

[return to updates](#)

MORE ON PORT ARTHUR



by Miles Mathis

First published March 26, 2019

Yesterday, in a tack-on to [my Christchurch series](#), I briefly dismissed the Port Arthur event as another obvious fake, where no one was killed and no one is currently in jail. I knew that almost immediately, without sifting other evidence, due to two things: 1) no other mass shooting that I have researched has been real, so the odds were very high this one was also fake. 2) I could tell just by looking at Martin Bryant that he wasn't a clinical moron, with an IQ of 66. I have eyes and I know how to use them.

But I pissed off some people by saying that if they couldn't also see this, *they* were of sub-normal IQ. I admit that was going too far, but you have to understand my position. I see these things immediately, and I just assume everyone is like me. They aren't. They watch TV. They read newspapers. They want to believe what they are told. I don't, and don't, and don't. You can see why I would be a little impatient for people to catch up or catch on. So for their sake, I am back to nail this one down.

To start this one off, look closely at the two photos of Martin Bryant under title. The mainstream has admitted from the beginning that the eyes in the second one were tampered with to make him look crazy. It caused a big brouhaha at the time when it was discovered. But even that is misdirection, since the second photo is fake through and through. Not just the eyes. What you should have noticed—but apparently did not—is that Martin's head is tilted at exactly the same angle in both photos. The line of his chin and lower face is exactly the same. He is slouching the exact same amount, with his shoulders intersecting his head at the exact same place. And why is the second one strangely fuzzed and pixelated, with a line ghost running across the photo horizontally, like it is being photographed off an old TV or computer screen? Because the image was computer generated, using the first photo as a guide. In the first photo, he is really there; in the second, he isn't. They also frizzed his hair, gave him a goofy grin, put him in a nerdy vest, and faked a background—importing the curtain from an old Johnny Carson show by the looks of it.

In the *60 Minutes* interview of 2011 with his mother Carleen Bryant, [Charles Wooley begins the segment](#) in front a photo of Martin Bryant, saying

Fifteen years after the Port Arthur Massacre, that photo of Martin Bryant still sends shivers down the spine. Nowadays we like to think his eyes are little crazy, and that expression is ever so slightly off-kilter.

The problem? Wooley is not standing in front of this photo:



He is standing in front of this photo:



So the producers of *60 Minutes* are trying their level-best to convince you there is something spooky about that face in 2011. If they can convince you of that, you are toast, since you will then think there is something spooky about all normal people. Because, my friend, there is *absolutely nothing* spooky about that face. His eyes are not in the least bit crazy, and he should send shivers down the spine of no one. He is looking into bright light, so he is squinting a bit, but even so he looks completely normal. He looks intelligent and thoughtful. He's a good looking young man, and that is all there is to it. But, as I have been telling you, they want to hypnotize young women into thinking he looks spooky there. Good looking young man + thoughtful gaze = mass murderer. No wonder the dating scene is a nightmare. It has been destroyed on purpose.

But do you know who *does* look off-kilter and spooky? Charles Wooley and the rest of the talking heads at *60 Minutes*, both in Australia and the US. One of the reasons I don't watch TV anymore is that I can't stand to look at these podpeople selling their inverted agendas.



That's a face to give you confidence, right? Nice rug, Chuck! And notice what it says on the board there: Jacinda Ardern's *60 Minutes* interview slammed as 'relentlessly creepy'. So I am not the only one who thinks these people belong on Pluto. And for those of you in the US, look at these creepy people:



That's Bob Simon taking a moment in between facelifts to get bombed with the perpetually bombed Steve Croft and Morley Safer. Hey little boy, it looks like Morley has some candy for you.



And look at those scary ladies. You will say I just grabbed the worst photos I could find. Yep. They can dish it out, let's see how they take it.

Checking the sidebar at youtube, I see *60 Minutes* Australia's main line seems to be pushing manufactured fear: fake serial killers (Henri van Breda), fake wife beaters, fake drug lords (Pablo Escobar), and so on. I guess *60 Minutes* USA is the same, though I am equally out of the loop there. I haven't watched it in about 30 years. I recommend the same for you: TURN IT OFF. It is all lies and fake events.

But back to Port Arthur. I posted a couple of other points in yesterday's paper, which are also conclusive. The media somehow got photos of him before they should have, published them illegally, and manipulated them to make him look crazy. That is now admitted. The only entity that has the power to do that is Intelligence, so I knew this was an Intel operation without further questioning. The FiveEyes, like the CIA, have been in control of the media for decades. Look up OperationMockingbird, now partially declassified. Intel has admitted it has done these things, and you can read about them at Wikipedia or CIA.gov. The CIA can and has planted many stories in top magazines and newspapers, and on TV and in films, and it can manipulate those stories any way it likes. It has Hollywood as a partner, and can get anything done immediately, including all the new hightech stuff like CGI.

Another way you can tell this is all fiction with no effort is again through that IQ **66** report. Bryant obviously doesn't have an IQ of 66, and when he pretends to be stupid he does a lousy job of it. He is a terrible actor, which is why they have to manipulate photos and films of him. [See the taped interview](#) with him, which is still available (in part) on the internet. We are told his verbal IQ is even lower, being sub-60. But he is way too quick and smooth verbally for that, and his vocabulary is far too large. Even though they only publish little snippets of him, you can tell that from his correct use of both horrendous and horrific. And that is just one example of many. Plus, I guess you caught the number they chose for his fake IQ. They would have preferred 33, but no way he could pull that off.

But if he did have an IQ of 66, it would also doom the script. Why? Because someone with an IQ of 66 is a clinical moron, also called "high grade defect" to avoid the old non-PC terms. They have a mental age of eight to twelve years old. Well, a child that age **cannot plead guilty** to such crimes, since he is not legally qualified to do so. This should have *necessarily* gone to trial, just based on the IQ of Bryant. They would have to *prove* he is guilty to a jury, based on actual evidence. But that didn't happen. There was no trial. You are told Bryant was judged competent to stand trial or plead guilty, but that is impossible. Who judged him competent, and on what legal grounds? Does it seem right to you, given the story you were told back then, that this moron should be able to **waive his own trial** by pleading guilty? Doesn't that throw up a gigantic red flag? It should. It should, because it is

too convenient. It bypasses anyone having to prove a case here, or having to read evidence into court. Once evidence is read into court, it becomes the property of the public. We can go in and check it later. But if there is no case, that doesn't happen. All we have or ever have had is this story told to us by the media.

You will say they got it from the police, but it turns out we know they didn't. As with Christchurch, the early stories were too early to come from the police. To *have* a story, the police first have to gather evidence, compile it, investigate it, and release it. But in all these fake events, we have stories being published that look to be pre-written. Within 30 minutes of the first body dropping, we have worldwide reports that include all the main points, including a shooter bio and a guilty determination. [*Good Morning America*](#) had a fully fleshed out report the next morning in the US, and it included amateur video footage of the event. How convenient they have amateur footage of this accidental event! If I just happened to be videotaping at a cafe—as we all do from time to time—and someone started mowing down patrons with military weapons, I wouldn't run. No, I would try to film it for *Good Morning America*. For that segment, we find Australian news had already tracked down a house painter that had worked for Bryant and several “friends of his”, all of whom called him a loner (several times) and “unusual”. Do you see the contradiction there? Bryant is a loner with lots of friends! You see what they are doing, though: they are “painting” anyone who withdraws from modern society or is unusual in any way as a possible mass murderer. No one needs a plea or a trial, since the press has already told you what to think of the event on the first day. Also remember 911, which followed that script exactly. They knew it was Osama bin Laden on the first day, before any investigation, and “with no warning this would happen”. **A real event would not work like that.**

Incredibly, **Bryant** Gumble then blows the cover of the whole story by pointing out that under Australian law, the media cannot report on the background of the suspect “until the trial is under way”. Gumble had just read that in the press. So he was surprised to hear Anne Fulwood from Australia telling the world about his background. Katie Couric tries to downplay it by saying that the broadcast was just for the US, but then they admit the show IS broadcast in Australia.

Here's another fact that is conclusive by itself. In other words, if this is the only thing you knew about the event, you could come to the correct conclusion from it alone. On the morning of the event in Port Arthur, some 25 specialist doctors (Royal Australasian College of Surgeons) from all over Australia had attended a training course in Hobart, and their last lecture was on **Terrorist Attacks and Gunshot Wounds**. Their seminar ended at 1:00pm and the shooting started at about 1:30. Convenient, right? But. . . who schedules a training course on fake terrorism for Sunday morning? Jews? Agents? Both? Anyway, these “surgeons” stayed on to take care of the wounded from Port Arthur. These are the people that allegedly worked on the wounded. **Not** local surgeons. **Not** surgeons flown in from the mainland after the event. No, *top specialists that just happened to be there, learning about terrorism and gunshot wounds*. There is no chance that was an accident. They were planted in the event. The odds of that are 100%. Period. They may (or may not) have been real surgeons, but they were briefed by FiveEyes going in, and they operated on no real bodies from the site. They either faked operations behind closed doors, or operated on people already in the hospital for other reasons, switching the paperwork.

Note that fact destroys not only the Martin-did-it story, it destroys all other stories. Fake surgeons means fake victims, which means no one killed anybody. It was all theater.

You may also be interested to know that Mr. Bryan **Walpol** gave last year's [keynote presentation](#) at the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons' Annual Symposium, entitled “Port Arthur: What a Difference

a Day Makes". Walpol was a staff specialist in the Emergency Dept. at Royal Hobart Hospital at the time of the event. I encourage you to notice his surname, which is a slight variation of Walpole, as in Horace Walpole, famous writer (*Castle of Otranto*), and son of famous first Prime Minister of England Robert Walpole.



Horace (Horatio) was a gay Jewish spook who lived at **Strawberry Hill**. The Walpoles were Earls of Orford at the time. Through his mother he was a **Phillips**, of the Phillips Baronets. He was also a **Sydney**, a Hastings, a Stanhope, a D'Arcy, a Dryden, a Perrot, a Finch, a Griffith, a Morris, a Fletcher, a Crane, a Shepherd, and a Bacon. The Walpoles are still Barons to this day, though the Barons themselves don't live in Australia. They live in Norwich, where they are now more closely related to the **Molyneux**, the Bourkes, the Clintons, the Cockburns, the **Murrays** (Stanleys), the Lombards, the **Percevals** (Earls of Egmont), the **Somersets** (Dukes of Beaufort), the **Hamiltons**, the Gordons, the Cecils (Earls of Salisbury), and the **Comptons**. Note that last name, since these are the same Comptons we saw in my paper on Christchurch. These Comptons/Walpoles ARE in New Zealand now, but they are called. . . **Arderns**. The current Baron Walpole's 2g-grandmother was a Perceval, and her mother was Catherine Compton, Baroness **Arden**. Chew on that a while. BTW, we also saw the Percevals in my last paper.

The Walpoles also live in Australia today as the. . . [Kidmans](#). Think Nicole Kidman.

But back to our Mr. Bryan Walpol. We haven't exhausted the strangeness here. Notice now his first name, which is curiously close to Bryant, the name of the fake shooter. Coincidence? I doubt it. Most of these people in the peerage have transported last names as first names, as we have seen. Also, if he is a doctor, why is he titled **Mr.** Walpol? Why not Dr. Walpol?

A search on these surgeons (RACS) pulls up lots of articles on gun control, both in the late 90s and now. These surgeons would seem to have enough to do in cutting people up, but they like to be heavily involved in politics as well, which we can read as another clue here. In fact, these same surgeons were [making a lot of noise last year](#), months before Christchurch, on the issue of gun control. So they seem to be an integral and longstanding part of this project.

Here's another clue everyone has missed. The event was at the **Broad Arrow Cafe**. You need to look up ["broad arrow"](#) at [Wikipedia](#):

It is a symbol used traditionally in heraldry, most notably in England, and later by the British government to mark government property. It became particularly associated with the Board of Ordnance, and later the War Department and the Ministry of Defence.

Any questions?

The broad arrow or *pheon* is used most famously by the Sidney/Sydney family of the peerage, for whom Sydney, Australia, is named. And who are they closely related to? Well, I just answered that above, with Walpole. Horace Walpole was also a Sydney, so everyone he was related to are also related to the Sydneys. They are also related to the **Churchills**, the Cavendishes, the **Hobarts**, the Berties, the Osbornes, the Russells, the Hoskins/**Hoskyns**, the **Husseys**, the Kirwans, the **Pagets**, the Townshends, the Clements, the Campbells, the Kings/**Kingstons**, the **Percys**, and the Wolffs.

Speaking of the Broad Arrow Cafe, did you know it was sold by Jim Laycock in June of 1995? Who did he sell it to? The Tasmanian government. They refurbished the cafe, including installing a new rear door. So if you thought that rear door broke from old age or disrepair, you would be wrong.

And did you know there just happened to be three rescue helicopters onhand on that Sunday? The usual number was one. Never before had there been three, or even two. There was a special hearse built to carry 22 bodies at the same time. It had just been commissioned. It was used just the one time and then put up for sale. What are the effing odds? This is **absolute proof** the whole thing was staged.

Speaking of odds, the story is Bryant fired from the right hip, his first burst being **17** shots that killed 12 and wounded another five. So he didn't miss once. Most of the dead were hit in the head, allegedly. And now for the punchline: Martin Bryant is **left-handed**. They actually used that to smear him, since lefties are supposed to be sinister, unstable, and stupid. I am left-handed, so you can see why I am pissed. So how did this lefty fire from the *right* hip, never missing? I guess he was also blindfolded, to complete the trick. Also: the number 17. **It adds to eight.**

Likewise for the reporters who just happened to be in Hobart for a seminar. More than 700 reporters from **17** nations were already in Hobart for a seminar, and like the doctors they were immediately called up. They all wrote their assigned reports on gun control, men-are-pigs, terrorism, fear everyone, etc. The chance that was just an accident: 0%.

And yet another seminar: on the day of the event (Sunday), all of the local governors of Port Arthur were out of town at a seminar. And it was a very strange seminar, with no guest speakers scheduled. Plus, again, who schedules seminars for Sunday morning?

The local cops were also off their regular beats in Port Arthur, with two on duty having been called away for a false alarm at Salt Water River. The cop on the scene (Constable Chris Iles, Sorell Police Station), was the first in pursuit of Bryant. Iles drove off from Port Arthur Store—about 3 minutes after Bryant left it—toward Seascapes, about 4km away. Although he was in hot pursuit, that part of the story mysteriously ends. Iles apparently drove off the edge of the Earth, never to be heard from again.

One of those allegedly injured soon thereafter was Carol Williams, who just happened to be the wife of a Canadian Embassy official. So she played the same part Barbara Olson later played on 911, except that Carol didn't have to fake her death. You remember Barbara Olson, right? **Yeshiva** University alumna, Fox News and CNN commentator, unadmitted CIA agent, and alleged wife of US Solicitor

General Ted Olson. She lived in McLean, VA, in the early 1990s: CIA's backyard. She was allegedly on flight 77 that allegedly crashed into the Pentagon. And now for the punchline: Ted Olson was born on **September 11**, grew up in Mountain View, CA (spooktown) and went to Hearst U. (I mean Berkeley). He was counsel to President Reagan during Iran/Contra, which was all manufactured, and later was counsel for Bush in *Bush v. Gore*, which was also manufactured. Gore was the scripted loser there, knowing he would lose. Remember, he voted against himself in the Senate, when he had to break a tie as Vice President. What a script!



[BTW, some embedded agents are trying to sell you the idea that Barbara Olson has been spotted as Lady Booth. I just ran across that today, or I would have commented earlier. It is false. They look nothing alike, as you should be able to tell by the side-by-side photos. This is another DallasGoldBug-type disinfo project. The interesting thing about Lady **Booth** Olson is not her facial similarity to Barbara, it is her name. It also links her to the peerage, as well as to John Wilkes Booth. And is Lady her first name, or her title? They tell us it is her given name, but I am not prone to believe it. My guess is Olson married a fellow peer, and that Lady Booth is connected to the [Booth Baronets of Allerton Beeches](#). You will say she should be British then, with the requisite accent. No, take that link and you will see that her (possible) father or uncle went to Beverly Hills High School. Both he and his father worked in television, which seems to fit. Or she may be linked to the family in other ways. Being the daughter of a baronet wouldn't make her a Lady. There is no information on her online, indicating links have been scrubbed. Whatever the case may be, the name Booth is a huge red flag.]

ASIO, Australian Security Intelligence Organization, was present at the Port Arthur event *from the beginning*, although this was initially hidden. Why were they there? According to the given story, no one called them in (until possibly later) and they had no jurisdiction. This was just a local boy gone mad, so no terrorism was involved. The local police should have been able to handle it. And how did ASIO get there so fast on a Sunday? Do you think ASIO just has Port Arthur—a tiny island off the coast of Tasmania—on their normal weekend beat? No. Clearly they were there to run this event themselves. You will say that *they* killed all these people then, but there is no evidence of that and a lot of evidence against it. See above, with the surgeons planted in the event. The alternative stories all push alternative shooters, but those stories are all planted as well. Remember what I told you first with the fake Kennedy assassination: *both* the mainstream story *and* the alternative stories are planted. They have stories for everyone's taste, except this one: it was all theater. It was Hollywood and no one died.

But why plant all these fake scenarios as alternatives? Because the alternatives sell the main point just as well as the original story. The main point is not that you believe Bryant did it, or that he hates certain people. Those are just sidelines. The main point isn't gun control, either. That is a red herring. The main point is the creation of fear and chaos, so that they can sell *more* guns, pass more legislation,

further destroy the heterosexual relationship, hire more police, install more expensive body scanners, have more security, and spend more on the military. They don't care who you think did it or why, as long as you think it was done. In fact, if you buy any of the alternative stories, you are probably *more* fearful than those who buy the original story. Thinking your own government is mass-murdering its own citizens is far worse than thinking some lone moron did it. With some luck you can avoid a lone moron. But you cannot outrun your own government.

So the alternative stories will mess you up even more than the mainstream story. Which is of course why most people stick with the mainstream story. They can see pretty quickly that the “conspiracy” stories are even scarier than the first story, so why go there? Only my reading is able to break that cycle, since although my reading is a “conspiracy” reading in a way, it dissolves the fear. The deaths are all fake, so you don't have to fear being shot by a madman *or* by your government. It is all fiction. The only thing you have to fear is fear itself. Puts a whole new meaning to that old quote, right? You didn't realize Roosevelt and Kennedy were telling you the truth there, did you—or what kind of truth they were telling? You didn't realize how literal that quote was.

For example, they have some of this information [up on the internet here](#), in a story told by Andrew MacGregor. First of all, the MacGregors are from the Families, so you should know you are being spun there without further effort. Also notice the Eye of Horus on the front page three times, twice surreptitiously blinking at you from a strange scroll. MacGregor tells a lot of truth here, more than most, but of course he spins you into dark forces who ran the event, using Bryant as a patsy. Much scarier than the original story.

One of the two cops diverted to Salt River was Constable Paul **Hyland**. [The Hylands in the British peerage](#) are indeed in South Australia, and they are related to the **Percys**, Dukes of Northumberland. You will remember that the Percys were also involved at Aramoana, pretending to be a family of victims. The Hylands are also closely related to the Manners, Dukes of Rutland; the Seymours, Dukes of Somerset; the Chaplins (as in Charlie Chaplin), the Lewises, the Burrells, the Galbraiths, the Stopfords, Earls of Courtown; the Fords, the Carrs, the **Dohertys**, and the Beverleys. So this lowly policeman in Nubeena was actually related to at least three dukes. Hmmm. What could it mean?

How about Glen **Pears**, allegedly one of the victims? He had two handcuffs on him, remember, although I was not aware he had four arms. The Pears are also in the peerage, of course. See Vice-Admiral Sir Edmund Pears, who was involved in the looting of Benin City and the taking of all their art. There, he was under the command of a **Phillips**. The Pears in the peerage are related to the Bulwer-Longs, the Rawlinsons, the Straceys, the Petries, the Frys, and the Reynolds. Their wives are scrubbed for several recent generations, which is strange. But through the Reynolds they links us to the **Barclays**. That is the Quaker Barclays, of Barclays Bank. Also see Rear-Admiral Steuart Pears, whose daughter married an **Erskine**. We also saw the Erskines in my Christchurch paper, didn't we? To remind you, the founder of Christchurch, James Fitzgerald, was married to Frances Erskine Draper.

How about Constable Gary **Whittle**, Hyland's partner? Do you want to guess? Also from the peerage. [Whittles of Australia and Christchurch, NZ](#) are listed in the peerage. They are also closely related to the Tuckers, Evans, Christians (think Fletcher Christian) and Adams of the Pitcairn Island hoaxes. The [Whittles are also related to the Ardens/Arderns](#). These are the Ardens that descend from Rear-Admiral **Hamar**, just so you know. But perhaps the most interesting connection of the Whittles is [to the... Bourbons](#). In the 1970s, Christopher Whittle married Priscilla dei conti Rattazzi. Conti means counts. Her mother was an Agnelli (of the Agnellis that founded Fiat), and *her* mother was [Donna Bourbon del Monte dei principi di San Faustino](#). Principi means princes. So she was the Princess of San Faustino.

Donna's mother was American heiress Jane Allen **Campbell**, of the linseed oil and soup Campbells. These people also link us to the Princes and Princesses von Furstenberg, who link us quickly to the Douglas-Hamilton Dukes as well as the Princes of Monaco. So that's who the Whittles are. Somehow they forget to tell you that in the Port Arthur stories.

Do I need to go on? I don't think so, but I will anyway, just for fun. What about our Constable **Iles**, who disappeared while in hot pursuit of the shooter. Can't you just see it coming? The Iles are also in the peerage. See Dorothy Iles, who married Lt. Col. Jame Meldrum **Knox** in 1904. You will remember from my last paper that the Fitzgerald/Kennedys of Australia/New Zealand are closely related to these same Knoxes of the peerage. Which links Constable Iles to the shooter at Christchurch, whose mother is a Fitzgerald. The son of Iles and Knox married a Jean Leith-Marshall in 1935. After divorcing Iles, this Jean married a **Montagu**, Baron Swathling, whose mother was a **Goldschmid**. Montagu's grandmother was a **Cohen**. The first Baron Montagu changed his name to Samuel Montagu from Louis **Samuel**. So that is who we are dealing with, as usual. This links us to British billionaire Jewish banker Sir James Goldsmith, who we saw in my *Titanic* paper. See BNP Paribas and Slater**Walker**.

Also see Kate Iles of the peerage, who married **Herbert Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound** in 1939. These Murrays were the Earls of Minto, related to the Herberts, Middletons, Sackvilles and Maitlands. The Herberts were dukes, as we've already established. The Iles were also closely related to the Pakenhams, Barons Longford, who we also saw in my Christchurch research. The Iles of Australia/New Zealand are in the peerage, related to Cocks, Parsons, Wodeshouses, and **Bromleys**. The Cocks were Earls Sommers. They later married the Usshers, Tates, Youngs, Messines and **Barr-Smiths** of Christchurch.

What about Sergeant Andrew **Fogarty**? The Fogartys are related to the Queen Mother, since one (Kieran) married a **Bowes-Lyon** in 1970. This Margaret Bowes-Lyon was the daughter of the 13th Earl of Strathmore and Frances **Smith**—granddaughter of Abel Smith. Yes, that is the same Abel Smith we saw in [my paper on the Titanic hoax](#). He was an ancestor of Captain Smith. Kieran Fogarty's sister-in-law is Anna D'Abreu, co-founder of Sadista Sisters in 1973 with **Judith** Alderson. They were a punk/exploitation group that incorporated scenes of rape. Lovely. So we now know where that came from as well. The D'Abreus descend from the Throckmorton Baronets. We find one of the D'Abreus marrying a **Rachel Green** in 1967. I hit that in my last papers as well. The Fogartys of the peerage are also closely related to the Pagets (**Anglesey**) and the **Borgias**. Yes, you read that right. Through the Pagets, they are related to the **Murrays**, **Smiths**, and **Butterfields**.



What about Police Superintendent Barry **Bennett**? Later Assistant Commissioner. Well, we already

know about the Bennetts. That name is a red flag with no further research. We have seen them involved in dozens of hoaxes over the centuries, including [Salem](#), [Lizzie Borden](#), Smedley Butler, Alistair Crowley, and Confederacy of Dunces. They are baronets, barons, and viscounts, and they are also Egertons, **Percys**, Cavendishes, and **Murdochs**. In fact, there is a [Barry Bennett](#) in the peerage of the right age to be our man, and he is from New Zealand. His daughter married a **Murray**. His sister married a **Lezemore** in Hamilton, NZ, in 1972. His grandfather Charles was born in Canterbury, NZ. These Bennetts were among the founders of New Zealand.

What about Sergeant Terry **McCarthy**? The McCarthys are related to the Manners, Villiers, and Foxes. There is a Terry McCarthy in the peerage, wife Dora **Spencer**, changed his name to Terry Kendall for some reason not given. His daughter married actor Sir Rex Harrison, which means this Terry is too old to be our Terry here—but that doesn't mean they aren't related. There *are* McCarthys from NSW and New Zealand in the peerage, and they were also related to **Smiths**, Powells, Laings, Huishes, Buffetts and Bruces—and the Bruces link us to Admirals and Baronets. The Laings link us to the **Christians**. We also find a Terence **Webb** McCarthy in the peerage related to **Hobart**-Hampdens, Earls of Buckinghamshire, Veres, **Berties**, **Webbs** and Stewarts. The Webbs link us to the Queen. Finally, we find a possible link for our Terry McCarthy to Gary Whittle through the Douglas-Hamiltons. See [Harold Cuthbert McCarthy](#), d. 1982, b. New Zealand, married a Stuart, daughter of **Douglas-Hamilton**, in **Tavistock**. This Douglas-Hamilton links us immediately to the Princes of Monaco and the Princes von Furstenberg. Harold McCarthy's children are not given, but I would bet one of his descendants is our Terry McCarthy of the Port Arthur hoax.

OK, let's go back to MacGregor's ridiculous story at HiddenMysteries. To be fair, he didn't write the script here, he is just repeating it and spinning it.

There is one final twist to this macabre story. There was only one exit door to that part of The Broad Arrow Café, known as the Gift Shop. This door was inoperative due to a faulty fire exit door lock. When the shooting started inside the Broad Arrow Café, several patrons headed for this exit door, but found that it wouldn't open. The two staff at the gift shop counter were already aware that the door was inoperative and all they could do was to hide behind the counter, and that was where they were slain.

Some patrons, when they realised their position, were able to hide their wives behind display stands and curtains, but were unable to save themselves, and these women watched in horror as the gunman shot their husbands whose last acts were to save their loved ones.

OK, see any problems there? The Broad Arrow was one of the town hotspots, frequented by local cops. But no one knew the fire exit didn't work? The building had no rear exit, and no one thought that might be a fire hazard or other problem? C'mon! They admit this was a big tourist spot, not some dusty deserted hole in the outback. There is no way it didn't have a rear exit. Even worse, we are expected to believe these victims could “hide their wives behind display stands and curtains”? The men died but the women did not. What parallel universe does that paragraph make sense in? This is typical Langley-style writing, by writers whose brains are firing on only one cylinder. If you don't see why I say that, remember that the first burst was 17 shots in 15 seconds that killed 12 and injured 5. It is on tape (though the tape is a fake). That doesn't really give a husband time to hide his wife behind a salt shaker or ketchup bottle, does it?

MacGregor now mentions *Suddenly One Sunday*, the book on Port Arthur by Mike **Bingham**. Who is he? Well, again, his name tells us all we need to know. Before we hit the peerage, I beg you to remember Mark Bingham, of 911 fame, who allegedly died when flight 93 crashed in Shanksville.

They now admit he was gay, so he was gay Jewish actor who faked his death #92,871. Mark Bingham is famous for the call he made to his mother from the airphone, saying "Hi Mom, this is your son Mark Bingham". As we do when we are calling our mothers. Hi Mom, this is your son, Miles Mathis. Because she wouldn't recognize her own first son's voice, right?

Surprisingly, this Mike Bingham of Port Arthur has zero web presence, despite allegedly being an author. A websearch pulls up nothing but this one book at Amazon. Apparently Mike Bingham rushed this crap book into print to back up the lies, then fell off the edge of the Earth, joining Constable Iles in outerspace. But as usual thepeerage tells us who the Bingham are. They are Baronets of Castlebar, Baronets of Melcombe, Barons Clanmorris, and Earls of Lucan. See the 7th Earl, who faked his death in 1974. His wife was a Duncan and a **Watts**. His grandmother was a **Gordon-Lennox**, daughter of the 5th Duke of Richmond and his wife Lady Carloline **Paget**. They were also Villiers (Earls of Jersey) and **Campbells** (Dukes of Argyll). The Bingham are also closely related to the **Erskines**, see above, the **Schiffs**, and the **Hamiltons** (Dukes of Abercorn). Of course this links us to the Douglas-Hamiltons again, linking Mike Bingham to Terry McCarthy and Gary Whittle. They were all close cousins. Since we may assume they were all gay actors, they may have been kissing cousins.

Also curious that this book is now out of print, with paperbacks going for \$195 at Amazon. It must not be telling the current storyline the way they want, so they retired it.

One of the survivors of the Broad Arrow Cafe is Major Sandra Vanderpeer. Her testimony is where much of that story comes from. But it is pretty suspicious to have an army major as one of the female survivors, don't you think? A female army major and the wife of a Canadian Embassy official in this group of about 40? Pretty amazing. Vanderpeer has no presence online except for this Port Arthur mention, so she is also a ghost. The Google computer doesn't like her name, immediately suggesting van der Meer. And we can see why the computer doesn't like it, because there are no useful results. The name looks either made-up or changed.

Also convenient that Seascape Cottage was burned to the ground, allegedly destroying all evidence. I am just surprised they didn't claim the fire burned the entire island to a cinder, making all forensics impossible. It doesn't really matter, since no real forensics was done anyway. All they did is fake a few forensics reports, garbling them so that as usual they make no sense.

We have a problem with the reports of Bryant's burns as well, with many many stories about him running out of the house naked, all his clothes having burned off. In the hospital he was supposed to be covered in bandages, with many 3rd degree burns. He was supposed to smell of burned flesh and his pretty hair was supposed to be a cinder. Strange then that just a few weeks later he appeared in interviews with his long hair completely regrown and no sign of scarring on his skin. Compare this to the [stories of Charles Manson](#) I pulled apart in my paper on him. Manson was supposed to have been splashed with gas or lighter fluid and set on fire by prison mates, suffering 3rd degree burns on his hands and face. Unfortunately, we see him in interviews afterwards, with no scarring to either hands or face.

MacGregor gives up the farm again here:

It was the EMA (Emergency Management Australia) Port Arthur Seminar Papers that demonstrated the preparedness of all these bodies, especially with the Royal Hobart Hospital and it's newly completed 'Code Brown' Emergency Plan. But we are then given another clue. The Coroner, Ian Matterson, the Staff at the Royal


Hobart Hospital, including some doctors, and many Ambulance Service personnel initially believed that it was simply another "exercise" and some ignored the calls until they heard the news on the radio and television. In other words these people had been conditioned to attending exercises until they were sick of them.

In his book, 'Suddenly One Sunday', journalist Mike Bingham wrote, "Involvement in these national and local exercises was to prove invaluable as Tasmania Police set about managing the Port Arthur Massacre. The responses were to work so well that there were times when *it all seemed like an exercise*, despite the enormity of all that had happened."

They love to tip their hand to us, all but admitting here the event was another fake, another exercise gone live, another fiction sold as real. But no one ever asks this: Why all these exercises to prepare for something that had never happened before? Why buy a 22-bed hearse for a town that hadn't had 22 people murdered in the past 10 years? Before Port Arthur, Tasmania had an amazingly low murder rate, and no history of mass shootings. It now looks like the local officials saw that as a problem: possibly it cut into their ability to apply for terrorism funds and interfered with their desire to expand the police forces.

Plus, what is that "Code Brown"? I propose it is another Intel joke, meant to imply this is all caca.

What about Dr. Ian **Sale**, who first interviewed Martin Bryant? The Sales are also in the peerage, related to the **Fitzroys**, Barons Southampton, and the **Dundases**, Marquesses of Zetland. The Sales were also related to the **Hoskyns-Abrahalls**, [which links us to the Whittles](#), Bennetts, and Egertons above. Take that last link, which page I hit on both my searches for Ian Sale and Gary Whittle. Coincidence? Not a chance. Also see Elizabeth Sale, who married a Denison, 8th Baron Londesdale, in 1957. His first wife had been Lesley **Churchill**. In 1962, [Jean Sale married John Elliot](#), who links us not only to the Campbells, but to the Elliot-Murray-Kynynmounds. Which links us back to Constable Iles, above. Amusingly, Dr. Ian Sale is still practicing, but he has a one-star rating (out of five) online.



The Chief Justice in our story was William **Cox**, later Governor of Tasmania. Selling fear to the end. See the previous series on Christchurch, where the Coxes are cousins of shooter Brenton Tarrant. Just another whacky coincidence you have to fit into your little head, eh?

Fit it in there with this. . . Ian **Kingston**, [the part-time parking attendant working Port Arthur*](#) for the event, just happened to be moonlighting from his more important job: [Manager of the Tasman Peninsula State Emergency Service \(SES\) since 1984](#) [see cached]. Obviously, he planted himself there to help oversee the operation. But that isn't all. Just a few months before the event, the Premier of Tasmania, Ray Groom, suddenly retired, appointing himself. . . Minister of Port Arthur. Just ten days before the event, Hank Timmermann was installed as the new leader of SOG (police Special Operations Group). Can you read these clues or do I need to draw you a picture? In this picture, I will include the Earls of Kingston, related to the Walkers, **Barclays**, Evans, Rathbones, Gore-Booths, Pagets, and **Fitzgeralds**. Also see Charles James Kingston of the peerage, lived at Aramac, Queensland, daughter Lydia married Charles **Caulfield**, 11th Viscount Charlemont, whose mother was a **Goldsmith**, and whose grandmother was a **Gray**. These Viscounts were also of Queensland, back to the 1860s. They were bankers. They are also related to the Greens, Stuarts and Pearces.

Also tying in here: Coroner Ian Matterson ruled that no inquest into the 35 deaths would happen, due to Bryant's guilty plea. That's convenient. Did they even catalog the bodies, or did they just throw them into the ocean, as with the *Titanic* fake? Or did they bury them all in unmarked graves, as with the Nazis, Lincoln assassins, Rosa Luxemburg, French revolutionaries, Adam Lanza, etc.?

Now MacGregor tips his hand to us again:

However, back to Professor Mullen. In 2000, Mullen along with another psychiatrist, C. H. Cantor and another gentleman, Philip Alpers wrote an article titled 'Mass Homicide: The Civil Massacre', in which they use 7 'Lone Nut Gunman' type massacres to prove their findings. These cases are (1) Julian Knight, Melbourne 1987, (2) Michael Ryan, Hungerford England 1987, (3) Frank Vitkovic, Melbourne 1987, (4) David Gray, Aramoana NZ, 1990, (5) Wade Frankum, Strathfield, 1991, (6) Thomas Hamilton, Dunblane Scotland, 1996 and (7) Martin Bryant, Port Arthur, 1996. These 7 massacres are all seemingly related by circumstances besides the fact that they were used specifically to introduce firearm control by the governments of the day.

Yes, they *are* related by circumstance beyond firearm control, as we have seen in my papers. All these fake shooters are from the same peerage families. They are all wealthy crisis actors, and none of them died or are in jail. They are at home eating crackers and having a good laugh.

You will say Vitkovic doesn't sound like someone from the peerage, and indeed he isn't. . . or not by that name. But no parents are given for this ghost. His parents are only given as Italian mother and Croatian father. But note his list of victims: **Morris, Spencer, Dowling**. He killed **eight** people on the 8th of December, injuring 17, then leapt to his death from the 11th floor. The Post building had. . . **eighteen** floors. Chai. MacGregor also kills the Vitkovic story himself, by admitting the main fact: Vitkovic is said to have sawn off the barrel of his M1 Carbine so that it could be snuck into the building. Problem with that is? If you saw off the barrel, there is no pressure to reload. He would have had to reload after every shot, making him a sitting duck in the tight quarters of an office building. An even bigger problem? He is said to have escaped from two men holding him, jumping through a plate glass window. Impossible except in Hollywood, since those building windows are made to withstand big hits. You have watched *Die Hard* too many times. A man cannot jump through one of those windows. Go try it and get back to me.

Since we know MacGregor is spinning, it is also pretty amazing to see him admitting this:

In the case report on Martin Bryant, this article makes some astounding statements. It states that, "The killings began with the murder of an elderly couple against whom Bryant's family held a long-standing grudge". This is not correct. There was never any grudge between the Bryant and Martin family. Mrs Bryant totally denies any such allegations, as does Glen Martin.

The report continues with, "he believed had contributed to the suicide of his father." No, no, never. There is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that Martin Bryant believed that actions by the Martins had led to his father committing suicide **thirteen** years later.

MacGregor is correct about that, but it leaves us wondering why Wikipedia is still repeating that story to this day. That is sold to us on the current Wiki page as the cause of the rampage.

Then we have the fact that witness Frank **Milburn** said this:

He [Bryant] wasn't going bang bang bang bang. It was bang and then he'd pick someone else out and line them up and shoot them.

But the Wilkinson videotape records the first 17 shots in 15 seconds. So either Milburn is lying or the tape is lying, *or both*. So are the Milburns baronets? You betcha. Not only that, but they are baronets from Northumberland, the demesne of the **Percys**. The current baronet, who was also baronet at the time of Port Arthur, is the son of Anne **Scott-Murray**, [and her mother is Dorothy Walpole](#). Her father was **Lt. Col. Horace Walpole**. I know, I know, you can stop jumping up and down. Yes, this links us back to the Mr. Walpol above, alleged surgeon. It also links us to the Miss Scott who was another fake victim.

Which brings us to three more fake victims at the Cafe: Kevin Sharp, Wally **Bennett**, and Ray Sharp. I already did the Bennetts above, and I did the Sharps in my Christchurch paper. If you remember, the Sharps of the peerage link us to the Dundases, the Campbells, the Husseys, the Ritchies, and the Grahams. They link us to John Podesta and Gordon Duff. They link us to Bottomley, mother of Jacinda Ardern.

Another fake victim was Robert **Elliot**, no doubt related to Dr. Ian Sale above as well as to the Elliot-Murray-Kynynmounds.



What about the **Mikac** victims? Strange to find Croatians at a cafe in Port Arthur. Or is it? You may wish to visit [this page](#) on Marijan Mikac, d. 1972, who came out of the Yugoslavian Navy to become a writer. Already a huge red flag there. Not only was he a writer, he was an *avant garde* writer and poet.

Those guys are spooks to a man. He was a **Dadaist** who wrote the novel *Monkey Phenomenon*. Dadaist pegs him as a Jew. Don't believe me? He was also famous for the novel *Adventures of Moric Schwarz* [note the Jewish name], which "created a humorous superstructure which depicted Nazis as disguised Jews". Hmmm. See [my paper on Hitler's Genealogy](#), which proves they were precisely that. He then worked for major US film companies in Berlin just before WWII, again indicating he was a Western agent. After the war he moved to Argentina, confirming he was both a Jew and an agent. There, he was one of the first to sell the fake [Bleiburg repatriation](#) story, which never made any sense. We are told the Croatian army wanted to go to occupied Yugoslavia to surrender to British forces. They allegedly fought their way across the Austrian border, although this was after May 8, 1945. So we don't really understand who they were fighting and why. Once in Yugoslavia, the British accepted their surrender, but then for some reason we are told they were forced to march across the country and then were executed in large numbers. Mostly this story is used to further stir your brain, since you are supposed to believe the anti-Communists were Axis and the Yugoslav Communists were Allies. Doesn't really fit the larger story, but there it is. You are also supposed to believe that the British and US forces controlling Europe were fine with Yugoslavian Communists exterminating all their Croatian people. More likely the story is the usual cover of the truth: this had nothing to do with Communism, since Communism is just a fake construct. It had to do with being sure that area of Europe didn't think it had won any right to self-governance just because the war was over. The Allied forces, at the behest of the bankers and industrialists, wanted to be sure Yugoslavia, just like the rest of Europe and the world, would be prostrate before any and all of its plans. So those being suppressed in Yugoslavia were anyone believing in local autonomy of any kind. Those being promoted were anyone willing to grovel at the feet of the industrialists. Any deaths were vastly inflated to create fear, and stories were planted to keep the populace cowering.

So anyway, the bio of this Marijan Mikac gives us a pretty good idea of who the Mikacs of Croatia were, and still are. It would appear they are *still* in Intelligence, offering their services to the industrialists and their worldwide schemes of ruination and fear.

What about fake victim Graham **Colyer**? Are the Colyers baronets? What do you think? They married the Fergussons in 1862 and became the Colyer-Fergusson Baronets. So his name is probably Graham Colyer-Fergusson. As usual, they are closely related to the **Hamiltons**, Dukes of Hamilton. His first name indicates he is probably related to the Grahams, Dukes of Montrose, as well, and that is borne out by further study at the peerage, where we find the Colyer-Fergussons closely related to the Grahams, Forbes, **Cohens**, Mullers, Stanleys, Ledgers, **Behrens**, Herberts, Gordons, Bells, Melvilles, **Goldings/Gouldings**, Moncktons, Bowers, **Salmons**, Hore-Ruthvens (Hoares), Gores, and Ford-Smiths.

Other fake victims include the couple Dennis and Mary **Olson**. Hey, wait, we just saw Barbara Olson of the 911 fake victims list above. Who are these Olsons? The peerage is there to tell us. We quickly find Gerald Olson marrying Penelope **Christian** Patch in 1983. Her mother is an **Erskine**, daughter of Lt. Col. Sir Thomas Erskine, 4th Baronet. His name is purple from a previous click. I have hit him already. He married an Anstruther, daughter of a **Hussey**. If we click on this Hussey, we find she was the granddaughter of Baroness Harriet **Windsor**, daughter of the 5th Earl of Plymouth. This Harriet married a **Clive**, son of the Earl of Powis and Lady **Herbert**. They were also **Egertons**. The daughter of Lt. Col. Erskine married a **Sharpe**, and his son married a **Pratt**. Small world. In 1940 Eileen Olson of Wellington, NZ, married Augustus **FitzHerbert**, whose mother just happened to be. . . Janet Mclean **Knox**. Remember, the Knoxes were all over my papers on Christchurch, being closely related to the ruling Fitzgeralds there. The FitzHerberts are also baronets, related to the **Beresfords**. The 7th Baronet FitzHerbert married a **Maitland**. His stepmother was a Simpson, daughter of Annie **Knox Campbell**

Murray.

So I guess we now know not to turn our backs on a famous Olson. Like . . . the Olsen twins, Ashley and Mary Kate. Yeah, remember Mary Kate was involved in [Heath Ledger's fake death](#). Also see Admiral Eric Olson, the only Navy Seal to reach to reach four-star rank. He was head of NSWDC or Seal Team 6, a Navy anti-terrorism unit. Unfortunately, there is no terrorism, except terror the military creates itself, so pardon me if I don't salute. In 1999 he became head of Naval Special Ops, which just means he was in charge of the top fakes of that period, including the fake murder of Osama bin Laden in 2011. Also see Frank Olson, who faked his death at age 43 in 1953 as part of the famous LSD dosing. He really died in 1994 at age 83. In 1953 he had recently switched from Army to CIA, and they needed him to go undercover. Which is why they still publicize the story. If he had really been murdered in 1953, they would have covered it up completely and it would have never made the papers. More proof of that is the 2017 Netflix movie *Wormwood*, reselling the original story. Netflix is just another CIA front, pushing these old fakes. [We have already seen that](#) with their series on serial killers—all of them fake. If Netflix is producing a new movie selling an old event, that is proof the event was fake. Same as Hollywood, but moreso.

Which brings us to Clifford Olson, fake Canadian serial killer. You have to read his Wiki page to believe how stupid the story is, and how transparent. **Eleven** victims, he was born on **1/1/40**. First charged for the murder of Judith **Kozma**. Really? That's a Hungarian Jewish name, which—if the name were real, which I don't think it is—would link her to the top royals there, all the way back to the Jagiellons, Vasas, Radziwills, and Medicis. Think Cosimo de' Medici. Cosimo=Kozma. See Bona Sforza for the link between the Radziwills/Jagiellons and the top Jewish families of Italy. The Canadian police paid Olson \$10,000 for the location of each victim, and his wife actually collected \$100,000 for the murders. That doesn't exactly deter murder, does it? Crime pays in Canada. . . literally. Wikipedia links us to a “background of Olson” page at cbc.ca, but of course it is empty. Wiki gives zero information itself. What a surprise. Also interesting that they admit Olson is collecting \$1170 a month as his old-age pension, despite allegedly being in jail. Except that, we have no evidence he is *in* jail. The picture they show of him doesn't look like maximum security to me, since he has long hair, a watch, and no prison clothes.



Also Mancur Olson, fake economist paid to slander unions. See for example [The Rise and Decline of](#)

Nations (1982).

He argues that groups such as cotton-farmers, steel-producers, and labor unions have an incentive to form lobby groups and influence policies in their favor. These policies will tend to be protectionist, which will hurt economic growth; but because the benefits of such policies are concentrated, and their costs are diffused throughout the whole population, there will be little public resistance to them. As distributional coalitions accumulate, nations burdened by them will fall into economic decline. His work influenced the formulation of the Calmfors-Driffill hypothesis of collective bargaining.

That's a convenient theory for the industrialists who paid his salary and promoted him, right?



Also see author Walter Olson, a Cato Institute creepazoid, who, like Mancur Olson above, is just a tool of the trillionaires. That is his Twitter photo above. Now I ask you, who looks creepier? Him or Martin Bryant? They admit he is a legal pundit who lacks a law degree. Typical. If you are from the Families, you don't need degrees or other qualifications. You don't even need to talk sense about anything or have any definable skills. You just need to follow the rules, promote the billionaires, and shaft the little guy.

Also Sara Jane Olson of the fake Symbionese Liberation Army. We are now told her real last name is Soliah, but I don't believe it. Being involved in this fake, she acts more like an Olson. If she *was* born a Soliah, she must have taken the name Olson from her maternal grandmother.

Also Tillie (Lerner) Olsen, Jewish fake Communist, and fake feminist. She wrote for the *Partisan Review*, now an admitted CIA front. Also for *The Nation* and *New Republic*, not-yet-admitted CIA fronts. Her job was to infiltrate the left and feminism, blowing them from the inside, and I say that as a leftist and feminist. She wanted to make leftists look as unappealing as possible to your average American, to push them right and toward the fascist ruling families that were hoaxing them. So rather than promoting equal treatment under the law, these fake feminists redirected feminism into a battle of the sexes, a battle against sex (just say no), and a tarring of men in general (#Metoo). That is what many now think of as feminism, and in that sense I am **not** a feminist, obviously. The newer promotion of trannies and "gender identity" is a spin-off of this late-period fake feminism, so it just keeps getting worse. No sensible person would be promoting this stuff, which is just more indication it is a project coming out of Intelligence. It is a massive psyop, meant to spread chaos and misery, and thereby generate huge profits.

Also Larry Olsen, founder of the Janus Society, promoter of BDSM. . . bondage etc. So, another disgusting person selling sexual chaos.

Also Niels Olsen, architect of the Russian Navy. He was a Norse/Dutch sailor who became a Russian

Admiral. So . . . he was Phoenician in the service of Russia. Olsen's fleet was given by Peter the Great to Count Golovin (also Jewish), Chancellor and Field Marshal of the Russian Empire. Golovin was descended from the Byzantine emperors, so he was likely a Komnene or one of their close relatives. Olsen and Golovin used the fleet to dominate the Baltic, the Black, and the Caspian Seas, winning territory from the Ottomans.

[**Added April 6, 2019:** OK, enough of the Olsons. I think you get the point. Let's go back to the Erskines, who we not only saw in my paper on Christchurch, but who we have linked to players here in Port Arthur, including the Pears, the Olsons, and the Bingham. I was rereading recent papers for typos, and came across the Erskines again in [my paper on Cambridge Analytica](#). If you remember, I linked them there to Carole Cadwalladr, the *Guardian* writer in London who broke the story. The Cadwalladrs were kings of Wales back to the year 655, later becoming the Owens and Tudors, including the Henry kings. Later they became . . . the Erskines, Barons of Restormel Castle, and they still are. Pretty amazing, eh? So we see the same people in all the big hoaxes of the past decades (and centuries).]

[**Added March 31, 2019:** Now that I have linked everyone else in this saga to the peerage, we can go back to Charles Wooley of *60 Minutes*. Where did he come from? Well, he was born on the Isle of Arran, Scotland. Otherwise his bio is pretty thin. They don't even give his wife on his Wiki page, much less his mother. But we do find an [Albert Charles Wooley](#), formerly **Woolley**, at Geni.com, d. 1981 New South Wales. So that may be his father or uncle. His wife was a Paxton, and her grandfather was a Mudford who apparently came to Australia on the *Lord Stanley*, as a *free* passenger. Suggestive already. The ship's demise says "Bottomley". That means someone named **Bottomley** chartered the *Lord Stanley* for this trip. Do you remember who is a Bottomley? Jacinda Ardern's mother Laurell is listed as maiden name Bottomley. Mudford's wife was an Ebden and his mother was a Haywood. His grandmother was a Wills. These people come from West Chinnock, Somerset. Woolley's aunts married a **Shakespeare** and a **Fisher**. The Shakespeare was a Stanley Thomas, son of Elijah, grandson of Elijah. This also links us to Blackburns, **Popes, Pitts, Whites**, and Dawsons. An Ivy Pitt is listed at Geni, but her husband Pitt is scrubbed. Emma Fisher's husband is given as Calbert Fisher, but he is immediately scrubbed. We already have more than enough to run this over to thepeerage.com for a crosscheck. If you were thinking Wooley might come from Jewish wool merchant lines in the peerage, guess what? You are correct. There are about 100 Woolley/Woolseys, including a recent baron. We are told this Harold Woolley, d. 1986, was raised to the house of Lords for his services to farming, which is absurd. Other Woolleys in the peerage are equally strange, since although webmaster Lundy says they are linked to the Pitmans in a footnote, he doesn't link them to any Pitmans on the main pages.

Finally, we find an Evelyn **Spencer** Wooley marrying a Holmes á Court, grandson of the 2nd Baron Heytesbury. This links us immediately to the Bouveries (**Bouviere**), Earls of Radnor; and through them to the **Douglasses**, Earls of Morton. We then link to the Heathcotes, **Whites**, Taylors, Yorke, Hudsons, Manners (Dukes of Rutland), Russells (Dukes of Bedford), Noels, Drummonds, Cocks (**Cox**), **Husseys, Armstrongs**, Roses, **Greys**, Ponsonbys, **Maudes, Fitzroys**, Berkeleys, Lennox. Here we find the Maudes are the Viscounts Hawarden, which will tie us to Martin Bryant below. [The 1st Viscount Maude](#) married an Allen, which also ties us to the Bryants. The Berkeleys quickly link us to the Maitlands and Balfours. We link to the Whites at least twice, and this is important since the Albert Charles Woolley of NSW was also descended from a White. This gives us an almost certain link between our Charles Wooley and the Woolleys of the peerage. The names Cox, Grey, Hussey, and Armstrong are also indicative, since we have seen them before, both here and in Christchurch.

We also find a Gillian Woolley of the peerage marrying a **Graham** (scrubbed), and then a Baring in 1966. This **Lt. Col.** Thomas Baring is the son of Maj. Edward **Baring** and Virginia **Ryan**. The Barings are of Barings Bank and the Barons of Revelstoke, and they link us to the Windhams, the **Greys**, the Ponsonbys, the Spencers, the **Taylor**s, and the **Fishers**.

Also see Edith Wooley, father allegedly unknown, who married the 1st Baronet Coates in 1878. Why is this interesting? Because their son the 2nd Baronet changed his name to . . . **Milnes-Coates**, after his wife, who was a Crewes-Milnes. Her father was the Marquess of Crewe, and her mother was a Graham of the Dukes of Montrose and the Stewarts, Earls of Galloway. They were also Hamiltons and Spencers. This reminds us of Sayyad Milne, who was allegedly killed in Christchurch. The 3rd Baronet Milnes-Coates' sister Bridget married a Cuthbert, and their son John married. . . Lady **Percy**, daughter of the Duke of Northumberland. Linking us to the Percys for the hundredth time in a week. Her mother was Lady Diana **Montagu Douglas Scott**. Her grandmother was a **Gordon-Lennox**. Her brother-in-law is the current Duke of Northumberland, and he married a cousin, Isobel Richard, daughter of Mary **Scott**.

Also see Thyra Woolley of Perth who married Edwin **Sydney Buffett** in 1941. She was the daughter of Irma **Allen**. Buffett's mother was a Waterhouse, daughter of a **Taylor**.

Collating all this information indicates Charles Wooley is related to all these people as well, explaining why he is interviewing them. You didn't think he got where he is by his incredible skill, looks, or charisma, did you? No. Almost none of these people advance on merit, except some of the comedians. Except for Dane Cook, comedians generally have to be funny, or they don't advance. But the rest of these peerage children are just propped up, which is why they are so nauseating to watch.]

Let's return to Martin Bryant. What clues can thepeerage.com give us about him? Well, there are 141 Bryants of the peerage and they are *closely* related to the Foxes, the **Hoskyns-Abrahalls**, the **Grays** (who link us immediately to the Manners dukes), the Scotts, the Newtons, the Harrisons, the Channings, the Zavitz, the Hawkins, the Kerrs, and the **Butterfields**. We find a Francis Bryant in Sydney before 1856, and he was a banker. His son was named Francis **Egerton** Byrant, linking us to the Egertons one more time. He married a **Christie**, as in Julie Christie, Agatha Christie, and Christie's auction houses.

Also see Frederick Bryant of Mayborough, Australia, whose daughter Maria married Berkeley Reynolds **Moreton**, 5th Earl of Ducie, in 1903. His father was the Colonial Secretary of Queensland. The 1st Earl had married a **Herbert**, daughter of the Earl of Carnarvon, linking us to them again. It also link us immediately to the **Montagus**, Dukes of Manchester, and the **Villiers**.

Also see Reginald Bryant of NSW, who married Elizabeth Lambert in 1944. She was the daughter of Nathaniel Lambert of **Anglesey** and Margaret MacDonald.

There is a **Martin James Bryant** of the peerage who married Lisa **Maude** in 1984. The Maudes are also Williamsons, Allens, Torpys, Wheelers and Kings/**Kingstons**, and we just saw that they are the **Viscounts Hawarden**. They were of Bowral (or Cowra), NSW. Although our Martin Bryant's genealogy and family is not given, my best guess is he is related closely to this Martin Bryant of the peerage.

Also see Patricia Bryant, who married Malcolm **Barr** in about 1960. That probably links us to the Barr-Smiths who we just saw in my third Christchurch paper. Her daughter married Matthew Rupert

Freud, great-grandson of Sigmund **Freud**, in 1991. She then married the 9th Earl **Spencer**, whose grandmother was Lady **Hamilton**. Her father was the Duke of Abercorn and her mother was Lady **Bingham**, daughter of the Earl of Lucan. See above.

Also see Julian Piers Bryant, who married Susan Page in 1955. She was the daughter of Anne **Murray**, descended from Murrays (Dukes of Atholl), Woodhouses, Bacons, **Pagets**, Smiths, and Olivers.

Also see Margaret Bryant, who married Brian Murray-Gourlay, 27th of Kincaig, in 1953.

Also see Venerable Mark Bryant, Archdeacon of Coventry (later Bishop of Jarrow), who married Elizabeth Eastaugh, daughter of Lady **Palmer** in 1976. Lady Palmer is the daughter of the 3rd Earl Palmer of Selbourne. They are also Cecils and Riddleys.

Also see Derek Bryant, who married Julia Favell in 1976. Her father is Commander Richard **Molyneux** Favell and her grandfather is Vice-Admiral Sir **Cecil Ponsonby Talbot**. This also links us to the Somersets and Fitzroys again.

Also remember Clara Bryant, wife of Henry Ford. They are in the British peerage, though we aren't told why.

Now, what are we told of Martin Bryant? Wiki tells us the father is Maurice, but gives no maiden name for the mother. I could find no maiden name anywhere. So she is also a ghost. She must also be an actor paid to play this part, since her story makes no sense. She encouraged Bryant to plead guilty while claiming he was innocent. Strangely, there are no other family members of Martin Bryant. His dad conveniently committed suicide a few years earlier, and no other family members except his sister Lindy are mentioned in the stories. But she changed her name and disappeared as well. She has never said a word.

I finally found [this website](#), which is pretty good in outlining major flaws with the Port Arthur story. Here are some of the top things “Elissa Hawke” told us in 2011, which I haven't hit:

- No DNA evidence from Byrant at the cafe.
- No blood splatters or DNA evidence taken from his body, clothing, or vehicle.
- Bryant's attorney John Avery took six months to convince Bryant to plead guilty. Which means. . . he originally pled not-guilty. They don't give you six months to sit there and think about it. John Avery himself pled guilty in 2008 to 130 counts of stealing and other misconduct. He was convicted and disbarred. What does this indicate? It indicates they needed someone crooked to propel the fake Bryant case in 1996, and Avery was their man. It indicates that because he had worked for Intel he thought he was permanently protected. It may indicate he failed to kickback the agreed-to percentages to the big boys, got caught, and was made an example of.
- The murder weapons were never linked to the murders. You can see why they didn't want to take this to trial.
- Only two witnesses identified Byrant a month later, *after* his face had been all over worldwide media.

Although all her evidence points at my conclusion and none point at real murders, Hawke nonetheless ignores that and implies the deaths were real. She links to a youtube video, now gone, which she grimly assures us shows police footage of 20 victims. But she admits the video was found in a second-hand shop in 2004. What she doesn't admit is that there is no way to identify the bodies as either the

victims listed, or as real murder victims. You could be seeing a pile of bodies taken from a morgue, for all you know. This tells me that Elissa Hawke isn't who she says she is. She is also an Intel front, and that posted picture isn't the author. They just chose a girly font to fool you. How do I know? Notice she calls herself a wanker. Girls don't call themselves wankers, because they can't wank. Wanking is jacking, and only guys can do that. Wanking isn't a general term for masturbation, it is specific to the male motion.

Now let me address this quibble, which I get occasionally in email. "The peerage is huge, with thousands of surnames. You could link any people this way. It is just a trick." Nope. Not a chance. There are 137+55 baronetcies in the British/Irish peerage, with 31 dormant or vacant, so just 161 total. That is 161 surnames that link directly to current baronets. But there are tens of thousands of surnames, even if we limit ourselves to English-speaking countries like the FiveEyes. And yet I have linked almost everyone involved at Port Arthur directly to a baronet. The odds of me being able to do that by chance are vanishing. Try this: go downtown and take a survey of the first fifty people you meet, taking only surnames. Then try my method: go to thepeerage.com and see how many you can link directly to baronets. At best you will get one or two out of 50, maybe a couple more than that if you are in Oxford or Isle of Man. But above I have linked almost every person in the event to the upper reaches of the peerage. There is no chance that is just a coincidence. Not only have I linked them the peerage, I have linked them tightly to one another, which is even more unlikely as a matter of chance. The number of crosslinks between these people is absolutely astonishing, and if you still aren't astonished there is no help for you.

The next thing I wish to address is the claim they can't manufacture huge events like this. It would require too many people and too much cooperation by the authorities. That claim isn't really worth a response, since it requires complete ignorance about. . . well, just about everything. But to make it short, I suppose you have been to the movies. They shoot big Hollywood movies on location all the time, in downtown New York City, say. Think of *Taxi Driver*, *The Professional*, etc. etc. How do they do that? Well, the studios get permission from the city to cordon off a city block, or part of a city block, and they pay for the police to help them do that. They then shoot very early in the morning, as soon as the Sun comes up, from say 5:30am to 6:30am. The city makes them promise they will be out of there by then, since that is when things really get crowded. You can't just shut down NYC. They then bring in a very large crew, and they do. . . well, anything they want. They can blow the shit out of stuff and fire fake weapons and have car chases and pretend to kill dozens of people, as long as they clean up everything afterwards or pay for damage. Well, with these events like Port Arthur, *they do exactly the same thing*. . . except that afterwards they sell it as real rather than fiction. They don't release it from Hollywood into a theater, they release it from CNN and FOX right into your little squawkbox. I don't see how that is hard to understand. Why would that be difficult? You might tell me the mayor of New York City wouldn't agree to selling fiction as fact, but he is a politician. That is what they do all day everyday. It is business as usual for these people, whether they are hoaxing you via politics, news, or whatever. The truth means NOTHING to these people, as you should know by now. They are upside down to the truth ALL THE TIME.

We have seen dozens of Google-promoted sites selling the theory Port Arthur was real, but done by dark forces in the government, with Bryant as a patsy. Just like with the Kennedy alternative theories. Strange that this theory outnumbers the "no one did it" theory by a million to one, isn't it? I have told you why that is, above. All these websites are CIA fronts. You may have noticed that [I linked to Wikileaks](#) for one piece of data above. Once you get there, you will find they are also selling the event as real, and they are surrounding it with as much spooky music as possible (also as usual). Notice they say this near the top of the page, as a lead-in:

All Port Arthur Massacre (PAM) researchers face essentially the same obstacle when they seek to show that the official narrative cannot be true. If the official story is not true, people ask, then why haven't eyewitnesses come forward to denounce it as a hoax and tell us what they saw? In my opinion, it is impossible to answer this question satisfactorily without presenting an overarching theory of the case.

It is not only *not* impossible to answer that question, it is very easy to answer that question. We have seen that this was a movie set, and I assume it was not shot in the afternoon. I assume it was shot very early in the morning, like Hollywood movies done on location in big cities. Therefore someone should analyze shadows in the fake films. My bet is they show very long shadows, indicating early morning, not afternoon. This would also explain why no witnesses have come forward: everyone there was planted. They were all paid extras, every last one of them. Remember, Leni Riefenstahl had 30,000 extras to work with in her Nazi films, and they admit that. *Ben Hur* also used thousands. It is not hard for Hollywood or any government to hire extras. Those extras are under contract, and I assume part of that contract is non-disclosure. If they blab later, they not only have to return their wages, they open themselves for breach of contract, as well as revocation of their SAG cards or other memberships. They would be permanently blacklisted, if not worse. Plus, there is no good reason for them to blab, since they know it was all fake. Their conscience doesn't bother them in that regard, since they have no blood on their hands. They don't feel required to finger the murderer, since there is no murderer; and they don't feel required to protect Bryant, since Bryant isn't a patsy and isn't in jail. He is just another actor from the families like them. Which also explains their silence. We have seen that all these actors, large parts and small, are from top families from the peerage. They are all related. And this is what they have been doing for centuries: faking these events is how they maintain their hegemony. They keep the commoners in line by scaring them silly several times a month. The commoners like you and me are kept squishy that way. We will then accept higher taxes, body scanners, and a million other daily squashings, indignities, and humiliations, all for the sake of "security". We will accept vaccines, fluoridated water, TV licensing (tax, UK), smart meters, toll roads, dental xrays, sobriety checkpoints, usurious loans, cell towers, CCTV cameras everywhere, bugged phones, tasers, power-tripping cops, censored websites, and an Intelligence squid that is now so overgrown it defies belief. The total Intelligence budget is now far larger than the military budget itself, though much of it is off the books. The spending is now so large it isn't even tracked. The accountants gave up long ago, and no audit would be possible since records aren't kept. The agencies basically take whatever they want, sky is the limit, and Congress rubberstamps it. We see so many fake events because these millions of agents have to justify their paychecks somehow. They get bored sitting in the dungeons of Langley, listening to eachothers phonecalls. To get out of the house and test the tech, this is what they do. They run their own gruesome home movies and then sell them to you as real. This is how they get their jollies. This is who they are. They are just as amazed as I am that you haven't figured this out yet.

They appear to be required by law to insert the truth prominently into everything they release, a sort of displayed disclaimer, so that if you decide to buy the story anyway, that is *your* bad. If the gods or alien overseers then land and haul them before a cosmic court, they can say, "Hey, we told them it was fiction! Every page of this stuff is riddled with clues that any monkey could see. So don't blame us".

I say that only partly in jest. There really does seem to be some rule to the game of that sort, though I don't know who makes the rules. Maybe they do that just to make themselves feel better. They perform the magic trick, then feel sort of bad that you bought it. So they perform it a second time in slow motion right in front of your face, tipping their hand to you every few seconds. Then they do it a

third time, just telling how they did it. When you still don't get it, they figure you deserve to be fooled. Fools deserve to be fooled. They should put that above the door at Langley, and for all I know they do.

I would expect several updates to this paper.

*If that video get taken down, it is of Kingston on ABC TV (Monday 8pm), admitting he is the one who told Bryant where to park that day.