

[return to updates](#)

Who *is* Ted Bundy?



by Miles Mathis

I was led to look again at Ted Bundy after writing [my recent exposé of the Tate “murders,”](#) where I showed the whole thing was manufactured by the Intelligence Agencies (FBI, CIA, DIA, ONI). Since Bundy's alleged killing spree started just five years later, we should ask if this series of events was manufactured as well, and if so, for what reason.

If you haven't read my 83-page PDF on the Tate “murders,” you are in no position to read further here. You will find my line of reasoning bizarre. But after you have read that paper, you will see everything in a different light.

My first clue that the Bundy murders were all faked was discovering that, like Charles “Tex” Watson, Bundy supposedly fathered a child while on death row. Since that is impossible, we have an early indication that this whole thing is another charade. But what really got me on the right track was looking at Bundy's earlier life. In 1966, Bundy went to the University of Washington to study Chinese. Big red flag. Those who study foreign languages in college, especially Russian and Chinese, are disproportionately recruited by Intelligence. In addition, we know he worked on Nelson Rockefeller's Presidential campaign in 1968, and of course Rockefeller was long involved in Intelligence, including being President of the NSC and Chairman of the PCG (Planning Coordination Group—overseeing the CIA) under Eisenhower. Later, Bundy was a spy for Republican Governor Daniel Evans of Washington in 1972, posing as a college student to shadow Evans' opponent, and—amazingly—this is admitted at Wikipedia. He was then hired as assistant to the State Republican Party Chairman. Bundy was accepted to law school on the recommendation of Evans. Evans was also a staunch supporter of Rockefeller, perhaps losing a Vice Presidential nomination when he refused to endorse Nixon in 1968. We have a series of red flags there, indicating Bundy was already an insider and spy from the beginning.

As for his birth and life as a child, it all looks like a rewrite and whitewash. Every story has three variations, and none of them make sense or are consistent. His biographies read like poor fiction,

written by flunkies at Langley. So who was Bundy, really? Or I should say, who *is* Ted Bundy?

I got nowhere on that question for about a year, since I wasn't willing to travel to look up documents. Finally, the answer fell into my lap. We have seen that the elite like to use their own children in their manufactured events, since these children are available and very easy to control. In most cases, they don't even bother to change any names. Think of Lynette "Squeaky" Fromme, Sharon Tate, Abigail Folger, Susan Atkins, John Phillips, and Jim Morrison. For an example beyond the Tate event, where we saw many children of the elite used, think of John Hinckley, Jr. Hinckley's father was a close personal friend of the Bushes, and the Bushes were even dining with the Hinckleys the night of the alleged shooting of Reagan. Even that hint didn't help me until I started studying CIA control of art in the 1950's and 60's, through the Congress for Cultural Freedom and other front organizations. In that research, I stumbled across McGeorge Bundy, National Security Advisor (CIA supervisor) to Kennedy and Johnson and later president of the Ford Foundation. Before that, in 1953 he was appointed Dean of Arts and Sciences at Harvard. He was only 34 at the time of that appointment. That was possible only because Bundy was already CIA at the time. He had been on the Council of Foreign Relations since he was 29. He had been in Intelligence since 1941, when he joined OSS right out of Yale at age 22. He was born into the prominent Boston Brahmin families of Bundy, Putnam, Lowell, etc.

McGeorge's older Brother William was also a prominent CIA agent, being also a foreign affairs advisor to both Kennedy and Johnson. He had a key role in planning the Vietnam War. Perhaps even more interesting is that after his government service, he became a historian, writing many books. The most famous is *A Tangled Web: The Making of Foreign Policy in the Nixon Presidency*. We are told that William had three children: Michael, Christopher and Carol.

Bundy. . . Bundy. Was it that simple? Had they really not even bothered to change the names? Looks like it. Looks like they decided to make it easy on Ted, letting him keep his name. They were so confident from past successes, they figured they could cover up every link afterwards. They would tell everyone Ted had been adopted, was originally named Cowell, and so on. Mark that: Cowell. It is a little joke, since, as we have seen, the CIA loves inside jokes. It is one letter from Lowell. We have just seen that McGeorge's mother was a Lowell of the famous Lowells of Boston, and she was Ted's grandmother.


They also hid McGeorge's children. Notice they are not listed at Wikipedia. His family isn't even mentioned, and you would think he was gay or a bachelor. I had to go to old obituaries to find out [that McGeorge had four sons](#), Stephen, Andrew, William, and James. If we do a websearch on those names, we find convincing pictures of Stephen, Andrew and James, and none of them look to be Ted. They look somewhat like Ted (enough to be brothers or cousins), but no match. But we find no pictures of William. Was he less well known, hence the lack of web photos, or was there a fifth brother? This will have to be determined by further research.


The fact that they hid McGeorge's children and his early photographs leads me to suspect Ted is his son, rather than the son of William. But Ted could be the son of a third unknown brother for all I know. The genealogy appears to have been changed, so I have no paperwork to go on for this essay. I have not uncovered documents here, since it is doubtful they exist. I am pursuing facial comparisons, since that is my specialty. That and photo analysis.

To get started, we should first ask if Ted is the right age to be a son of McGeorge or William. He is. William was born in 1917, McGeorge was born in 1919 and Ted was said to have been born in 1946. In 1946, McGeorge was 27, a probable time for a first son. Since McGeorge didn't marry until 1950, it

is possible Ted was illegitimate. It is also possible they simply changed the dates. This plays into Ted's faked bio, since in that bio Ted and his biographers tell several stories about finding a birth certificate or being shown one by a cousin. He is supposed to have discovered his grandparents weren't his real parents, and that his sister was really his mother. That was always beyond belief, and we now see a more likely history for Ted. He may indeed have been a bastard, but he was William or McGeorge's bastard, not the bastard of some air force veteran named Lloyd Marshall. That name is also a CIA joke, since the CIA was founded as an introduction to the Marshall Plan in 1947. General Marshall would be Secretary of State beginning in 1947 and then Secretary of Defense in 1950. Ted was said to have been born in 1946, when the OSS/CIA was already forming the Marshall Plan to fight Communism in Europe. It is also interesting that Ted was said to have been born in Vermont. Although he is later tied to the West Coast, Vermont is of course just above Massachusetts. Burlington is about 200 miles from Boston.

All this is admittedly speculative and circumstantial, but it is given a very large dose of legitimacy by studying photos of the three men:





The first two are of William Bundy, the last three Ted. I couldn't find any photos of McGeorge as a young man. At first I thought I had found one, but it was mis-tagged. On further research, all of them turned out to be William. Curious that we don't have any of McGeorge as a young man. Possibly he looked even more like Ted than William. At any rate, as a professional portrait painter—hired by wealthy people to reproduce their likenesses or the likenesses of their children—I can tell you the match above is quite close. If not for the difference in the upper lip, these people could be clones. Notice they have the same eyebrows, the same jawline, the same head shape (exactly), the same size forehead, the same eye-to-mouth ratio, the same neck size, similar ears, and very nearly the same noses. William tends to squint (probably because of the glasses) while Ted tends to open his eyes wide, but other than that the eyes are the same, too. They are the same width and they tilt up the same. Ted was probably instructed to open his eyes wide, to make him look crazy. They gave the same direction to Manson five years earlier. Ted and William even have the same color hair and part it on the same side. You can see Ted's natural part in pics 2 and 3, and it matches his father's. They have parted it on the wrong side for the mugshots, which is why it is flopping over in a weird way. That is what anyone's hair will do when they part it opposite of the way it naturally grows or is trained. William, McGeorge and Ted were also the same height: 5'9" to 5'10" and the same weight and build.

Another indication is provided by the fact that all three men had blue eyes with brown hair, which isn't that common in the US. The odds that both men would have this mixed trait is on the order of 1 in a hundred ($1/10$ times $1/10$). It *was* common in the Bundy family however, since Stephen, Andrew, and James also had the same trait.



That first pic is McGeorge at about age 45. He looked very much like William, except that McGeorge's hairline receded much earlier. That makes him appear to have a larger forehead and throws off the similarity somewhat at first look. That is probably why we don't see pictures of McGeorge in his 20's or 30's online. But notice that the mouth and lip match is much closer with McGeorge and Ted than William and Ted. William's lips turned down at the corners. But McGeorge and Ted both have that nearly perfect cupid's bow on the upper lip. Ted's mouth matches McGeorge's mouth nearly exactly in length, width, and curvature.

We can now run some rough numbers on all these trait matches between the older Bundys and Ted. The odds that two unrelated men would match at that weight and height and hair color aren't that low, since after all that is about dead average. But the odds of matching that plus blue eyes, same jaw line, same eyes, same build, same face shape, same nose length, same mouth width, and same last name are extremely low. Even before the last name match, I would estimate the odds being something like 1/100,000. With the same last name (for any stated reason), the odds are more like 1 in 10,000,000. Stated another way, the probability that two men with the same last name who look this much alike are closely related is *very* high. Again:



In calculating these odds, we have to take into account the *closeness* of each match. For me, the eyes and jawline tell us all we need to know. Look at how the neck meets the jawline: an exact match.

Of course this isn't proof. For proof that would hold up in court we would have to have documentary evidence or a DNA test. I assume all documents have been shredded and switched out for fakes, and it is unlikely Ted will come out of hiding for a blood test. So for now this is just being offered here as my professional opinion, based on a hunch and on some photo analysis. Do with it what you will.

No doubt, some will start by saying, "It can't be. These people wouldn't allow the famous Bundy name to be dragged through the mud on purpose! The Lowells, Putnams, etc., wouldn't allow it. The Boston Brahmins wouldn't wish for a famous serial killer to be linked to their names in any way, but they especially wouldn't *make* it happen!" Anyone who says something like that sounds like they are still living in the 1890's. They should be living in a Henry James novel. The truth is, everyone in the know already *knows* Ted was used for this program, and they find it amusing. So it doesn't sully anything for these wealthy families. It is a point of honor, in fact. As for what the rest of us know or think of them, they couldn't possibly care less. That is why they expend so little energy and time trying to make these scenarios air-tight. They know that *neatness doesn't count*. They know most of us can be fooled by a sloppy magician's trick, and that is all they care for. They don't need to fool all of us. They only need to fool 95%. If a few fish like me swim out of the net, what do they care?

Think of it this way: say Sherlock Holmes were alive now. Do you honestly think the wealthy families or the CIA would have anything to fear from him? No. No one is going to hire him. As long as no one hires him, any crime he solves will be nothing more than an amusing novella. For it to go beyond literature, the police or the courts would have to get involved, and that isn't going to happen. The police and the courts have no interest in pursuing wealthy families or the government agencies. Only when wealthy families fight one another do things still happen, but that isn't what we have here. What we have here is the wealthy families controlling the greater society, and those families have closed all avenues of resistance against them: courts, police, the media, Congress, and so on. All those institutions are defunct.

The question remains, why would Intelligence be interested in faking a serial killer? Simple: to create instability and fear. This was one of the prime goals of Intelligence at the time, and of course it still is. In the 1960's, the FBI had COINTELPRO and the CIA had CHAOS, and both programs have been partially declassified now, enough so that we know the one of the directives of each program was destabilization. And this was not just destabilization of the “enemy.” This was a general destabilization of the whole society. Since the entire society was seen to be moving left in the 1960's, Hoover of the FBI, Helms and Angleton of the CIA, and many others felt that general destabilization was necessary to maintain control. Of course they had been creating fear since the end of WW2, but in the beginning that was mainly to keep military expenditures high. They needed to justify continued military spending, as well as spending to expand the Intelligence community, and the best way to do that was to manufacture conflict and fear. The Cold War was manufactured by both sides, since it allowed for massive “defense” budgets both here and in Russia. The Red Scare in the 1950's was part of that creation of general fear. But by the late 1960's, the Government had domestic problems to deal with, including an ever-increasing resistance to the Vietnam War.

Communism had been destroyed domestically—everybody knew that—so they needed a different way to create general fear. One of the ways they decided to do that was with manufactured bogeymen of the Manson, Bundy type.* Manson's bogeyman was created as a hippie in order to destroy the hippie movement, and he was incredibly successful in his role. But by 1975 the hippie movement was also dead, so the bogeymen no longer needed to be of that mold. They now wished to demonize the good-looking white guy. Why? Several reasons. First of all, the charismatic, college-educated white guy was still the most dangerous person in the eyes of Intelligence at that time, since in 1975 he still had the most real power. The good-looking white guy had been the biggest thorn in their side during the hippie movement and the war protest movement. They had been the high-profile speakers with the most bravery, tenacity, and the greatest ability to sway a crowd. Therefore, Intelligence wanted to recruit all the charismatic white guys they could into their agencies, and hog-tie the rest.

Intelligence also wished to create as much sexual dissatisfaction as they could, because they found it helped sales in all areas. The dissatisfied bought more drugs, more liquor, more guns, more magazines, more newspapers, watched more TV, and were generally easier to propagandize on all issues. And this time, the focus was on women. If Intelligence could make women fear all men—*especially* the good-looking ones—they would immediately create huge levels of sexual dissatisfaction. These women would then watch soap operas and read pulp romances and join feminist groups, where they could be further propagandized. They would suffer from a thousand forms of anxiety and all the mental and physical effects of that anxiety, which would require a million forms of drugging and therapy, legal and illegal. And as the women went, so did the men. If the heterosexual women could be driven nuts, the heterosexual men would be taken down with them. The sexual relationship is like that: if you destroy one half of it, the other half falls as well.

Of course this is still the program, and it seeds Oprah's empire as well as half the hospitals. It seeds the pharmaceutical industry, the porn industry, Hollywood, the cosmetic industry, radical feminism, women's studies, men's studies, postmodern art, and a thousand worthless TV channels.

If you or the CIA wonders why I am researching these things like a fiend, it is because my life has been ruined by these programs. [In previous papers](#) you have seen how the CIA's (now admitted) control and destruction of art during the 20th century would affect someone like me, but these sexual destabilization programs are also ruinous, and I take them personally. Like the rest of the heterosexual male population, I have been forced to try to date these women who have been brought up on a constant fare

of planted stories of the Manson, Bundy type. I can point to many specific instances with real women where Manson, Bundy, or one of the other mainstream figments was brought up in conversation as a source of their anxieties. And it continues up to this day, with the manufactured events we see in the papers daily, many of them aimed directly at young women.

The government has been manufacturing tragedies year by year for decades, and we are now up to several a month, just to keep the patient properly traumatized. It used to be that one fake serial killer every couple of years would do the job, but in this as in everything else, the patient develops a tolerance. After 911, the audience became more difficult to startle. In addition to your daily dose of shootings, maulings, rapes, suicides, crashes and molestations (most of them also manufactured for your viewing pleasure by the Intelligence agencies), you are now privy to at least one mass shooting or bombing every two or three months. It was found that the serial killer story took too long to unwind, so they ditched that. You don't get serial killers much anymore. It is mass shootings instead, since they happen all at once. The American public no longer has the attention span required to follow a serial killer. Think about that, please. Don't you think it is convenient that crazy murderers decided to quit the serial thing and go in for the mass thing instead? So nice of them to change with the times, scripting their madness to fit the demands of the media!

As Ted Bundy goes, so goes [Jeffrey Dahmer](#), Ted Kaczinski, David Berkowitz, Richard Ramirez, Adam Lanza, James Holmes, Anders Breivik, and most of the other high-profile murderers.

*For an interesting cloaked exposé of this phenomenon, I recommend you to M. Night Shyamalan's film *The Village*. He is telling you that your bogeymen are faked.