

The Gunpowder Plot was ~~99%~~ 100% Faked



By “Anonymous”

In honor of Guy Fawkes Day, I thought it would be fun to *blow up* this bit of historical fiction. Miles has already briefly outed this one as a fake, but I am going to hit it with more gusto. If you don't know, the Gunpowder Plot was a **Jesuit** plan to assassinate the Protestant King James I and his Parliament, using boatloads of gunpowder, and then somehow restore the old Catholic monarchy. Already we're off to a great start, since Disraeli all but admitted that the first Jesuits were Jews. Anyhow, this terrorist plot has its roots in the War of the Roses, when the official state religion changed from Catholicism to Protestantism. I suggest you refresh your memory from [Miles' paper](#). Suffice it to say, most Englishmen were still deeply and devoutly Catholic, and they were as distrustful of the Protestant religion as they were of the aristocratic families who were foisting it on them. Any sort of movement to restore Catholicism in England would have been very popular among the working classes, and that is exactly what King James I and the Protestant regime feared.

With that preamble, we can make quick work of the story from Wikipedia, which is ripe with low-hanging fruit. To start, we learn the following of Thomas **Percy**, one of the chief conspirators in the plot:

On 9 June, Percy's patron, the **Earl of Northumberland**, appointed him to the Honourable Corps of Gentlemen at Arms, a mounted troop of 50 bodyguards to the King.

In other words, one of the conspirators was one of James I's personal bodyguards and a protege of this very powerful Earl. He also happened to have the same surname as that very powerful Earl. The Earls and Dukes of Northumberland were. . . Percys.

That should raise all sorts of alarm bells in your head. As convenient a movie trope as it is to have a bodyguard be a double agent, it doesn't happen in real life. Bodyguards are the most rigorously vetted employees in the world, and the same was true back then. Even less believable is who appointed Thomas – his kinsman Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, who had a reputation as a Catholic sympathizer and **who James I was specifically warned about** prior to his ascension to the throne as a possible covert enemy, along with Henry Brooke and Sir Walter Raleigh. Together they were called the “diabolical triplicity”. Brooke and Raleigh led the Main Plot against James I *before* the Gunpowder Plot, and both were imprisoned in the Tower of London. Percy, on the other hand, was promoted to James I's Privy Council. So after finding out that two of the three suspected “diabolical” enemies to the throne were precisely that – enemies – you decide to invite the third into your inner ring? You'll say this was a case of keeping your friends close and your enemies closer, but James I made Percy the captain of the royal bodyguards. You don't put a suspected enemy in charge of your bodyguards, nor do you let him appoint his nephew among the guard. And there is certainly no chance Thomas Percy could have carried out these clandestine operations right under the king's nose.

Equally incredible is this next bit of fiction:

On 25 March 1605 Percy also obtained the lease for the undercroft directly underneath the first-floor House of Lords. It was into this room that the plotters moved 36 barrels of gunpowder from Catesby's lodgings on the opposite side of the River Thames.

We are supposed to believe that there were rooms available for anyone to rent just beneath where the country's most important politicians met on a regular basis? That's like saying there are apartments for rent under the U.S. Capitol building, and not only that, but these apartments are not under any kind of surveillance, so that 36 (or **18 + 18**, double *chai*) barrels of explosives can be smuggled in totally unnoticed. Yes, this was 1605, not 2021, but just like today political elites are constantly and heavily guarded. If the Capitol Building is stormed, you can bet it was all staged ahead of time. And if Parliament was going to be blown up in 1605, you can bet that was staged too. History has been staged for thousands of years now, and the last 500 years are particularly stiff with these fake events.

We continue with the theater:

On Saturday 26 October, at his house in Hoxton, [William Parker, 4th Baron] Monteagle received an anonymous letter that warned him to stay away from Parliament. Uncertain of its meaning, he delivered it to Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury. Cecil was already aware of certain stirrings, although he did not then know the exact nature of the plot or who exactly was involved. Instead of informing the king immediately, he decided to wait and watch what happened.

More nonsense. Cecil was James I's most trusted advisor and called him "my little beagle", referring to his stature (he was barely 5 feet tall, indicating his Jewish ancestry, since he descends from Goldsmiths) but also probably a veiled reference to Cecil's role as a prototypical head of Intelligence. A close reading of Cecil's biography makes it clear he was the MI6 director of his time. As such, he wouldn't have risked his reputation by withholding information about an impending terrorist act. The fact that he was already aware of "certain stirrings" makes it more absurd that the conspirators were able to smuggle 36 barrels of explosives beneath the House of Lords. That place would have been crawling with security agents.

For this and other reasons, several historians have claimed that Cecil was secretly orchestrating the whole plot. In fact, this is one of the first things his Wikipedia page mentions about him. But these accusations are concealing the full truth. Yes, Cecil was in on the plot, but not as a plot – as a *hoax*. He was never trying to blow up the House of Lords, and neither was Percy, Fawkes, or any others. The whole thing was faked from the ground up. Evidence of this is the fact that Cecil was already involved in uncovering plots before this one, including the Main Plot already mentioned. The problem there is that Henry Brooke, mastermind of the plot, was Cecil's brother-in-law. We are told that Cecil had his own brother-in-law arrested and executed. A far simpler reading is that both Cecil and Brooke were playing their parts in a family-run project.

That's the only way to explain how these guys got 36 barrels of gunpowder to begin with, since the government held a monopoly on gunpowder production and carefully guarded its stores. Stealing a single barrel would have been a major feat, to say nothing of 36. You could say that this is proof there was a government insider on the job – like Cecil – but you'd still be missing the point. Like people who claim 9/11 was an inside job, but then sell the terrorists and the hijacking as real. But none of it was real. There were never hijacked planes, and there were never 36 barrels of gunpowder beneath the House of Lords.

Back to Wikipedia:

...the prosecution claimed that ...the conspirators were digging a tunnel beneath Parliament. This may have been a government fabrication, as no evidence for the existence of a tunnel was presented by the prosecution, and no trace of one has ever been found... Logistically, digging a tunnel would have proved extremely difficult, especially as none of the conspirators had any experience of mining. If the story is true, by 6 December...the conspirators were busy tunnelling from their rented house to the House of Lords. They ceased their efforts when, during

tunnelling, they heard a noise from above. The noise turned out to be the then-tenant's widow, who was clearing out the undercroft directly beneath the House of Lords—the room where the plotters eventually stored the gunpowder.

Again, none of this scans. Why would the prosecution claim the defendants were trying to tunnel their way through to the undercroft, but then fail to provide any evidence? For one, a baseless claim would have seriously undercut their argument. But more importantly, it was a totally unnecessary claim since they had (allegedly) already caught Fawkes red-handed with 36 barrels of gunpowder underneath the House of Lords. What other evidence did they need for a conviction? This whole tunneling business is just evidence that they sold one version of the story for many years until later researchers disproved it, so they had to come up with a second story that didn't require tunneling. In other words, we're seeing the layers of lies that have been papered on over the years to try and keep the edifice from completely falling apart.

It is also significant that the anonymous letter was sent to the Baron of Monteagle. It turns out his mother was a **Stanley**. You're about to see why that's so significant. In fact, the name Stanley is the lynchpin to this whole hoax and many others, as Miles has so often taught us. Also, his wife Elizabeth's maiden name was **Tresham**, and her grandparents were John Tresham and Eleanor **Catesby**. Two of the key conspirators in the Gunpowder Plot were Francis Tresham and Robert Catesby. So they were relatives of the man who outed them! In fact, Monteagle married Robert Catesby's first cousin, and Catesby was the ringleader of the whole plot. As usual, they fail to tell you that this event was all in the family. Monteagle's lineage also includes Nevilles, Beauforts, and Harringtons, linking him many times over to Fawkes, as we're about to see.



There's no telling if the sketch above bears resemblance to the real Fawkes, but if they were trying to hide his Jewishness, they failed masterfully. According to contemporary accounts, he was tall, handsome, and redhaired. Since they lied about his

handsomeness, we can assume they lied about his height as well. But the red hair I believe, and it may be an important clue. Fawkes' parents are given as Edward Fawkes and Edith, nee "Blake or Jackson". Already we have a red flag, which is that the historians can't tell us his mother's maiden name. It's always the maternal lines that are scrubbed or fudged, because that's usually where the Jewish ancestry is hiding. In this case, though, Fawkes' own surname is a giveaway. More on that later. Edward was Edith's first of two husbands. Her second was **Dionysius Bainbridge Slingsby**. How's that for an aristocratic name? Dionysius' father was Sir Henry Slingsby, a Member of Parliament. Around this time the Slingsbys were marrying with the Stapleton baronets and the Ingrams, Viscounts Irvine. Dionysius' mother Frances was a Vavasour, who were Lords and baronets, related around this time to the **Manners, Earls of Rutland and the Middletons**. Further back they are related to the Gascoignes, Lords of Gawthorpe. Incidentally, Middleton links us to the modern-day Kate, and the Baron Monteaigle (surname Parker) links us to Prince Charles' wife Camilla **Parker Bowles**. It's 400 years later and England is still being strung along by the same cast of characters.

So far we are only looking at Fawkes' stepfather, so supposedly Guy is of no relation to these peerage families. But at the very least, we know that Fawkes' mother was not some plebian with an untraceable genealogy. Her second husband was a peer and Parliamentarian, and those types never marry nobodies. So you can bet Edith's genealogy is being intentionally hidden.

Regardless, we can link Fawkes to the peerage through his grandfather, Sir William Fawkes. He was **Registrar of the Exchequer Court of the Archbishop of York**. Guy Fawkes' father also worked for the Archbishop of York as a lawyer. It should strike you as unusual that the son of a prominent lawyer under the employ of one of the highest Protestant religious offices in the country would end up becoming a Catholic terrorist. It is admitted Fawkes was raised Protestant, though they try to sell his conversion to Catholicism due to the influence of his stepfather, Slingsby. You could make the argument that Fawkes was an agent of the Yorkists and that the Gunpowder Plot was a later skirmish in the old Yorkist vs. Lancastrian feud. Even if that's the case, it wasn't really about Protestantism vs. Catholicism. As Miles showed, the religious war was simply cover for a war between the Northern and Southern lines of the Phoenician Navy. But I am about to show you why I'm not convinced Fawkes' loyalties lay with the Catholic/Yorkist set. This wasn't a sign of the covert war, it was a false flag.

Wikipedia mentions that Fawkes' grandmother Ellen Harrington was "the daughter of a prominent merchant, who served as Lord Mayor of York in 1536." They fail to give you his name, but it turns out to be Sir William Harrington, a descendent of the **Nevilles and Molyneux**, whose contemporary relatives included Ashtons, Standishes, Norrises, Leycesters, Lumleys, Hultons, Talbots, **Treshams**, Radcliffes, and **Stanleys**. These were the Stanleys of Hooton, close kin to the Earls of Derby. As it turns out, **Sir William Stanley of Hooton was implicated in the Gunpowder Plot** but was exonerated by Cecil. This is a major clue to unwinding the event, since Fawkes was a close cousin of Sir William Stanley and actually served under him while a soldier in the Spanish

Netherlands. Yet somehow Stanley skated while Fawkes was executed? This explains why Wikipedia fails to mention that Fawkes was related to Stanley, because they want you off his scent. To know that the Stanleys were involved in the plot, and that Fawkes was related to them, changes your whole perspective on the event. Why? Because the Stanleys were at the very top of the British peerage at this point. [As Miles has shown](#), they had taken the Crown through Henry VII a century earlier under the Tudor pseudonym. The Stanleys/Tudors originated with the Komnenes, crypto-Jewish Byzantine Emperors. Remember, the Gunpowder Plot was all about blowing up the House of Lords, including James I, who was a Stanley/Tudor. So the protagonists and antagonists of the Gunpowder Plot were both Stanleys. Not at all suspicious, right?

More evidence of close ties between the Fawkes and Stanleys is that the earliest Fawkes we can trace back is [John Fawkes](#), born 1435, who was **Steward of Knaresborough Forest**. Steward for whom, you ask? With a little digging we find that Knaresborough Castle was acquired by [John of Gaunt](#) in 1372, then passed to his third wife Katherine Swynford, matriarch of the [Beaufort](#) family. This means the Fawkes were in the employ of the Beauforts *before* the War of the Roses. That's important because Henry VII's mother was a Beaufort, and therefore on the Stanley/Protestant/Lancastrian side of the war.

This is why it's highly unlikely Fawkes was a Yorkist/Catholic, because he was a Stanley, and the Stanleys were the main family behind the Protestant coup of England. Do you really think the Stanleys would turn around and counter-coup themselves?

What's more, James I employed [John Haryngton](#) (Harrington) to be the tutor of his daughter Elizabeth, and for his services he was ennobled as 1st Baron Haryngton of Exton in 1603, just a couple years before the Gunpowder Plot. You'll recall that Fawkes' grandmother was a Harrington, making it all more unlikely to find him trying to assassinate James I.

It's worth looking at the name Fawkes a little more closely, since their lineage doesn't go back very far, yet we find them connected to the highest levels of the peerage. Where did they come from? At [geni.com](#) someone has posted a coat of arms bearing the name Faux. That gets us closer to the truth, as you'll see. At [thepeerage.com](#), we don't get any Fawkes before the 1700s, which is strange since we know Guy's grandfather was knighted. Nevertheless, we find a Walter Ramsden Beaumont Fawkes in the mid-1700s whose father strangely is not a Fawkes, but a Hawksworth. These Hawksworths were earlier baronets, though they also seem to enter the peerage out of nowhere.

One obvious possibility is that Fawkes was a Fox, as in martyrologist John Foxe. Miles has already shown that Foxe was an agent for the Stanleys/Tudors. The Foxes of the peerage became Fox-Strangways, Earls of Ilchester. They were based in southern England, while the Fawkes were from the northern Yorkshire region, so there's no immediate geographical link.

I was about to give up my search into the Fawkes' roots when I noticed this:

[Jesuit priest Henry] Garnet and Catesby met for a third time on 24 July 1605, at the house of the wealthy catholic Anne Vaux.

If you're tempted to read her name as French ("Voe"), don't. This is England, so it would have been pronounced "Vox". See where this is going? To the left of this sentence on the Wikipedia page is a drawing of the undercroft with the following caption:

William Capon's map of Parliament clearly labels the undercroft used by "Guy Vaux" to store the gunpowder.

Wikipedia is giving us a huge clue here. Without ever explicitly linking Anne and Guy, they're telling us who the Fawkes really are. They were Vaux. Anne was the daughter of William Vaux, 3rd Baron Vaux of Harrowden. They admit she was related to Francis Tresham, and we already saw that Fawkes was a Tresham. The Barons Vaux (originally de Vaux) were related to the Nevilles, and Fawkes was also a Neville. All this suggests Fawkes = Vaux. More evidence in this direction is that the Vauxhall district of London was named after **Falkes** de Breauté. Pepys referred it as "Fox Hall" in his diary, suggesting my first hunch was correct, too. Fawkes = Vaux = Fox.

Miles: we may assume it also equals Vox, as in Vox Day, the website Vox.com, etc.

So, where did these Fawkes/Vaux originate? Check out [this genealogical research](#) by a present-day Faux, who drops a big clue:

The name **Falc** and variants first arrived with the **Normans**. The best source is "A Dictionary of English Surnames" by Reaney. He notes that the following surnames are equivalent: Fawke, Fawkes, Fawcus, Faux, Falck, Falco, Falk, Falkous, Falkus, Faulkes, Faulks, Fake, and Fakes. All mean falcon or falcon's son (with the "s" added).

To that list we can also add Faulkner, as in William. Remember that the Normans were really Phoenicians. That's why we find the earliest Falkes/Fawkes of England being known for a notorious Phoenician trade:

Thus the Falke family at some early date were **master ship builders**, and some (descendants of Alexander Falke of Aldeburgh for example) may have built ships such as the Pelican at Aldeburgh (near Worlingham) for Sir Francis Drake.

As the author notes, Falk is also a common Ashkenazic surname in Germany. This means Guy Fawkes was exactly who we suspected him to be: a ranking Phoenician/Jew. This Jewish connection brings Fawkes' red hair into relevance, since Fox is often an anglicization of the German/Jewish Fuchs, a surname often given to people with red hair. Which of course links us right back to Miles' last paper, where he showed that Adenauer's maternal grandmother was a Fuchs.

Wikipedia also tells us that the [de Vaux](#) were an "old Norman noble family", the "old" likely signifying that they go back further than the Normans, to the Phoenicians. Wikipedia also traces the de Vaux forward to Scotland and Ireland, where they became

Vances and Vasses. (Think Lt. J. Paul Vance of the Sandy Hook hoax.) The clans Ross and Munro descend from the de Vaux. (Think President Monroe and Chief John Ross). The Munro baronets were closely related to the highest peers of Scotland, including Stewarts, Campbells, Keiths, Gordons, and Kennedys.

The meaning of falcon also tells us just how old the Falkes/Vaux lineage is. See Horus, the **falcon-headed** deity of ancient Egypt. The name Horus comes from the ancient Egyptian word for falcon and is believed to have originally meant “one who is above”. It is also etymologically linked to the Semitic verb “to see”, so it makes sense that the Eye of Horus is actually the eye of a falcon. The Phoenicians later [picked up on the falcon deity motif](#). You’ll say I can’t have my cake and eat it, too – Fawkes must either point to falcon/Phoenician or fox/Jewish. But this is how these elite families choose their names; everything is a double (or triple) entendre. Everything is wordplay to them, including the similarity between Fawkes the French *faux*, meaning **fake**. In fact, that may have been the primary reason Guy was chosen for this project. Plus, we don't have to choose between the Jews and Phoenicians: they are the same people.

We can link Fawkes to the Percys through his stepfather Slingsby, whose relative [Sir Henry Slingsby](#) married a Mary Percy around 1580. Her grandfather was the 4th Earl of Northumberland and her great-grandparents were a Spencer and a **Beaufort**. Yes, same Beauforts that employed the Fawkes at Knaresborough. This also pretty much blows the lid off the fiction about Guy’s stepfather influencing him to become a Catholic, since his stepfather was related to the Beauforts, who were Stanleys/Tudors. The name Spencer links Fawkes and Percy to Catesby, who descends from the Spencers.

We can link Fawkes to Sir Thomas Knyvett, the man who searched under the House of Lords and discovered Fawkes. Knyvett’s brother-in-law was a Vavasour. We can also use the Vavasours to link Fawkes to Sir William Wade, the Lieutenant of the Tower of London and Chief Examiner of the Jesuits who oversaw Fawkes’ alleged torture, since Wade’s great-grandmother was a Vavasour.

Speaking of the Tower of London, there were apparently two very different quarters of the Tower, since while Fawkes was supposedly being tortured in some dark dungeon there, Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland – who you’ll recall was implicated in the plot and also confined to the Tower – was enjoying a very different experience:

Northumberland made himself comfortable in the Tower of London. He had spacious apartments in the Martin Tower, which he redecorated and refurbished. He was attended by 20 servants, some of whom he lodged on Tower Hill. He spent £50 per year on books and grew a considerable library. He had his own covered bowling alley and access to facilities for tennis and fencing. He regularly met scholars whom he patronized, including Thomas Harriot, Walter Warner and Robert Hues, who were known as the “Earl of Northumberland’s Magi.” Together with Sir Walter Raleigh, who had preceded Northumberland to the Tower with a death sentence hanging over him, they discussed advanced scientific ideas and smoked tobacco.

It seems the Tower of London is not what we think it is. It sounds more like a resort than a prison, just like today's prisons for the wealthy. If they even spend any time there at all, it's just an extended vacation, with everything but golf.

We have linked almost everyone involved in the Gunpowder Plot to each other, including Fawkes, Catesby, Percy, Tresham, Knyvett, Wade, the Baron of Montegale, and James I. We can also bring in Robert Cecil, since he was related to Norrises, as was Fawkes. Also, Cecil's sister married a de Vere, Earl of Oxford. The de Veres were related to the Vavasours at this time, which links us to Fawkes' stepfather and Wade above. Best of all, Cecil's niece Elizabeth de Vere married...William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby. Shocker, another Stanley relative tied to this event! Now you see why I say the Stanleys were the lynchpins to this whole hoax. You'll say this doesn't proven anything, since all prominent people back then were related. But that's the point, isn't it? If they're all related, we shouldn't expect to find them hatching plots to indiscriminately blow up government buildings along with entire city blocks of London. They'd be liable to kill several relatives and allies. This is never how power struggles work among the higher ranks; they have far subtler and more effective means at their disposal. If a terrorist plot like this really was attempted, it should have been from the peasant class, who had reason to indiscriminately target all aristocrats. The Gunpowder Plot was nothing more than the Stanleys staging a fake attack against Protestantism to blackwash Catholicism and scare the citizenry away from any kind of revolutionary activity.

They continue to use Guy Fawkes in the same way today. Consider the Guy Fawkes mask. For one, it's incredibly creepy. It makes you think the person wearing it is the villain, not the hero. That was always a big part of the project behind the Occupy Wall Street movement. They were trying to invert your thinking by selling black as white, villainy as heroism, anonymity as bravery. As evidence, consider that the man who designed the Guy Fawkes mask was David **Lloyd**. Hmm, as in Lloyd's of London, one of the biggest financial scammers in the world? Or how about the author of *V for Vendetta*, Alan Moore?



Do you really think that guy wants to enlighten you? Really? A man whose most revolutionary act was becoming vegetarian? Who wears those ridiculous rings on his hands? Who endorses Aleister Crowley and **Kabbalah**? Who wrote a novel titled **Jerusalem** which he described as “**genetic mythology**”? (You get the clue, right?) Moore is only there to invert you and increase chaos. Just read what he says about conspiracy theorists:

...conspiracy theorists actually believe in the conspiracy because that is more comforting. The truth of the world is that it is chaotic. The truth is, that **it is not the Jewish banking conspiracy**, or the grey aliens, or the twelve-foot reptiloids from another dimension that are in control, the truth is far more frightening; **no one is in control**, the world is rudderless.

Do you like how he blackwashes the Jewish banking conspiracy by lumping it in with multi-dimensional reptilians? Nice. The truth is, he is selling you the exact opposite of the truth, and it's far *more* comforting because it allows you to turn a blind eye to the whole charade and do the controllers' bidding without having to think or act for yourself. It absolves you from the responsibility of being a contrary soul in a world full of crooks, liars, and flunkies. But Moore knows he is lying through his teeth, because if no one is in control, why bother protesting Wall Street? If it's all just chaos, why spend so much effort promoting political anarchy? The world is already ruled by anarchy, right? Indeed, there's no good reason to protest anyone or anything in Moore's papermâché world, since it all amounts to nothing.

This is what Guy Fakes and the Gunpowder Plot is all about. It's about replacing real revolution with endless fake versions of it, hoping you will become too confused or tired or disenchanted to do anything. Contrary to what *V for Vendetta* or *Fight Club* or *The Matrix* or Marvel Comics tells you, being a revolutionary never involves blowing up buildings or hacking computers or sowing chaos. It never requires you to read Aleister Crowley or buy bitcoin or get a sex change. All these things keep you trapped inside the labyrinth. All that is required is to open your eyes and walk out of it.