

[return to updates](#)

SHAKESPEARE: INTEL PROJECT



by Miles Mathis

First published October 3, 2017

As usual, this is just my opinion based on personal research.

I have had many requests to do this one over the years, and I have finally gotten around to it. You may be surprised to discover that it never interested me that much, and you are about to find out why.

You see, I intuited that all the alternative theories were also misdirection, so I didn't wish to take a side. As we saw in my Kennedy research, variant theories can be planted to keep you off beating the bushes, far away from the main action. So even before I figured out what was really going here, I could see that most of those promoting Bacon or De Vere or Derby or Marlowe were also lying or hedging. For instance, Mark Twain [was promoting the Bacon-as-Shakespeare](#) theory in the 19th century. Well, I didn't trust Twain on this, and now you know why. [I have written a long paper on Twain](#), and we find him from the same families as these guys. And so my hunch regarding that was proved true.

Ignatius Donnelly was selling the same theory at about the same time (1888) in his book *The Great Cryptogram*—and doing a pretty good job of it. His opening chapters, showing that Shakespeare could not have written the plays, are completely convincing. And true. However, it turns out Donnelly was also a spook, and I assume he was from the same families. His genealogy is scrubbed past his parents, with no grandparents listed, which is strange for a US Congressman from Minnesota and Lieutenant Governor from just over a century ago. However, we find 67 Donnellys in the peerage, including Vice Admiral Sir Ross Donnelly, who became an admiral in 1838. His daughter married Baron Audley, whose grandmother was Susannah **Robinson**. This Robinson married Baron John **Hussey** Delaval, which links us to the Husseys and Robinsons of the [Lizzie Borden hoax](#). His mother was Rhoda Apreece, which looks like a Jewish name. The Husseys link us to the Fairfaxes and Cravens. These Fairfaxes link us immediately to the Sheffields, Earls of Mulgrave, and the Cranfields, Earls of Middlesex.

We also find a James Donnelly, whose daughter married Francis **Baring**, 5th Baron Ashburton, in 1906. We will see the Barings again below, of **Barings Bank** and Northumberland. His grandmother was a **Fox-Strangways** (Earls of Ilchester), and they were related closely to the **Murrays** and **Digbys**. We also find a John Donnelly of Fall River, MA, in the 19th century. Of course that links us to the Lizzie

Borden hoax again. No clue why he is in the peerage, since he is otherwise scrubbed. The Donnellys were also related to the **Stuarts** and **Cecils**, whom we will see below.

So you see why I was leery of the Bacon theory, at least. It took me until this year to unravel the Shakespeare mystery, and that is because it required research outside the normal channels. That is, it required me to research beyond the given arguments and counter-arguments. I was never going to figure this one out simply by reading previous dissertations and trying to tease the truth out of them. Why? Because the really interesting truth wasn't contained in them. Again, as with the Kennedy assassination, the real truth hadn't been discovered or told until I came along. The story was much deeper and more complex than any had imagined. In fact, I only tripped across the answer when I wasn't looking for it. It ended up requiring years of genealogical and historical research on all these guys like Bacon, Derby, etc., and I did that research for other reasons. I came to understand who Derby was not by researching him in connection to this question, but by researching his family the **Stanleys** in connection to many *other* questions.

You will say, "If that is true, it sounds pretty interesting. Are you saying you are still blasé on the subject?" No, now that I have the tools to see through all the misdirection, I have to admit that the question is fascinating. Which is why I started writing today. But back when it was just a matter of choosing Shakespeare or Bacon or Derby or whomever, it wasn't so fascinating. All the previous theories bored me a bit, because none of them gave us a good answer as to why the fake was perpetrated. To me, that was the really interesting question, and none of them addressed it. They told us it was because these nobles didn't want to be seen as nasty writers, but I could see that answer was a diversion. Writing wasn't seen as a nasty profession back then. *Acting* was, but not writing. After all, Bacon admitted to writing his philosophical and political treatises, so why not admit writing poetry and plays? It never made sense to me, and once you know the truth you will see that the old stories were just cover.

Now, my readers know I don't do things the normal way, and so they will not be surprised to see me skipping past all the previous research with only a sniff. I am not going to rehash the old claims and try to sort through them, since—as I say—this is what they want you to do. They want you to get lost in all the claims and counter-claims, because if you do that you will never ask the really penetrating questions. The only thing I am going to do before I drive around that mass of confusion is comment on my title briefly. Yes, there probably was a Shakespeare the actor, and he probably was born in Stratford, though it doesn't really matter one way or the other. What my title means is that the **great author** you know as Shakespeare never existed. Shakespeare the actor was just a front chosen for a writing committee. In this, the previous theories are partially correct. They tell us we have been lied to, which—you will not be surprised to hear—is correct. However, I will show you that the lie is much bigger than any of them have admitted.

As another bone I can throw to the alternative theorists early on, I will say that pretty much *all* their guys were involved in the writing committee. It was a big committee, since the works of Shakespeare are vast and varied. But again, I am not going to get into the question of who wrote what percentage, since I don't think that is the interesting question. The interesting question is "to what end were these things written and promoted?"

You have already seen what got me in: the name **Stanley**. There is a reason the "Derby theory" isn't promoted as aggressively as the others, I think: they don't want anyone to see what I finally saw. The four main contenders for the real Shakespeare are Sir Francis Bacon; Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford; William Stanley, Earl of Derby; and Christopher Marlowe. But of those four, Stanley has been the least

promoted. Historically, Bacon has probably gotten the most attention. De Vere is the current favorite. And a lot of ink has also been spilled over Marlowe. But somewhat less has been spilled promoting Stanley. It is also interesting that Stanley is normally referred to as “Derby”. They prefer not to remind you over and over he was a Stanley, for what should be obvious reasons to my readers.

And yet I believe Stanley is probably the central character here. Why? Read my previous papers of the past five years and you will see why. These Stanleys have been behind many of the biggest projects of the past 600 years, including putting the Tudors on the throne, faking the Revolution, the Beatles project, the Hitler project, and the Mussolini project, among many others. They have been pulling the biggest strings in England since the time of Henry VII, and probably before. Remember, they were the Kings of Mann, and Anglesey was part of their territory. I have shown that they were so powerful they preferred *not* to be ennobled past Earl, since they wanted the attention off them. They preferred to let other less powerful families be Dukes and Kings.

I have a lot of research left to do on the Stanleys: my research so far is just the tip of the iceberg. But finding the Earl of Derby involved here was like a bomb going off in my brain. It told me immediately the Shakespeare project was much deeper than anyone had so far conjectured.

Those promoting Bacon should not be despondent, since elevating Stanley does not jettison Bacon. Bacon was definitely involved, but not I think as the lead writer. Like the Stanleys, Bacon was also from these top crypto-Jewish families that went back to William the Conqueror and before. Bacon has not been quite as glittering a name in my research as Stanley, but the Bacons were not only very prominent—far more prominent than has been admitted—they were also *related to the Stanleys*. In fact, all these people were related, including De Vere, Marlowe, and the rest. This is another thing that clued me in to what was really going on here: I could see that these alternative authors were not just a motley crew thrown together by chance or circumstance. They were hand-picked from the top families for this project.

For example, there are 394 Bacons in the peerage, including our Sir Francis. He was a Viscount, of course, but his half-brother was a Baronet—one of the first in 1611. So were his three nephews. Bacon's niece [Elizabeth](#) married a Mansel, whose mother was a **Somerset** (Earls of Worcester). This niece married the Mansel *before* 1600, which is important, since it means the Bacons were not marrying into Earldoms due to Sir Francis' Chancellorship. Francis didn't hit the big time until about 1603, when he was knighted by King James I. What does this indicate? It indicates the Bacons of the peerage have been partially scrubbed. They must have been extremely prominent even *before* Francis joined the peerage and before his half-brother was made a Baronet in 1611. Commoners do not marry the daughters of Earls, except in the case they are billionaires. Anyway, through these Somersets, the Bacons were immediately linked to the **Nevilles**, the **Herberts**, and the **FitzAlans**. Of course, we have seen the FitzAlans are the same as the **Stuarts/Stewarts**, and all these families were tight with the Stanleys.

Through the Herberts, we link immediately to the Beauforts, **Beauchamps**, Arundels, **Berkeleys**, Despencers, Devereaux, and **De Veres**. The De Veres are also closely related to the Nevilles and the **Howards**, since the 12th Earl of Oxford married a Howard and the 13th Earl married a Neville. The 16th Earl also married a Neville, and she was the stepmother of our De Vere, 17th Earl. At this time the De Veres were also closely related to the **Cecils**, the **Goldings**, and the **Sneyds**. We saw the Sneyds in my paper on MLK.

But here's the big one: the Stanley were are looking at, 6th Earl, was married to Elizabeth de Vere,

daughter of the 17th Earl of Oxford. So two of our candidates are that closely related. Oxford was the father-in-law of Derby. They don't normally tell you that, do they?

What did these Stanleys look like, I wonder?



The portraits of the 6th Earl aren't that good, but that is his son James. Shocker, right? That he looks Jewish. Look at the length of that nose. The subtext to that painting is “James Stanley was a man of deep religious feeling and of great nobility of character”. Does it look that way to you? Not to me. He looks weak and untrustworthy to me.

OK, but how does Christopher Marlowe fit in? Well, I confirm that he faked his death to join the writing committee, though I won't get deeply into the question here. That faked death has been a prominent theory for a long time, and it is central to the Marlowe-as-Shakespeare project. Any skimming of the evidence shows huge anomalies with the death, all pointing to a fake. Confirmation of that is the mainstream response to those anomalies, which as usual is pathetically weak. As they do now with “debunking” 911 or any other hoaxes, all they do is dismiss the theory with a wave of the hand, without addressing any of the evidence. If they do look at evidence, they misdirect in a hamhanded manner, giving it credence with their own ineptness.

But the main clue with Marlowe is that he signed his name Christofer **Marley**. Makes us think of Jacob Marley in *A Christmas Carol*, doesn't it? I don't think that is a coincidence, since Dickens wrote both Marley and Scrooge as Jewish stereotypes—which is OK since Dickens himself was a crypto-Jew. If he wants to write characters like that, he is free to do so as far as I concerned. Accusing Jews of anti-Semitism is the height of foolishness. Anyway, it looks to me like Dickens was referencing “Christofer Marley” there, so I see it as a clue.

Marlowe's bio, like Shakespeare's, looks faked. He was born in the same year as Shakespeare, within two months, although there is no record of his birth. Both may have been born on the 26th, which is

another marker: $2+6=8$. We are told his father was a shoemaker, but somehow he managed to attend King's School in Canterbury and Cambridge University. Both very exclusive, of course: they didn't admit the sons of cobblers. The Privy Council intervened at his graduation, commending him "for good service to the Queen". Beg pardon? What had this cobbler's son done for the Queen while at Cambridge? Join MI5, perhaps? You think that is a stretch? I am not the first to come to that conclusion. Wiki admits Marlowe may have been working for Walsingham's secret service, and that he may have joined it while at Cambridge.

This is interesting because Walsingham was the Queen's principal secretary, known as her **spymaster**. But it gets better, since Walsingham's stepfather was John Carey, uncle of Henry Carey, 1st Baron Hunsdon. Hunsdon just happened to be the principal patron of Lord Chamberlain's Men, **Will Shakespeare's theater company**. Since Hunsdon's mother was Mary Boleyn, mistress of Henry VIII, he may have been the Queen's half-brother. Also note that Hunsdon was married to Anne **Morgan**, daughter of Sir Thomas Morgan and Anne **Whitney**. Anne served Queen Elizabeth as Lady of the Privy Chamber. The name Morgan is about to come up again.

Henry Carey, Baron Hunsdon, had a sister named Catherine, and she married Sir Francis Knollys. Their daughter was Lettice Knollys, who we have seen in several previous papers. Her daughter Penelope married Robert **Rich**, Earl of Warwick, a descendant of Richard Rich. You will remember that Richard was Lord Chancellor under Edward VI, and that with Thomas Cromwell he destroyed the monasteries of England under Henry VIII. He also served on the Privy Councils of Queens Mary and Elizabeth. Rich's genealogy is scrubbed, but he apparently descended from an earlier Richard Rich, a wealthy mercer and Sheriff of London in 1441. This would make the Riches Jewish.

Sir Francis Knollys is also worth a peek, since when Mary became queen, Knollys had to flee to Germany "due to his being a Puritan". Hmm. Strange then that in Strasburg he "was on intimate terms" with John Jewel and Peter Martyr. **Jewel's** surname is the clue, since he was Jewish. Strange, since he was also the Bishop of Salisbury. You will say, "Then he couldn't have been Jewish!" No?



Jewel became in 1547 a protégé of Pietro Mariano Vermigli, or Peter Martyr. A few years earlier, Peter Martyr had been turned to Protestantism by Juan de Valdes. No, not the Columbian coffee guy, but another spook from Castile. Juan just happened to be twin: Intel loves twins, as we know. Juan's twin brother was a courtier of Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor. Charles was not only ruler of the Spanish Empire and the Holy Roman Empire, he just happened to be the **Duke of Burgundy**. See my paper on

the Crusades for more on that. Charles was born in **Ghent** to Joanna of Castile. Do you see the red flags piling up? Joanna descends from both **Braganzas** and from **Pereiras**, so we have the Jewish link on both sides. For more on the Braganzas and Pereiras, see [my paper on Keanu Reeves](#). In short, the Pereiras came from the Carabajals, who are admitted to be Jewish. See [Nuno Alvares Pereira](#), for example. This is where the Perons of Argentina came from. As for Valdes, we are told he attended Pope Clement VII, which is yet another clue in the same direction. **That Pope was a Medici**. [I have previously outed](#) the Medicis as Jews. Which only leaves us with Peter Martyr. He was brought to Oxford to teach the Bible by Thomas Cranmer, but we have to ask why Oxford needed this dissenting Protestant on the campus. He was too disputatious even for the Lutherans and was run out of Strasburg as a troublemaker. Like Knollys, he was supposed to be an early Puritan, but Oxford should not have been in the market for hiring Puritans. It later refused to admit them, as we saw in my paper on Salem, so why would it be hiring them?

We now know the answer: all these people were crypto-Jews running the old project. They were stirring up dissent and chaos in any way possible, and through their connections to the nobility they were able to infiltrate any and all spots, public and private, at the highest and lowest levels, in all countries. They are still doing it. See Projects Chaos and Cointelpro.

Before moving on, let's back up and finish Walsingham. There were more connections I wished to make. Walsingham's aunt Elizabeth married Thomas Ayloffé, whose mother was Audrey **Shaa**. Her father was a London **goldsmith** who became Lord Mayor of London in 1501. This indicates the Shaas were Jewish. Walsingham's daughter married Sir Philip Sydney in 1583. Sydney was of course another famous English poet, and he is also on the list of candidates for the author of Shakespeare's works. So we may assume he also had a place on the writing committee, probably a prominent one. Sydney's grandfather was John Dudley, 1st Duke of Northumberland, and his sister Mary married Henry Herbert, 2nd Earl of Pembroke. His uncle was Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester, who had been tutored personally by the other spymaster **John Dee**. Dee later "passed his torch" to Sir Francis Bacon (see illustration below).

Walsingham's daughter later married Robert Devereaux, 2nd Earl of Essex, who was the son of Lettice Knollys. So you see how that works. Walsingham's mother was Joyce Denny, and she was the one who married a Carey. What I didn't tell you before is that this Carey's mother was Margaret **Spencer**. We are about to find the Spencers closely related to Christopher Marlowe, which gives us another link between Marlowe and Walsingham.

Anyway, Marlowe/Marley clearly wasn't who we have been told. So who was he? Well, we just have to go to the peerage to find out. What we quickly find is that the Marleys/Marlays are closely related to all the people above. For example, see [Thomas Marley](#), Chief Justice of Ireland. At thepeerage.com, he is listed with that spelling, otherwise scrubbed. No parents or dates given. But at Wiki, he is given as Thomas **Marlay**, b. 1680. Too late for Shakespeare, so we need to trace him back a generation or two. Well, his mother was Elizabeth **Morgan**, daughter of Robert Morgan of County Sligo. His grandfather was Sir John Marlay, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. You remember that location from my paper on [Daisy Ridley](#). It links us to **Northumberland** and the **Greys**, Liddells, **Barings Bank**, etc. We saw the name Baring above. Northumberland links us back to the Stanleys, since there are many links between Cheshire and Northumberland in the upper reaches of the peerage. We have seen some of them in previous papers.

John Marlay was a prominent merchant and military commander. He was also a Merchant Adventurer, which ties him to the East India Company. Marlay had the food contract for the English Army, which

had to be immensely profitable. He was a Royalist in the Revolution, but somehow avoided losing his head when Cromwell took over. Instead, he was banished to the Spanish Netherlands. This indicates he was a crypto-Jew like the rest. At the Restoration he returned to England and became Mayor of Newcastle again. Although we are told many sob stories about his destroyed reputation, he resumed his seat in Parliament and became wealthy “again”. His wife was Mary **Mitford**. You may recognize that name from later in history. The Mitfords were friends of Hitler. John's great-granddaughter Elizabeth Marlay married prominent banker David **La Touche**. Some of you may recognize that name as well. He was related to Rose La Touche, the child John Ruskin fell in love with at age 39. Rose's bio at Wiki fails to mention her parents, but the La Touches are also in the peerage.

It is difficult to trace the Marlays back before 1600, so we have to switch to the Morgans. At Wiki we are told that Thomas Marlay's grandfather was Robert Morgan of Cottlestown. [We find him](#) in the peerage, but his daughter is listed there as Eleanor, wife of John Sankey. Wiki told us she was Elizabeth, wife of Anthony Marlay. So something doesn't add up here. More helpful is that the peerage tells us these Morgans are related to the Herberts, who we saw above. [A Morgan of the peerage](#) married a Herbert in Wales in about 1502, and their daughter married a Baynham. Through this marriage we are linked directly to the **Spencers** and Grants. At the time of Shakespeare, this Spencer was 1st Baron Wormleighton. He married a **Willoughby**, and her mother was a **Grey** (Marquesses of Dorset and Dukes of Suffolk). At the time of Shakespeare, the 1st Duke of Suffolk Henry Grey married Katharine **FitzAlan**. We saw them above, same as Stuarts. Their daughter was Lady Catherine Grey, who also married a Herbert (Earl of Pembroke). And her son was Edward **Seymour**, Lord Beauchamp. His son became the Duke of Somerset.

Edward Seymour is very interesting here because [his brother William has been proposed as a candidate for the real Shakespeare](#). Ira Sedgwick Proper, the famous American suffragette, proposed William Seymour as the Shakespeare author in 1953. Curiously, her Wiki page does not mention this. However, her bio does indicate she was a spook. She was a Dodd and a Dewitt. She worked with Malvina **Hoffman**, whom I assume was Jewish, and was a founding member of Heterodoxy. A quick search on that indicates to me that the feminist movement was infiltrated and managed by Intel back to the beginning. We find people like Emma Goldman involved, as well as Amy Lowell, Ida Rauh, Mabel Dodge, and Max Eastman. Red flags everywhere. But we will have to hit that another time.

So, my pulling on the Morgan string paid off. The Morgans do link us to other players in the Shakespeare mystery. What does this prove? Well, remember the Morgans and Marlays were closely related at the time of Shakespeare, so Christopher Marley was probably linked in this way. And the peerage gives up some more crumbs, when we find that Agnes Marley married Nicholas Tempest in about 1525. Their grandson Sir Nicholas became the 1st Baronet Tempest in 1622. He married a Lambton. The Tempests were major landowners in Lancashire, related to . . . the Stanleys. See [Richard Tempest](#), d. 1537, whose mother-in-law was Margaret Stanley. The Lambtons are also related to our people here. See [Catherine Lambton](#) in the peerage, d. 1575, who married Sir Henry Curwen. His grandmother was Katherine **Neville**.

All this proves to me that Christopher Marlowe was really Christopher Marley. He *did* know how to spell his own name, as it turns out.

The other thing I have to tell you that you probably haven't heard before is that Christopher Marlowe's famous portrait looks like a fake.



As a portrait painter, I saw that right off. It doesn't match the period style at all. A little research confirmed it, since we find the portrait wasn't known until 1952, when it was allegedly found at Cambridge. The wording in the corner is also a bit too pat, giving us both a date and an age of the sitter. The forgers look to be trying a bit too hard. In fact, they appear to have gotten the math wrong, as was pointed out in 2014 in an article in *The Times*. Cambridge alumnus Peter Roberts, a historian himself, reminded everyone that the Latin means "in the year of his age", indicating the sitter is in his 21st year. But that does not mean he was 21. If you are in your 21st year, *you are 20*. The forgers apparently didn't know that little nicety. As a portrait painter, I suggest the forgery would be even easier to prove. The canvas and paint should be tested. That is the normal way to prove a forgery. I can tell just at a glance: the sitter and expression look far too modern. But that wouldn't stand up in court. A paint test would.

OK, on to the next part. I have shown that all these people are related in the peerage, and that they are all linked to the Stanleys, Earls of Derby. What does it mean? Well, I remind you that we pulled Walsingham in here, and he is admitted to be a spymaster. I have shown in previous papers that Bacon was also probably a spymaster, inheriting one of the mantles of John Dee.



Remember, Dee is the one who invented the 007 image used by agent and writer Ian Fleming for James Bond. Above, we see Dee passing the lamp to Bacon. I now see this as one MI5 director passing the torch to the next. So if you are American you can think of Bacon as Director of CIA, and Stanley as Rockefeller making policy behind him. The difference is, it is possible Stanley was a talented writer. We have never seen any indications the Rockefellers have any artistic talent. Marlowe was also

recruited as a writing talent, along with Ben Jonson and many others. Like Stanley, De Vere may have been both a ranking agent and a writer. I doubt that Bacon did much of the writing, though he appears to have been a consultant on major parts of several works. In this Donnelly appears to be correct. Bacon's knowledge would have been useful, and there is evidence it was used. As with the writing committees at Langley now, I see them sitting around a large conference table, combining their forces to create this major project.

So, like J. K. Rowling, Shakespeare was just an Intelligence project. But to what end? Propaganda, of course. Disseminating information and forming opinion. You thought Edward Bernays started that? Nope. It has been around for a long time. Remember, prominent Jewish critic Harold Bloom has recently argued that the modern Western mind has been all but created by Shakespeare. Given what the modern Western mind has become, I don't see that as a great recommendation, but Bloom said it, not me.

Actually, I think Bloom is partially correct, but not in the way he is normally read. Bloom intends that the great mind of Shakespeare made possible the magnificent modern world, but we are seeing the opposite: the modern mind has been crushed by Intelligence and its puppetmasters, and Shakespeare was indeed one of their greatest and most promoted projects, over more than four centuries.

We are told in the encyclopedia entries that either Shakespeare or the alternative authors were anti-Monarchical, but if you reread the major works with your new knowledge in mind, I think you will see there is much more to it than that. You can see the old Jewish project raising its head in a thousand ways. You will no doubt say, "What about Shylock in the *Merchant of Venice*? Would crypto-Jews have created that character?" Yep, just as Dickens later created Fagin, Scrooge, Marley, and others. Besides, the mainstream reading of the *Merchant of Venice* has always been upside-down. Shakespeare is called an anti-Semite for making Shylock the antagonist, but Shylock isn't the antagonist. He is clearly the victim of dishonest Christians, turning the whole play on its head. This was no accident, and it isn't hard to see. I saw it the first time I read the play, though I didn't understand what was going on until recently. Wikipedia actually says this:

It is difficult to know whether the sympathetic reading of Shylock is entirely due to changing sensibilities among readers, or whether Shakespeare, a writer who created complex, multi-faceted characters, deliberately intended this reading.

You have to be kidding me! *Of course* the authors intended this reading. Do you think words had different meanings back then? No, audiences then would feel exactly what you feel now: Antonio is a conceited upperclass twit who deserves whatever punishment he receives. When he dodges all responsibility in the end, the unfairness of this is obvious to anyone, and we are *made* to feel sorry for Shylock. We are also made to detest Portia and Nerissa for making a mockery of the law. A reader realizes that only a dishonest person could support the "Christians" in this tale, successfully poking a hole in Christianity.

As a sidelight, the play also whitewashes the name Bassanio, making a reader think the name is of Italian, and therefore Christian, nobility. But it is not. As it happens, the Elizabethan court musicians at the time of Shakespeare were Jews from **Venice** and Milan, and three pre-eminent family names among them were **Bassano**, Comys, and Lupo. See for instance [Aemilia Bassano](#) Lanier, who just happens to be another candidate for the author of Shakespeare's works. Her Jewish heritage was hidden in her own time, and is still being hidden. Wikipedia leaves the question open, although prominent Jewish authors like James Schapiro (*Shakespeare and the Jews*) admit the Bassanos were

Jews.

Which brings us to more proof of my theory. When Aemilia Bassano's father died, she went to live with Susan Bertie, Countess of Kent. Why would the daughter of a Jewish court musician go live with a Countess in Kent? Because all these nobles were also Jewish. Bertie's husband was Reginald **Grey**, 5th Earl of Kent. We saw the Greys several times above, didn't we? Bertie's mother was Catherine Brandon, Duchess of Suffolk. Her maiden name was Willoughby, which we also saw above. We found that a Willoughby was the wife of Baron Spencer, he being related to the Marlays, Greys, and Seymours. The Dukes of Suffolk were closely related to Queen Elizabeth, since Catherine's husband Charles, the 1st Duke, had previously been married to Mary Tudor. This made him Elizabeth's uncle. His daughter Mary Brandon married Thomas **Stanley**, 2nd Baron Monteagle. This Stanley was the cousin of the Earl of Derby. Brandon's daughter Frances married Henry Grey, father of Lady Jane Grey. This of course links us back to Lady Catherine Grey above, her sister, who was the mother of Edward Seymour, Lord Beauchamp. I remind you that William Seymour was another candidate for author of Shakespeare's works.

So the Jewess Aemilia Bassano links us to all the same people, indicating she was indeed another member of the writing committee. Possibly they needed a woman to help supply the female point of view.

But let us return for a moment to the Earl of Kent, husband of Susan Bertie. His uncle was the 3rd Earl, Richard Grey, whose first wife was Elizabeth **Hussey**. Hold on, we saw that name above as well: they were related to the Donnellys. Grey's father-in-law was Sir William Hussey, Attorney General and Chief Justice under Henry VII. Hussey's daughter Mary married a Willoughby, doubling that link. The Willoughbys were the largest landowners in Lincolnshire. Hussey's son married Lady Anne Grey, sister of the 4th Earl, also doubling that link.

Which reminds us that actress Olivia Hussey played Juliet in Franco Zeffirelli's 1968 *Romeo and Juliet*. That can't be a coincidence.

Before we got diverted by more genealogical evidence, I was showing you that *The Merchant of Venice* yields evidence its authors were Jewish, confounding its "normal" reading. Well, this is just one example of thousands. Shakespeare's works now beg for a total rereading in light of our new understanding, in my opinion.

You will say, "Such as? One example will hardly suffice to prove your point." OK, let us go to *Love's Labour's Lost*. They don't really need the second apostrophe there, do they? I will be told it is a contraction of Love's Labour **is** Lost, but without the apostrophe it means the same thing. Love's labours *are* lost, with the *are* understood. Anyway, don't you find it strange to find the Nine Worthies in this play? Most will say, "No, since I don't know who the Nine Worthies are, or care". Well, the Nine Worthies are paragons of chivalry, chosen in the 14th century by Jacques de Longuyon—supposedly a Frenchman from Lorraine. What is strange is that three of them are Jewish: Joshua, David, and Judas Maccabeus. Also strange is that these Nine Worthies are being presented to a Christian audience in Elizabethan England. Would you expect Jews and Pagans to be given equal consideration in a Christian country? No, not even now, but especially not back then. Again, the numbers are what are important: three of each. Not seven Christian heroes, and maybe one Jew and one Pagan as a nod to history. No, *three of each*. Also curious is the Jews included. Not Moses, but Joshua. Not Abraham or Isaac or Jacob or Noah or Solomon, but Judas? Could it be because Judas was a Kohen? Nearly as curious are the pagans included in the Nine Worthies: Julius Caesar,

Alexander the Great, and Hector. Hector? But most curious are the three Christians: Charlemagne, King Arthur, and Godfrey of Bouillon. What? Aren't they missing someone there? Like maybe. . . *Christ*? Would you pick Godfrey of Bouillon over Christ himself? Godfrey was one of the leaders of the First Crusade, after which he became King of Jerusalem. So that's a bit of red flag, eh? We have not only the three Jewish worthies, we have the King of Jerusalem. So the Jews already seem a bit overrepresented in the Nine Worthies, don't they? After reading my paper on the Crusades, they will seem even more overrepresented to you, since Godfrey was probably Jewish himself. I showed that the Crusades were a Jewish enterprise from the start, with the Byzantine Emperors, French Kings, and even the Popes being Jewish. I haven't fully researched Charlemagne yet, but from what we discovered about the French Kings during the Crusades, it is possible Charlemagne was also Jewish. Hmmm. Are all nine of the Nine Worthies Jewish? I think it is a question to be asked, but I am not prepared to answer it at this time. I am prepared to tell you these Nine Worthies are a huge red flag, and that their appearance in *Love's Labour's Lost* was not a coincidence or accident. They are a bit of very obvious propaganda inserted into this play.

How about *Measure for Measure*? It starts with soldiers hoping for a war with Hungary to start, so they can take part and find glory. Sounds like the same old song, doesn't it? It is called war propaganda, and as we know war enriches the industrialists. In the next scenes, we find that the city's brothels are to be shut down, and you the reader are led to commiserate with Madam over the unfairness of this. Why are the authors selling you on brothels? For the same reason they are selling you on war: they are very profitable for the same people. We then get the famous “bed trick” and “head trick”, whereby lovers are substituted in a bed, and then bodies are switched in an execution. The second trick sounds familiar, doesn't it? My readers saw a similar head trick [in my next to last paper](#), where they substituted a body from the morgue for the body of Mussolini. In *Measure for Measure*, they seem to be preparing you for such shenanigans, implying it is OK. Also OK, according to them, is tricking people into sex, as long as you have a good excuse. Similarly, one of the minor character's punishment for speaking ill of the Duke is being forced to marry someone he doesn't wish to marry. It is all in good fun in this “comedy”.

This is not only possibly the worst play Shakespeare ever wrote, it is possibly the worst play anyone ever wrote. The character Mariana has been glorified by many painters and writers, including Tennyson, but although I have been called by some the last great romantic—due to my paintings and poems—I find her utterly without merit. Just to jog your memory, she is the fiancée of Angelo, the corrupt judge. He won't marry her because her dowry has been lost at sea. The only way she can get him to sleep with her is to turn the lights off and make him think she is Isabella, whom he has been lusting after. So she knows he doesn't love her, just wants her money, is lusting after others, and is a serial liar. What's more, she knows he has a blood lust, since he wants to murder Claudio, whom he knows to be innocent. Despite all that, she not only still wants to sleep with him, she stills wants to marry him and save him from punishment. And she has been sold as some sort of heroine for it! Talk about the miseducation of women.

Tennyson continues this miseducation in his poem *Mariana* of 1830, which romanticizes a general feminine depression. Bringing all this forward to the present day, we can see that the current push to sell anti-depressants via confusion and chaos isn't new. The governors have been purposely miseducating us all, male and female, since the beginning—in order to control us and profit from our miseries.

What about *All's Well That Ends Well*? I am not the only one who thinks this is a wash. It is obviously from the same second-string writing squad that produced *Measure for Measure*. Again, we have nobles

forcing people to marry, maidens in love with creeps, war propaganda, bed switches, faked deaths, and huge plot holes. Tellingly, George Bernard Shaw, Fabian phony, loved it. He also loved Mussolini and Stalin. On Shaw's page, we are told one of his major works is *Saint Joan*. Really? *Saint Joan* a major work? All this is now coming together, isn't it? Remember, we saw a Shaa above, mother-in-law of Walsingham. Shaa=Shaw.

How about *Two Gentlemen of Verona*? Being from more than a decade earlier, we would expect it to be worse than *All's Well That Ends Well*, but it isn't. It is just as full of plot holes and unbelievable action, but isn't as crammed full of propaganda. We only have the one instance of cross-dressing here: the writing committee not yet comprehending how much sexual chaos they could force into one play. However, the way Proteus' character is written is enough by itself to turn all maidens in the audience off men for an entire year.

In short, not as much has changed in the past 400 years as you think. The Shakespeare writing committee was doing pretty much the same thing the Hollywood and TV writing committees are doing now: turning your little mind into mush. These plays aren't boldly irrational by accident, any more than new scripts are boldly irrational by accident. They can't have you expecting plots or character actions to make sense, because if they did, you might expect life to make sense. If life made any sense, you might figure out how to take part in it in a sensible way, and they can't have that. They want you so confused you cannot possibly respond to any of their projects, other than go along with them. For the most part, they want you non-functioning as an active member of the world. They prefer that you are just conscious enough to get up in the morning and go to work, but not conscious enough to question anything you are told during your day. To achieve that, all your entertainment is purposely confusing, chaotic, and illogical. Likewise, all your education—whether it is provided by teachers or by media—is also utterly uncentering and confounding. The history you are taught is false and senseless, and current events are manufactured to produce fear and imbalance. It is a miracle any of us can function at all.

And why is this done? Profit. You are more profitable to the masters as a confused beast of burden than as a intelligent being. If you weren't hoaxed and drugged into a permanent stupor, you might demand a real life and a fair share of the fruits of existence. And if you did that, the billionaires would be forced to drain their offshore accounts and gilded bunkers and airplane hangers and marble swimming palaces and so on. They need those things, you know, because without them they are nothing. They define themselves by gigantic useless objects, and by their ability to lie without consequence, and by their knack for squashing their fellow creatures.

But the funny part is, you didn't have to fall for it. Most of us have been complicit in our own destruction, and many of us to a large degree. But the truth was always there, ready to be found. The good deed was always available, ready to be done.