

[return to updates](#)

# WHERE DID ALL THE PHOENICIANS GO?



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published Ides of March, 2020*

We have already established that the Phoenicians flourished due to their early control of shipping and banking, but it appears a semi-monopoly on iron production was also a part of it. Turns out the “Sea Peoples” destroyed the Hittite Empire in about 1200BC, and according to mainstream history the Hittites were linked to a monopoly on iron smelting. As part of this old theory, the Sea Peoples took over the monopoly and spread it west. That theory has been pooh-poohed by more recent “historians”, but since those historians tend to be Jewish, we can take their denials as confirmations. So it looks to me like the Iron Age itself is a pointer to Jewish hegemony. The Phoenician capital Byblos was right on the southern border of the Hittite empire. So it is probable the Sea Peoples were so dominant at that time because they were the only ones with iron armor and weapons. Everyone else in Europe and the Near East was fighting with bronze until many centuries later. The only other people who had iron at that time were the Indians, but the Indians were never especially interested in war. The Hittites got the technology from India, but like the Indians they weren’t that interested in empire building. It was the Phoenicians who had the fleets and who were interested in conquest.

More indication of this is that at the very time the Sea Peoples were sacking the Hittites and many other places, the Israelites were allegedly defeating the Canaanites and founding their 12 tribes—including the Tribe of Asher, which was the furthest north and contained the Phoenician ports of **Tyre and Sidon**. Well, the Sea Peoples were called the Wesh-ash by the Egyptians, which is a corruption of “men of Asher”. The Egyptians also called them the Dan-yen, which means “men of Dan”. Dan—another tribe of Israel—also had a prominent seaport at Jaffa. The Egyptians also called them Sher-dan (pictured under title), which the historians pretend not to understand, or link to Sardinia! But that almost certainly points to Sidon again. Or to the Dan again.

The mainstream historians pretend not to be able to place the Sea Peoples, but just coincidentally the history of Phoenicia matches the history of the Sea Peoples. It is admitted Phoenicia's high point was 1200-800BC, right after the Sea Peoples sacked the entire world. While everyone else was in a dark age, Phoenicia was still prospering. Wikipedia doesn't want to tell us anything about that time, but its authors do give up the farm rather conspicuously in this section, if you bother to read closely:

**A unique concentration in Phoenicia of silver hoards dated between 1200 and 800 BC, however, contains [hacksilver](#) with lead isotope ratios matching ores in [Sardinia](#) and Spain. [40] This metallic evidence agrees with the [Biblical](#) attestation of a western Mediterranean [Tarshish](#) said to have supplied [King Solomon](#) of Israel with silver via Phoenicia, during the latter's heyday.**

We just saw Sardinia above, didn't we, as misdirection away from Sidon and Sherdan. Mainstream historians tell us the Sherdan can't be Phoenicians, since the word Srdn has that "r" in it, and since the ancient Sardinians—the Nuragics—had horns on their helmets like the Sherdan.



That's a good dodge, but the Phoenicians did, too, since they had been worshipping bulls for thousands of years. See their own page, which takes them back to Bahrain, and Dilmun, a trading center on the Persian Gulf which had its heyday around 2000BC. There you will find this bull's head, which dates from that period. It was discovered in the Barbar Temple.



So the Nuragic sculpture is more evidence leading us *to* the Phoenicians, not away from them. Whether you try to link Sherdan to Sidon or Sardinia, you end up with the Phoenicians.

On the page for Sherdan, we find this admitted once again, since the Phoenicians had prominent trading posts on Sardinia in the late bronze age.

Also worth pointing out here is that we see from the quote above that the Phoenicians were hoarding metals at the beginning of the Iron Age. We are supposed to think they were stealing silver to make trinkets or something, but the more likely explanation is that they were stealing metals of all kinds from city-states throughout the Mediterranean region, and using those metals in iron alloys, or for other military or industrial purposes. The superior metals would help them build better ships, of course, as well as other implements of all kinds.



There is the Phoenician bull again, guarding Tyre. That is Ba'al/EI, and he is our first indication in this paper that Phoenicia was synonymous with Cretans/Minoans. . . think the Cretan Bull/Minotaur. We will see more below.



That is thought to be Apis, the Egyptian god, with his solar disk. But he and Ra aren't the only ones commonly found with that curious solar disk. The Sherdan also have it, and so did Ba'al. With Ba'al it is sometimes a sphere instead of a disk. With the carvings of the Sherdan in 2D, it looks like an old TV antenna rather than a solar disk. This is where the idea of the halo came from. We may look more closely at that in a future paper.

Let's see, who else had horns on their helmets? The Vikings.

To see some third-rate misdirection on this topic, you may go to the [History.com](http://History.com), a front for the usual people. There we are assured by Elizabeth Nix that the Vikings did NOT have horns on their helmets. Here is the entirety of her evidence against:

**In fact, only one complete helmet that can definitively be called “Viking” has turned up. Discovered in 1943 on Gjermundbu farm in Norway, the 10th-century artifact has a rounded iron cap, a guard around the eyes and nose, and no horns to speak of.**

So, based on **one** sample, we are supposed to believe the hypothesis is disproven? And are we really supposed to believe that only one Viking helmet has been found in all of history? C'mon! How stupid does she think we are? She then goes on to admit that 19<sup>th</sup> c. Wagnerians based their depictions on recent discoveries of actual horned helmets from that place and time, but we are assured these predated the Vikings. Really? So, the helmets had dates on them? That's convenient. Just so you know, you can't carbon date recent metal artifacts, because they don't contain carbon and aren't old enough. They generally have to be dated by where they were found. So this claim that they predated the Vikings is at best wild conjecture and at worst the usual boohockey.

Amazingly, she then admits that Greek and Roman historians reported Northern European warriors wearing horns, wings and antlers, but that is dismissed thusly:

**not only did this headgear fall out of fashion at least a century before the Vikings appeared, it was likely only donned for ceremonial purposes by Norse and Germanic priests.**

But wait, didn't Nix just admit Norse priests wore horns? That's good enough for me. Plus, the first part of that sentence doesn't even make any sense. How does she know what was in fashion then? And how did the Vikings “appear”? They weren't there one year and suddenly they were there the next? After a few centuries of Norwegians wearing horns as fashion, suddenly they quit and then started calling themselves Vikings? I can't make sense of this, can you?

---

---

All that is interesting, but the question I want to hit in depth here is where the Phoenicians went *after* their admitted heyday. On the Wiki page for Phoenicia we are told that Cyrus the Great of Persia defeated them in 539BC, but if we go to his page we find that hardly mentioned. At the end of the section on “Lydian Empire and Asia Minor”, we get one sentence informing us that Cyrus' general Harpagus captured Lycia, Cilicia and Phoenicia, by using earthworks. Harpagus doesn't even link out. Wiki does have a page on him, though, so we go there. There we find Harpagus was a Median general who had defected to the Persians, leading to the defeat of Astyages and elevating Cyrus. However, since Astyages was the grandfather of Cyrus, that defeat didn't mean much. It was all in the family.

Same for Cyrus' defeat of the Lydians, since Astyages' wife was the sister of **King Croesus** of Lydia. Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon was also family, being another brother-in-law. Lydia, Babylon, and Media were all one empire by blood and marriage, so when it later became Persia with Cyrus, nothing much had changed but the name. The same people were running it all along. Plus, Persia didn't even exist until Cyrus the Great. He is the one that joined these smaller empires into Persia. So it is very suspicious to see Persia arising overnight from nowhere and immediately taking over the world. Like all the more recent stories concerning the Phoenicians, it makes no sense. Huge empires shouldn't be built overnight. The Roman Empire took centuries to create, so seeing Persia pop up and take over the world just as Phoenicia is supposedly dying is a huge red flag. It is even more suspicious given the story we are about to unwind.

Before we get there, remind yourself that Lydia was the same as the Hittite Empire, Hattusa. After the Sea Peoples destroyed Hattusa, Lydia arose in its place. Since Hattusa was defeated by the Sea Peoples, the Sea Peoples must have taken the place over. And since the Sea Peoples were Phoenicians, that must mean the Lydians *were* these Phoenicians. QED. And if we check the page for Lydia, we find this:

**For the Greeks, Tantalus was a primordial ruler of mythic Lydia, and Niobe his proud daughter; her husband Amphion associated Lydia with Thebes in Greece, and through Pelops the line of Tantalus was part of the founding myths of Mycenae's second dynasty. (In reference to the myth of Bellerophon, Karl Kerényi remarked, in *The Heroes of The Greeks* 1959, p. 83. "As Lykia was thus connected with Crete, and as the person of Pelops, the hero of Olympia, connected Lydia with the Peloponnesos, so Bellerophon connected another Asian country, or rather two, Lykia and Karia, with the kingdom of Argos".**

That's rather revealing, and you may want to come back and read it again after you read the pages below. That is because I show Thebes, Argos *and* Mycenae were crypto-Phoenician. Thebes had been founded by Cadmus, admitted to be a Phoenician. Amphion constructed the famous walls of Thebes with his twin brother Zethus. He married Niobe of Lydia, indicating once more that Lydia was linked closely to the Phoenicians. This would be expected, since it was just north of them, with many famous ports including Miletus, Ephesus, and Phaselis.

It is also worth pointing out how scrubbed Croesus is, despite being one of the wealthiest men in history. There is no sidebar on his page and no mother is given. But like many of these people we are looking at and will look at below, his ancestry goes back to Heracles. That by itself is informative since Heracles was supposed to come from Argos as well. This would make Heracles a crypto-Phoenician like the rest.

As I was studying the history of Lydia and these other places, I noticed no real evidence of a dark age after 1200BC. It now appears to me that this period was called a dark age only because it was the period when Phoenicia *most obviously* took over the entire Mediterranean. The famous historians, who are, almost to a man, Jewish, don't want to tell us anything about that period, so it is dark for that reason, not because people were any more starving or ignorant than before. The period isn't dark, it is blacked out to hide the Phoenicians.

Anyway, back to the founding of Persia. The General Harpagus was also of these royal families, though we are told he came to detest Astyages for personal reasons. However, Harpagus' page does tell us what we came for, since there we get a direct translation from Herodotus.

**After conquering the Ionians, Harpagus proceeded to attack the Carians, the Caunians, and the Lycians. The Ionians and Aeolians were forced to serve in his army...**

Let's see, what are we missing there? The Phoenicians. **No mention of Harpagus conquering the Phoenicians.** And, just so you know, the Carians, Caunians and Lycians were the same as the Lydians, being colonies of western Anatolia. So he couldn't have conquered them, either, and wouldn't have needed to. They were already run by cousins. Notice it says he "attacked" those people, not that he defeated them or conquered them. The Phoenician/Persians were always attacking themselves for profit, and they still are.

Do you know why there is no mention of Harpagus conquering the Phoenicians in Herodotus? Because the Phoenicians were more relatives of the Persians by marriage. This has been mostly scrubbed, but I can re-create it for you just by studying the pathetic lies we are told by the mainstream. It is easiest to see by visiting the [Wiki page for Bardiya](#), son of Cyrus the Great. Start at the bottom, where you will find that Gore Vidal and Jorge Luis Borges both wrote about this mystery. Why would famous Jews be writing about such obscure stuff 2,500 years later? Because this is what they do: they have to continue to misdirect century after century, or someone like me might catch on.

OK, now go back to the top of Bardiya's Wiki page and start reading. If you can make sense of it, you deserve a medal, since the authors are doing their best to keep you from it. It is a soup of multiple and changing names, and people with the same names posing as one another, until you eventually throw up your hands and quit in disgust. Unless. . . unless, like me, you are there seeking something specific, in which case you read not the text, but in between the text and around it.

Here is how to unwind it. First, look who Bardiya's mother is. Cassandane. Doesn't sound like a Persian name, does it? So let us assume either she or one of the other wives here is Phoenician, and the authors are trying to cover that by inserting as much chaos into the story as possible. That would immediately explain the unexplainable, wouldn't it: why the short line of succession from Cyrus to Darius is such a tangled mess. It only took eight years, but it is one of the biggest messes in the history of royal succession. Cassandane is said to be the daughter of Pharnaspes, but he doesn't link out and no information is available on him online. The name is close to Pharnaces, as in the King of Pontus, but no match. If she were really an Achaemenian noblewoman of rank to marry the King, her father's name would be in the lists. But he isn't. Also curious is that her daughter Atossa married Darius. This makes no sense given that Herodotus tells us Darius was a spearman of no consequence, and therefore couldn't be the son of the satrap of Bactria—and not of rank to marry into the royal family.

So, just notice that whatever story you choose to believe, we have a complete break in the royal succession right after Cyrus. Cyrus founds one of the greatest empires the world has ever known, and **eight** years after his death his line is already broken. His son Cambyses ruled eight years and then died in mysterious circumstances in route to Syria, without issue. Cambyses brother Bardiya was then supposed to become King, but he disappeared from the face of the earth, either replaced by an impostor or not. At any rate, Darius deposed whoever was on the throne after a few months and became King.

Another thing to notice is Bardiya's wife, Phaidyme, who was supposed to be able to tell the real people from the impostors. She had also been the wife of the previous king, Cambyses. So she had been Queen for many years, and allegedly married both brothers. That is unlikely; and again, that doesn't sound like a Persian name. Like Cassandane, it sounds Greek. Her daughter Parmys also married Darius. In fact, Darius married the two daughters of Cyrus *and* his granddaughter—all, we suppose, to lend legitimacy to his position. . . or. . . *to continue those female lines.*

Another clue is that Darius later supposedly became paranoid, believing that everyone around him was an impostor, including his cousin by marriage Nebuchadnezzar III. Look at what Wikipedia has to say about it:

**Darius often accused rebels and opponents of being impostors (such as [Nebuchadnezzar III](#)) and it could be straining credulity to say that they all were.**

Would it really? At this point, would anything be hard for you to believe? Not me. I suggest almost the entire “Persian” court was composed of impostors. Or, to say it another way, the entire royal house had been taken over in a coup. The mainstream accounts admit that, since we are told that despite the run-around, Darius was NOT of the royal lines. They also admit the coup, since Darius, supposedly with seven other nobles, deposed someone and took over the throne. But since Darius wasn't a noble, why was he chosen of the seven? He wasn't. The story is the person whose horse neighed first at dawn was to be selected as monarch, and Darius cheated by goosing his horse or something. So that is what they decided to go with. Because with no sensible story could you explain how or why Darius—not being noble—would be chosen over these nobles. According to Herodotus, one of these nobles, Otanes, was the father of the Queen Phaidyme, so he would certainly outrank Darius in any account.

Could anything explain this mess? Yes. Suppose Phaidyme was Phoenician. The Phoenicians had hoped to infiltrate the Persian lines that way, but Cambyses and then Bardiya both died without issue, so the gambit would appear to be a fail. Without prompt action, the royal family would choose a cousin and put him on the throne. But if the Phoenicians could install their own man and quickly marry him to one of the Phoenician ladies in the noble line, the bullet could be dodged. You will say then why not install an actual Phoenician man in that case, forgetting all this female nonsense. One, because that is not the way they do things. They trace lineage through the women, as we know. Two, because to have any hope of having the new king accepted, he had to be mostly Persian in looks, demeanor, and voice. He was their front, you see. Remember, we have seen this many times in later history, as when [the Medicis took the French throne](#), for example. They take it through the Queen, with the King as a front.

You will then say, “But why Phoenician? With no strong evidence one way or another, why not assume these women were Assyrian, or Egyptian, or Chinese? You have shown the possibility they might be usurpers, but why Phoenician?”

Well, I have an answer for that as well. The answer is that I am trying to fit this story to later events that are also mysterious, but that tie in. The main clue there is that this Darius we have been looking at is the one who started the war with Greece. Well, not only do we have no real evidence the Persians ever conquered Phoenicia, we have the fact that the Phoenicians supplied most of the ships and know-how for the attack on Greece. This attack began in 492, just 47 years after Phoenicia allegedly fell. So why would Phoenicia suddenly pop up as Persia's greatest ally and facilitator? When Persia wanted Phoenicia to attack Carthage, the Phoenicians said no, so we can't assume Phoenicia was prostrate before Persia. Plus, if Persia had really conquered Phoenicia in 539, Persia would have simply taken their ships. Phoenicia would have ended, or at least been crippled. But here less than 50 years later, Phoenician ships were the centerpiece of the attack on Greece. Which means . . . Phoenicia and Persia were either allies all along, **or were in some sense two names for the same people**. And given that realization, the logical thing to do is seek a possible Persian/Phoenician link in the years leading up to that. Which is what I just did.

Darius attacks Greece with Phoenician ships *and* with Phoenician captains and armies on the ships. A few years earlier, Darius had taken over Persia in a mysterious coup that makes no sense. He had married two daughters of Cyrus the Great and one granddaughter. All three mysteries point at the same solution, as you now see: **those women were Phoenician.** Which means Persia never really existed. All we have to do is take the female line back one more step, to Cyrus' wife, and we can throw the name Persia in the dustbin of history. That wife was Cassandane, whom I already hit. But there was also another wife/consort of Cyrus who is scrubbed, throwing up a big red flag. That was Amitis. Wikipedia lists her in the sidebar, but mysteriously when you click on her, you are taken instead to Cassandane's page, where Amitis is not mentioned. That's curious, as I think you will admit. We also learn of Roxana, daughter of Cassandane and sister of Atossa, who was the third woman of this line to marry Darius. That name also doesn't sound Persian, and we aren't given any information about her.

It gets stranger, because if we do a general search on Amitis Persia, we are taken back to Wikipedia, which has a disambiguation page on the name, and it tells us this first wife of Cyrus was Amitis Shahbanu. But again, when we click on that we are taken to the page for Cassandane. That disambiguation page does give us more information, however, since we can click on Amytis, daughter of King Xerxes, from just a few years later. She and her mother Amestris are described as the most powerful women in Persia. According to Ctesias and Dinon, Amytis was the most beautiful and licentious woman in the realm: once again pointing to the Phoenicians/Jews. Amytis was like the Cleopatra of her time. But this is all very strange, since anyone reading the page of Cyrus would have come to the conclusion that women in Persia had no power at all. They are hardly mentioned. But Amytis was so powerful she led her husband Megabyzus in a Syrian revolt against Persia. That is, a revolt against her own brother Artaxerxes. Although we are told this revolt was *successful*, neither Amytis nor Megabyzus advanced due to it. Nor were they punished after the war and negotiations were started. We are assured Megabyzus was exiled for five years, but then he returned to court and all was forgiven. Does any of that make sense? The clue here is where Megabyzus was exiled *to*: a town on the Persian Gulf. Could that have been in Dilmun, linking us to the Phoenicians again? My guess is yes, and that to make sense of this story we just have to insert the Phoenicians once again. This revolt of Syria looks like cover for the line of queens in Persia solidifying their power structure, and possibly punishing Artaxerxes for assuming he had any real power. Also remember that the father of this Artaxerxes had a wife named **Esther**. Do I really need to spell that out for you? That comes from the Bible, where they admit these “Persian” kings were taking Jewish wives—confirming my whole line of reasoning here.

Another clue is that the son of Amytis, Zopyrus, went to Athens after the death of his mother, and was “well received due to the service Amytis had rendered that city”. What? Persia and Athens were still at war up until 449, so what service could the sister of the King render Athens? They don't tell us, but she was probably involved in giving asylum to Themistocles, who had been the top admiral of the Athenian fleet during the war, including the famous Battle of Salamis. Since we are told that she rendered service to Athens, not that Artaxerxes did, we have more confirmation the women and their Phoenician families were running things from behind the scenes here.

You should really key on this information about Themistocles, since the stories of his fall don't make any sense either. We are told that mostly due to jealousy and his boasting, Themistocles was declared a traitor by Athens and his property seized. He soon ended up in, of all places, Persia, where the son of his great enemy Xerxes not only gave him asylum, but set him up like a prince. He was given control of several cities in Anatolia and Thessaly, including Magnesia, Myus, **Lampsacus**, Skepsis, and Percote, the profit of which he was free to use as his own. However, Themistocles lived at court with Artaxerxes where he was treated as a close friend, hunting with the royals and so on. *He became a*

*Persian in dress as well as language.*

We are told Themistocles, this central figure of the Persian Wars, came from nowhere ancestrally, with his father a nobody according to Plutarch and his mother unknown. Nothing is known of his early years, except that his family were immigrants. Sound familiar? We are told the same thing about most famous people now. The same thing is being hidden now that was being hidden 2,500 years ago.

And Themistocles was not the only one of the Greek leaders to find asylum in Persia. Hippias, Alcibiades, Demaratos, and Gongylos also found rich exile in Persia. [And don't forget Alexander, who is coming up]. Let's look at them each in turn.

Hippias was the son of Peisistratus and was the last tyrant of Athens, up to 510. They admit he used mercenaries to control Athens. Phoenician mercenaries? Like the rest of these people, these tyrants seem to come out of nowhere and have no genealogies: always a red flag. If these people were who we are told, their histories should be much more solid. No mother *or* father is given for Peisistratus, for example, but his name links him back to Peisistratus of Pylos, son of Nestor (see below), which would make him a Phoenician. Also note that Hippias was overthrown by Cleisthenes—an Alcmaeonid and therefore a descendant of Phoenicians. Cleisthenes is the one who allegedly turned Athens into a democracy for the first time, and began the Golden Age of Classical Greece. Themistocles rose from nowhere under Cleisthenes, becoming Archon Eponymous at age 31. As your next clue, Themistocles immediately began building up the **ports and the navy**. Sound familiar? Isn't that what a Phoenician would do?

Demaratos was King of Sparta until 491, and he was a Eurypontid. That means he was descended from Heracles through Procles. What they don't tell you is that Procles' mother was Argia of Thebes, daughter of King Autesion. Since Thebes was founded by Cadmus, a Phoenician, you see how it goes. **Always follow the women.**

Alcibiades is the most famous traitor of all time, making Benedict Arnold look like Mary Poppins. In the Peloponnesian Wars he started out with Athens, moved to their enemy Sparta, moved to Persia, moved back to Athens, and finally headed back to Persia, where he was supposedly murdered along the way by agents of Lysander. However, more likely his death was faked, since the stories vary widely and we have no good evidence he was killed at all. Alcibiades was an Alcmaeonid through his mother, which means they traced themselves back to Nestor. This is interesting because Nestor was from Pylos, a major port at the time on the southwest coast of Greece. It was run by . . . the Phoenicians, of course. For more proof of this, see the links between Thebes and Pylos, especially in the [Thebes tablets](#). Pylos was a major port of Mycenae, which is a clue in the same direction. Which means Alcibiades looks like yet another Phoenician agent, manufacturing wars for profit. . . just like today!

But even without all these ancestral links to the Phoenicians via the Alcmaeonids and others, the links between these Greek statesmen, generals, and admirals and Persia is enough to send up a huge red flag. As is the fact that someone like Alcibiades was able to go back and forth between Athens, Sparta, and Persia without being immediately arrested and killed as a spy or traitor. The biography of Alcibiades is one of the biggest mysteries in history, since it makes no sense on any level given what we are told. After he had waged war on his own home town of Athens from both Sparta and Persia, he returned and supposedly convinced the Athenians that he could broker an alliance with Persia. Note that it was the top officers of **the fleet**, including Pisander, who schemed to bring back Alcibiades. So, the Phoenicians again. In the coup of 411, these conspirators overthrew the Athenian democracy and made Alcibiades a general again, though the specifics of this coup are a tangled mess—as usual on

purpose. Note the actions of Thrasybulus especially, who is sold as both a defender of the democracy and as the one who brought Alcibiades back, ending the democracy. Historians such as Donald Kagan—Jewish of course—are only partly to blame for the garbled mess that stands for history here, since it had already been garbled beyond any recognition by Thucydides, Aristotle, and everyone else. Kagan is just continuing the misdirection of his forebears.

Anyway, though Alcibiades was ancestrally a Spartan, he allegedly won battles against the Spartans at Abydos and Cyzicus, and by 407 he was once again supreme commander of land and sea for Athens. This success was short-lived, since Alcibiades was defeated in the next year by the Spartans at Notium, and the Athenians lost the entire war as well as their fleet in 405 at Aegospotami. This battle is possibly the stupidest in the entire history of naval warfare, since we are expected to believe the entire Athenian fleet—despite knowing the Spartan fleet was just up the coast—disembarked to forage for food. The Spartans then sailed across from Abydos and took the empty ships, leaving the Athenians on land with no fighting. And yes, they expect us to believe this. They have been telling the same story since the time of Xenophon and no one until me has called it a hoax.

If you don't believe me, just notice all the places that come up in this specific part of the story. One of the towns Lysander and the Spartans had just seized was Lampsacus. We already saw it above. It was owned by Themistocles just a few years earlier, wasn't it? Given to him by Artaxerxes. What a coincidence! Abydos was a Phoenician colony from the beginning, and later it was “Persian”, up to about 450BC. For a short time after that it was part of the Delian league, but we are supposed to believe it defected to the Spartans in 411. Why? We aren't told, but the clue is given when we find the city was defended *against* the Athenians in 408 by Persians led by Pharnabazus. So it was actually still Persian, meaning it was Phoenician.

The town of Sestos is also mentioned in the Battle of Aegospotami, since it is given as the Athenian base. Well, Sestos was also Persian, being an outpost of the Achaemenid Empire started by Cyrus. This is where Xerxes bridged the Hellespont, remember. It was another old Phoenician port.

This might be a good time to point out the similarity between the words Achaemenid and Alcmaeonid. The Achaemenids were Persians, since Cyrus, first King of the Persian Empire, was an Achaemenid. We have seen above that many of the Greeks involved in these stories were Alcmaeonids, since they descended from Nestor, and thereby from Phoenicians. That should remind you that Achaemenid is a strange word for a Persian family line. The Achaeans were another name for the Greeks in general. That is what Homer called the Greeks in the *Iliad*. This is because Achaea was the name of a large region of the Peloponnese, the northernmost part of that peninsula. So why would the Persians be known as Achae-menids? We are told they hale back to Achaemenes, a minor 7<sup>th</sup> century ruler of Anshan, but if we take that link at Wikipedia, they admit he was probably mythical and nothing is known of him. They also admit that Achaemenes was never mentioned until Darius had his name carved on the Behistun Inscription around 490BC. Since Darius is known for just making stuff up, this means nothing. Or, it means Darius or someone later is giving us a big clue here about the links between these “Persians” and the Achaeans. I strongly suggest they were from the same families, those families being Phoenician.

So what was the point of faking or managing these battles between Persia, Sparta, Athens, Thebes, etc? It was the same point as now: to drink from the treasuries for manufactured or faked events, while making people *think* Athens, Sparta and Persia were independent states or empires. When in fact they were all Phoenician outposts, run for profit by the Phoenician navy. But the Phoenician navy had already figured out by 1000BC or so that relying on trade was a meager way to drink from local

treasuries. It was much more efficient to gain control of each treasury directly, by installing their people in all the major cities as kings, queens, or archons. The easiest way to do this was through marriage, but where that failed, as in Athens, their people could be installed as admirals, generals, or assemblymen, voting huge sums for fake or managed projects. Again, just like now.

In fact, we see that only recently have the Phoenicians made major changes to their protocol. Their go-to method of major theft from the treasury was for centuries war, with construction projects being a secondary method. But in the past few centuries they have added many new gambits to their playbook, and they can now drink from the treasury with fake science, fake art, and fake events of all kinds. As we are seeing with the coronavirus, they can also drink from the treasury to the tune of billions of dollars for fake pandemics. Just about any method for creating fear or confusion can be used to steal money from the treasury, with no questions asked.

As more proof of my thesis, let's take a look at the Macedonian wars that arrived soon after the period we just studied—since they confirm my analysis once again. Like Persia, Macedon came out of nowhere and took over the world immediately. Before the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, Macedon was a small kingdom to the north of Greece that had never done much of anything. Philip's father Amyntas had actually lost his kingdom and had to be restored **by outside influence**. What outside influence? We are only told “Thessalians”. Yes, but what Thessalians? We have two big clues here, though no one ever ties them in. One, Thessaly was originally the Kingdom of Aeolus, who was visited by Odysseus in the *Odyssey*. Although a mortal king, he was called the keeper of the winds, and he provided Odysseus with a west wind. Now, who would be concerned with winds? Sailors, right? *Phoenicians*. Odysseus was also a Phoenician, like the rest of his “Greek” pals in the *Iliad*. In fact, Aeolus was his 2g-grandfather. Ithaca was a Phoenician stronghold from way back, and as you will remember, Odysseus also visits Phoenicia in the *Odyssey*—he was visiting relatives.† Two, Thessaly was the site of Magnesia, one of the places given to Themistocles by Artaxerxes, as we saw above. Thessaly was taken by the Persians in 480, and the Aleuadae family of Larissa joined the Persians at that time. Strangely, Peisistratus, who we looked at above, is mentioned in the ancestry part of the Aleuadae page at Wikipedia, indicating he may have been of that family. It fits the rest of what we are discovering. We aren't told where these Aleuadae came from, but I am smelling the familiar smoke. I think they were probably crypto-Phoenicians. This guess is given much form by the fact that these Aleuadae are the ones that invited Alexander II of Macedon to invade Thessaly and drive out the Pherae in about 370. We also find Thebes strong again in these years, since they rose up and drove Alexander back out. So we again see one crypto-Phoenician state playing fake tug-o-war with another.

Before we move on, I want to pause on Odysseus for a moment, since he allows me to pull in the Trojan War. Since the Trojan War is dated to the exact time of the Sea Peoples' destruction of the Mediterranean and the rise of Phoenicia, best guess is Troy was attacked by Phoenicians to take over some large mining operation there, with the Helen story used as cover. Remember, I have shown you this was the beginning of the Iron Age, and the Hittites had been ruling Anatolia (Turkey) up to that time. They were the only ones in Europe creating iron weapons, and they fell at precisely the same time as Troy. So there is no chance that is a coincidence. With that in mind, I checked current mines in Turkey. The big iron mines are currently in the east, but I found [the world's 7<sup>th</sup> largest silver mine](#) on the west coast of Turkey, at Gumuskoy. It still has 640 million ounces of silver, and of course back then it would have had even more. It is south of the ruins of Troy, but is near enough that it could have been controlled by Troy. **Or, the real Troy may not be where we are told it is**. Despite what we have been told by the media, Troy VI/VII has never been connected in any real way with the Troy of the *Iliad*. All we know is that this was a very old city, rebuilt many times: we do not know it was Troy. They admit this at Wiki:

**But, the evidence at the site of Troy itself is minimal. Looking at the layers of Troy VI, we discover that there is little documentation of the excavation of this layer, and little documentation of the goods discovered in this layer. . . .**

**Initially, the layers of Troy VI and VII were overlooked entirely, because Schliemann favoured the burnt city of Troy II. It was not until the need to close "Calvert's Thousand Year Gap" arose—from Dörpfeld's discovery of Troy VI—that archaeology turned away from Schliemann's Troy and began working towards finding Homeric Troy once more.**

However, they also admit that Troy VI was destroyed by earthquake, not by men. This makes Troy VII the best candidate for Homeric Troy, but to this day we have no firm evidence it is. We would need something like a stone tablet with the name Priam on it for that.

For this reason, I would look for Troy near an old mine, preferably an old tapped iron mine. This is what the Phoenicians would have wanted. They weren't interested in carrying away maidens, they were interested in harder and more durable treasures, as now. That would actually be quite easy to do, since the ancient mines would have to be very near the surface. They didn't have the technology to dig deep into the earth back then. Therefore, these old mines, having the magnetic signature of iron, should be easy to find using airplanes equipped with the right sensors. A large buried city near this mine would have a similar signature, since it would contain iron artifacts. Although invaders would carry off all the iron they could, it is doubtful they would find all of it.

If this theory is correct, then the silver we saw above from Tarshish would actually be Trojan silver. Tarshish would be Troy. That would explain a lot of things, since the time periods match. We also have the right consonants to make this work, since if we drop vowels we get Trshsh. But sh and j are very similar sounds, so it would only take a very small transcription error to turn Trj into Trsh. It would also explain why silver is still measured in **Troy** ounces. A search on that yields the usual runaround, but this would explain it immediately. In confirmation, we can go to [a list of the largest silver mines in the world](#), since the silver in the ground has not moved since Trojan times. The silver is where it has always been. That list is dominated by Mexico and Poland, and we know Tarshish was not there. Also Australia and Peru. Tashish was not there. Then we find Turkey, and the mine just happens to be on the west coast, south of old Troy. Bingo!

[And what about a connection of silver and iron? This was the beginning of the Iron Age, but silver keeps coming up in our research here. Could they have been using an iron/silver alloy? Yes, since adding silver to iron lowers its corrosion and raises its conduction. Iron is magnetic by itself, but not highly conductive. Silver is highly conductive. The iron could also be silver-plated. So if those solar disks on the Phoenician helmets did have some electrical or radio function, adding silver to the iron armor would tie in. But we won't go there in this paper. My assumption would be the silver was used either to lower corrosion, or perhaps as plating to blind the enemy in the bright sun. But in that case the Phoenician warrior would need sunshades, or he would be blinded as well by his comrades. You will say this is absurd, but we know Archimedes built large mirrors as a device of war, to blind the enemy. We don't have any evidence of sunglasses of course, but diffracting visors (lots of slits) would work in the same way. If these visors were made of organic matter like wood, we would have no evidence of them since they would have rotted away. Just a thought.]

Also worth mentioning is that the ruins of Troy as we now know them were discovered by the "Levantine" (read Jewish) Calvert family, who have red flags all over them. They bought the land

where the digs are located in 1833, probably after reading the calculations of Charles Maclaren (who was likely a relative), published ten years earlier. Maclaren founded the *Scotsman* newspaper with William Ritchie. We aren't told how Maclaren knew where Troy was. Family secret I guess. Ritchie is partially scrubbed, but since his family was wealthy from textiles, we may assume he was of the peerage and related to those prominent Ritchies (including now Guy Ritchie). The Calverts were aristocracy from Malta, related to the Calverts who founded Baltimore, Maryland, as well as to the Campbells of Argyle. This is how I think we can link Maclaren and the Calverts. As co-founder of the *Scotsman*, Maclaren was likely related to his partners the Ritchies, and since they were peerage they were probably related to the Campbells. The current Ritchies are.

Charles Calvert was British Consul for the Dardanelles, and through this became wealthy via fees paid by ships he serviced as Consul. His son Frank became Consul after him, though these positions are not normally hereditary.

Heinrich Schliemann, who famously excavated Troy, also has red flags all over him. He supposedly came out of nowhere as an uneducated cabin boy from a ruined Lutheran family, but allegedly learned 14 languages on his own. At age 28 his brother allegedly died in California after becoming a wealthy speculator in gold. So we can be sure Schliemann was from a wealthy Jewish family to start with, the rest being the usual lies. At age 29 he started a bank in California and moved a million dollars worth of gold in six months. We are told he cheated the Rothschilds and had to flee, so . . . a conman. He later lied about dining with President Fillmore. He also lied about being an eyewitness to the San Francisco fire of 1851, getting the date wrong. In 1852 he married the wealthy Jewish heiress Lyschin and lived with her in Russia. He cornered several markets in Russia, probably by illegal means, and retired at age 36. So, that is who we are dealing with. If you believe anything about him or by him you are a fool.

But back to Macedon. We see the same strange tangled line of succession in Macedon as we saw in Persia, with there being four rulers between Amyntas III and his son Philip II. Philip's two older brothers were two of these, which is not too tangled, and the third was the son of one of those brothers—also understandable. But the fourth was a Ptolemy of Aloros, who seduced the queen mother and assassinated Alexander II, her son. He had to be driven out by . . . the Thebans again. Funny how they are always there to mop up in this period.

We are up to 359 and Macedon is still a minor empire, relying on Thebes to right its spills. But suddenly Philip II takes over and all hell breaks loose. Why? Well, look to the women, as I keep telling you. Philip's mother was Eurydice, a name we should now connect to the Phoenicians every time we see it. We also saw it in Persia in the royal court, which is yet another clue. Eurydice was also the wife of Nestor and the wife of Creon of Thebes. Eurydice, mother of Philip, was a Lyncestian, and they were a Molossian tribe from . . . Epirus. That is a huge clue for this reason:

**Epirus has been occupied since at least Neolithic times by seafarers along the coast and by hunters and shepherds in the interior who brought with them the Greek language. [1] These people buried their leaders in large tumuli containing shaft graves, similar to the Mycenaean tombs, indicating an ancestral link between Epirus and the Mycenaean civilization.**

Ignore the second part of the first sentence—which is misdirection—and focus on the first part. Epirus was occupied by . . . seafarers. Sea People. Phoenicians. The shepherds from the interior *may* have brought the Greek language, but the Phoenicians brought their own. And yes, there was an ancestral link between Epirus and the Mycenaeans, but this was once again a Phoenician link. It is the

Phoenicians that were behind both the Mycenaeans and the Minoans, though a lot of ink has been spilled to cover up that obvious fact. Mycenae was a port and Crete is a smallish island in the middle of the sea. Get it?

You should also key on that mention of shepherds from the interior “bringing the Greek language”. It reminds us of the absurd lengths current “scholars” go to in order prevent us seeing that the ancient Greek language is an offshoot of Phoenician, *despite the fact that they admit the Greek alphabet is based on the Phoenician alphabet*. See the Wikipedia page for [Phoenicia](#), where we find this:

**The Phoenician alphabet gave rise to the [Greek alphabet](#), which in turn gave rise to the [Latin alphabet](#).**

So let me just see if I have this right: the Greek alphabet came from the Phoenician alphabet, but the Greek language *didn't* come from the Phoenician language? The Anatolian and Hellenic languages borrowed the Phoenician alphabet, but otherwise arose out of thin air?

Just go to the [Wikipedia page for PIE](#), or Proto-Indo-European languages. What is missing there? No mention of Aramaic, Phoenician, or even Hebrew. That's sort of an obvious omission, isn't it? They even publish [a large graph](#) of all PIE languages, but I couldn't find Hebrew, Phoenician, or Canaanite on it. Since the Semitic languages are the oldest known, and since they obviously come from the same region as the PIE languages, it has to look pretty odd that they are left out of the discussion altogether. Not only is no effort taken to include them in PIE, no effort is taken to derive PIE from the earlier Semitic language. In that graph, the Hellenic languages have no precursors, except the word “Indo-European”. And we are told the Semitic languages are not Indo-European. So what are they, Martian?

In fact, any least study of the question shows that PIE is complete misdirection, with millions of man hours devoted to keeping you from seeing the obvious, as usual. The mainstream admits Semitic languages go back to almost 4000BC, while Greek goes back to only around 1400BC, making it fairly new. So the natural thing to do would be to try to connect the later language to the earlier, right? A search on that question finds nothing. That never occurred to anyone, apparently. A huge amount of work has been done trying to tie PIE languages like Greek and Sanskrit to one another, but no work has been done trying to tie PIE to earlier languages. I wonder why not? I suggest it is because they don't want you realizing that all languages are offshoots of proto-Phoenician, and that we are all speaking dialects of it.

You will say it is because there are no similarities or point of obvious connection between PIE and Semitic languages, but I would think the alphabet might be the first clue. We saw another obvious clue just a few months ago in a paper of mine, where we found [Welsh was mistaken for Hebrew](#). Welsh is currently categorized as a Celtic language, part of PIE, not Semitic. And for another “coincidence”, look at the guy whose picture was published with that 2012 article:



The second guy there is given as Gareth **Montgomery**-Johnson, but he looks just like the statues I have been looking at as I research these questions, down to his brushed-forward wavy hairstyle. Remove the hoody and put him in a toga, and he could pass for a Phoenician. There is a reason for that: given the name Montgomery, he likely IS a Phoenician.

A search on this link between Welsh and Hebrew takes us to [this top-ranked forum](#), where a guy presenting evidence is shouted down by a bunch of trolls as usual. Not one substantive point is made against him and no effort is made to look at his evidence or argument. Sound familiar? The fact that this site is top-ranked on the question is proof enough of the misdirection.

It may be worth reporting that the Phoenicians called themselves the Ponnim, and their land Put. Apparently the ancestors of both the Canaanites and the Phoenicians called their land Khna or Chana, which of course reminds us of China. I will be told the Chinese don't call themselves that now and haven't for centuries, but that isn't the question. The Indians have been calling the place Cina in Sanskrit since at least 500BC. You will tell me the Phoenicians couldn't have gone to China, since they would have had to sail around Africa. No, they came from the Persian Gulf, remember? So all they had to do was sail out into the Arabian Sea. At that point India was no further away than Greece was from Byblos. Or, they could sail from Suez, where they always had a port as well. Herodotus admitted the Phoenicians sailed in the Red Sea—since he said they came from there, as well as Dilmun—and that they even sailed around Africa, coming back via Spain. If they could do that, they could easily get to China.

Returning to the language question, we find that the Phoenician alphabet came from Egyptian hieroglyphics, which fact the mainstream uses to separate the Egyptians from the Phoenicians. But it makes more sense to flip that, realizing that the Egyptians were just *earlier Phoenicians*. Proto-Phoenicians. Just as we have seen that Persia was another name for Phoenicia, Egypt was also another name for Phoenicia. It was the same people all along, but after 1,200BC they got tired of hanging out in Egypt and burying themselves under rocks, and they got on their ships and moved out to conquer the world. Along with their new mobility, they needed a more mobile language as well, and so the hieroglyphs transformed into a simpler alphabet, one that could more easily be used for trade. In the

same way, the Akkadians were proto-Phoenicians. They were close cousins of the Egyptians, and they too got tired of hanging out in the Kish/Akkad/Babylon area, ruling a limited set of locales and locals. My guess is it wasn't just a matter of boredom: Mesopotamia and Egypt probably encountered droughts or other natural events that forced them into the sea to seek relief and succor.‡ They found it at first by direct pillaging, but then refined that over the next few centuries into the sort of covert invasion we have discovered here: infiltration of the ruling houses of all of Europe and Asia, and so drinking from the treasuries directly.

This immediately explains the Sea Peoples mystery, where Egypt was pretty much left alone. The Pharaoh even used Sherdan warriors in his retinue. We are told they were prisoners, but that never made any sense. You don't use captive warriors as a close guard, do you? You would just be asking for assassination. No, it looks to me like history has been poorly rewritten by later Phoenicians/Jews to make it look like both Egypt and Phoenicia crashed, when there was never any crash at all, only a transition. Egypt/Phoenicia simply spread out north, filling the Levant first, then Anatolia, then the rest of the West. They also moved east.

But if that is so, then the Phoenicians can't be the same as the Minoans and the Mycenaeans, can they? Yes, because this indicates that in order to continue to prosper, the Phoenicians had to leave most of their major settlements in the drought period, making their living on the sea as mariners and pillagers. Only once the drought ended could they again begin colonizing. The evidence confirms that, because unlike Hattusa, Mycenae and Crete weren't so much razed as abandoned. The end of Crete shows limited fires, but not major battles. Same for Mycenae. So it possible the Phoenicians burned their settlements upon abandonment, as some sort of ritual cleansing. Or the fires may have happened later, from lightning strikes, since no one was there to douse them. I will be told the Minoans weren't Semitic, but there is no evidence of that one way or another. No languages are known, only undeciphered accounting wheels—which would point to our trading and banking Phoenicians again. As for Mycenae, it is true that proto-Greek arose there, but only later, after 1500BC, and again only as accounting tablets, lists, and inventories. So the *form* of the finds again points to our Phoenicians, and the fact that they are no longer making inventories in Phoenician in late Mycenae only tells us that the inventories were meant to be read and checked by their customers as well as themselves. The Phoenicians now running the US don't still keep their inventories in Phoenician, do they? No, they keep them in English, since that is what their customers require. But some of them do still use Hebrew at home, you know, which is just Phoenician by another name.

I will be told this Phoenician=Egyptian theory won't fly, since we know the Egyptians were capturing pirates at that time. We see them in carvings. But these Shasu don't look like the Sherdan, so why are Jewish historians going out of their way to conflate them? There is no reason to think these Shasu were Israelites, Phoenicians, or Sea Peoples. Studying these Steles actually provides more confirmation the Egyptians and Sea Peoples/Phoenicians were *not* enemies, because it is admitted both were enemies of the Hittites. The famous battle of Kadesh in those years was not a battle of Egypt against the Sea Peoples, it was a battle against Hattusa. Although the Hittites won the battle at Kadesh, they soon lost the greater war to the Sea Peoples. What does that tell you? That the Egyptians/Phoenicians *were* the Sea Peoples.

We have confirmation of that straight from Wikipedia, in the section on the Poem of Pentaur:

**The poem relates that the previously captured Sherdan were not only working for the Pharaoh, but were also formulating a plan of battle for him; i.e. it was their idea to divide Egyptian forces into four columns. There is no evidence of any collaboration with the Hittites**

**or malicious intent on their part, and if Ramesses considered it, he never left any record of that consideration.**

In the next section, the authors tell of the attacks upon Egypt from Libya, and try to link that to Sea Peoples and Israelites, but the whole section is pushed. They admit the Merneptah Stele doesn't mention Sea Peoples at all. Then we read this:

**The Nine Bows were acting under the leadership of the king of [Libya](#) and an associated near-concurrent revolt in [Canaan](#) involving [Gaza](#), [Ashkelon](#), [Yenoam](#) and the people of [Israel](#).**

If you read that too fast, you may think Canaan and Israel have been linked to the invaders from Libya, but read slower. That isn't what it says, is it? It says there was a **near-concurrent** revolt involving Israel. But does that mean Israel was revolting with Libya against Egypt? No, not at all. The sentence is actually impossible to parse, since it is a non-sequitur, but the Israelis could have been revolting against Canaan, Libya, or someone else, or even be the ones being revolted against. And the word near-concurrent actually means *not* concurrent. If the revolt had been concurrent, that is what it would say. But again, read the sentence a third time. It says the Nine Bows were acting under the leadership of . . . a revolt in Canaan. How can a group act under the leadership of a revolt? This is actually just gibberish. For more gibberish, we keep reading:

**Exactly which peoples were consistently in the Nine Bows is not clear, but present at the battle were the Libyans, some neighboring [Meshwesh](#), and possibly a separate revolt in the following year involving peoples from the eastern Mediterranean, including the Kheta (or Hittites), or Syrians, and (in the Israel Stele) for the first time in history, the [Israelites](#).**

So the revolt that was “near-concurrent” was a full year later, and rather than the Sea Peoples, we have their enemies the Hittites. And although we are supposed to be studying the Merneptah Steles here, suddenly the author pulls in the Israel Stele, to bring in the Israelites. The problem? The Israel Stele *is* the Merneptah Stele, so this is just confusion. And again, read closely. How can “a separate revolt the following year” be “present at the battle”? Gibberish again. And someone is just trying to mash Israel in here, to make you think they were allies of these Libyans.

Also, we already saw way above that the 12 tribes of Israel *were* revolting in those years, but on those pages we were told they were revolting against Canaan, not against Egypt. But if we include what we now know, they couldn't have been revolting against Canaan either, since Canaan=Phoenicia=Israel. The Israelis were only squabbling among themselves, deciding who among them would get which of the 12 parcels. They all probably wanted Jerusalem, for instance, but they couldn't all have it. Hence the squabbling. This was in the middle of the drought, remember, so they were also squabbling for scraps. They were like 12 baby chicks in the nest, when the mother bird Phoenician fleet arrived with its spoils. Even if there is enough for all the chicks, they still tend to fight over each piece as it is seen in the mother bird's beak. Just so here, as representatives of the 12 tribes fought over the booty on the arriving ships.

Anyway, the Hittites and Ugarit were targeted early by the Phoenicians because 1) they weren't Semitic, 2) they had iron and probably silver, 3) they had pissed off the Phoenicians by winning the first naval battles in history in 1210 BC against Cyprus—which was just a Phoenician outpost. The Hittites used Ugaritic ships in these battles. On the page for King Suppiluliuma the Hittite, we find something else strange: according to Chamber 2 reliefs, he sacked his own prior capital at Tarhutassa. Which means the Phoenicians had probably already infiltrated that city, and he discovered it. We also

find that when the Sea Peoples destroyed the Hittite Empire, they actually came *from the west*. Meaning, from the direction of Troy. This confirms what I told you above. The Trojan War was real, but it had nothing to do with rescuing damsels in distress. It had to do with Phoenicians sacking the Hittite Empire for their metals, and coming in from the west—where the metals were—to do it. They seized the cities on the west coast to start with, taking over control of the mines. The mines kept them in iron armor, which guaranteed their continued success.

But if the Hittites had the mines, the iron, and the Ugaritic ships to start with, how did they fall to Phoenicia? Because Phoenicia had more ships, more allies, and had been established in the region longer. The Hittites had also probably made the mistake of selling iron armor to the Phoenicians in the beginning, then perhaps cut them off later when they realized their error. By then it was too late.

And where did these non-Semitic Hittites come from? How is it that they were so advanced? I suspect they came from India, since that is where ironwork started. If so, it would also explain their relatively pacific ways. Apparently they became warlike at the end, but not quite soon enough.

That was a rather long diversion, but I think it was worth it. Let us return to Philip of Macedon. We saw above that Philip II was Phoenician through his mostly scrubbed mother Eurydice, which explains everything that came next. Also notice that we are told Philip was held hostage as a youth in [Thebes](#) for several years. Which isn't true. No, he was there being prepped by his Phoenician cousins, who had a lot planned for him. They pretty much admit that at Wikipedia:

**While a captive there, Philip received a military and diplomatic education from [Epaminondas](#), became [eromenos](#) of [Pelopidas](#),<sup>[6]</sup><sup>[7]</sup> and lived with [Pammenes](#), who was an enthusiastic advocate of the [Sacred Band of Thebes](#).**

You really have to take those links to get a taste for this. An *eromenos* is a boy chosen to be the lover of an older man. Pelopidas was the top statesman and general in Thebes at the time. Not only that, but in 367 he made [a trip to Persia](#) as an ambassador to King Artaxerxes II, where he forged an alliance concerning the government of Greece. Pammenes was yet another Theban general who slept with the young Philip, so it appears Philip was chosen for reasons other than his ferocity. Probably it was for his looks. Besides being known as the most insatiable pederast of his day, Pammenes was central to the founding of [Megalopolis](#), a very large town manufactured from scratch in 371 by the Arcadian League, allegedly as a counterweight to Sparta. But that sounds like a cover story, and given that Megalopolis was used as a giant stage, with a 20,000-seat theater, a 67-pillar Thersileon, and other gaudy public buildings, it appears more like a sin city of the Las Vegas sort—a bread-and-circuses pavilion built to divert the public's attention away from all the conjobs being pulled at the time, only one of which was this rise of Philip and Macedon.

So you should find it a bit strange that in the very first year of his reign, this absurdly young Philip found himself against a trifecta of invaders, including Paionians, Thracians, and Athenians. The first two had already sacked the eastern regions of Macedonia, and Athens was trying to take Pella itself, by bringing in a pretender to the throne, the Greek general Argeus. Miraculously, Philip kept the first two at bay (we aren't told how) while crushing the Athenians. We are told he did this by introducing the phalanx infantry corps, armed with very long spears. But since he had just been trained by the Thebans, surely none of this was new. How does that explain anything that was happening? The answer: it doesn't.

More to the point is that Philip married Audata, daughter of the King of Illyria, Bardyllis. The Illyrian

kings were also Lyncestians, and I just told you what that means. Up to that time the Illyrians had been beating Macedon regularly, though—and this is important—the Illyrians had not been able to touch Epirus. Also curious is that Audata took the name **Eurydice** after marrying Philip. That was the name of his mother, remember, so this just gets weirder.

Despite having an Illyrian wife, Philip nonetheless crushed Illyria in the same year he married her. If you are keeping score, that means Philip the boy wonder has already crushed both Athens and Illyria in about two years on the throne (359-57). He isn't even 25 yet. Since Audata didn't immediately give him a son, he ditched her and married princess of Epirus, Olympias, who was the mother of Alexander the Great.

Philip continued fighting everyone around him over the next two decades, and defeated a combined Athenian/Theban army in 338 at Chaeronea. The only people he didn't defeat were the Spartans, who preferred not to be part of the play at this point. It was probably beneath their dignity to pretend to lose to this little gay boy from Macedonia. He then began to move against Persian holdings in Anatolia, but was assassinated at age **46** at his daughter's wedding in Aegae. This assassination was probably at the behest of Alexander and his mother, who were in danger of being cut out of the succession by Philip's new wife Cleopatra. . . who was *also* renamed Eurydice! They feared that any son of hers would be thought to be more Macedonian than Alexander, since Olympias was Illyrian.

You may find it strange to see Macedonian women named Cleopatra. Isn't that an Egyptian name? Actually, no, since the famous Cleopatra was the descendant of a Macedonian general. In fact, her ancestor Ptolemy I Soter may have been the son of Philip of Macedon. But regardless, that doesn't mean that any of these people were Macedonians. Macedonians, like Persians, are just a made-up name. The Macedonians are really Argeads, who hale back to Caranus and Temenus of **Argos**. Since Argos and Mycenae are the same thing, being located just a few miles from one another, you see what is going on here. This was a major port of the Phoenicians, and one of the oldest. So *both* the Macedonians and the Ptolemean Egyptians were crypto-Phoenicians.

Which of course means that *neither* of Philip's wives was more Macedonian than the other. They were about equally Phoenician, though it would take an actual blood test to figure out who was *more* Phoenician. However, it is probable that even Alexander and his mother Olympias didn't know what I am telling you. Just as we have seen someone pulling the strings of Philip, those same people were pulling the strings of Alexander, with the puppets understanding only a part of the greater game. **Just like today.**



Let's finish off this paper by looking at Alexander, and his alleged conquering of Persia, Egypt, etc. We will start at the beginning, when we are told the entire area revolted at news of the death of Philip. Like Philip at the start of his reign, Alexander should have had his back against the wall with this long list of enemies, including Thessaly, Athens, Thebes, and Thrace. But in the same way, and without bothering to tell a believable story, he simply rode over them. He immediately moved south to Thessaly, where a huge army was awaiting him between Mt. Olympus and Mt. Ossa. Rather than meet this army head-on, the Macedonians marched directly over Mt. Ossa and came up behind the Thessalians—who allegedly awoke that morning and promptly surrendered without battle. That's convenient, isn't it? But Alexander didn't take them prisoners, he instead “added them to his cavalry”. What? Were these people enemies or not? Tell me this doesn't look managed. Plus, the marching over the mountain reminds us of the armies of Napoleon marching over the Alps in winter. It is slightly more believable than that, but not much. For one thing, we aren't clear what good it would do to meet the army from behind rather than in front. They didn't know how to turn around?

Athens also surrendered without a fight. So Alexander moved back north to quell resistance from Thrace and Illyria. He did that without breaking a sweat and then headed back south to smash Thebes. He razed Thebes to the ground for daring to fight him and sold them into slavery, though we aren't sure why they deserved that response—especially since they were fellow crypto-Phoenicians. My guess is this razing never happened. At any rate, Thebes was restored just **eight** years\* later by **Cassander**, Alexander's successor. We are supposed to believe that the Athenians themselves rebuilt the famous walls of Thebes, which takes a lot of believing. In fact, more believing than I will ever be capable of. In the Byzantine period, Thebes became a center of the **silk trade**, which confirms everything above. Shortly after that, the Frankish dynasty **de la Roche** took over the city, and they were later joined by the **Saint Omers**. These de la Roches are exactly what you expect, being crypto-Jews that hale back to Alice de la Roche, Lady of Beirut, Kingdom of **Jerusalem**. They come from the Dukes of France who were ennobled by King Louis IX, aka Saint Louis. We have already blown his cover in a previous [paper on the Crusades](#).

[Note the name Cassander there. He was the son of Macedonian general Antipater. And then

remember Cassandane above, the wife of Cyrus the Great of Persia 200 years earlier. I said above that Cassandane didn't sound Persian, didn't I? Now you see what I mean. It is not only very close to the Cassander, king of Macedon, it is very close to Cassandra, Trojan princess and prophet whom no one would believe. She was descended through her father Priam from Erichthonius, or **Eric**, "the wealthiest of all living men". Who does that make you think of? The Phoenicians again. His father-in-law was Simoeis. Or, alternatively, **Simon**. Erichthonius' grandfather, Teucer, founded the Troad, coming over from Crete to do so. Therefore, a **Minoan**.]

At any rate, I hope you see that this tale about the razing of Thebes is fiction, which prepares us for more fiction in the history of Alexander the Great. In 334 we are told Alexander crossed over to Asia Minor with more than 92,000 men and 120 ships. Really? And we are expected to buy that? This army first took Sardis with little resistance. It then moved down to Miletus,

**which required a delicate siege operation, with Persian naval forces nearby.**

What? So we are supposed to believe an army of 92,000 snuck up on Miletus on the coast without waking the nearby Persian navy? And what about those 120 ships? They were invisible I guess. Next, the army moved south to Halicarnassus, taking it after a short siege. We aren't told what happened to that Persian navy. I guess they moved on to Sicily to cook up some burgers on Mt. Aetna. Alexander set up Ada of Caria as Queen of the Carians before he moved on, though we aren't told why these places didn't immediately fall back to the locals or to Persia. He should have had to leave large garrisons to prevent that, and he didn't. We are supposed to believe Ada's local popularity was enough to prevent any backsliding, although Alexander's armies had just trashed the place.

In the Phrygian capital of Gordium, Alexander "solved" the old Gordian Knot puzzle by simply hacking it with his sword. This story is obviously an allegory, meant to imply might makes right, but to me it yields a different lesson. It stands as a metaphor for the hamhanded histories these people like to tell, where they know that consistency and continuity don't matter. They know their audience is so gullible they can hack up any story and it will be believed. Like Alexander, they don't need a light touch or a subtle mind. All they need is a quick and brutal mash-up of names, places, and actions, with no least nod to believability.

Next we come to the Battle of Issus, in which Darius III of Persia allegedly marched out to near Antioch to meet Alexander. Alexander had only about 40,000 troops, so we aren't sure where the other 52,000 were hiding. Maybe they were on the ships, fishing for dolphin. According to ancient sources, Darius had 250,000-600,000, but modern historians have dropped that by a factor of 10 to make this slightly more believable. They put Darius' total at about 60,000. But in a real battle, we would indeed have expected Darius to have far more footsoldiers, since he was on his home turf. It was much easier for him to recruit locals. At any rate, we are supposed to believe that facing an army of 60,000 men, Alexander only lost. . . 452. You have to laugh. Darius is said to have lost up to 40,000 in a one-day battle, and modern historians have not shaved that down to a believable number.

We are told Darius blundered by being forced to move to a smaller battlefield, which gave Alexander the advantage. . . but that is just more whistling in the wind. As is the idea that Alexander was in the defensive position here. Let me remind you that Alexander was the aggressor, and that he was on foreign territory. Therefore it was impossible for him to be the defender *by definition*. Darius was simply blocking his way, and could choose any point he liked for that. Darius wasn't forced to choose a bad position. Rather, Alexander was forced to attack whatever point Darius chose to block, or go home. With such a large army, Darius could block a very wide point as Alexander was coming around

the corner of the Mediterranean, so that Alexander had no hope of going around him. Having the smaller army, Alexander would have to pick the point of attack, not Darius. Darius would then shift to meet that point of attack. It isn't rocket science.


So the idea of Alexander defending and springing a trap is absurd. You don't spring a trap on an army that size, since there is no reason for Darius to go forward. Alexander is the one that has to go forward, not Darius. A larger local army can always out-wait an invading foreign army, since the local army has local supply lines and allies.

Then we get a long section on the specifics of the battle, which is absurd. Do you think they had embedded reporters? No, this whole section is dependent on ancient historians who weren't there, or otherwise is complete fiction. The fact that they would make all this stuff up and expect you to buy it is just one more reason not to buy it. It is dishonest reportage on the face of it.

More reasons to return this all to sender is that we are supposed to believe that Darius marched hundred of miles out from Persepolis, but brought his wife and children with him, *as well as his mother*. Alexander captured the wife, mother, and daughters, and married the daughter. That's not suspicious, is it? Darius also allegedly left a fabulous treasure sitting on the battlefield when he fled, which is of course convenient. I guess he also left a warehouse of silks, 1000 crates of pig iron, and a year's supply of Tootsie Rolls.

They also admit that part of Darius' forces included 8,000 Greek mercenary special troops, all of whom survived and later fought for Spartan King Agis. So they fought the Macedonians again just a year and half later, appearing twice in the same play.

Next we come to another big hoax, the Siege of Tyre. This can be dispensed with using only one mainstream diagram:



Notice the positions of the Cyprian Fleet and the Phoenician Fleet. Tyre was Phoenician, so why would the Phoenician Fleet be attacking Tyre as an ally of Alexander? Here is the exact wording from Wiki:

**However, his previous victory at Issus and subsequent conquests of the Phoenician city states of Byblos, Arwad and Sidon had meant that the fleets of these cities, which had composed most of the Persian navy, came under his banner.**

But note the date of the Siege: it began in November. The battle of Issus was also in November. So we are supposed to believe that Alexander defeated Byblos, Sidon, and Arwad in the same month as he defeated Persia, and that the Phoenicians just gave him their entire navy after those land battles? Why didn't they just sail away? Strange that Wiki gives us long fictional accounts of Issus and Tyre, but not one word on these wins at Byblos, Arwad and Sidon. I guess we are supposed to believe that Phoenicia caved without a fight and turned over all their precious ships to Alexander just to be nice.

Just as absurd is the claim that Cyprus joined Alexander, lending him their fleet. Let's see, Alexander was out to conquer the world, and last time I checked Cyprus was part of the world, so Cyprus should have been shivering in their ships, fearing they were next. Alexander hadn't made any alliances up to that time, preferring to raze cities to the ground, take slaves, and suchlike. I will be told Cyprus was tired of paying tribute to Persia. Yeah, and they didn't think Alexander was conquering the world for tribute? He was razing cities just for sport or to grant them independence?

Plus, remember that we were told Alexander started this conquest with 120 ships. Are we supposed to believe they just ferried him across the Aegean and then returned home? And where did they come from to start with? Up to that time, Macedon hadn't been known for its navy, having won its battles on land. Well, you might notice that we are told Cyprus loaned him 120 ships for the siege of Tyre. The same number. Just a coincidence, right? These ships seem to appear when needed and then disappear when not needed. The Persian navy also appears and disappears on cue. Where was it in the Siege of Tyre?

I suggest to you that these Cyprian and Phoenician fleets appear here in the Siege of Tyre hoax as a further clue that Cyprus and Macedon were *both* Phoenician outposts. Alexander's jaunt around the world was just a grand Phoenician holiday or gay cruise, which the fake historians later refashioned into a conquest. I would bet that the famous historians who sold us these events were Phoenician as well, and that they were paid very well to create these tall tales, which not only glorified these otherwise detestable little people like Alexander\*\* and Philip, but also acted as propaganda in dozens of other ways. To start with they covered up the role of Phoenicia in the first millennium BC, recasting these worldwide governors as a minor merchant and naval entity. We have seen the same thing throughout more recent history, as the Jews have been recast as eternal victims and casualties of war, instead of the hidden rulers they actually are.

For instance, it is known that Plutarch was from a very wealthy family, so we are halfway there already. Plutarch addressed a treatise on marriage to **Eurydice**, thought to be his daughter. Plutarch has a link to Alexander through the philosopher Pyrrho of Elis, who travelled to India with Alexander's army. While there he studied with magi and gymnosophists, in a way similar to that still done by rich Westerners. Upon returning, he founded Pyrrhonism, and this doctrine of skepticism was later sold by Sextus Empiricus, Plutarch's uncle. Sextus was a teacher of Marcus Aurelius, so this looks a lot like a project, being very similar to the Theosophy project of 2300 years later. Plutarch already looks to be from a family of hoaxers.

For many years Plutarch served as one of two priests of Apollo at Delphi, and so took part in the Eleusinian Mysteries. This also pegs him as a spook. These Mysteries are the most famous secret religious rites of Greece, and Wiki calls them a cult. They "may have" come from Mycenae, so we

have that again. The rites may have included psychedelic drugs such as mushrooms. Although the Mysteries involved reward in an afterlife, we have evidence from Plutarch's personal writings that he believed in reincarnation. This would indicate the Mysteries were another fraud, and that he was well aware of it.

The story we are now told about the Mysteries is an obvious cover story, since we are supposed to believe this great secret had something to do with the seasons, and a harmless myth about their cause being due to Persephone's kidnapping by Hades. There is no reason for that to be secret, and it wasn't, so that can't be either the Mystery or the secret. These Mysteries were no doubt used to soak the gullible, since we see the same thing going on today. All sorts of fake rites and ceremonies are invented and sold for a fee, ostensibly to answer questions about this life or an afterlife. I doubt that these rites had any deeper or more genuine purpose, like praying to the god of the underworld, but if they did it is beyond my knowledge or interest. Either way, Plutarch's involvement here does not look like a good sign. In fact, it is more proof of my thesis.

Plutarch was also an archon and ambassador, more red flags. It means he was a tool of the governors, of course. He may have even been a procurator under Trajan or Hadrian, which would be even worse for his credibility as a historian.

Next let us look at Herodotus. He was from a rich family in the Persian Empire, which I have shown you already pegs him as a Phoenician. As does his hometown of Halicarnassus, a port. Herodotus may have also lived on Samos, since he claims it as a favorite. Like Miletus, Samos was an early and famous port of the Phoenicians. See this paragraph at Wiki:

**This early prosperity of the Samians seems largely due to the island's position near trade-routes, which facilitated the importation of textiles from inner Asia Minor, but the Samians also developed an extensive oversea commerce. They helped to open up trade with the population that lived around the Black Sea as well as with Egypt, Cyrene (Libya), Corinth, and Chalcis. This caused them to become bitter rivals with Miletus. Samos was able to become so prominent despite the growing power of the Persian empire because of the alliance they had with the Egyptians and their powerful fleet. The Samians are also credited with having been the first Greeks to reach the Straits of Gibraltar.**

Note the textiles, which shout Phoenician. Some of that in the quote is obvious misdirection, since they want you think Samos used the Egyptian fleet rather than the Phoenician fleet. And it is funny to see the Samians claiming to be the first Greeks to reach the Straits, since the Phoenicians had been doing that for a thousand years already.

We also have a clue in Herodotus' use of Ionian instead of Dorian Greek, although he was born in a Dorian district. This links him to his Phoenician predecessor Homer.

A similar clue is that Herodotus left Persia in mid-life to live in Athens, where he became close with the Alcmaeonid families. They then took precedence in his writings, and you now know why.

As for Thucydides, he admits his family owned gold mines in coastal Thrace, telling us all we need to know about him. We have the same pointers then as now. Herodotus admitted Thucydides family was Thracian royalty. This would make him a cousin of Miltiades and Cimon. In his thirties he was an Athenian general in Thasus, in the same area as his goldmines. He was supposedly exiled for 20 years by Athens for arriving late for a battle against Spartans in Amphipolis, also near his mines. This makes

no sense, so it must be cover for something else. Possibly he was bribed by the Spartans to stand down; or more likely he made an agreement with them to leave his mines alone if he would give them the city. All this taken together pegs Thucydides as a propagandist, not a historian. But of course we would could say that of all name historians, then and now. I have never read nor heard tell of a historian who had any regard for the truth.

This is why the present time is so unique in history. In no other time could the truth reach such a wide audience. Had I reached maturity a century earlier, not only would I have probably been unable to discover what I have (and certainly couldn't have discovered it so easily), I could never have published so widely for so little outlay.

But back to Alexander. Next we come to Egypt, and Wikipedia doesn't want to tell us anything about it, which is a red flag on the face of it. We get only a couple of sentences, and no link to a separate page. Very strange. We are told Egypt considered Alexander a liberator. A liberator from what and to what? He founded Alexandria, as you know, but why would he be allowed to do that? What exactly was his prior connection to Egypt? None, that we know of. But if he were a Phoenician, it would be explained immediately, wouldn't it? In that case, Alexander's gay cruise was just an excuse by the Phoenicians to solidify their control of Egypt. On the way back, Alexander's general and half-brother Ptolemy took Egypt with no battle and made himself Pharaoh. What? So Egypt was just sitting there unmanned, waiting for a foreign savior? If so, why hadn't Darius come in and taken it? Or one of the other nearby rulers? Why wait for this Ptolemy? I have already told you: because these "Macedonians" were really Phoenicians, and Phoenicia *already* ran Egypt, just like they ran Persia and Thebes and everywhere else. But Phoenicia wasn't happy with its current governor in Egypt, and so this transfer of power was planned. You don't just found a new city on the coast without planning, or because some passing playboy wants a monument to himself, do you.

Next, Alexander headed toward Babylon, which we have already established was another crypto-Phoenician city, held by cousins of the Achaemenians. In route, Alexander met Darius again, being even more ridiculously outnumbered. He still had about 47,000 troops, but according to the ancient historians, Darius had up to 1,000,000. That is actually about what you would expect if some foreign cowboy waltzed into the middle east and started razing cities, founding his own cities, and kidnapping the mothers and daughters of top kings. The entire area would rise up to squash him like a bug. Instead, Darius allegedly offered him all land west of the Euphrates, co-rulership of Persia, and 30,000 talents of silver. You have to laugh. Alexander still refused, though he had no way of permanently ruling even that small part of Asia, much less all of it. As I said before, that would require a huge permanent garrison, much larger than the army he had. Remember, back in Macedon, his father hadn't even been able to maintain control of any part of Greece or Thessaly or even Illyria, even after allegedly defeating them in battle. A year later they were revolting and he was fighting them again. But now, a few years later, we are expected to believe his son is able to stroll through Persia and India with a smallish army, losing only a few hundred men, and refusing tribute from the King himself?

The date of this battle of Gaugamela is given as October 1, 331BC. Notice that our writers are sure to get aces and eights in there. Chai. October means eighth month. Next we are given a lame story for why the Persians and locals didn't attack Alexander's supply lines, which were now very long. We are told it is because Darius expected him to take the southern route rather than this northern one. However, that is just more handwaving, since this army would have been easy to track. Once Alexander chose his route, its supply line could then be attacked, wherever it happened to be.

Next we are given modern estimates of Persian numbers, but we aren't told what they are based on,

other than that “the original estimates seem way too high for a Macedonian victory”. Again, the new lying historians cut the numbers by a factor of 10 to suit themselves. But we have no evidence one way or the other. How could we, since this is all a grand fabrication. You either believe it or you don't, but I have to say that if you believe it you will believe anything.

I don't have much more to say about the Persian experience, since I am already weary of it. But the next section is worth commenting on, since our authors try to explain something nobody ever thinks of: how did Macedon protect itself while Alexander was away for several years with its army? He took with him 92,000 troops, remember, which should have emptied the region of fighting men. As answer to this, we are told that Alexander's destruction of Thebes before he left had permanently cowed everyone in Greece. Which tells you why that event was manufactured. No one wanted to attack Macedon now, even though it was defended only by women and children. But they are forgetting about Sparta, which had never even met Macedon, much less been defeated by them. Sparta could have raided Macedon at that time, taking anything it wanted without a fight. In answer to that, we are told that Alexander left behind his general Antipater, who defeated the Spartans at Megalopolis in 331, killing their king Agis III. Even sillier is that we are supposed to believe that Antipater was sending reinforcements to Alexander in those years.

But if we look closely, we see this is all another transparent hoax. To start with, why would any battle be held at Megalopolis? That would be like having a battle held at Las Vegas, in the Luxor Resort. That is as much as to admit this battle was staged, since Megalopolis was a vast stage. Next, the name Antipater looks faked, since pater means “father” in Latin. This guy is the anti-father? They might as well name him Jim Bob Antipasto. As for Agis III, I don't believe he ever existed. For one thing, his bio is very short and looks manufactured, both his bio at Wiki and his bio by Pausanias. But the real clue is his brother Eudamidas, who succeeded him as king. Eudamidas' bio is also very short, but that is because we are told this was a time of peace. Really? Eudamidas' brother is killed in a big battle, and no one cares? Doesn't sound very Spartan, does it? Plus, remember that Alexander remained another seven years in Babylon, and then died. So Macedon should have been ripe for the taking at any time before or after that. In fact, upon Alexander's death in 323, a coalition of Greeks and Thracians *did* rise up against Antipater, but Sparta and Eudamidas mysteriously didn't join them. As in the period of Philip and before Alexander left, the Spartans had no interest in Macedon.

Finally, what about the death of Alexander? Was he murdered by locals, poisoned by his own men, or did he kill himself in grief at the death of his gay boy lover Hephaestion? Possibly none of the above. Given he was a prominent Phoenician, he probably faked his death, since that is what these people have always done. You will tell me faking your death in a foreign country would be dangerous, since your only protection would be your fame and your troops. But again, Alexander was a Phoenician, so he would have had their help in anything he wished to do. They probably whisked Hephaestion and him off to some pretty and remote Greek island. Or maybe they went to Capri. Yes, Hephaestion is a clue here, but not as it has previously been read. The close proximity of their deaths tells me Alexander wanted to take Hephaestion with him, so both deaths were faked at nearly the same time.

As I already said, I think this entire trip was staged, with Alexander used only as a front. The Phoenicians had a list of things they wished to accomplish in those years, and this gave them the opportunity to accomplish them, mostly in secret. A large part of the heroics was fiction, so you should read it like you would read of the heroics of Theseus, or John Wayne. But even so, Alexander found this extended Phoenician holiday exhausting. Like an actor, he was expected to make public appearances and possibly speeches, and this quickly lost its charm for him.

Also notice that he was said to have died at age 32. But since that was only about 40 days short of 33 years, and since his birth date is unknown, he may have been 33. In fact, he may have been *exactly* 33, with that later changed by a few days because it was thought to be too obvious.

**Addendum April 2, 2020:** A reader sent me to [a copy](#) of Laurence Waddell's 1924 book *The Phoenician Origin of Britons, Scots, and Anglo-Saxons*, which looks interesting in the title, but . . . isn't. I could tell I was going to be heavily misdirected simply by the names of the author, who is not only a Waddell but a **Chapman**. His mother was a Chapman, and she is in the peerage, listed as the daughter of John Jervis Chapman, otherwise scrubbed. Let's see, who else was a Laurence/Lawrence and a Chapman? That would be [Lawrence of Arabia](#), who was really a Chapman. And a spook. Also see my brief comments on Justine Waddell at the end of [my paper on John Major](#). Anyway, Laurence Waddell was also a Lieutenant Colonel, and we know what that means. Also Order of the Bath. So, completely untrustworthy. And we see what he is up to on page one of the preface, where he tells us the Phoenicians were Aryan. What does he mean by that? Well, he defines Aryans as being tall and fair-haired. So he wants us very much to believe the Phoenicians weren't Semitic. Why? Because he doesn't want us to connect them to the Jews/Israelites/Israelis.

You see, the problem was that Geoffrey of Monmouth had admitted in the 12<sup>th</sup> century that England had been settled by people from Turkey a thousand years before the Romans came over. See the *History of the Kings of Britain*, which was accepted as history for 500 years, until historians in the 17<sup>th</sup> century decided to bury it, calling it myth. ♀ They no longer wanted people making that connection, for reasons we have looked at in many previous papers. They didn't want Gentiles in Europe realizing they had been ruled over by Phoenicians/Jews since long before Roman times. This knowledge wouldn't fit with war history being sold in those centuries, where Jews were being tagged as eternal victims. It also wouldn't do for the citizens of Europe to realize the Phoenicians of the same families were still ruling them 2500 years later. The Kings of Europe were and had been sold as native in some way, being Prussian or Russian or French or Scandinavian, and these Kings didn't want anyone recognizing the obvious: they had always been Semitic and still were.

But by the 1880s, the governors could see their denials weren't working on a certain segment of savvy Gentiles, so they assigned Waddell a specific project targeting them. Like now, he would admit what was already known, and then spin it heavily. So, while his colleagues were still heading up the total denial project for the masses, Waddell spearheaded the controlled opposition, where he would admit Geoffrey of Monmouth was right, but try to convince his audience these Phoenicians sailing over from Asia Minor were actually tall blond Aryans. This is utterly absurd, so Waddell needed very high levels of sophistry to sell it. Which we see from the first pages of the book. His argument looks like propaganda from the first word, since it reads like a hypnosis. Rather than show you some *evidence* these people were tall and blond, he just says Aryan over and over and over. He does show many connections between Britain and Turkey going way back, so if you assume the early Britons were Aryan, it would seem to prove the Phoenicians must have been too. But do you see the fallacy there? Not only does he show no proof the people sailing over were Aryan, he shows no proof or even the least indication the leaders of Britain were Aryan. My assumption would be they were Semitic. Why? Because the rulers of Britain and the rest of Europe have *never* looked Aryan, and still don't. As we have seen, the number of tall blond rulers in *any* European countries over the centuries have been minimal. Even Sweden, where [we saw the kings and queens](#) were short dark people with huge noses.

What this indicates to any rational person is that the native people in the northern countries were Aryans, being tall and blond, but despite their size and beauty, they haven't ruled for millennia. Once the Phoenicians sailed over, *they* became the rulers. Although I am tall and blond with a smallish nose,

I still feel compelled to admit that, since it looks like the truth to me. I don't see any way to deny it to suit myself. Yes, some Aryans have advanced over the centuries, but mainly by marrying into Semitic lines. Some of the governors wanted to be taller and blonder, so it wasn't a matter of fairness, it was a matter of stealing genes.

Does this mean Aryans are a bunch of dum-dums, and that Jews are basically smarter? No. Logically, it means that the same thing that made the Aryans tall and blond also made them less ambitious: they were from the north. Being more strapping likely made them more likely to survive the harsh winters, and perhaps the lack of sun made them pale in skin and hair. But the harsh and long winters kept them indoors, so they couldn't be sailing the seas all year trading, colonizing, and conquering. Unlike the Mediterraneans, they got used to huddling for months at a time, which didn't make them stupider, but did perhaps make them less ambitious. I see this in myself. I don't think anyone would call me stupid, but I admit to liking my sleep. The old Jews we have been studying appear to never sleep, but I wouldn't live like that for a trillion dollars. And my levels of greed are likewise very low. Why? I am not sure. No one is, but I think it could be because my blood runs clearer back to my blond ancestors, who were satisfied living in a warm hut and snogging all winter with a pale and willing lass. I was born with less than no interest in economics, trade, money, big houses, cars, or large groups of people. I hardly notice the cold, but find too much heat really uncomfortable. So if the Semites want to run the world, I leave it to them. I just wish they would do a better job. I really don't think lying about everything all the time constitutes governance. Robbing your neighbors blind every other month doesn't constitute governance.

In fact, the levels of intelligence currently on display in running the world appear to me to be minimal. Even if I am told the Semites aren't running the world, but simply fleecing it, I still find little intelligence in that. How does any intelligent person see fleecing the world as a worthwhile pastime? Even if I could be convinced that fleecing the world was a *moral* pastime, I still wouldn't be interested in it. I guess that is because I find joy in growing my own wool, but none in taking someone else's.

\*On the page for Thebes, we are told Cassander re-established Thebes in 315. But on Cassander's page, we find he wasn't king until 305.

\*\*Although we are taught to think of Alexander as looking somewhat like Apollo, Peter Green has told us the limited truth here:

Physically, Alexander was not prepossessing. Even by Macedonian standards he was **very short**, though stocky and tough. His beard was scanty, and he stood out against his hirsute Macedonian barons by going clean-shaven. His neck was in some way twisted, so that he appeared to be gazing upward at an angle. His eyes (one blue, one brown) revealed a dewy, **feminine quality**. He had a **high complexion** and a harsh voice.

†The same applies to the Phaeacians. Remember the story of Nausicaa? She was a Phaeacian. The Phaeacians lived at the end of the world (Mediterranean) and were the greatest sailors known. So . . . the Phoenicians again. Were you really fooled by that variant spelling? Most of the places Odysseus visited were Phoenician locales, think Pylos, Aeolus (Lipari), Phaeacia, Ithaca, Troy, and Djerba (land of the Lotus-Eaters). Djerba was a Phoenician port for millennia, and later became an admitted Jewish stronghold after 600BC. It is probable that the *Odyssey* could be read as a *Phoen-odyssey*, with Homer the Phoenician giving us a covert tour of sacred spots. Even Ogygia, Calypso's island, is probably a real place, though I doubt it is Gozo. It should be a small remote island. Strabo put it in the Atlantic, so it may have been Porto Santo or one of the other Madeiras. Also interesting is that Calypso was probably a cousin of Odysseus, despite being a goddess. Her mother is given as Pleione, who also happened to be the grandmother of Iasion and Dardanus. Dardanus was an ancestor of the

Trojans. Like WWI and WW2, the Trojan War was a cousin war, with near relatives squabbling over resources. I have told you above that the real denizens of Troy were Hittites, not Phoenicians, but it looks to me like Homer peopled his fictional Troy with cousins instead, to make the story more cosy for his audience. These fictional people were related to real people, and may have been based on real people.

‡A search on that took me [here](#), where it is confirmed. The drought may have been up to 300 years long.

♀In 2017, the mainstream, via archaeologist Miles Russell, began admitting that Geoffrey's history is *not* just fictional. According to Russell, the book “contains significant demonstrable archaeological fact”. Wiki admits, “Geoffrey seems to have brought together a disparate mass of source material, including folklore, chronicles, king-lists, dynastic tables, oral tales, and bardic praise poems.” So why admit it now? I can only suppose it is because they think we are so thoroughly fluoridated we can no longer put two and two together. They think the danger of us Aryans figuring out anything is long past.