

Cloning is a Hoax



by Gabriel Oak

March 20, 2024

That picture under title is the infamous Dolly the sheep with her “creator” Keith Campbell of the Roslin Institute. Without even diving deeper, we can already spot some spookiness in that photo. I’m talking about his ring, which is rather odd. It’s on his wedding finger, but it’s rather unusual for a wedding ring, having a large rectangular head. It is possibly masonic. His pose intentionally draws attention to it, reminding us that these elites love signaling one another. I also can’t help noticing his tie, which appears to have some sort of ancient Egyptian (or are they Phoenician?) paintings/engravings.

Miles: actually that is Sir Ian Wilmut above, though I can understand the confusion. The internet is a mess on this question, as we are about to see. This Keith Campbell:



You can see why many places are selling Wilmut as Campbell, since it makes it a bit less obvious. This is also Campbell.



They have scrubbed that photo now in most places, including Wikipedia. Wiki publishes no photos of him. As for Wilmut, that is almost certainly a purposeful misspelling of Wilmot, since they are baronets and barons. Wilmut is from Yorkshire and so are the Wilmot baronets, who live at Beck House, Great Broughton. The Wilmot baronets are also Nevilles, linking us to everyone else here.

Keith Campbell is really Keith Henry Stockman Campbell, which means we already have a big clue Keith is peerage: at least four names. **More may be hidden.** His first name and last name together are also a clue: the peerage Keiths and Campbells have been related since at least the early 1600s, when the 7th Earl of Argyll Archibald Campbell married Agnes Keith. Agnes was the first wife of James Stewart, regent of Scotland and half-brother of Mary Queen of Scots, tangling

them up with the topmost rat's nest of the British peerage – notably Stuart, Murray, Douglas, Hamilton, Forbes, Erskine, and **Villiers**. The name Stockman strengthens our case, since the only Stockmans in the peerage come from the Childs. They descend from Charlemagne, were deeply involved in the East India Company, and are still one of the oldest banking families in England, which is why they're so well-scrubbed from the peerage lists. We do know they're closely related to the Villiers – the Child-Villiers were Earls of the Island of Jersey. The Villiers link us back to the Keiths and Campbells.

Another clue is that Keith's own ancestry is untraceable. We aren't even given his parents' names, which is strange given his notoriety. We know that he attended the King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Boys starting at age 8. **Most people start school at 6 or 7, even in the UK, so even that is a marker.** It is a "highly selective" grammar school and "one of the most academically successful schools" in the UK, according to Wikipedia. In other words, a school for aristocrats. In 1983 Campbell was awarded the Marie Curie Research Scholarship, another sign of elite favor, and began working at the Roslin Institute in 1991, where he allegedly created Dolly the sheep five years later. Roslin, you should know, is a major spook institute. Its origins trace back to Edward Albert **Sharpey-Shafer** and Francis Albert **Eley Crew** (more aristocrats), who founded an animal breeding research station at the University of Edinburgh. The staff at the new institute was "illustrious" and included Sir Julian Huxley (below) of the prominent Huxley family – yes, that includes *Brave New World* author Aldous Huxley, who was Julian's brother.



Does that joker look like he did any real science in his life? Julian was the first Director of UNESCO (spook alert), founding member of the World Wildlife Fund (spook alert), president of the British Eugenics Society (spook alert), and first president of the British Humanist Society (spook alert). As if that wasn't enough, he received a "Special Award" from the Lasker Foundation (spook alert) in the category 'Planned Parenthood – World Population'. Yikes. Julian's grandfather Thomas Huxley is famous for coining both the terms "Darwinism" and "agnosticism" and was a close friend of Charles Darwin. This ties into Miles's recent research on both **Huxley** and **Darwin** – they were both complete frauds and spooks. What are the chances Thomas's grandson Julian wasn't also in the family business? In fact, the Roslin Institute's ties to the Huxleys is pretty damning, and it strongly suggests that the whole cloning program is just a continuation of the evolutionism/Darwinism project. It has nothing to do with science and

everything to do with blackwashing religion and creating chaos. As usual, these so-called humanists and naturalists are the most anti-human and anti-nature of all.

We can also link Campbell to the evolutionism project through the Villiers: both the *Beagle* captain Fitzroy and early evolutionist Robert Chambers were Villiers. So Campbell is just pimping his own family's long-running fraud. If my genealogy of Campbell is correct, he is a close cousin of Darwin and Huxley, being a Stuart. The peerage Campbells are Stuarts by another name.

Other early staffers at the Roslin Institute were James Davidson **Stuart** Cameron and Alexander **Murray** Drennan. Sharpey-Schafer's own career was bolstered by Sir John **Murray**. We may surmise from this that the Stuarts and Murrays had a heavy hand in Roslin and the whole Darwinist project. You see now why Dolly being the creation of a Keith/Campbell is no coincidence, since, as with the Villiers, he is also probably related to the Stuarts and Murrays.

Another major spook to come out of Roslin was Bertold Wiesner, a Jewish creep who allegedly fathered over 600 children by anonymously donating sperm to his wife's artificial insemination practice. He is known for developing the pregnancy test, hormone replacement therapy drugs, and oral contraceptives. His company was later bought by Pfizer. He also researched "parapsychological phenomena".


Albert Eley Crew, who was the first head of the institute, was also the first Professor of Animal Genetics at the University of Edinburgh, a chair that was **indirectly funded by the Rockefeller Foundation**. Since the institute was part of the university, we can assume Roslin itself was also "indirectly" funded by the Rockefellers. More damning evidence that the whole cloning project is not what we're told. All the founders of Roslin were Fellows of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and Crew himself won the society's coveted medal, the **Keith** Medal. No joke. It was named after Alexander Keith, cofounder of the RSE who came from the peerage Keiths, of course. It's looking less and less coincidental that a Keith supposedly cloned the first mammal, isn't it?

Keith Campbell's interest in cloning was inspired by the work of Sir John Bertrand Gurdon, who won the Nobel Prize for his work. Nobel Prizes are strictly given to Phoenicians, of course, and usually for the opposite reason given – think of Obama getting the Nobel Peace Prize. In the category of science, the Nobel is always given to those who do the most disservice to real science. Gurdon is just a slur of Gordon, linking us again to all the top British peerage families.

You will say all of this is neither here nor there, since I haven't addressed the actual fact of cloning. But we've seen too much of how the world works just to ignore the people behind these movements and projects and major events. These things always lead us to the same cadre of inbred Phoenicians, which means it is actually more logical and efficient to start with the *who* before answering the *what, how, or why*. Once we find *them*, all else is easily explained.

So let's hit the "science" of cloning, which we can deconstruct fairly easily. A clone is any living organism that is genetically identical to another organism. This requires that **both the nuclear DNA and mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) are identical**. By this definition, identical twins are technically clones. This fact immediately dispels much of the mystery and mystique of human cloning. Nature herself produces clones, even human clones, without any expensive technology. The more narrowly defined type of cloning, however, is the attempt to create a living organism with only one DNA source, that is, one genetic parent. This is called **parthenogenesis**.

Again, Nature is capable of parthenogenesis in certain species, but the question is whether this is possible in mammals, including humans. Which brings us to Dolly the sheep.



Already we're off to a suspicious start, since, well...how can you tell? That's just a picture of a sheep, isn't it? Could you tell that sheep apart from any other sheep of the same breed? No, which means the ability to fake a clone is quite easy. They never even give us a side-by-side of Dolly with her genetic parent to show she is an exact copy. But as we are soon told, **being a clone does not mean the animal looks identical to its genetic parent**. For example, the first cat allegedly to be cloned, named CC, is a female calico cat that looks very different from her mother. By the way, CC died on **3/3/2020** at age **18**. Note the numerology.



That's CC on the left, with her genetic parent, Rainbow, on the right. Very different coloration, as you can see. So how do we know these are really clones? I'm not the first one to ask this. Skepticism was first voiced, of all places, [in The New York Times](#):

In the five months since the clone named Dolly was announced, some scientists have begun to grumble. **How do we know the whole thing wasn't a hoax?** ... Among the most vocal is Dr. Norton Zinder, a professor of molecular genetics at Rockefeller University. The paper on the

cloning that led to Dolly, published in the Feb. 27 issue of Nature, was “a bad paper,” he thundered.

But even this skepticism is carefully curated. Notice we have a Zinder (Jewish) from Rockefeller University as our voice of opposition. Remember, the Roslin Institute was funded by the Rockefellers. The article goes on to answer its own question – no, of course it’s not a hoax – without presenting any actual evidence for that conclusion. It veers off into a discussion of the “real” question – whether Dolly was actually cloned using adult cells instead of embryonic cells – leaving the hoax question in the dust.

You may also like to know that Dolly was named after Dolly Parton. Why? Because the sheep was allegedly cloned from a cell taken from an udder. Udder = breast. So even the name tells us that this is all just a big joke.

Let’s take a closer look at the science, then, and see for ourselves if it checks out. [Here](#) is a good overview of the methodology, known as somatic cell nuclear transfer (SCNT):

This procedure starts with the removal of the chromosomes from an egg to create an enucleated egg. The chromosomes are replaced with a nucleus taken from a somatic (body) cell of the individual or embryo to be cloned... **The egg is then stimulated, and in some cases it starts to divide.** If that happens, a series of sequential cell divisions leads to the formation of a blastocyst, or preimplantation embryo. The blastocyst is then transferred to the uterus of an animal. The successful implantation of the blastocyst in a uterus can result in its further development, culminating sometimes in the birth of an animal. This animal will be a clone of the individual that was the donor of the nucleus. Its nuclear DNA has been inherited from only one genetic parent.

Miles: The egg is “stimulated”? That wording is peculiar. Stimulated how? With a bit of sperm, maybe? As long as your somatic chromosome is “accidentally” adulterated with some sperm cells you are golden, is my guess.

Easy enough. The only problem is, what about the mitochondrial DNA? That same source reminds us that true cloning requires both nuclear and mitochondrial DNA to be identical. But this procedure only allows for the transfer of nuclear DNA; where does the clone’s mtDNA originate? It turns out **mtDNA can only be inherited maternally.** You can’t get mtDNA from your father. This would seem to preclude the ability to clone male mammals, since the clone would have no mtDNA and therefore would not be a viable lifeform. And yet, amazingly, [they claim to have created male clones](#) from male somatic cells! That link takes you to a 1999 *Wired* article which states that male mammals had been cloned previously, but they were “derived from female reproductive cells.” If you hearken back to your high school biology class, you may remember that sex is determined by paternal DNA. Maternal DNA only contains X chromosomes, and the Y chromosome is what’s needed to create male offspring. Even Wikipedia spells this out plainly on its cloning page: “In species that use the XY sex-determination system, **the [cloned] offspring will always be female.**” So that *Wired* article is just yanking your chain, trusting you will be too mystified by the idea of cloning to use common sense.

That still doesn’t disprove the claim about Dolly. She was a female, after all. So let’s click over to the Wikipedia page on somatic cell nuclear transfer:

There is also the potential for treating diseases associated with mutations in mitochondrial DNA. Recent studies show SCNT of the nucleus of a body cell afflicted with one of these diseases into a healthy oocyte [egg cell] prevents the inheritance of the mitochondrial disease. This treatment does not involve cloning but would produce a child with three genetic parents. A

father providing a sperm cell, one mother providing the egg nucleus, and another mother providing the enucleated egg cell.

Read those last two sentences again and see if you can figure out the problem. Have you got it? In the process of cloning, the nucleus of the egg cell is removed. This “enucleated” cell is therefore supposedly stripped of its DNA. It’s replaced with the nucleus of another animal’s body cell, and the resulting embryo therefore contains genetic material from only one source. In other words, the egg cell itself should have no DNA, because if it did, the resulting organism wouldn’t be a clone since it would be getting DNA from two sources/parents. Now go back and read those two sentences again. The mother providing the enucleated egg cell is listed as one of the three *genetic* parents of this type of clone. They are admitting that the enucleated egg cell does, in fact, contribute DNA!

If you still don’t believe me, or you simply aren’t following the logic, take it from actual scientists. There are many who are still telling the truth, namely, that parthenogenesis (of which cloning is a type) is not possible in mammals. See peer-reviewed research [here](#) and [here](#), for a start:

We conclude that the maternal and paternal contributions to the embryonic genome in mammals are not equivalent and that a diploid **genome derived from only one of the two parental sexes is incapable of supporting complete embryogenesis.**

And...

Therefore, the cytoplasm of activated eggs is fully competent to support development to term but not if the genome is entirely of maternal origin. We propose that specific imprinting of the genome occurs during gametogenesis so that **the presence of both a male and a female pronucleus is essential in an egg for full-term development.**

In other words, you always and irrevocably need a mommy and a daddy to make a mammal. But wait, you say, those papers are both from 1984, and Dolly was created in 1996. So those earlier scientists thought mammalian cloning was impossible, but they were later proved wrong. Fair enough, so let’s try something more recent:

The ability of organisms to undergo parthenogenesis most likely indicates a complete absence of genomic imprinting as it shows the paternal genome is dispensable. In mammals, however, a direct consequence of imprinted gene expression controlling fetal growth is that parthenogenesis is not possible. **Both parents are necessary to produce viable offspring making mammals completely reliant on sexual reproduction to reproduce.** Parthenogenesis has thus not yet been observed in mammals **despite claims to the contrary...**

And...

These experiments show the necessity for both the maternal and paternal genome in mammalian reproduction, and indicate the **two parental genomes express different sets of genes needed for complete embryonic development.**

That’s from a [2014 paper](#) by Denise Barlow, a British geneticist. In case you think Barlow was some sort of quack, she was an elected member of the European Molecular Biology Organization (EMBO), an honorary professor of genetics at the University of Vienna, and a recipient of the

Erwin Schrödinger Prize of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. So what, you say, doesn't that just make her another spook? Possibly, but if so, why has her work received absolutely zero media attention, while Campbell and his cloned sheep are famous? My guess is that Barlow's research was useful to the powers that be in some way, so they let her quietly publish her work popping the balloon of the whole Dolly project, figuring the average person would never connect the dots. You may also like to know that Barlow looked bright and healthy in her old age...



...while Campbell died at 57 by “accidentally” hanging himself in his bedroom while heavily intoxicated. Our psyches keep the score. **Some kind of sex game?**

What about all the other claims of animal cloning? Have they all been faked? Let's look at the Wikipedia page for “commercial animal cloning”, which is written as if such a thing was already happening. Yet the one and only example it can give is the “Tianjin animal cloning center” slated to open in 2015. It admits that, as of 2022, the center hasn't opened. So, it's all a bluff. Why even have a page on it? It proceeds to tell us about cloning of extinct or endangered species. The only example it gives is a Pyrenean ibex cloned in Spain in 2003, which conveniently lived for only a few minutes because of major lung defects. Are there any pictures of the animal? Of course not. The page then dives into pet cloning, giving the example of Snuppy the dog, the world's first cloned pet. If we dig further, we learn that the scientist who successfully created Snuppy was Hwang Woo Sek. Unfortunately, Hwang is a notorious fraudster. He published two articles in the journal *Science* in 2004 and 2005, where he reported he had succeeded in creating human embryonic stem cells by cloning. It soon came out that **all his data was falsified**. He was later charged with embezzlement and bioethics law violations. He pretty much skated, though, and is still active. In fact, his company is behind the Tianjin animal cloning center that never materialized. So all this Wikipedia page proves is that mammalian cloning is entirely smoke and mirrors.

More evidence of that is the fact that it reportedly took 1,095 cloned embryos before one – Snuppy – resulted in a successful birth. But when they tried to clone Snuppy using two other cloned females as the birth moms, nine out of the ten embryos were successful. So they jumped from a 0.1% success rate to a 90% success rate practically overnight? Yeah, right. **They perfected their method of secretly adulterating with sperm, I guess.** And I remind you again of what is plainly stated over at Wikipedia to this day: even if mammalian cloning was possible, the clone

would *always be female*. Snuppy was a *male* Afghan hound. There's no continuity to their lies, as usual.

Also see Clonaid, a U.S. company that claimed to create the first human clone, a baby named Eve. Of course it was a complete fraud, but it appears to have been fraudulent by design. For starters, the woman behind Clonaid was a devout follower of the fake UFO religion known as Raëlism. Is that like *Israel*? Raëlism teaches that extraterrestrial species known as the Elohim (that's **Hebrew** for gods) created humans using advanced technology. In other words, it's another fake religion a la Zecharia Sitchin, concocted by Jewish intelligence agents and promoted 100% by actors. Its purpose is merely to derail you, to herd you off toward one of the countless dead ends they've built into their labyrinth. The only evidence you need is their emblem:



A Star of David combined with a swastika – oi vey! For its laboratory Clonaid used a rented room inside a former high school in West Virginia. You have to laugh. The FDA investigation stated that this lab was “state-of-the-art” and had been funded by Mark Hunt, a state legislator who wanted to clone his dead son. The FDA made him promise he wouldn't clone his dead son inside the U.S. Seriously? If you believe any of this, you should just go ahead and become a Raëlist.

Another big name in human cloning is Robert Lanza. He allegedly cloned the world's first early-stage human embryos and was the first to successfully generate stem cells from adults using SCNT. But his bio is the usual bluff. We're told he altered the genetics of chickens in his basement as a teenager and showed up on the doorstep of Harvard Medical School with the results, causing a big to-do among the researchers there. As you do. He was then personally mentored by B.F. Skinner and Jonas Salk (polio vaccine inventor) for the next ten years. In other words, he got all the special attention and byes of an elite. The presence of Skinner in his early bio is a huge red flag, since Skinner was a spook to the teeth. His biggest contribution to philosophy was behavioral determinism, claiming that free will is an illusion. Determinism is just an offshoot of the evolution project, the goal being to demote humans to mere animals or automatons. Despite this, Skinner was considered one of the foremost humanists, proving just how anti-human he was. His genealogy is well-scrubbed, but we do know he's related to Tim Dowling over at Geneanet, which means he is related to the Stuarts. Again, all in the family.

Lanza eventually made *Time's* 100 list and was interviewed by Barbara Walters – all sure signs of a spook and a fraud. He wrote a book called *Biocentrism* that was universally canned by both scientists and philosophers for containing no real science or philosophy.



The guy is so fake they don't even bother supplying real photos of him, giving us this bizarre paste-up instead. My gut says he's related to the Adam Lanza ghost, the fake Sandy Hook shooter, possibly being his uncle. Robert is from Boston, and Adam's father Peter also has Massachusetts on his list of former residences. Someone else may be able to dig up a connection in the databases.

Why fake all this cloning business, then? What's in it for them? While human cloning is impossible, I do think real scientific work is actually being done with stem cell research, but even that is not what we're told. For one thing, it's another massive drain on the public treasury. In California alone, over \$3 billion of tax funds have been poured into stem cell research since Prop 71 was passed in 2004. Supporters of Prop 71 circulated a study that claimed California would receive a windfall in royalties from all the cures and therapies to come from embryonic stem cell research. We're 20 years on: how is that windfall coming along? Californians ought to be outraged. In fact, they ought to sue the state for that \$3 billion plus inflation, and directly sue the individuals who pushed Prop 71 on the grounds of fraud, including Robert Klein the multi-millionaire slumlord who spearheaded the proposition, not to mention the numerous Hollywood celebrities who promoted it: Mary Tyler Moore, Michael J. Fox, Jerry Zucker, and Kevin Kline, for starters.

But that's not to say stem cell research is a fraud. On the contrary, the elites think it will benefit them greatly, because **they want to stop aging**. That's what this whole stem cell business is about. See [this CNN article](#), for example:

It turns out, the best kind of anti-aging treatment is inside one's own body, and the rich are taking advantage of it, exploring the latest research in new technologies, genome mapping and stem cell treatments.

Among them is Oracle billionaire Larry Ellison, a large investor of the Ellison Medical Foundation, which supports research exploring the biology that underlies aging and age-related diseases. And there's billionaire Peter Nygård, who says he wants to live forever (or die trying), and has suggested he's found the keys to immortality in stem cell research.

Google has also sunk \$1 billion into anti-aging science through its California Life Company (Calico). Peter Thiel, cofounder of PayPal, has also poured millions into the Methuselah Foundation. Then there's the recently launched Altos Labs, backed by Jeff Bezos and Israeli billionaire Yuri Milner, which specializes in cell reprogramming techniques to reverse aging. Meanwhile, clinics are now offering to store your own stem cells for up to \$60,000 for initial extraction with annual storage fees in the thousands. Thiel and other billionaires have also

signed up with the Alcor Life Extension Foundation, which has been freezing dead people's bodies since 1976. These technologies are only available to the super-wealthy, which means they're using your money – via taxes or stock funds – to finance their own mad desire for immortality.

And why do they want to live forever? Not because they love life, of course, but simply because they can't stand death. They're terrified of it, because they know they will have to pay the piper for their many misdeeds on this earth. We've seen how rapidly they age due to their diseased souls, and so they want to pull a Dorian Gray, which only shows how misguided they are. Far better to take care of your existing cells by living a healthy life and spending your energies on things that matter, than to constantly replace them with new cells that you'll just as quickly damage. Their own materialism has blinded them to the way DNA really works. We've known for a long time that our genotypes are influenced by our phenotypes and by epigenetics, that is, by things outside of our genes. If they really understood this, they would understand why they all start shriveling up and rapidly falling apart at middle age. Their corrupt spirits are in turn corrupting their bodies, and no amount of blood transfusions or stem cell injections can fix that. Nor can they make their bodies immortal. But even if they could, why would that be desirable? Nature intends for our bodies to die for very good reasons, one of which is that our spirits can't move on to the next phase of their existence if they are trapped in these bodies indefinitely. Our mortal coil was meant to be shed and its energies returned to the earth, to be taken up by other lifeforms coming into existence. This earth is just a leg of the journey, like an inn by the roadside; you use its amenities respectfully and then you leave to make room for the travelers behind you. Only a soul that is traveling backwards would wish to avoid death.

What, then, about the cloning hoax? It's also easily explained, since it dovetails perfectly with all the ongoing projects against humanity. Cloning would prove that men and women don't even need each other biologically – a further splitting of the sexes. That's one big reason behind it. Cloning is also anti-Christian and anti-spiritual, since it calls into question the very definition of life, and especially of human life. In this way it is a child of the evolution project and a twin sibling to the determinism project, as I've already noted. As with the notion that humans evolved from primordial slime or that free will is an illusion, accepting the notion that human life comes down to some genetic code that can be replicated in a lab makes human life itself appear cheap and insignificant. It de-spiritualizes human life. The practical effect is to make society more materialistic, more manipulable, and more compliant.

It's also part of the Men-are-Pigs Project, or more specifically here the Men-are-Superfluous Project. The feminists have been telling us they don't need men anymore, just a few of our best swimmers, but cloning takes that to the next level, since you will have noticed it supposedly bypasses sperm altogether. They are claiming to make life without men. With cloning, men become completely unnecessary, sexually and otherwise. This not only suits the neo-feminism project down to the ground, if true it would make males extinct. Which would suit the Phoenicians, who are rightly scared of us. We have all the testosterone and therefore it is we who would lead any revolution against them. Clearly, among all their other wretched dreams, they dream about being the only men left on the Earth. My guess is they still won't be able to get any dates by natural means, having to continue to purchase them.