

[return to updates](#)

JONBENET RAMSEY CASE SOLVED



by Miles Mathis

First published June 4, 2021

As usual, this is just my opinion, come to by internet research anyone could do, but doesn't.

This is by request. Many readers have supposed I could see something others haven't here, and they were right. As usual, we will start at Wikipedia and move out from there. A lot of attention was focused on JonBenet's mother Patricia, but for me the red flags immediately pile up on her father, John **Bennett** Ramsey. Why? Because we have seen that name Bennett hundreds of times in my papers, linked to many of the top hoaxes over many centuries. The Bennetts are top British peers, linked to all the big names. If we do a genealogy search on John Bennett Ramsey, we find his Bennett line conspicuously scrubbed in all places, including Wikipedia, Findagrave, Geni, and Geneanet. That is very suspicious, since the other lines aren't scrubbed—indicating something important is being hidden from us. Confirming that suspicion is JonBenet's older brother's full name: **Burke Hamilton** Ramsey. The Hamiltons are at the top of the Scottish peerage and are linked in the peerage to the Bennetts, so we may assume we are looking at peers here. Which already indicates this murder was a fake, being another event of Operation Chaos. The peers like nothing better than faking events, and they have been doing it for thousands of years.

Before we hit the Bennetts harder, it is worth reminding you that John Bennett Ramsey also has lots of other spook markers on him, such as his link to **Lockheed Martin** and the **Navy**. Ramsey was with the Navy/Army for at least 11 years, from 1966 to 1977. We aren't given a rank and are led to believe he retired in 1977, although that's all as maybe. We know he was head of Access Graphics, the computer subsidiary of Lockheed Martin, but he could have remained Office of Naval Intelligence in that position. Access Graphics grossed over \$1 billion in 1996, the year of JonBenet's death, which is highly suspicious in itself. In 1997 it was sold to General Electric. Also suspicious is that JonBenet's name is the same as her father. JonBenet=John Bennett. The scriptwriters seem to be toying with us, as usual.

OK, now back to the genealogy. Through the mother, JonBenet [comes from the Webbs of Salem, Massachusetts](#), linking us to the [Salem Witch Hoax](#). See the Hayden line, and Peter Webb, d. 1717, of the merchants of Boston, Salem, and Braintree, related to Bass, Adams, Allen, and Scott. So these families have been at it a long time, on both sides.

The Haydens are also a clue, since Tim Dowling at Geneanet admits he is a cousin in that line—meaning, JonBenet's mother is related to the royal Stuarts. The Haydens take us to the Suttons in the 1700s, where Tim Dowling is a 4th cousin. That is because the Suttons then take us to the [Tildens](#), in the direct line of Dowling. The Tildens take us to the Bigges of Canterbury. They were linked to the Nevilles back to the 1500s, and of course the Nevilles take us back to our old friend John of Gaunt.

But let's check the Ramseys in the peerage related to the Hamiltons. They actually spell it Ramsay, and they were baronets in several places. The 9th of Bamff, Scotland, died in 1871. Do you want to guess who he was married to? Emily [Lennon](#), scrubbed. His grandson died in 1953, being the son of a Graham and the husband of a Stuart-Menteth. The Stuart-Menteth was the daughter of a Hamilton. Her sister was Sarah Hamilton Stuart-Menteth. They were also related to Drummonds, Noels, Gordons, and Middletons. Strangely, thepeerage.com scrubs the Bamff baronets after the 9th, but Wikipedia admits they existed until the 12th, in 1986. Their escutcheon was a Phoenix:



Which is no coincidence here. The Ramsays were also baronets of Balmain, marrying the [Whitneys](#) of Australia in 1935.

The Ramsays were also Earls of Dalhousie, with the 13th Earl marrying. . . [Lady Ida Bennet](#). Their son was Admiral Hon. Sir Alexander Ramsay, and who do you think he married? Only Victoria Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, Princess of Connaught and Strathearn. She was born in Buckingham Palace in 1886, the daughter of Duke Arthur and the Princess of Prussia. Arthur was the son of Queen Victoria. So that's who these Ramsays and Bennets are.

Lady Ida Bennet's father was the 6th Earl of Tankerville and her grandfather was George Montagu, 6th Duke of Manchester. This links us to the Hamiltons and Gordons once again, as well as to the Maxwells and Blairs. This Princess of Prussia was the granddaughter of Friedrich Wilhelm III, King of Prussia, and also the granddaughter of Maria [Romanov](#), Grand Duchess of Russia. Admiral Ramsay was Commander-in-Chief of the East Indies in the 1930s. He became Fifth Sea Lord in 1938. Sea Lord=Phoenician Navy.

I also remind my US readers of Gordon Ramsay, famous British chef knighted for his cooking. He is related to all these people as well. You don't think he got famous on merit, do you?

So anyway, I think you can see why my antennae quivered when I saw the names Bennett, Hamilton and Ramsey all in JonBenet's immediate family. What about the name Burke? That's also a transported surname, of course, and it links us to the same families in the peerage. There are 642 in the peerage, and they are also baronets. The current baronet Burke of Marble Hill was born in 1956, and his name is James Stanley Burke. The Burkes link us to the Nugents, Earls of Westmeath, and the de Burghs, Marquesses of Clanricarde. This links us to the Scots and Hays, who link us to the Grahams again, who link us to the Hamiltons, Drummonds and Stuarts. One big happy family, you know.

Knowing what you now know, go back to the name Burke Hamilton Ramsey, JonBenet's brother. Do you still think that name is just a coincidence? I don't.

So, can we link these peerage Ramsays to the US? We can. Admiral Ramsay's brother Patrick married a Surtees and their son David ended up in Chicago, where he married the daughter of Leonidas Arvanitidis, of the Greek shippers and merchants. An Arvanitidis is currently a senior producer at CNN.

But back to John Ramsey. There is a big gap in his bio. He got an MBA in 1971, at age 28, and didn't start his computer company until 1989, eighteen years later. He was Army Reserve for part of that time, but what was he doing otherwise? We aren't told. My guess it is something to do with Intelligence.

Curiously, Ramsey had another daughter who died in tragic circumstances. This daughter from a previous marriage, Elizabeth Pasch Ramsey, allegedly died in a car crash at age 22, in a car driven by her boyfriend Matthew Derrington. But if we look him up at InstantCheckmate, we find two of him, one who died in Burr Ridge at age 22, and one from the same locations still alive at age 51. That just happens to match the age he would be today.

The screenshot shows a search result for Matthew P. Derrington on InstantCheckmate. The search criteria are: first name=matthew, middle initial, last name=derrington, city=burr+ridge, state=IL, and age. The results table shows two entries for Matthew P. Derrington, one aged 22 and one aged 51, both located in Burr Ridge, IL. The 22-year-old entry lists possible relatives: Jennifer Coman, Daniel Derrington, James Derrington, and Janet Derrington. Both entries have a verified result icon and an 'OPEN REPORT' button. A sidebar on the left prompts the user to 'OPEN YOUR REPORT ON: MATTHEW DERRINGTON ILLINOIS'.

NAME	AGE	LOCATION	POSSIBLE RELATIVES	VERIFIED RESULT	FULL REPORT
Matthew P. Derrington	22	Sanibel, FL Burr Ridge, IL Hinsdale, IL	Jennifer Coman Daniel Derrington James Derrington Janet Derrington		OPEN REPORT
Matthew P. Derrington	51	Sanibel, FL Burr Ridge, IL Hinsdale, IL			OPEN REPORT

So the big computers think Derrington is both alive and dead.

We have the same problem with Elizabeth Pasch Ramsey, who is listed as being 51. Meaning, the computer has no death record for her and thinks she is still alive as well.

instantcheckmate.com/results?firstName=elizabeth&middleInitial=p&lastName=ramsey&city=burr+ridge&state=IL&age=

Next Steps: Find a result that matches whom you're looking for the most. You can click the headers to sort the results. Once you find a match, click "Open Report" to continue to the report.

Search Tip: Try adding a middle initial, current or previous city, and/or approximate age

Modify Search

NAME	AGE	LOCATION	POSSIBLE RELATIVES	VERIFIED RESULT	FULL REPORT
Elizabeth P. Ramsey aka: Elizabeth P. Ramsey, Elizabeth A. Parker, Elizabeth R. Parker, Beth A. Parker, Liz Parker, Elizabe Parker, Elisabet Ramsey, Parke Elizabeth	51	Worth, IL Alton, IL Catumet Park, IL Chicago, IL Maretta, GA La Grange, IL Riverdale, IL Louisville, KY Crestwood, KY Bowling Green, KY Clarksville, IN Lansville, IN Auburndale, FL Charlottesville, VA	Melinda Long Francine Moore Emma Parker Lawrence Parker Margaret Parker Rudy Parker John Ramsey Rudy Ramsey		OPEN REPORT
Lisa K. Pippio aka: Lisa K. Pippio, Lisa K. Ramsons, Lisa P. Pippio, Lisa P. Ramsey	45	Port Saint Lucie, FL Sunrise, FL Fort Pierce, FL Chicago, IL Crystal River, FL Dawn, FL North Lauderdale, FL Fort Lauderdale, FL	Tammy Bugda Tammy Cone Jon Pippio Michael Pippio Valerie Pippio Chad Ramsey Earl Ramsey Laura Ramsey Mario Ramsey Nicole Ramsey Richard Ramsey		OPEN REPORT

Even worse, notice the computer thinks she is married to someone named Parker. According to her mainstream bio, she never married. And look at all her locations. Do you think she lived in all those places by the time she died at age 22? If we check Intelius, we find a lot of those locations scrubbed, including the most suspicious ones like Charlottesville, VA. And why does the computer think there is some link between Elizabeth Ramsey and Lisa Pippio? Could that be one of her aliases? Just for fun I searched on Elizabeth Parker of Fairfax, VA, age 51. Guess what, I got a hit. There is an Elizabeth M. Parker at Intelius, age 51, of Arlington, Fairfax, Falls Church, *and* Charlottesville.

intelius.com/results/?firstName=Elizabeth&middleInitial=&lastName=Parker&city=arlington&state=VA&age=51

Helen Elizabeth Parker ROCKPORT, MA	52	Rockport, MA Manchester, MA Worham, MA Saint Louis, MO Newburyport, MA Longmont, CO Arlington, VA Chicago, IL Boulder, CO Chevy Chase, MD Washington, DC Alexandria, VA Boston, MA Washington Dc, DC Potomac, MD Charlotte, NC	Francis Brown Martha Brown Eric Parker Karen Szymoto Emily Thorne	OPEN REPORT
Elizabeth M. Parker ARLINGTON, VA	51	Arlington, VA Washington, DC Fairfax, VA Charlottesville, VA Falls Church, VA Bloomfield, NJ Belleville, NJ Newark, NJ Washington Dc, DC Hialeah, FL Winter Garden, FL	Carrie Fowler Americo Gomez Diego Gomez German Gomez Gregorio Gomez Martha Gomez Alan Parker Ingrid Parker Richard Parker Ingrid Smparker Maria Wagner	OPEN REPORT


This tells me that Elizabeth Ramsey and Matthew Derrington faked their deaths, probably to go into the CIA. Which is more indication Elizabeth's father was also CIA. And if Elizabeth Ramsey faked her death, JonBenet likely did, too. You see how that works?

When did Elizabeth Ramsey and Matthew Derrington allegedly die? January 8, 1992. That's 1/8/92. Aces and eights, Chai.

Speaking of Chai, you will remember a fake ransom note was left in the house, asking for \$118,000. Why that number? Now you know. We know the note was fake since JonBenet was found in the house a few hours later. But the question was always who faked it. You are seeing that John Ramsey probably faked it, but not because he or his wife had killed JonBenet, on purpose or accidentally. The

fake note was part of the larger fake, and now our question becomes. . . did JonBenet exist at all?

You will remind me that John Ramsey allegedly found JonBenet himself. And we assume the police and coroner confirmed that. Except that. . . we know the CIA can very easily control both the local police and the coroner. So we actually have no proof JonBenet or anyone else was ever found dead. None of the corpse photos are convincing at all, and as usual looked faked. Most are close-ups of the neck, but that could be the neck of any young corpse, borrowed from the morgue. They prove nothing.



That's so fake it requires no comment. If it were real, they wouldn't be publishing it. But none of the edges make any sense, especially along the profile, so we know it is manufactured and manipulated.

In fact, there are very few pictures of JonBenet with her family, and they are all poor fakes.



That's a truly horrible paste-up, one you can't even make sense of. I defy you. The three lower people appear to be sitting on something, but what? A floating tea table? A magic frisbee? You can see the standing woman's foot beneath JonBenet, but whatever they are sitting on has no legs. And none of the feet even appear to be resting on the carpet. Plus, JonBenet is mis-sized. If she stood up she would be way too tall for six. Also, we can tell this was shot with a flash, not only because the eyes are red, but because the bodies are outlined. But with a flash, the bodies would be casting shadows backwards. The standing people should be casting shadows on the back wall. They forgot to add those in, which is another reason this looks so strange. Another problem is that the father is too dark. Why is the flash making everyone bright white in the face except him?

Here's another horrible paste-up.



The biggest problem is the black thing behind her. What is that? She is supposed to be holding a black phone, and then the phone sort of merges into this black cape between her and her father. It is also under her hand. It makes no sense, so I will just tell you what it is. It was added to hide the seam between the two figures. That is always a problem area in these pastes, and here the faker thought the best solution was that black blob. And again, the lighting is inconsistent, since she is lit from the front by a flash, having no shadows on her face, while his face is lit less harshly from your right.



That's supposed to be JonBenet with her brother Burke. Except that it is very obvious he was pasted in there. Look how cut-out he looks! I can't believe they still publish that.



That, too, is a paste, using a bluescreen. The technology is more advanced, but it is still an obvious fake. We didn't get that one until later, when computer tech allowed them to fake this better. Here's one of the really bad older ones:



Look at the edge of her hair! That's just awful.

Plus, notice anything else weird? Compare her there to the previous one. Look closely at her bangs and at the shape of her lips. **They used the same photo of her for both composites!** The giveaway is that straight white line of hair in her bangs, which is exactly the same in both photos. That is impossible. Busted. Once you realize that, you realize his face is also the same. They just reversed his image and changed his bangs a bit.

Here's another test of your eyes. What else did they change on Burke in those two photos, besides reversing the image and changing the bangs a bit? Yes, they darkened the far eyebrow a smidge, but there's something even more obvious. Look closely at the nostrils. Although the angle of Burke's head is exactly the same in both photos, *since it is the same photo*, in the second one he is higher in the image, isn't he? So the photo faker thought you should be looking up more at him. So the faker lengthened the nostrils. That was a mistake, since it now looks like Burke has had a nosejob. Since he is just eight and has a cute nose to start with, we know he didn't have a nosejob. This is just more proof the photos were tampered with, since he should have the same nose in both. It is the first one that looks correct, doesn't it, and the second one that looks wrong.

[**Added July 23, 2021:** And here's a clue I didn't notice the first time. We have seen all the faking that was done on these photos. Well, what was John Bennett Ramsey's billion-dollar Lockheed computer company called? Access **Graphics**. He was a graphics specialist and had some of the top people in the world working for him. So this was an in-house job! How did everyone else miss this?]

Why on Earth would they need to be faking these photos of JonBenet with her family? Only one reason I can think of: she wasn't part of that family. This little girl obviously existed: we have videos and photos of her. But we have no proof she was named JonBenet or was part of the Ramsey family. We have to take the Ramseys' word for that. You will say surely the media verified that. But as we know, the media's job isn't to verify anything, especially when the CIA or military is involved. The media's job is to report what it is told to report. Same with the local police, who are under the thumbs of the Feds.

Another red flag pointing at the involvement of Intelligence is Lou Smit, a retired detective allegedly called in to jumpstart a stalled investigation, but really to push the Boulder police away from the Ramseys as suspects. The locals hadn't been able to solve the crime, but they could see that the Ramseys were stalling and misdirecting, and they saw that as evidence of criminality. As you see, it also fits my theory, since if the whole thing was a CIA ruse, the Ramseys would also be hiding that. In both cases the Ramseys would appear suspicious in the same way and to the same degree.

For instance, at Wikipedia they admit:

The police saw no evidence of a forced entry, but they did see evidence of **staging of the scene, such as the ransom note. They did not find the Ramseys cooperative in helping them solve the death of their daughter.**

That fits my solution better than any other proposed solution.

Here's another quote from the Wiki page, in the footnotes:

James Brooke of *The New York Times* reported, "The Ramseys have consistently maintained their innocence. But for four months after the murder, they declined to talk to the police. Instead, they mounted a defense team that sounds like a defense lawyer's Christmas carol: eight lawyers, four publicists, three private investigators, two handwriting analysts and one retired F.B.I. profiler."

That's obviously very suspicious, and you can see why the Boulder police thought the Ramseys did it. Why else would they block an investigation? Well, I am showing you why. If the whole thing was a fraud from the get-go, run by the CIA to spread fear and confusion, then they would naturally have to destroy, contaminate, or spin all the evidence. As I have shown you hundreds of times before, starting with the [JFK](#) and [Manson](#) events, any investigator's FIRST assumption should be to *assume nothing*.

First make sure there was a body and a murder before you assume there was. In other words, start with the simplest explanation and work out from there. When presented with a case that makes no sense, your very first theory should be that **it didn't happen at all**. Only when you are absolutely sure it did happen, based on a huge pile of evidence, should you proceed to investigating a murder. But we never see that with these famous cases, do we? They always skip over that first step, don't they? They rush you by any evidence a murder was actually committed and start by burying you under a mountain of details and conflicting stories. That isn't an accident. As we have seen, that is how these stories are told, on purpose.

The fake investigators always question everything **except what most needs to be questioned**. They never ask the questions I ask, do they? Not once have we seen a mainstream investigator question whether the event happened at all. They always seem to miss that possibility, even when, as here, the question is staring them in the face from all sides. And why is that? Obviously it is because if you are local police you aren't allowed to investigate the CIA. Even the FBI can't investigate the CIA. It is off-limits. So we always see what we see here: a bunch of wild goose chases that never lead anywhere. Most of these are manufactured by the CIA as cover. They don't want the case solved because they want to continue to use it for decades. Cases like this can be dredged up for many decades, reinforcing the old fear and seeming to confirm newer fakes.

Anyway, I encourage you to read the Wikipedia page of Lou Smit, for a good laugh. The CIA obviously created it as some sort of joke. Smit has no family and no early bio, arriving out of nowhere at the Colorado Springs Police Department in 1966, at age 31. Here is what we are told about that:

Smit fell just short of the department's minimum height of five feet and nine inches, but was able to join the force in 1966 after he had his cousin hit him over the skull with a nightstick, allowing him to meet the height minimum when he was remeasured the following day with the bump on his head.

Really? That's what they decided to go with? Was the Colorado Springs PD run by the Three Stooges? Besides, no police department ever had a height requirement of 5'9". It is normally 5'7" or less. In 1966 the *average* height of a man in the US was about 5'9". The height requirement for the Vietnam War was 5'0".

I remind you that Colorado Springs is flush with military bases, including the **Air Force** Academy, so best guess is Smit was military intelligence. He was involved in the Freddie Lee Glenn serial killer conviction, which also looks fake to me. Glenn came out of Fort Carson, and worked with Michael Corbett, a soldier there. They were likely Special Forces, since Fort Carson is famous for that. Several of Smit's fake cases later appeared on *Homicide Hunter*, another red flag. Smit's page also has the required numerology: he retired from the Ramsey case after **18** months. He died August 11, 2010, which is **8/11/10**. Smit was played by Kris Kristofferson in the movie *Perfect Murder Perfect Town*, which is apropos since Kristofferson was a Ranger and a captain. His father was an Air Force Major General.

Also of interest is that the Ramsey family's spokesperson was Rachelle **Zimmer**. That's a Jewish name. The district attorney who made various rulings in Boulder was Carol **Glowinsky**, ditto. The district attorney was Madeline **Mason**, ditto. The coroner was John **Meyer**, ditto. [For a long time the autopsy](#) was sealed, and when it was finally released six sections were redacted. Again pointing to a fraud. Without a full autopsy report, we have no proof the body was that of JonBenet.

[Did you know coroner Meyer](#) just happened to be present when the body was found? He was called to

the house [and arrived at 8pm](#) and the body was found at 8:20. That's strange, isn't it? Why do you call a coroner *before* a body has been found? Unless you know it is about to be found. Did you know he spent only ten minutes with the body at the crime scene, leaving at 8:30? He made no note of the lividity, and made no other effort to determine the time of death. He made almost no notations on the condition of the body or did anything you would expect of a coroner and forensic pathologist in a high profile case. That seems very curious, given that up until then Meyer had had a strong reputation locally. That can't be explained by any standing theories, since it would imply Meyer was an accomplice. So it is simply passed over as incompetence. But in my solution, it makes perfect sense, since the first person the CIA has to control in such a scenario is the coroner.

Boulder detectives Linda Arndt and Tom Trujillo were allegedly present at the autopsy, which is not the norm. Legally, autopsies are supposed to be independent and free of duress from either side. Police presence would be considered undue influence. I can only assume that Meyer required assistance in faking this autopsy, and Arndt and Trujillo were agents there to provide that assistance. Otherwise there was no reason for them to be there. Detectives would logically be present at a criminal autopsy only if they were suspicious of the coroner. But if they were suspicious of the coroner, they would hire a different one.

Another problem is that we are told John Ramsey removed duct tape from the mouth and the garrot from the neck immediately, and yet in the crime scene photos, most of the highest quality photos happen to be of the garrot still tightened on the neck. That makes no sense, and is a huge discontinuity in the story. Some of the pictures appear to be from the autopsy, since a card appears just below. What did they do, find another cord and retighten it around her throat for the autopsy?

According to Steve Thomas, p. 41, the garrot was still tightened on the throat at the beginning of the autopsy. But according to the mainstream story, her father cut it off when he took her upstairs. This was part of the contamination of evidence.

Another blip in the stories is that in trying to incriminate outsiders, one of the investigators claimed that doors and windows weren't locked Christmas night in the Ramsey home, and furthermore that a basement window had been broken by John Ramsey when he had lost his house key. I guess we are supposed to believe that this basement window had been wide open for weeks, letting in cold air, and that this rich guy had never thought to have it replaced. The things they expect us to believe.

More evidence of a fraud is that the Ramseys were indicted in 1999 by a grand jury, but the indictment was sealed. The CIA didn't allow the media to report the indictment for 14 years. The district attorney refused to sign or pursue the indictment, and the media falsely reported the Ramseys had NOT been indicted. All that was strictly illegal, in any case not presided over by the CIA.

We are told that 38 sex offenders were living within a two mile radius of the Ramsey home, in the richest section of Boulder. Do you believe that? I don't. Again indicating they were using false stories to spread fear.


So it looks to me like JonBenet is a total figment, a ghost. [Like Adam Lanza of Sandy Hook](#), she never existed. As with 100's of other events we have covered, this one was apparently manufactured by Intelligence as part of Operation Chaos, to scare people into believing bad people were killing pretty little girls and getting away with it. In that way, it acted as back-up for the Oklahoma City Bombing of the previous year, which [I also pulled apart recently](#). As I showed you there, the main plank of that event was the dead children. That is what drove the fear and the chaos, being the central part of the

story. But since there was never a daycare center in that building, the event becomes complete rubble. Sandy Hook was the same sort of event, with children as victims. [Waco was the same](#), with children as victims. And many others.

But why? Why would the CIA or military fake all these dead children? It's very simple: fear and chaos help them sell the military and the police. The budgets for both are huge, and require justification. If you believe the world is a scary place, with serial killers, mass murderers, pedophiles, and child killers all over the place, you will agree to astronomical military and police budgets. Plus, they need these stories to paste on the front pages to replace real news. They can't tell you what is really going on in the world, since if you knew you would revolt immediately. You would quit paying taxes and join a nationwide strike, calling for new Nuremberg trials and mass arrests. So they keep you diverted with these *National Inquirer* stories instead. And on a slightly lower level, they need these fake events to sell TV ads and magazine ads. Few people would tune in for real news, since they would find it boring. But they will tune in to be frightened and cajoled by a constant stream of sexy and sensational fake events. It is cake to the modern soul.

Of course they [faked all the BLM riots](#) for the same reason, while calling for the defunding of police: they want you to *demand* the police are refunded at even higher levels. You will be relieved when the military starts patrolling the streets to save you from those scary black people. It's all so effin transparent, I can't believe I have to be the one to tell you.

And now for the cherry on top. Many mainstream sources later published age-advanced photos of what JonBenet would look like now:



I'll tell you a little secret: that isn't an "artist's rendering". That really is the girl known as JonBenet. Yes, they have jacked with it a bit, to make it look like a composite or render, but I think they started with a real image of her. Since her death was faked, of course she is still around somewhere, and the easiest thing to do was just to publish a real picture of her, to make your confusion complete. They sell you the fake as real, and the real as fake.