “old style” science. For about 90 years now they have been shaming any young physics or chemistry students who asked the old questions or demanded sensible answers to physical questions. I know. I was one of those students. If you persist in asking those questions or working on sensible answers, they drum you out of physics.

It is in this way that these irrational explanations got enshrined. Top physicists got Nobel Prizes for these irrational explanations, so there was huge and ever-growing incentive not to question the irrational explanations.

However, on [my science site](#), I have shown that these seemingly unanswerable problems were not really unanswerable. Usually, the problem was either that the old physicists had asked the wrong questions; or, they simply didn't have the tools to answer the questions they faced. In some cases, they were applying faulty equations to the problems. In other cases, they had the wrong diagrams. They were failing to *visualize* the problem in the correct way, which prevented them from seeing the right answer. My ability to visualize often helped me see things they failed to see.

I am not making idle assertions or empty claims. If you don't believe me, spend a few thousand hours on my science site. You can start with these papers: [super.html](#), [super2.html](#), [entang.html](#). Link out from there and get back to me.

But of course you probably don't have time for that. You will have to decide this question in another way. If you don't want to read my papers, you could read mainstream physics. Study quantum physics for a while and see if you think it makes any sense. You will say you don't have time for that, either. OK. Try this. Read a gloss of quantum mechanics, at some place like Wikipedia. Just read about ten linked pages on a given topic. Then go to my site and read ten linked pages on the same topic. I predict you will find a big difference.

If even that is over your head, then you will have to simply compare this paper of mine to the article at *The Atlantic*. Once again, I think you will find a big difference.

As an example, I suggest you closely study Hoffman's second response at *The Atlantic*. The question posed him is: shouldn't creatures that see reality more clearly be better able to survive and prosper? If an organism consistently misread its environment, it wouldn't last long, right? Hoffman's answer is mostly illegible, but if you look closely, you can see it is just a debating trick. He is trying to switch you off "reality" and onto "fitness". He says the fitness function doesn't match the structure in the real world, but he gives you no example of that. Or, the example he gives is just a fudge. It has something to do with the amount of water being a bell curve, but it makes no sense on any level. Since the question concerns water, he would have to explain why a creature that could correctly sense where water was would not be more fit than a creature that could *not* correctly sense where water was. He misdirects you as far away from that as possible.

Hoffman's second answer is even less to the point, having something to do with images on your desktop not being real.

Suppose there's a blue rectangular icon on the lower right corner of your computer's desktop – does that mean that the file itself is blue and rectangular and lives in the lower right corner of your computer? Of course not.

Can you believe he is arguing this way? Does he think you are a moron? Apparently. If the icon is blue, it means *the icon is blue*. He implies that because the file itself is not blue, reality doesn't exist. Brilliant. The interviewer Gifter also immediately leads you into that conclusion, saying, "So everything we see is one big illusion?"

Because the file isn't blue, everything is one big illusion? C'mon! If you were the interviewer, would you say that? No. If I were the interviewer and Hoffman made that lame argument, I would say, "Really? Is that all you've got here? Your argument against reality is that the file isn't blue? Have you ever considered the possibility the icon being blue while the file is not means humans can differentiate between *several levels* of reality? Have you ever considered the possibility the icon is a *representation* of the file, and that the fact that clicking on the icon leads inexorably to the file means the clicker has correctly read reality?"

The "interview" pretty much devolves from there, getting worse, not better. But I found it amusing when Gifter asked Hoffman, "How did you first become interested in these ideas?" Since according to Hoffman I create my own reality, what I read next was not the embarrassing garbage apparently appearing on everyone else's computer screen, it was the far more informative response appearing on mine:

Hoffman: I became interested when Langley called me up and said they wanted me to be part of Project Chaos. They said all I had to do was get on the phone with some sim named Gifter—who was really working in the cubicle next to me—and lay a five-page runny egg at a website they were still tagging as *The Atlantic*—although the *The Atlantic* had of course been merged with Langley decades ago.

Giftter: And they pay you for that?

Hoffman: As far as I know. There are some figures on my bank statement I choose to read that way. I never leave the cubicle and they feed me lunch, so it never comes up.

Geftter: Cool.

Plus, notice that Hoffman's own career contradicts his theory. If reality is determined by fitness, then the personal reality he has created should have made him more fit for his function. In other words, his beliefs that he is a machine and that there is no reality should have made him a better scientist—better able to argue and better able to put together a theory that would convince others “sharing his consciousness”. Instead, all it has enabled him to do cobble together these asinine public responses that wouldn't convince a precocious porpoise, much less a person with any native intelligence.

But these strange people can't seem to see past their own eyelashes. I suppose Hoffman and Geftter must think they have made some good points, otherwise why publish this stuff with their names on it? They must genuinely feel that the icon being blue while the file isn't is some sort of master stroke of argumentation, worthy of wide dissemination and all due reverence. But that just means that both science and propaganda have hit some sort of historical nadir, where they believe they are scoring points while they are just fouling out in fantastic fashion.

If these fellows believe fitness is the final arbiter, they should note how a belief in reality and truth might serve someone in any given pursuit—say the pursuit of seeing right through them.

Yes, ironically, Hoffman's thesis is true in a sense, though not in the way they are selling it. They want you to believe snakes and trains don't really exist: you only *think* they do because it makes you more “fit” for something, although they don't say what. But snakes and trains **do** exist. There would be no point to your seeing them if they weren't there to be seen. Having a series of empty fantasies doesn't make you more fit for anything, except maybe easy destruction. That said, there is a subset of your experience that is an illusion. Although life is not an illusion, all the shit you are sold by the mainstream media *is* an illusion. Most of the news is an illusion, much of history is an illusion, large parts of the economy are an illusion, the elections are an illusion, Congress is an illusion, the President is an illusion, and so on. Not that these things don't exist; but they don't exist *as you think they do*. They are manufactured, managed, hoaxed, or otherwise faked. Animals and trees and so on live in the real world; you do only to a certain extent. To the extent you believe what the mainstream media tells you, to that extent you have been deluded, colluded, and just looted.

But I want to be sure you are seeing the turn of the screw. The reason they are pushing this “reality as an illusion” now as part of the continuation of Project Chaos is to prevent you from seeing all the hoaxed events. They know you have become aware of a major distortion, and they want you to think it is even bigger than it is. They know you are asking yourself and those around you if maybe the government is lying to you all the time about everything. So to confuse you, they are suggesting to you that maybe **it is your senses lying to you** about everything all the time. It isn't just the stories you are being told in the media that don't make sense, **it is life that doesn't make sense**. It isn't just Sandy Hook or the latest murder that is a hoax, **it is life itself that is the hoax**. It isn't just CIA-created stories that are illusory, **it is existence itself that is illusory**. If they can get you doubting that the snake or the rock exists, you aren't really going to care whether Sandy Hook happened. You will be so lost and confused you won't have the fortitude to question specific events. You will say to yourself, “Jeepers, if my husband and children are just figments of my imagination, I have more than enough to do in living with that everyday. That is more than enough to create a permanent never-ending neurosis, a hole in my head that cannot be repaired. Given the enormity of that, the latest government lie looks pretty trivial.”

I know that many readers will agree with that, but some will not like me accusing these guys of being CIA. Maybe Hoffman is what he says he is: a cognitive scientist. Just because I disagree with him doesn't make him an agent, does it? In truth, I don't care who or what he is. It is the message I am interested in, not the messenger. But I will tell you it would be an incredible coincidence if Hoffman just happened to be promoting exactly the same project in the same words, quoting the same sources, as all the other agents promoting Project Chaos over the decades. If these projects like Chaos and Cointelpro (which were real—they have been declassified, look it up) really ended back in the 1970s as we are assured, why is it that all the new projects look and feel exactly the same as the old ones? Why are all the major mainstream media sources pushing this “reality as an illusion” project, while none are pushing the opposite? Why is the entire modern education dominated by creepers like Hoffman? If the media is really open and multilateral, why does it appear so controlled and unilateral? If academia is just the search for truth, why does every “scholarly” or popular article you read have all the obvious earmarks of propaganda? Why do you never feel like you are being informed, but always feel like you are being spun?

And finally, why do you always feel like you are being spun not by Masters of Deception, but by pathetic flunkies residing in sub-basement 4 at Langley? Given the latitude and reach of Project Chaos, you would think they would assign it to top agents. Instead we find people like Hoffman and Gelter, people who couldn't win a junior-college debate and whose target audience would appear to be Zoloff-fogged teenagers. Do they really imagine that audience is clicking on articles at *The Atlantic*?

This is why I don't believe in the occult as it is sold, and why I think Intel is just using it as a smokescreen: I see no evidence of special powers, only the power to cower behind a tissue of poorly constructed fibs and feints. Dark Lords of the Occult would be far more impressive in every way, and there is no way someone like me could parry them with such ease.

I have already demonstrated that Hoffman is not arguing like a scientist would. He is arguing like an agent would, attempting to misdirect you with a series of parlor tricks. So even if he “really is a scientist”—working from an office at some university—it doesn't matter. If you are writing or speaking propaganda, you are a propagandist, and it doesn't really matter what your professional title is.

And that's the problem of the modern world: almost everyone *has* been hired, directly or indirectly, by the CIA or some front of a front of a front. The artists are propagandists, the scientists are propagandists, the academics in all fields are propagandists, the journalists are propagandists, the historians are propagandists, and so on. I would assume most of them know they are propagandists, and who they are working for, but even if some of them don't, it doesn't matter. Propaganda from dupes reads the same as propaganda from agents, and may be even more convincing.

And finally, you may have noticed I dated this paper 2106. If you agree with Hoffman, don't write in and tell me I made a mistake. There are no mistakes in a world of no reality, just “shared consciousness”, remember. I am sharing with you my consciousness that this may be 2106. Or not. I don't know why you care, because if the government tells you tomorrow it is yesterday, you will immediately back-date all your checks.