

[return to updates](#)

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Premier ~~American~~ British Spook



by *Miles Mathis*

First published July 25, 2017

As usual this is just my opinion, based on easy internet research anyone can do.

We will start with his genealogy, which gets us in quicker than anything else. It was that which got me writing today. Some of my readers find genealogy work tiresome, but it is actually a goldmine, as we are about to see again. On a lark, I just took a quick peek at Ben's genealogy to see if there was anything interesting. Oboy, was there. Ben's mother was Abiah **Folger**. Her grandmother was Meribah **Gibbs**. Her grandmother was Margaret **Lawrence**. And her grandfather was Sir John **Warburton**. [His wife was Jane Brereton Stanley!](#) I guess you can see why I started writing today.

John Warburton's grandmother was also a **Brereton**, so he married his cousin. The Breretons were Barons of **Cheshire** at the time, in the same area as the Stanley Earls. These families were also related to the **Leighs (Lees)** and **Daniels** at this point (1400s). They were later related to the **Booths**, Jacksons and Armstrongs. Geni scrubs the Stanleys here, and Wikitree and Ancestry don't even go back that far. Tim Dowling scrubs before we reach the Warburtons, so Geni actually gives the most information, for once. I guess that is because the Disconnectrix isn't on these pages. Anyway, we can take this information to thepeerage.com, [where we find this Jane Stanley was the niece of Thomas Stanley](#), 1st Earl of Derby and King of Mann. Through the Stanleys, Benjamin Franklin was immediately related to all the top families of the English peerage, including the **Nevilles** (Earls of Westmoreland), the **Montagus** (Earls of Salisbury), the Beauforts (Dukes of Somerset), and King Edward III. Through the Montagus, Franklin was related to George Washington, whose grandmother was a Montague. So, once again, they don't tell you that all the founding fathers were directly descended from the highest levels of the British peerage.

Through the Folgers, Ben was *very closely* linked to [the Salem Witch hoax](#). This hoax was still recent in his time, since he was born just 14 years after the fake trials. Ben's aunt was Bathsheba Folger, who

married Joseph **Pope**. She was prominent in the Salem trials, being a primary accuser of Rebecca Nurse, Martha Corey and John Proctor, all of whom were allegedly hanged. So that's what Ben's family was involved in at the time. They don't teach you that in history class, do they?



But let's return to the Warburtons. Ben's 5g-grandfather was a Warburton, as we just saw. Who were the Warburtons? Well, they later joined with the Greys and Egertons, acquiring many titles. In more recent times, they became the Egerton-Warburtons. For a current example of this family, see Taron Egerton (above), who starred in the 2014 film *Kingsman: the Secret Service*. A sequel is being released this September. Since the films are obvious spook productions, we see the same families are still at it. Egerton's genealogy is not given, but it is admitted he is from **Anglesey**. This is important because Anglesey was an island that was a territory of the King of Mann. The most important Kings of Mann were Stanleys.

The Warburton estates are in Cheshire near the Stanley estates, and we have already seen the two families were linked early on. The Warburtons became one of the first Baronets in 1611. These Baronets Warburton are scrubbed even at thepeerage.com, with no wives given for the first two. Finally, with the 3rd Baronet, we are told he married Diana Alington, whose mother was Lady Diana **Russell**. This was at the time of Ben Franklin's birth, so we see what his relatives were up to in England at the time. Diana Russell's father was William Russell, the 1st Duke of Bedford. He was married to Anne **Carr**, whose father was the Earl of Somerset and whose mother was Frances **Howard**. Howard's father was the 1st Earl of Suffolk. Frances Howard had previously been married to the 2nd Earl of Essex. The Earl of Somerset's great-grandfather was Sir Walter Scott, 3rd of Buccleuch. And they were closely related to the **Douglasses**, Earls of Angus. They were also related to the **Kennedys** Hepburns, Gordons, and **Lindsays**. The 6th Earl of Angus married the daughter of King Henry VII. Of course Henry VII was installed by Thomas Stanley.

Do the mainstream histories tell us Ben Franklin had relatives of this sort before the American Revolution? Not that I know of. In fact, the encyclopedias try to tell us Franklin's father was a soapmaker, and that his grandmother was an indentured servant. They tell us the Folgers were Puritans, "just the sort of rebels destined to transform colonial America." Given what we have discovered, that already looks like a lie. Franklin's family was from the highest levels of the peerage, as we have seen. And like Samuel Parris of Salem, the Folgers weren't real Puritans: they were crypto-Jews running fantastic projects.



For another indication that Franklin was from great wealth, we find he was closely related to the **Pratts** through the Folgers. Ben's maternal aunt was Dorcas Pratt. The Pratts were descended from Rices and **Byrons**. Like the Folgers, the Pratts were a very prominent family from the beginning, on both sides of the pond. See John Pratt (above), who was Lord Chief Justice of England 1718-1725. His son was the 1st Earl Camden at the time of Ben Franklin. This son was Lord Chancellor and a close friend of William **Pitt** the Elder. John Pratt's grandson was the 2nd Earl Camden, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. But more important to us here is that he was Secretary of State for War and the Colonies in 1804. So the Pratts had people on both sides of the American Revolution, and one of those people was Ben Franklin.

As for the US Pratts, we know Ben Franklin was related to the later industrialist billionaire Daniel Pratt (b. 1799), since in Daniel Pratt's genealogy we find the same names: [Holt](#), **Russell**, Putnam, Damon, Flint, **Chandler**, etc. In fact, Daniel Pratt's sister was named Dorcas Pratt, same as Ben Franklin's aunt. The Flints in Daniel Pratt's line come from Salem Village, MA. They try to hide this ancestry of Daniel Pratt by stopping the Pratt line at his father, but we get all we need to make the link in his mother's line.

From the name Chandler, we see where they got the idea for Franklin's father being a soap and candle maker. They tell us he was a chandler. But he wasn't a chandler, he was a **Chandler**. He was descended from people of that name.

Also see Charles Pratt (b. 1830) of Massachusetts who founded Astral Oil in the 1860s and soon joined Rogers and Rockefeller on the ground floor of Standard Oil in 1874. He was also a Dupont.

But back to the Franklins. At Geni they tell us the Franklins were originally Franklines, and they disappear after a few generations. But I suspect they were actually **Franklands**. Why do I think that? Because the Franklands in the British peerage are closely related to the Russells, and we have already seen that Benjamin Franklin was related to these same Russells through the Warburtons. The 1st Baronet Frankland was created in 1660, about 45 years before Ben was born. The 2nd Baronet Frankland married Elizabeth Russell in 1683. She was the daughter of the 3rd Baronet Russell and Frances Cromwell. Frances was the daughter of **Oliver Cromwell**, so if I am right about the Franklands, Ben Franklin was very closely related to Cromwell. This is probably one of the main reasons they scrub his Franklin line. Before she married the Baronet Russell, Frances Cromwell had

been married to Robert **Rich**. . . whose father was Robert Rich, 3rd Earl of Warwick. His mother was a **Cavendish**. They also would probably prefer you not make that connection to Ben either, since I have shown in previous papers the Riches were even more obviously Jewish than the rest of these families.

The 3rd Baronet Frankland's daughter married George Henry **Lee**, 3rd Earl of Lichfield, in 1745. Lee's mother was Charlotte **Fitzroy**, illegitimate daughter of King Charles II and Barbara **Villiers**, Duchess of Cleveland. Barbara's father was the Viscount Villiers. Her first husband was Roger **Palmer**, 1st Earl of Castelmaine, whose mother was a **Herbert** (Marquesses of Powis). She was also “associated” with John **Churchill**, 1st Duke of Marlborough. So if Ben Franklin was related to these people, you see how deep it goes.

We have more indication he was indeed related to them when we find that the Earl of Lichfield's mother was Lady Elizabeth **Pope**, daughter of the 2nd Earl of Downe. Lady Elizabeth married the 3rd Earl of **Lindsey**, who was the son of **Montagu Bertie**, 2nd Earl. His mother was Elizabeth Montagu. We saw all of those names in Ben's genealogy above. Remember, we saw that Ben's uncle was Joseph Pope. Through the Warburtons and Stanleys, Ben was related to the Lindsays and **Leighs**, as we saw above. Well, the Earl of Lichfield was a **Lee**, which is just a variant spelling.

Want more proof? OK, if we follow this Elizabeth Montagu, we find she married the 1st Earl of Lindsey, whose mother was Mary de Vere. De Vere's stepmother was Lady Neville, daughter of the 4th Earl of Westmoreland. Well, these Nevilles were also in Ben's line, since the Stanley we saw above married a Neville. Ben was directly descended from William Stanley. William's brother was Thomas Stanley, and Thomas married Eleanor Neville. Eleanor was the daughter of Richard de Neville, 5th Earl of Salisbury.

So, to prove the Franklins were the same as the Franklands, all we have to do is make the final link between the Neville, 4th Earl of Westmoreland, and the Neville, 5th Earl of Salisbury. Well, the 5th Earl of Salisbury was the uncle of the 2nd Earl of Westmoreland. So he was the 2g-uncle of the 4th Earl of Westmoreland. This means we have truly linked the Franklins to the Franklands, proving Ben Franklin is related to all these people, including Oliver Cromwell, the Riches, and so on. He is also related to the Despensers/Spencers through these Nevilles. See the 5th Earl of Salisbury's son Richard Neville, the 16th Earl of Warwick, called the Kingmaker. His wife was Lady Anne Beauchamp, daughter of the 13th Earl of Warwick and Isabel le **Despenser**. Isabel was the daughter of the 1st Earl of Gloucester. Isabel's first husband was another Beauchamp, the 1st Earl of Worcester, and his mother was Joan **FitzAlan**, daughter of the Earl of Arundel. We have seen in previous papers that the FitzAlans are the same as the Stewarts/Stuarts, and that they all descend from William the Conqueror, who was Jewish. In fact, *all* these interconnected families were are looking at are crypto-Jews.

[If you don't believe me, see *When Scotland was Jewish*, written by two Jewish authors. They admit the Stewarts and the other leading families of the peerage were Jewish, although they misdirect by telling us they weren't Davidic or Semitic. They propose they were Sephardic, and that the Sephardic lines aren't Hebraic or Semitic, being only conversos, or converts. However, although their arguments that these lines are Jewish is strong, their argument that they aren't Semitic is very weak. They give you a lot of interconnecting evidence for the Jewish thesis, but supply only a few strands of DNA evidence for the non-Semitic thesis. In previous papers, I have shown you a mountain of evidence of all kinds that these families are *both* Jewish and Semitic. Some are Sephardic, but they all hail back to the Middle East. At any rate, I promise to keep working on that thesis, but I do encourage you to read *When Scotland was Jewish* for yourself, to confirm that the non-Semitic argument is very weak. It looks to me like that was why the book was written by these Jewish authors: they admit what we

already know, but then try to water down and misdirect that admission by denying these people were really Jewish. By the rules of Judaism, converts aren't really Jewish, so admitting these lines were converts isn't the same as admitting they were Jewish. The authors actually undercut their title on purpose, which is very strange. It is proof enough they are misdirecting, since their findings contradict the thesis and title of the book. The whole argument has a slipperiness that is typical: it has that characteristic unction we have come to expect.]

The Nevilles at the time of Ben Franklin include George Neville, the 1st Earl of Abergavenny, whose godfather was King George II. This Earl married a Pelham, whose brother was the 1st Earl of Chichester. This Thomas Pelham, 1st Earl of Chichester married Anne Frankland. Which links the Nevilles and Franklands in the British peerage at the time of Ben Franklin—doubling our bet here. We see that the Nevilles and Franklands/Franklins were tied by marriage over many centuries.

Remember, the King at the time of the American Revolution was George III, grandson of George II. George II was the godfather of Neville, a close relative of Benjamin Franklin. They don't tell you that, do they?

George II was also godfather to George Spencer, 2nd Earl Spencer. So we should ask why George II was godfather to Neville and Spencer. Of course it is because they were also related. Remember, George I's grandmother was Elizabeth Stuart. Her father was King James I Stuart, and he was godfather to James **Egerton**, Viscount Brackley. We have already seen the Egertons above, related to the Warburtons. The Stuarts were related to the Douglasses, whom we have also seen above. And the Douglasses are related to the Nevilles, Spencers, etc.

What this means is that Benjamin Franklin was also related fairly closely to King George III. Since Ben's genealogy is scrubbed in the Franklin/Frankland line, it is impossible to say how closely, but I have just shown you some of the important links.

And what this means is that the founding fathers were actually from the highest reaches of the British peerage, closely related to the Monarch and the peers they were allegedly fighting in the American Revolution. Which should make us ask if the American Revolution—like the other wars we have unwound—was managed. We always see the same families on both sides of these fake revolutionary wars, indicating a large manufactured event. I will have to gather more proof as we go, but it already looks to me like the War of Independence was largely faked, with the same families controlling the United States both before and after the alleged Revolution. The US has never been independent from the beginning.

But let us return to Ben's bio to continue to unwind it. His early story is almost identical to Mark Twain's. Ben's brother James founded the *New England Courant* in 1721, when Ben was 15, and Ben went into the business. Remember, Mark Twain's brother Orion started a newspaper in Hannibal when Mark was 15, Mark going into the business. Orion was absurdly young to be founding or buying a newspaper, and we find the same thing with James Franklin. James was nine years older than Ben, making him 24. But if their father could only afford to send Ben to school for two years (Ben's schooling ended at age 10), how could James afford to found a newspaper? Another problem is that we are told contradictory stories. On the Wiki page for the *Courant*, we are told Ben was pressed into service as an apprentice at the paper at age 12. Someone can't do math, because when Ben was 12 the year was 1718, *three years* before the founding of the paper. But we do get an interesting clue on that page, when we are told that Ben's "apprenticeship included all sorts of odd jobs, including issuing pamphlets, linens, and silks". Beg pardon? What newspaper issues linens and silks? We appear to

have a clue here about the true nature of the Franklins' business, which was dealing in linens and silks—a Jewish trade.



The next part of the bio is equally absurd. At age 17 Ben ran away to Philadelphia. Although this made him a fugitive from his apprenticeship with his brother, he nonetheless took up the same work in Philly, working as a printer. After only a couple of months, the Governor of Pennsylvania, Sir William Keith (above), convinced Ben to go to London to acquire equipment for a new newspaper that Keith wished to start. What? Why would the Governor of the State be talking to this 17-year-old runaway from Boston, from a poor family? And why would the Governor choose a 17-year-old boy to manage his new newspaper? This makes absolutely no sense.

Well, if we click on Keith at Wikipedia, we find he was Lieutenant Governor, not Governor. But he was also a Baronet in the British peerage. A quick perusal of his bio shows us another ridiculous fiction, indicating to me Keith was in British Intelligence. We are supposed to believe that despite being 4th Baronet, Keith was mired in debt from early on and ended up dying in debtor's prison. Given the life he lived, that is highly unlikely. As a clue, note his date of death: 11/18. Aces and eights. Curious that his birth date is unknown, but his death date *is* known. Keith's story changes a second time if we go to the page for his Pennsylvania manor, Graeme Park. There we are told he was indeed Governor, since this manor was constructed as an alternative to his Governor's mansion at Shippen House in Philly. This manor is on 1700 acres, indicating Keith was never strapped for money.

You would think the historians could agree on whether Keith was Governor or Lieutenant Governor.

If we go to thepeerage.com for more on Keith, we find he is scrubbed there as well. Wikipedia told he was the 4th Baronet, but the 4th Baronet is given no parents, not even being tied to the 3rd Baronet. Very strange. In fact, there is no 3rd Baronet, or 2nd or 1st. Keith's father would appear to be George Keith, 7th Earl Marischal. George Keith's mother was Mary Erskine, and her mother was Mary **Stuart**—daughter of the 1st Duke of Lennox! George Keith married Mary Hay, whose mother was Anne Douglas—daughter of the 7th Earl of Morton. See above, where Ben Franklin was also descended from these same Douglases through the Warburtons. Ben was also a FitzAlan, and the FitzAlans are the same family as the Stuarts. This indicates Ben was related to Governor Keith, which is why the Governor was talking to him at age 17.

The Douglases were also closely related to the Hamiltons, so this means Ben was related to Alexander Hamilton. For more proof of that, we find that George Keith was a member of Hamilton's expedition to England in 1648. That would be James Hamilton, 1st Duke Hamilton, third in line to the throne of

Scotland. He was a chief advisor to King Charles I Stuart of England. His dukedom soon passed to the Douglasses, who became the Dukes of Hamilton.

The 8th Earl Marischal, William Keith, also married a Douglas. His wife was Mary Drummond, whose mother was Jean Douglas, daughter of the 1st Marquess Douglas. This Marquess was married to a **Gordon**, daughter of the 1st Marquess of Huntley and Henrietta **Stuart**. Henrietta was another daughter of the Duke of Lennox. Curiously, Wikipedia contradicts thepeerage.com on this 8th Earl. Wiki tells us the 7th Earl had no surviving son, while thepeerage tells us the 8th Earl was the son of the 7th Earl. On the Wiki page for the 6th Earl, we are told the 7th and 8th Earls were brothers. Wiki has no page for the 8th Earl, although thepeerage tells us he was a Privy Councillor. This misdirection tends to confirm my guess that the 4th Baronet Keith comes from this line at this point. Also notice that these Keiths are related at this time to the **Forbes** and **Turners**.

The 9th Earl Marischal, George Keith, a contemporary of Franklin, was—like the Baronet William Keith—a leading Jacobite. George was likely a nephew of William. George Keith was Prussian ambassador to France and Spain, which is also curious, being that he was not Prussian. Nonetheless, he was awarded the Black Eagle of Prussia in 1752.

So let's return to Wikipedia for more information on these Keiths. The 5th Earl of Marischal was one of the most powerful men in Scotland in the early 17th century. His daughter married John Campbell of Cawdor. His son the 6th Earl was Commander of the King's Navy in Scotland, in which capacity he sailed in 1634 to assist Wladislaw IV **Vasa** of Poland. I trust you recognize that name Vasa from [previous papers](#), where we found they were prominent crypto-Jews that captured many thrones of Europe—sort of like the Medicis.

The 10th Earl of Marischal was also a Prussian Ambassador, serving under Frederick the Great. We are told he was in Prussia because he had his titles and lands stripped for being a Jacobite. However, as usual, he was pardoned by a new King (George II) and regained his lands and titles. This once again indicates he was in British Intelligence, acting as some sort of spy. His brother James was a field marshal (5-star general) in the Prussian army, indicating the same thing. They were both friends and patrons of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, again indicating the same thing. As now, all these prominent writers were spooks working on projects. Rousseau was a contemporary Plato, selling fascism under a cover of progressivism. See his *Social Contract*.

And again, Wiki does not match thepeerage. Wiki says the 10th Earl was the son of the 9th, but thepeerage gives no children for the 9th. There is no 10th Earl Marischal, George Keith, at thepeerage.com. Once again, I assume one reason for this misdirection is to hide something about Governor Keith of Pennsylvania. This Keith is given as a Baronet of Ludquharn, and it is admitted these Keiths were the same as the Marischal Keiths, not only having the same name but marrying the same top families of Scotland. Given that the Marischal Keiths were fantastically wealthy, there is no chance the Baronet Keith in the same years was broke. It is all a cover story, and as I said it look to me like it is another cover for Intel. All these Keiths look like prominent spooks, so the fact that Ben Franklin is being sent by one of them to London at age 17 is the biggest red flag we could find.

The next huge red flag is Thomas Denham, who allegedly helped Ben return to the States. Denham was a wealthy merchant who allegedly hired Ben as a clerk and bookkeeper. But again, the story makes no sense. Given that Ben dropped out of school at age 10, it is very unlikely he could have worked as a printer or typesetter in his teens. A 4th-grade education simply doesn't prepare you for work of that sort. It also doesn't prepare you to be a clerk or bookkeeper. We are told Denham just

happened to be in London paying off old debts, but if you believe that you need serious help from Mars. We are then told Ben lived with Denham until 1727, when Denham died. What? Since Ben was 21 at the time, this must look a bit strange. Why would Ben move in with this benefactor? If such a thing happened today, we would all assume they were lovers, and I suggest you do the same here. Ben's mainstream bio stinks to high heaven, and it doesn't take a genius to come to the quick conclusion he was a young Intel recruit, hired for the usual reasons: 1) he was from a prominent family, 2) he was a crypto-Jew, 3) he was gay.

Wikipedia gives no dates for this Thomas Denham, and no such person comes up on a people search. As usual, he is a ghost. But we do get the usual clues. One, Denham was alleged to be a Quaker. That indicates he was a spook, since the Quakers [were a Jewish front](#) back to their founding by George Fox. Two, Ben is alleged to have helped Denham thwart a plot against one of his friends, the lawyer Andrew **Hamilton**. We just saw that name, didn't we? Three, although Denham—his best friend and roommate—allegedly died under the same roof and under the care of Ben, Ben couldn't remember what he died of in his autobiography: "I forget what his distemper was". OK.

[**Addendum next day**: rereading this for typos, it occurred to me that Denham is a slur of **Dunham**. I suggest this guy was actually Thomas Dunham, which would link him to many people, including Obama, Georgia O'Keeffe, and of course the **Stanley** Earls. In pursuit of this, I went to the peerage to seek a Thomas Dunham. I didn't find that, but I did find Stanley Ann Dunham, Obama's mother. In my previous research, I missed that. Why is Obama's mother listed in the peerage? Obama is also listed there. Is he a peer? Well Stanley Ann Dunham's father was Stanley **Armour** Dunham, linking them to the wealthy Armour family. His mother was Ruth Lucille Armour. Her line ends, but she was married to Ralph Waldo **Emerson** Dunham. He wasn't just named for Emerson, he was related to him. But that still doesn't explain why any of these people are in the peerage. It may be through the Paynes. Stanley Armour Dunham married Madelyn **Lee Payne**. Or, it could be through the Lees, who we saw above. Or it could be through the *Stanleys*. Or it could be all three. We test that theory by looking at the Stanley peers at this time. One is Edward Lyulph Stanley, 4th Baron Sheffield, whose mother was Henrietta Dillon-**Lee**. His daughter married a Hamilton. Another daughter married a **Montagu**, whose mother was a **Cohen**. Henry Stanley, 3rd Baron of Alderley, was also the son of a Dillon-Lee. These Dillon-Lees were Viscounts, related to the Phipps. See John Shaffer Phipps below, head of Hanover Bank and US Steel. These Lees are the Earls of Lichfield we saw above, with whom the Dillons married in the time of Ben Franklin. This indicates Obama's grandmother was indeed a Lee of this line.

Stanley, the 5th Baron Sheffield, had a daughter named Katharine, and she married Hon. Maurice Fox Pitt Lubbock, son of Alice Fox-Pitt. Alice's mother was also a Stanley, so we see cousins marrying again. Her father was Lt. General Augustus Fox-Pitt Rivers, whose mother was a Douglas (Earls of Morton). To start with, even the town I grew up in (Lubbock, TX) is pulled in here, which is interesting to me. These people run the whole world and all least parts of it, as we see. John Lubbock was the Baron Avebury, which I didn't know. Also didn't know his mother-in-law was a Stanley. Lubbock's son married a Stewart, and her mother was a Johnson—possibly linking us to Samuel Johnson below. Perhaps more to the point here, we see the names Fox and Pitt, linking us to the Quakers and to William Pitt (also Brad Pitt).

Another Stanley is Edward Stanley, b. 1918, 18th Earl of Derby. He married Lady Isabel Milles-Lade, daughter of Henry **Milles**. Isabel's brother was the 4th Earl of Sondes. Why do I mention him? Do you remember Charles Manson's middle name? Charles **Milles** Manson. Wouldn't it be funny if he was also a peer? This Stanley is also closely related to Hamiltons and Montagus, as well as Villiers.

His brother married an Egerton.

For confirmation of Obama's ties to the peerage, let us search on the name Payne. We find Gen. William Payne, 1st Baronet, which doesn't immediately help us with Obama, but which does help us with Franklin. His son married Emily Frankland-Russell, daughter of Robert Frankland-Russell, 7th Baronet. The 6th Baronet was a Frankland, so where did the Russell come from? Thepeerage.com doesn't tell us. The women of that time were Murrays (Dukes of Atholl), Hamiltons, and Grants, not Russells, but they are all related to Russells. All this links Ben Franklin to Thomas Paine, of course, since that is just a variant spelling. These Frankland-Russells were also related to the Crowes, which probably tells us where Russell Crowe came from.

More links between Payne and Franklin are found when Capt. Philip Payne-Gallwey of the peerage married Frances Warburton in 1854. Her mother was Alicia Bunbury-Isaac, obviously a Jewish name. Philip's son Stephen married Linda **Steiner**, ditto. Philip's son Arthur married Grace **Stanley** Parry in 1888, giving us another link between the Paynes and Stanleys we were looking for. Philip's son Albert married Katharine **Vaughan-Lee**, giving us another link we were looking for between the Paynes and the Lees. This confirms Obama's ties to the peerage once more. It also probably pulls in David **Vaughan** Icke, showing another way he fits in here.

But let us return to Thomas Denham/Dunham. I couldn't find any Dunhams in the peerage who went back that far, so there is more misdirection we have to get past. Could it be these Dunhams were originally Durhams? Well, we do find three Thomas Durhams of the peerage, all of the time of Ben Franklin. The oldest is Thomas Durham, b. 1732, 5th of Largo and Polton. He married Anne Calderwood, daughter of a **Steuart**, so we seem to be on the right track. These Steuarts were related to Hamiltons and Hopes, so that doubles and triples our bet. This Durham's great-grandmother was a Swift, which is also interesting, since Stanley Ann Dunham is related to Taylor Swift. This Thomas Durham is still too young to be our Thomas Denham, so we look for his grandfather. Unfortunately, he is scrubbed. Thomas Durham's father is given as James Durham, 4th of Largo, but he has no links to the 3rd of Largo. Very curious. Also no 1st or 2nd of Largo. If we take this information to Geni, we find the 2nd of Largo was Francis Durham, also the 7th of **Pittkerrow**. But still no 3rd of Largo. Wikitree gives us the 3rd of Largo as James Durham, b. 1850. But that gives us 82 years between the 3rd and 5th. Highly unlikely. Was your grandfather 82 when you were born? At any rate, the Thomas Durham we seek may have been his brother. None of these sites are giving us siblings. Wikitree and Geni imply these Barons of Largo only had one child each, which is also unlikely for the time. Given that these Durhams are related to all the same families we have been looking at, my guess is Thomas Denham is really Thomas Durham of Largo. Seeing that these Durhams are from Fife, Scotland, we have another indication I am right. The Barony of Largo was first given to Andrew Wood, Lord High Admiral of Scotland in around 1500. He married Elizabeth Lundie, whose mother was Elizabeth **Lindsay**. Lindsay's parents were Lord Lindsay of the Byres and Agnes **Stewart**. Agnes' grandfather was Robert Stewart, the Duke of Albany, and his father was Robert II Stewart, King of Scotland, whom we have already seen in this paper. Lord Lindsay's mother was Christiana **Keith**, an ancestor of Governor Keith of Massachusetts above. Her nephew married a Hamilton and their son was William de Keith, 1st Earl Marischal, of the Marischals we saw above.

I hope you see what that means. It means we have linked Thomas Denham/Durham to Governor Keith, and both to Ben Franklin, explaining why one of them was responsible for Franklin going to London and the other responsible for him returning.]

Although I have written eight pages already, I am only a few paragraphs into Franklin's biography. But

I am already finding it an absurd patchwork of impossibilities and contradictions, written in a naïve style as if for children. I find myself thinking, “What adult historian would be fooled by this?” Then I remind myself that those who commonly read these bios are indeed children. We commonly learn about the founding fathers in school, when we are teens or younger. Some history majors may read about them in college, but even then they are less than 22 years old. Which explains the form of these stories. They rely on you not coming back to them as an adult and rereading them, because if you do you may spot all these obvious flaws in reasoning, logic, fact, and continuity. So I assume adult historians *aren't* fooled by this garbage. They are simply paid to shovel it.

At age 22, Ben set up a printing house with Hugh Meredith. Again, kind of unbelievable for a poor young man with a 4th-grade education. But who is Hugh Meredith? We are told he was a farmer who took an interest in newspaper publishing. Right. He and Ben went to work for Samuel **Keimer**, who founded the *Pennsylvania Gazette*. He is another ghost whose bio makes no sense. One clue we get is that after he sold the paper to Franklin, he went to Barbados. We have seen Barbados over and over as a hub of these crypto-Jewish millionaires. Samuel Parris of the Salem hoax was from there, for instance. And Keimer is another Jewish name. In fact, Ben admitted Keimer was Jewish, telling us he had a Jewish beard and recognized the sabbath on Saturday.

At age 23, Franklin bought this newspaper from Keimer. Really? With what, green stamps? We assume he bought it with the small legacy he got from Denham, but that is convenient, isn't it? Denham appears in the story and then dies just when Franklin is in need of money. How many boys from poor families are able to buy newspapers when they are 23? Remind yourself that Ben should have had no family connections in Philly either, since he was from Boston. So we are supposed to believe he did this all on his own.

Another clue to Ben's spook status is the Junto Club, which he allegedly founded at age 21. In my experience, only spooks are involved in these clubs. This was supposed to be a philosophy and charity club, but how did Ben have enough funds to be charitable at age 21? He should have been in need of charity, not a provider. The name is also a clue, since it is fake masculinization of the word “junta”. A junta is of course the government of an authoritarian state by military officers. So why does anyone believe Ben's club was anything different? Another clue is Ben's fellow officer George **Webb**. We have seen the Webbs have been one of the most prominent crypto-Jewish families from the beginning, right up there with the Morrisons and Bennetts. The name by itself should always be a tall red flag. Other founding members of the Junto were Parsons, Potts, Grace, Breintnall, Godfrey, and Scull. Parsons we have hit before. Potts is often Jewish, just search on “Potts Jewish”.

Grace is also Jewish. Many current actors with the name Grace are Jewish, for instance. See Topher Grace, Maggie Grace (whose father ran a jewelry business), and others. Also see William **Russell** Grace, founder of Grace and Co., and note his middle name. It came from his mother, but she of course is scrubbed at Geni. Grace's brother was named **Morgan Stanislaus** Grace, so that is also a clue. It links them to Poland and the Vasas we saw above. It also links them to King Louis XVIII, whose full name was Louis Stanislas Xavier, which [I have shown you](#) was a very strange name for a French king. William Grace's sister married John Eyre, whose grandmother was Bridget **Herbert**. See above for the name Herbert, high up in the British peerage. His other grandmother was **Jane Eyre**. William married Lilius Gilchrest, whose great-grandfather was Isaac Wiley—a Jewish name. Gilchrest was also related to the Watts and **Robinsons** of Massachusetts and Maine. See her recent ancestor [Moses Robinson](#) who came over from Ireland. His wife was. . . wait for it. . . Mary **Fitzgerald**. William Grace's brother John had a son named Cecil **Stanley** Grace. His other brother Michael married Margarita **Mason**, and their children did extremely well in their marriages. One daughter married John Shaffer **Phipps**, head

of Hanover Bank and US Steel. Another daughter married Richard **Hely-Hutchinson**, 6th Earl of Donoughmore. His other daughter married a cousin, Raymond **Hamilton-Grace**, who was related to the **Smijth-Windhams** and the **Trotters**. Brad Pitt is a Trotter, remember. And the name Hamilton of course links us back to Ben Franklin's genealogy. It is the fourth time we have seen the name in this paper.

Geni doesn't tell you, but these Hamilton-Graces were in the peerage. They got in through the Smijth-Windhams. Joseph Smijth-Windham was the son of Sir William Smijth, 7th Baronet Smith of Hill Hall. The Trotters also entered the peerage at the same time, by marrying this Baronet. So I have now proved William Russell Grace came from the peerage, which means my assumption that his mother's name Russell came from the peerage is confirmed. This would tend to confirm his links to other European royalty, via his brother's middle name Stanislaus.

Also notice that this Baronet Smith changed the spelling of his name, adding a “j”. Why would he do that. With the “j”, the spelling is Dutch. Why would a supposedly English Baronet change his name to a Dutch spelling? Well, because many of these Jewish peers came over from Amsterdam or Rotterdam.

But back to the spooky Junto Club. Founding member Joseph **Breintnall** later became first secretary of the Library Company of Philadelphia. Since it collected these faked manuscripts, he was just a premier propagandist. He wrote under the code-name BusyBody, co-authoring with Franklin the 32 letters printed in the *American Weekly Mercury*. Note the number, which is a Masonic number, almost as important as 33. He was also Sheriff of Philadelphia, appointed by George II—who we have seen several times above. But most importantly, he was a wealthy merchant. This points us to the fact he was. . . yep, Jewish. For one thing, he was a Quaker, and I have told you what to think of that. Also see the later General Reginald **Heber** Breintnall. Heber is a Jewish name, a variant of [Eber](#). Also see George Washington Breintnall, the Drummer Boy of Shiloh, who allegedly stood by himself against 60 of Mosby's men. Right. His wife was a Wissler, which is Jewish. The Breintnalls were also [later related to the Parks](#), which ties us back to [my recent paper on MLK](#). MLK, Rosa Parks, and Billy Graham were all Parks. The Breintnalls were also [related to the Ripleys](#). See my paper on [Daisy Ripley](#).



Scull is another Jewish name. See Robert Scull (above), famous modern art collector and taxi tycoon of NYC. His wife was Ethel Redner, also Jewish. *The New York Times* [admits they were Jewish](#). They

helped advance the incredible price inflation of modernism in 1973 when they auctioned off a large collection of Rauschenbergs, Rosenquists, Warhols, Jasper Johns, etc. at a huge profit. I now assume this auction was faked to do just that, but I will have to hit that later.

Also see Joseph Scull, b. 1731, [son of Abel Scull](#). Abel's sister married Abel Lee, son of Elihue Lee. We saw the Lees above. These Sculls were related to the Somers and the **Paces**. [[Pace is also a Jewish name](#). See Pace Gallery, founded by Arne Glimcher in 1960. Glimcher—one of the biggest scumbags in the artworld—is Jewish and he chose the name of the gallery from a family name.] The Sculls are also descended from a Dutch woman given as [Beyers Barber](#). Given that her daughter is named Barbara, we can easily see the names have been switched. She should be Barbara Beyer. Beyer is a Jewish name, so that is why they are partially scrubbing it. Scull is supposed to come from the Dutch Scholl or Scholt, but that also looks fudged.

And on [this page](#), we hit paydirt on the Sculls. There we find the Sculls related to the Shivers, Doles, **Motts**, Hickmans, Townshends, Carpenters, **Laurences**, Lippincotts, Champions, Weavers, **Bassetts**, and Risleys (misprint for Ridleys?). The Bassetts were involved in the Salem Witch Hoax. John Proctor's wife Goody Proctor was a Bassett. Ben Franklin was also a Lawrence, remember? Lawrence=Laurence. The Champions are Jewish. See dancer Gower Champion, who married Marge Belcher, both Jewish, related to the Rosenbergs. His second wife was Karla **Russell**. Also see Patricia Champion, wife of Thomas Frist, both Jewish. Mott is often Jewish, and several prominent Quakers were Motts. Also see Jordan Mott, industrialist and founder of Mott Ironworks in New York. I suspect all the other names are Jewish as well.

Wouldn't you like to know Benjamin Franklin's middle name? I would. Some of the Franklins in his family have middle names, but many don't. I wonder why not? I suggest it is because many of these middle names are a give-away. What if his middle name were Cohen, for instance? Or Levi. That would be a game-ender, wouldn't it?

In 1732, Franklin published the first German-language newspaper in the colonies, *Die Philadelphische Zeitung*. Again, a strange thing for a Boston boy with a 4th-grade education to do. Especially one with no admitted German heritage. According to the posted genealogies, the Folgers came over from Norfolk, England, where they had been since the 1500s. The Franklins were from Northamptonshire. The Whites/Wights were also from Northamptonshire. The Morrills were from Essex. So why would Ben be publishing a German newspaper? Did he know German, and if so where and when did he learn it? The only clue we have above is the Keiths, who were Prussian ambassadors and field marshals. I have shown you Franklin was actually related to them, but his mainstream bio doesn't tell you that. We know of all the links between German and English nobility, so Ben publishing this German newspaper is just more proof he was a cloaked noble of some sort—one with direct links to Prussia.

Did Ben have a title? It is possible. His contemporary in England at the time, Sir Thomas Frankland, was Baronet Frankland of Thirkleby and Lord of the Admiralty. Thirkleby Hall was in North Yorkshire, and it was built by William Frankland, a wealthy London merchant, in 1576. I have shown you much evidence above that Ben also descended from this William Frankland, but as the lines have been scrubbed, I can't tell you exactly how. It could be through [Hugh Frankland](#), who we are told died without issue in 1607. Otherwise, it is not clear why any of these early Franklands are listed in the peerage at all. Since they precede the 1st Baronet by four generations and are not married to peers, they should not be listed as peers. Unless. . . this wealthy merchant was himself ennobled back to the 16th century. That is actually what we would expect, since the first title is normally given to the first millionaire in the family. However, due to the later fame of Ben Franklin, not only the lines but the

titles had to be scrubbed. They couldn't have you discovering Ben was a British noble. That would explain why these early Franklands are listed in the peerage with no titles.

Anyway, Franklin also published Moravian religious books in German at the same time. This is another red flag, as you will see if you go to the page on the Moravian Church. There is nothing in Ben's mainstream bio to explain his connection to the Moravian Church, but what I have shown you above explains it, since the Church is another Jewish front. It was founded in Bohemia by Jan Hus in 1415. Here is his picture from Wikipedia:



Gee, would you say he looks German or Czech? No, he looks very Middle Eastern, doesn't he? We are told Hus' movement gained the support of the crown of Bohemia. That is because the Crown of Bohemia at the time was controlled by the **Jagiellons**, who [we have seen before, linked to the Vasas](#). They were crypto-Jewish themselves. I will have to pursue that another time, but for now it is enough to know that Franklin liked to hang out at the [Moravian Sun Inn](#) in Bethlehem, PA. This is yet another huge red flag that no historian ever pauses to question. It was a hang-out of not only Ben, but of George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, John Hancock, John and Samuel Adams, and Lafayette. Fourteen members of the Continental Congress stayed there at the same time in September 1777. Are you getting the picture? This was an early Intelligence retreat, and the connection of all these people to the Moravian Church of Bohemia outs them immediately as crypto-Jews working a major project. I could see that in a matter of minutes, so how is it that no one else has ever figured it out?

Wiki admits that in a 1751 pamphlet, Franklin called the Germans in Pennsylvania “Palatine Boors” who could never acquire the “Complexion” of English settlers. That has been purposely read upside down by many commenters, to indicate that Franklin was an anti-Semite. These commentators imply that Franklin was implying these Germans were Jewish, and therefore had a darker complexion. But we now see it was just the opposite. The Palatinate was not in Prussia, but in Southern Germany, around Frankfurt and Stuttgart. It was part of the Holy Roman Empire, which the Jews hated above everything else except Rome. Franklin is showing his distaste for these German natives—in the colonies as well as in Germany—who hadn't yet been wholly conquered and assimilated by the Prussian industrialists. So Franklin was actually tipping his hand here a bit, which is why that passage was soon excised from later editions. They were afraid someone might read it correctly, as I just did.

This isn't to say that area of Germany hadn't been infiltrated by Jewish lines at the time of Franklin. It had. For instance, Holy Roman Emperor Charles VII, supposedly of the ancient Wittelsbach dynasty, was the son of a Sobieski from Poland, making him Jewish in several lines. However, in the mid-1700s, the issue hadn't yet been decided on the local level, despite the infiltration of these foreign lines. These crypto-Jewish royals had made many advances, but they hadn't yet completed their take-over of

all parts of Europe.

In his early years, Franklin's main project was creating a chain of newspapers. It is admitted that his was the first newspaper chain in the colonies. This should also tell us who he was, since the main use of newspapers, then as now, was not making money or “spreading virtue” (as we are told of Franklin, oivay), it was spreading propaganda and creating opinion. This was clearly Franklin's assignment, and he was fairly good at it. A corollary assignment was pushing the right “secular literature”, which he also did through his newspapers, advertising the books early Intelligence wished to promote.

Amazingly, that is admitted at Wikipedia. The biographer there inserts a curious pair of sentences in the section “Coming of Revolution”:

Franklin provided an early response to British surveillance through his own network of [counter-surveillance and manipulation](#). "He waged a public relations campaign, secured secret aid, played a role in privateering expeditions, and churned out effective and inflammatory propaganda."

That quote comes from Ed Crews' [2004 article](#) “Spies and Scouts, Secret Writing, and Sympathetic Citizens”, from the Colonial Williamsburg Journal. Sort of confirms my reading above, doesn't it?

At age 25 Ben became a Mason, and just three years later he was a Grand Master. That's 33 levels in 3 years, if you are counting. He edited and published the first Masonic book in the Americas, the *Constitutions of the Free-Masons*. That confirms my readings of him above: he was an extremely prominent spook from birth, groomed from the cradle to a life of projects.

And what was the first of those projects? Well, we have already seen that the press was then what it is now: a premier opportunity to lie all the time about everything. The motto of the press should have been, “Why tell the truth when a thousand lies will serve much better?” This sort of turns the whole idea of a free press on its head, doesn't it? They want you arguing about a free press, since if you maintain a free press you think your job is done. But it isn't. A free press may simply be free to spout a constant stream of fantastic lies—which is what it has done throughout American history. Yes, the media should be free of partisan government interference, but it shouldn't be free to lie. But how do you police it? Most would now consider any “policing” of the press to be undue interference on the face of it, but is that true? Not really. There is a categorical difference between outlawing obvious lies, say, and government control of the media. Sensible laws aren't normally seen as “pernicious government control”. But our rulers have promoted the confusion, since of course they wish to maintain their freedom to lie.

Currently the only way to combat obvious lies in the media is to counter them, or to sue. But no one sues except in cases of libel with malice, and even that is rare. You couldn't even get standing to sue to remedy most of the fantastic and obvious lies told in the media, since you would be required to prove those lies were specific to you. In this way, the media is “free” to be *both* government-owned and a bottomless well of lies. Congress could pass strict laws against lies and propaganda, and create non-partisan oversight bodies (as they claim to do in finance), but that isn't even close to happening. Why not? Because Congress is also government owned. Meaning, Congress is owned by the same families that own the media. So no regulation is going to get done, in any arena.

Besides, intellectuals like you and me have been so miseducated over the years by these same families, most of us would balk at any regulation of the press, automatically seeing it as government interference. In this way, any solution to the problem is stopped at its first step. But that will have to

be grist for a future paper.



For the next major contradiction in Ben's bio, we come to his common-law marriage to Deborah Read (above). Quite a beauty, eh? They admit she was already married, though her husband had fled to Barbados. Note the place to which he fled, which we have seen above and many times before as a red flag. They also admit that due to bigamy laws she was not free to remarry. But in the very next sentence we are told Ben established a common-law marriage with her. What? If she was not free to remarry, how could he establish a common-law marriage with her? A common-law marriage was and is legally the same as any other marriage, it simply isn't begun in front of a judge or priest. So again this makes no sense. It is a story for children who know nothing of the law or of the world. It is also told for people who can't take links at Wiki to learn things. All you have to do, for instance, is click on "common-law marriage", which is linked in the article on Franklin. If you do that, you quickly discover the contradiction.

Another problem is Ben's "illegitimate" son William Franklin. In fact, we have no proof he was Ben's son at all, since there is no documentation. We have only the word of Ben, which has turned out to be worth squat. To me, both William and Deborah look like beards for Ben, to make it look like he wasn't gay. William was supposed to have been born in 1730, when Ben was 24—the very same time Ben was getting together with Deborah. This has led some to propose William was Deborah's son. I would guess that is true, but I think he was Deborah's but *not* Ben's. Why has no historian ever proposed that, since it seems the most likely answer to the mystery. He wasn't Ben's illegitimate son, he was Ben's *adopted* son—without, of course, any adoption papers to clarify the matter. At any rate, the mystery doesn't speak well for Ben on any level. For someone always writing sanctimoniously about virtue, Ben's bio proves a hypocrite.

In a time when families were large, Ben had only one legitimate child, Sally. That also tends to confirm my guesses, since both Ben and Deborah were young and fertile: if they could have one, they could have had many. Why didn't they? We aren't told. Another clue is that Deborah never accompanied Ben on his extended trips to Europe. We are told it was due to a fear of the sea. More likely it was due to other causes, which may now occur to you. When she died in 1774, Ben didn't return for the funeral. He remained in Europe until the next year. That is also a clue, one that also confirms my guesses.

But back to William Franklin. He was also tied to Barbados, like his mother. Remember, Deborah's real husband fled to Barbados. So it is curious to find that William later married a girl from Barbados. Her father was a wealthy landowner there. That would tend to confirm that William was the son of

Deborah's real husband, not Ben. Also confirming that guess is the fact that William became a loyalist, following the views of his Barbados relatives, not Ben. You would have thought he would cling to the views of his famous and virtuous father, but that is not what we find.

In 1733, Ben began publishing *Poor Richard's Almanack*. Note the date. He was 27. He published under the pseudonym Richard Saunders. Why do virtuous people need pseudonyms? You might ask yourself that. You might also ask why he chose the name Richard **Saunders**, seeing that Saunders is another name from the upper reaches of the peerage. Think of Frances Stonor Saunders, whom I have unwound [elsewhere](#). She is the one who wrote the book *The Cultural Cold War*, about the CIA's control of Modern Art. At the time of Ben Franklin, the Saunders in the British peerage was Arthur **Saunders Gore**, 2nd Earl of Arran. [His father had also been Baron Saunders.] He married an Annesley, of the Viscounts of Valentia. They were related to the **Philipps** Baronets, the **Perrots**, the **Sneyds**, and the **Alingtons**. We saw the Alingtons above, didn't we, related to the Russells and Warburtons, and therefore to Ben Franklin. This ties Ben to these Saunders in the peerage. So his *nom de plume* was no accident.

You will remember the Sneyds from [my paper on MLK](#). Sneyd was an alias that James Earl Ray took when he fled to Canada. The Perrots later became Perots, as in H. Ross Perot. The Philipps Baronets may be related to the Philips of the Netherlands, who we have seen in many papers (Philips Electronics, which I have linked to both Karl Marx and Elvis Presley). These Philipps were also related to the Drydens, Stanhopes, and **Wilkes**, as in John Wilkes Booth. The Stanhopes were the Earls of Chesterfield. They were related to the Hastings, Earls of Huntington, and through them [to the Montagus and Nevilles](#). This links us back to Ben Franklin's genealogy again. If we click on that very Neville, we are taken once again to the 16th Earl of Warwick we saw above, as well as to the same Beauchamps and Plantagenets (3rd Duke of York).

If we return to Arthur Saunders Gore, we find that his daughter married Augustus Hanover, 1st Duke of Sussex, who just happened to be the son of. . . **King George III**. So these Saunders Gores, recent Earls of Arran, had some major peerage mojo going on at the time of Ben Franklin, for reasons not immediately clear. It leads me to look at the wife of this Arthur Saunders Gore. She was an Underwood, but her mother was a **Goold**. Aha! Although we are only told she was the daughter of a Caleb Goold, and he is scrubbed, that is already enough. They are obviously Jewish, and we must suspect this Caleb Goold was obscenely wealthy, from Gold, Diamonds, Opium, or some other stinking commodity. Cecilia Gore's marriage to Augustus Hanover was in contravention of the Royal Marriages Act of 1772, but lucre justifies anything with these people.

At [Cracroftspeerage.co.uk](#), we learn more about these Saunders, Earls of Arran. Another daughter of the 2nd Earl married John **Hamilton**, 1st Marquess of Abercorn. We have seen above that Ben Franklin was related to the Hamiltons. Another daughter married Rev. Charles **Douglas**, brother of the 17th Earl of Morton. Ben was also related to the Douglasses, as we have seen. I gave you this new peerage link, because on that page you can see at a glance all the later marriages of these people, as we get nearer to the present time. This helps you see how these alliances unwind over the centuries.

Now we come to his famous kite experiment, which we find. . . never happened. Franklin *wrote* about such an experiment, it is true, but never claimed to have actually performed it. No notes were taken or published, only an account of a possible experiment. I can tell you that lightning would have little or no interest in the kite string, wet or not, or in the flying key or kite. What it would have some interest in is the vertical human body in an open field, acting as a small lightning rod. Supposing the lightning got anywhere near the apparatus, it would go straight for the body, ignoring the kite altogether. This

was proved by Prof. George Richmann in Russia, who was foolish enough to perform a similar experiment. He was electrocuted.

Wikipedia tells us Franklin was careful to stand on an insulator, keeping dry under a roof, while performing this experiment. That is absurd. It is pretty hard to fly a kite while standing under a roof, and standing on an insulator would have broken the charge connection between sky and ground, nullifying the possibility of a strike. As usual, the entire story is a farce.

Franklin is said to have discovered the Gulf Stream, but even Wikipedia admits it was discovered at least 200 years earlier. At most, Franklin helped to map its strengths at different latitudes.

Franklin supported Huygens' wave theory of light, which choice looked good for a while. However, it has turned out to be wrong. Newton was right with his corpuscular theory, and Einstein helped prove that with the photoelectric effect. It is now known that light is made of photons, the new word for Newton's corpuscles. Mainstream physics still pushes a wave/particle duality, but that is just waffling. I have shown that photons have real spins, which create wave patterns in certain experiments, but light itself is not a wave. Light is made of real spinning particles, *which create wave patterns in the data*. The wave of light is not a field wave, but a spin wave. See my science site for more, if you are interested in this question.

Franklin understood that ice is a poorer conductor than water, but he did not understand *why*. The mainstream still does not understand precisely why, since the mainstream still doesn't understand exactly what is being conducted, or *how*. For more on this, see [my papers on structured water](#).

In 1750, Franklin began promoting the work of Dr. Samuel Johnson, especially his book *Elementa Philosophica*. Since by this time, Franklin and his spook pals were founding a whole series of colleges, they could promote this new coursework in that way. Johnson's "moral philosophy" would replace the traditional religious teaching of morality from the Bible. This requires a short diversion into this matter. As it turns out, Johnson was yet another crypto-Jewish spook, running an early version of the Theosophy project to damage Christianity. He started out teaching "Enlightenment" at Yale, but this was just a cover for malicious secularization. By that, I mean that the secularization of society wasn't intended to help people become more enlightened, but the reverse. It was intended to destroy previous ties and relationships, so that the financiers could profit by selling people a new set of ties and relationships. It was the basically the same project then as it is now. And these new relationships were not intended to provide people with more autonomy and wisdom, but less. Those who pushed these new schemes didn't want people to become more independent, they wanted them to become more dependent. This has been the movement of history ever since, so I hardly need to prove the project. The project proves itself.

At any rate, the early project at Yale failed, since the students apparently had some idea they were being propagandized. They claimed Johnson was a poor teacher and threw him out. But he was quickly assigned to a more gullible audience: he became a Congregationalist minister. The audience at Yale was too smart for him, so he sought an easier target. As usual, we have no indication Johnson had any qualifications for his new post, since we are not told he had ever studied divinity or acquired the correct degrees. But this doesn't stop Intel agents, as we know. Almost immediately, Johnson sprung his trap on his unsuspecting audience: he and nine other alleged clergymen began "questioning the validity of their ordinations". Within the year they had started the Great Apostasy, declaring for the episcopacy. You can look that up if you like, but basically it meant they were sowing the greatest dissention they could think of. They were thrown out of their positions and fled to England, where they

were embraced warmly by the Church of England. Hooboy, is this easy! Johnson and three others were ordained by the Archbishop of Canterbury and given honorary Masters degrees at Oxford and Cambridge.

Johnson then returned to Connecticut to continue the project. Immediately he married a superwealthy widow, Mrs. Nicoll. She was a descendant of Matthias Nicoll, and the Nicolls had settled and now owned most of Long Island. Their manor was Islip Grange, **100 square miles** of what is now Islip. This is just more confirmation Johnson was a top spook. Johnson then began furiously promoting the Anglican Church (Episcopal) in the colonies. Why would he do that? To spread dissention. He even admits it. See the title of his three pamphlets issued at the time: *Letters to his **Dissenting** Parishioners*. And who was his main target? The Puritans, of course. This was a continuation of the recent Salem Witch project, which also targeted the hegemony of the Puritans. The financiers needed to break the Church's power over the people and replace it with their own, you see. Johnson's new tie to the Nicholls' money shows how great the resources were behind this project.

The cornerstone of Johnson's new moral philosophy was “the pursuit of happiness”, although we aren't told how a pursuit of happiness is moral. You can see that his project has continued down to the present day, since that is still the cornerstone of large parts of current Humanism. Already we can see that Johnson wasn't promoting morality, but short-circuiting it as best as he could. Whatever Christianity at the time was promoting, Johnson would promote the opposite. Since the Biblical definition of morality was 180 degrees away from any pursuit-of-happiness mantra, Johnson was sure to promote what he did, as a sort of anti-morality. Note that I am not defending Christianity here, I am just exposing Johnson's project. I do not see myself as a defender of Christianity, as I have said before. I just tell things like I see them.

In 1851, Johnson began working with **Trinity Church** in New York City to build a college there. Note the name Trinity, which I have shown you is a sign of Intel. Remember, we have seen the Trinity Colleges of Dublin, Oxford, and Cambridge involved in many projects, so the word doesn't signify the Trinity of God, it signifies the number three, a favorite of Intel. Also remember that Oxford and Cambridge conferred Masters degrees upon Johnson for no apparent reason. At any rate, King's College was chartered by King George II, with Johnson as first President. This college was created on Franklin's plan of the American college, in which the study of theology would be replaced with Johnson's fake moral philosophy. Franklin opened the College of Philadelphia simultaneously with Johnson's opening of King's College. It later became the University of Pennsylvania, explaining why U. of P. is such a spook college to this day. It is where Noam Chomsky and Ezra Pound arose. Also Doc Holliday, William Carlos Williams, Warren Buffett, Steve Wynn, Elon Musk, and Donald Trump. All spooks.

Don't believe me? King's College received its Royal Charter on October 31, 1754. Halloween.

The Presbyterians attacked these new colleges as an Anglican plot, which they were, in a way. But as we have seen, it was much deeper than that. This was actually a Jewish/Industrialist plot to undercut Christianity as a whole, not just Rome or the Puritans. The wealthy people funding this project wished to fully secularize society, because only in that way could they obtain complete financial and psychological control.

Are you ready for the punchline? King's College is now. . . Columbia University.

To sum up this section, we see Franklin working to secularize society, something that flies in the face

of his reputation as a pious man. In fact, Franklin was a great *opponent* of Christianity, never attending services himself and later being a close friend of that old atheist Voltaire in France. As Oxford and Cambridge had awarded degrees to Johnson, Harvard and Yale awarded Franklin honorary degrees in 1753 for his work on the American college. Once Ben got this new college system off the ground, he too went to London, supposedly to lobby against the Penns. However, he accomplished nothing with that, and the mainstream bios even admit that was just his “official” reason for being there. Unofficially, he was there to consult with his relations in the peerage. Actually he spent around two decades in Europe—returning to the Colonies only on occasion—so we must assume he had been granted a partial reprieve from his projects here. Possibly he was wearied from hobnobbing with the commoners, and wished to return to his noble roots.

Although sold as a revolutionary, in 1764 Franklin called for a change from proprietary to a Royal government. That should look very strange to you. We are told he did this to counter the hegemony of the Penns, but in any case he was arguing for the Royals just 12 years before 1776. Although he was Speaker of the Pennsylvania House, this call for a Royal government cost him his seat. In 1765, while claiming to oppose the Stamp Act, he recommended a friend for the post of stamp distributor for Pennsylvania. Locals weren't fooled by his empty words and nearly burned his house down. Learning his lesson, he became a much better liar on the subject, and supposedly helped lead to its repeal.

In 1756 Franklin became a member of the Royal Society of the Arts, founded two years earlier. This further cements his spook status. As does his membership in the Lunar Society. It was founded by the industrialist Matthew Boulton, who just happened to be married to a **Robinson**. Another founder was Erasmus Darwin, whose wife was a **Howard**. The Howards were Earls of Carlisle and Dukes of Norfolk, closely related to the Cavendishes, Spencers, Leveson-Gowers, Boyles, Saviles, Russells, and Stanleys. Therefore, we may assume this Erasmus Darwin was also related to Ben Franklin.

While in England, Franklin was awarded an honorary doctorate by Oxford College. Though I used to read these things as signs of distinction, I no longer do. They are signs of Intelligence. While in Ireland, Franklin stayed with Wills **Hill**, the Earl of Hillsborough. He would soon be the Secretary of State for the Colonies 1768-1772. He was also President of the Board of Trade. His wife was Margaretta **FitzGerald**, daughter of the 19th Earl of Kildare. Her mother was an O'Brien, daughter of the 3rd Earl of Ichiquin and Mary **Villiers**. These were the Villiers, Viscounts Gradison. Sir George Villiers, Mary's great-uncle, was married to Audrey **Saunders**. Ben Franklin was a Saunders, remember, and wrote under the name of Richard Saunders in *Poor Richard's Almanack*. Mary Villiers' mother was Lady Frances **Howard**. We just saw the Howards with Erasmus Darwin, didn't we? So Franklin was hopping from one noble house to the other. These Howards were the Earls of Suffolk, related to the Dukes of Norfolk. Sir George Villiers married Barbara St. John, whose grandmother was Anne **Basset**. We saw the Bassetts above, didn't we? Do you remember where? In Salem. John Proctor's wife was a Bassett. Through the O'Brien's, these people were related to the **Boyles**, Earls of Orrery, who we just saw in the previous paragraph. They were also related to the Gordons, Lords of Gight. You also know the Gordons as the Byrons. Lord Byron was George **Gordon**.

So, let's pause and take breath. I remind you that Franklin was lodging with this Earl Hill in Ireland, just a few years before the American Revolution. This Earl Hill would soon be the Secretary of State for the Colonies, which means he was a top King's Man. He was a premier Tory or Royalist, and he was not on the side of the Americans. Rather, he was their British overseer. He should have been the enemy. The Earl Hill was promoted in 1779 to Secretary of State for the Southern Department, which means he was Secretary of State of Great Britain for South England, Wales, Ireland, and the Colonies. So he was very high up in the hierarchy during the War. What all this should tell you is that Ben

Franklin was a cloaked British noble, and that he was never a real revolutionary. I am not sure there *were* any real revolutionaries. Both sides of the War appear to have been managed. Franklin's close relationship to all these peers in the two decades leading up to 1776 is all the proof you should need of that.

As more proof, Franklin sat with the members of the Irish Parliament in those years, rather than in the gallery. Astonishing. And also strictly against the rules. But these people make the rules, so they don't have to obey them. In the next section at Wikipedia, we are told,

Franklin spent two months in German lands in 1766, but his connections to the country stretched across a lifetime.

What does that mean, exactly? His logical and lawful connections to Germany are never explicitly stated. So much is clandestine here that I can only assume his major connections were to German Intelligence and the German aristocracy, as with his British connections.



In the next year, Franklin visited Paris with his “normal travelling partner”, Sir John Pringle (above). Aha! Code for gay lover? It is likely, since Pringle, though married, also spent little time with his wife. They had no children. Pringle was a 1st Baronet and President of the Royal Society, indicating a major spook. His father was the 2nd Baronet of Stichill, also indicating strange goings-on. Sir John's brother Robert was the 3rd Baronet of Stichill, which means these two brothers were both Baronets of different demesnes. I have never seen that. These Pringles were related to the **Scotts**, Earls of Buccleuch; the Baronets Hope; the **Murrays** of Blackbarony; and the **Hamiltons** of Innerwick. Through the Murrays, the Pringles were related to the **Douglasses**, Earls of Angus. This indicates that Pringle was a cousin of Ben Franklin, since they were both related to the Hamiltons and Douglasses. These particular Douglasses link us to everyone, including the **Kennedys**, the Crichtons, the Gordons again, the Stewarts, the **Keiths**, the Flemings, and so on. Note the Keiths, one of whom we saw above as the Governor of Pennsylvania. The Keith we find at this point in the search is Sir John Keith. He married Lady Jean Stewart, daughter of King Robert II of Scotland.

The 2nd Baronet Pringle's brother Lord Newhall married a Katherine Johnston, scrubbed at thepeerage.com. Could she be related to Dr. Samuel Johnson above? Maybe.

Pringle was the professor of moral philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, so he was working on the same project as Samuel Johnson above, as well as Franklin. Remember the first tenet of this moral philosophy: “seek happiness”. Not far from “seek pleasure”, is it? Most people wouldn't know the difference. Pleasure-seeking is hardly a morality.

After the War of the Austrian Secession, Pringle became physician to the Duke of Cumberland. That would be Prince William Augustus, son of King George II and uncle of King George III. Pringle later became George III's personal physician. So Franklin's long-term “travelling partner” was the personal physician of the King. Let that sink in.

But let's pause on Prince William Augustus for a moment. His godparents were the King and Queen of Prussia, so we see the Prussian link again. The King was Frederick William I and the Queen was Prince Williams' aunt, Sophia of Hanover. [To better understand the relationship, it helps to know that the King of Prussia's great-grandmother was Elizabeth **Stuart**, Queen of Bohemia. Her father was King James I of England. It also helps to know that her 3g-grandmother in the maternal line was Anna **Jagiellon**. Anna's father was Casimir IV Jagiellon, King of Poland. We have seen him in previous papers.] Prince William never married, so he too may have been gay.

As for Pringle, he was a good friend and student of Albrecht von Haller, the famous “Swiss” physiologist. However, Haller is often a Jewish name, as you can see by searching on “Haller Jewish”. Here's a clue from his bio:

Before he was ten he had sketched a [Chaldee](#) grammar, prepared a [Greek](#) and a [Hebrew](#) vocabulary, compiled a collection of two thousand biographies of famous men and women on the model of the great works of [Bayle](#) and [Moréri](#), and written in [Latin](#) verse a satire on his tutor, who had warned him against a too great excursiveness.

Right. The stuff they expect you to believe. However, the Hebrew vocabulary is a clue, since a Swiss Calvinist would not have been taught Hebrew at the time. Another clue is that Haller's parents are not given in his bios. If we go to Geni.com, we get a nice clue: Haller's mother was an **Engel**. That should probably be Engels, which ties us to Friedrich Engels. [See my paper on him](#). Haller's paternal great-grandmother was a Glanzmann, also probably Jewish. Haller's wife's maiden name is suppressed at Geni as well, another clue. One of Haller's grandsons became a prominent banker. The Hallers are still prominent bankers, both in Europe and in the States. See for example Mendel Joseph Haller, who founded the bank Haller, Sohle and Co. in 1794 in Hamburg. These Hallers were related to Baron Stieglitz, court banker for Alexander I of Russia, and cotton merchant Louis Liebermann, father of the painter Max Liebermann. Stieglitz links us to the famous photographer Alfred Stieglitz, husband of [Georgia O'Keeffe](#). All these people are of course Jewish.



Still not convinced Franklin was gay? Well, you may wish to study the portrait above. Who is that? That is Franklin at age 34. I bet you have never seen that. I hadn't until today. It is mostly suppressed. I think you can see why. The older portraits of him are much less telling, aren't they? My guess is other portraits have also been suppressed, since if you search on images of Franklin, you get almost nothing except a couple of him in old age. Most are based on a single image. But since Franklin was actually from these noble families, we would expect far more images of him like the one above. These people love to have themselves painted and drawn, as we know. The portrait above is actually a detail of a larger portrait:



Notice his hand in his vest, like we have seen with Napoleon, Marx, and many others.

Now let us take a quick look at the Hutchinson Letters Affair of 1773. Franklin is said to have leaked some letters from Thomas Hutchinson, Governor of Massachusetts, and his Lieutenant Governor Andrew Oliver. Franklin was still in England at the time, so he must have gotten the letters there. He

had to send them back to Boston, where they were published by the *Boston Gazette*. These letters showed that Hutchinson and Oliver had been ordered to crack down on the locals by the King. This was another managed event. It was a controlled leak. How do I know? To start with, letters like this don't just accidentally get leaked. Leaks of this nature are almost always controlled. More importantly, I know because both Hutchinson and Oliver were of peerage families, like the rest of these people. We saw the Hely-Hutchinsons above, didn't we, Earls of Donoughmore, related to the Graces, Eyres, Robinsons, **Hamiltons**, Trotters, etc. Oliver was the brother-in-law of Hutchinson, and the Olivers are also in the peerage, related to the **Hamiltons**, the **Disneys**, the Turners, and so on. Through the Hamiltons, the Hutchinsons and Olivers had been related for generations. Through the same Hamiltons, they were also related to. . . Ben Franklin. So do you really think Franklin was outing his own people? Of course not. This was another controlled event, and we may assume the main point of it was to rehabilitate Franklin. He was on his way back to the Colonies after two decades hobnobbing with these nobles, so he needed some serious whitewashing. What better way to cleanse him than to fake this event in which he looked like a great patriot?

As usual, it was the wealthy merchants faking the event, since if you go to the page for Andrew Oliver, you find he was from a family of millionaire merchants. His mother, a Belcher, was from another family of millionaire merchants, and the Belchers had also been Governors of Massachusetts. The Olivers money came from. . . textiles, of course. As for the Hutchinsons, you will remember them from my paper on the Salem Witch hoax. Remember Elisha Hutchinson, the Boston magistrate who ordered George Burroughs to be apprehended? Also remember Elizabeth Hutchinson Hart, daughter of Anne Hutchinson, who was arrested for witchcraft in Salem and imprisoned. Also a different Anne Hutchinson, wife of William Hutchinson, *a wealthy cloth merchant*. She is now sold as an early feminist, but she was actually an early spook from this prominent family of cloth merchants and spooks. She stirred up dissent somewhat like we have seen Samuel Johnson do later, and for the very same reason. She was tried for heresy and traducing the ministers (fomenting dissent), and excommunicated. Her project having failed, her death was soon faked. A few months after the death of her husband, she was supposedly killed by hostile Natives.

But back to Franklin. He was actually present in London at the Privy Council hearing on the matter of the Hutchinson Letters. Although he was allegedly lambasted, nothing of consequence happened to him except his dismissal as Postmaster General. Since he had been away from the Colonies for years, that sinecure apparently meant little to him. It didn't matter anyway, since the Continental Congress made him Postmaster General again a few months later. Hutchinson was recalled and returned to England, which tends to confirm my reading. It proves he wasn't American to start with, but only a British governor. His real home was in England. His term was about to end anyway, so his recall meant nothing. As for Oliver, he allegedly suffered a stroke and died immediately in 1774. Believe that if you must.

[**Addendum next day**: a reader wrote in to tell me I missed Robert Morris in this exposé, so I am inserting him here. Morris was a wealthy merchant from **Liverpool** who financed the American Revolution and signed the Declaration of Independence. He controlled the Continental Navy. Morris was called the most powerful man in America after Washington. He was made a partner in the **Willing** Bank at age 24. This later became the Bank of North America and then the Bank of the United States. Robert Morris' mother is given as a Murphet at Wikipedia, but we may assume that is a slur of **Murphy**. But what I have to add is that Morris was probably also a peer, related to the Morris Baronets and later Barons. Robert Morris' father was also Robert Morris. John Morris, 1st Baronet, was the son of Robert Morris. The dates match. And if we move ahead a bit, we find the Baron Morris of Manchester who just died in 2012 was the son of Jessie **Murphy**. Curiously, the peerage does not tie

him to any previous Morrisises of the peerage. But the earlier Barons Morris of Kenwood were related to the **Isaacs** and **Cohens**. If we return to the Baronets, we find they were related to the Jenkins and **Parrys**. At the peerage these Jenkins and Parrys are scrubbed, but we find with more digging that they were related to Murphys. We also find that the Morrisises are related to Musgraves, **Daniels** and **Crawfords**, which links us to the others families in this paper, including the Franklands. Are they also related to the Stanleys? You bet. The Stanleys at the time are related to everyone here, including the Leighs, the Pitts, the Owens of Anglesey, the Seymours, the Rogers, the Greys, the Herberts, the Parrs, the Stanhopes, the Breretons, the Dudleys, the Cecils, the Hamiltons, the Spencers, the Mainwarings, as well as the Crawfords, Murphys, and Morrisises.

If we search this from Morris' end, we find his mother and paternal grandmother are scrubbed at Geni, just as we would expect. Also scrubbed at Wikitree and Geneanet. But his daughter married a Cox and his granddaughters married a Moore and a Carpenter. Another daughter married a Nixon. Moore, Carpenter and Nixon link him again to all the same families.

Before we continue, let's return to the name Willing above, as in Willing Bank. Who were these people? Well, they were also in the British peerage, although it is difficult to find out why. The earliest is [Charles Willing](#), b. 1710 in Bristol, England, d. 1754 in Philadelphia. The only link to peers I could find is Charles' granddaughter, who married a Stirling. The Stirlings were related to Campbells and Ruthvens. Stirling was the 1st Baronet of Faskine. His brother was a Vice-Admiral. The 2nd Baronet married a Byng, whose grandmother was a Pratt. She was the daughter of Charles **Pratt**, 1st Earl Camden, and she married the Baronet James, son of Jane **Holt**. This links us back to Ben Franklin, of course, who was a Pratt and a Holt. This means that Ben Franklin was related to the Willings of Willing Bank. And through them he was related to Robert Morris.

Charles Pratt had a sister named Anna Maria, and she married Thomas Barrett-**Lennard**, 17th Lord Dacre. Through the Lennards, we link to all the same names again, including the Palmers, Moores, Hamiltons, and Villiers. Through Anne Palmer, we go to her father, King Charles II. Through the Moores, we hit the Spencers again. We also hit the **Cusacks** and Darcys, which explains where the actors John and Joan Cusack came from. The Cusacks are related to the O'Tooles (Peter O'Toole), and through them to the FitzGerald. Through the Moores, we quickly come to the Coles, and through them to the **Molyneux**, the Whalleys (think Val Kilmer's wife), and the **Booths**. The Booths take us to the Warburtons, and through them to the Breretons and Leighs again. The Booths of the 17th century were the Barons Delamer, the 1st of whom married Lady **Clinton**, daughter of the 4th Earl of Lincoln and Bridget Fiennes (think actor Ralph Fiennes). [Remember, there was a General Clinton, leader of the British forces in the Revolutionary War.] This Booth also married a **Grey**, daughter of a **Cecil**. Which takes us back to the **Nevilles**. The mother of this Booth was an **Egerton**. His son was the 1st Earl of Warrington, who married a Langham, whose mother was a **Pomeroy**. See [my paper on John Reed](#), where we find Warren Beatty is a Pomeroy. I couldn't help that short diversion, since I still find it a thrill to discover all this sitting in plain sight in the peerage pages.

Another reader sent me [a link](#) to other research indicating Franklin was an agent—research I was not aware of when I wrote this paper. It is an article published in *Argosy* in 1970, relating facts compiled by Richard Deacon. I don't confirm everything at that link—especially the idea Franklin was a ladies' man—but much of it does ring true. Note especially Franklin's link there to Lord le **Despencer**. Even without the link to the Hellfire Club, this would confirm my lines of research above. For one thing, this Lord (Baron) le Despencer married a **Gould**. That's Jewish and equivalent to the **Goold** we saw above. This may explain how Despencer became Chancellor of the Exchequer. [Despencer was also

Postmaster General, like Franklin.] For another, although an alleged rake, this Despencer had no confirmed children. Rachel Dashwood Lee was supposed to be his illegitimate daughter, but there is no documentary confirmation of that. Since she was later used in projects (allegedly being kidnapped by **Gordon** brothers), she looks like another agent inserted into these stories. She was married to a **Lee**, another clue in that direction. Wikipedia goes out of its way to tell us she learned Hebrew, a curious thing to include in a short bio, and a very curious thing for a lady of the peerage to have done at the time. There is a Rachel Dashwood in the peerage, but it is Lord le Despencer's older sister. Also of interest is that Despencer was related to the Baronet Dashwood-**King**. The name King is a staple of my papers of the past several years. Likewise worth knowing is that Despencer's uncle was Thomas Fane, the Earl of **Westmorland**, an ancestor of George **Orwell**. This linked Despencer to the Blairs, Montagus, and **Gordons**, so it looks like Despencer just hired a couple of nephews to pretend to kidnap his fake daughter.

The Fanes were related to the De Veres, and through them to the **Townshends** and **Bacons**. And yes, these are Bacons of Sir Francis Bacon. The Townshends were the Viscounts Raynham. Through the Ashes they were related to the **Pitts**. The 7th Earl of Westmorland married a **Cavendish** (Duke of Devonshire), and through them was related to Butlers, Cecils, FitzGerald, Berkeleys, Howards, Dudleys, Greys, and so on.

But back to the *Argosy* article. Note something the author there fails to circle: the British diplomat Richard **Oswald**. I showed in my [last paper on Kennedy](#) that Lee Harvey Oswald was actually descended from the peerage as well, so he is probably related to this Richard Oswald. In fact, the first name **Lee** may be another indication of that, since these people tend to have all surnames. Their first names are just recycled last names. We saw Lee/Leigh many times above, didn't we, including about two paragraphs ago? Even better, Thomas Fane, Earl of Westmorland had a daughter Susan who married John Drummond. Drummond's mother was Lady **Hervey**. So Oswald's real name may have been Lee **Hervey** Oswald. The Herveys were Earls of Bristol.

Another clue in the article is the Chevalier de **Beaumont**, a spy skilled in crossdressing. His friendship and correspondence with Franklin again confirms that many of these people may have been gay.

Also interesting is Franklin's representation of the State of Georgia. I hadn't realized Franklin had any connections so far south. This is interesting because of the [State of Franklin](#), which almost became a 14th state in 1784. It was located just north of Georgia, and was offered by North Carolina to Congress as payment for debts. We must assume Franklin was named for Ben Franklin. What is most interesting is that the encyclopedias admit this State was also called **Frankland**, confirming my analysis above.

This article tries to spin Franklin's spying for the British as part of a larger plan that "included both a free America and an all-powerful British Empire", but that spin falls flat. But it may be why the article was initially published. It appears to me that the authors are admitting things already known, then trying to defuse their importance and divert us into other channels. Other than that, the article does contain much information we can use here.]

Franklin had almost nothing to do with the Revolution after 1776, since he moved to Paris in December of that year, staying for almost a decade. Franklin actually spent more time there working on the upcoming French Revolution, which I have shown was also managed. His main ally in this project was **Mirabeau**, whom I outed in my paper [on the French Revolution](#). You may remember that I circled there the fact that Mirabeau was awarded the Grand Cross of the Order of **Vasa** by the King of Sweden, Gustav III. Indicating Mirabeau was both a spook and a crypto-Jew. Therefore, the fact that Franklin

would team up with Mirabeau is another tall red flag of the same sort. Franklin also continued his work as a Freemason in Paris, serving as the first Venerable Master of the Lodge of the Nine Sisters. That's curious, isn't it? That Franklin, allegedly an American, would be the 1st Venerable Master of this French Lodge? Thomas Jefferson was also a member of this lodge. These nine sisters are supposed to be the Muses, but they tell me they never had anything to do with it. They inform me that they led me into this paper in order to wipe their names from this travesty forever.

We are told that when Franklin returned to the States in 1785, he held a position among patriots second only to George Washington—although we aren't told why. As we have seen, nothing in his bio would cause any sensible person to rate him that highly. Given that he had spent most of the past three decades in Europe diddling other nobles, it is surprising he was even allowed to keep his American citizenship. In that year he was 79, so he was mostly washed up. Although he was an honorary delegate to the Philadelphia Convention, apparently he mostly slept through it.

Although I have done only a brief and partial outing of Franklin, I think a good reader can already see the lay of the land. Like everyone else we have looked at closely, Franklin has turned out to be very different from his historical cut-out. Discovering this took almost no work, since it was clear from a first reading of his mainstream bio, as posted at places like Wikipedia or the Encyclopedia Britannica. You don't need to slog through dusty documents on dark library shelves, you only have to read the mainstream histories with both eyes open, unwinding them for sense. As I have shown you, the clues are both numerous and obvious, and you don't really need to be a genius to decode them. It is all right there in the open, waiting to be understood.

On the way out, we should ask if Ben Franklin was born in Boston, or in the Colonies at all. It would be pretty easy to fake his bio before age 17. What if he didn't go to London at age 17, but was *already* there? He was simply assigned his project then, and was shipped out to Philly to start it up. Everything I have found above leads one to that conclusion. The next step would be to check his early documents from Boston, to see if they exist or have signs of tampering. My bet is they either don't exist or are fraudulent. I will leave that to someone else to research. You can report back to me.

PS: I need some hacker help. I am getting my inbox spammed by a group of spooks posing as a forum and I need to someone who knows how to crapflood them for me. Send me an email and I will give you the details.