

[return to updates](#)

# Custer's Last Stand was a False Flag



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published October 30, 2015*

As usual, this is opinion, my best reading of the absurd reports the mainstream calls history.

My respect for historians—like my respect for Modern artists, critics, and scientists—is rapidly approaching zero. Nothing I read makes any sense. Custer's biography is another perfect example, since it simply isn't believable. It is replete with obvious anomalies, inconsistencies, absurdities, and impossibilities.

To start with, he is always characterized as tall, handsome, and charismatic. Just look at the picture above. Does he look handsome or charismatic? No, he looks like an imbecile. I see no sign of intelligence in his eyes. He looks either drugged, stoned, or of sub-normal IQ. Like many of the other people we have looked at recently (see pics I have posted of Whitman and Rockefeller), he looks a lot like a mental patient. Here's another one:



Again, mental in some way. His expression is empty, in a scary way. Absolutely no sign of intelligence there. Would you trust that man with your daughter? I wouldn't trust him with my goldfish. And why is he wearing a Civil War officer's slouch cap (with wreath)? This is supposed to be from 1859, his third year at West Point. *He wasn't an officer yet and the Civil War hadn't started.* To me this photo looks like some kind of joke.

For more indication of that, I emailed a friend who is a West Point graduate and who is also familiar with period uniforms. He had quite a bit to add. He found that this photo was dated all over the place on the internet, from '59 to '61. That jives with what I found at Wikipedia, where it stated Custer entered West Point in *both* 1858 and 1857. So we appear to be having our minds stirred on purpose once again. However, my friend sent me to [Cullum's register](#), which confirms the 1857 date. As for the date of the photo, he said it doesn't really matter, since it contradicts itself no matter the date. The reason? Custer is wearing a plebe's jacket, or a jacket for a first-year cadet. That would only work if the date were 1857 or 8, but no one has dated it that early. They don't date it that early presumably because they are trying to match the date to the cap, which has the officer's wreath. It is also not normal for plebes to take photos like this. Cadets take "firstie" photos, which are *senior* photos. This can't be a senior photo because Custer's jacket doesn't have anything indicating his senior status or his upcoming second lieutenant status. The jacket is plain, and is, besides, a plebe jacket.

His collar and cuffs aren't right, either. The collar is improperly turned over and we see no white at the cuffs. Cadets are taught to be extremely fussy about things like this, as you would expect. Custer is disrespecting the uniform—and therefore West Point—in many ways here.

Then there is the problem of the class ring. He isn't wearing one. Both his ring fingers are empty. He has a pinkie ring, but it is on his right hand. The class ring should be on the left hand. Some historians have tried to cover for this by saying Custer wore his class ring on his pinkie, but that isn't believable according to my West Point graduate. Besides, it wouldn't be worn on the right hand regardless. To answer this, some have pointed to the reversed photo also on the web. But the one above with the

pinkie ring on the *right* hand is the un-reversed photo, and the writing on the cap tells us that. Even without the writing, I know the photo above is correctly orientated, just by looking at Custer's nose. Custer's nose sloped to his left, not right. He also parted his hair on his left (although you can't see that here) and his left eyebrow was lower. As a portrait painter, I catalogued all this information from studying all his other photos. But if you still don't believe me, look at his jacket buttons. A man's jacket has the buttons on the right side. This confirms that Custer is wearing the pinkie ring on his *right* hand.

But the problems aren't over. He should either be wearing no hat or a cadet hat, but not a Civil War slouch hat. If we use his plebe jacket as a guide, this would have been his first year, which was 1857-8. *The Civil War hadn't even begun at that time.* But regardless of the year, he wouldn't have been photographed in a Union cap, since that would be considered taking sides in the war. West Point graduated officers both North and South and wouldn't have allowed partisanship like this, especially before 1861. As you now see, this one photo is a disaster, and it is incredible they still publish it at all. I assume they do so only as a continuing test or joke.

What about his height?



Custer is allegedly on the far right. Lincoln is center. We are told Lincoln was around 6'4". Custer is also supposed to be tall, around 6'. This picture does not confirm that. Custer is the shortest man in the picture, and appears to be almost a head shorter than Lincoln. Since a man's head is about 10", that would put Custer at 5'6". Even if we give him a couple of inches based on ground sloping down to the right and the fact that he may be behind Lincoln relative to the camera, that only takes him up to 5'8". This confirms my first impression of his height, from studying pictures of him alone. He looks small. It doesn't really matter how tall he is, of course, except that it is a sign here of more bad information.

This picture is curious for many other reasons. One, why is Custer standing off to the side? He is the only one not with the main group. Two, why does he have three feet? You will say maybe he moved during the shutter snap. Possibly. But that just confirms he was a moron once again, since everyone knew at that time that you don't move during a picture. Three, why is he wearing a different hat than everyone else? Four, why is he wearing a glove on only one hand? Five, why is he holding a curved saber when everyone else has a straight saber? Six, why have they erased someone from the far right of the picture? Look behind the chair, where we see a ghost. Seven, since this is supposed to be Lincoln with his generals at Antietam, why is there a guy in a cocked hat in the background who isn't dressed like the others? His coat has no shiny buttons and he has no shoulder ornaments. He looks like a bum compared to the others.

We are told Custer was a general, hence his appearance in this photo. But he wasn't. Being a *brevet* brigadier general, he shouldn't even have appeared in this photo of real generals. During the war there were dozens of brevet generals, and the rank was only temporary. At the end of the war, Custer returned to being a captain, which is several levels below general. You normally advance from captain to major to lieutenant colonel to colonel and only then to general. It normally takes many years.

Which brings us to Custer's promotion to brevet brigadier general, in 1863, less than two years out of West Point. We are told he was one of the youngest generals ever, reaching that rank at age 23. But there are problems with that, even compared to others who were promoted quickly due to the war. We are told that Custer was last in his class at West Point, which of course doesn't normally lead to quick promotions, either during war or not. He had a record-setting number of demerits and it is difficult to understand why he was passed at all. He entered service as a second lieutenant, as would be expected. McClellan promoted him to brevet captain, but he fell back to first lieutenant when McClellan was relieved of command in November of 1862. But somehow by June of 1863, Custer had been promoted to brevet brigadier general.

Let's compare that to Galusha Pennypacker, promoted to brevet brigadier general during the Civil War at age 20. However, Pennypacker was promoted through the levels one at a time, being a captain, then a major, then a colonel, and only then a brevet brigadier general. Even so, it took Pennypacker *four years* to go from captain to colonel. He was then given brevet general status as a reward at the end of the war.

You would think Pennypacker's promotions would be a record-setting pace, but Custer went from first lieutenant to brevet brigadier general *in seven months*. Civil War or not, that simply isn't believable. I don't care how badly you need leaders, you aren't going to promote a lieutenant to general. To captain, yes, but not to general.

We can also compare this to Francisco Franco's quick rise to general in Spain in the 1920s. We are always told how fast he rose to general. Well, Franco became a brigadier general in 1926 at age 33. He was the youngest general in Spain and in all of Europe. Still, it took him *16 years* to go from lieutenant to general.

For another completely unbelievable story, we are told Custer was present at Lee's surrender, and that General Sheridan gave him the table where the surrender was signed as a gift. Right. The most famous surrender in American history and a true first lieutenant snags the signing table? Who writes this stuff?

Custer never achieved the true rank of general. He was actually a lieutenant colonel during the so-called Indian Wars in the period after the Civil War; which rank—I will remind you—was the rank of

many of the Intelligence officers we have uncovered in previous papers, including Sharon Tate's dad in the Manson event and several players [in the Zodiac event](#). In 1867 Custer was court-martialed for abandoning his post, but again mostly skated due to the influence of his protector General Sheridan.

Just before the main event at Little Bighorn in 1876, President Grant ordered the arrest of Custer and stripped him of rank. He wasn't supposed to leave Washington. Somehow Grant was overruled, and Custer ended up in Montana under the “supervision” of General Terry. Since only Grant could renew his rank in such a situation, Custer apparently had *no rank* at that time. From reading the accounts of historians, it is difficult to say what his official position was.

Also curious is that date, one hundred years after the founding of the country in 1776. I don't think the fact this happened during the centennial was an accident. Likewise Custer's statement to his Native guides that this would be his last Indian campaign. How did he know that, and what did he mean?

Then there is Custer's famous mode of dress, which—given his brevet status—must be seen as not only pompous, but outright insane. It is just one more thing that makes no sense on a closer look. There is simply no way a person promoted from first lieutenant to brigadier general in seven months would dress like that. Especially the alleged son of a blacksmith. The real generals around him would have busted his ass into powder in a blinking. From my vantage, there are only three possible ways to explain the red kerchief and all the rest: 1) Custer was Military Intelligence and was thereby privileged. He didn't have to obey the rules and customs of the military, since he was just a plant. 2) Custer was American aristocracy and his bio was later scrubbed to hide his genealogy and his links to European royalty. 3) Custer was a mental patient used by Military Intelligence as a poster boy for certain projects. Nothing he did actually happened. He was only photographed to promote certain stories. In other words, he was an early crisis actor or stooge.

**We will see that most likely *all three* are true.**

Moving forward in time a bit, we are told that the army's Native scouts miscounted the number of hostiles in the Little Bighorn camp. We are supposed to believe they didn't know about all the reservation Natives that had joined Sitting Bull for the summer hunt. Right. Thousands of Natives supposedly leaving the reservations, and the Crow scouts didn't know that? Even the current story (at places like Wikipedia) is wildly inconsistent, saying Custer had been told by these Native scouts that 800 Natives were camped below. Then a couple of sentences later,

Historian James Donovan states that when Custer asked interpreter Fred Gerard for his opinion on the size of the opposition, he estimated the force at between 1,500 to 2,500 warriors.

The *mainstream* number has just tripled in two sentences. **Given that estimate, why did Custer go down into the coulee with less than 600 men?**

Which brings us to the matter of troop numbers. We are told Gen. Crook had one column and Gen. Terry had the other. Crook had 20 companies, or about 1,600 men. Terry's column was split between Colonel Gibbon and Custer. Custer was under Terry's supervision, remember, and was at best a Lieutenant Colonel. Gibbon had 10 companies, which should have been about 800 men. Custer was commanding 12 companies, which would be 960 men. That gives us 3,360 men total.

I draw your attention to the fact that *both Gibbon and Custer were under the command of Terry*. So why are we told this [at Wiki]?

Unaware of Crook's battle, Gibbon and Terry proceeded, joining forces in early June near the mouth of the Rosebud Creek. They reviewed Terry's plan calling for Custer's regiment to proceed south along the Rosebud while Terry and Gibbon's united forces would move in a westerly direction toward the [Bighorn](#) and Little Bighorn rivers.

Before we get to the main problem there, notice that Terry could not be unaware of Crook's battle *a week later*. Crook's battle at Rosebud was June 17 and Little Bighorn was June 25. The two battle sites are about 20 miles apart. You will say they were cut off by ravines or something, but at 20 miles you can easily see a smoke signal. With telescopes, you could see smoke signals at more than double that distance. How stupid do they think we are? Pretty stupid, because they even admit that. They tell us that Custer could see Terry's regiment ten miles away from its cooking fires. That was on the 25<sup>th</sup>. At the same time, they try to convince us Custer was trying to surprise the Natives with his attack. But wait, if Custer could see the cooking fires of Terry, we must assume the Natives could see them as well. So much for surprise. You might as well try to sneak up on a cat while barking like a dog.

Beyond that, how could Terry and Gibbon “join forces”? Gibbon's troops *are* Terry's troops. They are trying to make you think Custer has his own regiment, so they are creating three separate forces: Gibbon, Terry, and Custer. But Custer and Gibbon are both *under* Terry, so there is only one force here. If it is split, it is split because Terry orders it, not because Custer decides anything.

Besides, if Crook had already encountered “huge numbers” of hostiles at the Rosebud, then we are supposed to believe there are two separate camps of thousands of Natives just 20 miles apart? If they are massing for the summer hunt with Sitting Bull, why are they split into two camps of some 3,000 apiece, just 20 miles apart? It makes no sense. If we are to believe the mainstream story, that would be between 6,000-8,000 Natives camping in one small area in Montana, in two separate camps 20 miles apart. Then on top of that, we are supposed to believe the Crow spies the US Cavalry have hired don't know that? They don't know about smoke signals or reading any other signs, I guess.

[I will be told Wikipedia isn't a trustworthy source, but as usual that is more misdirection. These pages on US history are written by the universities and are policed. The information is taken directly from mainstream books, and the pages at Wikipedia are the most-read history sources in the modern world. So they are actually the perfect place to analyze and critique American History.]

Then there is the problem of Colonel Samuel Sturgis. Up until May, Sturgis had been the commander of the 7<sup>th</sup> Cavalry, not Custer. Custer was only his Lieutenant Colonel. So why was Sturgis “detached” and sent to St. Louis just in time to miss Little Bighorn? Curious, isn't it?

**[Addendum November 9, 2015:** I am now padding this paper out with more research. My West Point insider sent me some reading material, including the Osprey Campaign Series no. 39, which I assume was used in his classes. I skimmed it and underlined a few things that jumped out at me. To start with, we know the author's accounts aren't trustworthy simply from his gloss of Custer's Washita encounter, which is totally whitewashed. Even compared to other mainstream accounts it is a total whitewash, trying to make the massacre of peaceful Natives camped on a reservation into a battle with hostiles. So I have to admit I wasn't prone to believe anything I was reading by this Peter Panzeri.



The first thing I noticed was the photo on p. 11, a larger version of this photo I found online:



The photo in the book makes it clear the image above has been repainted. The face has been touched up to give it more detail. In the book, the face is blurry. So I checked other copies online. All of them have been retouched or hit with a filter. Why? Because the image is fake. Custer's head has been pasted in, and you can see that from the larger unretouched image in the book. How do I know? Two things: one, his face is blurrier than his uniform. That shouldn't be the case, even with the wrong shutter speed. All things the same distance from the camera should have the same blur, but his face doesn't have the same blur as the center of his uniform. Two, his head is too small. It doesn't match his head-to-body ratio in other photos and doesn't look right regardless.

That led me to look at his other photos more closely. These two have also been faked in the same way, with the head pasted into another body:



Both have multiple signs of tampering, including focus errors, edges redone, and light anomalies. To see all the problems, you really have to go online and study the largest examples closely. If you do, you will see what I mean. Once you look for the problems they are pretty obvious.

But back to the book. Nothing in the book made me doubt my thesis here. In fact, the more I read the more sure I became. The first thing I underlined in the text is on page 17, where we read,

Brigadier General Alfred H. Terry was a 49-year-old veteran of Civil War accomplishment, but this was his first campaign in 11 years, and his first fighting Indians.

What? In the pages before that we were told the US had decided to get serious about the Indian Wars in 1876, laying down ultimatums and planning for total war. Plans had been drawn up and huge resources allocated. So you would expect them to assign the best Indian fighters to this important summer campaign. Instead, they send Colonel Sturgis to St. Louis and pull Terry out from behind a desk. Why would they do that? Probably because Terry had graduated to Intelligence and had shown himself handy in faking events. Remember, Terry was otherwise known as a treaty negotiator at that time, not as a campaigner. He negotiated the Treaty of Ft. Laramie in 1868 and was sent to negotiate with Sitting Bull in 1877. He also sat on the 1878 Presidential Board to re-examine the court martial of FitzJohn Porter, cousin of David Farragut. So his presence at Little Bighorn should look mighty curious to you.

The same thing applies to Major Marcus Reno, also “in his first campaign of Indian fighting”. He was a “newcomer to the regiment” [ p. 20]. He was also a Master Mason. So he looks like another plant in the story. Like Custer, Reno was a master of demerits at West Point, taking two extra years to graduate because of bad conduct. You would think this is a common story of high-ranking officers, but of course it isn't. It is a clue here, a clue we now know how to read. He was probably from a prominent and wealthy family, since these are the only ones privileged enough to stack up demerits and still get through West Point. And indeed that is the case. Wikipedia tells us, “he was a descendant of Phillippe Francois Renault, who in 1777 accompanied [Lafayette](#) to America and was awarded a land grant by the U. S. (worth about \$400 million by Reno's time)”.

We then learn that Custer told his troops to leave their sabers behind. That makes no sense, being that he should have *expected* hand-to-hand combat with Natives. Seeing that the Natives could not hope to win a gun battle, they often ambushed and killed man-to-man at very close range. In that situation you would certainly want a saber. So the “box your sabers” order is being inserted into the story on purpose, to make you think it was another bad decision that might explain the defeat. Otherwise, it simply isn't believable.

Equally unbelievable is what we are told on page 36. Although Crook lost only ten men at the Rosebud the week before Little Bighorn, we are told

his entire column returned to the Goose Creek Camp to await reinforcements. This withdrawal removed his significant force from the field for over seven weeks. With the climax of the Sioux War at hand, nearly half the theater's combat power was effectively out of the campaign.

That's convenient for the story, right? But why wouldn't Crook simply join back up with Terry's column a few miles away? Then they would reinforce one another.

But by far the biggest red flag in the whole book is written instructions from Terry to Custer [p. 41].



. . . The Department Commander places too much confidence in your zeal, energy and ability to wish to impose upon you precise orders which might hamper you action when nearly in contact with the enemy. . .

They expect us to believe that? Do you think any general has ever given written orders to a Lt. colonel in that form? No. Never in the history of the world. To start with, why would anybody bother to put that blather into writing? It basically says, “you are so pretty you can do what ever you want”. No one would put orders like that on paper. It is beyond absurd. The only reason we have to read that is that the event coordinators wanted to supply future historians with some rationale for Custer's alleged actions. It should have alerted anyone with any brain that this event was manufactured, but I guess no historians since 1876 have fit that description.] *End Addendum.*

Then we get to the battle itself. According to Lakota accounts, braves took coup on soldiers who fled or quit fighting. That means they just tapped them with a stick, to embarrass them and indicate who was superior as a warrior. But according to mainstream historians, the Natives slaughtered Custer's troops to the last man, scalping them and otherwise mutilating them. Not only is the scalping not believable, since the Natives weren't interested in the balding scalps of whites, but the slaughter isn't either. The fake historians who have promoted this story need for Custer's men to be killed so that no one is admitted to survive to contest the story. If someone did contest the story, saying he was there, the historians could reply that no one survived, so the person must be lying. Also convenient is that other troops said to be in the area on that day were out of sight over a ridge or beyond the river or behind brambles, not only unable to come to Custer's aid but also unable therefore to see the alleged slaughter. This means that there were actually no firsthand witnesses to the “slaughter” except Natives, and the reports of the Natives have been so varied it is hard to avoid the conclusion they saw the event as a joke. Everyone and his brother took credit for killing Custer, and the joke continued to crescendo until 2005, when the Cheyenne officially credited a squaw with knocking Custer off his horse, leading to his doom. I guess she knocked him off with a wooden spoon.

To add to the hilarity, we are told Custer's plan on that day was to ride into the camp and use the women and children as human shields. Of course that would depend on the element of surprise, but we have already seen from the issue of smoke that there was no hope of that. The mainstream historians even admit,

Custer had wanted to take a day and scout the village before attacking; however, when men went back after supplies dropped by the pack train, they discovered they were being back-trailed by Indians. Reports from his scouts also revealed fresh pony tracks from ridges overlooking his formation. It became apparent that the warriors in the village were either aware of or would soon be aware of his approach.<sup>[17]</sup> Fearing that the village would break up into small bands that he would have to chase, Custer began to prepare for an immediate attack.

Good lord! The contradictions they expect you to fit into your little head. So, I guess we are expected to believe Custer knew the Natives knew he was there, but he thought that they were going to sleep in and let him come in and use their women and children as human shields anyway. OK.

Then we are given some fake battle movements:

Reno advanced rapidly across the open field towards the northwest, his movements masked by the thick bramble of trees that ran along the southern banks of the Little Bighorn river. The same trees on his front right shielded his movements across the wide field over which his men

rapidly rode, first with two approximately forty-man companies abreast and eventually with all three charging abreast. The trees also obscured Reno's view of the Native American village until his force had passed that bend on his right front and was suddenly within arrow shot of the encampment. . . . Neither Custer nor Reno had much idea of the length, depth and size of the encampment they were attacking, as the village was hidden by the trees

If you consult the little map that accompanies that text, you realize what a hash it is. B is Reno.



You can't ride in an open field and also be hidden by trees, especially when the trees are to your right. Besides, this was the cavalry, not a battalion of field mice. All those running horses could be heard from a mile away, so the protection of a few brambles was meaningless. But notice this account is being told not to convince us that the cavalry was sneaking up on the camp, but to convince us Custer and Reno still didn't know how big the camp was. He is already attacking it and is only a few hundred yards away, but *still* doesn't know what he is attacking. Right. This despite his spies telling him over and over, him seeing the pony herd of thousands, and so on.

So what does the first force—that of Reno—do? It stops and forms a skirmish line! I would think it would be difficult to capture women and children by surprise by stopping and forming a skirmish line. We are told Reno's Arikara scout Bloody Knife remained with him as they sat there and waited for the Natives to overwhelm them, but of course that isn't believable, either. We are told most of the Native scouts had already been released, so why would Bloody Knife go into a battle he knew was hopeless, stop to form an absurd skirmish line out in the open, and then sit on a horse waiting to get shot?

I won't bore you with the rest of the battle account, since it is a fairytale. It is all conjecture anyway, as they admit. Finally, we are told that on June 27<sup>th</sup> Terry arrived and the Natives drew back. Wait, on the 27<sup>th</sup>? It took Terry two days to travel 10 miles? I thought they were supposed to rendezvous on the 26<sup>th</sup>. Terry had no idea the biggest battle in the Indian Wars was happening 10 miles away, although many scouts had been released and the area was crawling with people from both sides? What did Terry and his men do all day on the 26<sup>th</sup>? Sit in camp with blindfolds on and their fingers in their ears?

But the stupidity won't end, because then we are told

Within 48 hours after the battle, the large encampment on the Little Bighorn broke up into smaller groups as the resources of grass for the horses and game could not sustain a large congregation of people.

If the area couldn't sustain all those people, why were they there to start with? That was the problem from the beginning, wasn't it? The Natives don't congregate in groups that large for that very reason. The reported numbers were always absurd, and now, after the fact, they tell you why, assuming you won't put two and two together. If the area couldn't sustain that many people *after* the battle, why could it sustain that many people *before* the battle?

Rather than pursue the fleeing Natives, Crook and Terry "remained immobile for two months" while the Natives supposedly slipped back into the reservations. Does that sound like the logical thing to do, on either side? Did the US Army ever act like that in the Indian Wars, at any other time? We are supposed to believe they just let a huge band of hostiles, burdened with their women and children, walk away? That, despite having almost 3,000 soldiers on hand and ready, who hadn't been in battle at all? And if the Natives were so formidable and had just routed the entire 7<sup>th</sup> Cavalry with few casualties, why wouldn't they immediately attack the other companies nearby? If there were at least 6,000 Natives in the area armed with rifles, they should have been able to wipe out Crook and Terry just as easily as they wiped out Custer. So why run away to the reservations? Why would Crazy Horse go to Ft. Robinson just six months later with other Oglala leaders and surrender? One minute the Natives are all-powerful and the US Cavalry is bumbling idiots, the next minute the US Cavalry is unbeatable and the Natives are helpless. I could possibly believe one or the other, but not both.

Frankly, I don't like to give up Little Bighorn any more than you do. I am very attached to it. I had always thought it was a high point of US history, since I had thought it was one of the few times the military had got what it deserved. I am also attached to the film *Little Big Man*, which has always made me laugh and cry. Although Dustin Hoffman was terribly miscast, Chief Dan George and the others make up for it; and since the script was based on Thomas Berger's very readable book, it has long been one of my favorites. But what I have learned in my brief research has fatally undercut that whole story as well, and I am afraid I can never watch the film in the same way again. Custer comes off as a buffoon there, but I can now see he wasn't even that. The whole event looks like another hoax of some sort, probably staged by Military Intelligence to force an end to the Indian Wars and justify a final round of atrocities and indignities. In other words, it now looks like just another false flag, on a par with the fake bombing of the Maine, Hitler's Reichstag fire, the Gulf of Tonkin event, and the World Trade Center destruction.

[**Addendum, November 8, 2015:** A reader did some research on Thomas Berger, unfortunately pulling up some red flags. Berger was a graduate student at Columbia in 1950, taking Lionel Trilling's famous course in modern American literature. He began a thesis on George Orwell but never finished it. He also studied at Charles Glicksberg's writers' workshop at the New School for Social Research, at the same time as Jack Kerouac, Mario Puzo, and William Styron. He later became an editor for *Popular Science Monthly*. It doesn't look good, but I haven't time to get into Berger in more depth here.]

I will be told there already exists a conspiracy theory with this event, that being that Custer was set up by President Grant for testifying in Congress against Grant's brother in the Belknap trial. So, as usual, the mainstream offers us a second story if we don't like the first one. If we don't like suicide, they give us murder, as we saw with Kurt Cobain and Marilyn Monroe and so on. Or, as with the Lincoln story,

if you don't like the murdered-by-Booth theory, they give you several other conspiracies to choose from. Here, if you don't like the mainstream battle story, they give you a little conspiracy to justify it. However, as usual the right answer is behind door number three: the whole thing was faked. Custer was probably Military Intelligence and this was his final and crowning project (under that name, anyway).

But why don't I believe the Grant conspiracy story? Because it *also* doesn't fit the history we have been sold. It does not make an inconsistent story consistent. It does not make an unbelievable story believable. It is just another absurdity. Say Grant *had* wanted to retaliate against a lieutenant colonel for testifying against his family in Congress, even to the extent of killing him. Well, there are a thousand ways to do that which are far cheaper and far less risky than staging a battle between US troops. You just have several agents ambush him on a road near his home and blame it on highwaymen or something. Same thing they do now with car wrecks or plane crashes. Besides, the main desired outcome of Little Bighorn is obviously not the death of Custer. It is the end of Native American freedom. That was what the false flag was about, not offing some rogue Lt. colonel. But to achieve the end of the Native, the US military needed a fall guy, a ranking person who could appear to go down with the ship. All they needed was a fake death, not a real one. So our *first* assumption should logically be that Custer was chosen for that position. Remember, I have shown that you should always cross off the easiest things first. Don't assume a death unless you have *proof* of a death. And if the circumstances around the death are wildly inconsistent to the point of absurdity, you can take that as further indication of a fake. We have all that here in spades.\*

Furthermore, we can add more focus to the cause of the event if we look at events just preceding it. Gold had been discovered in the Black Hills, and in 1874 a survey expedition led by. . . yes, Custer, confirmed the vast size of the mining deposits. This discovery nullified the Treaty of 1868 with the Sioux in the minds of the greed-heads in Washington, and they began planning their response at that time. The Battle of Little Bighorn was the glossiest event of that planned response, manufacturing public opinion to allow for the final mop-up of the Indian Wars. Noam Chomsky may have popularized the term "manufacturing consent" but he did not invent it. The US Government has been manufacturing consent from the beginning, as we see once again.

Custer's protection by General Sheridan is another clue in this direction. Again and again, Sheridan intervenes to keep Custer on his path, though the intervention never makes any sense given the mainstream story. The only way to make sense of it is to assume Sheridan was his overseer in Intelligence. Sheridan looks like an early CIA director, keeping his pawns in their proper squares.

In support of that theory, let's look more closely at Sheridan. Again, we find that Sheridan was promoted from captain to brevet major general in only six months. [However, Sheridan's promotions weren't ultimately brevet promotions, and he didn't revert at the end of the war. Although he was probably originally promoted on the speed track of Intelligence, Grant took him on and the rank stuck. Lincoln promoted Sheridan to *actual* major general 18 months later, after his famous ride at Cedar Creek.] We have confirmation of this when we are told Sheridan was useful early on for his "critical intelligence about enemy dispositions", and his later use in the Overland Campaign for "screening and reconnaissance". It was at that time that Grant probably switched him from Intelligence to regular army, or used him in both. However, Sheridan's raid on Richmond wasn't especially successful, "leaving Grant without cavalry intelligence" for the time.

Also in support of this theory, we find Sheridan chosen over older and more experienced generals like Meade, Franklin and Hunter to lead the Army of the Shenandoah. In this capacity, Sheridan would

perform his famous scorched-earth run called the Burning. Sheridan may have been chosen for his willingness to order such horrific events, the other generals begging off. Then as now, Military Intelligence was the home of those with the least scruples. Sheridan later did the same thing in the West with the Natives, burning their homes and killing their livestock and purposely introducing disease. He is the one who said “the only good Indian is a dead Indian”. He encouraged hunters to trespass on Native lands and “kill every last buffalo”.

According to the current rules of warfare, all those things are highly illegal. Not that they don't still get done, but we now admit in international documents that waging war in that way is uncivilized, beneath contempt, and—perhaps most importantly—**against International Law**. You may think these laws came about after the Nuremberg trials and the rise of the United Nations, but most of them are much older. In fact, most of the rules of US warfare were published *during the Civil War* as part of the [Lieber Code of 1863](#). Included in the Lieber Code were laws about treatment of civilian populations, including prohibitions against burning and poisoning. So not only were Sheridan's tactics against the Natives both morally reprehensible and highly illegal, his tactics (and those of Sherman, et al.) against the South were equally reprehensible and illegal. The only difference was, the Natives were never specifically included in the codes: or they were specifically *excluded*. Although blacks and slaves were included, Natives were not.

At any rate, in a time of towering assholes, Sheridan was possibly the worst, and any Native who knows much of history hates Sheridan much more than Custer. Compared to Sheridan, Custer was just a punk. Sheridan ultimately became General-of-the-Army, which was a 4-star general then and a five-star now. If he hadn't died young from overeating, he might have become President like Grant and Eisenhower.

My assumption is that Sheridan was also head of US Intelligence, and this is confirmed by many things, including his assignment to observe and report on the Franco-Prussian War in 1870.

As a guest of the [King of Prussia](#), he was present when Napoleon III surrendered to the Germans, which was gratifying to Sheridan following his experiences with the French in Mexico. He later toured most of [Europe](#) and returned to the U.S. to report to Grant that although the Prussians were "very good brave fellows [who] had gone into each battle with the determination to win, ... there is nothing to be learned here professionally”.

Sounds like early Intelligence to me. We also have indication of this from Sheridan's command of MOLLUS in the late 1880s. That is the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the US, formed right after the assassination of Lincoln by his honor guard. It looks to me like MOLLUS was an early front for Intelligence. See my [paper on Lincoln](#) for indirect but strong evidence of that. For more circumstantial evidence, we find that two of the three officers who founded MOLLUS were Lieutenant Colonels.

For many other cloaked references to Intelligence, you may consult Sheridan's or Custer's nauseating memoirs. But I will give you one last one, including a final visual:





That is Custer with Grand Duke Alexis of Russia, son of Czar Alexander II. A very curious photo for any number of reasons, not the least of which is that the Duke is holding a toy dachschund. We are told the photo was prefatory to a hunt Alexis was being taken on by Buffalo Bill, but even so it isn't clear why Custer is involved. Custer was supposed to be the grand marshal of the hunt, but again *why?* I repeat, Custer was just a Lieutenant Colonel at the time—and still the alleged son of a blacksmith—so there is no good reason for him to be palling around with Russian royalty. To understand it, it helps to know that the trip of Alexis was planned by the Minister of the Russian Navy, Admiral Krabbe. This is a clue because, like US Intelligence, Russian Intelligence was run out of the Navy in the early years. So this may be a joint Intelligence outing more than anything. But even if Custer *was* in Intelligence, it still doesn't explain this photo. Custer simply cannot be who were are told, since Alexis would never have allowed himself to be photographed one-to-one (as equals) with such a person. This indicates to me that Custer's true genealogy has been scrubbed. Custer simply *must* have had close ties to the European aristocracy: there is no other way to explain this photo set with Alexis. This would explain Custer's strange tenure at West Point as well as his strange behavior in the Army. Like more recent “American royalty” he knew he would be graduated no matter what he did. It would also explain his moronic look: the aristocracy had been inbreeding for centuries. It would also explain his Intelligence career: Intelligence has always greeted these scions of the first families with open arms, no matter their IQ or ability. If they are too stupid to do the difficult work, they will be assigned some sexy project nonetheless, just one that requires less skill.\*\* We have already seen that over and over in my papers. It is also interesting to find Grand Duke Alexis visiting West Point during his short trip to the United States. He only spent an evening in Washington and wasn't even asked to dine at the White House, but found time to visit West Point nonetheless. He also visited Harvard.

I will be told that Grand Duke Alexis was also photographed with Buffalo Bill at the same time, destroying part of my theory:



The problem? That photo is faked. Buffalo Bill was added later. Look at the outline of his hat and the way his boots look painted in. Look at the way his feet and the gun rest on the ground. They don't, do they? No, it looks like he is floating. The background has also changed from the one with just Custer and Alexis.

**[Addendum November 8, 2015:** A reader wrote in after doing some more research on this. He noticed that Custer's wife's maiden name was Bacon. Since I have written recent papers on Sir Francis Bacon, the idea there might be a link popped into his head and he went to the genealogy sites. He found that Elizabeth Bacon was indeed from the same family as Francis Bacon: her direct ancestor Thomas Bacon was the brother of the grandfather of Francis Bacon. Francis may or may not have been born royalty, but he did later have a title. And the Bacons have since been a very prominent family in Europe and the US. So Custer married into near-royalty, and this may explain his photo set with Alexis. However, I suspect there is more to it than that. It doesn't explain how the Bacon family found him a good match for their daughter. I suspect his blood was as blue as hers.]

All this leads us to ask if Sitting Bull ever actually moved his meeting from Ash Creek to the Little Bighorn River. It now looks probable the Natives were never in that valley to start with, and that Military Intelligence simply used the 7<sup>th</sup> Cavalry to stage a false flag. That is why they sent its commander Sturgis to St. Louis and replaced him with the spook Custer. You will say the Natives would have spilled the beans on that, but they would be as easy to fool as anyone else. No doubt other companies did skirmish with Natives in that area on that day, and the Natives just assumed we misreported the event as usual, blowing it up for our own purposes. We then suppressed any Native testimony that didn't suit us. Did the Natives have newspapers at the time, to counter our reports? No.

You will say that they have a strong oral tradition, and yet no rumor of this hoax has survived. Even if

that is true—and I am not at all sure it is—it would also be easy to explain. This hoax was sold as their finest hour, so the Natives would be as prone to lap up the story as anyone. Given the choice of a history where you went into the forts and surrendered, or of a history where you first routed the 7<sup>th</sup> Cavalry and *then* went into the forts and surrendered, which would you choose? The answer is clear.

I don't wish to earn the Natives ire here, you understand. I have always been on their side. I think we should have honored our treaties. . . and I *still* think we should. In other words, I think we should give them back the Black Hills right now, along with millions of other square miles. If I were Ted Turner or one of those guys that owns large parts of the west, I would will all my land to the Natives—with the proviso that the land could never be used for mining or casinos. So if you are Native, I don't mean any insult by this paper. I simply wish to know the truth, whatever it is.

Some will now ask me, “If Custer's death was another fake, what became of him?” We have a likely answer for that as well. I reminded you that Custer led the survey expedition of the Black Hills in 1874, finding huge gold deposits. After his fake death and retirement from the cavalry, I suggest he became involved in gold mining—under an alias, of course. After all, he knew where the gold was without prospecting. There was no luck involved. I assume many in the Army and Intelligence retired to set-up projects like this. Why wouldn't they? It was probably considered a severance package. Also remember that he told his scouts that Little Bighorn would be his last campaign: that is a rather large clue. He knew a career change was just over the ridge, and he even dropped hints of it.

We have some indication of this just from a cursory glance at the history books, where we find the Black Hills mines under the early ownership of. . . wait for it. . . William Randolph Hearst. I showed you some of Hearst's connections to Intelligence in previous papers, including [my paper on Patty Hearst](#) and my paper [on John Reed](#). So we know Intelligence—and those *behind* Intelligence—were there. Then as now, Intelligence was often simply a direct tool of the billionaires. So it is no stretch to suggest that others in Intelligence would be drawn to the Black Hills at that time. In fact, Sheridan's early death suggests to me that he may have done a similar thing a decade later. He may have felt his plans could be more easily pursued in that area under an alias. He already had a town named after him there, and he may have wished to put in his bids and contracts under a different name.

I admit this event begs for more research. I have purchased some very old books off of ebay and will let you know what I find.

**Addendum, November 2, 2015:** The first book I got was Horace Greeley's *American Conflict* of 1866. I bought a first edition, volume 2, printed only one year after the end of the War, still in its original disintegrating leather wraps. My suspicion was that “General” Custer's bio of later years wouldn't match his early bio, being padded and extended after his alleged death in 1876. With that in mind, I suspected I would find nothing or next to nothing about Custer in this 1866 report of the Civil War by a very important author. My suspicion was borne out, since in this very large book of almost 800 pages, Custer makes only three very brief appearances in three short paragraphs. On page 564, we find Custer near Charlottesville, “where he found his road blocked by a far superior rebel force”. He was being used to draw attention away from the main force of General Kilpatrick. On p. 741, Custer, with one division of horse, is supporting Crook and Devin at Sailor's Creek (a petty tributary of the Appomattox). On p. 743, Custer captured supplies on the Lynchburg railroad. Custer and Devin then pushed a vanguard of Lee back on the main army, “capturing 25 guns, a hospital train, a large park of wagons, and many prisoners”. Other than being present at the surrender on p. 744, that is all we hear of Custer from 1862 to 1865. He isn't pictured with Union Generals, but we wouldn't have expected

that since the illustration is only of Grant and eleven top Major Generals. But he also isn't pictured with "Union Defenders" on p. 272, which gives us 12 more Major and Brigadier Generals. We probably wouldn't have expected to find him there, either, except that Custer has since been sold to us as such a colorful character, we might expect Greeley to have livened up his book with the various tales of derring-do we have become accustomed to with Custer. And, Custer being such a legendary beauty, Greeley might have found some way to get his pretty mug into the book. We now know why he didn't.

\*As just one example of many, the doctored photos lead us in the direction of a faked death, not of a military murder. In a military murder, there would be no reason to doctor photos from years before the event.

\*\*Think of George Bush, who was assigned the part of President.