

[return to updates](#)

LAWRENCE of ARABIA



by Miles Mathis

First published August 3, 2018

T. E. Lawrence is one of the biggest spooks of the 20th century, though you wouldn't know it from reading mainstream history or from watching movies. Like the rest, he was promoted as a hero, and most of us picture Peter O'Toole in eyeliner riding across the desert on a camel when we hear the name. But of course that was all another whitewash, having little or nothing to do with what actually transpired. Just ask yourself this: who looks like the more ridiculous actor above? Hard call, isn't it?

The first problem is his name. His father was the 7th Baronet **Chapman** and he was never adopted by anyone named Lawrence, so where did that come from? We are told they took it from his maternal grandmother, but that really makes no sense. We are told the whole family adopted that last name when the father ran away with the housekeeper, and Lawrence was the housekeeper's mother's name. Really? But it appears to be an assumed name for them all, not a legal name. So we have the usual hijinx from the beginning.

They then do some more scrubbing on the ancestry to make you think his father the Baronet was the highest ranking person in the family. Not even close. The Baronet Lawrence's mother was Edith Sarah **Hamilton**, of the Hamiltons of Scotland and Ireland. These are the Hamiltons of Cadzow and Raploch, closely related to the ruling Stuarts and Douglasses of Scotland, later the Viscounts Clandeboye, later the Hamiltons of Bailleborough and Hamiltonsbrown of Ireland, related to the Brabazons and Alexander Hamilton of the US (as well as the famously tan actor George Hamilton—who is also [a Fuller from... Salem](#)).

But let us return to the name Chapman. Does it ring a bell? As in Mark David Chapman, who allegedly shot John Lennon. Amazingly, the mainstream admits Chapman is closely related to these people and many others. From [Famouskin.com](#):

Mark David Chapman is a direct descendant of Mayflower passenger William White. He is also kin to a number of former U.S. Presidents including Franklin Pierce, James Garfield, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Grover Cleveland, Gerald **Ford**, and both Presidents Bush. Historical members of his family tree include Revolutionary War hero Nathan Hale, abolitionist John Brown, aviation pioneer Amelia Earhart, dictionary publisher Noah **Webster**, women's rights advocate Susan B. Anthony, and aviation pioneers Wilbur and Orville Wright.

Celebrity kin of Mark David Chapman include actress Lillian Gish, movie director Howard Hawks, actress Katharine Hepburn, fashion designer Gloria **Vanderbilt**, television host Dick **Clark**, actor Matt Damon, singer and songwriter Amy Grant, actor John Wayne [Marion **Morrison**], actor Humphrey Bogart, singer and songwriter Harry Chapin, actor Ben Affleck, **and many others**. Literary kin of his include poet Ralph Waldo Emerson, author Harriet Beecher Stowe, author Clarence Day, novelist Constance Fenimore Woolson, and poet Emily Dickinson.

Wow. And *why* is Chapman related to all these people? Because he descends from these same Chapman Baronets as Lawrence of Arabia. Mark [is admitted to be](#) a Russell, a Ford, a Bennett, a Carpenter, a Gillett, a Warner, a King, a Curtis and a Webster. Even so, he is heavily scrubbed, since his 5th generation, which should have 16 names, only has four. His maternal line after his grandmother is missing, although other parts of his ancestry go back 15 generations. At Geni.com, Mark's mother is listed as <private>, with no info after that. At Wiki we learn Mark's father was military, given a rank of Staff Sergeant in the Air Force. Mark is supposed to have gone to Covenant College in **Lookout Mountain**, Georgia. That is simply another easy clue for me and my readers. We can link that to the secret Lookout Mountain Film Studio in Laurel Canyon, that we uncovered in [my Manson research](#).

Regardless, you should ask yourself what the odds are that this nutcase we are sold in the Lennon saga just happens to be from all these top families? Just another wacky coincidence, right? No. As I showed in [my paper on Lennon](#), Chapman was hired to play this part. He is another child of the governors, playing his part in the long con. Compare him to John Hinckley, fake shooter of Reagan, who just happens to be from the same families. His parents were dining with the Bushes on the night of the shooting.

Also remember that Chapman means “merchant”, which ties us back to previous research. All the Baronets were and are merchants ennobled simply for being filthy rich (and Jewish). Also see Alvah Chapman, owner of the *Miami Herald* and chairman of Knight Ridder. Also British spy Eddie “Zigzag” Chapman, whose bio is another sham. Also Sir Frank Chapman of BG Group, allegedly the son of a truckdriver (yeah). Also George Chapman, fake Polish serial killer. Also George Henry Chapman, Union General and newspaper editor. Also spook artists [Jake and Dinos Chapman](#). Also 4-star general Leonard Chapman, Commandant of the Marine Corp. Also William Chapman Ralston, founder of the Bank of California, also connected to the Comstock Lode. Ralston was later portrayed by Ronald Reagan, and they too were related. Also Tony Chapman, early drummer for the Rolling Stones, replaced by Charlie Watts. Also Sir Timothy Granville-Chapman, Vice-Chief of the Defense Staff of the British Army until 2008. The Earls of Granville were Leveson-Gowers, related to the Queen Mother. This general's parents are not given, but his name tells us he is related to Katherine Granville **Lonsdale** of the peerage who married Kyrle **Stewart** Chapman in 1921—indicating the general was also of the peerage. Of course this [also connects him to the Stewarts](#) and Fitzroys, including Admiral Stewart, Earl of Galloway, whose wife was a Paget of the Earls of Uxbridge.

Which takes us back to the peerage. There were actually three Chapman baronetcys. We already

looked at the Baronets of St. Lucy, who were also related to the Billings (think Lem Billings, [gay lover of JFK](#)). They were also related to the Steele baronets, and through them to the Graves. They were also related to the Edens, Barons and Earls of Auckland. This links us to the Finches (Earls), Pagets (Marquesses of **Anglesey**), and Huttons—and the Huttons link us to the Gibsons. The Chapmans, Baronets Underhill, were also related to the Gibsons, [think Mel Gibson](#) among many others. Finally, we have the Chapmans, Baronets of London, related to the **Webbs**.

OK, so was Peter O'Toole also related to Lawrence of Arabia? You bet! You can tell already by the fact that O'Toole is scrubbed at Geni, with only parents given. His page is managed by a **Rhodes**. He is also scrubbed at Wikitree and Ethniclebs. For myself, I assume O'Toole is descended from Michael [Valentine O'Toole](#) of the peerage, who married a Clements in 1916. Both the names Valentine and Clements are clues, since they link us to previous papers, specifically [my paper on Mark Twain](#). Twain was a Clemens, previously Clements, and he was a member of the Players Club in New York, founded by a Valentine. Anyway, Michael O'Toole's wife Lilian Clements was descended from [Beresfords, Gores, and Webbs](#). And that last name is the link we were seeking between Lawrence and O'Toole.

Peter O'Toole claimed he had two birth certificates, one from Ireland and one from England, and two birthdates, August 2 and June 1, 1932. Right. This story indicates to me that O'Toole might have had a twin. In that case there would be two birth certificates, but I suspect the dates are the same. We know he was chosen for his looks and his ancestry, but he may have been chosen as a twin as well. Just so you know, O'Toole was married to a **Phillips** from Wales, and she later married a **Sachs**.

As usual, with O'Toole they chose an actor far better looking than the real man. Lawrence had that Habsburg jaw and was only about 5'3", while O'Toole was around 6'.

Lawrence was born in Tremadog, Wales, which is just a few miles from **Anglesey**. The house he was born in is now a holiday house for groups of 35, which tells you how large it is. His father then inherited Killua Castle, but the family didn't wish to live there. They moved around, living in other posh residences in Scotland, Jersey, and Hampshire. We are told Lawrence was an outsider due to being a bastard, but remember he was the wealthy son of a baronet and the grandson of a Hamilton, which counted for far more than the marital status of his parents—which was hidden anyway. Lawrence attended high school in Oxford with other very privileged boys and then graduated from Jesus College, Oxford. At age 21, Lawrence was allegedly assigned to an archaeological dig at Carchemesh in Syria. Here is one of the earliest fake photos of Lawrence, supposed to be of him and a friend there:



It's hard to believe just how bad that fake is. They are both falling to your left and are floating over the ground in a strange manner. Also note where the light colored sleeve meets the background to your right. See the unnatural line there?

In the same year (1910) he sailed to Byblos, which is appropriate seeing that he was a Phoenician. Finally, we get a small bit of truth in 1914, when we are told Lawrence was recruited by British Intelligence as part of an archaeological smokescreen for a military survey of the Negev desert. We are told this was needed in case of attack from the Ottomans, but more likely it was to look for oil and minerals. Soon after that WWI began, and Lawrence was assigned to the Arab Bureau Intelligence Unit in Cairo. He soon attached himself to Sharif **Hussein**, Emir of Mecca, and especially his son Faisal. This much is admitted, since Lawrence started the Arab Revolt from the chambers of the Emir. What is not explained is how or why the Emirs—which were Ottoman—would have allowed the British such entry into their affairs. In other words, why would these Ottomans revolt against themselves? That is what is never explained. You would expect the British, French, Russians, and Ottomans to be fighting one another, but not the Ottomans to be fighting themselves. So this whole story makes no sense from the first word.

I will be told these Arabs of Mecca wanted to be independent of Ottoman rule. But since they had been installed from Istanbul and ruled only with the blessing of the Sultan, and were protected only by his armies and navies, this makes no sense. Are we supposed to believe these Emirs thought the British were going to fight their war for them, then pack up and leave? If the British left, the locals didn't have standing armies sufficient to protect themselves, so the Sultan would just take them back immediately. After beheading all the revolutionaries, he would re-absorb their territories. But no one ever thought of that, right?

What should be clear at this distance in time is that this entire Arab Revolt was manufactured by British Intelligence, and that in order for it to proceed as it did, they had to have infiltrated and taken over the Middle East by other methods long before. In other words, Syria already belonged to the British before any of this started, as did Mecca. These Emirs were just puppets, and it is entirely possible the British replaced them with their own people. For myself, I am not even convinced Faisal or these other people were of the hereditary lines we are told. We later saw many Jews in turbans pretending to be Arabs in

[previous papers](#), so the only question is, how far back does this go? Were the famous Arabs always Jews in turbans, or were they replaced by Jews in turbans later. . . or, were older Jews in turbans replaced by newer Jews in turbans from other families? We will see.

Well, to start to figure it out, we have to go back to the Young Turk revolution in Turkey, which also makes no sense. It also shows massive signs of British pawing, and it now looks like the British conquered the Ottoman Empire mainly through infiltration. The Ottoman Empire was already as good as dead by 1908, and the events of the Balkan Wars and WWI now look like the attempt to make it *look like* Turkey was defeated in battle, rather than by Intel. As perhaps the perfect sign of this, see the appointment of Kamil Pasha as Grand Vizier in 1908. He was a “Liberal supporter and ally of England”. Also a Cypriot, which is a huge clue. Why would the Sultan appoint such a person to be Grand Vizier? England was the enemy of Turkey in the upcoming wars, so this makes no sense.

I also encourage you to study the Wikipedia page for the Young Turk Rebellion. It is has almost no content. It is ludicrously short and gives you no feel for the event at all. If this event was real, why does it read so fake at Wikipedia? I guess Elon Musk would tell you that the realer it is the faker it looks.



Sultan Murad V

Well, to understand any of this, we have to go back even further, studying the Sultans themselves. If you want to know why a Sultan would appoint Kamil Pasha as Grand Vizier, study that Sultan. As it turns out, all the Sultans of this period have strange genealogies as well. None of their women (queens) are Arabs. You would expect the Sultan to marry an Arab woman, but none of them did. For instance, Abdul Hamid II, the 34th Sultan and ruler during the Young Turk Revolt, had as his mother a woman named Virjin, probably from **Armenia**. So he may have been at least half-Jewish, and Jewish according to Jewish law. Abdul Aziz, 32nd Sultan, was admitted to be ¼ French. His mother Besime was from the Caucasus, with historians now selling her as Circassian. They do this because many Circassians are now Muslim; but others have said these Ottoman queens were not Circassian, but Georgian, meaning they were **Russian** and not Muslim at all. So if Aziz was ¼ French and ½ Russian, he was *at most* ¼ Arab. The 31st Sultan's mother Suzi was also “Circassian or Georgian”. Suzi doesn't sound like an Arab name to me. Naksidil, mother of the 30th Sultan, was also from the Caucasus, and even Wikipedia admits she may have been Georgian. The 28th Sultan's mother was also from Georgia.

The 27th Sultan's mother Ida was born in France. Which leads us back to the 32nd Sultan Aziz, who Wikipedia admits was $\frac{1}{4}$ French. But we have just seen he was descended only from other Sultans and Georgians. Only one 2g-grandmother is French, which doesn't make him $\frac{1}{4}$ French. So there is something we aren't being told here. Several of these other "Georgian" ladies must be half French as well, which makes it even less likely they are Muslim.

And, I hope you can do the math: if all these women are not Arab, then the Sultan is less Arab in each generation. Let's say the 26th Sultan was 100% Arab/Muslim/Turk—meaning, he had no Jewish, French, Russian, British, or German blood. Well, if he marries a French girl, then the 27th Sultan is only half Arab. The 28th is then $\frac{1}{4}$, the 29th is $\frac{1}{8}$, the 30th is $\frac{1}{16}$. And the 34th Sultan is then. . . $\frac{1}{256}$ Arab. I trust you can see what I am getting at. The Ottomans have been infiltrated without any war having been waged.

You will say that they have been infiltrated mainly by Georgians (Russians), in that case. But since Russia was ruled by the same people as Germany, England, and Denmark in this period (Hanovers/Romanovs); [and since those people were really Jewish as well \(Jagiellons\)](#), you can see who really infiltrated the Ottomans.

Which means? The Ottoman Empire was just another arm of the OCTOPUS from the beginning. It was never an independent state from the beginning, any more than any country or state is *now* independent. Not only was the Arab Revolt a sham, the Young Turk Revolt was also a sham. These events may have been real to some extent, since I assume people actually did things: they don't exist only on paper. But they weren't revolutions. They were events manufactured by the bankers for their own purposes—either to consolidate power, to transfer power, or simply to keep the populace occupied and confused. In other words, these events made money and kept everyone's eyes off real events. And in some cases, they were fake revolutions run to *pre-empt* real revolutions. Nothing forestalls a genuine revolution like a manufactured revolution.

More evidence this was all staged is that by 1918 Lawrence was a major and the Turks had put a \$2 million bounty on his head. Despite the fact that he stood out like a sore thumb, this bounty was never claimed. That is completely beyond belief. If you don't see what I mean, go to the Wiki page for Sykes-Picot Agreement. This was a secret treaty between Britain, France, and Russia from 1916, giving Syria to France. But what it also did—and they admit this—is nullify all of Britain's promises to the Arabs in the region. The area was supposed to go to them, remember? That is what the Arab Revolt was all about. It is also admitted that the Bolsheviks leaked the agreement in 1917, publishing it for the world to see. So the stupid Arabs in Mecca should have seen it then, right? Why didn't they immediately turn on Lawrence and hang him as dog meat? Because the entire story you are told is false. The Emirs of Mecca, like the Sultans of Turkey, were in on the scam from the start, and they didn't give a damn about any homeland for the Arabs. They didn't care a fig for the areas they ruled, they only cared about maintaining some part of their power. Surrounded and infiltrated by the British, French and Russians, they had no hope of meaningful resistance. They could only negotiate for the appearance of a small amount of local autonomy. The British and French were glad to give them that, since the locals were far more docile and easy to control if they believed their rulers were their own. This is the way it is done in all countries: the families hide behind a facade of local governance, leaving as much of the old machinery in places as they can. In this way, the Syrians think they live in Syria, ruled by Syrians; the Iranians think they live in Iran ruled by Iranians; and the daffy Americans think they live in America ruled by Americans. In truth, *none* of the countries of the world are independent. They are all ruled by the same few families from behind the scenes. The Wizard of OZ is real, and he isn't some bumbling magician.



To see who was really running things here, we can look at Colonel Sir Tatton Benvenuto Mark Sykes, 6th Baronet, who signed the Sykes-Picot Agreement for Britain. Notice he was also a Baronet, like Lawrence. Also like Lawrence, his links to the peerage went far above baronet. Sykes' mother was a Cavendish-Bentinck, and they were the Dukes of Portland *and* the Dukes of Devonshire. In the immediate family they were also Boyles, Earls of Cork; Saviles, Marquesses of Halifax; Noels, Viscounts Campden; Seymours, Dukes of Somerset; Devereux, Earls of Essex; Cliffords, Earls of Cumberland; Dudleys, Dukes of Northumberland; and Lowthers, Earls of Lonsdale. We already saw the Londales above, related to the Chapmans, which means **Sykes was related to Lawrence**.

So Lawrence was just one of the families' eyes-on-the-ground in Syria. As such, you can be sure he wouldn't have been there if there was any danger to him. These people sell themselves as brave, but in my experience bravery and lying don't go together. The brave don't have to lie. If Lawrence had really been brave, he wouldn't have done what he did. He would have gotten out of the families altogether and told the truth.

To see what I mean, see Sykes' Wiki page, where we find that at the outbreak of WWI, although already a Lt. Col., he wasn't sent into battle. Instead he went into the Intelligence dept. working for Lord Kitchener. Sykes wrote pamphlets promoting Arab independence, which means he was a paid liar. Sykes is the one who created the Arab Bureau and designed the fake flag of Arab revolt. His design for that flag was later incorporated into the flags of Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Sudan, Kuwait, Yemen, Palestine, and the UAE. Which should tell you what is still going on in all those countries *to this day*.

Also interesting is a quick peek at Lawrence's superior, General Allenby. As a young man he failed the exam to enter Indian Civil Service, then failed the exam for the Royal Military College but was let in anyway. He then failed the exam at the Staff College at Camberley, but was passed his second time [again, probably with a bye]. Those at the Staff College later admitted they thought he was a dunce, but somehow he ended up a general anyway. Why? Same reason George Bush became President: he was from the families. Allenby's mother was a Bourne, of the Bourne Baronets. Curiously, they are scrubbed at thepeerage.com, with a 2nd Baronet listed, but no 1st Baronet. Wikipedia has a page for the 1st Baronet, where we learn he was the son of Peter Bourne of Lancashire and Liverpool. Taking that back to thepeerage, we find this Peter Bourne of Hackingsall Hall also listed as a peer. [That should be Hackensall Hall, previously owned by the Fleetwoods.] He married a Dyson, daughter of the Dyson

Baronets. Their children and grandchildren then married with the Ely Marquesses, the Campbells of Kirkcudbright, and so on. These are the Campbells of many Baronetcys, as well as being the Earls of Argyll. They were closely related to the **Hamiltons**, FitzGerald, Douglasses, Stuarts, and Gordons—the very top families of Scotland, including many Kings. So this links Allenby to Lawrence many times, most obviously through those Hamiltons. But there is a closer link: **General Allenby's wife was née Chapman**. So Allenby was an uncle or cousin of Lawrence.

Next, we are told that after the Arabs had taken Damascus and Faisal had become King, the French conquered the city and area in 1920, less than two years after the end of the War. The mainstream histories tell us this “destroyed Lawrence's dream of an independent Arabia”. Meaning, the liars are still being paid to lie. We have seen that the whole dream of an independent Arabia was a conjob. Lawrence's fellow peers had given the area to their French cousins back in 1916, so Syria was never meant to be independent. Of course Lawrence knew that, since he was not only part of the Intelligence units that drafted these plans, he was also a member of the families, being a cousin to both Sykes and Allenby.

We can also snare Lowell Thomas and his cameraman Harry **Chase** (note the last name there). They were famous American reporters who first promoted the Lawrence of Arabia story, especially in the US. They made a lot of money touring the world, lecturing on Lawrence's heroics, and showing films from Syria of veiled women, camels, and Bedouin armies. We may assume the films and stories were as genuine as the films and stories from the same region are now—in other words, *not*. They were and are Hollywood productions, with built sets and paid actors. The Arab revolt of 1916 was hardly more real than the David Lean film of 1962.

Which leads us to do a quick sniff on Lean. He is scrubbed after his parents at Geni.com by page manager Michael Rhodes, indicating we are on the right track already. Lean's father was Francis le **Blount** Lean, indicating they are related to the Blount Earls, Barons, and Baronets. Lean's mother was a Tangye, also linking them to the peerage. She was the niece of Lt. Col. Sir Richard Tangye, OBE, knighted for his work on gas engines beginning in the 1870s. His companies made millions, and later (during WWI) manufactured diesel engines. They married into the highest levels of the peerage when his son Nigel Tangye married Lady Bligh, daughter of the Earl of Darnley. These Blighs were closely related to the Pelham Earls, the Parnell Barons, the Dawson Earls, the Brownlows; the **Hamiltons**, Earls of Abercorn; and the **Stuarts**, Earls of Bute. These last two link Lean to Lawrence. This means that both Lean and O'Toole were related to Lawrence, which explains why the film was made. They were reselling the fake heroics of one of their famous cousins. This is how it works.

Lawrence continued the spookery and the fake names after the war, when he enlisted in the RAF as John Hume Ross. Since Lawrence was already a fake name, this was the alias of an alias. He was soon exposed and had to come up with yet another fake name: T. E. Shaw. By 1926 he was in India working on clandestine jobs that have still not been declassified. In 1928 his cover was blown again and he returned to England. Although Lawrence remained with RAF and Intelligence in the 1930s, he was either mostly retired or working local projects. He bought a fleet of expensive Brough Superior motorcycles, each one of which was worth more than most people's houses. At age 46 he allegedly crashed one of them and died. Seeing that we have the number 46 and that Lawrence was having trouble staying undercover, we may assume the death was faked and that he simply had been hired for a new and bigger project, where anonymity was crucial. More indication of this is that his place of death is listed as Bovington Camp, a military base. We are told Lawrence was visiting the adjacent Moreton Estate, owned by his cousins the Framptons (think Peter Frampton), but that looks like a cover story to me. Even stranger is that Lawrence was allegedly buried at Moreton in the Frampton plot.

Why would he be buried there? Why wasn't he buried with his family the Chapmans, who were Baronets? Because the whole thing was a fake.

No study of Lawrence such as this can pass by the section at Wikipedia on his homosexuality and masochism. Apparently his favorite companion was an Arab, Selim Ahmed, or Dahoum. Lawrence liked to be beaten, whipped and humiliated, and this is substantiated by many sources. So, once again, it appears that Lawrence was the polar opposite of who we are told he was in the newsreels and films.

This is from Lawrence's famous memoirs *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*:

In horror of such sordid commerce [diseased female prostitutes] our youths began indifferently to slake one another's few needs in their own clean bodies a cold convenience that, by comparison, seemed sexless and even pure. Later, some began to justify this sterile process, and swore that friends quivering together in the yielding sand with intimate hot limbs in supreme embrace, found there hidden in the darkness a sensual co-efficient of the mental passion which was welding our souls and spirits in one flaming effort [to secure Arab independence]. Several, thirsting to punish appetites they could not wholly prevent, took a savage pride in degrading the body, and offered themselves fiercely in any habit which promised physical pain or filth.

Lovely. The army should really use that in their ads instead of the whole "we do more before 9am" thing. It is also now known that he faked the records of his torture and sexual assault by Turkish guards in Dera'a. Although David Lean had to have known these events never happened, he included them in the film anyway. We can now see that Lawrence made up these stories simply as another sexual thrill.

And now a quick tack-on concerning Q-Anon. I don't give him his own paper since he doesn't merit it. The whole thing is another diversion, aimed directly at my readers. They have hired a lot of famous people to promote this fake Intel-leak so that hopefully those of you researching these topics will read Q-Anon instead of me. They consider any time wasted by Q-Anon well-bought. If you don't believe me, just consider the fact that Apple had an app called Q-drops, which promoted this project. Can you imagine Apple having an app called Miles-drop or something like that? No, they only promote fake research. Also, yesterday, July 31, MSNBC White House correspondent Hallie Jackson dedicated a portion of her show to Q-Anon—more evidence this hoax is promoted by the mainstream as misdirection. Q-Anon has also been promoted by the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and CNN. Any questions? Also notice that Q-Anon has a Wikipedia page promoting it. Do I have a Wikipedia page? Of course not: they don't wish to promote real reportage. You will say I am not as popular as Q-Anon, but I am no longer sure that is true. [We have recently seen evidence](#) both my sites have gone viral, though the media is not reporting on any of it. So although Q-Anon gets more mainstream promotion, I may have more real hits by real people. This is exactly why Q-Anon and other diversions were invented.

Also notice where Q-Anon is aiming your attention: at Trump and other fake current events. He is pushing the pedophilia scare stories, just like Hollywood has been doing for years ([see the 2015 film *Spotlight*](#), for instance). This ties in with the [fake gymnast molestation stories](#), the [fake #MeToo movement](#), and so on. I write about this stuff only to defuse it, while Q-Anon is always drawing your

attention back to it. He wants your eyes on this stuff to prevent your eyes from staying on the prize: the bankers and other governors robbing you blind year by year with their fake projects. He is also promoting Trump as a real person, while I have told you Trump is just an actor reading from the Teleprompter. Trump was hired to divert your attention, and Q-Anon was hired to help him continue to do so.

But mainly Q-Anon was created to blackwash all “conspiracy theories”, especially the ones that are true. They have to surround good research with tons of bad research, and that is what Q-Anon is. He also helps to blackwash Youtube, so that it can be “cleansed”. But Q-Anon isn't alone. I have shown you that almost all other major alternative outlets are also Intel fronts, created as misdirection. They were created to draw your attention away with sexy but false conspiracy theories. This keeps you off my research. And even when it doesn't keep you off my research (maybe you have time to read both), it confuses you. You don't know who to trust, so when Q-Anon tells you one thing and I tell you the opposite, the governors hope you will give up and run back to the security of the mainstream, which has a comfort movie and a shiny popsicle waiting for you.

The strange thing is that they would appear to prefer you believe Tom Hanks is a pedophile, for instance, than that Tom Hanks is Jewish and related closely to all other famous people—and that they are all selling you fake history. Anything but the truth, I guess. But seriously, the reason they allow this slander to be aired in the short term is that they know it won't stand. Hanks is part of the project, and no doubt he agreed to it. It will quickly blow over and it won't sully his reputation at all. They know that. In fact, they chose someone like Hanks on purpose. He is about as lovable as they come in Hollywood, and few people are going to believe he is a pedophile. So the claims only cut back on Q-Anon, as they were meant to. It is Q-Anon that will soon crash, not Hanks. And when Q-Anon crashes, they are hoping all other “conspiracy theorists” like me will be damaged with him. I won't, since I have nothing to do with Q-Anon, but that is what they are hoping, you see. With projects like Q-Anon, they purposely make the theories as dark and nasty and as false as possible, hoping to turn you off of all truth-seeking forever.

But again, notice the difference between Q-Anon's message and mine. My papers are difficult I admit. Like the advice of Yoda, they require you to “unlearn what you have learned”. But they aren't dark. I am not selling pedophilia or Satanism, or even uncovering it. I have shown you the governors and the families are thieves and liars at a fantastic level, but I don't think they are pedophiles, cannibals, or child snuffers. That is just a bunch of hoodoo, manufactured to scare and confuse you. In fact, I have shown you most of the famous murders sold by the mainstream never happened, like the serial killers, the Presidential assassinations, the star deaths, and so on. I have even shown you the battle and war deaths have been inflated, which should be glad tidings. Those who truly understand the import of my papers finally breathe a huge sigh of relief. They realize a large part of the history they have been sold is no more than a bad movie. It is fiction. It can be shrugged off as easily as a horror movie.

Yes, things are still bad, and the levels of lying, thieving and corruption are even higher than you ever imagined. But the total murder count is exponents lower than you thought. The horror movie side of history has been mostly manufactured to create fear. As your belief in that history evaporates, so can your fear. You should replace your fear with anger. And you should use that anger to change your life for the better. In that way, my message is just the opposite of Q-Anon's. He does not want to empower you with the truth or quell your fear and confusion. He only wants to add to it.

[return to updates](#)