

# How I Know the Hanging of John Brown was Fake

*by Miles Mathis*

*First published August 12, 2019*

First of all, I want to apologize that these new papers don't have any illustrations. I am having to write them with no internet access at home, so I can't just upload and paste photos into the text. When I get internet access again, I will add some photos.

John Brown was the famous abolitionist allegedly hanged in Charlestown, West Virginia, on December 2, 1859. If you don't remember the particulars of the story, look it up: I am not going to repeat it all here. It is a famous event of US history, and you should already know it.

Anyway, I know it was fake by closely reading one document: Henry Steele Olcott's "How We Hung John Brown". No that is not a typo: the title is "Hung", not "Hanged". The story is in 1875's *Lotus Leaves*, but you can access it for free online in several places. Our first and perhaps greatest clue is Olcott himself, since we have already seen in several previous papers that he was a top spook of the day. At the time of the hanging he was working as an editor for the *New York Tribune*, which was the *Washington Post* of its time: a newspaper created directly by Intelligence, and staffed completely by them. Later he was on the 3-man investigating committee for the fake [Lincoln assassination](#)—the Warren Commission of its time. And a decade later he was one of the two founders of the Theosophy project, along with Madame Blavatsky. So at this distance in time, his cover pretty much blows itself.

Olcott's story of the hanging is transparently false—outrageously so. So outrageously it is difficult to believe it was ever written down and published. But we have to remember that Olcott's audience was naive beyond any reckoning. . . sort of like now. The American public has always been fantastically gullible, unable to spot a lie from a foot away at top volume. So Olcott didn't have to take any reasonable care with his lies. He figured he could say anything, no matter how absurd, and it would be believed.

Olcott begins by trying to convince us he was an agricultural editor at the *Tribune*, which is a laugh. He probably didn't know a ewe from a kid or a wheatgerm from a corncob. He also wants us to believe he was a Whig, and therefore totally uninterested in the slavery question. An innocent bystander at the paper who only got involved for the thrill (or to help out his buddy Horace Greeley). Right. He actually tells us he had "as little to do with politics as any man in the city". Yeah. That's why just five years later he was on the investigating committee for the Lincoln Assassination. They needed disinterested aggies for that, I guess.

Next we are told the locals in Virginia were incensed that the abolitionist *Tribune* had sent spies south to report events on the ground, and were combing their ranks for these spies. Although Olcott says these spies were in fear for their lives from local mobs, he admits three suspects had been caught and driven out of Charlestown. That is "driven out", not lynched. So Olcott wishes us to believe he was risking his own life to get this story. He wasn't, as is clear if you read his own words closely.

Olcott began by taking a steamer to Petersburg, where he was housed by “a dear old friend”. Even Petersburg is a clue, since—among other things—it was an early hub of Intelligence. It had connections to a host of peerage families and Jewish merchants, far more than its population would lead you to suspect. But Olcott quickly tries to cover those tracks by telling us his dear old friend was a fire-eating defender of slavery, one who wanted to hang John Brown with his own hands. We will pause here to ask if that makes any sense. If Olcott's dear old friend was such a person, why was his house chosen as the “base of operations for Olcott”? As a dear old friend, this person would surely know Olcott not only had sailed from New York, but was working as an editor for the *Tribune*. I guess this dear old friend was either the most unsuspecting person ever born, or was as dumb as a bag of rocks.

Olcott is also trying to sell us the idea that Northerners didn't really care if Virginia hanged John Brown. Which means it isn't true. Although the hanging was faked, a majority of Northerners were against it. They believed it was real, and were genuinely upset by it. For many of them John Brown was a hero. See Thoreau, as just one example. As now, Brown was a manufactured hero, but he was a hero nonetheless. So, as usual, we see the layering of lies here, and the multiple levels of manipulation of the American people by their governors.

Was Thoreau another dupe, or was he part of the con? A question for another paper.

The next day, Olcott joined a group of recruits for the Petersburg Grays (Virginia Militia) doing duty in Charlestown to maintain order. Olcott tells us he was ready to fight with them and for them, should the need arise. This is what I mean by an outrageous lie. Who believes that these Grays would allow a Yankee to join them last minute? We have already been told they were on the lookout for spies, but no one suspected Olcott? What did he have to do to tip them off, wear a *New York Tribune* gimme cap, carry an Underground Railroad coffee mug, or wear an I♥JohnBrown t-shirt?

The very next day this new recruit to the Grays was taken charge of by General Taliaferro's Chief Surgeon, who Olcott admits just happened to be a fellow Freemason. Olcott, the Surgeon, and the other Grays boarded a train for Charlestown, and the train was later stopped by the provost-guard, which was looking for spies. “Every passenger was subjected to a rigid examination”. Despite that, Olcott was let off on the vouching of his fellow Grays—who, remember, had known him for all of one day. Besides, it can't be both ways. If he was let off on the vouching of the Grays, he *wasn't* subjected to a rigorous examination, was he?

Next, we learn that although Olcott was ready to fight for and with his fellow Grays, he was not in uniform. He and the surgeon were in street clothes. This also makes no sense. Getting off the train, Olcott was almost recognized by “a Washington acquaintance, Colonel Blank”, but dodged that bullet by screwing up his face. No, really, that is what it says.

Rather than bunk down with his militia mates, Olcott then went with his surgeon friend to General Taliaferro's own headquarters, which happened to be in a 5-star hotel downtown. Strange that this known Yankee was led directly into the enemy's camp, eh? There, he ran into South Carolina Senator Ruffin, who also knew him, but again avoided recognition by turning his head away. No really. Later that evening he slept in the house of “one of the principal functionaries of the court” (as in “judge”), along with the entire General Staff. Great way to fly under the radar, right?

Olcott actually brags that he had “a full-blooded blackie” to polish his shoes there. Charming. He also

drank whiskey, smoked pipes, and sang comic songs with his new pals in Southern Intelligence. There he learned more about Brown, including that he had “with a force of fifteen men taken Virginia with his right hand and Maryland with his left hand and shaken them, until every corner of the Union had resounded with their shriekings”. If this is the first time you are hearing of the doings of John Brown, that should be enough to peg it as a fake. Fifteen men (with swords again I guess—see below) don't cause such a ruckus, unless they have military intelligence faking and inflating their deeds. I am just surprised the number was fifteen. Given later—and earlier—events, we would have expected nineteen. See the 19 hijackers, 19 guerrillas with Castro, 19 witches hanged in Salem, *et cetera*. [As we will see below, it *was* 19, not 15. Olcott and his quoted author get the number wrong, probably on purpose.]

Next, General Taliaferro himself proclaimed that all strangers should report themselves to the provost for full examination. Again Olcott was not included in that number. But if he was not a stranger, then they must have known who he was. And if they knew who he was, why did they not arrest him as a spy?

Next, Olcott admits his trunk had been left at the station upon his arrival. Since it had his name on it and his place of departure, it should have given him away. He admits it would have been searched, leading to his arrest. So what does he do? He finds another Mason on the staff and sends him to retrieve the trunk. This Southerner, being a fellow Mason, asks no questions, develops no suspicions, and does not report it to his superior. Convenient.

Now we get to the greatest clue the hanging was faked. The entire city was shut down, and the citizens were told to keep away, under threat of martial law and being shot on sight. No one but military were allowed within telescope distance of the hanging, so no one but military “witnessed” it.

**There was a military force of between two and three thousand troops. . . the whole country for fifteen miles around was guarded by mounted and foot soldiers; all intercourse between town and country was stopped. . . the most stringent precautions had been made to prevent the townspeople from approaching the outermost line of patrolling sentries. . .**

We are told this was because the State of Virginia was “badly scared” of Brown being rescued by Pennsylvanians, or to prevent him from making any seditious speeches, but that is ridiculous. If you want to prevent a speech, you gag him. If you want to prevent a rescue, you have a guard, but you don't have to keep out the public. The only reason to keep out the public would be to prevent it from seeing the whole thing was a fake. Since military can be ordered to keep quiet and to see what they are told to see, we have no reliable witnesses to anything. We have a totally controlled event, with no civilian participation. Since the newspapers both North and South were also owned by those who owned the military, they could be ordered to report anything desired. In this sense, the media was also not “civilian”, so any reporters onhand—like Olcott—should also be considered military. Their reportage means nothing. It is not trustworthy. As we have seen over and over, if the mainstream media tells you it is day, assume it is night.

But we get even more clues. Olcott tells us when Brown was driven up, he was wearing a black suit and black slouch hat. Why would he be allowed to wear a black slouch hat? Not only would a hat interfere with the hanging, but it would *prevent recognition*. Did they also allow him to wear sunglasses, a full beard, and makeup? As soon as he took off his hat, they quickly placed a white hood over his head.

To round out the fake story, our Mason Olcott is sure to include a bit of numerology at the end, for no

apparent reason other than to wave at his pals in lodge. We are told they waited **eight** minutes to hang Brown, while troops marched about. Then the signal was given by Colonel **Scott**, and Sheriff **Campbell** cut the rope holding the trapdoor. Good to see those familiar names. Other than maybe Stuart, Murray, or Stanley, those are the names we would most expect.

And then another clue: Olcott says, “After the thing had dangled in mid-air for twenty minutes. . .” Not “Brown” but “the thing”. The thing being a dummy, you see. The surgeons took a pulse, of course found none, but then allowed the thing to hang for **eighteen** more minutes. 18. Aces and eights. Just to be sure they got Chai in there, you know. Can't tell a fake story without including Chai. It is in the Mason handbook, I assume.

But even that one mention of eighteen wasn't enough, since four sentences later we get it again. The drop of the body in a hanging is eighteen inches, we are told.

---

---

What we discovered there is already decisive, I would say, but in the name of thoroughness I went to John Brown's Wikipedia page, which is another nest of red flags. Brown was the son of **Owen** Brown and **Ruth** Mills. So we have Jewish markers already. Owen was the founder of Western Reserve College, so Brown didn't come from nowhere, or out of the middle or lower classes as you are led to believe by the glosses you get in school. That later became Case Western Reserve, and Case=Chase. Ulysses Grant's father had apprenticed with Owen Brown. Owen was also a primary supporter of Oberlin College, which was founded by Philo **Stewart**. Oberlin was named for J. F. Oberlin of Germany. See his picture on his Wiki page, and note the endless nose. His mother was a Feltz. Indicating they were Jewish. Oberlin is called there “the true precursor of Social Christianity in France”. That is Christian Socialism, which couldn't be a bigger red flag. Anything to do with Communism, Socialism, or Marxism is and always was a project of Jewish merchants, who were trying to undercut both Christianity and Republicanism by misdirection and corruption.

You may have been taught that John Brown was a poor tanner, but the mainstream bios now admit he was a **wool merchant**. We are told that Brown “learned much about the Massachusetts' mercantile elite”, but aren't told he didn't learn it from books. He learned it by being one of them. We are told he battled the Massachusetts wool cartel, trying to import wool from Europe to contest their local markets. But they ended up allegedly bankrupting him. Immediately after that Brown founded his first militant group, the League of Gileadites.

If you are aren't smelling the usual smoke by now, you may need to take a decongestant or an antihistamine. This should clear your head: Wikipedia next admits Brown was financed and supported by New England's top merchants and richest men. They were known as the Secret Six, though there were more than six. One of these was industrialist George **Walker**. Think George Herbert Walker Bush, a descendant. Walker was the brother-in-law of Franklin Sanborn, another of the Six, famous for writing about the Transcendentalists, including Thoreau. Sanborn was a wealthy spook whose mother was a **Leavitt**. So, another Jew.

Another of the Secret Six was **Amos Adams** Lawrence. He owned Ipswich Mills, the largest producer of knit goods in the US. His wife was Sarah Appleton, also Jewish. Another of the Six was Gerrit Smith, whose wife was Ann Carroll **FitzHugh**. His daughter was the suffragist Elizabeth Cady Stanton, telling us what to think of her as well. This links us to the peerage several more times, since these were

the Smiths of Wales and Nottingham. Smith's mother was a **Livingston**, as in Levinson. She was also a Ten Broeck, of Dutch nobility. The FitzHughs were also nobility. Smith ran for US President in 1848, 56, and 60. Another of the Six was Thomas Higginson, of the Boston Brahmins. Not only was he a billionaire, he was Steward of Harvard College. His grandfather had been in the Continental Congress. His wife Channing was a close relative of the Fullers, linking us again to Intelligence. Another of the Six was George Luther Stearns, a descendant of Isaac Sterne of Salem. So, again, Jewish. Stearns was born 1/8/1809. Chai. Another of the Six was William Lloyd Garrison, who founded the newspaper *The Liberator* with Isaac **Knapp**. Jewish.

So you may want to ask yourself why these wealthy Jewish merchants of Boston and Springfield were funding John Brown. And why they weren't charged for conspiracy along with him. Also why, with all this money and power behind him, Brown was only able to gather 15 or 20 men for his militia, and why he couldn't avoid trial. Keep those questions in mind as we proceed.

Brown's career as a vigilante or guerrilla started in 1856 at the Pottawatomie Massacre, where he and his band attacked a group of slave hunters. **Armed only with swords**, they killed five of them. Right, and you believe that? Slave hunters wouldn't carry guns? They would get ambushed by a few guys with swords? C'mon!

In the next paragraph we are told that prior to these murders, only **eight** killings in Kansas were attributable to slave politics. There is your clue that Pottawatomie was faked. The name itself is another sign, since the writers wished to give this ridiculous story a ridiculous name. They kept up that drollery with the Osawatimie Siege, where, despite being outnumbered 7 to 1, Brown and three of his sons allegedly escaped after being surrounded. No chance that happened. The genius historians who wrote all this weren't mathematicians as usual, and hired no continuity editor, also as usual, since they tell us 29 people died in the Bleeding Kansas period of three months. But 23 were killed at Osawatimie alone, which leaves only six for the rest. So, although Bleeding Kansas is sold as a major preview of the Civil War, the amount of blood was actually minuscule, even according to the mainstream fake story. I don't believe Brown's battle ever happened, which takes us down to six. And the odds are those six were faked as well, taking us to . . . zero.

Next we learn that Brown hired as his drillmaster and military consultant Hugh **Forbes**. Forbes was allegedly a mercenary who had taken part in battles in Italy with Garibaldi, but that is doubtful. More likely he was a banker's son on holiday. His name alone is a towering red flag. As is Brown's other supporter in this period: **Allan Pinkerton**. Pinkerton was head of the Pinkerton Agency, of course, precursor of both the secret service and the CIA. So I don't think we could pile any more red flags on the head of John Brown if we tried.

But let's try. Although Brown's draft plan for attacking Harper's Ferry Armory called for 4,500 men, he attacked it with . . . 18. Chai. With Brown himself, that would be 19, so we do have that number come up, linking us to 911, Salem, Cuba, etc. We are told the Armory contained 100,000 rifles, but was guarded by a single watchman. Yeah. Reminds us of the single drunken policeman (related to Mary Todd Lincoln) who was guarding Lincoln at the theater, but went next door for a pint.

We aren't told how Brown and his merry band of 18 planned to carry off 100,000 rifles. I guess they overlooked that little logistics problem. Or maybe the Chinook they hired blew a fuse.

Local farmers pinned them down and they were captured on . . . October 18. 10/18. Chai.

Since Harriet Tubman also worked with Brown, we can take her down with this as well.

Clearly, the whole John Brown saga was manufactured from the ground up by military intelligence, under orders from the wealthy merchants we saw above. It was part of the wind-up to the Civil War, but not in the way we have been told. The slavery question was used as cover for the real causes of the War, as it still is. The War was not between the North and the South, but between the richest merchants in the North and the richest merchants in the South. It was a battle for control of most of North America by a small number of trillionaire families, those families still living on both sides of the pond.

In that context, we can begin to understand that the Underground Railroad, as far as it actually existed, was not so much a road for freeing slaves, as it was a recruitment pipeline for the upcoming war. The South was obviously seen as having a huge excess of black manpower, which could be used as a military weapon in the event of war. So the North naturally wished to siphon off as much of that power as they could. One, by physically moving as many of those slaves north as they could, where they could be drafted into the Union Army. Every man moved was a double or triple gain, since what the North gained the South lost. And the lost slave was not only a lost soldier, but also a lost commodity and source of income. Two, by making all slaves as discontented as possible by a constant line of propaganda. Slaves who could be turned against their masters, even if just in word, would be useless in battle. They would have no fighting spirit. By constantly talking of freedom, the North would be creating enemies against the South in their own homes.

This is what the slavery question was really about, as we see anytime we look closer at the people involved. You can be sure these rich northern merchants didn't give a damn about black people. Why? Because they didn't give a damn about white people, either, unless those white people were others in their families. These rich bastards were the same then as they are now, so we don't have to squint or use any imagination. For them, most people—black and white—are just robot workers and consumers, who are allowed to exist only to be fleeced at every opportunity. So any time we hear them start talking about human rights or freedoms, we can be sure we are being snowed. Such talk has always been used to herd us around at will. They will say whatever is necessary to set us up for the next plunder.

There is much more to be said about the Civil War, but I can't say it all here. As with the other major wars, I need more basic research to build upon. All we can be sure of is that we will uncover more fakes everywhere we look. But after collating all of them, who knows what we will find. Is the mainstream story 50% false, 75% false, or 98% false? We will see. If it follows the lines of the Lincoln assassination or the John Brown story, it will be closer to 98% false.