

# Stephen King

## Royal Fake



by Donny Joel Osmont

Stephen King has written a lot of books. I wanted to know just how many, so I Googled “How many books has Stephen King written?” Well, Google itself gave me an answer: “At least 94.” How about that? Apparently not even the most sophisticated search algorithm in the world can keep track. [Wikipedia](#) says he has published 58 novels and six non-fiction books, as well as several collections of short stories. But then it provides the following tally:

- ! Novels: 59
- ! Collections: 10
- ! Nonfiction: 5
- ! Others: 11

That would equal 85, so Wikipedia is contradicting itself and, like Google, is also apparently confused and overwhelmed by the magnitude of King’s opus. A January 2018 article titled “[A Definitive Ranking of Every Stephen King Novel Ever](#)” on the Barnes & Noble blog ranks 49 novels, with a mention of his 50th novel, which hadn’t yet been released (*The Outsider*, May 2018). You’ll say they didn’t count the seven novels he wrote under the pen name Richard Bachman, but that would still only amount to 57, not 58 or 59. An [EW.com article](#) posted in September 2017 in honor of King’s 70th birthday mentions the coincidence that King has published “about 70 books.” Why can no one can agree on how many books Stephen King has written?

For simplicity's sake, let's assume the correct number of books is about halfway between Google's and Wikipedia's answers – so, 90. King wrote his first published novel, *Carrie*, in 1973 – 45 years ago. Back of the napkin, that means King has cranked out a book's worth of material every six months for nearly half a century. What kind of writer has that stamina? Lots, you'll say, just look at this [list of prolific writers](#). Granted, but study who's on that list: Isaac Asimov, L. Ron Hubbard, Jacob Appel, Ursula Bloom, Charles Hamilton, Prentiss Ingraham, Kathleen Lindsay, Nora Roberts, R.L. Stine, Bertrand Russell, H.P. Lovecraft, and so on. Notice the names? They're all either Jewish or prominent families in the peerage (crypto-Jewish). Several have already been outed on this site (Asimov, Hubbard, Russell, and [Lovecraft](#).) I submit that all these authors are spooks whose books are churned out by the writing committees at Langley, King included.

You can fault me for making such a sweeping assumption, but we already know that most real writers were phased out at the turn of the 20th century and replaced with fake writers. Yes, Tolstoy and Dickens and Twain were prolific, and they were probably offspring of the ruling Families ([Twain](#) certainly was), but you can tell they wrote their own stuff, and they had real talent. They were producing [art](#). They weren't writing about girls whose telekinetic powers were unlocked by their menstrual period, or couples devoured by carnivorous toads, or other-dimensional clowns that pop out of sewer drains and hack off your limbs. Starting in the early 1900s, Intel kicked its chaos machine into high gear, and that could only be accomplished by a complete takeover of literature by the Langley writing committees, who had both the manpower and the artistic unscrupulousness to produce propaganda – and thus destroy real art – at an unprecedented rate.

The King committee can't help admitting as much through their own writing. You see, they love to write about themselves. They don't know anything else to write about, since they're so out of touch with reality, having lived for so long in the fake realities they create. I'm referring to two of King's stories, *Misery* and *Word Processor of the Gods*. Most of us are familiar with *Misery*. A romance novelist is held captive by one of his biggest fans. She turns out to be a psychotic serial killer nurse who coerces the writer through torture to rewrite his latest novel because she's unhappy with his decision to kill off the main character. If you think the lesson is not to compromise your artistic vision, you're wrong. The new version is slated to be his biggest bestseller yet. *Word Processor of the Gods* is even more overt. Published in *Playboy* in 1983, the short story tells of a middle-aged writer unhappy with his life. After his nephew dies in a car crash, he finds among the boy's effects a word processor that can affect reality. He "deletes" his own son and wife and then makes his sister-in-law his new wife, thus making his dead nephew his (now living) son.


Can you read the clues? It's so obvious it's laughable. The committee writers are the "gods" writing not only the stories, but the authors that front them. Stephen King is as much a fiction as the characters in his novels. It's no surprise that the rise of metafiction rose concurrently with the mass takeover of literature by Intel. See, for example, L. Ron Hubbard's [Typewriter in the Sky](#), where the protagonist finds himself inside the story of his friend's book, or *The Twilight Zone* episode "[A World of His Own](#)", where a dictation machine brings things into existence, or the 2006 film *Stranger Than Fiction*. They have no other realities to write about now besides their own experience of fabricating reality. With the same Families now rabidly consolidating control over all aspects of modern life, their (our) culture and art has become totally self-referential. We are now witnessing the collapse of literature into its own vacuum.

Need more evidence that the “King” brand is just a writing committee? King tells us that upon hitting it big, he blew his money on alcohol and drugs and quickly became addicted, so much so that he claims he doesn’t even remember how he wrote some of his books! Of course, it’s hard to remember writing books you didn’t write. Plus, if a book every six months is unbelievable, even more unbelievable is a book every six months while addicted to drugs and alcohol.

Having reached the end of my little preamble, we can now move on to genealogical work, which constitutes the bulk of this paper. If that bores you, do your own research, which is much more exhilarating. I have doubtless left several leaves unturned in King’s family tree, so by all means bolster my research with your own. In any event, I will try to make this genealogical work as little cumbersome as possible. I think you’ll be surprised at what I’ve discovered.

For the uninitiated, I’ll be employing the Mathisian methodology. That is, I’ll seek a connection between King and the “Families.” Any time you can link a person to these Families, you can assume whatever organizations, events, or art for which they’re known are a “project” on some level. These Families, who have controlled the global power structure for centuries (millennia?) through the four levers of banking, industry, politics, and culture, are Jewish or crypto-Jewish, and they hide their connections to and between the Families through a constant fudging, scrubbing, and revising of history and genealogy. But, like anyone who gets away with a crime, they can’t help bragging about it and tipping their hand every now and again, perhaps for the fun of seeing just how blind the masses really are. They’ve also been known to out one another as part of the infighting that occurs in any family. Because of this, ordinary people can discover a lot about the Families and their projects with nothing more than an Internet connection and a functioning brain.

Equipped as such with the Mathisian methodology, it’s easy-breezy to out a famous author like Stephen King as a member of these hidden Families. Any of you reading this could have done the job just as well. But the task has fallen to me, and I have the honor of blowing the lid off our dear friend Mr. King. I’ll tell you just how I did it. Seeing that his name is King and he’s from Maine, I naturally questioned if he descends from the famous Kings of Maine.



Richard King was a wealthy merchant and land speculator, and his son William (above) became the first Governor of Maine. There's another Richard King, founder of King Ranch in Texas, who [Miles has already outed](#). That Richard King was big in the cotton trade, and our Maine Kings opened Maine's first cotton gin. We can assume they were closely related. William's grandfather was [John Fennel King](#), and it's at this point on geni.com that Erica "the disconnectrix" Howton takes over, so we can assume some mischief is afoot. John's father, also John, was born in 1670 in **Salem, Massachusetts**, so he would have been 22 at the start of the Salem Witch Trials. That's a huge red flag, since it seems the entire town of Salem was in on that hoax. John's mother was **Tabitha Walker**, linking us to all the famous Walkers, including George Herbert Walker Bush. [These Kings originate in Kings Langley](#), a village in Hertfordshire, England. And yes, the town of Langley, Virginia was named after it, both being owned by the prominent Lee family of England and America. Langley, as you know, is home to CIA headquarters, the George [Herbert **Walker**] Bush Center for Intelligence. The Langley of Hertfordshire was once the location of Kings Langley Palace, a royal palace of the Plantagenet kings.<sup>1</sup> Langley was later given to the Russells, **Dukes of Bedford**. Bedford keeps coming up in Miles' recent papers as well.

We already have three links to Stephen King. First, his wife's name is Tabitha, like Tabitha Walker King. That may feel like a tenuous connection now, but it won't by the end of this paper. Second, many of Stephen King's stories are set in or mention the fictional town of **Jerusalem's** Lot, Maine, shortened to '**Salem's** Lot. Again, it may seem like a tenuous connection now, but it won't when I'm through. Lastly, as we'll find out, Stephen King has family ties to the Russells.

But I haven't yet established that Stephen King actually descends from these Kings, have I? Alas, you'll understand my dismay when I found out Stephen King is not a King at all. He's a **Pollock**. Why did I just drone on about the Kings, then? What a waste of time, you say! Not at all. It turns out Stephen is, in fact, related to these Kings, though not in the way you think. More on that later.

Stephen's father was born Donald **Pollock** but changed his last name to King as an adult. We're never given a reason why his father changed his name. But I can give you the reason. It was to hide the fact that he was Jewish, since Pollock is a common Jewish surname [see, for example, the famous fake painter Jackson Pollock]. We're never told he legally changed his name. Wikipedia only tells us that he "used the surname King" as an adult. That's even more suspicious. Couple this with the fact that Donald Pollock a.k.a. King was part of the merchant marines, and we start to get the markings of an Intel agent. Merchant marines are an auxiliary to the Navy, and in wartime a merchant mariner is considered military personnel. Many naval intelligence officers have operated through the merchant marines to hide their intelligence ties, especially those who later became authors: Jack London, Jack Kerouac, Allen Ginsberg, Herman Melville, and Mark Twain were all merchant mariners. Donald's unexplained name change provides strong evidence that Stephen King's father was in Navy intelligence. Indeed, we find

---

<sup>1</sup>It strikes me that these Kings were originally from Kings Langley, but ostensibly the town was named for the fact that it hosted a royal palace. Is it possible that these Kings were actually descendants of the Plantagenets who, upon moving to America, changed their last name to hide their royal ancestry? And that, for an inside joke, they chose the surname King? Or perhaps that they were from the real royal Family, and the lower-case kings they hosted in their royal palace (the Plantagenets, in this case) were merely the branch of the Family that fronted the throne? I present this all as pure speculation. You're free to believe what you will on the matter.

that Wikipedia is hedging on Donald's ties to the Navy, as [his obituary plainly states](#) that he was a Navy officer *in addition to* being a merchant mariner.

Study his obituary a little more closely. Do you notice anything? It lists three sons and a daughter, none of whom are Stephen. You'll say it was because he was estranged from his original family, which includes Stephen. But he died in 1980, at which time Stephen was already a megastar, having written many of his most iconic novels, including *Carrie*, *Rage*, *The Shining*, and *The Stand*. You don't think Donald's obituary would mention that he was Stephen King's father? It also lists his wife (Stephen's stepmother) as Mayard Costa, but at [geni.com](#) she is named Helen Costa, and her genealogy is totally scrubbed. It lists his father as William **David** Pollock, but geni.com has him as William **E.** Pollock. We can already tell Stephen's family roots are being fudged.

If you're into it, Donald is riddled with numerology. He was born March 11 ( $3 \times 11 = 33$ ) and died at age 66 ( $33 + 33$ ).

Look at the photograph posted of Donald Pollock on geni.com:



He just looks like an Intel agent with his mustache and glasses, doesn't he? And the photo itself appears to be some sort of official government headshot, judging by the imprint on the bottom left corner. But he doesn't appear to be in uniform. Here's a photo from his wedding to either Stephen's mom or his stepmother:



You can tell right away this photo has been heavily tampered with. Parts of the photograph are extremely blurry, while others are unnaturally clear (particularly his right arm).

[This website](#) provides a good historical survey of the Pollock name. The surname Polk derives from Pollock. For instance, the great-great-grandfather of President James Polk was Robert Pollock, who emigrated from Scotland to the American colonies. So the Pollocks – or at least one line of them – are one of the crypto-Jewish Families that came to the U.S. via Scotland. We're told these Pollocks weren't Jewish, and that later Jewish families from Poland also had the name Pollock, but this is misdirection. My guess is these Polish Jews came to Scotland much earlier than we're told. The earliest known Scottish Pollock is Petrus de Pollock, whose father, Fulbert, was a Norman who worked for Walter **FitzAlan**, High Steward of Scotland. See *When Scotland Was Jewish*, which traces a significant migration of Jews into Scotland right around this time. There's no explanation given for his designation "de Pollock," nor is there any information on his mother. My assumption was that his mother was a Polish Jew from a wealthy merchant family. Supporting this, we find that later Pollocks in Ireland became "prominent there in the linen trade." In other words, they were Jewish. We also know Petrus was a knight in the Crusades. Since we know [what the Crusades were really about](#), we can make some safe assumptions about the Pollocks of Scotland. Thus, when ethnicelebs.com says Stephen King is mostly Scottish, they aren't lying. But they aren't telling the whole truth, either. [Miles: they are lying.]

We get more red flags when we trace the emigration of Pollocks from Scotland/Ireland to America:

Family tradition says that John Pollock eloped with the step-daughter of **Lord Russell** and fled from Scotland to Northern Ireland. They lived in Northern Ireland for about thirty years before coming to America in 1800 and settling in **Ohio**....

King's Pollock ancestors trace back to Ohio right around this time. John Pollock was born in Ohio in 1828. His mother was a Mary **Stanley**, whose genealogy is completely scrubbed. It

seems like Stanleys appear in nearly every one of Miles' papers, indicating they were (and are) one of the most prominent families among the Families. What's interesting here is that the Stanleys, Earls of Derby, owned extensive lands in Lancashire. Guess where else the Scottish/Irish Pollocks emigrated to?

Other Pollocks in the 19th century headed for industrial Lancashire.

The fact that King's Pollock line ends in Ohio in the 1800s with a Pollock-Stanley marriage is no coincidence. Both families came over from Lancashire, a fact they are trying to obscure. Miles has already established that the Earls Stanley spearheaded a Jewish invasion of England through the Isle of Man and Anglesey.

Since we're on the topic of Lancashire/Isle of Man/Anglesey, you should know that the town next to Anglesey is Bangor, after which Stephen King's hometown of Bangor, Maine is named.

Notice that a John Pollock supposedly married a stepdaughter of Lord Russell. That's William Russell, of the Dukes of Bedford who we've already run across in this paper. He was one of the premier spooks of his age, having been elected to Parliament for the borough of **Tavistock**, a seat traditionally held by a member of his family. The current-day Tavistock Institute traces its founding and name back to Tavistock Square, which formed part of the Bedford Estate that was owned by Russell. The Tavistock constituency of the British Parliament has long been a nest of spooks, going all the way back to the 1300s. Tavistock MPs include Fords, Rogers, Underhills, Fitzes, Throckmortons, Bacons, Morisons, Knightleys, Vaughans, Monatgus, Fleetwoods, Hicks, Ratcliffes, Drakes, Leveson-Gowers, Brands, Spencers, Grants, Foxes, Byngs, Carters, and d'Aguilars. Lord Russell himself was related to the Howards, Earls of Essex, Douglasses, Kennedys, Lindsays, and Gordons. I suspect Stephen King's official birthdate is a nod to his family's connections to Tavistock. King was allegedly born September 21, 1947. The Tavistock Institute was founded one day before, on September 20, 1947. It goes without saying that the CIA was founded three days before, on September 18. The meaning is clear: King and all his writing are works of fiction in the ultimate sense. They are creations of Intelligence.

Another notable Pollock is [Oliver](#), friend of [Robert Morris](#) and fellow financier of the Revolutionary War who is credited with creating the U.S. dollar sign (\$). Wikipedia tells us he began his career as a merchant, trading from port to port in the West Indies, with his headquarters in Havana, Cuba. By the outbreak of the war, "Pollock had become very wealthy and had significant political influence." His lent the U.S. government 300,000 Spanish pesos, which amounts to \$1 billion in today's dollar. If you think he amassed that fortune from scratch, or that he later went bankrupt and died in obscurity (as we are told), you're an imbecile. He was from an already-wealthy crypto-Jewish family and became even wealthier carrying on the family trade. Stephen King is probably a relative of Oliver Pollock. The last Pollock in King's ancestry is James Pollock, the husband of the aforementioned Mary Stanley. James was born in 1782 in Pennsylvania. Oliver settled in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania in 1760 at age 23. He would have been 45 when James was born and was probably an uncle or cousin of James.

Stephen King's mother was born Nellie Ruth **Pillsbury** on 3/13/13. Her father was Guy **Herbert** Pillsbury and her father was **Howard Leavitt** Pillsbury. Note the Leavitt, which is Jewish. Pillsbury puts us in mind of the Pillsbury Company, now owned by General Mills, which was founded in 1872 by Charles Pillsbury and his uncle John **Sargent** Pillsbury, the eighth Governor of Minnesota. That middle name is important, because it links us to the Salem Witch Trials. One of the accused and executed (not really) was Susannah Martin, one of the only victims not from Salem (she was from Salisbury). It turns she had been accused of witchcraft twice before the Salem hoax, the first time by William Sargent, Jr., who claimed he witnessed

Susannah give birth to, and then kill, an illegitimate baby. This story is as absurd as the witch trials. In what circumstance would Sargent have seen Susannah give birth? If he was there, why didn't he stop her from killing the baby? How did he know the baby was illegitimate? Why did he later drop the charge of infanticide against her, but not the charge of witchcraft? None of these details are explained, because they're inexplicable. It seems Sargent was part of the run-up to the main witch trial project, or perhaps part of an earlier attempt at the same project that failed and was aborted, because nobody in Salisbury was buying it. I suppose they packed up the set and moved down the road to Salem, where they had better success.

Is there a link to this Sargent and the founder of Pillsbury? You bet. John Sargent Pillsbury was the 4g-grandson of William Sargent, Jr. Hence the middle name. That means Stephen King has family ties back to the Salem Witch Trials through the Pillsburys. He has another link. One of King's distant great-aunts is a Martin. So King is a relative both the accused and the accuser.

Martin is also the link we need between Stephen King and the Pollock baronets, who Miles has covered [elsewhere](#). 1<sup>st</sup> Baronet Sir Frederick Pollock's youngest daughter, Frances, married Samuel Martin.

Through the Pillsbury line, Stephen King's great-great-grandmother was [Rebecca \(Grant\) Robinson](#). The Grant links us to President Ulysses S., and we've encountered Robinsons many times before. Her uncle was Captain Wentworth **Stuart**, nephew of a Mary **Walker** and Sarah **Austin**. The Grant line is also married to **Bradstreets** and **Farnhams**. Further back in the Grant line we find **Goulds** and **Stones** – Jewish names. We also find another Martin – Mary Martin, who in the late 1600s moved from Kittery, Maine to Amesbury, MA, which is right next to Salisbury, home of Susannah Martin of the Salem hoax. Mary's family tree on the Martin side is totally scrubbed, but we may assume she was a close relative of Susannah. Now you understand why King's fictional town of 'Salem's Lot is not such a tenuous connection, after all. King in fact has many ties to the real-life Salem.

Let's switch over to Stephen's wife, Tabitha. The first thing to notice in her [genealogy](#) is that her father is set to <private>, though we know from Wikipedia his name was Raymond George Spruce. That's all we know. What is being hidden here? Among other things, that Tabitha is related to Marcel Proust. Spruce and Proust are both variants of the French surname Prouse/Prowse.<sup>2</sup> And did you know Proust was Jewish? [His mother](#) was a Weil, related to Cohens, Meyers, Levys, and Oppenheims. In 1517 we find a [Richard Prowse](#) marrying an Ann Vaughan, daughter of MP Stephen Vaughan and ex-wife of Henry Locke, through whom she was related to Simon Throckmorton, MP. Remember both the Vaughan and Throckmorton MPs held the Tavistock seat of parliament, so they had close ties to the Russells, Dukes of Bedford.

Tabitha's mother's side is surprisingly well-documented. Here's where the Kings of Maine re-enter stage left, because – surprise, surprise – *Tabitha is a direct descendent of these Kings!* Remember how I said Stephen really was a King, just not in the way you'd think? That's because his wife is actually the King. That would explain her first name, since she was named after her ancestor, Tabitha Walker King. That should make you wonder at the amazing coincidence of Stephen's father randomly changing his name to King and his son later marrying a descendent of the famous Kings of Maine. I admit I don't know how to read that, but I'm

---

<sup>2</sup>Prouse may itself be a variant of Bruce, as in Robert (the) Bruce, King of Scotland. For example, see a [John Prouse](#) of Maryland born in 1757 to George *Bruce*, from Scottish Bruces. David Bruce, King of Scotland, married a Plantagenet.

certain it's no coincidence. [Miles: They're probably cousins/beards, as usual. In other words, they are *both* Kings.]

By the way, the Kings of Maine married into the very wealthy [Van Rensselaer family](#). Maine Governor William King's grand-niece Elizabeth King married congressman Henry Bell Van Rensselaer in 1833.

Tabitha's great aunt was Laura **Gould**, a Jewish name we also saw in Stephen's ancestry. In her family tree we also find names like Watson, Gray (including a Jean Jane Gray), Clark, Staples, Parrson, Wallace, Graham, Hill, **Russell**, Gordon, Springer (a common Jewish name – see Jerry Springer, admitted Jewish), and Webster. That last name links us to Salem again and “half-hanged” Mary Webster. The Websters in Tabitha's line [were living in Essex County](#) at the time of the witch trials and were members of the same famous Webster family.

Let's switch back to Stephen's genealogy, where I've saved the best for last. Geni.com traces King's genealogy back to an [Anna Jagillo](#)! Yes, this is the same **Anna Jagiellon** we've seen over and over in Miles' research. For followers of Miles' work, linking a modern-day celebrity back to the Jagiellons is like winning the lottery on Christmas Day. They are crypto-Jews from Poland going back many centuries, and they are the ancestors of royalty across Europe, including the kings of Poland, England, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Russia.

Here's where it gets weird. Geni.com lists this Anna as being the wife of [Heinrich Nicholas Rittenhausen](#). For those who don't know, the Rittenhouses were a prominent Pennsylvania family who became very wealthy running the country's first paper mill. Anyone familiar with the city of Philadelphia will have heard of Rittenhouse Square. David Rittenhouse was the first director of the U.S. Mint. They were “German aristocrats” originating in Brunswick, and there is still a large nature preserve next to Brunswick called Riddaghausen. Stephen King isn't far removed from these Rittenhouses; his great-grandfather was David Rittenhouse Pollock. So everything you read about Stephen coming from obscurity and poverty is a farce.

King's ancestor is supposed to be Heinrich's first wife, Maria Von Weyhen. Anna Jagiellon, we presume, was his second wife, with whom he had no children. But that's not possible, since Anna's only known husband was Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I, whom she married in 1515, a day before her twelfth birthday. They remain married until her death in 1547 (note the numerology). So when did she have time to marry this Heinrich fellow? Geni.com lists Heinrich's birthdate as March 10, 1503. Ferdinand I was born March 10, 1500 – same exact birthday, only three years apart. What's going on here?

It becomes a little clearer when we flip over to Daniel Kolb Cassel's *A Genea-Biographical History of the Rittenhouse Family*. Look at page 54 of the [PDF](#), where he draws a clear genealogical link between the Rittenhouses and the Habsburg dynasty (of which Ferdinand I was a member). He lists Henry (Heinrich) Nicholas as being the son of Philip I, King of Castile, and later given the surname Ferdinand, a.k.a Emperor Ferdinand I. So Cassel's assertion is that Heinrich and Ferdinand *were the same person*. Then Cassel lists Balthaser as his son, a.k.a Emperor Maximilian II. Balthaser/Maximilian's son Mathias became the first Rittenhouse in 1591, when he was knighted to the House of Knights, or “*Housius Riders*” – a.k.a. Rittenhouse. This, at least, was Cassel's conjecture.



*King Ferdinand I, a.k.a. Heinrich Rittenhouse?*

We get the full backstory at the bottom of Heinrich's Geni.com page:

The lineage of the RETTINGHAUSEN family has not been proven. It has been a controversial issue for over 100 years. In the Daniel Kolb Cassel book published in 1893 on the Rittenhouse Family History, he made a link to the Royal Habsburg Families. This was accepted for many years until Calvin Kephart, President of the National Genealogical Society... "debunked" the statements of Daniel K. Cassel linking the Rittenhouse ancestry to royalty. He came up with an alternate possibility, connecting them to a baronial family in the general area, named VON RÖDINGHAUSEN. Here again his views were accepted until more recently when more information came to light.

...

There has been new information found in 2002/3 by Berdine Rittenhouse. This was presented at the Rittenhouse Reunion in Lancaster, Pa. in October 2003.... The documents located by Berdine Rittenhouse were some of the original handwritten manuscripts that Daniel Kolb Cassel made when he was writing his book. This story now gets to sound like "cloak and dagger" stuff. There were some notes penciled in this manuscript that lead present researchers to believe that Daniel Cassel did NOT wish to issue the information on the Habsburg connections as actual fact. It appears that he was only going to offer it as one possibility. But something happened between those notes and publication and when it was printed those details were shown as actual facts. It looks now as if someone else tampered with the manuscript before it reached the printers.

Oh, the intrigue! Who are we to believe? It helps to remember that Ellen Marie Larson, the Geni curator who posted the above info and manages Heinrich's page, still has him linked to Anna Jagiellon even though she strongly implies that the Habsburg link is spurious. She is dangling the carrot while denying the carrot exists. I should point out that Ellen is the daughter of a Campbell and a Dixon, according to her own Geni.com profile. I will leave you to decide if she

is another planted “disconnectrix.” I’ll just say this: it is suspicious that she would have so much information posted about the Rittenhouse family – including information only shared during a Rittenhouse family reunion – while her own genealogy is scant.

The easiest way to support a link between the Habsburgs and Rittenhouses is family resemblance. We’re fortunate that the former had a very pronounced family trait: the “Habsburg jaw”. This was actually a genetic disorder involving the overgrowth of the lower jaw causing a severe underbite. Here is a portrait of the same Ferdinand I shown above, but younger in life, before he had a beard. You can see the Habsburg jaw, though it’s not as pronounced as some other members of his family.



The portrait on the right is David Rittenhouse, though it’s a rather obscure portrait of him. Can you guess why? His jaw is very pronounced, almost Habsburgian, if you will. Most other portraits of him downplay his jaw. There are other noticeable similarities, including the high forehead, wideset eyes, long face, and long nose bridge that is slightly down-curved.

As mentioned, King has written several novels under the *nom de plume* Richard Bachman. Wikipedia has an [entire page](#) devoted to this pen name, completely separate from Stephen King’s wiki page, which is very unusual. King apparently created an extensive bogus biography of Bachman, including the fact that he had one son who fell down a well and died at age six, and that Bachman survived brain cancer thanks to a “tricky” operation. After King outed Bachman as himself, he selected a new pen name, Jason Wilch, which we are told was the name of a childhood friend of King’s “who never properly went through puberty.” That last bit is supposed to be true, but it reads as fake as the fake stuff. The writing committee making up King’s actual biography doesn’t know how to tell a fabulous claim from a realistic one. Their story of King’s life sounds just as fictional as the bogus story of Bachman’s life, which they also wrote. They’re layering fiction upon fiction so profusely and sloppily that they can’t keep track of – or don’t really care – when it’s supposed to be believable and when it’s supposed to be absurd. But what of the name?

Bachman was inspired by Bachman–Turner Overdrive, a rock and roll band King was listening to at the time his publisher asked him to choose a pseudonym on the spot.

Again, this sounds fictitious. I’ll give you the real origin of the name. In King’s ancestry we find an [Anna Bechmann](#), which is a variant spelling of Beckman and **Bachmann**. They just dug into

King's genealogy, you see. But why wouldn't King admit he chose the name from his own family tree? Because Bachmann is a Jewish name. Yet again, we find a famous person hiding his Jewishness. King's ancestry is scrubbed after Anna Bechmann, further evidence that his Jewish roots are being purposely hidden even as they're being paraded around in broad daylight.

I'll finish where I started, with the assertion that "Stephen King" himself has always been a project. He seems to have been born and bred to be a shameless monger of fear and horror. Here is the photo his alma mater, the University of Maine, published in its announcement that one of its own had "hit the big time":



You have to laugh at that. Behind the deranged look is an obvious smirk, because King is just a childish, spoiled prankster who believes in his art as much as an atheist believes in the afterlife. Despite that, the whole purpose of the King project is to make you believe that people really are deranged. This is why they've used his novels – *Rage* in particular, about a student who goes crazy and shoots up a classroom – to explain the seemingly inexplicable string of school shootings that have popped up in recent decades. You can read all about it on *Rage*'s [Wikipedia](#) page, where a whole section is devoted to "Connections to actual school shootings":

- ! San Gabriel High School hostage incident – Jeffrey Lyne **Cox** took a semi-automatic rifle to school on April 26, 1988 and held 60 students hostage. "A friend of Cox's told the press that Cox had been inspired by the Kuwait Airways Flight 422 hijacking and by the novel *Rage*, which Cox had read over and over again and with which he strongly identified."
- ! Jack County High School hostage incident – Dustin L. Pierce took a history classroom hostage in a nine-hour standoff with police on September 18, 1989. "Police found a copy of *Rage* among the possessions in Pierce's bedroom, leading to speculation that he had been inspired to carry out the plot of the novel."
- ! East Carter High School shooting – On January 18, 1993, Gary Scott Pennington shot his English teacher Deanna McDavid in the head and held the class hostage for 20 minutes. "Just before the shootings he had written an essay on the book *Rage* and was upset that McDavid had given it a C grade."
- ! Moses Lake school shooting – Barry Loukaitis opened fire in his algebra classroom at Frontier Middle School on February 2, 1996, killing two students and his algebra teacher, Leona Caires. As his classmates began to panic, Loukaitis reportedly said, "This sure beats algebra, doesn't it?", mimicking a line from *Rage*. "Loukaitis has also stated that he

tried to model his life after the novel *Rage's* protagonist Charlie Decker, who kills two teachers and takes his algebra class hostage."

- ! Heath High School shooting – 14-year-old Michael Carneal shot eight students at a school prayer meeting on December 1, 1997. "He had a copy of *Rage* within the Richard Bachman omnibus in his locker. This was the incident that moved King to allow the book to go out of print."

I assume all these events were hoaxes, coordinated by the same hoaxing Families that produced the Salem Witch Trials and begat Stephen King, who is linked to all these hoaxes. Miles suggested to me that the reason they tapped Stephen to be the face of the King novels was because of his creepy looks. They may have put more thought into it than that; then again, maybe not. What's interesting is that he has had significant work done to correct his buck teeth, as you can see:



This has made him far less creepy, in my opinion, which hurts his image as the type of motel-stalking psychopath you might encounter in one of his novels. Maybe in his old age he's finally getting sick of playing the part assigned to him. Maybe Intel wanted him to die a bizarre, early death fitting of his novels, but he decided he wanted to settle into the role of the beloved, grandfatherly writer, instead. Or maybe he has wanted to bow out of the limelight for years now, but they've coerced him into keeping up the project, since it has proved so lucrative. Either way, I hope he (his committee) officially retires from writing soon. The last thing we need in this world is another Stephen King novel.