

[return to updates](#)

PRESIDENT WILLIAM MCKINLEY

another fake assassination



by Miles Mathis

First published December 12, 2020

The alternative press (*WinterWatch*, I assume CIA) just came out with [a controlled opposition story on this one](#), which woke me from my winter slumbers. According to that site, McKinley was murdered because he stood in the way of the deep state. Specifically, he was murdered by top bankers because he was promoting sound money and opposing central banking. If you believe that, you really need to take off the mask and breathe deeply: your brain is skunked on CO₂. No one gets to be President in the first place without being an agent of the bankers. They run this country and always have. We will see evidence of that specific to this story below.

I have previously outed this event as a fake in my 2015 [paper on Eugene Debs](#), but I only gave you about a paragraph there, so I am back to hit it in more detail, as promised. This event is fabulously easy to see through, so it is all the more amazing no one has done it before. *WinterWatch* drops a whole nest of clues right down your throat, and we could prove a case only from that. But there are many other sources I will hit as well.

In the Debs paper, I showed you one fake photo that pretty much sealed the deal on its own:



Look closely at his feet and the stairs. They were drawn in, weren't they? And not very well. Ask yourself why they needed to fake photos of a real event. This by itself all but proves the event was fake.

But as I say, I have a lot more for you here if that isn't enough. We will start with the fact that McKinley's father-in-law *was* a top banker. Yes, McKinley married Ida Saxton, daughter of James Saxton of Canton, Ohio. The Saxtons owned and ran the town, having founded the banks and the newspaper as well. Ida's mother was Kate Dewalt, born **August 18, 1827**. Kate's mother was a Harter. Ida's stepmother was Hettie Medill, closely related to journalist Joseph Medill. Medill owned the *Chicago Tribune* and was also the mayor of Chicago. Medill links us to the [fake Lincoln assassination](#) as well, since he had been a friend and top supporter of Lincoln.

James Saxton's bio is curiously scrubbed, since we are told that after becoming the top banker in that part of Ohio, he went to New York for many years to work on important projects. We aren't told what those projects were. When Ida married McKinley, the couple lived in the gigantic Saxton mansion with her parents. They remained there until McKinley became Governor.

Paydirt comes when we do [a genealogy search on this James Saxton](#). The name was formerly Sexton, and he was a **Bush, a Harlan, a Spencer, and a Fitzgerald**. He is descended directly from Sarah Whitman Bush of Cumberland, NJ. Also from Hanna Spencer of Hartford, CT. These are the Spencers who came over from Bedfordshire, England. This does indeed link us back to the Earls of Sunderland and the Dukes of Marlborough, and forward to the Spencer-Churchills. It also links us to the Herveys, **Stanleys and Nevilles**, taking us straight to the top, and to my analysis in previous papers.

But McKinley wasn't just linked to the other Presidents and the peerage through his wife, he was linked to them directly through his own mother, who was a **Campbell**. There are a lot of Campbells in the peerage, but these Campbells came from Kamis Castle, Bute, Scotland, where they were related to

Boyd, and McLeans. These Campbells were the Baronets of Auchinbreck, also related to the Stuarts, Kennedys, Penneys, Fords, Noels, Crichtons, Erskines, Lindsays (Earls of Balcarres), Gordons, and Blairs. The Stuarts take us directly back to the Stewarts, High Stewards of Scotland. At the time of the McKinley assassination, the Campbell Baronet was the 10th, and he married the daughter of the Marquis de Sarzano, Girolamo Carandini. The Carandini were a very old noble family of Modena, first ennobled by Frederick Barbarossa. This link to Italy is not beside the point, as you are about to see. As a side note, the actor Christopher Lee is a Carandini. Remind yourself what he looks like.



On his father's side, McKinley was a Rose and a Chapman. Rose is a Jewish name, originally Rosen. He was also a Stewart in the McKinley line, meaning his parents were cousins. Geni scrubs the Chapmans, but we know who they are: they link us forward to Mark David Chapman, who they admit was related to everyone famous. They also link us to Lawrence of Arabia, who was a Chapman. The Chapmans were also baronets, linking us to the Boyds again and completing the circle. So McKinley's parents were cousins in a second line. The 4th Baronet Chapman married a Fetherstonhaugh, whose mother was Dorothea George. Hold onto that name, since we are about to see it again. Dorothea's father Denis George was the Baron of the Exchequer in Ireland, meaning he was a banker.

I have already linked these people to the fake Lincoln assassination above, but they were linked to another faked death, in the person of Ida Saxton's brother George. Just three years before McKinley's fake assassination, George was allegedly murdered in 1898. This one is also a transparent fraud, one that any investigator could spot in about 30 seconds. We are told George Saxton's lover Anna Ehrhart George was tried for his murder, but was acquitted, claiming self-defense. We are not told how it could be self-defense when she allegedly followed him to the house of his current lover, and shot him on the doorstep—just as she had threatened to do many times. Notice that she was a George, meaning she was related to these people before the fake murder, as I just showed you. So it was all in the family, as usual. We see another joke in the name of Anna's ex-husband: Sample C. George. Reminds us of Lenin's grandfather Dr. Blank. And who did Sample George marry after divorcing Anna? Lucy Graham. The Grahams are Dukes of Montrose, remember. The Duke at the time of the McKinley assassination was the 5th, whose mother was a Montagu, of the Dukes of Manchester. This links us to George Washington, of course, since he was a Montagu.

Also notice the name Ehrhart, which is the same as Earhart. So this lady may have been related to [Amelia Earhart](#). In fact, she almost certainly *was*, since Earhart was related to all the Presidents, and therefore also George, McKinley, and Saxton.

Anyway, neither the Saxtons nor the McKinleys attended the trial of Anna George, indicating they knew it was a hoax and therefore a waste of their time. They knew that George Saxton, a notorious playboy and gambler, had gotten in over his head in debt and had to flee the State. A faked death was the best way to cover his tracks. These people do this all the time, and we have seen it over and over and over. All you have to do is fake the story of a trial in the newspapers, and conveniently these people owned many top newspapers, as we saw above. We have more confirmation of this in that Anna repeated the whole story again with her next husband, **Dr. Arthur Ridout**, another notorious gambler who also faked his death. So whatever Anna's real name was, it looks like she was just an Intel actress/cousin inserted into these stories to play the foil. Ridout's fake death was ruled a suicide, which means it was even easier: they only had to pay Anna and the coroner. Ridout was of the Ridouts of Toronto, who were also British peers. They came from the Powells and Grants of Boston, linking us to President Grant. This also links us to the Baronets Floyd, and through them to the Murrays. Also to the Baronets Wodehouse, who link us to the Bacons. Most importantly, the Ridouts were also. . . Campbells, linking the same families once again. At the time of these faked deaths, the Ridouts were the top merchants of Toronto. They were also involved in insurance, indicating life insurance fraud may have been part of these cons. See George Percival Ridout of Toronto, who was head of the British American Assurance Company from 1853-73. These Ridouts were also tied to the massive insurance fraud of the *Titanic*, since Walter George Ridout was allegedly on it. He is on the victims' list as a saloon steward. His body was never found, of course.

The fact that the McKinleys and Saxtons failed to attend this trial reminds us that Ida McKinley also failed to attend the funeral of her own husband three years later, though she was First Lady. Like Mary Todd Lincoln before her, she couldn't be bothered.

I will get to more evidence in a moment, but I will tell you the main reason McKinley's death was faked when it was. Notice it was faked right after he started his second term. He had only been in office five months, and he had done almost nothing. So little was going on in 1901, McKinley and his wife were touring the nation that spring rather than working in DC. Even that tour had to be cancelled, due to Ida falling ill. Rather than return to Washington and get busy, McKinley went into hiding, indicating either 1) it was *he* that was seriously ill, not Ida, 2) the planned transition to his Vice President Roosevelt was already under way, or 3) both. Remember, McKinley was very popular, so they knew going in he could win the election. But though the hidden families preferred Roosevelt, they weren't sure they could get him elected. He was too young, being only 41 when the election started. This would open him to attacks. It was far easier to attach him to McKinley, have McKinley elected, then make the switch afterwards. Just like with Lincoln. Lincoln was re-elected to insert Johnson, and McKinley was re-elected to insert Roosevelt. This has always been a weak point in the US system: the governors can insert anyone they like into the Presidency this way, completely bypassing the voting process. No one really voted for Roosevelt in 1900, since a suit stuffed with straw could have played the same role in the election. Voters vote for the President, and the Vice-President is a ghost.

My feeling is that McKinley, like Lincoln, *was* mortally ill. I come to that conclusion by looking at his wife and what she did after his death. If she had also died or disappeared or moved out of the country, I would suggest McKinley lived on, relocating somewhere. But since Ida lived six more years in the family mansion in Canton, I assume McKinley really died soon thereafter. But there are other possibilities. McKinley could have holed up in one of the family mansions, or he could have left Ida

and moved abroad anywhere he liked. These families have infinite resources and can do anything they wish. As we have seen many times, faking deaths is cake for them, and if they want to remain in town in the old home, they can do even that. All it takes is a wig and a change of clothes. Put McKinley in overalls and a beard, and no one will recognize him. And if someone does, the story will never make the papers, since the papers are owned by their families.

OK, now let's return to *WinterWatch* to extract the clues there. We start with the story that security for the President was non-existent. Same thing we were told with Lincoln. . . but it wasn't true. Winter doesn't question that story, simply repeating it, indicating he is another plant:

Security was non-existent as the shooter came through a receiving line at the Temple of Music at the Buffalo, New York, Pan-American Exposition. As assassinations go, this was an easy operation.

Yes, assassinating Presidents is always an easy operation, since they travel with no security and have no security protocols. Except that they do. The President has always had heavy security, and before the Secret Service was the Pinkerton Agency, which you can read about at Wikipedia and other places. Anyone who knows of the Secret Service and the Pinkerton Agency knows that these stories we are told about Lincoln and McKinley and Kennedy having zero or slack security are just lies. In fact, we saw exactly the same lies in the story of [Olaf Palme's assassination in Sweden](#). Palme was supposedly wandering the streets at night with his wife without a security detail. You have to laugh. They know that people will believe anything, so they don't even have to come up with a believable story. They can directly contradict what is known and admitted by experts, since they figure you aren't an expert and won't look up anything. You will just believe whatever you read. That is what Winter is relying on.

On a separate page, Winter tells us about George Cortelyou, McKinley's personal secretary, effectively his Chief of Staff. Winter admits Cortelyou was a protégé of Wilson Bissell, whose brother was president of the New York Bankers Association. Winter spins this to imply Cortelyou was a mole, but the position of private secretary wouldn't be a good place to insert a mole. McKinley knew Cortelyou far too well, and had appointed him himself, obviously; so this was no position for a mole. What Winter is trying to cover is the obvious fact that Cortelyou again linked McKinley to top bankers. So he couldn't have been their enemy. Under Roosevelt, Cortelyou became Secretary of the Treasury, just in time to be at the helm for the managed Panic of 1907. Winter tells us the Panic was managed by J. P. Morgan, so that he could look like a savior of the economy, but that was only a sidelight. The main functions of that Panic were twofold: replacing the Independent Treasury with the private Federal Reserve, and stealing billions from lesser investors. The billionaires could also buy up failed businesses and properties in this created downcycle. . . just like now.

Next, Winter contradicts himself mightily, admitting that the Secret Service and private detectives *were* there. We are even told that the head of the Exposition Louis Babcock had heard a rumor the President would be shot that day, and hired extra security, including a dozen artillerymen in full uniform in the aisles. Winter implies Cortelyou was in on the plot to murder McKinley, but then also admits that Cortelyou was standing right next to McKinley when the shots were fired. That makes no sense, since you wouldn't want to be standing a foot away in a real event: you might catch a stray bullet. The bullet that allegedly ricocheted off McKinley's button could have caught Cortelyou in the eye.

And we get another parallel to the Lincoln story: McKinley was allegedly taken to the makeshift Exposition hospital, which had no doctors. Only nurses. This despite the fact they were in Buffalo, with many hospitals nearby. They weren't in Tahiti or on the Moon. Two doctors were brought in at

last, but one was a gynecologist. So you see how the jokes continue. The room had no lights and no surgical equipment, but apparently no one thought to take the President someplace that did. Many hours later a specialist arrived, but he declined to take over the surgery even though the gynecologist had not been able to find the bullet. Although the surgery had been a failure, when McKinley was moved at last, it wasn't to a real hospital. It was to the private home of John Milburn. Because that makes sense, right? Milburn was a high-powered attorney and friend of McKinley and Grover Cleveland who had represented Standard Oil. So he was yet another spook here.

But here's the clincher: when McKinley died after a week of utter neglect, his autopsy was done by . . . the same two doctors, including the gynecologist. Hmm. I didn't realize gynecologists were licensed to do autopsies. They never found that bullet, though we are told he died of gangrene from it. Winter doesn't question any of this, beyond implying it meant McKinley's treatment must have been botched on purpose, as part of a larger conspiracy. Not once does he consider that this impossible story might be the sign of a fake.

However, I point out that if this murder had been part of a larger conspiracy, the conspirators certainly would have covered their tracks better than this. Do you really think they would have hired a gynecologist to be part of this conspiracy? Why not hire a doctor who looked real? Why not hire a real coroner and pay him off? Why have this specialist travel from Niagara and then refuse to operate? Why not have McKinley carried to a real hospital, and pay off staff there? Why publish a story so obviously full of holes?

I will tell you: they aren't careful with these stories and spend no time making them seamless because they know it doesn't matter. No real murder took place, so any investigation is guaranteed to turn up nothing. No one fears being found out, because there is nothing to find out. There is no chance anyone will be tried for murder in a real court, since there was no murder. It is all just a story. And the story is not for any enemies of the conspirators, who might make them pay. The story is for you and you alone, and they figure you are a moron. These stories are for the unwashed public, who know nothing about nothing. They are for people who couldn't solve the mystery of a baby's fart.

The next big clue Winter gives you is that billionaire banker Jakob Schiff was bankrolling the whole Jewish/Socialist side of this fake, including Trotsky, Emma Goldman, and by association also Leon Czolgosz, the alleged gunman in the McKinley story. In the mainstream story, Czolgosz was tied not only to Emma Goldman, but to Abraham Isaak in Chicago, publisher of the fake communist rag *Free Society*. This of course tied Czolgosz not only to the fake assassination attempt on Henry Frick, but also to the fake assassination of King Umberto I of Italy. What the mainstream and alternative stories don't tell you is that Schiff was bankrolling these people as a pretend opposition. Communism had been invented by the bankers [even before Marx arrived](#), and it was invented to infiltrate and detooth any real Republican opposition to the capitalists. Marx was bankrolled by his uncle, who was a Philips of the billionaire Dutch Philips—involved in banking and everything else. They were an arm of the Rothschilds. Well, Schiff was just their richest cousin on this side of the pond, and as such he was expected to run the fake Marxist scheme here, importing all these European Jews to come to the US and pretend to be revolutionaries. When they ended up appearing to kill the President, any real revolutionary or republican spirit would be crushed. No American patriots would want to join these foreign Jews in their projects, and the public would be even less sympathetic. It was all another grand blackwashing of the left.

And it continues. We see the same thing right now in the current and ongoing Presidential election, where they are blackwashing the left with Antifa and Social Justice Warriors and BLM and so on.

They want you to hate “liberals”, moving you right by a grand fooling. So they fake all these liberal organizations and pay them to do outrageous stuff. They have you right where they want you: blabbing about how you hate bankers, but then voting Republican—for the bankers. Yes, shake yourself awake and remind yourself that they now have you within a few months or weeks of joining a revolution on the street to support the Republican Party. Let me say that again, for effect: **a revolution for the Republican Party.** You will be screaming and clamoring and perhaps shooting in support of the Republican Party. The party of the very rich. Yes, both parties are owned by the bankers, but the Republican Party has been their premier arm for many decades, and that hasn't changed. While the Democrats were moving hard right into fascism over the past 25 years, the Republicans were *not* moving left. In other words, the Republicans were not becoming the party of the people, the populist party. The Republican party has zero populist planks, although it sometimes pretends it does. Is the Republican Party for taxing the rich, regulating business, supporting unions, lowering income disparity, breaking monopolies, nationalizing the Fed, or preventing corporate looting and predation? No. Just the opposite.

Let's go ahead and blow the fake assassination of Umberto while we are here. He was the father of King Victor Emmanuel III, who we saw hiding behind [Mussolini in my paper on him](#). To start with, Umberto died at age 56, which is about all the life these royals could expect at the time. They normally lived lives of such dissipation they were ruined by their 50s. So we should go in once more with the assumption he was mortally ill, and they simply used his death to blackwash the Republicans or “Communists”. In fact, given the connections of this event to similar events at the same time in the US and other countries, we should take that assumption as almost a given. I have proved they were doing just that, and this duck quacks in exactly the same way.

There had been two previous assassination attempts on Umberto, though they were lame, being with knives. What kind of idiot tries to kill a king in public with a knife? They also appear to be fake, and act mostly as foreshadowing of the later event. The assassination was July 29, 1900, in Monza. That is 7/29. Add em up, it equals 18. Wikipedia tells us nothing about the assassination, which is curious. His assassin was alleged to be Gaetano Bresci, and once again we only have a fake photo of him:



As a professional portrait painter, I can tell you that is actually a painting made to look like a photo. But since they had photos at that time, we should at least have a mugshot of him. A mugshot would not be taken in black tie, so we have to wonder why he seems to be in a tuxedo there. He was not

supposed to be wealthy, being a poor weaver from Paterson, NJ. He was a founder of the anarchist newspaper there, *La Questione Sociale*. Bresci was allegedly radicalized by Errico Malatesta, who at least has a real photograph.



I'm not saying that's really him, but it is a real photo. Malatesta was a friend of Bakunin, which already pegs him as an agent. They admit Malatesta was from a rich family in Caserta. The Malatestas had ruled Rimini for centuries. This may link us to the Carandinis above, since Rimini is near Modena, both being in the vicinity of Bologna. Regardless, Caserta links Malatesta to the Bourbons, who owned Caserta Castle. And this links him to the Savoys, which is the important link here. He got his start writing nasty letters to Umberto's father, Victor Emmanuel II, a Savoy. Which means he was writing nasty letters to a peerage cousin.

Although Malatesta was an aristocrat, the opposite of a worker, he joined the International Workingman's Association in 1871. This was the First International, founded in St. Martin's Hall in London by a congregation of spooks. Its first congress was held in Geneva, not exactly a workingman's destination. Geneva is one of the wealthiest cities in Europe, and is not known as a haven for laborers. Do you want to guess who founded this organization? Charles **Limouzin**, among others. Does that name look familiar? It should. George Orwell's mother was a Limouzin, and they were extremely wealthy merchants, all but owning Burma at the time. This is not beside the point, since Orwell's aunt Ellen was heavily involved in the fake Socialism project. See for example the Wiki page of Eugene Lanti, who worked with her and even lived with her. She is listed as his spouse. He was a founding member of the French Communist Party, though as usual it was just a big front for controlling the opposition.

Charles Limouzin was actually the name of Orwell's uncle, though this was a later relation. The Limouzins had been French nobility for millennia. Eleanor of Aquitaine, who married both Louis VII of France and Henry II of England, was a Limousin, as well as a Poitiers and a Rouchefoucauld. She was also a **Savoy**, which of course ties in here. Louis VII's mother was Adelaide of Savoy. King Umberto was a Savoy. So the question you should be asking is, why were the billionaire Limouzins involved in founding the First International in London in 1864. Does that make any sense? Were the Limouzins workingmen? No, they were the sworn enemies of workingmen the world over, and

literally enslaved many people in Burma. It would be sort of like like Ramses founding an anti-slavery group.

So, I have now linked Bresci to the First International and that nest of agents, proving he was one of theirs. Since the Limouzins were related to the Savoys, they certainly wouldn't hire someone to kill the Savoy king, would they? So we know without further proof that this must have been faked somehow.

We also know by the form of the story, [which is possible to track down online](#). Umberto was allegedly shot while giving awards to athletes after a competition. So once again we are supposed to believe the King travelled with little or no security and obeyed no security protocols. Those in the crowd were not frisked. This despite the fact that the King, a tyrannical monster, was wildly unpopular and had allegedly been attacked at least twice before.

We are supposed to believe that rather than shoot while the King stood like a target on the podium, Bresci waited until he had climbed back into the carriage. That makes no sense since Bresci would have to fire through a window and would be blocked by those surrounding the carriage. On the podium Umberto would have been a clear target. Obviously, the story was told this way so that there would be no observers. On the podium, there would be hundreds of observers. But in the carriage there would be only one or two. People on the ground could be easily fooled, since almost no one could see into the carriage. All they had to do is fire four blanks and then drive off.

More proof it was faked is that Bresci was sent to the island prison of Santo Stefano, where he mysteriously died before serving one year. Why send him to an island prison? Again, because fewer people would see him there, or NOT see him there. Same reason they claimed to send Napoleon to St. Helena. Santo Stefano is where they always sent anarchists, and now you know why. It should have always seemed curious, since there is no other reason to send these people to an island prison.

Another clue is found by searching on the Brescis. They were not poor **weavers**, although that is a clue. They were wealthy linen merchants from Sicily, related to the Marcheses and Alianos. In other words, Phoenician Navy. They later headed the Mafia in Palermo, but that of course was just another cover for the Families. These were crime families, but they weren't low-life mobsters, they were centuries-old or millennia-old nobility. Marchese means "Marquis" or "Marquess", the noble rank just under Duke.

But let us return to McKinley's fake assassination. We have already tied the shooter Czolgosz to the fake socialists, but let's hit him a little harder. His mother was a Nowak from Poland, which means they were Jewish. Nowak=**Novak**. Leon Czolgosz came out of the Knights of the Golden Eagle, and even Wikipedia admits it was funded by secret societies like the Odd Fellows (and, we may assume, the Freemasons). The Knights of the Golden Eagle was a spin-off of the Knights of Pythias, which was founded by Justus **Rathbone**. I trust you recognize that name from the Lincoln Assassination. A Rathbone was in the box with Lincoln when he was killed, and allegedly fought with John Wilkes Booth. The Rathbone who founded the Pythians was Justus Henry Rathbone, b. 1839, an **actor**. He is given no bio at Wiki, but he was indeed related to the Henry Rathbone in the Lincoln event, b. 1837. In fact, they were cousins, both being from upstate New York. The Rathbones were also wealthy merchants, so there is no reason for them to be founding Socialist organizations. Also of interest to us here: Henry Rathbone's mother was a **Penney**, linking us to the Campbells and McKinleys.

And remember, these Rathbones were close relatives of the Todds, as in Mary Todd Lincoln. So we can link the two assassinations through the Rathbones.

The emblem of the Knights of the Golden Eagle is not really an eagle, it is a phoenix, of course. Telling us once again who we are dealing with.



We aren't told where the name Pythias comes from, but we may assume it is not from the wife of Aristotle. More likely is that it refers to the Oracle of Delphi, where the high priestess was called the Pythia. As the Oracle of Apollo, she was named after Python, the dragon slain by Apollo. Delphi, the center of the Earth, had been the lair of Python. So this looks like another nod by the secret societies to a regeneration myth, like that of the Phoenix. But while the Phoenix regenerated itself on the flames, Apollo founded a new religion on the bones of Python. Which reminds us that Apollo was just a Greek rebranding of the Egyptian god Ra. Ra was depicted as falcon, but the falcon appears to have been later conflated with the Phoenix. Both were drawn with outstretched wings and claws holding balls or planets.

I also point out that this may be where Monty Python got their name. That has always been a mystery, and this would explain it. My guess is the Pythons are referencing the same ancient lines their more serious cousins are. I remind you, Monty Python is most famous for ridiculing both Christ and King Arthur. Just a coincidence? You have to be kidding.

At any rate, I have previously tied Delphi to the Phoenicians, and this confirms that reading. How? By explaining the Temple as a conquering and rebranding of a local, pre-Phoenician religion at that place. In other words, the Phoenicians, who were offshoots of Egypt, conquered Greece sometime in the second millennium BC, replacing a local deity at Delphi with their own Ra/Apollo deity. To make that replacement stick with locals, they claimed the priestess there was divinely possessed, speaking straight from the godhead. Nothing stops questions more fully than a claim of divine inspiration.

But back to Czolgosz and McKinley. Czolgosz is said to have shot only twice, the first bullet ricocheting off a button, and only one bullet entering the President's belly. Does that make any sense? He shot with a revolver, so why shoot only twice? And since this was a .32 caliber, a coat button could not block the bullet. The bullet would have driven the button straight into the belly, causing awful damage. And if only one bullet entered McKinley's belly, the odds are that wouldn't be fatal. Czolgosz should have aimed higher in the torso or shot McKinley in the head. He was standing a foot away, so why not shoot him right in the face? The only way a single bullet to the belly would be fatal is if it went through and hit the spinal cord, but we aren't told this happened. Otherwise, the bullet should have been easy to find, fat or no fat. You just follow the path of damage. McKinley allegedly died eight days later. He died at 2:15am. Adds to eight again. To go with the eights, we get an eleven in the story: the shots rang out at 4:07pm. Add em up. Giving us aces and eights. Czolgosz was taken to the 13th precinct house, though it wasn't the nearest police station. They just wanted to get that number

in there, I guess.

The prosecutor was Thomas Penney, and we have already seen that name above, *twice*. McKinley was a Penney through his mother, so the prosecuting attorney was another cousin. Also remember that Lord Penney was later head of the British delegation at the Manhattan Project.

Mysteriously, Czolgosz was assigned not one but two men to defend him, one being Robert Cyrus Titus, formerly of the New York Supreme Court; and the other being Loran Ludowick Lewis, also formerly of the New York Supreme Court. So two top New York judges were defending this deadbeat assassin, we assume *pro bono*. We are told they were appointed by the court, but the court had no authority to appoint two ex-Supreme Court judges as defense attorneys. They must have volunteered. They weren't able to help him at all, and didn't even appear capable of entering a plea. Czolgosz himself entered a plea of guilty, but the judge wouldn't accept it, entering a plea of not-guilty instead. Proving the trial was fake once again.

Czolgosz was electrocuted with three jolts of 1,800 volts. Aces and eights again. We know this is a signal, since that number isn't even right. In the beginning, the voltage was 1,700 volts, and it is now 2,000 volts. It was never 1,800 volts.

On the way out, we will look at the reason this was event was run one more time. We saw above that it had to do with retiring a possibly ill McKinley and inserting Roosevelt without an election. But these events are always used for multiple purposes. Think of the 911 event, which joined many projects, including getting rid of unprofitable towers, insurance fraud, blackwashing Arabs, starting a war, and founding the Department of Homeland Security. The McKinley event did multiple-duty as well, and one of the top secondary duties was allowing Roosevelt to come in and crack down on Socialists and Anarchists. Since there were almost no real Socialists or Anarchists, he used the event to crush unions, progressives, and all government critics. He used it to quash any form of populism, republicanism, or libertarianism, while positioning *himself* as a populist.

Which reminds us that the Republican Party has been doing this from the beginning. Despite always being viciously *anti-republican*, the Republican Party coopted the name, completely flipping it. The word republican originally meant supporting the people against predation by the capitalists, but the Republican Party has always been owned by the top capitalists. Same for the Democratic Party, of course, which has never had any interest in democracy. Their interest since the beginning has been in undermining democracy by any mean possible, making the people think the country was democratic when it was just the opposite. That has never been clearer than now, so I suggest you slap yourself awake. Take off the mask and breathe deeply. There are things to do and maybe now you know what they are.

I will give you a hint: it isn't shooting the fake President, whoever he is. It isn't joining Antifa or the Proud Boys. It isn't buying bitcoin. It isn't yapping about Satanists or pedophiles or Freemasons or the Illuminati. It is about saying no to the future the merchants have planned for you. Don't buy their shit or believe their lies. Don't accept the vaccine or any of their other drugs, don't accept social distancing, don't accept masks, don't accept the splitting of the sexes or the destruction of the family, don't let them close your business, don't let them close your church, don't let them take your home or your savings, don't let them turn your schools into propaganda fronts, don't let them control your children through TV, Hollywood, and the internet. Don't let them control you through your children. Throw the TV and the computers and the cellphones out the window if you have to. Whatever they tell you to do, refuse.