

[return to updates](#)

JEFF BEZOS LOOKS LIKE ANOTHER CIA FRONT



by Miles Mathis

First published March 8, 2017

As usual, this is just my opinion. . . except for all the research from mainstream sites, which is not just my opinion.

I got here in the usual way: unusually. I was looking up a trivia question from a game last night about the 80s song *Always Something There to Remind Me*. I thought it was by Crowded House, but I was wrong. It was by Naked Eyes. Since I was on youtube, I was assaulted in the sidebar by CIA promotion “chosen just for me”. Oh, lucky me! It was a video about a too-bright Venus. I have noticed Venus seems abnormally large and bright, but I assumed it was because I was getting older and my eyes couldn't focus it like they used to. So I clicked. I was taken to a cache of videos by Steiger and Olson at GNN, and was immediately suspicious, of course. The production stunk of spin, so I called up a list of all their videos, looking for Flat Earth promotion. I didn't find that, but I found a video on Bezos and Elon Musk. Steiger/Olson are doing a straight promotion of both guys, saying “isn't it great” to see competition in the space race. That's all I needed to know. Since [I have shown you Elon Musk](#) is probably a total fraud and that SpaceX is a definite fraud, I have a lot of evidence Steiger/Olson are pushing another Intel project here. . . perhaps from the halls of Langley itself. I say that because Steiger admits he is a friend of Bezos, having sat with him on a panel in 1999. He says, “I love this guy!” That's a big clue here, though most will pass over it. If Steiger is sitting on panels with Bezos, he isn't exactly an independent source of information here, is he?

Anyway, that told me that if Musk is a CIA front, Bezos probably is, too. So I did a quick genealogy search on Bezos. They have scrubbed him at Geni.com, but not very well. On his maternal side, we have nothing past his mother. But she is given as a **Gise**. On his father's side, we get very little, but we do find his grandmother as a **Pollack**. Both those names indicate Bezos is from prominent Jewish lines, and linked to the families of my previous research. If you have read those papers, you know about Pollack. But you haven't seen the name Gise before. I send you to [Moishe \(Morris\) Gise](#), b. Russia and d. 1983 in NY, son of Schmuel Lev Gise, and father of Yetta. Moishe is listed as an “owner

of gas stations". My guess is that links him to Standard Oil and the Rockefellers. See below for a second hit on this. Further research turns up a Madeline Morris Gise in MA, which means the Gises married with the Morris of Massachusetts. See my paper on [the Lizzie Borden hoax](#) for more on the **Morris/Morrison** clan, which is also part of the cabal. Also notice Moishe's anglicized name above. This Madeline has a son David Gise whose [marriage announcement](#) to Erin Yavener was in the *New York Times* in 2015. Yavener is another Jewish name. The couple were married by Rabbi Bayar.

That gives us enough to go on concerning that question with Bezos. Despite that, no one else on the internet appears to know Bezos is Jewish. Jew or not Jew tells us he isn't Jewish. Even Stormfront denies it. Weird. Why would Stormfront take the time to deny Bezos is Jewish, when he obviously is? Because Stormfront is also a front.

I also pause to point out the obvious: [Steiger is also a Jewish name](#).

I wanted to watch an interview with Bezos, so I went to youtube, where the first thing that was listed is [a Vanity Fair interview with Walter Isaacson](#). I couldn't watch more than a few moments, one because the interview was so boring, and two because these two people made me immediately nauseous. I don't understand how other people fall for this stuff, but maybe they don't. I'm sure the numbers at youtube are manufactured, so maybe no one else is clicking on this, and if they are, maybe like me they are running screaming after a few seconds. Anyway, I wanted to remind you who this Walter Isaacson is. He is one of the Jewish bigwigs who runs everything, especially in the media. We saw him recently in my paper on Steve Jobs, where we find Isaacson as his biographer and promoter as well. Curious, eh? In that paper, we discovered he was an editor at TIME, and later CEO of CNN. He is currently CEO of the Aspen Institute. He is also on the Board of United Airlines, Harvard University, Tulane University, Bloomberg philanthropies, and the Carnegie Institute for Science. That would seem to be several full-time jobs, but somehow he still has time to write biographies of Steve Jobs and interview Bezos and so on. We may assume he is a high-ranking spook, heading several writing committees in Langley, and that his main job has to do with operation CHAOS. He pushes forward these projects like Jobs and Bezos, acting as a handler to these people sort of like George Martin did with the Beatles. For, while Isaacson seems spooky, he doesn't seem stupid. He keeps his charges on track. This indicates to me that being CEO of Aspen and on the board of Bloomberg Philanthropies and so on doesn't take more than a few minutes a month. That really isn't surprising, is it, considering that philanthropy is just a pose to start with. These people steal a million dollars and give back a penny, and giving back the penny probably doesn't take long.

Isaacson and the wider media are trying to convince us these people like Bezos are fascinating, but are they? Even if Bezos had done what they say he did, I don't think I could care less. He founded Amazon and has billions of dollars. So what? Is Amazon.com fascinating as a subject? Am I missing something? I find it about as fascinating and intellectually stimulating as WalMart. It is a big online store. I don't see the genius involved. Why is this guy being interviewed? Why was he TIME's Man of the Year? You might as well interview the guy who runs the dime store. And since the first interview with Bezos years ago was a big yawn, why keep going back? Does everyone think he is eventually going to get around to saying something poignant? He isn't. We have seen millions of businessmen interviewed over the years, and not one has ever said anything that would break a snooze.

Anyway, it looks to me like Bezos is just another rich boy from the families, chosen as the face for the Amazon project. Just as Zuckerberg is the face for the Facebook project, and Musk is the face for the Tesla/SpaceX projects, and Jobs was the face of the Apple project, and Gates is the face of the Microsoft project, Bezos is the face of the Amazon project. So to understand my argument here, you

should have read my papers on [Jobs](#) and [Zuckerberg](#), as well as my paper on Musk. If you don't do that, you will think I am way out on a limb here. But I'm not. I'm not flying on intuition or a hunch, I am progressing on previous research.



All these rich Jewish nerds look and act like the pathetic phonies I used to run across in the art scene, before I ran screaming. Like art and physics, large parts of big business have been taken over by these cardboard cut-out geeks who register zero on the charisma scale, zero on the intelligence scale, and zero on the reality scale. They just aren't convincing in their roles. About all they seem capable of is getting their picture taken and reading from the Teleprompter, and most of them can't even do that convincingly. I don't know about you, but I am past believing in any of them. What it looks like to me is that they are just talentless rich kids who asked Daddy to set them up on camera. They want to be famous, but they can't actually do anything, so Daddy has to use them in some ongoing project. The CIA has lots of projects that need human fronts, and so these rich kids are chosen for the part. Compare these kids to George Bush, Jr., who—if the world worked on merit—would have been cleaning pools somewhere. Instead, they set him up as President. That tells you how much value they put on the role of President. They didn't even care that he royally screwed up every press conference and speech: it just didn't matter. We could say the same of Trump. The screw-ups work as misdirection, since the media can then talk about that instead of addressing more important issues.

In my opinion, Amazon is another Octopus/CIA company, owned by the trillionaires and also used by Intel for data collection. Bezos probably has absolutely nothing to do with it, either as a founder or owner. He is just the front: meaning, he is the guy they *tell* you owns it and runs it, so they don't have to tell you who really does own it and run it. They tell us he is worth 71 billion or so, but I don't believe it and you don't have to, either. You don't have to believe anything that isn't believable. Remember that. Just five or six years ago, they were telling us Bezos was worth only about 18 billion. Now he is worth 71 billion? So he quadrupled his wealth in five years? Really? In a down market? While everyone else was going broke, he quadrupled his wealth? I think it is false, but if true you still shouldn't "love this guy". He is either A) a total fraud, or B) a towering crook. Take your pick. I choose A.

I broke the numbers down for you in my papers on Jobs, Zuckerberg and Musk, showing you why the given levels of wealth don't add up. So I am not going to do it again here. Just be advised that Bezos' entire bio is again a thing of smoke and mirrors.

For instance? For instance, his name has changed. His birth name is Jeff Jorgensen. Why can't any of these people exist under their real names? I will be told his stepfather adopted him at age 10, but that seems to happen an awful lot with these people I research. A person doing research on famous people

would come to the conclusion that about 3/4's of all people are adopted by their stepfathers at some point. Statistically, that is way off, of course. Probably less than 1% of people are adopted by stepfathers. Which means that these biographies appear to me to be made up as misdirection. I have shown much evidence of that with many previous people I have researched, so it is a good assumption. They need to confuse your mind, so they start by mixing in a bunch of adoptions and step-parents. They then have parents dying, name changes, and truncated genealogies. Most people see the mess and give up, just accepting what they are told because it is easier than unwinding the tangle.

At Wikipedia, we are told that Jeff's maternal ancestors owned very large acreages around Cotulla, Texas, but we aren't told who they were. We are told his maternal grandfather was a director of the US Atomic Energy Commission, but once again aren't given a name. Since it is scrubbed at Geni as well, more research is required. We find with some digging this grandfather was Lawrence **Preston** Gise, husband of Mattie **Strait** and son of Lloyd Preston Gise and Rebecca **Hall**. I trust you are paying attention, because we already have possible links there to famous Texans Preston Smith, George Strait and Jerry Hall—who just came up in my last addendum. Rebecca Hall's mother is Henrietta Trammell, which may link us to Trammell Crow. Rebecca's father is Thomas Hall, who is the grandson of Col. John Gladden **King** of Gonzales, TX. Which takes us just where I figured we were going when I saw the name Cotulla. I am from Texas, so when I see mentioned “large landholders in south Texas”, I automatically think of the King Ranch. Turns out, Jeff may come from these Kings. [We are told](#) Bezos owns a huge ranch in West Texas, but Cotulla isn't in West Texas. It is in **South** Texas, 60 miles south of San Antonio. It isn't part of the *current* King Ranch, but the Kings used to own or run most of Texas below San Antonio. It looks like maybe they still do, under different names.

And who are these Kings? Geni doesn't tell us, since the given history of Bezos' family ends with Col. King in around 1813. We are told he came from SC, but nothing else. More digging turns up bupkis, other than that Gladden was his mother's name. But we may assume these Kings are related to the Kings I have already outed in previous papers, including [my paper on F. Scott Fitzgerald](#). Scott's first flame is given as Ginevra King, remember, daughter of billionaire Charles Garfield King of Chicago. We also found that Fitzgerald author Aaron Latham of Spur, TX, was the grandson of Sarah King. I hadn't thought to link Aaron Latham of Texas to the King Ranch, Texas, but I should have.

I also researched the Kings in [my paper on C. S. Lewis](#). Remember, his fake mother with whom he lived for 33 years was Jane **King** Askins. This ties in here, because the King Ranch was co-founded by Kings and **Lewis**. Gideon Lewis was a co-founder. Another co-founder was Mifflin **Kenedy** from Pennsylvania. They misspell that to break the link to the Kennedys, but of course they were related. Mifflin was from Pennsylvania and was [a Quaker](#), so we have red flags everywhere once again. I will have to research this Kenedy later, since it would swamp this paper.

I have shown previously that the Kings are also related to the Garfields, the Chases, the Rockwells, the Alsops, and more recently the Emanuels (think Rahm and Ari Emanuel). I show you all the links in my paper on Fitzgerald. So this is where Jeff Bezos probably comes from.

I couldn't make the link to him from the direction of Col. King, so let's try from the direction of Charles Garfield King of Chicago. His ancestors come from Northampton, MA, and before that from Northampton, England. [We find them connected to the Kelloggs, the Pitts and the Rhodes](#). Some of these Kings [ended up in Lincoln, Nebraska](#). Others ended up in Georgia (see the brothers Thomas Butler King and Stephen Clay King). But any link to SC has been scrubbed at Geni.com.

Before I try again on that problem, you may be interested to know that I can link Bezos to Musk in a

rather curious way. I have shown that Bezos is a King. The director of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center from 2003-2009 was David King. During the same years, the director of NASA was Mike Griffin. Griffin also worked for In-Q-Tel (CIA) and later worked with Musk. So we have just a couple of degrees of separation. Also interesting is that David King is from South Carolina, having graduated from U. of South Carolina.

I will be told this is all beside the point, since the King Ranch wasn't founded by Col. King. It was founded by Richard King. The problem with that is that Richard King has no genealogy. At Geni and Wiki, he has no parents. His wife, however, has ancestors that go back to Plymouth, MA. And his daughter married a Kleberg. Does that name look Jewish to you? It should, since his maternal grandmother was a Sachs. Not surprisingly, she is scrubbed, with no parents given. Her husband is also scrubbed, although his name is given as von Roede. Curiously, a search on "von Roede Jewish" takes us first to a page at Wikipedia on Jewish Royalty, where we find the Austrian [Barons von Rede](#). Although we aren't told where the name Rede came from, this family is related to the Rosenberg banking family, as well as the von Kaullas—also ennobled Jews of Austria. The von Kaulla family owned the Bank of Wurttemberg.

Wow. If you aren't shaking your head, you don't have a neck. The other link for von Roede is just as interesting. It takes us to a Wiki page in Germany, which we have to translate. The von Rodes were Landgraves in Marburg. This reminds us that von Roede is probably a variant of Rhodes, which already came up in this paper. See above, where the Kings in Massachusetts in the 1700s married with the Rhodes. Now we find the Kings in Texas marrying with the von Roedes. Coincidence? I doubt it. You are free to come to your own conclusions, but to me it looks like Richard King was a son or nephew of Col. King, and that they both come from the Kings of Massachusetts. We weren't able to link them through South Carolina, but we finally linked them through Rhodes/von Roede.

And for those saying the Kings of King Ranch couldn't have been Jewish, note not only the genealogical evidence I have shown you going way back, also remember the more recent evidence with Bezos. Bezos is a Pollack and a Gise, and he now owns part of what used to be the extended King Ranch. His ancestors ARE Kings, and they admit that. So he probably didn't buy these fragments or extensions of the old King Ranch, it looks like he *inherited* them.

More evidence comes from the scrubbed bio of Richard King, which still has residue on it I can read. We are told he was a jeweler's apprentice in New York City at a young age. They should have scrubbed that and now probably will, since it tells us he was very likely Jewish. Most jewelers in NYC were Jewish. Like textiles and banking, it is a famous Jewish trade.

[**Addendum March 12, 2017:** My reader and guest author Kevin did some more research on the Kings and sent it in. Max and Crystal Eastman descend from the Kings of Massachusetts and Southern England. {This links us to many prominent Eastmans such as George Eastman of Eastman/Kodak and Linda Eastman (wife of Paul McCartney). Also Linda's father Lee Eastman, born Leopold Epstein, lawyer not only for McCartney, but also for modern artist Willem de Kooning. It also links us to Joseph Bartlett Eastman, son of Lucy King. And he links us to [current artist Bo Bartlett](#), who I have been trying to figure out for years. It also links us to Max Eastman, who we saw in my paper on [Eugene Debs](#).} Roger Eastman married Margaret King and Josiah Chapin married Mary King. The Eastman and Chapin lines include names like: Ephraim, Benjamin, Abihue, Samuel and Elijah. Max and Crystal's parents served as pastors at the church of Thomas Beecher. Beecher was a close friend of [Mark Twain](#) and married him to [Olivia Langdon Clemens](#). Through his parents, Max also became acquainted in his youth with Twain. *The Liberator* was a monthly [socialist](#) magazine established by

[Max Eastman](#) and his sister [Crystal Eastman](#) in 1918. The publication was an organ of the [Communist Party of America](#). Their mother was Annis Bertha **Ford**. Social work pioneer and journal editor Paul **Kellogg** offered Crystal Eastman her first job. Crystal's son Jeffrey Eastman **Fuller** was an OSS field operative, serving in the Research and Analysis Branch of the U.S.S.R. Division in Washington, Berlin, and [Central Europe](#). Fuller was discharged from the Army in June 1946 with the rank of Major, but continued to serve as a Major in the reserve, where he specialized in [psychological warfare](#). {This links us not only to the CIA, but to the Fullers like Margaret and Buckminster.}]

But back to Bezos. His stepfather is also a pile of red flags. This Miguel Bezos is supposed to be a Cuban immigrant who became an engineer at Exxon. That links us to Standard Oil, of course. I don't think I have ever done research on famous people that didn't lead to Standard Oil. A person researching famous people would come to the conclusion that about 3/4's of all people ever born work at some point for Standard Oil. But of course the statistics don't support that, either, making it a huge red flag.

Although Bezos' degree was allegedly in computer science, he went to work after graduation for Bankers Trust. He then went to work for D. E. Shaw, a large hedge fund company. That doesn't make much sense. At age 30, while driving cross-country, he supposedly came up with the business model for Amazon. In one way, that is believable, since it isn't like nobody had ever thought of a mail-order business before. But in this case it was web-order. As with the founding of Facebook and the idea of social networking, it doesn't take a genius to come up with the idea for a web-order business. In fact, in both cases many people beat them to the idea.

The section on the founding of Amazon is paper-thin on Bezos' Wiki page, so for more information we go to Amazon's own page. Again, almost nothing. So we go to the "timeline of Amazon" page. Again, almost no useful information on how or why Amazon flourished. The one thing we do discover—that Amazon started out selling only books—is a head-scratcher. Were book sales on the rise in 1994? No, just the opposite. Books sales have been in a steep decline for decades, and if it weren't for *Harry Potter* and Oprah books, new book sales would be near-zero now. By 1990, Trivial Pursuit had removed its original brown Literature category, since it was considered defunct. Their PR department likely reported to management it would be like having a category devoted to cobbling or leechcraft. Besides, Abebooks and Alibris were going online in the same years as Amazon, so Amazon should have found stiff competition. Since both Abebooks and Alibris outlasted Amazon as a bookseller, we may assume Amazon *didn't* win that war (or at least not until it bought out Abebooks years later in 2008). Beyond that, they admit Amazon didn't make and "didn't plan to make a profit for four to five years". Really? That's a great way to pull in investors, right? The old no-profit plan. We are told Amazon turned its first profit in 2001. So, yes, Bezos is looking like a real genius. A 1994 online bookstore with a 7-year no-profit plan. Why wouldn't that score big?

TIME named Bezos Person of the Year in 1999. Wait, let me be sure I get this straight: Bezos—a man whose company hadn't made a profit in five years and wouldn't for another two years—is named Person of the Year by TIME? And you don't think these people are toying with your mind?

If you still think Bezos isn't Jewish, we now go to the Amazon board of directors. Surnames: Alberg, Gorelick, Rubinstein, and Gordon. Gordon is a partner in Kleiner, Perkins, Caulfield, and Byer. Do I need to draw you a picture?

So I am not saying these guys like Bezos aren't rich. Of course they are. They are from the families, so

they are very rich. But their wealth doesn't arise the way we are told. It probably isn't distributed the way we are told, either. In other words, I assume these guys are worth a few tens or hundreds of millions. They are set up in a big house and they have lots of vehicles. They have to, to maintain the fiction. But all the other billions are funneled elsewhere. If they exist anywhere but on paper, they exist in the coffers of the top families who actually run these largest companies. And I assume they are hidden. They may be Rockefellers or Rothschilds (or not), but they almost certainly aren't these dweebs like Musk and Bezos. The real governors seem to search the families for the geekiest cousin they can find and set him up as the poster boy. They see this as the perfect misdirection, for many reasons.



These rich gay Jewish momma's boys are chosen specifically for their looks, since that too is part of the project. It is no accident that all your role models in business are people like this. They want you to believe that people like this become billionaires, since that totally messes with your mind. While they are crushing your body with fluoride and GMOs and aspartame and cellphone radiation, they are crushing your mind with daily contradictions. Watching these squishy guys like Gates, Musk, and Bezos seem to take over the world of high-tech and finance must short-circuit all rationality. If you want to advance, you will naturally model yourself after those you see advancing. But if you model yourself after these guys, you will be guaranteed *not* to advance. Which is fine by them, because it means they won't have to compete with you.

So you see, it is all part of the emasculation project, which is a subset of the CHAOS project. They suppress you with confusion, drugs, and bad information, so that you have no hope of advancing past a certain level. And if, like me, you come knocking on doors nonetheless—having skirted the drugs and bad info—they then just lock the door and pretend no one is home. Since they own all the markets, they know you can't advance in any major market without their permission. Without market support, they figure you will die on the vine in short order. This is the way they maintain hegemony.

Remember, it is all about money with these people. They don't see the world like I see it. When the Muses asked me early on if I would rather be a real artist, but poor, or a fake artist, but rich, I choose the former. I wanted to become an artist in order to create beautiful works, not to get rich. That's what being an artist meant to me, and it still does. I didn't admire Raphael or Van Dyck or whomever because they were rich. I admired their paintings. They aren't famous now because they were rich. They are famous because they created real works of art. And when I got involved in physics, it was the same. I wanted to do real physics, not just collect a paycheck.

But these people in the families aren't like that. They look at people like me as aliens, or as another species. What I just said doesn't register with them. I know, because I have worked with some of them (in the galleries). I have seen them look at me in wonder. They can't figure out what I am up to. They

think I am running some con on them, preparing to unleash some kind of financial reverse-whammy on them, picking their pockets while their guard is down. It never occurs to them that I am serious.

This is why they have destroyed art, literature, science and everything else. Those things really don't mean anything to them, except as potential commodities. I have never seen any real evidence they are Satanists, but I have seen lots of evidence with my own eyes that they are fatally shallow, unable to appreciate anything with depth. In my first field of art, they admit it. I have seen many top gallery owners admit in print they don't care anything about art, and heard many more admit it in person. They see art only as easy money. Likewise in physics, where we have seen top physicists admitting that physics means nothing to them. They are only interested in a shallow heuristics. If that. I suspect they too are only interested in money, or appearing on camera.

More broadly, it has always looked to me like the governors *want* you think they are Satanists, because as Satanists they would actually be far more interesting than they really are. But this is just a Halloween costume they like to dress up in, because it makes them look like they have a personality. They are so devoid of all imagination, they can't think of anything but to scare you. That is the extent of their creativity.

I leave open the possibility there may exist some interesting people hidden away somewhere on this planet, but I have yet to meet them or hear of them. The rich and influential people I have met have not been the most interesting, but the least. Hanging with them has always been like eating plastic fruit, and I would rather spend time with my cats. Which is what I do.

This is because I have found by long experience that not only do these people have nothing interesting to say, they will allow nothing interesting to be said. As a child, I remember being able to enthrall just about any audience with my observations, but that all ended at about age 12. It wasn't that my stories became less interesting: in fact, I believe they have become more and more interesting as time has passed. What changed is my audience. While children are pure enough to be enthralled by a true story, most adults are not. Most adults don't want to hear anything they haven't already heard on TV. Teenagers are heavily groomed by culture, and they are entertained only by those who can mimic the major entertainers and forms. Although I could do that as a young man, I didn't find it entertaining for myself. Beyond a certain age, I was no longer interested in aping Steve Martin or Robin Williams or whoever was in the news. In short, I grew up. I needed more from my entertainment than a few shallow jokes. I like comedy routines and sports, but only as a sidelight in my downtime. For my main courses, I need to feed on something more substantial.

Most adults no longer grow up. They are stuck at the level of comedy routines and sports. They are groomed by long custom to remain at this level. If you get beyond those categories, your audience is lost. They look at you a like time traveller from the 19th century. You might as well be wearing a powdered wig and buckles on your shoes. If you say anything interesting, they will ignore it as if it wasn't said. This happens to me everytime I go out (which isn't often anymore). I still try to be interesting, but it doesn't fly. So almost the only time I speak out now is in these papers. I have my say, entertain myself mightily, and possibly reach a few adults who retain that child inside.

I find the stories I have told you and myself over the past years far more interesting than any history or fiction, and not just because my stories are true. My stories are more interesting because they contain a complexity that is unmanufactured. While they have some similarities to Sherlock Holmes mysteries, they make Sherlock Holmes mysteries look like grocery lists. I unlock more mysteries in one long paper than Holmes did in his entire career. And while Holmes' mysteries are both trivial and fictional,

mine are neither.

That closing was a bit of a diversion, but I will let it stand. I find it, too, entertaining, and you may as well. If not, the historians may get something from it later.