

[return to updates](#)

HENRY VII

another Jewish Invasion of England



by Miles Mathis

First published November 4, 2016

As usual, this is just my opinion, based on private research. Also as usual, none of this is conspiracy theory, with all my information coming from mainstream sources, including Wikipedia.

We saw King Henry VII of England come up several times in my last paper, so I decided to pursue his history and genealogy a bit more closely here. What we will see is that I have to move my Jewish invasion of the European nobility back several more centuries. I already have readers telling me the Jews never *invaded* these lines: they were Jewish from the beginning. That may be true, but I will have to discover it for myself. I no longer believe anything I haven't researched fully myself.

Henry was the first Tudor King, defeating Richard III, who was a York, in the final stage of the War of the Roses. We are taught that was a war between the Yorks and the Lancasters, but it wasn't. If it had been, a Lancaster would have become King at the end of it. He didn't, a Tudor did.

We can see the misdirection in the first paragraphs of the pages at Wikipedia, where we are told on the [page for Lancaster](#) that house was a branch of the house of Plantagenet. But on the page for [The Battle of Bosworth Field](#), we are told that the end of the War of the Roses was “the end of the Plantagenet dynasty”. See the problem there? If both the Lancasters and Yorks were branches of the Plantagenets, and the War of the Roses was between them, how could the end of the war end the Plantagenet dynasty? It would be like being told the Super Bowl was between the Dallas Cowboys and the Pittsburgh Steelers, with the final score Dallas 0, Pittsburgh 0, San Francisco 28.

Then we are told:

the Lancastrian political cause was maintained by [Henry Tudor](#)—a relatively unknown scion of the

[Beauforts](#)—eventually leading to the establishment of the [House of Tudor](#).

Sounds suspicious, doesn't it? Notice they avoid saying Henry maintained the house, saying instead that he maintained “the political cause”. Strange wording. The Beauforts arose from the third wife of John of Gaunt (Ghent). Gaunt was a Plantagenet, son of Edward III—making the Beauforts Plantagenets—but this third wife Katherine Swynford is very mysterious. To start with, her mother is conspicuously not given. Then her patron saint is given as Catherine of Alexandria, which is a huge red flag. This Saint Catherine's story is utter garbage, to put it nicely. We are told she was the daughter of the Governor of Alexandria during the late Roman Empire. She was also a princess and a scholar. Study her Wikipedia page, which is rife with the usual numerology markers. She was martyred at age 18. 1100 years later Joan of Arc identified her as a counsellor. She appeared during the reign of Maximian, 286-305AD. The first number adds to 8 twice, the second to 8. A tradition dating to 800AD states that angels carried her corpse. Her body was discovered in 800AD on Mt. Sinai. The most prominent shrine to Catherine in the West was in Rouen, which, in the Middle Ages, had a large Jewish settlement of 6000, being about 20% of the population. Somehow I knew that before I even read it. Historians now admit the story of St. Catherine is fiction, but it is fiction that probably came out of Rouen in the Middle Ages.

Katherine Swynford has no mother given, but her father is given as Payne Roet. He is also a mystery, but note the name Payne, which has come up in every paper in the past year. We also know that Swynford's sister Philippa married Chaucer (think *Canterbury Tales*), so we have more indication literature has been part of the big con from the beginning. The Swynfords were part of the household of Philippa of Hainault, who is also suspicious. So let's do her genealogy instead. She was the Queen of Edward III in the middle 1300s. Her great grandmother was Maria Arpad of Hungary, later Queen of Naples. Her family was said to be of Cuman ancestry, but to me that looks like the usual misdirection. The Cumans were early Turks, but since her mother Elizabeth the Cuman married King Stephen V of Hungary, it is unlikely the story we are told is true. In the 13th century, the Turks were considered barbarian pagans from the East. Stephen was of the Arpad dynasty, which was (allegedly) Christian. It is very unlikely he would marry a Turk. More likely is that Maria Arpad was of a very prominent Jewish line. In support of that, we find the Arpads soon intermarrying with the nearby and similar Przemyslid dynasty. Part of this joint dynasty led to the Habsburgs, but another part led to the Jagiellons, as you can see on the Wiki page for [Przemyslid](#). I have already outed the Jagiellons as crypto-Jews [in several previous papers](#).

This shows that one way the House of Tudor was infiltrated was through this Katherine Swynford. I assume she was related to Hainault*, linking her to the lines above. Her son was John Beaufort. These Beauforts are very curious, since although they were declared a legitimate line to the throne twice by Parliament and once by the Pope, they were later barred from succession by King Henry IV. Why? We are told it is because Katherine wasn't married to John, but that looks like a cover story. More likely is that they were from a Jewish line, and Henry IV knew that.

But let us return to John of Gaunt for a moment. He is Henry VII's link to the Plantagenets, but even John is a mystery. Although said to be the son of Edward III, he was born in Ghent (Flanders, Belgium) and his father was not present at his birth. There were rumors at the time he was not actually the son of Edward, but of someone in Ghent. Although he was allegedly the third son of Edward, John was one of the wealthiest men in England “due to some generous land grants”. Really? Not because he was actually a Jewish merchant inserted into the genealogies, or because he had married several Jewish women? Not because he married Constance of Castile, descended from the equally suspicious Menezes family? The Menezes come from Tello Perez de Menezes, mother unknown. He was *tenente*

(lord) of Cea in 1181. Note the numbers. He was given several mills by King Alfonso VIII. Again, that was *mills*, and the number 8.

Through his wife, John of Gaunt claimed the Kingship of Castile (most of Spain), but was rebuffed. However, his daughter later married King Henry III of Castile and became his Queen. This Henry was also curious, in that, like the Tudors, he was said to be of an illegitimate and “cadet” line—in this case, the Trastamaras of the House of Ivrea. To me, these Trastamaras look like more crypto-Jews. In support of that, we find that Henry III supported the anti-Pope Benedict XIII, who also has no mother listed. Henry stopped the persecution of the Jews. Moreover, his maternal line goes back to Sicily and before that to **Poland**. His great grandmother was Euphemia of Silesia-Liegnitz, and she was part of the same Arpad dynasty we saw above. That is very strange, and we may take it as a major clue here. She is descended directly from Bela IV of Hungary, who was also the grandfather of Maria Arpad above. This would make Euphemia the niece of Maria Arpad.* Also, Henry III died and was buried in Toledo in 1406. This is odd for many reasons, not the least of which is that his biography has no connections to Toledo. He was born in Burgos, far north of Toledo. He was married in Palencia, also far to the north. However, Toledo has a famous Jewish history, of course. The Jews themselves claim they have been in Toledo since the 5th century BC. Before 1492, Toledo had a very large Jewish population.

That was Henry VII's maternal line. If possible, his paternal line is even more suspicious. His grandfather is given as Owen Tudor, from Anglesey. We have already seen Anglesey many times in previous papers. It is the island off the northwest corner of Wales, the site of much mystery. This Owen Tudor married Catherine of Valois, widow of King Henry V. Her grandmother was Taddea Visconti, of the rulers of Milan. Taddea's mother was a della Scala, the rulers of Verona. One grandmother was a de Carrara, another ruling family of Northern Italy. Another was a Morosini, rulers of Venice.

This last connection is the most important, since Venice was a Republic in its own right. It became extremely wealthy in the Middle Ages through trade with the Levant. As cloth traders, Jews and crypto-Jews were prominent at all levels in Venice, as you would expect. Like the Medicis, the Morosinis were probably crypto-Jewish. One of the first Morosinis, Domenico (d. 1156), lends credence to this supposition, since—despite being a Doge—all records of his ancestry have been lost. We are told:

This unusual lack of publicly recorded information is likely because his dukedom was relatively unremarkable in terms of conquests, expansion, and events of significance — historians of the Republic would have had little interest in “digging up the past” either to glorify or to mar his legacy. He was married to a woman named Sophia, according to legend a captive from the East.

Misdirection, as usual. The lack of information is not “unusual”, assuming he was Jewish. It is par for the course. The information isn't missing because he was an insignificant person—what Doge of Venice was insignificant?—but because it has been scrubbed. Also notice the wife Sophia, a captive from the East. That is a prominent clue Morosini was Jewish, since this story was a cover for his very Eastern-looking wife, who was also Jewish. For more indication Domenico was Jewish, we find the entire Republic of Venice was excommunicated by Rome during his tenure “for its familiarity with the Byzantine Empire”. Right. We know this is false since the excommunication was rescinded not when Venice broke with Byzantium, but when it recognized the power of Rome in Venice.

Also note the name Morosini. Look familiar? Morosini. Morrison.

That reminds me of something I will insert here. Some of you may know that there is a theory on the web that Jim Morrison became Chevy Chase. It is promoted by the same spooks that promote Bill Hicks becoming Alex Jones. These theories are all misdirection, but in the case of Chase and Morrison, there *is* a match with the eyes that I confirm. They aren't the same person, but they do have very similar eyes. Well, I have shown the reason for that in recent papers: they are closely related. The Chases and Morrisons come from the same stock, and their families have intermarried many times. Chase and Morrison are hidden cousins, which is why their eyes are very similar. Given that, it is possible the same may be true of Hicks and Jones. Remember, I recently showed the Jones family was involved in the big con at least back to Inigo Jones. I don't know about Hicks. Someone else with more interest in the subject will have to do the genealogies.

Which brings us back to Owen Tudor. That also links us to many previous papers, most obviously my paper on [Engels and Owen](#). Robert Owen was a prominent player in the early Communism project, and he was from northern Wales. [In more recent papers](#), we have seen the Owens coming right out of Anglesey. They were heirs of the Penrhos Estate on the island. So it looks like the Tudors were not really Tudors, they were Owens. You should follow the first name of Owen Tudor, not the last name. In support of that, we find Owen Tudor's ancestry completely scrubbed. Or, some names are given, but then they admit:

The fact that little is known about Tudor's early life and that it has instead become largely mythologized is attributed to his family's part in the Glyndŵr Rising. At various times it has been said that he was the bastard son of an alehouse keeper, that his father was a fugitive murderer, that he fought at Agincourt, that he was keeper of Queen Catherine's household or wardrobe, that he was an esquire of Henry V, and that his relationship with Catherine began when he fell into the queen's lap while dancing or caught the queen's eye when swimming. The sixteenth-century Welsh chronicler [Elis Gruffydd](#) did note that he was her sewer (someone who places dishes on the table and tastes them^[4]) and servant. However, it is known that after the Glyndŵr Rising several Welshmen secured positions at court, and in May 1421 an 'Owen Meredith' joined the retinue of Sir [Walter Hungerford, 1st Baron Hungerford](#), the steward of the king's household from 1415 until 1421.

If that is so, it obviously conflicts with what we are told of Owen's father and grandfather, who are supposed to have been Welsh noblemen. At any rate, it is incredible that so little would be known of the grandfather of a King of England. *All* the given stories are unbelievable, so we may assume they aren't true. The widow of Henry V wouldn't marry the son of an alehouse keeper, the son of a fugitive murderer, or one of her servants. She also wouldn't marry one of these minor faux-nobles from Anglesey. But she might marry a filthy rich Jewish merchant. We have seen that happen many times. In support of that, we again find the usual numerology. Owen Tudor was the namesake of Tudor Hen, whose birth date is unknown but whose date of death is given as October 11, 1311. Remember, October means "eighth month", so they often use it to denote 8 instead of August. And so we have aces and eights, dead man's hand. Aces and eights actually have nothing to do with a dead man: they denote some signal of the top families. Just as they like the number 33 and the number 47, they also like aces and eights. The numbers probably have a more specific meaning, but we can read them all as "we are here" signals.

On Henry VII's page, they admit his connections to Welsh aristocracy were not strong, his great grandfather having been a butler to the Bishop of Bangor. It is still not explained how the son of this butler, Owen Tudor, was able to bed the former Queen of the realm. We are told

Owen Tudor, the son of the butler, like the children of other rebels, was provided for by Henry V, a circumstance that precipitated his access to Queen Catherine of Valois.

Say what? So we are supposed to believe that every son-of-a-butler "provided for" by Henry V had

“access” to Queen Catherine? Interesting.

More indication we are on the right path is the fact that Anglesey is an important port, used in shipping. Today, Holyhead is mostly a ferry port, but in earlier centuries it was used for shipping products. The richest Jewish families have naturally congregated around such ports, as we saw above with Venice. I suspect something else is going on on Anglesey, but haven't figured out what. It may simply be an analogue of Martha's Vineyard: an island where the superwealthy can hide without going very far from the action.

But let's return to Henry VII. His father is given as Edmund Tudor, first Earl of Richmond. Strange that the King's father would be the *first* Earl of anything. Also curious is that this Edmund had a brother named Jasper. Really? Jasper? Why not Moses or Israel? That would make as much sense. Then we are told:

Born to [Owen Tudor](#) and [Queen dowager Catherine of Valois](#), Edmund was half-brother to [Henry VI of England](#). After being raised for several years by [Katherine de la Pole](#), Henry took an interest in Edmund's upbringing. Once he came to age, Edmund was granted a title and lands by Henry. Both Edmund and his brother [Jasper](#), were each made advisers to the King as they were his remaining blood relatives.

But wait, that conflicts with other things we are taught. Henry VI had a son, Edward of Westminster, who didn't die until 1471, so why would he be promoting these idiot-pretender half-brothers from Wales? Edward was born in 1453, when Henry was 31, so Henry would be in no hurry to promote half-brothers. Edmund Tudor only lived to be 25, and in 1453 he was only 21. Also, the Duke of York (whose son was later Edward IV) was always heir presumptive to Henry VI, with much greater claims to the throne than Edmund or Jasper, so there is no possibility these brothers had a look-in. It would be foolish for Henry to promote them in any scenario. The Duke of York's main rival for the throne before Edward of Westminster was born was not Edmund Tudor, but Edmund Beaufort—who also had much greater claims to the throne than the Tudors. Therefore, there is no chance the given story is true. Henry VI probably never even heard of Edmund Tudor, who may not have existed at all.

continued below



That is supposed to be the tomb effigy of Edmund Tudor, but it looks like a fake. It comes from Wikipedia. There is no information where they got that or how it was created. A tomb effigy is normally a carving, but that is obviously not a carving. It is also not a stone rubbing. As a line drawing on a black background, it would have to be a recreation of some original effigy, but why not show the original? If the original has been destroyed, how do they know what it looked like?

Another problem is that we are told Henry Tudor was born in Pembroke Castle. That castle is nowhere near Anglesey, being in the *southwest* corner of Wales. It looks to me like it was chosen for this story because it is a very impressive existing structure from that period. Pembroke Castle was supposedly given to Jasper Tudor just five years before Henry Tudor was born, but, as I said, that is very unlikely. Jasper would have been just 22 at the time, and had done absolutely nothing to merit such a castle. Yes, his mother was a former Queen of England, but when she had died in 1437, her husband Owen Tudor had been thrown into prison. That is the response we would expect for a step-family of the King, not their promotion. It is not clear why his sons were not also thrown into prison, or silently smothered. Also a problem is that we are told Pembroke went to Jasper, not his older brother Edmund. As the Earl of Richmond, perhaps Edmund got the Castle of Richmond. But the problem there is that at the time, the Castle of Richmond was already falling into disuse. It would soon be in ruins. So why would the younger brother get the better castle? I will be told Edmund was given other more livable properties as well, and that may be so, but it brings up another question. Richmond would certainly have been his most profitable and prestigious estates, which is why he was the Earl of that region. But if we look at the previous owner, John of Lancaster, 1st Duke of Bedford, we find a huge mismatch. John was the third son of Henry IV, and the brother of Henry V. His other sister was the Queen of Denmark. John was also the Regent for Henry VI. He was a successful general in the Hundred Years War. That is the sort of person you would expect to be given Richmond. Edmund Tudor, on the other hand, was the illegitimate son of a relative nobody, and we have no way to even verify he was the son of his alleged parents. The story of his father and mother strains all credibility, and is admitted by mainstream

historians to be mostly myth. At least two dozen nobles in the kingdom merited Richmond more than this Edmund Tudor, and Henry VI would have caused a (real) civil war had he actually given Richmond to such a person. So we may assume he didn't.

The death of Edmund Tudor also reads like fiction, since it doesn't make any sense. On his Wiki page, we are told that in 1456 the Duke of York was deposed by the King. In retaliation, York sent an army in August to take South Wales. While there, they captured Edmund Tudor. Sitting in jail for several months, he caught the plague in November and died. He was buried in Carmarthen. None of that is believable. Let's start at the end and work our way back. Why would he be buried in Carmarthen? He was born in Anglesey, remember? Carmarthen is in south Wales, while Edmund was from far northern Wales. Why would he catch the plague in November of 1456? The Black Death had been in remission for over half a century, and anyway it was normally worst in the warmer months. If he was going to catch it, he would have caught it in August, not November. If Edmund had really been captured, his captors would certainly not have thrown him into rat-infested quarters. He was supposed to be the son of a Queen, and a favorite of the current King. They wouldn't want him dying of disease, since as a captive he should have been useful as a bargaining chip. Why would York attack South Wales in 1456 in any event? Say the King had deposed him: what could be gained by attacking Carmarthen? A threatened York would have had better things to do than send troops to Carmarthen. But all those concerns are just quibbles compared to this: **in fact, in 1456, York had *not* been deposed.** All you have to do is consult his page at Wikipedia, where they admit that in that year York's Lieutenancy of Ireland had been renewed and he continued to attend meetings of Council. There is nothing about York being responsible for the death of Edmund Tudor. In August, the Court moved to Coventry, but there is nothing concerning a fall of York. There could hardly be, since York had captured the King in the Battle of St. Albans in 1455, and Henry VI was still in York's control in 1456. York's fall wouldn't be until 1459, when he was beaten at Ludford. We have more confirmation of this on the page of William Herbert of Pembroke, who is claimed to have been responsible for imprisoning Edmund Tudor. Curiously, there is nothing about that on his page, either, although it would have been the biggest event of his life. Luminarium.org has [a much longer page](#) on this Pembroke, but it also fails to mention anything about the year 1456. He is said to have done notable service against Jasper Tudor, but nothing about imprisoning Edmund Tudor.

Now, let us return to Henry VII. Did you know his mother was said to have been 13 when she bore him? I assume this number was chosen to fit Henry's claim to be the *Y Mab Darongan*, or the Destined Son of Welsh Legend. No other King of England since Arthur had been claimed by the bards to be this messianic figure of the Celts, which is highly curious. I suggest it was crypto-Jewish writers at the time who made this claim, making the Welsh people think it was coming from other sources. It helped Henry's cause immensely, hiding him behind local legends. Of course, it is very unlikely his mother was 13 when she bore him. Although some women did marry that young, very few were fertile at that age. Although menarche does occur today at around 13, in the 1400s it didn't. It occurred at around 17. See [this page](#) at Wikipedia, which states that in England in 1840, menarche was at age 16.5. Four hundred years earlier it would be even later.

This is more indication Henry VII's entire bio is a myth.

For more mystery, we can look to Henry's time in France, after Edward IV regained the throne. Henry lived for 14 years with Francis II, Duke of Brittany. Why is this mysterious? Because this Francis descended in his matrilineal line from the same families we saw above. His grandmother was Valentina Visconti of Milan. This indicates Francis and Henry either had the same 2g-grandmother, or their 2g-grandmothers were sisters. Further back, Francis' ancestors were Przemyslids from Bohemia.

We saw them above as well. We can take them back to Judith of Habsburg, whose first name is even a clue here. Judith is commonly a Jewish name, of course.

The Przemyslid dynasty appears to have been infiltrated in about 1200 when Vladislaus II, Duke of Bohemia, married Judith Thuringia. Note her first name. Their son would be Ottokar I, King of Bohemia. Ottokar married Constance, daughter of Bela III of Hungary, who was—as we saw above—an Arpad. We are told Judith of Thuringia was the daughter Hedwig of Gudensberg, but this whole family comes out of nowhere. I suggest Judith was Jewish. It is admitted that many Jews lived in the realm at the time, especially in Prague, and were very prominent traders. So to see a Jewish marriage into nobility in Prague is not that surprising. It is exactly where you would expect such a thing to happen.

The next shocking thing we find in the bio of Henry VII is this:

By 1483, Henry's mother was actively promoting him as an alternative to [Richard III](#), despite her being married to a Yorkist, [Lord Stanley](#).



Of course this links us back to my previous papers, and the name Stanley. As my regular readers will know, it may link us to John Lennon, whose mother was a Stanley. It may link us to Obama's mother. This Lord Stanley was Thomas Stanley, 1st Earl of Derby. We were just told Stanley was a Yorkist, but a check of his genealogy shows he was—or should have been—a Lancastrian. His great grandmother was Eleanor of Lancaster. Stanley's father and grandfather were high officials in Lancashire. His father represented Lancashire in Parliament nine times. Stanley's grandfather John owned large parts of Liverpool, including Stanley Tower. The clue to all this is found here:

A landed magnate of immense power, particularly across the northwest of England where his authority went almost unchallenged, even by the Crown, Stanley managed to remain in favour with successive kings throughout the [Wars of the Roses](#) until his death in 1504.

Yes, and how did he manage that? Well, how is such a thing managed today? It is managed by

working behind the scenes, funding both sides and playing them off of one another for profit. This is admitted by the Oxford Dictionary, which says that Stanley was “probably the most successful power-broker of his age”. Gee, who does such things? Financiers, of course. This indicates to me that the Stanleys were probably the creators of this entire false history, a sort of Rothschilds of their time. They were Yorks when it suited them, Lancastrians when it suited them, and later Tudors. They were the puppetmasters.

Like more recent financiers, Stanley was slippery as an eel, appearing disloyal to both sides, but always “forgiven” for it. Since this could be said of no one else, it is a great clue as to his real status in the play. He was not actually an actor in the scene, he was the *director* of the scene, and therefore above all recrimination.

I have to admit this is all far more than I had hoped to find when I began this paper. I was looking for more data on Henry VII, not on the Stanleys. But when that name popped up on Henry VII's page, I knew I had hit a nugget. Does this mean the War of the Roses was faked? Probably not. For now, I would say it looks managed, like the other wars we have looked at. Certain facts were faked, but as a whole the war was probably not faked. Completely faked wars cannot be managed for profit, since they exist only on paper; but staged wars can be.

Discovering this once again proves to me that there are no real historians. This was so easy to unwind it is unbelievable no one did it before me. The tenured historians now look to me like paid propagandists, misdirecting you away from all real history and all logical readings of the given history.

We see proof of Stanley's slipperiness again in 1483, at the death of Edward IV. We are told Gloucester physically attacked Stanley in Council, wounding him and sending him to prison. But that makes no sense. Gloucester was not yet King, and therefore had no authority to imprison another Councillor. Besides, we find Stanley miraculously released a few months later. To explain that, we are told

Apparently “in preparing the ground for the usurpation and in consolidating his position, Richard found it more expedient to appease than to alienate the house of Stanley.”^[1] Thus, Lord Stanley was soon at liberty and continued as steward of the royal household, apparently flourishing at the heart of the new regime. He bore the great mace at Richard's coronation, while his wife carried the new queen's train. Richard stripped Stanley's wife Margaret Beaufort of all her titles and possession for her part “in compassyng and doying Treason”, but transferred all her properties to Stanley, effectively negating much of the punishment.^[2]

Right. The things they expect you to believe. If Stanley's wife had been treasonous, so had Stanley, and yet both escaped all punishment, the King simply transferring Stanley's wife's possessions to Stanley—which was already the case.

More shenanigans are found in the next paragraph, where we are told of Buckingham's rebellion. It is admitted that Stanley's wife Beaufort was a key conspirator against the King, and that Stanley himself may have been involved, even while being Lord High Constable. And yet both of them again skated.

This is simply not credible, given that Stanley would soon again conspire against Richard III (formerly Gloucester), this time unseating him, killing him, and replacing him with Henry VII. Since Stanley controlled northern England and Wales, it was he himself who enabled Henry to attack from that direction. Stanley's brother William fought as a general against the King, and of course won. We are told

Lord Stanley took no direct part in the action but stood unmoving between the two armies. . . .

Hmmm. That doesn't sound like a very good place to stand in a battle, unless you are the director. Richard III was allegedly killed on the battlefield, and Thomas Stanley was conveniently at hand to take the crown off his head and put it on the head of Henry VII. Although Richard had Stanley's son Lord Strange captive during the battle as insurance, he miraculously escaped death. In a real battle, that would never happen. At a clear sign of defeat, he would have had his throat immediately slit.

I will be told that the brother William Stanley was executed by Henry in 1495, but that whole thing was completely faked. It was part of the Perkin Warbeck rebellion, which is the most ridiculous thing in this ridiculous history. It was obviously the cover for yet another managed war (this time with Scotland), but since Henry had been installed by the Stanleys, there is no possibility he would execute one of them. I will have to unwind it later. But if you doubt the Warbeck rebellion was fake, just consider one piece of evidence. When he was captured after a battle in Cornwall,

Warbeck was initially treated well by Henry. As soon as he confessed to being an impostor, he was released from the Tower of London, and was given accommodation at Henry's court [where he spent at least 18 months]. He was even allowed to be present at royal banquets.

You have to be kidding me. This is a guy who had been claiming all over Europe that he was King Edward IV, the rightful ruler of England. Upon capture, he should have been summarily executed by the King's guard.

But back to Thomas Stanley. As Lord High Constable in 1483, Stanley was in control of the Tower of London, where the famous Princes in the Tower were held that year.



You may know of that beautiful painting by John Everett Millais. It depicts Edward V, king for two months, and Richard, Duke of York. Richard III allegedly imprisoned them and had them murdered in order to take the throne for himself. He had to murder Richard as well because the boy had better

claims to the throne than him. Well, it now looks like that whole story was managed by Stanley as well, and the boys were probably just relocated. No bodies were ever found, which is supposed to be evidence of murder but is really stronger evidence of a fake. Seeing Stanley as their guard at the Tower is more evidence of a managed or faked event, since he specialized in those. Stanley simply wished to install Gloucester, and this is the story he chose to cover it. You will say that Stanley needed to kill the boys to prevent them coming back later, but that isn't true. To come back later, the boys would have required more powerful promoters than Stanley, and none of those existed. Stanley knew that, so he had no need to kill the boys. Like everyone else, they would follow orders. Stanley knew by long experience that these nobles had no initiative. If they had, they would never have allowed people like Stanley to take over England. That's why he could stand nonchalantly between two moving armies, with no fear of a stray arrow. He probably didn't even have on armor.

If you don't think any of this could have been managed, consider this strange admission at Wikipedia on the page for Stanley:

Also, since Buckingham's uprising was expressly staged in favour of Henry Tudor's claim to the throne. . . .

Note word "staged". Buckingham's rebellion was also in 1483, and it was allegedly led by Henry Stafford, 2nd Duke of Buckingham.



Does he look English? Not even a little bit. Buckingham was a Beaufort, so he was tied to all the cons above. He was also related to the Greys, who would be involved in the later Lady Jane Grey hoax. They were also related to the Berkeleys and the Spencers. His 2g-grandmother was Elizabeth le Despenser. Despenser's grandmother was Joan of Acre, a strange name curiously close to the later Joan of Arc. We are told Joan got the name Acre from being born in the Holy Land. Joan of Acre's mother was from Castile, which we saw above. If we continue going back in the matrilineal line, we come to Alys, daughter of Constance of Castile. Alys' sister Margaret married Bela III of Hungary, who we already saw twice above. So all these people are of the same lines.

Which leads us to look again at the Stanleys. We have to go way back, but the Stanleys changed their name from Alditheley in about 1125. Apparently they took the name from the matrilineal line at the time, which was Stoneleigh. Other than that, I couldn't find much in the ancestry, which is well scrubbed. However, it is interesting to find that Thomas Stanley's daughter married a Molyneux. Of course this reminds us of Stefan Molyneux, a prominent figure in conspiracy circles on youtube. He

looks like a disinfo agent to me, but you will have to come to your own conclusions there. I do not waste my time squabbling with current actors. However, I will point out that he went to **York** University and also McGill. Coincidence? I doubt it. At York he was an actor at *Theatre* Glendon. He also attended the National *Theatre* School of Canada. Is he related to game designer Peter Molyneux, OBE? Except for the bald heads, they don't look alike, but possibly. Peter looks very French, while Stefan looks English or Dutch. Neither look particularly Jewish, I admit.

In marrying a Molyneux, it looks like Stanley's daughter was marrying a cousin, since both families descend from Houghtons. [On these pages](#), we again find Erica “the Disconnetrix” Howton as page manager, which connects “her” to these people. Houghton. Howton. It looks like she was assigned the job of hiding all the important links in these Stanley/Molyneux/Houghton pages. However, we do find links to the Leighs here, which would later be Lee. See my previous paper for more on the Lees. We also link to Audley and Mainwaring. That last link is important, since Mainwarings are still involved in the current hoaxes.

Stanley's mother-in-law was Alice Montague, which ties us back to [my paper on George Washington](#), where we saw his grandmother given as Mary Montague.

Another family I haven't yet touched on is the Woodvilles. They were also part of this clan. To understand where they came from, we again go to the genealogies. Elizabeth Woodville was Queen of Edward IV. Her father was the 1st Earl Rivers, but her maternal great grandmother is the key. She was an Orsini. This family produced three Popes and 34 cardinals. At the time of our tale, they had ruled Rome and Naples on and off for centuries, both through the church and through the Senate. The Orsinis claim to descend from Julius Caesar, but no one believes that. I suggest they are crypto-Jews, like the Medicis and Morosinis. The Orsinis and Medicis intermarried several times. As another clue in that direction, remember Count Orsini-Rosenberg, featured in the film *Amadeus*. He was actually First Prince of the Holy Roman Empire. Well, if you saw the name Rosenberg today, you would probably assume it was Jewish. I suggest you assume the same thing about Orsini-Rosenberg, and therefore Orsini.

Strangely, we find witchcraft mentioned in the lines of the Woodvilles. Elizabeth's grandmother, Jacquetta of Luxembourg, was famously accused of witchcraft by Thomas Wake, a follower of Warwick. Her first husband Bedford was the brother of Henry V; but her second husband was Woodville, who was killed by Warwick in 1469. She was cleared when Warwick freed Edward IV from custody. But Richard III brought similar charges against her 12 years later, claiming the Woodvilles had acquired the Queenship by witchcraft. Of course we now know how to read this: then as now, witchcraft was just a cover for spycraft, and the Woodvilles didn't make a Queen through witchcraft, they made her through Jewish financial and matrilineal connections. Same way they made Kings.

From all this, we can see how the Jewish lines pushed across Europe from the east, starting in Poland and Hungary, moving down into Italy, and only then pushing across to Holland and England. They moved via the great port cities like Venice and Naples and Amsterdam, which is why Liverpool figures prominently in the English story, and why we see Anglesey playing a lesser role.

Addendum, November 6, 2016: I just discovered more connections to Anglesey. I showed in my recent paper on Obama's genealogy that Elizabeth Taylor's line goes back to Lewises. I did that to link her to C. S. Lewis and others. However, I didn't go back far enough. If we keep going back, we come to [Hugh Lewis, b. 1515, Presaddfed, Bobedern, Anglesey](#). He married Agnes Griffith and his mother

was a Vaughan. This links us to the published genealogy of Daniel Day-Lewis, as I show in a 3-page addendum to my [C. S. Lewis paper](#). He was descended from these same Lewises, Vaughans, and Griffiths.** Anglesey is small island, so it is curious to find all these famous people descending from there, also including Jones. Also remember Field Marshal Henry Paget, Marquess of Anglesey. This just goes to confirm my thesis above.

*You will say, "Of course the two Arpad lines are linked, since that is how John of Gaunt claimed Castile. But no, John claimed Castile through his second wife, Constance of Castile. But above, I showed a link to his *third* wife, Katherine Swynford. Strictly, the Arpad dynasty link was between Philippa of Hainault and Henry III of Castile. But since Katherine's sister was also named Philippa, I propose there weren't two Philippas but one, and that Katherine Swynford was the *sister* of Hainault. This would mean John of Gaunt just happened to marry two women linked to the Arpad dynasty, and that mainstream historians have never noticed that. Since that is unlikely, a better assumption is that the mainstream has always known it, but is scrubbing it.

**Think Andy Griffith and Melanie Griffith, among many others. I am now seeing that almost all US actors descend from these families. Brad Pitt is probably descended from Sir William Pitt and the Earls of Chatham. And so on. So much left to do.