

[return to updates](#)

The Ridolfi Plot was Faked



by Miles Mathis

First published June 17, 2020

According to mainstream historians, the [Ridolfi Plot](#) was an assassination plot of 1571 against Elizabeth I. Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk (above), was allegedly going to marry Mary Queen of Scots, and with her overthrow Elizabeth and take her place. I am not the first to point out how ridiculous this story is, and even Wikipedia has a section called “modern criticism”, which is very rare for a story like this. But in that section, we are told critics only suggest the plot “would have been doomed to fail even if it had not been discovered prematurely”. So we are supposed to think all the holes in the story are just a sign of poor planning by outrageously stupid conspirators, and not a sign of a fake. But I will show you why it was definitely the latter.

We will start with what these mainstream critics admit at Wikipedia:

- 1) the small number of troops that were to be led by the Spanish Duke Alba, coming from the Netherlands, wasn't sufficient to overthrow a small town, much less a Queen.
- 2) The vagueness of the plans for attack, including routes of invasion, are strange. We are told they were going to either attack via Portsmouth or Harwich, but it turns out the lead plotter—**banker** Roberto Ridolfi—didn't even know where Harwich was.
- 3) Norfolk wasn't even Catholic, so he seems like a strange choice to lead a Catholic invasion of England.
- 4) The marriage of Norfolk and Mary would have been the fourth for both of them, and their previous spouses didn't die of natural causes, so, as Wikipedia puts it, “the notion of two thrice-wed royals leading England back to Catholicism is somewhat problematic”.

But those aren't the biggest problems here by a longshot. Perhaps the biggest red flag is Norfolk's previous bio, which doesn't match this story at all. To start with, Norfolk was very closely related to Queen Elizabeth. Her maternal grandmother was a Howard, so they were second cousins. According

to Jewish lineages, **Elizabeth was a Howard**, since it is the maternal line that counts. Norfolk's mother was a de Vere, of the Earls of Oxford—who were also involved in [the Shakespeare fake](#). This also links us to the **Stanleys**, of course, since Norfolk's other cousin Elizabeth de Vere was married to the 6th Earl of Derby. This is of profound importance here, because the Stanleys—Kings of Mann—had put the Tudors on the throne to start with, and were still hiding behind them.



Which calls for a short digression. In all these histories, we hear a lot about the other ministers of the monarch, but not much about any Stanley. But the 4th Earl of Derby is the one we should be looking at here, since his mother was. . . Lady Dorothy Howard. [Check out the page of his father](#), the 3rd Earl of Derby. It is ludicrously short, despite the fact that he was raised by Wolsey and Henry VIII himself. We are supposed to believe that Howard, the 3rd Duke of Norfolk, married Derby to his daughter without the King's permission. No chance that happened, but the story was written to make us think the Stanleys are being moved, instead of doing the moving. Although Derby became Lord High Steward and Privy Counsellor to Elizabeth, most of his bio is suppressed. We are only told he was a commissioner at Lady Jane Grey's trial, and “was present” at the trials of various heretics. Yeah, I bet he was.

His son the 4th Earl has an equally truncated page, where the high point of his career is that he “participated in the trials of Mary Queen of Scots and the Earl of Arundel” (Philip Howard), for which he was appointed Lord High Steward. That's it. But since we know the 1st Earl of Derby was a kingmaker and the most powerful man in the British Isles, there is no chance these later Earls were the nobodies they are made out to be. Just keep that in mind as we proceed.

The Howards were the righthand men of the Tudors and their greatest allies, and you now see that is because they were all the same family. The 2nd Duke was the general who defeated the Scots at Flodden, while Henry VIII was chasing French pastry in France. He was also Lord High Treasurer. He had previously been Earl Marshal, presiding over the coronation of Henry. Norfolk was Henry's second minister, after Wolsey. His son, our Norfolk's grandfather, was a close companion of Henry, and was Lord High Admiral, also taking part in the great Flodden victory. He followed his father as Lord High Treasurer. A decade later he became Lord High Steward. He brutally suppressed the Pilgrimage of Grace uprising in 1536. This Norfolk is the one who dispatched Thomas Cranmer in the Annes of Cleves affair.

The 3rd Duke was also involved in a fake act of treason against Henry, but we are here to study his grandson's fake event, not his. We are told that he was spared death by Henry dying just before his

sentence, but that is the usual bollocks. It just meant they were spared the necessity of faking his death.

Thomas Howard, 4th Duke, was schooled by the Protestant martyrologist John **Foxe**, which is another hidden clue (not so hidden). A martyrologist is someone who studies the making of martyrs of course, and in a sense that is what the Howards had been hired to do for Henry and then Elizabeth. By pretending to attack the monarch, the Howards created sympathy for them, as well as allowing the monarch to crack down on real enemies without looking like an ogre and a butcher.

Norfolk's aunt was the Duchess of Richmond, the sister-in-law of Elizabeth. She, too, was involved in these fakes, since she allegedly testified against her own brother, the Earl of Surrey, whose death was faked soon after. He also was supposedly plotting against Henry.

Like his forefathers, our Norfolk was a top general of the Queen. As the 4th Duke of Norfolk and richest man in England, not only was he the only Duke in the country (at age 18), he was Earl Marshal, making him the leading officer of arms. When his son Philip was born, King Philip II of Spain, husband of Queen Mary, was his godfather. That's how close the Howards were to the Crown.

He was the commander of the English army in Scotland against Mary of Guise, who was the mother of Mary Queen of Scots. He was later head of the commission at York that heard evidence *against* Mary Queen of Scots, including the casket letters. So he was Elizabeth's righthand man there as well. Therefore, the idea that he would within a year scheme with Mary against Elizabeth is absurd. Only someone who knew nothing of the previous history would believe it.

Obviously, the whole point of the Ridolfi plot was to further blackwash Mary, without however having to try her for attempted assassination. Mary was already (allegedly) in prison in England, so she was no danger to anyone, but Elizabeth needed to prevent any sympathy for her. The trials for this plot all mysteriously focused on Norfolk and ignored Mary, though it was known the public would come to the proper (false) conclusions. We have much more evidence in this direction, starting with the fact that we are given two accounts of the trial, [even on the current Wiki page](#). In one account, Norfolk was given a one-day trial and executed on the same day. In the other account, he was tried in January and executed in June. You would think that after 450 years they could get their story straight. They do however remember to work in aces and eights, Chai, since Norfolk was first taken to the Tower on **October 8**, 1569.

At Luminarium.org, our almost hidden historian (Mandell Creighton—also peerage of course*) tells us:

Elizabeth saw how little she could count on the English nobility, who were all anxious for the settlement of the succession, and were in some degree or other on Mary's side. It was resolved to read them a lesson by proceeding against Norfolk, who was brought to trial for high treason on 16 Jan. 1572.

That's true in part, since Elizabeth *did* feel she needed to read the nobles a lesson. However, that lesson was taught via a fiction, not a fact, as usual. Her cousin Norfolk simply volunteered to help her teach that lesson, by faking his death.

But perhaps the final evidence this was all faked is that the Howards never lost their lands, titles, or wealth. They still have them to this day. Although the 3rd Duke was convicted of treason and came within a day of losing his head, the Dukedom was only attainted temporarily. His son was allegedly beheaded for high treason, but somehow this didn't affect his grandson, who became 4th Duke pretty

much on schedule. Does that make any sense to you? If anyone had really believed the Howards were traitors against the Crown, their lands would have been seized permanently and taken by the Crown or given to some other duke. They would have been kicked out of the peerage permanently. And yet Henry's own daughter Elizabeth, who saw all this with her own eyes, made the 4th Duke her most trusted general and advisor. Upon his beheading for treason, the Howards should have again been stripped of all wealth and privilege, but they weren't. Two of his sons remained Earls, and the dukedom only went underground for a short time, as part of the story. They needed his son Philip to keep most of his titles, since he was to be used in the same way, pretending to convert to Catholicism and pretending to die in the tower, again to blackwash the Catholics. Elizabeth needed Catholics to appear to be traitors and murderers, since, like her father, she was moving the entire country away from Rome.

Another clue is that Norfolk was supposed to have been buried in the Tower of London. That makes no sense, since the body should have been returned to the family. Bodies are only hidden in this way when there is no body. We have seen it a hundred times.

You would think Philip Howard's arrest and imprisonment in 1585 would have looked bad for his brother Thomas, the Earl of Suffolk; instead, Elizabeth made him an admiral and Knight of the Garter. Maybe she didn't realize these two were brothers, and were the sons of the traitorous 4th Duke. Suffolk later became Lord Chamberlain. When James I became King, Suffolk became one of his top three ministers, becoming Lord High Treasurer. I guess James didn't read history either. Suffolk led the prosecution of the Gunpowder Plot in 1605.

Although Suffolk stole heavily from the treasury and was caught, James did almost nothing. We are told he was fined and disgraced, but since two of his sons were also fabulously wealthy Earls, it didn't seem to affect the family much. The 2nd Earl of Suffolk's daughter married a Percy, Earl of Northumberland, linking them to that fantastic wealth as well. So I guess the Percys had also failed to be informed the Howards were attainted. Suffolk's son, the 3rd Earl, was Earl Marshal for Charles II, and as we know **that position was reserved for the Duke of Norfolk**. Indicating he was still Duke of Norfolk, except in the history books. The 2nd Earl's brother was the Earl of Berkshire, who married the daughter of Cecil, Earl of Exeter. So the Cecils also appear to have forgotten the Howards were ever attainted.



Now, if we go back to Philip Howard and the Earls of Arundel, the main line here, we find it claimed his son the 14th Earl (above) was born into “relative penury”. Right. His grandfather had been the richest man in England, but the family was now broke? We are told that Arundel's great uncles restored the family to favor under James I, and Arundel's estates and titles were restored. That's a bit vague, isn't it? His only paternal great-uncle was Henry, Earl of Northampton, who did indeed become Lord of the Treasury under James, but this just begs further questions. Since Northampton was the younger brother of the 4th Duke, he should have fallen when his father and brother fell. Instead, we see that his advancement was only delayed by a short time.

Arundel's restoration is also a mystery, since how can estates be restored? Once things like lands are gone, they should be gone for good. Say Elizabeth gave the Howards' lands to the Stuarts. How can her successor James come back 30 years later and give them back to the Howards, when the Stuarts have done nothing wrong? Do you think the Stuarts are just going to pack up and vacate without complaint?

In answer to this, [we are told much of the family estates had just been transferred to these great-uncles](#). What! So, we are supposed to believe that as punishment for high treason, a duke's lands and other property are just shifted over to his brother(s)? Is that really how it worked? If so, I can see why treason was such a common crime. The King didn't really seize your lands, he just shifted them over to your brother for a while. It was all a paper shuffling.

Despite supposedly being in penury and from an attainted family, the 14th Earl nonetheless married the daughter of Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury. Talbot also hadn't followed recent history, being too busy fox hunting to realize his daughter was marrying into a family that had been plotting against the Crown and getting their heads lopped for a century. By 1611, Arundel was made Knight of the Garter, just 39 years after his grandfather was beheaded for high treason. In 1621, he became Earl Marshal, again a position reserved for the Duke of Norfolk. In the same year he presided over the trial of Francis Bacon for corruption, I guess because his family knew so much about it. By this time, Arundel was so un-attainted, his son's godmother was Queen Anne. This son Henry married a Stuart, daughter of the Duke of Lennox, and their son Thomas again became 5th Duke of Norfolk—exactly 88 years after the 4th Duke had his head lopped.

But they continued the theater, since Henry's brother William, Viscount Stafford, was allegedly executed for treason in the fake Popish Plot of 1678. They now admit the Plot was fake, invented by Titus Oakes, but historians do not admit the executions of Howard, Herbert, Arundell, Petre, and Belasyse were faked, or that Charles II was in on the fake. The Popish Plot was manufactured to once again blackwash Catholics, and especially to blackwash Charles' brother James, whom Charles hoped to kick out of the royal succession in favor of his illegitimate son the Duke of Monmouth.



Remember, Charles famously had seven illegitimate sons and zero legitimate ones, causing him major problems. He didn't have the gumption of Henry VIII, never getting rid of his first wife Catherine of Braganza, who couldn't do anything but miscarry. So even his daughters were illegitimate. The Popish Plot was his rather pathetic attempt to do what Henry VIII had done, without actually doing it. It failed miserably, and Stafford and all the rest faked their deaths in vain. It continued to fail after Charles' death, when Monmouth (above) tried to take the throne by force but was destroyed at Sedgemoor in 1685. He was allegedly captured in a field of peas in Ringwood, but that is also absurd. I am not the first to conjecture Monmouth escaped. The common story gives us many clues to that, even at Wikipedia, where they say

The prisoner unsuccessfully implored his mercy, and even offered to convert to Catholicism, but to no avail.

Notice they say “the prisoner”, not Monmouth.

The King remarked that “Monmouth did not behave as well as I expected” at the beheading. Which only means the hired actor overacted the part.

We are told the bishops withheld the Eucharist before the execution, because Monmouth would not admit his sins, including his relationship with Lady Wentworth. Ridiculous, since the bishops wouldn't be concerned with such things at that time. Monmouth had been found guilty of treason, not adultery or blasphemy.

It supposedly took **eight** blows from the executioner to sever his head. Impossible, unless Monmouth was really Iron Man. They just wanted to get that number in there. Monmouth was supposedly buried in the Tower of London, also ridiculous. Being a Duke and the son of a King, his body would have been returned to his family for burial. Except that there *was* no body.

His subsidiary titles of Earl and Baron were soon returned to his grandson, proving the same thing.

There is a portrait of Monmouth painted *after* his execution, which would seem to be a problem. But the story is they exhumed the body, sewed the head back on, and sat him for the artist. No, really.

According to legend, Monmouth became the Man in the Iron Mask, having fled to France. Minus the mask, this is the likely truth, though we should probably substitute the Netherlands for France. Monmouth had been born in Rotterdam and spoke Dutch. He had also “exiled himself” there at age 30, and he remained there from 1679 to 1685, the year of his rebellion. So after the defeat at Sedgemoor, it would be fabulously easy for him to hop back over to Amsterdam. Sedgemoor is only a few miles from the sea at Bristol Channel, where he would naturally have a boat waiting. Ringwood is many miles in the other direction, toward Bournemouth, so there is no reason for Monmouth to have gone that way.

But let's return to the Ridolfi event, to finish it off. Ridolfi's story is equally silly, since although he had allegedly been jailed as a Papal spy for two years starting in 1568, he was released in 1570 for lack of evidence. Right. Lack of evidence never stops these people, since if they need evidence they just create it. Conveniently, Ridolfi was supposedly released from prison almost simultaneously with Norfolk, at which time they hatched this plot to overthrow the Queen. Yes, because they wouldn't have been followed or watched, right? This was the perfect time to hatch a major conspiracy: just after you get released from prison as a Papal spy. They admit Ridolfi was a blabbermouth, broadcasting the plot all over Europe, but I guess Norfolk didn't notice. Ridolfi even told Cosimo de' Medici, an enemy of Elizabeth, but we are supposed to believe de' Medici warned her himself. Oivay caramba, no way that happened! Remember, the Pope *was* a Medici up until 1566 (Pius IV), and they also owned Pius V, who was Pope during the Ridolfi Plot.**

Ridolfi escaped of course. He later became a senator in Florence.

In conclusion, I have blown the Ridolfi Plot, the Popish Plot, and—in part—the Monmouth Rebellion. So if you ever wondered why there seemed to be so many plots and so much intrigue among the royals and nobles, now you know: most of it was faked. It never happened. And if you wondered why I chose to write this now, when I could be writing about George Floyd or something, now you know: if I can make you understand that these fake events have been staged for centuries, maybe you can wrap your head around the current fakes. Plus, these old fakes are much more important and more interesting than the new ones. George Floyd will be forgotten in a few years, but these old English plots have survived almost half a millennium. They have been taught as history to British schoolchildren for centuries, and still are.

*Creighton was also a bishop of the Church of England, and you see how that fits in here. In other words, he was anti-Catholic. We are supposed to believe Creighton's father was a carpenter, but here is a picture of the family:



Those are some affluent looking carpenters. Mandell's brother became director of the North British Railway, as carpenter's sons are wont to do.

**Pope Pius V was a Ghislieri, and the common bios scrub his parents or tell us they were poor shepherds. They weren't, and this is admitted [on the Italian pages at Geni.com](#), where we find the Ghislieri were actually nobles from Bologna. They had been patricians back to the 11th century, and were wealthy mill owners who went on the first three Crusades. Although driven out of Bologna by the Bentivoglios, they returned in 1506 with Pope Julius, who expelled the Bentivoglios and re-installed the Ghislieri. At that time they became top bankers, senators, and Marquises. They had many palaces and even a tower in Bologna. Their tower is still there, now part of the belltower of the Church of Saint. Gregory and Siro. As bankers, we may assume they allied themselves to the Medicis, perhaps by marriage. My guess is Ghislieri's mother was a Medici, which is why she is scrubbed from the history books. Also interesting is that some of the famous Ghislieris of history were named Bonaparte, since Napoleon, remember, was not French. He was Corsican, which may link him to these Ghislieri. There was an Alexander Ghislieri just a half-century before Pius V, who was a Count Palatine and Canon of St. Peter. So the claim that Pius V came from poor goatherds is absurd.