

[return to updates](#)

THE FIRES OF AUSTRALIA



Fir0002/Flagstaffotos

by Miles Mathis

First published January 7, 2020

A reader just sent me to Paul Joseph Watson's [newest Youtube video](#) on the Australian bush fires. Apparently it fooled her, and I can kind of see how. Watson is pretty convincing in his role and always has been. He fooled me for a while several years ago, before I wised up and caught on to the con. I had to remind her that Watson is one of Alex Jones' boys, and also probably a peerage brat. So we should know not to trust him on anything. Wikipedia has a page for him, but no parents or early bio are listed. My guess is he from the prominent Watsons, baronets in two lines, related to the Kennedys, Hamiltons, Beresfords, Walkers, MacKenzies, Dorman-Smiths, Robertson-Aikmans, and Dykes. Remember Aaron Dykes, also of Infowars? Possibly a cousin. Is Watson related to [Vice-Admiral Sir Philip Watson](#), d. 2009? Paul's father is named Philip, so possibly this is a great-uncle. You would think Paul would be too young or unimportant to have a genealogy posted online, but surprisingly Geni.com has a page for him. Although it is completely scrubbed, listing parents as private (not much of a genealogy page), its very existence indicates Paul is connected. *The DailyBeast* also [partially blew Watson's cover](#) in 2018, all but proving that he lied about his past. Watson has claimed he grew up poor in a council flat (poor housing), but it turns out he grew up on picturesque country estates in Sheffield. He went to highschool at Bradfield, which is inside a national park, and is perhaps the prettiest setting for school you will ever find.



That's nearby High Bradfield. His parents later lived in France. Paul's Watsons are from the vicinity of Sheffield, and a search on that area find a listing [at Dod's peerage](#) for Sir Henry Edmund Watson of Shirecliffe Hall, Sheffield, chairman of Cammell & Co, Cyclops iron and steel works; also director of Sheffield Banking Co.; also with a residence at Park Cottage, Worksop. Why do I mention it? Because *DailyBeast* tells us Paul Watson's dad worked as a grinder at an ironworks shop. I scoffed when I read that, thinking, "Yeah, or he owned the place". *The DailyBeast* piece looked to me from the beginning like a limited hangout, admitting Watson wasn't from the poorhouse, while still failing to tell us who he really is. I still believe that. Any other clues? Yes, since Shirecliffe Hall also happens to be very near where Paul Joseph Watson grew up. It is about **1 mile** from Loxley. Yes, Paul Joseph Watson grew up a stone's throw away from Shirecliffe Hall, where Sir Henry Watson, owner of large parts of Sheffield, lived. If you think that is a coincidence, you need to drink a stronger blend of coffee. Also interesting that Cammell & Co. was a major military contractor, making ordnance as well as steel for warships. In 1896 it bought out Solway Works and in 1903 took over the Birkenhead shipyards of the Laird Brothers.

Also of possible interest is that the [2nd Baronet Watson](#) of Henrietta St, London, (d. 1907) was also a **Jones** through his mother. His uncle and grandfather were both named Joseph Watson and his other grandfather was Edward Jones of Brackley. So Alex Jones and Paul Joseph Watson may be related. That would explain the previously unexplainable: how those two got together.

Anyway, Watson has that upperclass look about him, doesn't he? Plus, he admits he is part of the New Right, a big red flag. I have news for you, real revolutionaries don't come from the right and never did. They are supposed to come from the left. Being on the right means you are allied to the status quo and the rich. Is that really where you want to be? I didn't think so. They want you to think that if you are against transsexual bathrooms in grade schools you are conservative and therefore on the right, but don't let them fool you. If you are against the superwealthy lying to you and robbing you blind all the livelong day, you are on the LEFT. This is just more opposition control. The merchants are always trying to undermine their opposition, and one of the many ways they do that is by reversing the definitions of words, so you don't know who you are or where you are. Revolutionaries calling themselves rightists is just the most obvious example of that. It is a lead story of Operation Chaos.

Anyway, Watson tells us the fires in Australia are not a result of global warming. So he starts with the truth, to hook you. He shows Jennifer Aniston lying her ass off at the Golden Globes or somewhere,

which gets you on his side. No honest person can watch her lips moving without cringing. Ricky Gervais warned her not to talk political causes on the show, but did she listen? No.

So after leading with the truth, Watson then diverts you into his own lie: he tells you the fires were due to arson and to greenie tree huggers not allowing cutting in winter, to create fire breaks. So where Aniston was using the fires for her own fake cause, Watson is using them for his. He shows a long clip of some Crocodile Dundee in a hat calling environmentalists effing wombats and accusing them of being complicit in the deaths of 500 million animals. Even that huge lie contains a parcel of truth, since the fires *were* purposely set (arson) and the lack of tree breaks did add to the damage. However, Watson is spinning furiously, and you will understand how only after I unspin him.

Because the truth is behind rarely seen door number three, as usual. In the mainstream you always get door number one: the go-to lie, which in this case is the Global Warming thing. Then you get door number two: the alternative lie for the partially educated, which in this case is the “greenies did it” thing. While all along the truth is behind door number three: the merchants/capitalists/Phoenicians did it, to make money. I have no proof that is what happened here, so I will simply remind you that if we look to the past, we find that these events normally fall out in this way: the land developers and other fatcats in the area notice an untapped resource somewhere, so they start scheming how to make the most of it. Often they find that some poor people (often of some color) are camped out on or near this resource, which is inconvenient for their plans. So they need to find some way to move those people out. They could just buy these people off, and if the people are ignorant enough, they do. But people tend to get suspicious when billionaires start offering them low amounts for land, and some of them inevitably make trouble. So the capitalists and the companies fronting them learned long ago that it is often more efficient to drive the people off by burning them out, flooding them out, quaking them out, or something like that. Often these events will drive the people off altogether, in which case the rich guys take the land for little or nothing. They can then redevelop it any way they like, or mine it to any extent they see fit.

So, just by going from the past and running the odds, the chances are very high that is what is happening here. Notice that these events always seem to happen in areas experiencing high growth. You don't see them happen in repressed areas in rural Kansas or North Dakota, do you? Why? Because no one wants that land. No one is moving there, so all values are low. You see these events in places like California, Oregon, and Australia, where either land values are high or resources are tight. Do you think kids don't play with matches in low-rent, low-resource districts? Of course they do. But in low-rent districts they don't have the representatives of billionaires coming in and paying them to set fires in specific places.

If you don't believe me, just watch what happens in the places that appear to be the most targeted in Australia. Over the next decade, these locales will be taken over and redeveloped in some way by some big companies that miraculously make billions from them.

I have shown you that the billionaires even use wars for this purpose. We have seen that in the World Wars, the slums miraculously got targeted, while the commercial centers somehow avoided damage—just the opposite of what you would expect. After the war, the local governments conveniently used this to drive poor people out of city centers, relocating them and gentrifying their districts.

I still believe this is what happened in New Orleans. That was a planned fail if there ever was one, *at the least*. Even if hurricane Katrina wasn't created or abetted by weather modification, it is certain the failed response and breaching of the dykes and levees was no accident. It looks to me like the Army

Corp of Engineers were there to make sure the city was flooded as much as possible, in the right places. In fact, Wikipedia now admits many investigations concluded just that, with the Army avoiding prosecution only due to “sovereign” immunity from the Flood Control Act of 1928. The state can do no wrong, you know. If you don't believe me, see [this article from 2019](#), studying gentrification of New Orleans post-Katrina. It confirms our suspicions absolutely.

Now that you see what is probably going on in Australia, remind yourself who is enemy number one of the land developers. . . the GREENIES. Who benefits most from Paul Joseph Watson's blackwashing of the Greens? The land developers, big companies, and other billionaires and trillionaires. So, as usual, we find the same people controlling all sides of this, spinning it in several ways, and all spins spin for them. They spin it as due to global warming, which benefits the superwealthy, who are now invested in all sorts of schemes to address it. See Al Gore. They are currently discovering new ways to tax you for global warming on a daily basis, draining the treasury for another fake cause. They also spin it as due to environmentalists who love trees so much they end up causing a whole continent to go up in smoke. This creates a planned backlash against environmentalists and environmentalism, which suits the developers and big companies just fine. They don't want any real environmentalism, they only want Al Gore's fake environmentalism. They want a fake Green movement that doesn't accomplish anything, but that fills coffers and makes rich people richer. They don't want a Green movement that bans products, bans emissions, and meaningfully regulates commerce. They want a Green movement of higher taxes, carbon credits, and carbon trading, but they don't want a Green movement that bans chemicals, bans pollution, bans dumping, bans degradation, or bans corporate predation.

So be an environmentalist, just be the right kind. Be a leftist, just be the right kind. Normally you can do that by making sure you are on the opposite side of the predatory rich at all times. But you have to watch them like a hawk, or they will have you thinking you are on the right, or that you are a Communist, or that you are an anarcho-syndicalist or something. Before you know it, you will be so confused you won't remember what door you came through, and won't be able to tell the exit sign from the men's room.

Addendum January 8: I am informed by a reader I am on the right track. A main line of these fires just happens to be on the proposed route of a new expensive train. See [here](#) for more information. So Australia appears to be being prepped for a new “Smart” future, in which government can manage all facets of their lives.