

## AND YOU THOUGHT THE THEOSOPHY PROJECT HAD ENDED?



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published November 22, 2021*

That big campaign you see above came out in the UK in 2009, but I am just hearing of it. That appeared on 800 public busses in the UK, 200 of them in London. It also included a massive campaign in the subways, with 1000 posters plastering the Underground. Also two huge television screens on Oxford Street. Notice the usual aces and eights already. We are told it generated some controversy, but it appears I am taking it worse than most religious organizations in England and Scotland, [many of whom welcomed it](#) as part of some dialog. Since I am neither Christian nor especially religious, what do I care? As a scientist, I should find this refreshing, right?

No, and that is because I see it for what it is. It was sold at the time as some sort of atheist response to Christian proselytizing, but that isn't what it was. We are told the lady above, "comedy writer" Ariane Sherine, became angry when she saw some Christian advertisements warning non-believers they were going to hell. Really? Where did she see those? They forget to tell us that, don't they? Were they big signs plastered on the sides of 800 public busses and 1000 Underground posters and two huge TV screens? I don't think so.

Actually, I looked it up and the ad was on ONE London bus, and it said nothing about being damned to hell. It was quote of Jesus about the resurrection and the life.

Also interesting is that Ireland refused the atheist adverts. Good for them.

This is clearly a government project, funded by the usual Jewish suspects, and it has nothing to do with atheism. They just used these people like Sherine and Richard Dawkins as fronts and shunts, to make it look like it was privately funded by scientists or minor celebrities. If you don't know what I am talking about, [see my paper on the Theosophy project](#), showing where this came from, how long it has been

going on, and what it is really about. They want you to think it is about freeing your mind from small-minded right-wing religious zealots, but it has nothing to do with that. It has to do with the centuries-long project to destroy religion going back to Henry VIII and before. At first it was about seizing huge ecclesiastical wealth across northern Europe, by breaking ties to Rome and then looting the monasteries, churches, abbeys, and all other property. It hit high gear in England and Germany in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and took down France in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It came late to the US, begun by people like Ben Franklin, but not thrown into high gear until the 1870s. By then it wasn't mainly about stealing Church property; it was mainly about stealing its tithe. An easy 10% was still up for grabs, and these people have never seen a percentage they didn't think was rightly theirs.

Sherine is also from the families, of course. She is actually a nasty piece of work, as you won't be surprised to hear. [See this “comedy” piece on her parents](#), where she conspicuously fails to name them. Her bio is completely scrubbed, and no one wants you to know who she really is. A large part of the article is about her dad's penis and his bathing habits. Also about bottles of urine. Lovely. The rest of it is about how poor her family was. Right. That's why she was soon hanging out with Duran Duran by age 16. Those guys loved hanging with poor girls. They were all gay anyway, so I am not sure why they needed female groupies. Beards, I guess.

You may also be interested to know she had a nervous breakdown after the atheist bus event, though she tried to blame it on a previous boyfriend who had beaten her five years earlier. She never pressed charges, so that is all just another story. Here is what being an atheist can do for you:



Before and after pics. Looks like she is enjoying life, right? Not worrying? She is now on major medication. She did not write any “comedy” or anything else for three years after the atheist bus event, which I guess is just as well. If only she had hung it up permanently. One of the things she wrote in her glory days was “The New Worst Witch”. Yeah, I bet.

Sherine probably isn't her real last name, since that name is normally a Persian first name. So her name is like Tina Louise. My guess is she is a Cohen or something, being half Iranian and half Jewish. That is the only thing that would explain her career, such as it is. Was.

Richard Dawkins is also a nasty character. I believe he was tapped by intelligence to continue the Bertrand Russell project, as in Russell's "Why I am not a Christian". I recommend you read that lecture. You will perhaps never find such a heap of *non sequiturs* pretending to be an argument or a lecture. It is embarrassing to see a man who claimed to be intelligent resorting to such transparent sophistry. But we know why Russell was not a Christian: he was a crypto-Jew. So we don't really need an argument beyond that. It is all very clear. Could we find the same easy explanation with Dawkins? Well, we do find him in the peerage, hiding as [Clinton Richard Dawkins, b. 1941](#). His mother was a [Vyvyan](#) and a Ladner, otherwise scrubbed. Through the Smythies, Dawkins is also a [Phillipps](#), descending from Sir Ambrose Phillipps, MP. Which also makes him a [Dashwood](#). These Dashwoods were baronets and one was Mayor of London in 1700. The Dashwoods and Phillipps continued to marry into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. They also link us to the Lindsays and Douglasses, as well as the Windsors and [Goulds](#). Dawkins descends *directly* from General Sir Henry Clinton of the Revolutionary War, from whom he gets his first name. The Clintons are the Earls of Lincoln, later becoming the Pelham-Clinton dukes. As these dukes, they soon married the Manners, who were also. . . Russells.

Now is the time to do your little dance, since I just linked Richard Dawkins to Bertrand Russell. Do you still think my guess was a stretch? No, they are actual cousins. The common ancestor is the 6<sup>th</sup> Earl of Lincoln, whose great-grandson married a Manners, of the Dukes of Rutland. Her mother was Catherine Russell, of the Dukes of Bedford, and they are direct ancestors of Bertrand Russell. So Dawkins is definitely continuing the projects of his famous cousins from the peerage, wittingly or unwittingly. If you think unwittingly, you have no wits about you.

And I remind you, the Phillipps also link us to Marx, and the Communism project. Marx's maternal uncle was a Phillipps from Holland, and they are the same family as the English Phillipps. They link us to very closely to the Rothschilds.

A nearer cousin of Dawkins was Brig. Gen. Henry Stopford Dawkins, Order of the Bath. Also Sir Clinton Dawkins, Order of the Bath. Also John Wyndham Dawkins, who married a Churchill in 1903, linking us not only to that family, but to the Cousts-[Nevills](#), and through them to the Russells again. Specifically, Maj. Gen. John [Cecil](#) Russell, CVO, a cousin of Bertrand. Another cousin married a [Villiers](#) in 1903, linking Dawkins to the Earls of Clarendon and the Earls of Lathom (Bootle-Wilbraham). This links Dawkins closely to George Villiers, Lord Chancellor 1938-52 and also chairman of the BBC.

And finally, through the scrubbed Vyvyans, Dawkins is related to the [Barclays, MacDonalDs, Herberts and Stanleys](#). This brings in many more prominent cousins of Dawkins, including the Earls of Carnarvon and the Earls of Ducie. The 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Carnarvon, Henry [Howard Molyneux](#) Herbert, was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. And yes, these are the Howards, Earls of Arundel. Herbert's son George was the Earl of Carnarvon associated with the King Tut excavation.

The Theosophy Project is still going on here, as you know, and it is also continuing in the UK, though on a smaller scale. The billionaire and trillionaire plutocrats are still targeting religion, and not only Christianity. All religion stands in their way of a complete secularization of society, in which their financial interests will be the only religion and they the only gods. In destroying religion, they aren't freeing your mind or allowing you to enjoy life, they are coopting your mind for their own nefarious purposes, which are becoming clearer decade by decade. And the last thing they want you to do is quit worrying. They want you worried about *everything* all the time, see the newspapers and the 24-hour

fake news channels. This keeps you enslaved to their projects.

Just ask yourself why someone like Richard Dawkins would seem to be so interested in this subject, to the extent of allegedly spending thousands of pounds on it. For myself, I don't believe he spent a shilling of his own money: [I am sure he is paid handsomely to front this project](#). But just ask yourself if there is any real link between science and atheism. We are told there is, but I have never seen it. If there is any link, it is a new one, since it didn't exist until recently. Before the Theosophy project came along, real scientists stayed in their own fields, letting clerics argue about religion. They saw no reason to promote atheism, because there *was no reason* for scientists to promote atheism. Atheism doesn't benefit real science, because there is no real point of contact between the two. Unless the Church is forbidding science, as with Galileo, there is no reason for scientists to become involved in the question. But of course that hasn't been the case for centuries. After the French Revolution, the Church's power in that regard completely crashed. Science hasn't been attacked by the Church for a very long time, so why is science attacking the Church?

As I say, it isn't. Those attacking the Church are just hiding behind these people like Dawkins, whom they have paid to front them. If you could see behind or through Dawkins, you would find the usual suspects in Intel, and behind them you would find the Phoenician Navy, pulling the big strings. For them, the atheists are just another useful front, a band of agents reading from poor scripts supplied them from Langley or Vauxhall or wherever.

Why else would they use such sloppy language? God “probably” doesn't exist? Says who, and where are the probability charts? I haven't seen those, have you? If this answer is being promoted by scientists, they must have some scientific data, right? They don't. It is just the usual pettifogging you always get from these people, back to the beginning. According to them, we don't have a verifiable footprint or pelt of a god, like with Bigfoot, and don't have a god in a cage in a zoo somewhere, therefore gods don't exist. Plus, life isn't one long smiley-happy, which is either proof God doesn't exist or that he is a big meany. That's about the extent of their “data”.

Dawkins has also used the “argument” that Natural Selection completely explains the origins and progression of everything, precluding any need for God. Right. That idea doesn't even merit a response, but if you need one I have made one [here](#). Soon after I published that Dawkins had a stroke. Just saying.

But concerning the atheist bus ads, Stephen Green made a valid point in his complaint to the authorities at the time, which was that the signs were making a statement of fact: God probably doesn't exist. Which according to the rules that had always been enforced regarding such signage, should require substantiation. The ASA ruled against him, admitting the statement was not capable of substantiation, [which is to admit it was not science](#). The ASA ruled the statement was not a scientific statement. Which should have been of some concern to Richard Dawkins, but wasn't. It was later admitted the word “probably” was added over the advice of top atheists, specifically to dodge the ASA and its rules. Adding “probably” should have made the assertion easier to substantiate, but everyone missed that logic. The word “probably” doesn't make anything an opinion or unverifiable by itself. So the whole thing was the usual slur, given a pass by the ASA probably at the request of MI5 or the Home Office.

Canadian author Margaret Atwood also made a strong point, pretty much the same one I am making. She said the advert was religion itself: “Once you're paying money to put slogans on things, well it's either a product you're selling, a political party or religion”. Brilliant. It is a [product](#) they are selling: secularization and all taxes to the state, without choice. You can choose which denomination to tithe,



or none. With the government, you have no choice. *They* decide the amount you put in the plate, and enforce it with force. The churches don't have any SWAT teams, but the IRS does.

This is interesting since Atwood, like me, was not picking a side here. She is not an atheist or a Christian, as far as I know. Also not a scientist. I assume she is Jewish. She looks *very* Jewish/Phoenician, and as a younger woman very much resembled Meryl Streep or Barbra Streisand:



She is a Webster, a Rand and a FitzAlan. Meaning, she is a Stuart. She is also a Bullfinch from Salem and a Hand, linking her to Learned Hand. So you would expect her to come down on the Phoenician Navy side of this, but she didn't.

So is Atwood finally rebelling against her cousins and overseers, like Salinger did, or is something else going on here? It is a bit of mystery, since you will remember that she wrote *The Handmaid's Tale* back in the 1980s—a very feminist and anti-Christian book, one that was written specifically in response to the fundamentalism in the US in the Reagan years. Maybe she was following orders or maybe she really did think that was a likely play-out of the politics of the time. But by 2008 perhaps she could see that the precise opposite had occurred: the men were becoming the handmaids and religion was being attacked like never before. And that trend has only accelerated since 2008, going into overdrive with the Plandemic in 2020. Churches are being forcibly closed in the US and Canada, but not to absorb them into the state or to create a centralized fundamentalism. They are being attacked because they will not give up their last claims of independence from government. There can be no separation of church and state in the future, since the state allows no separation from it. Not by anyone at any time.

Beyond that, it never occurs to these so-called atheists that we may be too stupid to detect gods that

don't wish to be detected. That hypothesis is improbable why? Actually, I have run those odds and they approach one in one. I have shown that humans have been too stupid and too blind to detect the Phoenicians for 2500 years, believing they had gone extinct around 500BC, even though these assholes were standing right in front of them all along. I have shown that humans have been looking at historical photos that are at least 90% fake, and have never realized it. These same humans have believed that all their favorite stars in Hollywood came from poor backgrounds, with parents that were truckdrivers or possum trappers or something. They thought all these big-nosed, droopy-eyed people were of Irish or Welsh or German extraction. And they thought they were straight.

So that is how perspicacious humans are. But you think it would be hard for a god to hide from you?