

# Henry VIII was Gay and an even bigger surprise revelation



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published May 22, 2022*

I know, I know. It is like a broken record. Every famous person is Jewish, everyone is gay. [First I told you Bill Clinton was gay](#), and that was hard enough to wrap your head around, given all his promotion as a ladies' man. Then I came back and told you [John F. Kennedy was gay](#), too. Even harder to believe, given all the stories about him, including the Marilyn Monroe story. But you have to admit I made very strong cases in both papers. I didn't just say it, I all but proved it. Well, we have the same thing here, though it just came to me today. I will tell you exactly how it happened. I was walking down to the rural mailbox as I do about every three days, looking up at the sky and letting my mind wander, lonely like a cloud. We had had visitors earlier in the day, and were touching on the usual subjects, the visitors being readers of mine. Henry had come up, because one of the visitors was new to me and she hadn't realized that only two of Henry's wives were allegedly killed. I told her how it was and completed the story by informing her that even those two were faked. So on the trip to the mailbox, I guess that was still rattling around in my head. I was reminded I hadn't solved that mystery to my own satisfaction, even now. It was one of those rabbit holes I hadn't yet hit bottom of, and that always bothers me. I knew there was something more there. Why fake these deaths? Why do anything Henry had done, regarding his women? None of it made any sense, even after my revelations.

And then, like a bolt from the blue, it hit me: Henry had been gay! It was an AHA moment, and I

laughed out loud. I almost stripped down to the buff like Archimedes and sprinted down the street, crying out Eureka! to the astonished neighbors. It would make a good story, so maybe I should just say I did.

How had I not thought of it before? It explains the previously unexplainable, in one fell swoop. Plus, you have to admit my logic is tight: if we have explained newer mysteries this way, we will likely be able to explain older mysteries in the same way. It is simply a matter of odds.

Also, if I am tearing down all the old histories, you have to admit this is good place to focus. If you told some stranger you had already outed Clinton and JFK, and you asked who should be next, he might say Henry VIII, another famous alleged womanizer, one of the biggest. Henry would be the Mt. Everest for someone like me. So my progression is not without its method.

We will start with that painting above. Who is that? That is Henry VIII at age 17. I bet you haven't ever seen that. I can't say that it rings a bell, though it is on his Wiki page. I assume it was always there and I just overlooked it, because I didn't already have this thought in my head. I wasn't looking for it, so I didn't see it. Or I saw it, but I did not *observe* it, as Holmes would say. Can I rest my case on that? Of course not. I would be the first to admit that you can't judge a guy by the way he looks. We know the hairstyles and royal clothes of the time were unfortunate, to put it nicely, but still. It is a piece of evidence. We can include it. You have to concede his mouth and expression are very weak and don't match at all the impression we have always had of him as a brute. It may be because that was painted when his father was still alive, so they didn't *need* to sell Henry as a brute. We can now read the later Holbein portraits as propaganda, meant to scare off other kings and invaders.

That was painted in 1509, but we aren't given a month. That is the same year his father died and Henry rose to the throne. So my guess it was painted earlier in the year. Regardless, it brings us to the next clue, which also arrives in that year. Henry's older brother Arthur had been married to Catherine of Aragon, and when Arthur died the families wanted Henry to marry her. Very weird, regardless, as you will admit. At first Henry apparently thought so, too, since he refused her when he was 14. She was six years older. But for some reason he decided to accept her three years later, after he was crowned. Does that make any sense? This was an older girl, age 23, not attractive even by the standards of the day, with whom his brother may have already slept. If you are Henry, you are a virile young king of one of the richest countries on Earth, and you can literally have your pick, not only in England but in all the countries of Europe. You won't be allowed to marry any commoners, but still, all the duchesses and princesses of Europe are at your disposal. So you are just going to marry your brother's widow, a woman who isn't even a virgin? Are you kidding me?

Remember, at that point Henry was King, so he wasn't bowing to his father or mother or anyone. You will say, "The pressure was coming from the Stanleys, the kingmakers, who were sitting behind the throne. They would allow him a secret harem, if he wanted one, but they would appoint the queen". Although I agree that the Stanleys were behind him, since that is *my* theory, you would still expect them to allow him to pick his queen from their shortlist. After all, he needed to get it up for this woman now and then in order to sire heirs. The only way I can see that they would be able to convince him to take his brother's widow is if he didn't have any strong attraction for women one way or the other. He appears to have thought this one was as good as any other, which is how a gay man would feel about it. Straight men don't think like that. They have strong preferences, even concerning women they will only have to mount a few times. The fact that Henry, sold as so pig-headed later, was so blasé and opinionless on this Catherine question leads me to believe his harem was an all-male harem from the start.



Next we have that problem. What's wrong with that portrait of Catherine of Aragon? It's a fake. It was painted much more recently. Much. It is absolutely awful, and doesn't match the period style at all, as you can see by comparing it to other portraits of his wives on Henry's page. It may even have been done on a computer. Look at the way the red bodice is "painted"! No real painter ever painted anything like that, in the 16<sup>th</sup> century or any other century. Look at the hard edge between the bodice and the black veil. That totally looks computer generated, using a cut feature. Look at the black outline of the far shoulder! And is that headdress supposed to be Spanish? According to whom? It looks more *Star Trek*. Maybe she is a Vulcan? It is hard to believe they actually publish stuff like that. They admit no painter is known. They tell us it was re-identified in 2012 as Catherine, and is in the National Portrait Gallery. Hah. Is that the NPG in London or DC? I'll tell you a secret: it isn't there. This is all another conjob. That painting doesn't even exist. It is computer-generated.

But do you know why they publish it? **Because there are no genuine portraits of Catherine of Aragon!** Princess of Aragon and Castile, and Queen of England for 24 years, but not one image of her?! Impossible to believe. They must have destroyed them or stored them, which confirms they are hiding something very big. You will say Henry ordered them all to be destroyed when he divorced her, but he couldn't destroy portraits back in Spain, could he? She came over to England at age 15, so there should be childhood portraits of her back in Spain. But there aren't. There is a Flemish portrait of a girl they have assigned to her, but although the painting is period, the assignment almost certainly is not correct. Her family in Spain should also have copies of later portraits of her. But they don't and apparently never did. We will come back to that.

OK, now let's go to the other end and look at his last wife, Katherine Parr. She also doesn't fit the mold we have been sold. She was 31 and looked ten years older, as was common with women of the time. They didn't age well back then.



She too was a widow, and they admit he chose her for her wealth. Which makes no sense. He had already stolen billions from the monasteries, so he hardly needed to marry for money. She had been married twice before Henry, to a Burgh and a Neville. Henry was married to her for 3.5 years and there is no evidence they ever slept together. There were no pregnancies and no children, though she did have a child later with her 4<sup>th</sup> husband Baron Seymour. She wasn't barren or frigid. So she again looks like a beard. He was just 51 when they married, so it is surprising he chose such a woman. Henry only had one son, Edward, who was not of strong constitution, so he should have still been choosing his queen based on that. His sixth wife should not have been a thirty-something lady like Katherine, she should have been a fertile 18-year-old, one who could do all the work on top of him. It is hard to believe the Stanleys would choose Katherine, or allow her to be chosen, for that reason. It indicates to me that they had given up, and the only way they would have given up is if Henry was completely impotent with women by then. So, either gay, or so fat and diseased he couldn't get it up. Or both.

So let's move back two wives, to the 4<sup>th</sup>, Anne of Cleves. They admit this one was also unconsummated, which is even harder to explain. She was 25 and, according to the portraits and accounts, may have been the most attractive of the six. But he annulled her after six months and moved on to Katherine Howard.

There is no evidence he ever slept with Katherine, either, soon making up a cocknbull story about her cheating with a courtier. They soon faked her death and moved her back to the Howard estates.

So the last three of the six wives weren't really wives at all: they were just ladies he met.

Then we go back to the third wife, Jane Seymour, with whom he may have slept only once. She was the mother of Edward and died soon after that birth. Or was her death faked as well? Hard to know, but this marriage is also strange. She was 28 when they married, and she was a close cousin of Henry

and at least two of his other wives. She had been a maid of honor to Catherine of Aragon since she was 23, but Henry had allegedly never noticed her. Even stranger, she had never married at age 28, which meant she was an old maid—something very unusual for someone of her class, alleged talents, and lineage. Being a 3<sup>rd</sup> cousin of the Howards and a Seymour herself, she was of a very wealthy and prominent family. On her mother's side she was a Wentworth, Despencer, Clifford, and Percy, all extremely wealthy families. So why had she never married at 28? We aren't told. The whole story is mysterious in the extreme. Again, as someone who desperately needed a son, Henry should have married a very young woman, in the 17-22 age range. There was no reason for him to marry this dowdy old maid. Or, if he married an older woman, he would marry one who had already proved she could bear a healthy son. Seymour was neither. Also curious is that although she was announced as queen in 1536, **she was never crowned**. They say this was due to the plague, preventing them from crowning her in London, but that hadn't prevented them from being married in Whitehall, **London**. So that story doesn't scan, either. It is also odd we don't know what she died from. There were conflicting accounts of the cause of death, which is normally a sign of shenanigans. Later, several stories were concocted by Jewish historians, based on nothing, which is also a sign of shenanigans.

Also strange is the two-year gap between Seymour and Anne of Cleves. Again, Edward was an only son and not especially hale. Sons didn't tend to last long in the Tudor homes, so Henry should have been working on a second son immediately. But he wasn't. It was as if he had given up on women after Edward was born—again indicating he was gay and had always been sleeping with women as little as possible.

So, if you are keeping score, that is four wives and only one confirmed boink among them.

Which takes us back to the first, Catherine of Aragon. Only two couplings are confirmed with her, one being the one that produced Mary, and the other being the one that produced Henry IX. There are now claimed to have been other stillbirths, but that's all as maybe. Those stories could have been added later, to cover Henry's homosexuality and disinterest in coupling with women. That is admitted again when we find that they are only able to confirm two mistresses for Henry in his entire career: Hastings and Blount. The historians concede that is a problem, and even say so at Wikipedia:

**Blount is one of only two completely undisputed mistresses, considered by some to be few for a virile young king.[32][33] Exactly how many Henry had is disputed: David Loades believes Henry had mistresses "only to a very limited extent",[33]**

Also note the footnote numbers there. **33**. Telling us we are being given a clue. This is how they signal it.

But they don't have to signal it, since we can count. No real heterosexual king would have two mistresses. He would have two. . . a day. See Genghis Khan, or Naill of the Nine Hostages, for instance. If you are a heterosexual male with a normal libido, and you were king of the entire island, would you have two mistresses over a period of 40 years? No. You would have somewhere between 200 and 2000, not 2. **In fact, the number 2 by itself is absolute proof he was gay.** The way he looked can be explained away. That number 2 cannot be explained away.

We know he was with Blount to try to sire a son in a variant way, since it wasn't working with Catherine. She did give him a son, Henry Fitzroy, but Fitzroy was also gay as a goose, so that didn't do them any good. And it is just more indication Henry VIII was gay, since gay fathers are more likely to have gay sons. [Mainstream science now admits that](#). It has been a problem for these royal families in

many countries for centuries or millennia. They still try to dismiss it as a function of upbringing (parenting), but there is a lot of evidence it is inherited, and they are very far from proving it isn't.

At any rate, Wikipedia tells us the second undisputed mistress was Anne Hastings, but curiously if we take that link, her own page denies it.

**There is no evidence that Anne and Compton committed adultery. Nor that she was Henry VIII's mistress, aside from illogical notion that Compton met her to hand her a message from the King, which he could easily have handed to her in less scandalous way.**

Someone doesn't appear to know what "undisputed" means. It is disputed even between these two pages. So we have already cut that huge number two in half. We are down to Elizabeth Blount, who also has no surviving portrait. That's odd. Like Jane Seymour, she was a maid of honor to Catherine of Aragon, and Henry met her when she was about 18. She is an ancestor of singer James Blunt ("You're Beautiful"). The history books sell her as a nobody Blount and scrub her, but she was from the Barons Mountjoy, later Earls of Devonshire, related to the Leighs and Willoughbys, and through them to the Greys, Nevilles, and Plantagenets. So she was actually another cousin of Henry. Just what we would expect. She later married a Fiennes, Baron Clinton, making her an ancestor of the Fiennes brothers, famous actors.

So best guess is Henry mounted her only one time and got lucky because she was so fertile. He got lucky twice because the child was a male. But the luck ended when the little guy started lisping and sashaying by age eight. Nothing wrong with being gay, you will say, and that's true unless you are a king who needs to mount his wives. If you can't get it up for women, there is definitely a problem, and it has been a known problem of the rulers of Europe for a very long time. I didn't make it up. I have hit this Henry Fitzroy in previous papers, and the mainstream admits he was gay, so let's leave it.

After poking at this question for years, I now think Henry didn't divorce Catherine of Aragon in pursuit of a son. As we just saw with Blount and Fitzroy, in a pinch Henry could have always forced Parliament to legitimize one of his bastards. He was just 36 when he began fighting with the Pope, so he should have had plenty of time and stamina to be siring more children. There was absolutely no reason for the desperation, so we know the story we have been told is false. It is just the usual cover story. The truth is, the Stanleys behind Henry *wanted* to break with Rome, and they used this Catherine of Aragon divorce story to create the necessary rift. Their goal was to steal all ecclesiastical wealth in the British Isles from Rome, and the most efficient way to do that was to dredge up the old Investiture Controversy, cloaking it with this alleged need for a divorce. The divorce was just the excuse they needed to drive the Catholics out and steal billions of dollars worth of land, gold and silver, art, and tithes. You can tell that from the rapidity with which they proceeded, for in just a few years Henry had already seized all Church property in England, with the express consent of Parliament (Act of Supremacy). We are supposed to believe that was a natural outcome of the divorce controversy, caused simply by Henry's anger, but as you see it was much more likely to be a planned outcome, craftily staged from the start. Not only did England *want* Rome to refuse consent, I have shown you before that Rome was probably in on it as well, receiving a large kickback.

How could Rome be in on its own rape? Because Rome had been infiltrated as well. The Pope at the beginning of the controversy was Clement VII, whose real name was Giulio de' Medici. Amazingly, if you go to the Wikipedia page for Dissolution of the Monasteries, Clement's name is not on the page once, proving they don't want you to see what I am showing you. The Medicis were billionaire Jews from Florence, and they were southern cousins of the Stanleys, who were Komnenes. The next Pope,

Paul III, was a Farnese, and as such was also a cousin and puppet of the de' Medicis. So it looks like the Komnenes and Medicis allied in this controversy, having their people on both sides. This allowed them to manage the entire pillaging of the British Isles in those decades. They had just completed a similar pillaging in Germany in the preceding decades, and it had gone off like a charm, so they were already well practiced in this deceit. Even in England, they had been practicing for this for centuries. Henry V, a Lancastrian grandson of John of Gaunt, had already taken many monasteries in the 1400s, using the old Avignon schism as his excuse. Tellingly, the Popes in Rome had also been in cahoots with Henry V in that seizure, as well as previous seizures of “foreign, French” monasteries by Edward I and Edward III in the 1300s. The monasteries seized at that time in England were said to be allied to the Avignon popes, and therefore French, so the popes in Rome supported their seizure by English kings, no doubt receiving a percentage.

This should tell you the Avignon popes were actually on the right side of the schism, with history flipped to hide that fact. As with the Medici infiltration in the Renaissance, the Vatican had been previously infiltrated in the 1300s by Boniface VIII, from the Jewish/Phoenician Caetani family. But the French king Philip IV—a Capetian and an Arpad—discovered this and put a stop to it, or tried to. Philip was also a Phoenician/Jew, but from opposing lines to the Caetani. He could see that Boniface was trying to rape France like Clement would later rape England.

Remember, Boniface was placed in the 8<sup>th</sup> circle of Hell by Dante, who apparently knew something we don't. The 8<sup>th</sup> circle was for Simoniacs. Meaning? Well, simony is the sin of selling church offices, church lands, or church property for profit, so you see how that plays in here. Also remember that Simon is a Jewish name, and simony was named for Simon Magus, who was a foe of Peter. Again, you see the parallels going way back, since Peter was the rock on which the Catholic Church was built, in the case of the Vatican, literally.

Well, if all these people were Phoenician, why do I say the Avignon popes were on the right side? Weren't they all just fighting for the right to rape the peasants? In a sense, yes, but as we saw with Henry VIII in England, this Stanley/Medici rape was especially awful, in that it led over the centuries to a secularization and despiritualization of society. It led directly to where we are now, in fact, which is why I am arguing against it. Through this worldwide coup, this Phoenician alliance initiated what we now call the New World Order, in which all religions would be jettisoned and replaced by lay governments. Theocracy would be replaced by corporatocracy. Many will see that as progress, but I don't. Yes, the Old World needed a lot of work, but replacing it with soulless corporations and godless people was not the work needed. Like now, greed was sin number one, so any progressive movement should have addressed that. Instead, greed has been on a steep rise ever since then, and continues on apace.

I could end with that nice summation, but I still want to hit Anne Boleyn again. She is the only wife we haven't hit in this paper. [I have previously proved her death was faked](#), but we didn't look much at the rest of her bio. Let's start with the misdirection around her portraits.



Many exist, as you see, but they are all variations of one portrait, and none were painted while she was alive. So they are all fakes, in a way. They want you to think she looked like the first one, but sell the second one as more likely in most places. That is the one they lead with at Wikipedia. There is only one portrait done of her during her lifetime, and it is on a coin, which has been damaged.



But given that, we can now say the third painting is closest to the truth. Which I expected from the beginning: the worst looking portrait is usually the most accurate. Her face and nose were very long, as we would expect from these families, so she was not attractive at all. Just the opposite.

Plus, we now know that she was in no way the cause of the break with Rome. Henry and the Stanleys probably had no interest in her, beyond as a marionette in their story. She was dangled in the public eye for a couple of years to explain the break with Rome and draw the hate of the public, then her death



was faked and everything was scrubbed down to white. They hired some writers to make up a history about her and it has fascinated the gullible since then.

I also point out how strange it is that only one of those coins would exist. That is called a prototype from 1534, so I guess they want you to believe no real coins were ever struck from it, or even medals. It is lead, which is why it got squashed. Lead is very soft. Since Anne was queen for two more years, you would expect them to strike some medals or coins from this. Otherwise it was wasted time. My guess is they did strike some medals from it, perhaps as many as 100, but all were soon collected and destroyed or stored, again to prevent us from doing what I am doing here. They don't want you to have any actual information, because they want to control it all. . . just like now.

So, did Henry sleep with Anne at all? I will be told she had Elizabeth I, so he must have slept with her at least once. But there are other possibilities. Let us return to the gay Henry Fitzroy:



Knowing what you now know, does that picture of him jog anything in that pretty head of yours? I will give you a moment. It only just came to me as well. I didn't see it coming in.

Time's up. Here is your next clue:



That's Elizabeth I, of course. Have you got it now? No?



Strange that Elizabeth looks so much like her brother, right? They allegedly had different mothers, so they shouldn't look like twins. But that isn't the strangest thing. It is something that I finally *observed*. Ask yourself why Fitzroy is wearing a bathing cap. Probably because he had alopecia or some other scalp problem. It is extremely odd to see a teenage boy depicted like that, and I can't say I have ever seen it before. Well, Elizabeth is famous for having the same problem. She always wore wigs, even in

the beginning, and had that famously ultra-high hairline, where you could see she was bald underneath the wig. She also removed her eyebrows, and we can now see why: it broke the resemblance to Fitzroy. The white pancake makeup is explained the same way: she was covering the gray cast of her lower face.

We know I am not the first to suggest Elizabeth was a man, but am I the first to make this connection to Fitzroy? It looks like it. Bram Stoker, author of *Dracula*, famously believed Elizabeth was a man, and even suggested she was one of her own nephews, the son of one of Henry VIII's bastards. I now think he was right, though I believe it wasn't a nephew. It was Fitzroy himself.

So let's take a look at the dates and ages. Fitzroy is said to have been 14 years older, which doesn't kill the theory. Elizabeth died at age 69, so Fitzroy would have been 83. That's certainly possible. She became queen at age 25, so Fitzroy would have been 39. That doesn't really work, I admit, which led me to look at Fitzroy's given birthyear of 1519. We already saw he was the son of Elizabeth Blount. So our question is, could they have moved his birthyear back, to hide this possibility? And lo and behold, we find many bells ringing immediately. First of all, Blount's year of birth has been fudged, being given as 1498-1502. That's very curious, isn't it? Why wouldn't they know this? Being a close cousin of the Plantagenets, most records for her should exist in some form, since these genealogies are known in many cases back to Charlemagne. So let's take the latest date as the most likely, meaning that when she is said to have met Henry in 1516, she was only 13 or 14. Not believable. Not only could she not have been a maid of honor to the queen at that age, she could not have been post-pubescent. As we have seen before, girls in those centuries were not fertile until after 17. So if we move the whole Blount story up three years, that would put Fitzroy's birth in 1522, making him only about 10 years older than Elizabeth.

This would also explain the lack of a portrait for Blount, though she was supposed to have been such a beauty: portraits in that century often had a date painted on the front, and even the birthyear of the sitter, which would have given away this entire con. So all portraits had to be destroyed or hidden. As more indication of that, we are told that Henry VIII continued his affair with Blount for **eight** years, five years after she gave birth to Fitzroy. That is also very unlikely, since kings generally tire of very young mistresses much quicker than that. Even the seven-year itch is faster than that. It also conflicts with other details of the story, since if Henry really *did* like 14-year-old girls, he would be even *less* likely to stay with a mistress for eight years. Guys who like very young girls generally like a quick turnover, since girls only look 14 for a very short time. The Japanese even have a name for it: the mousmee. A girl is only a mousmee for a matter of months. So none of this adds up, as usual.

Of course, if they could fudge the dates of Fitzroy or Elizabeth by three years, they could fudge them more than that. We have more indication of that on Fitzroy's Wiki page, where they admit his birthdate is also not known. They give a firm date at the top of the page nonetheless of June 15, which is dishonest. That dishonesty is itself another clue here. They are trying to fool the casual reader, who may only read the first paragraphs. They also admit that the birth of Fitzroy was not mentioned in diplomatic dispatches or any other records of 1519. The christening is also not recorded, another huge red flag confirming my guesses. Then we get this:

**The boy's upbringing until the moment when he entered [Bridewell Palace](#) in June 1525 (six years following his birth) remains shrouded in confusion.**

More proof we are being seriously jerked here. Fitzroy entered the peerage in 1525 as well, indicating that may have been the year of his birth. Which doubles our fudge to six years, putting Fitzroy within

seven years of Elizabeth I.

We know that Fitzroy went with Henry to France in 1532, where he stayed for a year at court. But was he seven or thirteen? In 1533 Fitzroy was married to Mary Howard. Were they fourteen or eight? Ringing another bell, we find **Mary Howard's birthdate is also fudged**. That is impossible to believe, since the Howards rank right under the Stuarts and she was the daughter of the Duke of Norfolk. There is no possibility her birthday is not known. In the bios it is given only as 1519, I assume to match Fitzroy. So we are finding big piles of obvious clues I am right.

Fitzroy's death is also replete with the usual signs of fraud and fakery. They claim he died in July 1536 after an extended illness, but admit he was seen in public appearances in May looking fine. He allegedly died of tuberculosis, but no one dies of tuberculosis in one month.

**Fitzroy's father-in-law, the Duke of Norfolk, gave orders that the body be wrapped in lead then taken in a closed cart for secret interment. However, his servants put the body in a straw-filled wagon. The only mourners were two attendants who followed at a distance. The Duke's ornate tomb is in Framlingham Church, Suffolk, which contains various Howard family monuments.**

Really? And we are supposed to buy that? Henry VIII was even then planning to make Fitzroy his heir, but on his death he is just thrown into a donkey cart and dumped in Suffolk? You have to be kidding me! Of course no one saw his body. His body was wrapped in lead and there were only two mourners. And why would he be buried in Howard tombs? That makes absolutely no sense.

So Fitzroy's death was obviously faked. But again, was it at age 11 or age 17? I say he was 11 and Elizabeth was 4. But wait. . . could they have fudged Elizabeth's birthyear as well? It is very possible, since it is given as September 1533, a couple of months *after* her mother became queen. Awfully convenient, in so many ways. But Henry met her mother Anne Boleyn *years* earlier, in 1525, when Anne was already 24. Again, already approaching old maid status for the time, so as usual none of this is really adding up. She should have already been too old for Henry in 1525, to say nothing of 1533, when she was 32. With more digging, we find that Anne's birthyear is also hotly contested, and I would say 1507 is a much better guess than 1501. That would make her 18 when she first met Henry, and 26 in 1533. But that still doesn't explain why Henry waited seven years to sleep with her. He had already proposed in 1527, and she had accepted, so they were engaged. Do you really think they waited five years after that? Here is what the anonymous authors at Wiki say:

**There is no evidence to suggest that they engaged in a sexual relationship until very shortly before their marriage; Henry's love letters to Anne suggest that their love affair remained unconsummated for much of their seven-year courtship.[[citation needed](#)]**

Hmmm. Citation needed indeed. Who says there is no evidence? Did that person *look* for any evidence, or did he just come to that conclusion after being paid by the Stanleys? But evidence or no evidence, the claim is ridiculous. No one waits seven years to have sex, but especially not a king. Henry needed sons, so waiting around was counter-indicated by every fact at hand. He didn't need for Anne to be his wife: as far as he was concerned a mistress was as good as a wife, since he could always legitimize his bastards. And the idea Anne could stall him for seven years in search of a ring is the stupidest proposition of all time. For that reason, we can be almost certain they were sleeping together at least by 1527. So there should have been children by 1528, unless Anne was barren. So it is quite possible, I would say highly probable, that they have moved Elizabeth's birthyear up by several years, making her seem younger than she was. **Which means she and Fitzroy were about the same age.**

If so, why would they fake Fitzroy's death in 1536, when he and Elizabeth were about eleven? Only one reason I can think of: Parliament *wasn't* really agreeing to legitimize him. They tell us an act was going through Parliament that year to allow Henry to appoint Fitzroy as successor, but no such act was passed. We are told it was stalled due to Fitzroy's death, but I don't believe it. There is no evidence of that, and plenty of evidence against it. To prove me wrong, all you have to do is show me the voting record on that bill. Good luck. I believe it was stalled for some other reason, perhaps because Parliament didn't like the Duke of Norfolk that close to the crown at that time. Remember, Parliament was very divided in those years, and the Stanleys still had huge resistance from the Yorkists and other noble lines in those decades. The Stanley victory was still touch and go at the time, as we saw in previous papers with the upcoming problems they had with Mary, Jane Grey and Charles I some years later. It would continue to be on a knife's edge until they installed William and Mary.

I propose that Parliament refused to recognize Fitzroy, but the Stanleys decided to install him as King anyway, using perhaps their best trick of all time. He had the preferred bloodlines, after all, the son of a Blount being far preferable to the son of an Aragon or even a Boleyn. By the time they needed him, in 1558, he would be 33, and I suggest Fitzroy was already a crossdresser, giving them the idea himself. And they may have thought they could get a son out him after all, since a male would continue to be fertile long after a female would. He only had to successfully perform once, and they had tricks even there, putting him and his boyfriend together with a woman: you can imagine the rest.

You have to admit this explains a lot. Bram Stoker's theory explained a lot by itself, which is why it was so popular and is still well known, but my additions advance the theory a very long way beyond Stoker. To see how far, let us look at Stoker's theory, which you can read [for free at Gutenberg.org](http://www.gutenberg.org). See the final chapter of *Famous Impostors*, called "the Bisley Boy". The first thing of use we find is that Elizabeth spent time at Bisley, Gloucestershire, as a girl. Stoker then tells us of a "traditional" tale he has discovered, claiming that Elizabeth suddenly died there and was replaced by a local boy who resembled her. This imposture was allegedly able to fool the king upon his visit, and according to Stoker's account it fooled everyone from then on but three other people: Mistress Ashley who was caring for Elizabeth at the time, the Cofferer Sir Thomas Parry, and the parent of the boy.

That is all patently absurd, of course, but the reason I mention it is this: Stoker admits the manor at Bisley was owned by the Bohuns, and that name jumped out at me, because I had just seen it in my research today. The Bohuns were first cousins of the Plantagenets and Fitzalans, which as we have just seen links us not to Anne Boleyn or Elizabeth I, but to Fitzroy and his mother Elizabeth Blount. Indicating it was Fitzroy holed up in Bisley with his relatives, not Elizabeth. So the tradition is partly true, but Stoker has garbled it, either on purpose or by accident.

How does my theory differ from that of Stoker, other than in the identity of Fitzroy? Well, it differs as a whole and in all parts. You have just seen that Stoker's theory requires that *everyone* be fooled, including the king and all queens. That would never happen. But in my theory, very few people have to be fooled, and no one close to "the Queen". If this was a plot by the Tudors and Stanleys and all the other Lancastrians, then they were all in on it. None of the top people or insiders had to be fooled, least of all the King. Only the top Yorkists and other ranking enemies in Parliament would have to be fooled, and even they would only have to be fooled at first. After Fitzroy was crowned, the thing would be a *fait accompli*, and irreversible even by the Yorkists. At that point they could not have outed the fraud except by bringing down both sides of government and the entire sanctity of the crown. The very fabric of society would be in jeopardy, and the Phoenixians would not have countenanced such a thing for any reason. It was completely outside their rules of internecine warfare. If the Yorkists

wished to counterattack, they would have to find another way to do it. They could not risk telling such a huge truth.

In fact, now that I study it, I believe Stoker's theory was misdirection—a planned fail. His theory is so weak, it almost refutes itself. He offers no evidence and very little argument, just a lot of wordy waffling. Reading this chapter, you would think the man couldn't write at all, but *Dracula* doesn't read like this. It is relatively tight and quickly moving. So I think his job was to take you near the truth, but then spin you off out in the bushes. This is one of the tricks of these people, and it normally works very well. They make the truth look ridiculous or at least unlikely, so that when anyone else like me trips across evidence later, they find they have been pre-blackwashed by people like Stoker. Those coming upon my research may Google on it and discover it has already been broached and dismissed by the “experts”. So they won't bother studying my analysis, or noting how it differs from or betters previous arguments. I will have been pre-judged, as usual, which is job one for agents in this line of work.

So did Elizabeth really die, as Stoker proposes? Maybe, but her death is not necessary to the story. Once they decided to replace her, she could be whisked off to Germany, Holland, France, or dozens of other places. She didn't even need to be locked in a nunnery. All they had to do is change her name and send her off with other noble girls her age. When the time came they could marry her off to some earl or baron and hide her in the country. She could be called a bastard Tudor daughter—who were of no account politically anyway—or the Howards could be ordered to claim her as one of their bastard children. If she ever started making claims they could say she was suffering from delusions of grandeur or something. If she got really rowdy they could ship her back to Germany again till she cooled her heels.

And what exactly did this achieve for the Stanleys and Tudors, other than putting a male on the throne who didn't have any Yorkist or Catholic leanings? After the disaster with Mary, you can see how they wouldn't be too keen on another female or queen. Well, it also gave them many more decades to produce another male heir. Even if Elizabeth was fertile, she would only be fertile for a couple of decades. But Fitzroy would be fertile until he died, since that is the way males are. Their sperm counts drop, but there is no menopause for men. You will remind me that men can't conceive, so how would they get a son out of him? Quite easily, in theory. They marry him to a man, but continue to couple him to women. Once they achieve a pregnancy, they stuff his gown and say he is pregnant. When the child arrives they say he is the mother, not the father. Nothing easier. It is not like he has to breastfeed in public or something. Plus, this whole con may have been necessary for another reason: Elizabeth may have been barren or otherwise compromised. Her sister Mary never had any children, despite huge efforts, so she was effectively barren. We may assume Elizabeth had the same problem, making her absolutely useless to the Stanleys as a queen. So Fitzroy was their only hope at that point, making this a necessity from both ends.

Given that, I think we have to give Fitzroy the best actor of all time award. He kept up the part for 44 years. But if he was already a crossdresser to start with, it wasn't really an acting job, per se. It was a lifestyle choice, as they now say:



Even that portrait gives us a clue. Look at her pearl necklace. You should ask yourself why the artist has looped it up over there in a circle, rather than letting it hang naturally. It looks very odd, almost as if he is circling something. But there is nothing on her bodice. Well, he *is* circling something, but it isn't on her dress. He is circling her (or his) lowest rib. Eve was supposedly created from Adam's rib, remember, and they normally illustrate that as coming from Adam's lowest rib. So we are being told that Fitzroy has created Elizabeth from that rib. Very clever, right?

So, as you see, the clues are all right there, thrown in our faces, and it should surprise you no one ever found them before me. Bram Stoker, selling himself as a great detective, missed every single thing I found here in one day.