

[return to updates](#)

# IF YOU RUN PROJECTS AGAINST ME I WILL OUT YOU and Everyone Around You

*by Miles Mathis*

*First published July 2, 2017*

Hundreds of bozos are running low-level projects against me, and I am getting tired of it. The projects are transparent and I can't believe anyone is falling for them, but some are.

I have mentioned DraftScience at youtube before. He doesn't make it clear he isn't me, and his vids pollute the page of my friend Steven Oostdijk. Steven is the Dutch guy who made [the video on pi=4](#) for me. DraftScience appears in the sidebar, and some think he is me. He isn't. But some scumbags are using his ugly mug to imply that I have aged very poorly in the past decade. I now think that may have been his main assignment and use. People think he is me and run screaming.



That first pic is me, the second is DraftScience. Can you tell the difference? Some will claim that is an old pic of me, but it isn't. It is a selfie I just took in the bathroom mirror. The first selfie I have ever taken. I didn't clean up first or use professional lighting, since I didn't want an unfair advantage. Still, I think you can see why I don't like being mistaken for DaftScience.

I am almost 54. Yes kids, you too can age gracefully if you get your sleep, don't smoke, don't drink and don't do drugs.

The second person I wish to out is TexasShrugged, who I have mentioned recently. He is also at Youtube. I can see how he fools people, since he has a nice voice. But I saw through him immediately. The clue? He is pushing the parallel universes gambit, using quantum physics to confuse you. Read

[this paper](#) and you will also see through him.

But what got me writing today was Apollonian Germ, also at Youtube. Real name Michael Huttner. One of my readers sent me to him, since the Germ seems to be promoting me. He isn't. He is trying to tie me to people I don't wish to be tied to, including himself and [Julius Evola](#). See [his video on Evola](#), then take that last link. Who is Evola? Evola is one of the biggest creeps of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as well as one of them most obvious spooks of all time—right up there with Aleister Crowley. To make this short, Evola was in the Nazi SD, which was the Intel arm of the SS. Which basically means he was a Jewish actor from the prominent families, *pretending* to be a Nazi. Even though the whole Nazi history is a fake, these people are still very bad guys. They are just very different bad guys than what you were told. See my papers on the [Beer Hall Putsch](#) and on [Hitler's Genealogy](#).

So if the Germ is reading my papers, he isn't reading very closely. The Germ is trying to surround me with all this fascist, “traditionalist”, anti-liberal garbage, but don't fall for it. I am not a fascist, I am an anti-fascist. I say that in almost every paper and it is obvious even when I don't. I also call myself an old-school liberal: by which I mean I am against unbridled predation by the wealthy upon the lower and middle classes. I critique Modernism all the time, as you know, but that doesn't mean I have or want any alliances with the right, the Republican party, or cloaked fascists by any other name. I also don't want any alliances with the Democratic party, since it is just another front for the same fascists—as we will see again below.

By the way, Michael, you better knock off the cigs or you will look like DaftScience in no time at all.

The Germ uses the term “traditional” on purpose, since I also use it. My paintings are traditional and much of my advice is traditional. I have a great respect for the past—the *real* past. Which just means I can recognize old things of quality. Old beautiful paintings, old beautiful architecture, old beautiful ideas. But the Germ tries to flip all that on you, using the term traditional but then promoting admitted fascists and Nazis like Evola.

So I don't really appreciate being read and promoted by a guy who is also reading his crap college papers, Evola, Marcus Eli Ravage, and so on. I would prefer he left me out of it.

**[Addendum July 8, 2017:** I heard from the youtube Michael Huttner today, and he assured me he was not related to any of the people below. As a nod to fairness, I agreed to post that here. Since there are no genealogies posted, it is impossible to say. I also watched his response video to this paper, also as a nod to fairness. It did not allay any of my suspicions. There he says that I am the only one who would think anything about his Evola video, or suspect it was being used to blackwash me, but I doubt that is true. Anyone who knows who Evola was would find that video a strange inclusion on his channel. Why would a good guy include Evola on his channel in any way, other than to expose him? No answer to that was forthcoming. I also watched Huttner's video called “A Few Outlandish Theories”. He also prefaces them by calling them “goofy”. The first three are mine, uncredited. If Huttner is such a great fan of mine, why is he calling my papers outlandish and goofy? In his email, Huttner offered to remove my name and content from his channel completely. I accepted. We will see what he does.]

More easy research on the Germ turns up some curious things. For instance, if you search on his name, you are taken to Michael Huttner, crisis communications expert, author, and CEO of Fenton.



Fenton is a pretend-left organization created to control the opposition. It was started in 1982 by David Fenton.



He was formerly PR head at *Rolling Stone* in the 1970s. He also started J Street, a pro-Israel “peace” group. I wonder why? Could be [because he is Jewish](#). Huttner is also probably Jewish. See [here](#), where we find a Michael Dean Huttner of Boulder, CO, related to Bienenstocks and Herzes. The Michael Huttner above is from Denver, just up the road, and his middle name is also Dean. Bienenstock and Herz are Jewish names, just so you know. So is Michael Dean Huttner related to the Germ? I could find no confirmation online, but my guess is yes.

Regardless of who he is related to, Michael Dean Huttner is well worth exposing as a fraud. He also founded ProgressNow, which is closely tied to MoveOn. Both promoted Obama, remember. As part of that, Huttner wrote the book *50 Ways You Can Help Obama Change America*. That really worked out well, didn't it? Obama turned out to be so progressive and such a breath of fresh air, right?

Let me pause on that word “progressive”. These fake traditionalists like the Germ try to redefine “progressive”, just like they have redefined “liberal”. They tell you it has something to do with crazy feminists, fake social justice warriors (which were manufactured by the right, by the way), over-the-top gay promotion, and so on. But neither progressive nor liberal mean anything like that. I am against crazy Modern stuff, as you know, but I still call myself a liberal. That is because I still use the old pre-CIA definition of liberal, which has to do with protecting normal people from the very rich—whether those very rich people are nobles or financiers. Here is the first paragraph at Wiki on “liberalism”:

**Liberalism** is a [political philosophy](#) or [worldview](#) founded on ideas of [liberty](#) and [equality](#).<sup>[1][2][3]</sup> Liberals espouse a wide array of views depending on their understanding of these principles, but generally they support ideas and programmes such as [freedom of speech](#), [freedom of the press](#), [freedom of religion](#), [free markets](#), [civil rights](#), [democratic](#) societies, [secular](#) governments, [gender equality](#), and [international cooperation](#).

I agree with all of that, which is why I am a liberal. Originally, equality meant “equal under the law”. It has to do with equal *rights*. It doesn't imply everyone has equal abilities, or should be given equal

consideration on every issue—even issues they know nothing about. It implies that normal people shouldn't be lied to and preyed upon by rich people, and that therefore normal people should be treated with equal consideration in matters of law, education, finance, health, and so on. That is, *public* matters, not private matters. It is simply a fairness doctrine. Same with gender equality. It didn't originally mean that the sexes should be indistinguishable. It meant that one sex shouldn't be able to prey on the other one in any arena. It meant that women should be equal under the law. That's what all the other issues are about as well, including freedom of speech, freedom of the press, unions and so on. Without those things, it is too easy for the rich to monopolize society, raking everything into their corner.

However, as I have shown you, the rich have found a way around all that. One way they have found a way around it is by twisting the passage above, making you think liberalism is something it is not. People like Alex Jones, Mike Adams, the Germ, and thousands of others have been drumming into your head the idea that the collapse of Modern society is the fault of liberals, and of the idea of liberalism. They want you to think that all the worst aspects of our culture came from the promotion of liberalism. But just the opposite is true. As we have seen in my papers of the past five years or so, real liberals didn't create any of these movements—including Modern art, what now passes for feminism, gender chaos, or any of the rest. They were all top-down projects of Intel, usually coming out of the military, and financed by the big capitalists—most of them Jewish. I didn't know that a few years ago, and honestly didn't want to know it, but there it is. I am honest enough to admit the truth when it hits me in the face. I did my own research from the ground up, and that research took me to the same culprits *every time*.

This means that liberalism has been blackwashed on purpose. It has been blackwashed just like republicanism was before it, and for the same reason. Both liberalism and republicanism are anti-fascist. They promote the rights of the lower and middle classes not to be preyed on by the rich. But, as we have seen, the rich have been infiltrating and blackwashing republicanism for centuries. That is what Marxism was all about. Marx was from Jewish industrialist families, and he was nothing more than a mole into the republican camps, blowing them from the inside. It is the same with liberalism, which has been blown both from the outside and from the inside, via the long telling of fantastic lies by thousands of paid agents.

Another way the rich have undercut liberalism is by allowing things like free speech and freedom of the press, while gutting them of all real meaning. In theory, we have freedom of the press in the US, since the military is not actively shutting down major media at gunpoint. In reality, the press is not free at all, since it is completely *owned* by the rich. That is the neo-fascist answer to the press: not to forcibly control it, but to *financially* control it. In our society, the media is managed, which makes it utterly useless as a tool of liberalism.

Beyond that, an owned and managed media can be used to flip the world on you, making you think things exist at A when they really exist at Z. They have convinced you the US is suffering from liberalism, and that therefore we need to move right. When the truth is, the US isn't liberal at all, by the definition above. The country is tightly controlled from the top down, your freedoms are illusory, and all the events you see in the news are manufactured to keep you from the truth. Which means—by the old real definitions of words—we need to move sharp left. Basically, “right” means the rich control everything and have all the advantages; “left” means normal people have an equal chance for advancement and can expect to be treated fairly. The entire world is far far far right.

Some have asked me why I seem to care so much about the lower and middle classes. Where does my

feeling of solidarity come from? They say something like, “You are a 1%er in every way, except financially, so what is the connection?” Well, to be honest, I don't feel that much solidarity with the lower or middle classes, especially when they are driving by in their monster trucks, throwing shit at me as I innocently try to ride my bicycle to the organic market. The only feeling of solidarity I have is that these people are being treated unfairly by the rich, just like me. Well, not just like me, but in similar ways. We are all being lied to and preyed upon and squashed. And I feel even less solidarity with the rich, who aren't 1%ers like I am. They are 1% only in regards to cash, which means nothing to me. Think of the Bushes, who couldn't have gotten out of high school without a bye.

But mainly it isn't about solidarity. It is that you find early on in this life that you have to pick a side, and I have picked my side. Those people asking me about solidarity follow that question up with another, which is “Why didn't you just join the 1%? It would have been so much easier to marry the Jewish girl, use her connections, and coast. You would be sitting pretty by now”. Yes, I had my chances to do that, but I chose not to. I don't regret it. In fact, I am more sure I made the right decision every year. Why? Because although I like to win, I like to win on merit, not by cheating the other guy. I cheated in minor ways a couple of times when I was a kid, and I hated myself for it. But I learned my lesson. That isn't who I want to be. I want to be who I am. Which means the lower and middle classes could become much more debased, vulgar, and despicable than they already are, and I still would not wish to cheat them or prey on them. Cheating them blackens my own soul, and I don't want a black soul.

I want to like myself, and I do. I don't *have* to live with anyone else day to day except myself, so I had better remain a good companion. If I begin hating myself, it is all over. It doesn't matter how much money you have or don't have, if you can't stand your own company. That's the bottom line, isn't it? My detractors claim that I love myself, but I don't. Not in the way they mean. But I do like myself and have a lot of self-confidence, and the reason I have that is because I haven't let my soul become black. This rankles them, and I suppose the blacker their souls are the more it rankles them. They don't like themselves, so they can't stand to see anyone who has avoided the pitfalls they have failed to avoid.

So that is how I got where I am. Some look at me with apparent pity, since they would not want to be where I am, fighting with the whole world and struggling financially. But they don't understand that I am right where I want to be. I made a series of informed decisions (and good guesses) to get here, and I believe they were the right decisions. I would much rather be here than anywhere else I know of.

But back to the matter at hand. The company Fenton is also closely tied to Wikipedia. Fenton was “awarded” \$250,000 in 2009 to build the credibility of Wikipedia. Another fail. As for ProgressNow, it was started in 2003 as a response to the “libertarian” Independence Institute, also of Denver, Colorado. Of course, that institute isn't libertarian at all, it is conservative/fascist and is linked to the Koch brothers. But ProgressNow is also misnamed, since it isn't progressive. It is simply the controlled opposition, being run by the same fascists. As usual, they control both sides, both the fake left and the fake right. These Jewish guys are hoaxing you from both sides, on every issue.

With a bit more research, we run across [David Huttner](#), who—you may or may not remember—ran for President in 2016.



Study that face. If you trust this man at a glance, you need years of practice in studying faces. Grandfather of the Germ? Who knows? He tells us he is the world's best social scientist. That would be pretty hard to quantify, wouldn't it? There is no Masters tournament to decide that, is there? It is sort of like claiming to be the world's best blogsnorter or the world's best snapflapper. In his bio, Huttner tells us that although Jesus was a mythical person, George Orwell really did die for our sins—and that this had something to do with latent homosexuality. I strongly encourage you to read David Huttner's campaign speech, at the last link. It is the craziest thing of its type I have ever seen. But notice he does to Mark McCutcheon exactly what the Germ is trying to do to me: surround him with craziness. David Huttner goes out of his way to confirm to you he is crazy, then he recommends the work of Mark McCutcheon. So McCutcheon gets blackwashed. This is what it is to be an Anti. Huttner is being a perfect Anti here, which makes me think he *is* the grandfather of our Germ. They are running the exact same project in the exact same terms.

If you don't know what I mean, you haven't read my science papers. As it happens, Mark McCutcheon was questioning mainstream physics about a decade ago, same as me. Although he is now off the radar (as far as I know), he put forward an expansion theory of gravity that had some rough similarities to mine. So it looks like he was targeted by the same people for the same reasons.

[Intelius tells us](#) that Michael Huttner is related to David Huttner.

On our search, we also find an artist David Huttner at Gallery Steiner in Vienna, 2011. Since he is doing really bad photorealism, we may assume he is part of the anti-art project aimed at people like me. The Modernists have to keep real Realism in the grave, so when it began making some genuine advances after 2000, they once again created their own opposition, bringing in these fake artists from their own families to promote as budding Realists. That was enough to sour the public on Realism for another decade at least. People saw this garbage and decided art wasn't really worth fighting about, or fighting for.



If that is the Realist response to Modernism, why bother fighting for a return of Realism? For more on this question, see [my older paper on Tim Eitel](#).



There is also a David Huttner who is Senior VP of Nyras, formerly Virgin Blue. This links him to Richard Branson (above), of course. Branson is another spook from the old families of the peerage, as you can see [here](#) at WARGS. Like Paul McCartney and Mick Jagger, Branson has been knighted, but that was probably a step down for him. He is probably in the peerage, and thereby outranked all knights from birth. Like many others, he is sold as a self-made billionaire, but there is no such thing in this world. Notice that he is a **Hamilton**, **Chaplin**, Warner, **Fisher**, Barnes, Phillips, **Brabazon** and Durham. Also notice that his ancestry is very scrubbed. His Jenkins line disappears after his grandmother, indicating that is where much of the action is. That is the matrilineal (Jewish) line, by the way. Branson may be scrubbed in that line because the Jenkins in the peerage [are related to the Dunbars](#) and MacKenzies, linking us to major action in Scotland—as we saw in my recent [paper on Paul McCartney](#). This line links us to the Grants, Gordons, and Eyres, [as well as the Hamiltons again](#). This double hit on Hamilton in so short a space does indicate to me that Branson is related to the peerage Jenkins. With a little more digging, we find the Jenkins [related to the Vaughans and Herberts](#), possibly linking us already to David Vaughan Icke and Stacy Herbert. These Herberts are the Earls of Powis, and they link us to the Grahams (Dukes of Montrose), the Montagus (Dukes of Manchester), and the Crowleys. Gee, that name already came up above, didn't it? Aleister Crowley.

Guess who the Crowleys were related to? [The Owens](#). On that page, we find a **Lettice** Crowley. That

first name also rings a bell, doesn't it? Remember [Lettice Knollys](#) (below), related to the **Riches**?



She was mother to the Earls of Essex and Leicester (above), the latter of whom was the favorite of Elizabeth I.

This indicates Crowley was from the same families, and was therefore a crypto-Jew like the rest. Shocking, eh?



And all this time you probably thought he was an Inuit. No, that is the real Crowley above, looking like a peer.

But seriously, to get a taste of the Crowleys, see [Elizabeth Crowley](#), who in 1725 married John St.



**John**, 11<sup>th</sup> Baron St. John of Bletso. Her grandson married the daughter of Baronet Charles Rouse-Boughton, whose grandmother was a Somerset and whose great-grandmother was a **Russell**. These Somersets were the Dukes of Beaufort and these Russells were the Earls of Bedford. They were also related to the **Grevilles**, Barons Brooke. Of course, this indicates Aleister (Edward Alexander) Crowley was another crypto-peer, running his stupid projects out of the House of Lords.

As you have seen, I got tired of outing the small-time slop at youtube and moved on to bigger fish.

We have more indication I am right in Crowley's mainstream bio, which starts by telling us he was born into a Plymouth Brethren family. Right. These were evangelicals, so we once again see the Jews infiltrating and blowing the evangelicals (in more ways than one). Actually, Crowley's father was born a Quaker, which does tie him to my previous research, [where I showed](#) the Quakers have always been a Jewish front, back to their founding by crypto-Jew George **Fox**. The Quaker mention also links him to the Riches and Knollys, since they were closely linked to the Foxes. More indication of the same thing is Crowley's place of birth, Warwickshire. The Riches were [Earls of Warwick](#). The first Earl's mother-in-law was Lettice Knollys, above.

You don't think of the Plymouth Brethren as being upperclass, but Crowley's father was very wealthy, retiring even before Aleister was born. He was a partner in Crowleys Alton Ales.



This business passed from the Baverstock family to the Crowley family in 1821. And guess what, Baverstock is a Jewish name, related to the Reiners. Think Carl Reiner (who started out in Army Special Services), and then see [Jack Baverstock](#), A&R manager of the Kinks. A&R was founded by Phil Ramone and Jack Arnold in 1958, which also may tell you where the Ramones came from. But we will have to hit that later.

Crowley was trained in magic by Samuel **Mathers** and Allan **Bennett**. Note those last names. We have found those families up to their neck in many hoaxes through the centuries. The Mathers were involved in everything from the Salem Witch hoax to Beaver Cleaver to the current Eminem project. For a taste of the Mathers in the peerage, I send you to Baron Mathers, b. 1886. He married a **Robinson** and a **Graham**. We saw the Grahams above, Dukes of Montrose. The Robinsons we have seen again and again, most memorably perhaps in [my paper on Lizzie Borden](#). Baron Mather's mother was Annie **Barclay**, daughter of James Barclay. Think Barclays Bank, *which is linked to the Quakers*. You may also wish to study the Mather baronets, who came from Jacksons and Hughes. In the mid-1800s, the Jacksons took the name of one of their mothers, who was a Mather. Almost immediately they became baronets, indicating it was this marriage that did it for them. Despite that, this Sarah Mather is scrubbed at the peerage. We know she came from Cheshire and Liverpool, which is a hint. That is where the Stanleys rule the roost, remember? Anyway, the Mather-Jackson baronet [later](#)

married a Brabazon. Hold on, we saw that above, didn't we? Richard Branson is a Brabazon! Isn't this fun.

The next Mather-Jackson baronet (5<sup>th</sup>) married Victoria Ford Freyberg in 1941. Her mother isn't given, but we may assume she was a **Ford**. We also find a Michael **Vaughan** Mather, and we saw the name Vaughan above as well. We will see it again below. Also a Frederick Mather who married Agnes **Percy** in 1888. She was from the Percys, Earls of Beverly and Dukes of **Northumberland**. This links us to the Lewises, Seymours, **Cavendishes**, Pierreponts, and just about everyone else in the upper reaches of the peerage. Agnes Percy's grandmother was Mary Manners-Sutton, and her grandmother was Diana **Chaplin**. That's also a second hit on Chaplin. Richard Branson is also a Chaplin, remember? Oh, hah, *hum*.

The Chaplins go back to the Baronet Chaplin, head of the [South Sea Company](#) (est. 1711). This was an early Jewish scheme to defraud investors, and it worked marvellously, as always. I really advise you to read the Wiki page there closely, where you will find that the SSC dealt mainly in insider trading, that its heads escaped largely unscathed, and that it was closely tied to the Bank of England. But pay special attention to this:

The [South Sea] company was restructured and continued to operate for more than a century after the Bubble. The headquarters were in [Threadneedle Street](#) at the centre of the financial district in London; today the [Bank of England](#) has headquarters on Threadneedle Street. At the time of these events the Bank of England also was a private company dealing in national debt, and the crash of its rival consolidated its position as banker to the British government.<sup>[4]</sup>

Just another astonishing coincidence, right? Although the crash of the SSC caused billions in losses and should have led to bankruptcy, somehow the company continued to operate for another century. And its good buddy the *private* Bank of England conveniently benefitted from this “crash” of the SSC, becoming the de facto national bank. You will say the SSC and Bank of England were competitors, but if you believe that you are smoking too much mainstream ganja. From just those three sentences, you should be able to intuit that the whole thing was managed, exactly like the recent managed collapses (Lehman Brothers, etc.). In all these events, it is the national treasury that takes the real hit. It gets robbed over and over in all countries in broad daylight by the same masked bandits, and no one ever seems to figure out the modus. The Keystone Kops are always looking the other way, with their hands in their britches and their tongues lolling out.

It reminds me of the old Smith Barney commercial with John Houseman: *we make money the old-fashioned way. . . we steal it*. That's what he said, isn't it? Anyway, that's the way I remember it.



Before we move on, it may interest you to know that the South Sea Company was a scheme of Robert **Harley**, Earl of Oxford and Lord High Treasurer (first above). Well, Harley's alleged great enemy was Viscount Bolingbroke, Henry **St. John**, Secretary of State (second above). St. John was also a director of the SSC from 1711 to 1715. We have seen that name above as well, haven't we? It was where Elizabeth Crowley married Baron John St. John. The two St. Johns were were half-brothers. Furthermore, these St. Johns were closely related to the Riches, Vaughans and Fishers. Richard Branson is a Fisher. Ollyollyoxenfree.

Henry St. John's mother was Lady Mary Rich, daughter of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Warwick. We saw them above as well.

What this indicates is that, as usual, all these people were cousins, pretending to joust with one another while actually being allies. Henry St. John is supposed to have caused the arrest and jailing of Robert Harley after the crash of the South Sea Company, but that now looks faked. After a short two-year sentence, Harley was released, acquitted, and all his titles were returned to him. He lost no money in the deal—in fact, he left prison magnificently fattened in all ways. My belief is he never spent an hour in the Tower of London. Like the current thieves, he probably spent the two years on the golf course. No, wait, golf hadn't been invented. So he was hunting foxes or something. The alleged jail term was just his exit from the project, making the public think something had been done. It successfully took everyone's eyes off him.

As more indication of this, we can look at the Harleys in the peerage. Robert Harley's brother Edward married Sarah Foley, whose great-grandmother was Margery **Bennet**. Remember, Aleister Crowley was trained in magic by Allan Bennett. Coincidence? No.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Oxford, also Edward Harley, married Henrietta Cavendish-Holles. We saw the Cavendishes above, closely related to the Mathers. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Oxford married Martha **Morgan**, daughter of a Morgan and a **Vaughan**. The Morgan is scrubbed, but we can be sure he is related to J. P. Morgan. The 5<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford married Jane **Scott**, who had supposedly been a lover of Lord Byron, a **Gordon**. No chance that happened, since he was gay. So she was just a beard. This Jane Scott is scrubbed at both the peerage and Wiki, but her father is given as James. He is probably related closely to Hugh Scott, 5<sup>th</sup> of Gala, who married Elizabeth **Stewart** in 1727. These Stewarts are related to the **Douglases**, so we are right to the top of the Scottish hierarchy.

The 5<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford's daughter married Lt. Col. Henry Venables-Vernon-Harcourt, whose mother was Lady Anne **Leveson-Gower**. Her brother was the Duke of Sunderland, her grandfather was Scroop **Egerton**, the Duke of Bridgwater, and her grandmother was the daughter of Wriothesley **Russell**, the Duke of Bedford. So the Harleys linked themselves to three Dukes with that one marriage in 1748. Not bad. Through the Russells, they also linked themselves to the Crowleys.

I hope you noticed I just made a probable link from David **Vaughan** Icke to Aleister Crowley. Not really surprising, is it?

Anyway, we just saw that the Harleys were Vaughans, and that the St. Johns were Vaughans. So the whole story about Harley, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Oxford, and St. John, 1<sup>st</sup> Viscount Bolingbroke, being enemies is very unlikely. As with everything else we have studied, the opposition was staged. They were both in on the ground floor of the South Sea project, promoting it to the hilt. So why would the crash of the SSC cause one to be sent to the Tower and not the other? It makes no sense. One simply played good cop and the other bad cop.

On the way out, I will point out something you may have missed. Look at all the portraits of these rich bastards above. Then remind yourself that I am a portrait painter. Now do you understand why I have refused to paint the portraits of the elite of today? I have had my chances, but I have always begged off. Those around me didn't understand why I would refuse good money, but maybe now you do.