

[return to updates](#)

# DECODING

## Silver Linings Playbook



by Miles Mathis

*First published July 6, 2014*

This may be a couple of years too late, but I work on my own schedule. I can't be bothered to respond to all propaganda in a timely manner. The film *Silver Linings Playbook* came out in 2012 and was nominated for 8 academy awards. Jennifer Lawrence won best actress.

I will now decode the movie for you. As part of that decoding, let us look at its 92% “fresh” score at Rotten Tomatoes. Along with IMDB, Rotten Tomatoes is one of the top online review sites for new movies. So a lot of people base their movie choices on the scores at these places. Like everything else, these scores are rigged. A large percentage of the “counted” reviews are written by embedded Intelligence agents, so—like the Academy Award nominations—these reviews simply act as promotion by the CIA for their own movies. You will ask for proof of that assertion, but the 92% score is proof enough by itself. Given nothing but the plot of the movie, anyone can see that score is ridiculously high. Any intelligent person can tell from [the preview](#) alone that the movie is garbage: each snippet is more cringe-inducing than the last. But the pages at Rotten Tomatoes disprove the number as well. [Go to the review pages](#) and catalog all the responses. If the movie were really so popular, [this guy's thread](#) should have been absolutely swamped by lovers of it. It isn't. A large percentage of posters agree with him that the movie was terrible. You find the same thing off the site, where a general Google search finds far more than 8% negative reviews. An honest researcher quickly discovers that a good percentage of real people didn't like this movie at all, which means that the “consensus” numbers

at the big sites must be faked.

What I am telling you is that there is no reason to trust the numbers at IMDB, Rotten Tomatoes, Metacritic, or anywhere else. Does that really surprise you? Given that you already know the government has infiltrated everything else, from your phone, your computer, your voting machines, your TV, your magazines, and your bank account, why would you trust IMDB or Rotten Tomatoes to tell you how good movies are? Do you think either place has an impermeable firewall that the CIA cannot penetrate?

Now let's study the plot. Husband Pat finds his wife in the shower with another man and beats him up. Everyone around Pat, led by psychiatrists and state workers, uses this to label him violent and bi-polar, drug him up, and then put him in an institution. No one in the movie finds this strange. Rather, the director of the film uses every trick in his arsenal to make the audience *agree* with the psychiatrists and state workers: a man who gets mad when he catches his wife in the shower with another man is mental. The sane reaction to such a situation is to ask them if they need any shampoo, I suppose; or to walk out the door, stroll calmly to the drugstore, and buy a year's supply of tranquilizers.

Actually, that part of the plot is told to you as backstory, which conveniently keeps you from questioning it. It just burrows into your brain like an alien worm inserted into your ear. It is surrounded by bad jokes and fast dialog, and you will have swallowed it before you even knew it was in your dinner.

This is so easy to deconstruct, folks. The government doesn't want you to think you have the right to feel any real emotions, or, worse, to act on them. If you feel mad or sad or even happy, they want you to think you have gone mental. They want you to believe the only sane response to the world is a flat acceptance. Even a shrug of the shoulders is suspect, because it indicates you may be hiding your true feelings. *You aren't allowed any true feelings.*

That is what "bi-polar" is telling you, you know. They are trying to sell you the idea that mood swings are unnatural. Just as they have labeled kids' natural energy as ADHD, they have labeled adults' natural moods as bi-polar. People are *supposed* to have mood swings, but they don't want you to believe that. People are supposed to feel both happy and sad, provided they have some reason to feel either way. Life here on Earth provides highs and lows in abundance, so we should look sideways at people who do *not* have mood swings, not those who do. If you don't have mood swings, you are a zombie in training.

But that doesn't suit the drug pushers. They see human nature not as a given, but as another thing they can exploit for profit. They want to turn every action and thought into a symptom they can medicate.

This movie is selling four things, and is not selling them subtly. First, it is selling the idea that being a man (or a human) is now unacceptable behavior. Fifty years ago, the same scene in a movie would have been read the opposite way: the wife would have been seen as an adulterer, the other man would have been seen as a creep who got what he deserved, and Husband Pat would have been seen as a hero. If Husband John Wayne had thrown other man out the window on his head, no one would have blinked an eye.

But that was the past. They are now prepping you for the future. They want to fill the jails and institutions with men and women who have done nothing but defend a spouse or a child. And they want you to look the other way as they take away your family members for minor infractions. They

want to train you to say to yourself, “Well, Dad *did* raise his voice and hit the wall when we lost our life savings. I guess he *does* need to be tasered 20 times, taken away in a straight jacket, and force-fed expensive pharmaceuticals for several years.”

And that's the second thing they are selling: drugs. It's all drugs all the time with these people. Not just ads and commercials for drugs, but entire TV shows and books and movies selling drugs. Remember how we caught *New Yorker* writer [Andrew Solomon pushing Celexa](#) for his billionaire dad recently, and getting top literary prizes for it? Well, that is now the norm. The big companies now own everything and everyone, including the literary prizes, the art prizes, and the science prizes. They own the debunking sites and news sites and information sites. They own the encyclopedias and the dictionaries. They own the bookstores and the music stores. And they own Hollywood.

Actually Hollywood has been owned for many decades, but they no longer even bother to hide it. At least half the movies are now just the CIA writing about itself, in plain sight. David O. Russell has long been one of the go-to directors for the most transparent propaganda. His first film *Spanking the Monkey* is renowned for its mother/son incest plot. We aren't sure if the CIA suggested that plot to Russell or if it just brought him to their attention. He directed *Three Kings* and *I Heart Huckabees*, both as transparent as thinnest glass. *Three Kings* was definitely suggested to him by some government agency, since it is about GI's stealing gold during the First Iraq War. Although it is an absolutely awful movie in every conceivable way, we are told it grossed over \$100 million worldwide. Believe that if you must, but I don't. I remember I saw it (don't remember *why*) with a girlfriend who was definitely not a conspiracy theorist, but even she saw through it immediately. Now I remember: it was a first or second date in 1999—before 911 turned me into a Truther—and I was impressed that she used the word propaganda before I did. That doesn't happen very often anymore.

*I Heart Huckabees* was intended to “humorously” undercut the environmental movement and to sell a couple of shallow new-age philosophies, but the plot is such a godawful mess it is doubtful the audience was done much harm.

*Silver Linings Playbook* may be more successful in that regard, because it is more insidious. Of all the negative reviews I read, none could point to the most dangerous plot devices. They hated it for technical reasons, not moral ones. No one pointed out what I did above. Nor did they point out that when Pat wasn't being controlled by doctors or psychologists or social workers, he was being controlled by crazy or evil women. Pat can't seem to do anything—good or bad—without some woman pushing him or pulling him along. This is to further cement into your mind that women usually make everything happen in this world—and should—although the truth is the opposite. For instance, we always see beautiful women pursuing men in movies, but in the real world we almost never do. Tiffany hits on Pat and follows him. Personally, I have *never* seen that happen. I lived and dated in Austin for 20 years, and Austin is one of the hottest places for singles in the country, according to the statistics. I am a good-looking guy and most of my male friends were/are good-looking. We went out constantly. Not only did women *not* approach us, they usually avoided eye contact as if we were all mutants or lepers. Every guy knows that women make you work for it. Most of the good-looking women already have boyfriends, but if they don't, they know they are a hot commodity. They know the guys will line up to talk to them, and all they have to do is pick. They will never approach a guy because they know they don't have to. They don't even flirt. I suppose women may have known how to flirt 50 years ago, but I see no evidence they do now. The only evidence I have seen of flirting in the past 30 years in my own life is women who flirt with guys who are already taken or otherwise unavailable. That by itself tells you all you need to know about current sexual politics.

So why do directors always invert this in the movies? Why are women always flirting and giving single guys the come-on in movies? To mess with your mind. They are selling you an upside down world on purpose, to permanently confuse you.

Which brings us to the third thing they are selling you here: psychology and psychologists. The plot is heavily driven by psychology, psychologists, and psych drugs. In the book the film was based on, Pat's character says he thinks of his psychologist like Yoda: whenever he has a problem to solve, he thinks of carrying his psychologist on his back, like Luke carried Yoda in *The Empire Strikes Back*. The psychologist talks into his ear, driving him on. It is pretty easy to see how that makes the psychologist into superhero. Yoda isn't just a guru, he is a *Jedi Master*. This is how the psychologists see themselves, and how they want you to see them. They want you to see them that way because if you do it is so much easier to push drugs on you.

Psychology has been a primary product of Hollywood for decades, but this gambit kicked into higher gear in the 1990's with films like *Good Will Hunting*. [That was a typo, but I like it: I am going to start calling all propaganda films "flims." Think "phlegm," "flimsy," and "flim-flam."] If you will remember, Robin Williams plays Will's psychologist, and he has a major roll in the flim. He even makes the flim's poster, instead of Ben Affleck.



It is from Williams' character that we get some of most transparent propaganda.

But back to *Silver Linings Playbook*. The fourth thing they are selling you is gambling. Pat's dad wins his parlay, which never happens.

The only good thing about the flim is when Pat throws Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* out the window. But he does so only because the book doesn't have a happy ending. There are a lot of [reasons to throw the book out the window](#), but that isn't one of them.

So here is your final flim workbook: listen to your doctor, be a quiet cuckold, takes your meds (the entire sack full), don't hit on women because they will come to you, suppress all your emotions, don't have any opinions, and go to a casino at least once a month. Oh, and marry a crazy girl, because that's all there is left. She will then tell you what to do moment to moment, channeling the CIA men in her head.

