

[return to updates](#)

# The **SOCIETY of FRIENDS** *looks like another* **JEWISH FRONT**



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published July 17, 2016*

I know that some will not understand why I would want to attack the defenseless Quakers. Well, I don't *want* to, they just happened to fall under my glance today. I was researching something else and I came across the Wiki page of George Fox, the founder of the Quakers. It was such a morass of red flags I felt I couldn't help but point out how and why.

To start with, I have a small amount of experience with the Quakers. I went to Haverford College for a short time, and it is a Quaker College in Pennsylvania. I even went to a couple of meetings, although I found them excruciatingly dull. It was like watching paint dry. No, watching paint dry is far more exciting. I had my suspicions even then: I find anything that dull to be suspicious, by my very nature. It seemed like advanced training to be a slug. Since I was already finding all of society and life to be training of that sort, the last thing I wanted was to accelerate my training in dullness.

But, truth be told, my suspicions were formless until today. I hadn't given it much thought until I started reading about old George Fox [pictured above]. It helped that I had already researched the foundings of the Mormons and the Jehovah's Witnesses, which as we will see were similar. It also helped that I had recently researched that period in history [mid 1600s] in recent papers, including [my paper on Cromwell](#), Kabbalah, etc.

We'll start with his picture above, although I admit it is far from the most important bit of evidence. I made no judgment on it alone, but I do consider it as a fair piece of evidence. I look away from nothing, and as a portrait painter and student of the human face and body I consider myself as learned a judge of such things as any. I won't go into an extended commentary, again because it isn't really worth it: we have better points to consider. But I will point out that nose. It is not what you normally think of an English or a northern European nose. I will leave it at that. Let it float about your head as we look at the rest of the evidence.

We are told Fox was the son of a Leicester weaver. Already we have a possible pointer, since many weavers were Jewish. The second pointer is the usual misdirection we find here. Fox's father was wealthy and left him a substantial legacy. Since that cannot be said of most weavers, we must assume his father was not just a weaver. He must have been some sort of wealthy textile merchant, which makes it even more likely he was Jewish. Nothing else appears to be known of his ancestry, which is also a red flag.

Next we are told he was apprenticed to a local shoemaker. Rich young men who expect a substantial legacy are not apprenticed to shoemakers, so this is absurd. From what we can tell, Fox never worked a day in his life, using his legacy to live upon and travelling about the world "preaching". So his ability to cobble apparently never did him much good. His bio is just blather until 1647, when he allegedly began preaching. Note the date. One of the main things he preached against was tithing. There would be no better way to destroy the Christian Church—whether Catholic or Protestant—than by preaching against its source of income. A Church with no source of income is immediately defunct. But Fox could not have *intended* that, could he?

We are told Fox was imprisoned dozens of times, but he always skated the charges, suffering none of the torments or long sentences of other prominent dissenters. Although we are told he was imprisoned for blasphemy in 1650, then having his sentence doubled for passivism against the monarchy, we find him out and preaching by 1652 (and probably earlier). That's a ludicrously short term for blasphemy and doesn't match other accounts from the same time. Death was a common penalty for blasphemy, and they admit that when Fox was again arrested in 1653. The local judges sentenced him to death but Parliament itself intervened, not only freeing him from the sentence of death, but freeing him altogether!

In 1655 he was brought personally before the Lord Protector Cromwell, although we aren't told why this dissenter merited such attentions. Instead of Cromwell threatening Fox with the Tower, drawing and quartering, or extended torture, we are supposed to believe that Fox lectured Cromwell. We are supposed to believe that Cromwell got tears in his eyes and said **'Come again to my house; for if thou and I were but an hour of a day together, we should be nearer one to the other'; adding that he wished [Fox] no more ill than he did to his own soul.** Right. I'm sure that happened. Fox met personally with Cromwell at least three more times over the next two years.

Another main point of Fox's preaching was that rituals are useless and should be avoided. Again, that strikes at the heart of organized religion, which relies on ritual. What would the Catholic Church be without its rituals? This is what endears it to people, more than anything else. In the same way and for the same reason, Fox preached against cathedrals. Again, I see what he is doing, since about the only thing that ever drew me to Catholicism was its cathedrals, rituals, and art. In other words, it was the beauty of the thing that had worth to my artist's eyes. In rooting all art out of religion, Fox was destroying it in the eyes of those like me. But Fox could not have *intended* that, could he?

Like other Protestants, Fox also preached against priests. Unlike most Protestants, he also preached against any firm reading of scripture. Curious, since that would have the effect of destroying organized religion for a whole other set of people: those who needed rules and guidance. That set of people is far larger than the artistic set, and far more important to the Church. But Fox could not have *intended* that, could he?

Another main point of Fox's preaching was his antipathy to baptism by water, even the little water from a basin. This being probably the central ritual of Christianity, it is hard to deny that Fox was attempting to destroy the roots of Christianity. Even Protestants baptize. Who doesn't baptize, besides Quakers? Jews, of course.

Fox's "wife" Margaret Fell is also a huge red flag, probably the biggest in the project. Like Fox, she was from great wealth, being the widow of barrister Thomas Fell, member of Parliament. He was also vice-chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, which means he worked for the Duke. However, at the time (as now) the Duke of Lancaster was the King himself. The current Duke of Lancaster is Queen Elizabeth II. This Thomas Fell was a big supporter of George Fox even before his wife got involved. This is highly suspicious, since you have to ask yourself why this Quaker, son of a weaver, would have such support at such levels. But it does tell us how Fox managed to skate all charges during his entire life. Even when there was no King—as when Oliver Cromwell was running things—Fox still had support from the top. Fox took meetings with Cromwell and was supported by him. What? Fox was supported both from Lancaster and from Cromwell? I don't know of anyone else at the time who could say such a thing.

It is also worth remembering that in these years others of the family Fell were very prominent, including the Chancellor of the University of Oxford Samuel Fell and his son John, Bishop of Oxford. John was later offered the Primacy of Ireland. He was called "the most zealous man of his time for the Church of England". So it is highly suspicious to find his family mixed up with the Quakers. It may help you understand it when you read this:

**He made many converts from the [Roman Catholics](#) and [Nonconformists](#).**

It may also help if you know that John Fell controlled the Oxford University Press. This was better than controlling a large city newspaper, and put him in charge of a premier mouthpiece of propaganda at the time.

Margaret Fell was née Askew, which family was also noble. See Sir William Askew, who had been in the court of Henry VIII. He was a juror in the trial of Anne Boleyn. So to see her marrying the son-of-a-weaver George Fox after the death of her first husband should look very strange to you. But it is strange for other reasons. One, she was ten years older and had already had eight children. She would have none with George Fox, since she was already 55 years old. Two, they would not live together. Three, they were not even legally married by the laws of the time, being married by neither the Church nor the State.

As there were no priests at Quaker weddings to perform the ceremony, the union took the form of a civil marriage approved by the principals and the witnesses at a meeting. Ten days after the marriage, Margaret returned to Swarthmoor to continue her work there while George went back to London.

Sounds like a fake to me. And they are misdirecting you: that is not even a "civil" marriage. A civil

marriage is when you are married by a justice of the peace, say, instead of a clergyman. What they had was common-law marriage, of a sort. But neither the Vatican nor the Church of England recognized common-law or “clandestine” marriages in 1669, even for Quakers. Quakers were not recognized as an exception until the Marriage Act of 1753.

Also curious is that we are told Margaret Fell's children were Quakers even before she “married” George Fox. That means this family of nobles were Quakers almost before there *were* Quakers. How does that work? George Fox invents the Society in the 1650s and immediately we find a prominent house of Quakers in the nobility? Fox was already visiting Swarthmore Hall, the home of the Fells, by 1652. The entire connection of Fox to these people is fishy in the extreme, and it looks to me like an Intel project run mainly against the Catholic Church.

To get a better idea of who Fox really was, it is instructive to study his actions with regard to James Nayler. Nayler became a fellow Quaker and was a prominent speaker, so much so that he began to compete with Fox. Although Fox preached that none should remove their hats in court or bow to authority in that way, he yet demanded that Nayler and other Friends should remove their hats while he prayed. When they refused this as being inconsistent, Fox flew into a fury. When Nayler also declined to kiss his hand, Fox demanded he kiss his feet instead. Again, Nayler refused. Curiously, the next time Nayler was arrested, Parliament intervened and threw the book at him. He was pilloried, whipped through both London and Bristol, branded on his forehead with the letter B (for Blasphemer), bored through the tongue with red-hot iron, and imprisoned in solitary with hard labor. When he was released, he just happened to be attacked by thieves, who murdered him. But all that was just a coincidence, right? Fox had nothing to do with it, right?

With the restoration of the monarchy and Charles II in 1660, you might think Fox would be in trouble, having been a friend of Cromwell. Nope. Charles released all Quakers from prison. So it appears the Quakers were a government project, independent of the civil war and the other factions. They were supported by British Intelligence as a general tool against Rome. Charles II was advised by his councillors to issue a decree for New England recommending against banishing or jailing Quakers, which he did. This indicates the project extended to the colonies.



A last clue is given by Fox's promotion in the colonies by William Penn. He was the son of British Admiral Sir William Penn, who was a member of Parliament from 1660 to 1670. His mother was Margaret Jasper, daughter of a rich merchant from Rotterdam. Really? Three clues in one sentence. Jasper may be Jewish, and the Dutch East India Company was centered in Amsterdam and Rotterdam.

[According to Geni](#), Margaret was the daughter of William and Hans Jasper. In other words, she had two fathers and no mother. According to Wikitree her father was John Jasper and her mother is unknown. However, on John's page she is not wholly unknown: we get a first name of Rachel, which of course may be Jewish. However, if we click on her, she is said to be the daughter of Giles Penn. That can't be right, so we are being led on another wild goose chase. At Coltechpub.com, we are told Margaret Jasper was the daughter of Jan Jasper and Alet Pletjes, whose family was from Prussia. And if we take that info back to Wikipedia, we find Alet Pletjes was the daughter of Driessen Pletjes and Alet (Adelheid) Goebels. Oi vay! A Goebels in this as well? That same Wiki page, written not by an English speaker, informs us that the Pletjes were related to the op den Graeff family. Alet's sister Margaret married Hermann Isaac op den Graeff. In the 17<sup>th</sup> c. the op den Graeffs were linen weavers from Krefeld. A famous op den Graeff was Abraham op den Graeff, a rich Pennsylvania cloth merchant now famous as a subject of a poem by Whittier. With his cousin William Penn he helped establish Pennsylvania as a Quaker outreach program. Abraham's grandfather was also a wealthy cloth merchant in Germany. They had been wealthy cloth merchants for centuries.

What they don't tell you is what should by now be obvious: all these people are crypto-Jews. Jasper is a Jewish surname. See spook philosopher Karl Jaspers. They deny Jaspers was Jewish, only admitting he was “tainted” by his Jewish wife in the 1930s. But notice they scrub his genealogy, as usual. Jasper is also a variant of Yasgur, Jasper being the western spelling and Yasgur being the eastern (Russian) spelling. In Europe, “J” is usually pronounced like “Y”. And of course a “g” is just a curly “p”. Study the letters in type in the previous sentence. Then see Max Yasgur, Russian Jew famous for hosting the Woodstock Festival on his farm in Bethel, NY, in 1969.

If we check Joseph Goebbels' genealogy to see if he is connected to these people, we find his paternal line scrubbed past his parents. Nothing. We do notice he allegedly died at age 47. But more on him another time.

Now let's go beyond George Fox for more clues. The Quakers have been described as “natural Capitalists”. What could that mean? I don't see the connection of Capitalism to anything else in the sect. And yet they *have* founded several major banks, including Barclays, Lloyds, and Friends Provident. Jesus wasn't a big fan of banking, last time I checked. I don't think he has ever been called a “natural Capitalist”. The Quakers have become major merchants in other areas as well, including confectionery: see Cadbury, Rountree, and Fry's, just to name three. Given the mainstream story, none of that makes any sense. Given what you have learned above, it makes total sense.

Seeing the name Rountree takes us to the next clue: about a hundred and forty years ago—nearly simultaneous with the rise of the Theosophy project—the Quakers were assigned a new project, and entered their modern phase. John Rowntree was a leader of that phase. He was one of the “Liberal Friends” who promoted Darwinism, feminism, modern Biblical criticism, and generally a more aggressive humanism. Later this was accelerated even more. In 1947 the Association of Evangelical Friends was formed. Note the date. The Quakers found that their project was failing, so they made some concessions to potential members, including bringing back baptism. Those concessions failed as well, and the Quakers are now a tiny sect, having only about 300,000 alleged members (and only about 80,000 in the US). In comparison, the Mormons claim about 15 million and the Jehovah's Witnesses claim about 8 million. Since US Intel now numbers above 6 million, everyone in the Society of Friends could be a spook and no one would know the difference. Intel would only have to assign one in 80 agents to claim membership.

The many sub-sects of Quakerism are also not an accident. This splintering is part of the project and

matches the manufactured splintering achieved in Communist and Socialist organizations. You would think such a small sect would be both stable and cohesive, but the opposite is true. The Quakers probably have more divisions *per capita* than any other movement in history. Again, not an accident, since the primary goal of the project since the time of Fox has been the destruction of organized religion, particularly Catholicism. The method from the beginning has been to pull members out of established religions and then wean them off all religious principles. We have seen this method in many other splinter groups, not just the Quakers, and in *every case* it is part of a centralized project. As I have said, all of the old religions stand in the way of trade, and so they have been countered by the Industrialists with a slew of longrunning projects, many of them these manufactured sects. Those who are snared are misled with some high-sounding rhetoric, but all along they are schooled on an entirely new of thinking—a thinking that supports trade, Industrialization, humanism, materialism, and all the other desiderata of their masters. Notice that the Quakers call their meetings “programmed worship”. Given what we are discovering, that has a dual meaning, doesn't it? Like other fake sects, they are being programmed. We all are, but the Quakers admit it.

If you still don't believe the Quakers are fishy, go to the Wikipedia page toward the bottom and look at the numbers listed for worldwide membership. The numerology is astonishing. In Jamaica, there are 330 Quakers; in Bolivia, 33,000. In Colombia, 8. In France, 71; in Peru, 1700. In Spain, 8; in Greece, 3. In Germany, 338. In New Zealand, 660. In Indonesia, 3000. And so on.

And what about this Society of Friends symbol?



Doesn't look very Christian to me. Red and black? When has Christianity ever been symbolized by red and black? And an eight-pointed star? What does that have to do with Christianity? I get a bad feeling just looking at that thing, and I am not even a Christian. It looks more like a Chaos Star. The double square of the Masons also has eight points. Also compare to this:



The CIA doubles the eight to sixteen, but again uses the red.

**August 25, 2016:** My guest writer “Kevin” has extended the research above into some other alleys, which you may read about [here](#).

**November 14, 2016:** It just occurred to me that Chevy Chase went to Haverford College, which I mentioned in passing above. Of course, so did I, but I got out after one semester. I didn't like the place. [Not enough girls, for one thing. I purposely took three of my four courses at Bryn Mawr, thinking to be surrounded by women (I like odds like that—that was also why I later took ballet at UT—it worked great at UT, not so great at Haverford), not realizing most of them would be gay. I was a naïve boy from north Texas, and no one had bothered to clue me in. My parents were just as naïve as me on things of that nature—except that they still are.] I mention Chevy here because I have now linked him to the families many times. It wasn't hard to do, given the names Chase and Crane. Well, as it turns out, I now have an inside source at Haverford, a person who contacted me via email after I started writing these papers. That person will have to remain anonymous, but he/she gave me permission to quote from an email. I had asked if he/she had noticed a spook element while working at Haverford.

Sadly, yes. The spook connection appears to be alive and well to me.

There's a professor there now who is up to no good, in my opinion. Barak Mendelsohn. "Ex-Israeli military." Runs the Al Qaeda project. It's a database of all of the public statements of aQ.

Supposedly used by the Army and the State Dept.

<https://ds-drupal.haverford.edu/aqsi/>

Young, handsome guy. Plays with his dog on Founders Green. Gives the girls the vapors. Stinks of Mossad.

They run the project out of the library (the converted Chapel). It's a grotesque perversion of the so-called Quaker ethic. Profane blackwashing of Christianity to my way of thinking.

Don't recall if you called Quakerism a trial run for Theosophy and all that came after. But, it makes sense to me.

They also still swell with unseemly pride at Quaker naval architects designing the original 6 frigates that comprised the Continental Navy.

Then there's the institutional pride for that d-bag alumnus, Alex Karp, who founded Palantir - a too clever name for the ultimate privacy violation tool.

[https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alex\\_Karp](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alex_Karp)

Then there's the big Wall St. Benefactors: Howard Lutnick, of Cantor Fitzgerald 9/11 fame, and John Whitehead (alum, Navy, Harvard 47, starts at Goldman, as a partner ~'48, Dep. Sec. State, Bilderberg).

[https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/John\\_C.\\_Whitehead](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_C._Whitehead)

Finally, there remains the huge Jewish over-representation. The explanation is that Haverford, not being subject to the evil anti-semitism of other Liberal Arts Colleges, embraced the Jewish community - who've ever since rewarded that embrace with ongoing favor and support.

Sure.

For me personally, the worst example of institutionally supported villainy was an "art" exhibition that ran in the past few years. It was entitled "White Boys."

It was the worst example of hate as art that I've ever seen. Beautyless propaganda whose sole purpose was the evisceration of young white men.

<http://exhibits.haverford.edu/hankwillisthomas/white-boys/>

Mossad projects, Street money, anti-straight white male modern art, pervasive "community" involvement. The whole enchilada.

So, yeah. The spook connection is alive and well...

Miles here again. While we're telling stories about Haverford, I have one for you. As I've said, I spent one semester at Haverford back in the fall of 1981. I didn't last long for many reasons, but one reason had to do with the golf team. Yes, the golf team. You will say this story isn't looking very deep from the start, and that may be true, but what happened told me very quickly what kind of people I was paying my very high tuition to.\* I had read that the Haverford golf team got to practice at Merion Country Club next door, one of the top courses in the country. Since the golf team normally comprised about three or four guys, this wasn't a great burden for Merion CC, but it was a nice gesture all the same. However, when I arrived I was told the golf team had been eliminated, and the link to Merion terminated. Of course they waited until *after* I had gotten there and they had cashed my tuition check to tell me that. The reason this had happened, I was told, is that Haverford had discovered Merion didn't have any black members. Merion hadn't had any black members since 1912, but Haverford fortuitously didn't discover that until a few months before I arrived in 1981. So Haverford had decided to break connections to Merion in protest. Now, I agree with the sentiment, but the method never made any sense to me. You can't apply pressure to an entity by refusing a favor that entity is doing you, can you? If Haverford had been doing Merion a favor, it could have applied pressure to Merion by withholding that favor until Merion changed its policy. But refusing a favor is no way to apply pressure. There is no pressure applied, and no doubt Merion's answer was, "whatever." In fact, Merion shrugged off Haverford's boycott in 1981, not changing its policy until 1990. And they did that not in response to Haverford, but in response to the PGA. [In order to sponsor a tour event](#), a golf course must have at least one black member. Merion and several other places squeaked by with the minimum: one black member.

In fact, nothing much has changed since 1981, and private clubs can still legally limit their membership any way they like. See [the story just this year](#), when Woodmont nearly voted to keep Obama out. Notice at that link that they *could* have done so. We are told it would have been because Obama was anti-Israel, not because he was black, but that is just a dodge. In reality, Obama was about as anti-Israel as Alan Dershowitz.

The point is, I could see Haverford was an encampment of ninnies, one that couldn't help shooting themselves in the foot even over the smallest things. Their "brave" stance was meaningless then and it is still meaningless. The only people it ever effected was its own golf team. I have since discovered that is the way politics normally works, or fails to work. It rarely accomplishes anything, the only



fallout being a further inconvenience to people on the ground. In fact, that is what modern politics is generally designed for: creating needless disturbances that fail to help the aggrieved parties, only creating more aggrieved parties. Rather than solving problems, politics creates two problems where before there was only one. And not by accident. As you have seen in my papers, problems are not created by accident. Society is not just accidentally a big mess. The mess is created with full intent, for the purpose of accelerating change and thereby expanding needless markets. Solving problems is bad for business, and they figured that out long ago.

\*And yes, I paid most of my first semester's tuition, via several scholarships. My parents paid the rest of my college bills after that, but since I transferred to the University of Texas and got in-state tuition, they got a little better deal than we were getting at Haverford. In 1981, tuition at Haverford cost almost \$4,000 per semester. [UT cost \\$226 per semester](#). Tuition at UT doubled by 1988, quadrupled by 1993, and by 2001 it had increased 10X. A ten-fold increase in just 20 years! It has more than doubled again since then, giving us a 22-fold increase in 36 years. Haverford is bit better in that regard, increasing by only about seven-fold. This while total inflation has been about 2.6X in the same period. Meaning, college costs have increased at a rate three to eight times the rate of inflation! Do you think you are getting a better education now than in the past? Hah-hah. I don't have kids, but if I did I wouldn't send them to college. I would teach them how to type in gutenber.org, and open a line of credit for them at ebay books and abebooks. I think it would take them a while to spend \$264,000 in that way. That is what it would cost to go to Haverford for four years now.