

[return to updates](#)

The Monica Lewinsky Scandal was faked




by Miles Mathis

First published March 5, 2016

As usual, this is just my opinion, arrived at by personal research and protected by the Constitution.

What got me into this one was seeing a picture of Clinton and Lewinsky together and realizing it was faked. I then checked the other photos of them together: they were *all* faked.

We'll start with the photo above, which is the one I stumbled across. Let's look at a better copy of it:



I hope you can see why I knew that was a fake in the first seconds. Start with the edges of Lewinsky, where she meets the background. Completely unnatural. The worst may be the top of her head. Why is her hair weirdly flat on top? Then look closely at her hair on the side of her head near Clinton. No wisps over there, just odd strands that look like they were drawn in in photoshop. Next, look at the thin white line where her cheek on that side meets her collar or hair. That indicates this photo of her was taken outside, and she was standing next to something very white which was reflecting back on her. Nothing in this picture, as it is, would explain that white line. The picture of Clinton was also taken outside, as we can see from the shadows—or lack of them. He is lit from above by the sun, not by indoor office lights of the kind indicated by the background. This is a very poor paste-up.

This one is even worse:



The lighting and focus on the two isn't even close to being the same. Clinton was pasted into that one. The easiest way to tell is to notice the thin black line around his head, which no real photo would have.

How about this one?



They are really testing you there, since it is a real photo. Not a paste-up. But it isn't Clinton or Lewinsky. It is two look-alikes. It may have originally been tagged honestly as look-alikes, but it is

now being sold as real by many websites.



That's another paste-up, so bad I am not even going to comment on it.



Did that one fool you? It isn't even Clinton. It is just some guy with gray hair. It's staged. Clinton has wirier hair than that. He's also taller. Consult the first photo, where he is about 8 inches taller than her. She is only 5'6". Is she supposed to be standing on a box? And ask yourself this: have you ever seen anyone else on the cover of a major magazine identified by the back of his head?



That's genuine, but it isn't Lewinsky. The face shape is wrong, especially the chin.



That's faked. Clinton is too short and he has been pasted in. Note the dark line again around his head, especially on his nose and chin.

There are no pictures of Clinton and Lewinsky together. All of the them are poorly faked. Does that by itself prove the scandal was faked? Not necessarily, but it is a strong indication. Especially the faked TIME cover. Some may argue these other photos were faked later to illustrate history, but that TIME photo is extremely difficult to explain away. For one thing, to me it is proof Clinton was in on the hoax: otherwise he would have blown TIME's cover, telling the world that wasn't him. Why would he sit idly by while TIME published a photo of Lewinsky with the back of another man's head, falsely

tagging it as him?

Let's go to the Wikipedia page for the scandal to see if we can find other clues to support this thesis. We will start with Lewinsky. She is Jewish on both sides of her family. She went to Beverly Hills High and Bel Air Prep (think Fresh Prince of Bel-Air). She was in the drama classes there. She was also in drama at Santa Monica College. She dated her drama instructor, who was married. In 1995 she allegedly got a psychology degree from Lewis and Clark College. So how did she land a White House internship immediately after graduation? Such prestigious internships are normally saved for top students in political science or law from such universities as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Stanford, Columbia and so on. Middling psychology graduates from Lewis and Clark are not in the running. Also curious is that her internship only lasted five months before she got a paid position White House Office of Legislative Affairs. Again, that isn't how it works. An internship would be for one year, and after that you would expect her to return to graduate school to get more degrees. A person like Lewinsky doesn't just waltz into a paid position after five months. . . unless. . .

Unless she is an actress and a spook. We have already found confirmation of my thesis with Lewinsky's background in drama. My guess is her degree was either faked or was actually in drama. We have more evidence from her mother, [whose second husband is R. Peter Straus](#). Wikipedia tells us he is a media executive and former director of Voice of America under Carter. The VOA is the official broadcast institution of the US, involved in radio, TV, and internet. Wikipedia admits that even mainstream scholars have accused the VOA of being propaganda.

So Lewinsky's step-father was head of US propaganda. He was also an official at the United Nations. But my readers will be most interested by a previous job he had: he was head of WMCA in New York back to the 1950s, and the radio station helped launch the Beatles in 1963. Considering what [I have told you about the Beatles](#), that has to be considered a fairly large red flag here. In that paper, I discovered the Beatles were promoted by the American arm of British Intelligence, which was run out of Rockefeller Center in New York.

WMCA under Straus was also the first radio station in the country to call for the resignation of Nixon, which ties us to [my paper on Watergate](#). Straus also wrote a book called *The Father of Anne Frank*. So he was involved in a series of major cons. He was a ranking spook. Wikipedia admits "family connections" helped Monica land the White House internship, and we now know what family connections those were. It was her step-dad that got her in. *She was a plant*.

I will be told Lewinsky's Mom didn't marry Straus until 1998, but the mainstream bios admit he knew Marcia Lewis before the scandal broke. They say he didn't meet her until 1997, but there is no proof of that one way or the other. Since Lewis had been divorced from Bernard Lewinsky since 1987, I assume Straus had been part of the equation back to the beginning of this event. You will say that would have had to have been 1995, but not necessarily. The story may have been back-written by Straus. In other words, since we are discovering the whole thing was manufactured, with none of it actually happening, Lewinsky didn't really have to arrive in Washington until 1997 or 1998. Straus didn't have to plant her in the White House in 1995, he only had to plant her in the scandal in 1998. The rest of it could have just been back-manufactured.

What about Linda Tripp? They admit Tripp was Army Intelligence. She was working in the Pentagon at the time, and that is where she met Lewinsky. Lewinsky had been allegedly transferred over to the Pentagon in 1996. So this whole story came out of the Pentagon. It could only be more suspicious if it came out of Langley. We are told Tripp was acting on the advice of Lucianne Goldberg, which is

another clue here. Goldberg was also Jewish, both through birth and through marriage to Sidney Goldberg, executive editor of the North American Newspaper Alliance—another propaganda machine. Hemingway and Fitzgerald both wrote for NANA. See [my paper on the Paris Salon](#) for more on Hemingway, including his outing as a CIA agent (cia.gov admits Hemingway was an agent). Anyway, Lucianne Goldberg was also a spook. Her Wikipedia bio admits she worked as a spy for the Nixon campaign against George McGovern. Since we discovered the Watergate event was really the CIA's baby, Goldberg was working for them, not Nixon. Both Goldberg and Tripp were Intelligence agents or assets.

The two Jewish references so far aren't beside the point, since of course Chelsea Clinton recently married Jewish investment banker Marc Mezvinsky (Goldman Sachs and Eaglevale).

But there's more:

[Lucianne] Goldberg was also the [literary] agent for former detective [Mark Fuhrman's](#) bestselling account of the [O.J. Simpson trial](#), *Murder in Brentwood*.

Isn't it neat how these hoaxes all tie together? See [my paper on O. J. Simpson](#), where I prove both the murders and the trial were faked.

But let us return to Monica Lewinsky. We find more easy evidence of the hoax when, despite her alleged immunity agreement with the court, she nevertheless cooperated with Andrew Morton and the 1999 book *Monica's Story*. This book was excerpted by TIME in a cover story the same year. That TIME story came out on March 15: the Ides of March. She was also interviewed by Barbara Walters on March 3, 1999, to a viewership of 70 million. [Note the date. In case you missed it, that was 3/3/99. The spook marker is 33.] If the Impeachment Court had been real, this would have been impossible. In exchange for immunity, Lewinsky was supposedly ordered not to talk to the press, and in a real agreement the book, the TIME cover story, and the Walters' interview would have destroyed her immunity agreement and set her up for prosecution. Since we see her immunity agreement being ignored, we can be sure the whole thing was staged.

To see the contradiction in bright light, we only have to study this quote from Wikipedia:

In March 2002, Lewinsky, no longer bound by the terms of her immunity agreement,^[30] appeared in the [HBO](#) special, "Monica in Black and White", part of the [America Undercover](#) series.^[40] In it she answered a studio audience's questions about her life and the Clinton affair.

But wait. She had already answered questions for Barbara Walters in March of 1999, so the agreement must have just been a pretend agreement.

Since the scandal was first reported by the *Drudge Report*, we have evidence Drudge is also an accomplice. If you haven't already, add Drudge to your list of compromised sources.

Clinton allegedly admitted that he had an improper physical relationship with Lewinsky on August 17, 1998. That's more numerology, telling us this was a fake event. That is 8/17/98. Or $8/1 + 7 = 8/98$. Note all the eights.

For more proof, remember that Lewinsky later graduated from the London School of Economics, a top spook school. She graduated in 2006, at what age? . . . 33.

Now, let's move on to Clinton. Clinton was allegedly born August 19, 1946. There is numerology even there. 1946 is of course the year the CIA was founded. August is the eighth month. He was also elected at age 46. As usual with the spooks, Clinton's heritage is fishy. He wasn't born Clinton. He was born William Blythe III. We are told his father died before he was born, and that although his step-father was an alcoholic who beat him and his mother, and refused to adopt him, Bill nonetheless changed his name to Clinton when he was sixteen, on his own resolve. This despite the fact that his parents were divorcing that year. I find that dubious and well as suspicious. Clinton's "real" father is also suspicious. William Blythe Jr has no bio previous to 1942, when he was 32. At that time we are told he "shipped out for military service", but we aren't told whether he enlisted or was drafted. Since he was married and had an infant child, and was 32, he should have been spared the first draft. We are told he was stationed in Italy and Egypt, which is curious as well. He was supposed to be in the motor pool, working on Jeeps, but Egypt and Italy weren't hotspots for that. Actually, they were hotspots for Intelligence. Remember those places, since they are about to come up again.

We get more strange info when Blythe returned to the US in 1945. Although he and his wife were from Texas and Arkansas, they bought a house in Chicago. That's a long way away and a big change, and we are given no explanation. As a traveling salesman, Blythe would have found competition stiff in the big city. Although we are told they bought a house in Chicago, they allegedly lived there only four months, moving back to Hope, Arkansas. That's not even time to move in and put the house on the market. We are told Blythe died in Sikeston, Missouri in 1946, when his car skidded off the road. He was thrown clear but drowned in a ditch in three feet of water. At least it wasn't 33 feet of water. But Sikeston isn't anywhere near Chicago and wouldn't have been on his route. We are told he was returning to Arkansas to his wife, who was then living with her parents, but that makes no sense. According to the timeline, Blythe returned to the US in 1945, immediately got his wife pregnant around December 1, moved to Chicago in February—the middle of winter—with a pregnant wife, bought a house, and moved back four months later?

Since Blythe is said to have been from Texas before coming to Arkansas, the best guess is he is related to the Blythes of Houston and San Antonio. Remember, we have a William Jefferson Blythe Jr, b. 1910, alleged birth father of Bill Clinton. Well, there is also a [William Jackson Blythe](#), b. 1907 *in southern Arkansas*. This Bill Blythe was from Fordyce, which is only about forty miles from Hope, Arkansas, where the Clintons were from. He then moved to Huntsville, TX, where he was an attorney and career military, becoming a colonel. He graduated from the Naval War College. During the war he was stationed in Egypt and Italy. Who else was stationed in Egypt and Italy? Oh, that's right, Bill Clinton's real dad. More about this Colonel Blythe:

In the Korean Conflict he served both in Intelligence and Military Government, General Staff, IX, U.S. Army Corps. . . . Later as Chief of the Special Warfare Division, Department of the Army, he was responsible for policy, training, and conduct of world-wide Army Special Forces (Green Berets). . . . Upon retiring from the military in 1962 he settled in Austin and founded, with his son, the William Blythe Advertising and Public Relations Company.

1962 is the year Bill Clinton allegedly took the last name Clinton from his drunkard father. According to his obituary, Colonel Blythe was fond of genealogy. Yes, as we are seeing, he was quite fond of faking his own genealogy. Colonel Blythe also married Bess Tyson, whose family founded the Republic of Texas. [She died on November 11, 2011](#). That's 11/11/11, so we seem to be on the right track.

[Added November 4, 2019: Plus, in creating the career of Bill Clinton, a public relations company

would be very useful, wouldn't it? And finally, there are Jacksons in Bill Clinton's recent Blythe line. See [Andrew Jackson Blythe](#), his 3g-grandfather. For this reason alone, his grandfather's name would more likely be William **Jackson** Blythe than William Jefferson Blythe, wouldn't it?]

Too many parallels here to be a coincidence. It is pretty clear the two Bill Blythes are the same. So why was Bill Clinton's genealogy faked? Possibly he was born out of wedlock to one of Blythe's mistresses, and they thought that would prevent him from his political career. Or, as we will see below, possibly Bill Clinton was someone else's child, and Blythe was simply created to take his place. Or possibly he was not a "natural born citizen" for some reason, and they needed to cover that up. I have to admit they did a better job covering it than they did with Obama. Possibly the ease with which they faked Clinton's bio caused them to become overconfident, and they figured they could get away with anything—which they have.

This all helps to explain Clinton's career, which was hard to understand given his mainstream bio. You need connections to do what he did, and we now know what they were. It also explains his college membership in the Order of DeMolay, a freemason and spook organization whose other members include Walt Disney, Paul Harvey, Mel Carnahan, Burl Ives, John Wayne, Jim Wright (Speaker of the House), John Steinbeck, Pete Rose, Edgar Mitchell, Elmer Lower (president of ABC News), Mark Hatfield, Reubin Askew, Frank Borman, Carl Albert (Speaker of the House), and several other state governors.

Although we are told Clinton was a Rhodes Scholar, he has no degree from Oxford, which is unheard of. At least I have never heard of a Rhodes Scholar leaving without a degree of some sort. Since all bills are paid, there is no excuse to leave for that reason. We are told he was in a hurry to get to Yale Law School, but that is a diversion. He didn't start at Yale until September of 1970. That gave him two full years at Oxford, and it is easy to apply for an extension. Most are granted. We are told he was afraid of the draft, and in that case Oxford was the perfect place to hang out for another year. There was no reason for him to be applying to ROTC in Arkansas or the National Guard. Mainstream sites now say he switched courses of study, but that is hooey. In [this 1992 article](#) at the *Independent*, there is no mention of switching courses. He was working on a B Phil, as most do. In that article, the spin is again that he was afraid of the draft and couldn't concentrate on his coursework, but that, too, is hooey. No Rhodes Scholar has ever been drafted out of Oxford, for obvious reasons. These are the 32 best students in the country, and you don't send them off to be cannon fodder. That has always been true, and the students themselves know it. If anyone wasn't worried about the draft in 1969, it was a Rhodes Scholar.

Which means we need to look for good pictures of Clinton at Oxford. Guess what? There aren't any.



That's all we get, and neither is convincing. Why is the first one cropped so close? Probably so that we can't study it for anomalies. We can only compare him to the one other face, but even so, the shadows don't match. Look at the shadows under his chin compared to the other guy whose neck you can see. No match. That does look like Clinton, but we have no evidence it is from Oxford. Same with the other one. You will say that building in the background looks like England, but Yale also has buildings that look like that.



So does Georgetown.



In fact, I think that picture of Clinton is from Georgetown. Here is what the robes at Georgetown look like:



Here is what the robes at Oxford look like:



See the furry fringe? Clinton doesn't have that in the second pic, does he? Besides, he didn't get a degree at Oxford, so he wouldn't have been present at commencement.

What about this one, said to be from Yale?



It's another paste-up. Study the light on Hillary's face and Bill's face. See how she is pinkish, with no shadows on the right side of her face (her right)? Now look at Bill. His highlights are orange instead of pink, and half his face is in partial shadow. Impossible that they are lit by the same sun. Bill and his Mom are in the same photo, but Bill and Hillary aren't. There is a seam right down the middle.

Now, their wedding photos look real to me, so I am not saying they were paired later. I just don't see any evidence of them together at Yale. What about this one?



I admit that does look like them, but the problem is it doesn't look like Yale. I have been there and it doesn't look like that. And there are more problems, since a second “hippie” photo surfaced at Huffington in 2012.



Do you see the problem? Bill's head position and expression is *identical*. Compare them side by side:



Although Hillary has moved completely, and Bill's body has shifted considerably, his head is *exactly* the same. The only difference is they have tilted the head before the paste. This indicates a fake. I admit it is a much better fake than the others, but still a fake. They should have stuck with the one image, since the paste is very well done.

Hillary Rodham was born October 26, 1947. More spook numerology there. October means eighth month, $2 + 6 = 8$, and then year one of the CIA. Hillary's maternal grandmother Della Murray married Max Rosenberg in 1933. Hillary's grandfather Edwin Howell was the son of Emma Monk. Her mother was Sarah Abbs. Abbs and Monk are both common Jewish names. So it looks like both of Della Murray's husbands were Jewish. This doesn't necessarily make Hillary Jewish, but it does put lots of Jewish blood in her veins and explain her many Jewish contacts.

Here's something most don't know about Hillary. In 1974, during Watergate,

she was a member of the impeachment inquiry staff in Washington, D.C., advising the [House Committee on the Judiciary](#).

Since she was just out of law school and only 26, that seems odd. It seems even odder seeing that she had just flunked her bar exam. She doesn't seem like the one to go to for advice. But it didn't matter, because, like Bill, she had been chosen. Even before that, Betsey Wright had come from Texas to guide her career. Who is Betsey Wright? No one knows. She showed up for the first National Women's Political Caucus in 1973, along with such people as Gloria Steinem, Bella Abzug, Shirley Chisholm, and Betty Friedan. Given Steinem's inclusion, we may assume the NWPC is another CIA front. The same can be said for Abzug, who, like Steinem, is Jewish. She earned a law degree from Columbia in 1947. Note the year.

I found no bio for Wright previous to 1973, although she is said to have graduated from UT Austin. No parents are listed, which is odd. She is a famous lesbian, apparently, and in 2009 was charged with 51 felonies for sneaking weapons into a prison. She plea-bargained 48 of them away, but that left 3. For three felonies, we are told she was sentenced to one year of probation. That pretty much proves she is a spook, since only spooks can get 1 year of probation for 3 felonies. I suspect she is related to Speaker of the House Jim Wright, also from Texas.

But back to Bill Clinton. His time at Yale is also suspect, due to his working on McGovern's campaign in 1972. He was supposed to be in law school at the time and graduated on schedule in three years. So how did he have time to hang out in Dallas, even having an office there on Lemmon Avenue? Clinton worked with both Anne Richards and Ron Kirk while there. Steven Spielberg was also allegedly there. I guess the Pope was there, too, and the Pillsbury Doughboy, and the Loch Ness Monster. And if you are wondering why Bill Clinton is in Texas at this time, remember that Col. William Jackson Blythe is just up the road in Austin at his public relations company, with his son. Betsey Wright is also from there, as you just saw.

In the same year, Clinton was supposed to be living with Hillary in California. Was that supposed to be for the summer? Why California? Regardless, we are told Bill Clinton was McGovern's campaign manager in Texas, which doesn't seem to me like a summer job. The election was of course in November, so Clinton must have missed the most important part of the run-up in October. Not much of a campaign manager, being absent in October.

However, [according to Betsey Wright](#), that isn't how it happened:


Wright did not respond to emailed questions for this story. But in 1992, she said in a [New York Magazine interview](#) that, like [Garry] Mauro, she was impressed that the couple worked full time on a presidential campaign while simultaneously attending law school. "I'd never been exposed to people like that before. I mean, they spent the whole semester in Texas, never attended a class —then went back to Yale and aced their finals," she said. Did Mauro ever see either one of them study? "Christ, no," he said.

OK. Good to know. Yale Law School without attending class or studying.

Next, we are told he immediately returned to Arkansas and became a law professor. In the same year he ran for the House of Representatives. But he was only 27 and just out of law school. Two years later he ran for Attorney General and won. At age 29, with no experience as a lawyer. Had he even passed the bar?

To see how strange this all is, [we can consult his resume of 1974](#), allegedly given to the Dean of the University of Arkansas Law School. Notice that someone has had to pencil in his JD at Yale in 1973, because Clinton doesn't indicate it. In that subparagraph on Yale Law School, he mentions nothing after spring 1972. He did nothing in the law school his entire senior year? Also notice that on page 2 of the resume, Clinton confirms what Wright said above: he was in Texas until November of 1972 working on McGovern's campaign. Since this is supposed to be his third and final year of law school, I don't understand how that is possible. And in the spring semester of what was supposed to be his final year of law school, he was teaching three classes at the University of New Haven. To me this indicates he never actually graduated from Yale, which means he couldn't have taken the bar, much less passed it.

As proof of his time as a law professor, we get this photo:



That is also faked. For the easiest clue, look at his hair over his ear. That was drawn in in Photoshop. That whole line of hair is a poor fake. His hair is also too dark. Clinton didn't have black hair at that age, did he? He had light brown hair, going to red. That is why Chelsea had reddish hair, you know. See how white his shirt is? That tells us he had bright light coming from the front and above. So his hair couldn't have been in shadow. Even the chalk writing was added. It isn't on that board. It is just a layer. How do I know? It has too much focus. It is sharper than the background it sits upon.

Besides, law schools don't hire kids right of school, even as assistant professors. They are expected to have some experience in the field.

So it looks like Clinton's entire early bio is faked. He was just inserted into Arkansas politics in his late 20s, and the elections were probably bought or stolen, as usual. Although most people think of Arkansas as the sticks, it is actually controlled by the same people as all other states. Remember, Winthrop Rockefeller had been governor of Arkansas 1967-1971 (that was two terms back then). Winthrop Jr was Lt. Governor 1996-2006. Before him, Orval Faubus had been governor for twelve years. Faubus was a major in Army Intelligence, and had worked under Patton. Faubus is most famous for using National Guard troops to prevent desegregation, but that whole event was manufactured as well. Even mainstream historians [see Harry Ashmore] admit it was manufactured, although they misdirect you on the reason. They tell us Faubus manufactured the controversy to get back at political opponents who were using segregationist rhetoric. But that makes no sense. From this distance, it is clear the event was manufactured to show the national public that Federal intervention in State matters was a good thing. Most people cheered when Eisenhower federalized the National Guard and took them away from Faubus—which was the point. They later did the same thing with abortion. It was all about shifting power to the Feds. If you don't believe me, just ask yourself this: do you think Faubus really thought he was going to prevail? Do you think this governor of Arkansas honestly thought he could defy a court order from the Supreme Court and the entire US military? Of course not. In fact, before the manufactured event, Faubus had already ordered the desegregation of state buses and public transportation and was pushing for multi-racial schools. This was of course in response to 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education*. What else could he do? So his action in 1957 was both out of character and contrary to previous legislation—which he had signed. That is the only clue you need, if you are still looking for one.

But why were the Rockefellers in Arkansas to start with? Aluminum, oil, and gambling. Arkansas produces about 90% of domestic bauxite, the principle ore of aluminum. Along with the Mellon family, the Rockefeller family is one of the primary owners of the aluminum cartel. Also Murphy Oil, which is still a front for the Rockefellers. It was acquired in 1913 by SOCAL (Chevron). It is one of the largest companies in Arkansas to this day. And of course the split up of Standard Oil was just a ruse. The Rockefellers are still behind all parts of it. For the gambling links, see below.

And what is Clinton's relationship to the Rockefellers? According to [an article](#) by Sherman Skolnick buried at Beyondweird.com, Clinton is Winthrop's grandson. Since this sensible looking paper is buried in a site of occult topics, you might be prone to dismiss it. However, since the article doesn't even touch upon the occult, we should judge it on its own merits. We are told Clinton's maternal grandmother (who is Edith nee Grisham Cassidy) had a torrid affair with Winthrop Sr. I could find no verification of that, or even a second source, but I did confirm much of the other information in the article (see below for the confirmation). And I found nothing in the article that is obviously false, which is rare enough. Whatever Clinton's relationship to the Rockefellers is, I agree with Skolnick there *is* a relationship. Clinton was clearly handpicked, and these people normally promote their own,

either by birth or marriage. The bios have been scrubbed and manufactured, so it is certainly in the realm of possibilities Clinton is a Rockefeller. In fact, my first assumption is this article has been buried on this website to blackwash it. In 50 years, my papers may be buried on similar websites.

This is the first time I have run across Skolnick, but he has his own Wikipedia page. Apparently he is known. His page links him to Webster Tarpley. Of course that doesn't make him trustworthy. But even the plants tell a lot of truth, to salt in the lies. We just have to separate the two. So I have given you the link. We will have to sift through Skolnick as we proceed.

But back to Clinton's bio. We are told he became Attorney General of Arkansas at age 30 because he had no opposition in the race. Well, no Republican ran against him, which is strange in itself. Since the Republican Party in Arkansas is run by the Rockefellers, they must have ordered a stand-down. It looks like they also ordered a stand-down in the Democratic primary, since my research on both his opponents indicates controlled opposition. Both George Jernigan and Clarence Cash were practicing attorneys in Little Rock. As such, they should have been able to expose the fact that Clinton had zero experience in anything, except in running for offices for which he had no qualifications. Before he was 30 he had run for two state offices, including running for the House right out of law school. He had zero qualifications for Attorney General, since he had never been an attorney. As I have shown, it is doubtful he even had a degree or had passed the bar.

Clearly, Attorney General was just a stepping stone. Plus, they had to age Clinton a bit. He wasn't even old enough to run for governor in 1976, the minimum age being 30. Clinton's Republican challengers for governor also look like controlled opposition. Lynn Lowe, the R candidate in 1978,

found few issues on which to challenge Clinton until the Democrat announced his opposition to a [referendum](#) to remove the [state sales tax](#) on groceries and prescription drugs. Clinton determined that the state could not afford to lose the \$60 million then procured from the sales tax. Lowe noted a \$40 million state surplus and urged repeal of the taxes.

Really? That's all he found to challenge Clinton on? How about the fact that Clinton had no qualifications to be governor? When he began running, Clinton was just 31, and would become the youngest governor in the country. The youngest governor right now is 44 (Nikki Haley). During the race, Clinton had been Attorney General for less than two years, in which time he did squat. Beyond that, Lowe could have hired a private detective to discover all I have told you above. Why didn't he? Probably because Lowe was being paid to run against Clinton by Rockefeller.

Remember, we are told [in many later stories](#) that Clinton was hated by many in Arkansas from the beginning. We are told a solid 30% wouldn't have voted for Clinton if he was running against Hitler. But with negatives that high, the numbers don't add up. He got 63-64% of the vote several times running for governor. Starting 30% in the hole, statistically, that is almost impossible. Think about it: if you are his opponent and you know you have 30% without running an ad, all you have to do is convince another 20% to vote for you. While Clinton has to target the remaining 70%, trying to get 5 of every 7 voters to vote for him. In other words, he has to beat you 5 to 2, or get 2.5 times as many votes as you get from that remaining pool of undecideds. Given the two-party system, that should be almost impossible. This indicates to me that these stories about Clinton are manufactured like everything else. They are created to make you think Clinton overcame great odds. They are also manufactured to misdirect you into these fake scandals, which are created to divert you from more important things—and the truth. In my opinion, all those guys pushing Clinton scandals over the years were paid opposition. Like the Lewinsky scandal, it was all a hoax.

We will come back to that, but I think I have given you enough evidence to see that large parts of Clinton's bio were manufactured. So let's skip ahead to the Lewinsky scandal. You might want to ask yourself why, when the scandal broke, Clinton didn't just tell everyone to mind their own business and invoke executive privilege? After all, this is what all the other modern Presidents did when they got in trouble for much more important things than a blowjob. This is what Bush II did during the 911 hearings. It is what Reagan did during Iran/Contra. It is what Nixon did during Watergate. The President knows he doesn't have to answer to Congress or some Independent Council like Kenneth Starr, and when a President really wishes to avoid questioning, he does. Even much smaller figures dodge Congressional hearings whenever they have something better to do. During the more recent banking scandals, the bankers just stopped showing up for questioning, except when it was part of some script. Congress has no power and had none in 1998. So if Clinton showed up for these kangaroo courts, it was only because he was part of a planned event.

I remember asking myself and those around me that very question back in 1998. How did this get to be such a huge story, when more important things get buried? The answer was staring me right in the face: this story got so big *in order to keep the more important things buried*. It was manufactured to do so. In this way, it was exactly like the manufactured O. J. Simpson trial of 1995. It kept your eyes off the main events. We have already found evidence of that above, where we saw Betsey Wright mysteriously involved in both events. Well, Skolnick gives us another connection in his research. In the article linked above, he ties both Clinton and O. J. Simpson to Jeremy Jacobs of Buffalo, NY, head of Emprise and later Sportsystems. Is Skolnick correct? Well, the Betsey Wright connection would indicate he is, since it gives us a second string between Clinton and Simpson.

Jacobs is Jewish and a graduate of Harvard Business. He has been owner of the Boston Bruins since 1975, and has been described by players as villainous and a bully. This from hockey players. He is one of the top 500 wealthiest people in the world.

Is he related to David M. Jacobs, ufologist from Temple University? If so, it has been scrubbed. But I did find some curious things about this UFO Jacobs. According to Intelius, he doesn't exist. There is no David M. Jacobs of Pennsylvania in his age range. This would explain why this prominent person has no bio. His mainstream bios list no age, no parents, and no bio before 1973, when he is said to have gotten a PhD from University of Wisconsin. This indicates he is a ghost, if not a spook.

Here's a connection no one else has made. Simpson made commercials for Hertz Car Rentals, as most know. Well, that company was started by Walter Jacobs in 1918, and he sold it to Mr. Hertz in 1923. However—although the company was sold again to GM and then to Omnibus—Jacobs remained as president or director of the company for 50 years, until 1968. Is Jeremy Jacobs related to Walter Jacobs? I found no proof they were, but that doesn't mean they aren't.

Skolnick doesn't footnote the connections between Jeremy Jacobs and Bill Clinton, but they do exist. Jacobs won the concessions contract (hotels, restaurants, stores, and other services) at Yosemite in 1992. Hmm. Who became President in 1992. Oh, that's right, Bill Clinton. We are told Bruce Babbitt was against Jacobs, but that is just a smokescreen (like everything else Babbitt failed to do). Jacobs won the Yosemite contract in suspicious circumstances, with even [members of Congress alleging the Park Service](#) had awarded the contract in record time, indicating it was a fix. In 2015, Jacobs lost the contract to Aramark. How did he lose it? He lost it because Aramark is now owned by a consortium including J. P. Morgan Chase, Goldman Sachs, and Warburg Pincus. In other words, he got swallowed by the Octopus. Jacobs is claiming that the Yosemite contract is no longer profitable, so no great loss, but if it was not hugely profitable the Octopus would not have wanted to gobble it up.

What about Jay Jacobs, currently head of the Clinton Foundation? Is he related to any of these Jewish families, like Jeremy Jacobs or Walter Jacobs? Who knows? These people scrub all their connections and hide their genealogies. But I would guess he is. Since he runs a large charitable organization, he may be a nephew of Jeremy Jacobs.

What about designer Marc Jacobs, who has ties to the Hillary campaign as well? Is he related to these people? Probably. His father, whose name is not given, was an agent at the William Morris Talent Agency. His mother—name also not given—remarried three times after this agent allegedly died. Who did she marry? It would be interesting to know. Probably more “agents”. So Marc Jacobs' bio is also scrubbed, indicating he has something to hide. However, with some digging, I found his mother is Judy Weisbord, and her last husband was Jim McKee. [And her uncle was President of William Morris](#) [Callahan, p. 31], making him Sam Weisbord—president and CEO. This means Marc Jacobs' great-uncle was head of William Morris, which explains Marc's rise to fame.

Is Judy Weisbord related to [Albert Weisbord](#) of the Socialist Party of America? If so, that would tie us neatly to my recent [paper on Eugene Debs](#), and the faking of the US communist parties. His wife was Vera Buch. Judy Weisbord's father was Abbot (Abraham) Weisbord, son of Jacob Weisbord and Goldie Kaufman. Sam was Abbot's brother. Well, Albert's father was *also* a Jacob Weisbord, and Albert was born in the same decade and same city (New York) as these others. But his mother is listed as Chasha Muslow. Did this Jacob Weisbord have two wives, with Chasha dying in about 1907 and he remarrying to Goldie in 1908? It is possible. I found nothing to confirm it or deny it.

But back to Jeremy Jacobs. I finally found [the article](#) that confirms what Skolnick said. *This New York Times* article from 1992 admits that Jacobs was one of the largest contributors to the Clinton campaign. It also confirms Skolnick's claim that Jacobs' connection to Arkansas was the Southland Greyhound Park, the nation's largest dog racing track—which of course ties it to gambling and all that entails. I found [links to that](#), too, possibly the ones Skolnick failed to reference. In a *Sports Illustrated* story [May 1972] called “Look What Louie Wrought” that has since been scrubbed off the net, we find the Jacobs empire tied to organized crime in the Congressional record. Beginning in 1970, Arizona Congressman Sam Steiger began attacking Emprise on the House Floor, naming the names of crime bosses in many states who were connected to the company. Since Steiger didn't end up with a hole in his head, we can assume this was another controlled attack on Jacobs by other billionaires. In support of that, we see that Steiger was also Jewish, his mother being Rebecca Klein.

For more dirt on Emprise, you can go to the [San Diego Reader in 2004](#), where you will find Bill Clinton's largest contributor Jacobs being fined \$10,000 for illegally concealing the ownership of a Las Vegas Casino. There were also secret cash payments to prominent politicians in the 1950s, by his father Louie Jacobs.

However, as I have shown you in many recent papers, these references to organized crime are themselves a diversion. The mobs were taken over by Intelligence by 1960, at the behest of the billionaires. The billionaires didn't want these capos taking any of their business. The Octopus wanted it all, and took it. So whenever you see references to the mafia, mob, or organized crime, you may replace them with CIA. The Octopus is the only organization that still exists. The spokesmen for Emprise and Delaware North always respond that the company isn't what it was in the past. That is true. When the company was started almost a hundred years ago, we may assume government control was less perfect. Maybe some of these rackets *were* run by mobs. But in the Modern period, that is no longer true. They are all run by the big boys: the investment groups and bank holding companies that

are the fronts for the very richest families.

But I still haven't told you why the Lewinsky event was manufactured. What news were they burying with this created event? To see that, you can go to [my paper on O. J. Simpson](#), where I list many of the events of real history being papered over by these fake trials. Except that, when I wrote that paper, I supposed the Simpson trial was diverting us from Clinton's troubles. I now see that *both* the Simpson trial and Clinton's troubles were manufactured for the same reason. What we have learned here is that the whole list of Clinton's troubles was manufactured as controlled opposition, which is why nothing ever came of it. He weathered it without a scratch, didn't he? He wasn't called Slick Willie and the Teflon Man for nothing. All these events washed off him because they were all manufactured. It was all another tempest in a teapot, meant to draw your attention away from reality.

Also see the 1997 Barry Levinson film *Wag the Dog*, with DeNiro and Hoffman. This came out just before the Lewinsky scandal, and its premise was a President who manufactured a war in Albania to cover up a sex scandal at home. Notice that the Lewinsky scandal is the exact opposite, with Clinton manufacturing a sex scandal to cover up wars abroad. This was no accident or coincidence, it was Hollywood purposely plowing the field for the Lewinsky scandal, but flipping it on you.

Just to be clear, I am not claiming Whitewater was manufactured. It appears to be a standard cover-up. But even so it got more attention than it deserved, which is why I do consider it a diversion. As for the deaths of Vince Foster and Ron Brown, my assumption is that both were faked. Neither report makes any sense, which others have seen as a cover-up of murder. I see it as a cover-up for a faked death. Just for a start, Foster's body was allegedly found at Fort Marcy Park, which is like the front lawn of Langley. No one ever mentions that, but it is a huge clue. Even Wikipedia mentions that Foster had a Swiss bank account and may have been involved in espionage. Curiously, this brings us once again to Sherman Skolnick, who published [a lengthy theory of Foster's death](#). And while it gives us some good hints, it looks spun to me. Skolnick tells us Foster was an NSA plant, with rank equivalent to general. I doubt it. Foster was more likely CIA, got caught, and had to be pulled and re-assigned. These people hardly ever kill one another, as we have seen again and again. But they are very fond of fake deaths, which are much more useful in all ways.

We can tell the *American Chronicle* story is misdirection with all its mentions of Israeli nukes and nuclear launch codes. Foster is said to have had possession of the nuclear launch codes, which is ridiculous for any number of reasons I shouldn't have to list. But the greatest signal the whole story is manufactured by some arm of Intelligence as a variant form of diversion is that none of these anonymous authors or Skolnick ever put on the table the possibility Foster's death was faked. As we have seen in hundreds of other top events, that should be the first assumption in *any* investigation of the death of a prominent person. Given what we know now, it should not have to be proved, it should have to be *disproved*.

The same applies to Ron Brown, who had been a Captain in the army 20 years earlier, and had probably been promoted since then. He, too, was probably Intelligence. Like Foster, he was acting as some sort of spy for one arm of the Octopus against the other, got caught, and had to be re-assigned.

I may do a full analysis of the various alleged deaths in the Clinton administration, but not here.

Notice that in saying these events were faked I am not saying Clinton was a great guy who didn't do anything wrong. Just the reverse. He was total phony and his whole life was a fake. But all the salacious events you have been sold were controlled opposition, created to keep your eyes on sexual misconduct and murder, when the crimes were of a different sort entirely. These crimes were less sexy but far more important, and include GATT and NAFTA, the repeal of Glass-Steagall, the rise of GMOs, the creation of the derivatives market, and the continued rape of Europe and Africa (and everywhere else).

You know what else the stories may have been hiding? The fact that Bill Clinton is gay. As I composed this paper—coming to realize not only that the Lewinsky scandal was faked but that the Jones, Flowers, and other scandals were also probably faked—it occurred to me that these events were the perfect cover for homosexuality. It is exactly what they do in Hollywood when they wish to whitewash a gay man, making him look wildly hetero. It also explains Clinton's strange choices, which never made sense to me. A het man in Clinton's position of power can have almost anyone he wants, so why would he choose fat little Monica Lewinsky? The same goes for Paula Jones, who is not a head-turner, to put it nicely. These ladies may be very amiable in their own ways, but they are not A-listers. Every normal guy had the same reaction at the time: “Geez, if I were the President and prone to cheat, I wouldn't cheat with these average gals. I would cheat with some leggy models from New York or Milan or something, or with some hot actress”. Lewinsky was a red flag in so many ways, and it is amazing so few saw through it.

I came to the conclusion Clinton might be gay on my own steam, but I thought I would do a search on it, to see if anyone else had beat me there. [Of course they had.](#) Apparently there have been rumors in the gay community back to the 1970s. Although I have no use for Anne Coulter, she has recently stated on TV that Clinton is gay. She should know. And the response to Coulter indicates she is right. A retort was quickly created to be aired on Letterman, and it was uncharacteristically vicious for that show, indicating an outside writing team.

This means that Hillary is gay as well, and it turns out there have been rumors of that from the beginning, too. This explains so much, as I think you will agree. It isn't hard to believe at all. Just the reverse.

[Added July 22, 2023: Proof of this has recently come out in the news:



You may think I put that together in photoshop, but nope: they now admit that is a real painting of Clinton that was hanging in Jeffrey Epstein's Manhattan townhouse—not in a back bedroom, but in full view in a common room. In 2019 *The Daily Mail* in London (the same newspaper that ran a story on my outing of Steven Hawking as an imposter) [broke the story](#), even giving us the artist: Petrina Ryan-Kleid. The reason I am adding this now is that I just heard of it through Joe Rogan, via an article at the Gateway Pundit. Rogan had a segment about it this week, but he is claiming it is proof Clinton was “owned” by Epstein. But that wouldn't be the logical first reading of anyone who came across this, would it? The most likely and default reading of this is that Clinton and Epstein are both gay, and probably lovers. I have previously said as much about Epstein, telling you the whole young girl thing (Lolita Express) is a red herring, just as Monica Lewinsky was. Epstein, Clinton, and all the rest—including Bill Gates and Prince Andrew—are gay, and this story is just a cover-up for that. If they are trafficking or molesting anyone, it is boys, not girls. And of course Epstein's death was faked. Even Ricky Gervais admitted that, on TV at the Golden Globes. But it goes even deeper than that, because being gay or wearing dresses isn't illegal. All this stuff was leaked and is continuing to be leaked as part of some covert war between the billionaires and trillionaires. This is the way they embarrass and control one another, so in a sense it IS about being owned. But it isn't about Epstein owning Clinton. It is about Epstein, Clinton, Prince Andrew, and Bill Gates all being attacked by some more powerful entity, either as a diversion for the news cycles, or as part of some real split in the Phoenician Navy.

On the way out, I need to return to Sherman Skolnick, who came up twice in this paper. Many will be surprised I haven't tripped over him before, but that is how it is. As I have said many times, I do my own research and shy away from other people's research and opinion, no matter what it is. I like to go into a case cold, relying as much as possible on mainstream accounts—which I can then unravel in my own way. But the second time Skolnick came up, I was forced to read more of him. That is because I

could see in this second instance he was blowing smoke. So I Googled on “Skolnick Vince Foster”, which took me to [his account of Waco at apfn.com](#). I have to say it didn't seem nearly as sensible as the first short thing I read from him on Clinton at BeyondWeird.com. The Waco article contains a mountain of things that are obviously false on a first read. It now seems to me that first excerpt about Clinton just accidentally contained a series of brief assertions that weren't complete hogwash. As I said, these guys have to tell a lot of truth to salt in the lies, and there we hit a patch of truth. However, since I found no confirmation of Clinton's grandmother having any relations with Winthrop Rockefeller, and since that isn't necessary to my thesis, I will drop it. From my own research, it looks more likely that Clinton was related to the Blythes of Huntsville, TX, including Colonel Blythe. I suspect there *are* connections to the Rockefellers—you don't become governor of their state five times without their imprimatur—but whether there is blood link I cannot say at this time.

In Skolnick's Waco account, we get a lot of obvious misdirection, such as his claim that Hillary Clinton, Hubbell, and Foster were running the country. Hillary isn't capable of running a dime store; and besides, the country hasn't been run out of the White House since. . . I don't know, Andrew Jackson? Like Congress, the White House is now just a big diversion. Foster may have been Langley's man on the ground in the White House, but he wouldn't have been running anything. The Clintons wouldn't have outed him, since I am sure they knew who he was and what he was doing. A clue is that the mainstream accounts of the Travel Office controversy admit that

Attention initially focused on the role of the [Federal Bureau of Investigation](#) (FBI), since on May 12, 1993, a week before the firings, associate White House counsel William Kennedy had requested that the FBI look into possible improprieties in the Travel Office operation.

First clue, May 12. $5 + 1 + 2 = 8$. Second clue, Kennedy was Foster's associate counsel, so that makes no sense on any level. Why would the White House create its own scandal and then invite the FBI in to investigate them? At first I thought this might be a continuation of the old CIA/FBI turf war, but the CIA won that back in the 1970s. No, this looks more like the CIA/NSA turf war we have now, which we saw big signs of with Edward Snowden, and before that Julian Assange. I speculate both parts of Intelligence had White House liaisons, perhaps with Foster and Kennedy on opposite sides. They got in a tussle over something, starting outing one another, and the result was that Foster had to be pulled.

Another clue in this direction is the name Kennedy. I guess we are supposed to believe this Kennedy is not related to the other Kennedys, but my assumption would be he is. They are so brazen they let him exist in this story without changing his name. So what we have here is another sign of the big families fighting each other. This is one tentacle of the Octopus wrestling with another tentacle. Best guess is Foster—like the Clintons—was a suction cup on the tentacle of the Rockefeller arm. Kennedy was a suction cup on the Kennedy tentacle. These two tentacles have changing alliances to other tentacles, but we will leave them out of it for now. All that is necessary here is that you understand the general principle. These scandals and apparent murders are almost always signs of the trillionaires nudging one another, jockeying for power in Intelligence. It is Intelligence that runs the country now, including the military, although Intel takes orders from the trillionaire families.

Which means Skolnick can be placed pretty quickly and easily. Since he is outing the Rockefeller tentacle, we may assume he exists as a suction cup on a competing tentacle. And since he is misdirecting furiously on the Kennedy assassinations, I speculate that is the tentacle he is on. Honestly, the more I read of Skolnick, the more ridiculous he becomes. He is clearly a Lyndon Larouche clone, though apparently he predated Larouche. His project is not to “clean up the courts”, but to spread misinformation. By the way, he was Jewish on both sides of his family. One of his pet

theories, especially on Lenny Bloom's show, was that the Jesuits controlled the world. Right. Not trillionaire Industrialists, many of them Jewish, but Jesuits.

Yes, the Jesuits have been involved in centuries of skullduggery, but like everyone else, they were controlled. They controlled *nothing*.

I need to back up for just moment. We just saw a Kennedy involved above, although no one else before me seemed to notice he is a Kennedy. We are told there is no connection and most people accept that without question. I don't. Well, this gives us a third link to the O. J. Simpson event. There was a Kennedy in that, too, remember? Kathleen Kennedy-Powell, who has the same name as JFK's sister and RFK's daughter. She was the grand jury judge that dismissed the jury and found on her own personal authority that there was enough evidence to go to trial. I showed in [my paper on Simpson](#) that such a finding was unprecedented and probably illegal, since grand juries are required for all first-degree murder trials. According to precedents going back to the Magna Carta, it is not allowed for a single individual to make such a ruling.

So it is highly curious to have these two major faked events during the term of Clinton, with Kennedys as major cloaked players in both. Also amazing is that the cloaks are so transparent, but still manage to hide. These people don't even need to change their names. They simply tell you they aren't really Kennedys, and you believe them.

[Addendum October 11, 2021: I realized later that *Wag the Dog*, the 1997 film with Dustin Hoffman and Robert DeNiro, gave us a clue about the Lewinsky scandal. That film predated the scandal, and was meant to pre-spin it. In the film, the President boinks a campfire girl in the Oval Office (in under 3 minutes) eleven days before the election and Hollywood and Madison Avenue are hired to bury the story. Hoffman plays a big producer (with a house "bigger than the White House") and DeNiro plays a fixer from someplace like Burson Marsteller. Together, they manufacture a war with Albania to bury the affair. That film came out just a few months before the Lewinsky scandal, and we now see it was no accident that it did *exactly the opposite*: it buried foreign wars and other scandals with a fake Presidential affair. See the bombing of Sudan just a couple of months later and the bombing of Yugoslavia soon after. Even Wikipedia now points out the flip in the film of the upcoming reality.

That movie does some other things as well. For one thing, it spins the 303 number, making us think it came from DeNiro glancing at his watch at that time in the AM. Which also whitewashes all instances of 33 you may see. It makes you think the 303 Committee of McGeorge Bundy was named by accident, for instance. It makes you think the same of the current 303 magazine. When the right answer is that they are CIA fronts. The use of 303 in *Wag the Dog* is the same signal, but they pretend it isn't. Also notice that at minute 4:50 in the film, we are told the President is set to fly back from Beijing soon, and the camera focuses on an international clock. It is 3:30. At minute 29:20, we get a shot of a cameraman for no reason, and he is on camera 3. Hoffman's character is named Stanley Motss, which is two clues in one. Stanley points to the Stanleys, Earls of Derby, while the double "s" at the end of Motss is a common CIA clue as well. Compare it to Bob Dylan's alias Elston Gunn, or Dylann Storm Roof of [the exceedingly fake Charleston event](#).

At minute 33:00, they show us how they can fake footage from foreign countries with CGI and green screen backdrops. They have actually been caught since then doing just that, see the sets sold as Tripoli in the Second Libyan War.

I also remind you that *Wag the Dog* admits the Gulf War was faked by Bush, that the Grenada invasion

was faked by Reagan, and that the Iranian Hostage Crisis of 1979-80 was as well. The film is based on the book *American Hero*, which admits the first but not the others. The writers Henkin and Mamet added that themselves, I guess. The additions also could have come from DeNiro, who was also producer as well as star, and delivered the lines about both.

But the funniest line of that film is where DeNiro says he saw the first draft of the Warren Report, which claimed Kennedy was killed by a drunk driver. He then says he was in Falls Church, VA, (Langley) where they shot the Kennedy assassination with ¼ scale models. Is that true? I found no evidence of it, but it doesn't mean it isn't. Some of the footage of that day is no better than that, including the Zapruder film. The producers are telling us a lot of things here, not the least of which is what they think of the American people. We will believe *anything*. Except when they admit exactly how they are fooling us in films like *Wag the Dog*. That bounces right off.]

And in other news, the wires are reporting today that a nine-year-old black boy was killed in Chicago by an “executioner” named Dwright Boone-Doty. It is supposed to be part of gang killings. I don't want to write a whole paper on it, which is why I am tacking this on here. It is faked. There is no such person as Dwright Boone-Doty. It is a bad fake name, made up by the spooks. Just check Intelius or any other person search. No one by that name exists anywhere. I knew that before I even checked, since Dwight is spelled with no “r”. Beyond that, the last name is faked as well. There is no one with the last name Boone-Doty in the entire world, as you will realize if you think about it for half a second.