

BITS and BOBS

by Miles Mathis

July 19, 2018

Yes, I am using the British term for my title, just because I can. And just to piss off you-know-who. This will be a collection of smaller, dislocated facts that are nonetheless pertinent to our ongoing investigation.

You may know that Simon Cowell and Sting have been feuding for several years. What you may not know is that Sting's real name is Gordon Sumner, and that his mother's name is. . . Audrey Cowell, daughter of Edgar Cowell, son of James Cowell, son of William Cowell, son of Thomas Cowell. The Cowells are from Wallsend/North Shields, **Tyne and Wear**, and before that from **Isle of Man**. The Cowells continued to do well for themselves in the 20th century, [marrying into the Drummond/Berkeley/Murray/Russell/Stanley/Stewart family](#) in 1967. These are the Drummonds, Viscounts Strathallan; Murrays, Marquesses of Atholl; Stanleys, Earls of Derby; and Stewarts, Earls of Atholl. In 1951 the Cowells married into the Curtis/Tennant family. That is the Curtis Baronets, and the Barons Tennant. They are related to the Pagets, Campbells, Monktons, etc.

Sting's Sumners also go back to Sunderland, Tyne and Wear. [The Gibsons were wealthy merchants](#) in Sunderland back to the 1700s, which is interesting because the Sumners in the peerage married the Gibsons several times. Most Reverend John Bird Sumner was Archbishop of Canterbury in the mid-1800s, and his son Jonathan married Elizabeth Gibson. Curiously, his daughter Elizabeth Sumner married William Gibson. Their son was the famous cricketer John Sumner Gibson. Some of his siblings used the name Sumner-Gibson. These people may be related to Mel Gibson.

In about 1850, Frances Sumner married a Hamilton and their son became John Hamilton, Viscount Sumner, who became Treasurer of the Inner Temple. This of course links the Sumners to the other Hamiltons of the peerage, especially the iron merchants of Manchester. Being Treasurer of the Inner Temple links them to the bankers and cloth merchants of the City of London, as well as to the East India Company.

In 1973 Johanna Sumner married Lord Wellesley, son of the 8th Duke of Wellington. Curiously her history is scrubbed at the peerage. We are supposed to believe a nobody married the son of Duke. Also curious is that this 8th Duke of Wellington married Diana Ruth McConnel **in Jerusalem**. I will be told it is because the bride's father was Maj. Gen. Douglas Fitzgerald McConnel, Commanding Officer of Palestine and Trans-Jordan, but that doesn't really explain it, does it? It just gives us more things to explain. Also interesting is that this general had a twin who supposedly died at age 15. Lord Wellesley's brother, the 9th Duke, married the Princess of Prussia, great-granddaughter of Emperor Wilhelm II. Which means Johanna Sumner was a sort of sister-in-law to the Princess. We also link directly to the Guinnesses, since the Princess' grandfather was the Earl of Iveagh. Of course this Prussian Princess is also in the line of succession the *English* crown, since Wilhelm II was the grandson of Queen Victoria. Which links the Sumners to the English and German crowns both.

If you don't think any of this could link us to a pop star, hold on to your shorts. Remember James Blunt, the little guy who sang "You are Beautiful" and then jumped off the cliff into icy water? He

married the daughter of the Duke's brother. So the 9th Duke of Wellington is his uncle. Johanna Sumner is one of his aunts. So if I am right and Sting is of these Sumners, Blunt and Sting are closely related by marriage.

In 1949 [John Sumner](#) married the daughter of Henry Ludwig Mond, 2nd Baronet Melchett. This also links us immediately to the Grahams, Dunbars, and Balls, which links us back to old George Washington.

Simon Cowell's partner Lauren Silverman is Jewish, but Simon claims he isn't. Strange, since his father is admitted to be Jewish. Wikipedia claims his father didn't discuss his background with his children. Right. Although Simon's father agreed to put his name on the birth certificate, the couple [was not married at the time](#). In fact, Eric Cowell was still married to another woman at the time, making the birth certificate fraudulent. Eric Cowell later became a recording executive at EMI, so Simon didn't come out of nowhere. Simon is also a Levy and a Malinsky via his grandparents. He is also an Allerton and a Rice. The Allertons are also in the peerage. See for example Air Vice Marshal Richard Allerton, d. 2008, who married a Campbell of the Mackenzie Baronets. Simon's family came from Brighton in Sussex, which is interesting since the Cowells of the peerage also came from there, going back centuries. See [William Cowell](#), b. 1803, at the Park, Brighton, Sussex. His father was General Andrew Cowell and his mother was of the Stepney Baronets.



That's General Cowell, also known as Conehead the Barbarian. Just kidding. His other son (William's brother) became the Baronet Cowell-Stepney. William's daughter Una married the Baron von Dachenhausen, and their son married Ellen Jones, whose brother was Edwin Jones of the famous Edwin Jones stores (later Debenham's). Edwin married a Fanny White, daughter of a **Jacobs**. The Whites were also **Abbotts**, **Stewarts**, Hoares and Dusautoys. The Jones hail back to the Jones Baronets. [These Jones Baronets are scrubbed](#). We have seen that before with these Baronets, though rarely this obviously. Sir Henry Jones, Baronet, is listed, but is given no parents or bio. This person is also scrubbed at Wikipedia. We do know these Jones were related to the Vaughans. The early Jones are also not mentioned by Burke's peerage, which is curious, though they may have originally been Wakes. I have hit these Jones several times, the first time in my paper on Obama and the Dunhams.

[Another Cowell of Brighton](#) married into the peerage in 1890, becoming the wife of the Baronet Blaker. Their grandson married a **Russell** in 1968. Her father was Col. John Tinsley Russell, DSO.

It is also worth looking at Maj. General Rt. Hon. Sir John Clayton Cowell, no wife given at the peerage, whose daughter Alice married the son of Earl Howe in 1892. This linked her to the Gores and Montagus as well, seeing that Howe's mother was a **Gore**, daughter of a **Montagu**. The Montagues link us to George Washington. Her father was Vice Admiral Gore, KCB. General Cowell was also Privy Chamber and KCB. He was governor of Prince Alfred and later became Lt. Governor of Windsor Castle. Wikipedia tells us he also had a son (denied at the peerage) Albert Cowell who succeeded to the Clifton Castle estate, Yorkshire. It remained with the Cowells until 1970, when it went to the Hills, Marquesses of Downshire. Alice Cowell's daughter married a Hussey son of a **Peel**, linking us to Home Secretary and Prime Minister Robert Peel, 2nd Baronet—who is on the cover of *Sgt. Peppers*. Of course this links Simon Cowell to the spook music business again, so you begin to see where he came from.

Augusta Cowell married an Irby, Baron Boston, in 1849. This makes her the stepmother of many Irbys, and links her to the Powells, Rhodes, Townsends, Windsors, Metheuns, Cobbs, and Champion de Crespignys.

In 1964, Elizabeth Cowell of the peerage married Captain Fane, son of Hon. Harriet Hepburn-Stewart-Forbes-Trefusis, of the Barons Clinton. [Harriet's sister married a Bowes-Lyon](#), linking us directly to the Queen, whose mother was a Bowes-Lyon (Earls of Strathmore and Kinghorne). They were also Cavendish-Bentincks. This may link Simon Cowell to the Queen.

Elizabeth Cowell married a **Balfour** in 1942.

Simon's mother is named Josie Dalglish, which is also a Jewish name. See for instance Peter Dalglish, famous Canadian “humanitarian” and WHO bigwig recently charged with raping two boys in Nepal. The name was originally Dalgleish, Scots related to the Douglasses, Campbells, Guinnesses, Scotts and other top families. See *When Scotland was Jewish*, written by Jews. Many Dalgleishs are listed in the peerage. One was solicitor for Kings Charles I and Charles II. Since we saw the Guinnesses already above related to the Cowells, it probably indicates Simon's parents are close cousins.

So it looks like both Simon Cowell and Sting have had their links to the peerage scrubbed and that their recent feud was manufactured to give them more publicity.

Today I looked up another 19th century author, Andrew Lang. He and his wife are most famous for the 12 colored Fairy Books they put out from about 1890 to 1905. Turns out Lang's father was a Sellar, and we looked at them before (when I did Tom Selleck, Peter Sellers, etc.). Lang's father was a banker for the Leveson-Gowers, Dukes of Sutherland. Mrs. Lang was actually an Alleyne, of the merchants and plantation owners of Barbados, also Baronets. Her uncle was the 3rd Baronet, and her first cousin married the Baronet FitzHerbert. The 3rd Baronet Alleyne was a billionaire not only from sugar, but from steel milling patents.

This led me to look at the Leveson-Gowers. If you think Leveson is just a variant of Levinson, you are correct. The Levesons took over the Gower Baronets in about 1640 and turned them into Dukes by 1833. The Levesons were top London mercers back to the 1400s, and in the 1500s they immediately doubled their power by marrying another top mercer family, the Greshams. See for instance Sir John Gresham, who supplied silks to Henry VIII and Cardinal Wolsey before becoming Lord Mayor of

London. His brother Richard also became Lord Mayor of London. They were involved with the Merchant Adventurers, a prelude to the East India Company, and were heads of the Worshipful Company of Mercers, the premier livery company of the City of London. So you can see how London has been owned and run for centuries by Jewish merchants (and still is).

As for the Levesons, they were also trustees of the Globe Theater, working with Shakespeare, Pope, Augustine **Phillips**, and those folks—more indication that whole thing was another Jewish project. By the way, interesting to see a Phillips having a 1/8th share in the Globe, isn't it?

In the 1500s the Levesons also linked themselves by marriage to the Temple Baronets, the Newport Barons, and the Brooke Barons. Also to the Savile Earls and Villiers Earls, who became stepfathers to several Levesons. And when Richard Leveson became Vice Admiral, he married a Howard, daughter of that Earl. My guess is that none of these marriages was outside the faith.

The Vice Admiral's story is an interesting one, since it reminds us of many others. One of his enemies, Sackville, Earl of Dorset, became Lord High Treasurer and targeted Leveson's wealth and that of his family. We have seen the wealthy attack their own over and over, recently with the raid on Khashoggi's wealth, and even more recently with the attempted raid on Philip Anschutz. Such is the world of piracy, I guess. No matter how wealthy you become, you are never secure from a raid from above; and we must assume that the top family is not secure from raids from below. Anyway, the Vice Admiral's story is most interesting for the admitted piracy it involved. As the mainstream admits, it came out in testimony at the time that Sir Richard Leveson was only faking poverty to avoid the bulk of the raid by Sackville. In reality, Leveson had stolen millions in pearls and calico from Portuguese carracks (ships) and squirreled them away in hidden vaults (the loot should have gone to the Queen, you know). Since we know the Levesons survived this raid quite well, we may assume the story is true. The pirates in the Treasury can only steal what they can find. More indication of this is that although the Levesons were supposed to be devastated financially at this time, Sir Richard's nephew and heir nonetheless rebuilt the family seat at Trentham Hall just a few years later (1630)—indicating he was not short of money.

Lady Gaga's real name is Stefani Germanotta. Her mother is a Bissett, and Gaga is closely related to actress Jacqueline Bisset. The Bissetts are related to the Brownrigg Baronets, the Lethbridge Baronets, the Hoare Baronets (Jennifer Aniston), the Alcocks, the Gibbs Barons, the Edgcumbe Earls, the Stewarts, and the von Borosinis. These Gibbs descend directly from Antony Gibbs, Merchants of London. They later married the Ritchies, the Durants, the Gascoyne-Cecil Marquesses, the Crawley-Boevey Baronets, the Beresford-Hope Earls, the Adams, etc. Amusingly, the 5th Baronet Brownrigg was married to a woman named Linda Lovelace in 1959. The Bissetts of the peerage moved to New York City in the past century, and Lady Gaga was born there in 1986.

As for the Bissets, they were Earls of Fife back to the 1300s, when they married into the MacDuff clan. They are also related to the **Balfours**, the Abercromby Baronets, the Sutherlands, the Brabazons, the Haliburtons, the **Stewarts**, the Murrays, the Trelawney Baronets, the Wardlaw Baronets, the Maude Viscounts, the Loftus Marquesses, and the Turners. In 1947 the Bissets married the Listers, linking them to the **Villiers**, Earls of Clarendon.

Lady Gaga's dad is very wealthy, and not from managing her. He founded a company that installs wifi in hotels. Beyond that, his mother is a Calderone from Italy. That should ring a bell. Remember the

famous Calderones, mafiosos who ran Sicily? Gaga is also a Burghardt, which is more commonly spelled Burckhardt or Bourchard, cloth merchants who have run Basel since the 1400s. In later centuries they branched out to Naples and . . . Sicily. This proves once again the mafia was never what we are told. We are led to believe it was always composed of lower-class crooks who combined and made it big. It wasn't. Even before the mafias of the world were absorbed by the governments in the 20th century, they were composed of the same families who ran and owned everything else. Meaning, they were crypto-Jewish merchants hiding behind local names and organizations. Not only is the Jewish mob Jewish, the Irish mob is Jewish, the Italian mob is Jewish, the Russian mob is Jewish, and we may assume the Chinese mob is also Jewish. And for the most part they don't compete. That is just for Hollywood. Like the Intel agencies, they coordinate worldwide to maximize the theft and graft.

So, although Gaga is sold to you like Madonna, as an Italian Catholic, like Madonna she is really Jewish. I know, you are shocked. And you thought that long Jewish nose she has was just a trick of the light. [You should have seen it before the nose job.](#)

Donald Trump allegedly pardoned the Hammonds last week. I say allegedly because the whole story is part of a long running fake project. It concerns the Bundys and Hammonds in Oregon, as part of that whole highly publicized series of standoffs going back to 2014. It is supposed to be between cattlemen and the Feds, but it is another manufactured and staged play, meant to keep your eyes off other things. Trump didn't really need to pardon anyone, since this entire saga has been another hoax. I can tell this just from the names, and you should have caught those, too. Hammond and Bundy. Top families we have seen many times. The Hammonds we saw in my paper on Bob Dylan, since a Hammond was head of Columbia Records, being the man behind both Dylan and Leonard Cohen. The Bundys we saw in my paper on Ted Bundy, who spent some time in the Northwest, as we know. He was in nearby Washington state, pushing forward various projects in the 60s and 70s. He was at Washington State and then worked on Rockefeller's campaign in Seattle. He was actually a Rockefeller delegate in 1968. Amazingly, this links us back to Simon Cowell above, since Bundy is supposed to have been born as Theodore **Cowell**. What are the odds?

In that paper I linked Ted Bundy to McGeorge Bundy, a head of the CIA. So we have all sorts of obvious red flags in this story about the standoff in Oregon. The Bundys involved there are Ammon and Cliven Bundy. We get another clue very fast, since Cliven's wife is Carol **Turner**. Another name from the same families. Ammon Bundy was the leader of the occupation in Oregon, which is curious since before that he was a car fleet manager living in Arizona. His father Cliven Bundy was born in **1946**, and these [Bundys of Utah](#) are related to **Russells** who came from Vermont in the mid-1800s. The CIA Bundys are also from Vermont, and Ted Bundy has links to Vermont—being born in Burlington. This means the Bundys in Utah are (posing as) Mormons. However, since the Mormons were created by Jews and now often act as a front for them, you see how it goes. These Bundys are also related to the Funks and Barnums. And, as [Las Vegas Now reported](#) in 2016, they are also related to **Abbotts** and Leavitts. The Abbotts we have seen many times before in these hoaxed events, and Leavitt is an old Jewish name, a variation of Levy. The name Abbott also confirms my link to the east-coast CIA Bundys, since those Bundys had a branch that was part of the Boston Brahmins, along with the Abbotts. The Abbotts are not on the main [Brahmin list at Wikipedia](#), but like the Bennetts, Ayres, Edsons, and several others, they either should be on the list or exist just off it. However, the name **Dwight** is on the Brahmin list, so keep that in mind. You are about to see it again.

Perhaps the best way to see that this was all staged is by the fact that all charges in the Bundy standoff were later dropped “due to prosecutorial misconduct”. Right. That's convenient, isn't it? It fits perfectly with all the other fake trials we have unwound. In the Malheur NWR occupation, Ammon Bundy was acquitted on all charges. My guess is these people didn't spend one minute in jail.

Here's another way you can tell it was fake. Go to the Wiki page for the Bundy standoff, and note that it began in April 2014 when armed protestors demanded their confiscated cattle back from BLM and local sheriffs. We are supposed to believe the Feds backed down, releasing the cattle. No arrests were made, no citations issued, and nothing was done about overdue grazing fees. Bundy took the cattle right back out onto the federal lands and continued to graze them, despite being forbidden by court order from doing so since 1998. Does that sound like a true story to you? The Feds just failed to enforce a court order for 16 years, and when they finally got around to confiscating the cattle, they just gave them back when Bundy and some friends showed up with guns? Sure. Even more risible is that we are told the BLM had cancelled a cattle roundup in 2012 when Bundy threatened them with violence. Funny, because I thought that threatening government officials with violence was a serious offense. According to this mainstream story, it isn't. We are told the County Sheriff's Dept. wouldn't help BLM because the court order had become “stale”. Really? We are supposed to believe that? We are supposed to believe the BLM, a federal agency, relies on the gunpower of local Sheriffs? BLM can't call in back-up from the FBI, the military or the National Guard? That's not what we were led to believe in Waco in 1993, was it? There we were taught that if you cross any federal agency they send in the stormtroopers and burn you up with your children, down to the last babe in swaddling clothes.

Another way you can tell it was fake? *Two days* after the confrontation of April 2014, Cliven Bundy appeared on both Sean Hannity's and Glenn Beck's national programs, demanding that locals “disarm the federal bureaucrats”. Right. Who believes this stuff? He calls for armed insurrection on national TV and we are supposed to believe the USGov just looks the other way? I *encourage* you to read the long Wikipedia page on this event and see if it makes any sense. That may be easier for you to do now that four years have passed.

More clues come from the linked Las Vegas shootings in June of 2014, where the Millers supposedly shot two police officers in cold blood at a pizza parlor. Guess what one of the officer's name was. . . Beck. A cousin of Glenn Beck, maybe? And who was Jerad Miller? An actor. The mainstream admits he was working as a street performer just before these events transpired. But that's not suspicious, is it? Ask yourself this: why are we not supposed to think this event was just another street performance, bankrolled this time by the Feds? Just three months earlier, he had—we are told—sent messages to the local DMV, threatening to kill anyone who showed up to arrest him for having a suspended driver's license. They are testing you again with that story. What is wrong with it? One, they don't show up at your house to arrest you for a suspended driver's license. They have to catch you driving illegally, don't they? If you don't want to get arrested, all you have to do is walk or ride your bike. Two, if you threaten State employees in any way, they send a sheriff out to arrest you. If you have a previous record—as Miller is supposed to have had—they not only charge you with the appropriate crime (assault, etc.), they keep you in jail as a precaution until the trial. Otherwise you might drive your car through the front glass at the DMV and hurt or kill someone. So, according to the given story, Miller shouldn't even have been on the street in June of 2014. He should have been in jail awaiting trial for threatening State workers.

More clues come from the other leader along with Ammon Bundy. His sidekick was named Ryan **Payne**. Hmmm. A Payne involved. The Paynes are from the same families, aren't they? See Payne Stewart in my paper on Tiger Woods. They have been billionaires for generations, and are related to all

the Presidents, including Abraham Lincoln.

Which brings us back to the Hammonds. The elder Hammond in this story is named **Dwight Lincoln** Hammond. I guess you caught that middle name. This confirms we have the right Hammonds, since the famous Hammonds are closely related to the Lincolns. For instance, John Hammond the Columbia head was the son of a Vanderbilt. With that in mind, go to the Wiki page for Amy Vanderbilt, where you will find one of her sons was **Lincoln** Gill Clark. All of those names are family names, and the Lincolns are closely related to the Clarks via the Todds. Mary Todd Lincoln's close relatives were Clarks. They don't want you to know this, which is why they scrub the Hammonds at Geni.com. They refuse to tell us the paternal grandparents of John Henry Hammond II. But we can walk around that easily, by going to Wiki, which has a page for a different James Henry Hammond. Yes, John Hammond Jr.'s father was named James Henry Hammond, which should look strange. How can John Henry Hammond be a II if his father is named James Henry Hammond? Anyway, the James Henry Hammond at Wiki is a generation or two too early, but the name can't be a coincidence. He is from the same family, being from South Carolina. His Hammonds are related to Fitzsimmons, Hamptons, and Fishers, telling us again we are on the right track. Anyway, this Hammond's parents were Elisha Hammond and Catherine **Fox** Spann. The name Fox again tells us we are in the right place. The Hamptons and Hammonds were among the wealthiest plantation owners in the South prior to the Civil War, and the Foxes are old Jewish money as well (though normally hiding behind Quakers).

I hope you also caught the first name of Hammond, which was Dwight. All three of his names are surnames, you see, and I reminded you above that Dwight was on the list of Boston Brahmins. Not a coincidence, as you now understand.

We can also link the Hammonds and the Bundys through the name Lincoln, since *both* are related to Lincolns. See [William Lincoln Bundy](#), d. 1940, in the line of Cliven Bundy. He married a Burton whose sister married a Vanderpool. They are also related to MacArthurs, Reeds, and Lymans, which takes us back to the Boston Brahmins again. They are also related to the Iversons and Morrisons, including Walter Morrison who invented the frisbee. No doubt this takes us directly to Jim Morrison of the Doors and his father Admiral Morrison of the Gulf of Tonkin hoax.

This also links us to [Phil Lyman](#), who was involved in the BLM fracas and allegedly sentenced to ten days in jail in 2015. If you remember, he was the San Juan County Commissioner, but nonetheless allegedly took the side of the protestors, becoming personally involved. He and others organized an ATV ride in Recapture Canyon in Utah. Well, his name is another red flag here. Like the Bundys, the Lymans are another prominent Boston Brahmin family going back centuries. This indicates that Lyman, the Hammonds, and the Bundys were all cousins, hired to appear in this stageplay by its directors.

I got scolded by an old lady today for giving away kittens. She said what I was doing "wasn't right". I guess it takes a special sort of person to harass someone for having kittens. She said the animal shelter had plenty of kittens and I was "competing with them". Well, I support the animal shelter, but I don't see that I am competing with them. I am just providing a different service. I am a different sort of husband. I told her there were a lot of children who need to be adopted as well, but that doesn't mean people should stop having children. I asked her if she also harassed people with children, telling them what they were doing wasn't right. She said there were already too many cats in the world. She is a

real animal lover, as you see. I asked her if she knew how many domestic cats were actually in the world. She didn't. The answer is about a billion. That's indeed a lot, but there are about seven times more people in the world than cats, and each person does about 100,000 times more harm to the environment than any cat ever could. So by her logic, she really needs to get busy scolding every person she meets who has a child.

Do you think cats use plastic straws? Do they drive cars? Did they create a pile of trash in the middle of the Pacific five times larger than Texas? Are they knocking the tops off mountains in order to mine? Are they clearing rainforests so that they can eat hamburgers? Are they hoarding wealth by the trillions, so that billions have to starve? Not the last time I checked. I think we have larger problems than a few kittens.

One guy told me that he doesn't like cats because they damage the bird populations. In the big cities that is partially true; but again, people do far more damage to all bird populations than any number of cats could do. Think of the number of birds killed by cars, as just a start. Do you think this guy didn't have a car? Think again. I am only responsible for my own cats, anyway, and they rarely kill birds. They prefer mice, which are far easier to catch. They kill twenty or thirty mice for every one bird. And because I feed them raw—including organ meats and bones—they don't catch many mice, either, because they don't need the nutrition.

Beyond that, the first lady had no idea who she was talking to, and didn't bother to find out. If I had been raising kittens to sell to pet shops, so that they could be fed to snakes, I would deserve a lecture (and an arrest). If I was giving them away to the first kid on drugs that walked up, so that he could dump them after a few weeks, I would deserve a lecture. If I was dumping more kittens on the shelter, I would deserve a lecture. But I am not. I raise these kittens with love and find them homes as “organic kittens”. That means I don't vaccinate them, don't fix them, and feed them raw food. So they are much healthier than the kittens at the shelter—who are vaccinated, fixed way too early, and fed garbage. I question anyone who wants to adopt one, to be sure the cats can go outside, will eat mostly raw, and won't be vaccinated. I realize some people will have to fix their cats, but I school them on the proper way to do that, waiting as long as possible. Cats who are fixed before they have matured have health problems later, including skeletal issues. I also tell them the truth: despite the small glut of kittens at the shelter, Taos is not overpopulated with cats like some cities are. So they can have kittens if they like. I even offer to help them find homes for them. It isn't difficult here. There is a large turnover to the coyotes, so people need new kittens.

I actually spread as much joy as anyone in Taos, and it is all due to my kittens. Almost everyday I run into my previous clients, who are keen to tell me how their babies are doing and to confirm that I have the sweetest kittens in town. I do, and it is because they are raised right. Not only do they get good food, they live in a peaceful house where they get a lot of loving attention. They get to stay with mamma for 12 weeks, not just six like many kittens, so they are very well adjusted. The extra weeks of nursing make a huge difference, not only in health but in happiness.

Some will say I am feeding the coyotes if not the snakes, but I don't see it that way. We all feed the worms, but that is no reason not to be born. You have to remember that domestic cats have a very high fertility rate, which is somewhat strange for a predator. So Nature has decided this for us, and she is far more wise than we could ever be. She knows that small predators have a high mortality rate. They can't all live and we shouldn't expect them to. But it is better they are born and have whatever life they are meant to have. That is the way of things. Just because they can't all live to 30 is no reason to fix them. I don't fix my cats for the same reason I wouldn't fix myself or my children. I find it grisly and

grotesque. Yes, it means I am going to lose some to the coyotes and owls and cars, but I can deal with that. It is better than not having kittens or cats at all, isn't it? Cats really do have nine lives anyway. We all do. We all have far more than nine. They will be back and so will we.

But I shouldn't have to explain this to everyone I meet, or *anyone* I meet. I don't have to justify myself to any busybody sourpuss old lady, so if I take such unasked-for advice with an ill humor, now you know why.

Also interesting to see that [Randi Zuckerberg is criticizing her brother Mark this week for defending free speech](#). She is suggesting the US join some European countries in banning Holocaust denial. This is obviously a manufactured event, to allow her to do just that. No real people are outraged that Mark Zuckerberg defended Holocaust deniers, since there is nothing offensive about what he said. Free speech is nothing more than Constitutional law in the US, and always has been. The Zuckerbergs manufactured this whole controversy, just so that Randi could promote a ban on free speech. Which should be far more offensive to average Americans, and probably is. All the people in the media pretending to be outraged at Zuckerberg's comments are simply planted mouthpieces, and this entire event was manufactured and staged like everything else in the news. It indicates the fascists are feeling the heat, and their answer of course is to turn up the fascism. If people aren't buying the old lies, *force* them to buy the lies at gunpoint. It won't work, since the US *can't* pass a ban on any free speech or any idea without overturning the entire Constitution. Not even I believe they are about to do that. Since they can't do that, they are trying to do the next best thing: *if you can't change the laws, change the customs*. They are trying to change the way you think by hitting you with this 24-7 barrage of propaganda. They want to convince you that those who question the mainstream on any topic are bad people, so they hammer away at these stories day in day out. But it isn't working. Why isn't it working? Because in order for it to work, the masses have to trust/respect those doing the hammering. No one trusts the Zuckerbergs and no one ever will, so Randi Zuckerberg isn't a good spokeswoman. Her propaganda is worthless and it will never stick.

That can be said about all these people in the news now. Everyone can tell they are transparent fronts for the powers-that-be, so their words don't have any weight. They and their families have been caught lying over and over about everything, so why should anyone believe them about the Holocaust or anything else? The answer: no one does. It isn't just the Holocaust that people are denying these days, it is *everything*. Sensible people are seeing that nothing about recent history makes any sense, so why believe it? If it is full of contradictions and isn't believable, why believe it? Even if the government overturned the Constitution and banned questioning government stories, it wouldn't make any difference. It might prevent the publication of some ideas online, but it wouldn't prevent people from believing what they believe or talking to their neighbors. You can't legislate that.

That is the real problem of people like Randi Zuckerberg. Not only can you not police what people think, once you have lost their trust you can't even *influence* their thoughts anymore. The propaganda doesn't work anymore, and that is what really concerns them. But as I have said many time before, it is their own fault. They had a pretty good propaganda machine working up until 2001, but they broke it by their own actions. CIA allowed DHS to come in and use their tools, and DHS broke those tools. There have simply been too many flubbed projects since 2001, and that isn't the fault of any Holocaust deniers. That is the fault of Intel itself. The problem goes far beyond Holocaust denial, since they would also have to address 911 denial, Sandy Hook denial, Manson denial, Hitler denial, Lenin denial,

Cold War denial, Bay of Pigs denial, Castro denial, Kennedy denial, Hawking denial, MLK denial, serial killer denial, and news denial. People don't believe the news anymore, period. So what are the governors going to do about that? Are they going to pass a law to force you to believe the news? How will that work?

I will be told they are preparing for the onset of a *1984*-style control grid, but I don't think they are. If they are, they are going about it the wrong way. The time to slip into that scheme was back in the 1950s, when everyone believed what they were told. In that case, ramping up the propaganda and having it believed was at least a possibility. But as it now stands, there is no possibility the masses are going to fall for such a naïve scheme. They aren't going to sit in front of some large screen and buy even bigger lies than they are already being sold. You don't implement *1984* when everyone is already suspicious. You have to ease into that scenario from a position of trust. You can't blast into it from a position of distrust, because if your audience balks the whole plan fails from the first moment.

The governors already have a vast control grid in place, but the problem is it is failing. It relies on incredible levels of propaganda, but the lies aren't being swallowed. Successful propaganda requires trust, and all trust is gone. So the governors are now just relying on your inertia, which they make sure to supplement with as much drugging and confusion as possible. This is why they mothballed the just-say-no campaigns and switched to just-say-yes campaigns. This is why many States are legalizing marijuana and why they are watering down laws against other drugs. This is why they have made street mj much stronger. They are quite happy for you to be stoned out of your gourd. But of course you can counter that plan as well, by not buying the stuff. Stay lucid, friends, it is your only hope.

So, what *will* they do next? If the past is any indication, and it always is, they will continue to work undercover, scurrying about in the dark as much as possible. I don't expect to see them make any direct attack on your freedoms, since that would be counterproductive. Instead, they will try to continue to undermine your power and your sanity as much as possible. But once you know what they are up to, this is very difficult for them.

A different question: what *should* they do next? Well, since the current schemes aren't working, they should give them up completely and go another way. I am not suggesting they should turn themselves in and stand trial for all the crimes, since there is no chance that will happen. I am suggesting they should slowly ease into a plan B, by which they take the heat off themselves by taking the heat off of us. If they change their plan of governance from a plan of wholesale looting to a plan of beneficent governance, everyone will be happier, including them. Governors will always be rich, even under a plan of beneficence, but it doesn't have to be this obscene and dangerous level of wealth that lopsides the world and does no one any good. Surely it has occurred to them that after a certain point, wealth is just a meaningless column of numbers. Once you have a big house and four or five absurd automobiles and an even more absurd boat and college tuition for the kids, the rest is surplus. It doesn't do you any good and costs you more in lost freedom than it is worth as coinage. That is to say, after the first ten million or so, the wealth is just a burden. And yet these people have billions and sometimes trillions in the family, money just squirreled away in holes all over the world, doing nothing but earning meaningless interest. If they gave it all back they would never miss it. Indeed, they would sigh a big sigh of relief that they didn't have to guard it anymore.

I will be told their sense of self worth is propped up by this vast wealth, but I am telling them they would have *more* self-worth without it. These people have a crushing—and pretty pathetic—need to be looked up to. But rather than try to change that, which we probably won't, we can work with it. If they need to be looked up to, they can achieve that far more successfully than they currently are. Currently,

they aren't looked up to at all. They are hated and reviled. But rather than admit that, they buy newspapers and TV stations and other media and hire thousands of people to *report* that they are admired. More than half of all media time is spent promoting these assholes, though almost no one believes the promotion. Even the rich and famous themselves don't believe the promotion, because of course they know it is bought and spun. They know they aren't really philanthropists, so all the reportage means nothing.

Besides, in the real world, most self-esteem is built locally, by those around you who actually know you. What faceless people on the other side of the globe think is difficult to process, and it doesn't sink in positive or negative. What sinks in is the local response, from your family, neighbors, friends, and townspeople. This is what the soul can really feed on. So if you want to feel better about yourself, you have to concentrate on that local and full-faced response. Having billions or trillions can't help that local response, and in fact will only harm it.

I know what these people think: they have never been popular, so they think "If I can't be liked or loved, at least I will be respected or feared". But that doesn't work, does it, since they continue to want to be popular. They know they aren't respected, so that is out, and being feared isn't really satisfying. It might be fun for a couple of days, in the first flush of power, but it is an empty position in life. Being the bad guy is an interesting role in a movie, since it only lasts a couple of hours, but no one wants to play the heavy indefinitely. It not only crushes everyone else's souls, it crushes your soul as well.

So what to do? We all have some need to be popular or looked up to, so accept that and work with it. If you can't achieve that popularity by telling stories or being funny or running fast or having a pretty face, figure out what you *can* do. For the fact is, you *can* achieve both respect and popularity even if your personal charm isn't that great. How? *By being a good person and doing good things*. In fact, if you do good things, you will be far more useful to those around than those who have pretty faces or who tell funny stories. And those around you will know it. Yes, they will still be charmed by the pretty face and the funny story, and in those circumstances you will have to sit out of the limelight. But at the end of the day, most people know which is more important.

I know that some reading this will misunderstand me. They will think all they have to do is feed their stolen billions back into local coffers, and people will love them and forgive them. NO! That won't work, either, for reasons that should be clear if you think about it. Giving back stolen money isn't philanthropy, for one thing, and people know that. I said you had to *be a good person and start doing good things*, not that you just had to stop being a thief. If you want people to really respect and like you, you have to be active at the local level. You have to *do* things. You don't have to be beautiful or graceful or funny while you are doing it, you just have to be earnest. You have to care and show that you care. In other words, don't just send a check to townhall. Don't just underwrite local projects. Don't just hire people to go out and shake hands for you. Try actually doing something, even if it is just picking up trash or working in a public garden or volunteering at the animal shelter or riding a bicycle to the market. Yes, you have to give the money back, but that should be done with no fanfare. While it is the little human things that will show you have changed. These things will mean more to real people than anything else.

But the hardest part is doing all these things for the right reason. At first it will seem you are just doing PR. If you work in a public garden, you will do it at first *to be seen doing it*. That's OK. That's who you are and how you think. But over time, you may change. If you do the right thing, even for the wrong reason, at least you will be back on the right path. You will be slowly rehumanizing yourself. If you keep it up, you may find you like the gardening and the biking and the wee animals at the shelter.

You may find picking up trash is worth your while, since—like anything else—it is a job well done. If you do these things, or things like them, I can guarantee you will like yourself better and be better liked. And, once you like yourself better, you will not care so much what others think of you. Imagine that.