

# THE POST



*by Miles Mathis*

*July 22, 2018*

I got around to watching last year's *The Post*, about the publication of the Pentagon Papers by the *Washington Post* in 1971. I wouldn't normally watch a film I knew to be propaganda, but in this case it tied into [my old paper on Watergate](#). So I felt it was my duty, in a way. I figured it would give me a chance for some new commentary and I was right.

Meryl Streep plays the publisher Katharine Graham and Tom Hanks plays editor Ben Bradlee. Comedians Bob Odenkirk and David Cross from HBO's *Mr. Show* both have supporting roles, which made me laugh.

But that wasn't the biggest laugh. That had to be when Hanks as Bradlee drove up in his little inexpensive white car, as if he can't afford anything else. As if the editor of *The Post* has to drive a Ford Falcon, or whatever that is. To me, this was a perfect indicator of the sort of conjob this film would be. The next worst groaner was Bradlee's daughter selling lemonade on the sidewalk, with the cups placed in a perfect row as if she had spaced them with a ruler. It was one of those sickening moments of fake Americana that litter Spielberg films, and they get worse the older Spielberg gets. They were bad enough in the 1980s, but now they simply drip with kitschy goo.

But these were just preludes to the pseudo-patriotic hogwash coming up, crescendoing scene by scene, until the end when there were literally violins and tears as minor characters talked about the founding fathers and the Constitution. Ugh.

If you saw the film and bought any of that, you may want to bow out of this paper now. You may also wish to check your dosages. You are way over-medicated. Or under-medicated, if you wish to continue believing the crap they will be putting out next year. If you intend to keep feeling good about America, you may wish to save some money on pharmaceuticals and purchase instead a couple of bricks and a white nappy, like the Gumby brain surgeon on Monty Python.



But if you *don't* believe in any of the old lies, and don't particularly want to, you may start by asking yourself if it was just a coincidence that *The Post* went public in 1971, the same week the Pentagon Papers came out. In the film they misdirect from that by manufacturing Katharine Graham's fear that the bankers would back out of the deal, but of course that didn't happen—because it was never a danger. They only created that subplot to keep you off this further burning question: was the timing staged purposely to benefit *The Post*, the CIA's hometown back-pocket paper? Of course it was.

You may also wish to closely analyze the scene where Ben Bagdikian visits Daniel Ellsberg in the hotel room with the entire Pentagon Papers laid out. The scene is a bit raw, isn't it? Meaning, it isn't convincing as theater. It is completely transparent, and you can almost see the scripts taped to the walls as the actors read from them, as in *Saturday Night Live* skits. Anyway, Ellsberg begins sanctimoniously explaining that the Papers were commissioned by the government because the Pentagon wanted academics and scholars to analyze Vietnam War policy. Right! Who believes this shtuff? Do you really think government agencies making war policy give a rat's behind what any scholars think? Do scholars like that even exist? Not in my experience. Scholars and academics of all kinds are paid by the government to confirm and promote its theories and plans, not question them. In the case that any questioning is done it is only done to create the illusion of bipartisanship and the illusion of choice. Ask yourself why the government would commission thousands of pages of bombshell incriminating evidence against itself, then make multiple copies, then leave the copies lying around in unlocked drawers? Does that sound like a good plan?

Also of interest is that not only was Ellsberg a Rand employee, which is the biggest red flag you could find, he was a Harvard Fellow. See [my paper on Chomsky](#) for more on Harvard Fellows. Ellsberg is an Ashkenazi Jew whose family allegedly converted to Christian Science. Given what we have discovered about the Eddys and Christian Science, that isn't much of a whitewashing. It just means that, like the rest, Ellsberg is pretending to not be Jewish anymore. Ellsberg is also a Marine. He worked for the Pentagon as well as Rand, working directly under Secretary of Defense McNamara. Do you really think such a guy is going to blow the whistle on the entire Vietnam War, targeting his own superior McNamara? And that the military is just going to let him get away with it? Remember, Ellsberg skated completely when the judge claimed to discover prosecutorial misconduct. Convenient. Didn't we just find the same thing in [yesterday's paper](#), where Cliven Bundy skated all charges for the same reason? Yep. We find it in a lot of these cases, since they prefer not to have to fake a prison term. We saw it with the Chicago Seven, who all skated, including Abbie Hoffman.

Plus, since Ellsberg was military, and the trial I just talked about was civilian, he should have been charged by the military. He was a lieutenant (or higher rank) working for the Pentagon—which is military. Why didn't they ever come after him with a court martial? He should have been tried for treason/sedition in a military court, with death as a possible sentence. But the military left him alone

because they knew the whole thing was a project and that he was doing his job.

Here's another anomaly everyone misses. The judge in the Ellsberg trial was Judge William Byrne. He was nominated by Nixon in 1971 and took his seat on May 20. The Pentagon Papers were first published June 13, just three weeks later. What are the odds? Do you think he might have been a plant in this project? Byrne had previously been the director of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest, so he already looks like a spook. He took that position in 1970, and held it only for about a year.

And ask yourself this: if the Pentagon Papers were such a bombshell, why didn't the War end almost immediately? The Papers were published in 1971, and the war ended in . . . 1975, about 20 years after it started. That's almost four years later, so apparently it wasn't as explosive as we are led to believe. Remember, it wasn't even the Pentagon Papers that brought down Nixon, although that is why they were manufactured. That failed and the CIA was actually forced to move onto the next phase of the project: Watergate, which did work. In the film, it is made to look like every President since Truman was snared by the Papers and irrevocably tarnished. But that isn't how they were reported at the time. Besides Nixon, LBJ was made the main goat, and that is because he had retired early against the wishes of the families. He failed to fulfill his contract, like J. D. Salinger and others, and so was fair game. I assume he had to fake his own death soon after (1973) to avoid further projects run against him.

The scene about “holding them accountable” is equally absurd and transparent. Hanks is talking to Streep, telling her about JFK's ([fake](#)) death, and he goes into the predictable spiel about the new patriotism in 1971 among reporters, where the old “cigar smoking in backrooms” and comradery between the press and the government won't cut it anymore. At this point I guess you the viewer are supposed to salute the flag and kiss an apple pie and plant a cherry tree and whatnot. But again, who in 2018 believes this? Who could still fall for this transparent Hollywood jingoism? Do you really believe *The Times* and *The Post* decided to make anyone accountable in 1971? C'mon! This is screenwriting for dummies.

The main point of the film is the same as the original point of the Papers: misdirection. Those who read the Papers or watch the film are made to think that the Presidents and Bob McNamara and all these other people were actually making decisions or were responsible for anything. They weren't. As now, the Presidents and cabinet members are just government front positions. They are people hired to read from Teleprompters and scripts. They are mainly actors from the families. They are fall guys, positioned to take just this kind of fake heat and play these games of deflection. Everything in both the Papers and the film is manufactured to keep your eyes off the real players and the real events. Everything of importance is hidden from view.

They hire Tom Hanks—even with a gruff voice still apparently the world's most likable guy—to play Ben Bradlee, and to convince you Bradlee was a white knight, fighting for the Constitution against bad old Nixon. Nothing could be further from the truth. Bradlee was the enemy of Nixon, but the truth ends there. Bradlee was a CIA mole planted at the *Washington Post*. No, even that is too tame. The entire *Washington Post* was a CIA creation from the first day, and everyone who worked there was an agent at some level. That is still true today, though it is also true of every other newspaper, TV station, movie studio, etc. Intelligence runs the entire media and always has, including *all* the arts.

Which is another reason the Papers were published, and that this film was made. Both make you think the press is free, when it isn't. *The Post* was just going public at the time and was a CIA-creation, so they needed the public to think it was independent. What better way to do that than to allow them to

publish this fake story, making them look like great patriots. And what better way to answer current suspicions than to try to confirm that earlier story by retelling it and further embellishing it in the Hollywood way, with Hanks, Steep, and the comics of Mr. Show.

I also have to say, as the spokesperson for my mother, that it is sad the way Katharine Graham is portrayed as weak and vacillating. Yes, she makes the decision to publish, but it is not clear why. We are made to think she said go almost on a whim, to get the thing over with, or to prove herself. I assume the spook writers wrote her this way to take the heat off her. It is made to look like she is in over her head. But although they may be protecting her, they actually blackwash her and all women in the process. They later have her quote Samuel Johnson on a woman preaching: “a **woman's preaching** is like a dog's walking on his hinder legs. It's not done well; but you are surprised to find it done at all.” I say I am the spokesperson for my mother because she would not be amused by that quote. She would wonder how it got into this film. I am sure she would be offended by this portrayal of Graham as well. I am surprised Streep wasn't offended by it, since according to the history I have read, Graham wasn't like this at all. It contradicts Deborah Davis' portrayal of Graham for one thing, and I trust her far more than I trust Spielberg's spook scriptwriters. This is no defense of Graham, you understand. Just the opposite. I am sure she was a towering bitch. But portraying her as a squishy grandmother should offend just about everyone. If she had been that sort of person, she wouldn't have come to work at all. She would have delegated all work to others and spent her time gardening. This isn't to say I think she made the decision to publish. That was part of the larger project and so was decided by the families and their operatives in Intel. But I am sure Graham was just as steely—just as big an asshole in her own way—as Bradlee or any of the others. So why not portray her that way? Streep can play that character, too. She plays it everyday as herself, as we see from her offscreen propaganda on a variety of issues, which she must know is fiction.



Did you know Katharine Graham was nee Meyer? Meaning? Yep, Jewish. Her father Eugene Meyer was Chairman of the Federal Reserve and first president of the World Bank. Wiki admits he was crypto until later in life, when he began to admit to his roots. Dodging that must have been pretty hard to do, seeing that his maternal grandparents were Levys and Newmarks. His grandfather Joseph Newmark was a rabbi who founded B'nai Jeshurun in New York and B'nai B'rith in Los Angeles, the latter being the oldest synagogue in the city (now Wilshire Boulevard Temple). Eugene's father was Marc Meyer, President of international banking firm Lazard Freres. So Katharine Graham came from huge money. Despite that, I am just surprised Spielberg didn't have her also driving around in a Ford Falcon.

Graham's mother was Agnes Ernst, sold as Lutheran but also Jewish. She was a bohemian (pseudo)intellectual who hung out with Einstein, Thomas Mann, Marie Curie, Eleanor Roosevelt, etc. She was also a promoter of Cezanne, John Marin, and Brancusi. Her best friends as a girl were Katharine **Nash** Rhoads and Marion Beckett, and together they were known as the three graces of the

Stieglitz circle. They were all extremely wealthy, with Rhoads' father being a top banker. This linked her to the Rhodes of South Africa, of course, and ties her to other parts of this paper.

Katharine Graham's sister was married to Pare Lorentz, FDR's chief filmmaker. According to Wiki

His service as a filmmaker for [US Army Air Corps](#) in World War II was formidable, including technical films, documentation of bombing raids, and synthesizing raw footage of Nazi atrocities for an educational film on the [Nuremberg Trials](#).

Note the strange wording there, where Lorentz “synthesized” raw footage of Nazi atrocities. How does an American filmmaker “synthesize raw footage of Nazi atrocities” for an educational film? We are told Lorentz reviewed over a million hours of footage about Nazi atrocities. Really? And where did he get a million hours of footage? The Nazis just provided it to him, I guess, to blackwash themselves. Curiously, the film *Nuremberg* that came out of it wasn't created for Allied audiences. It was created to play in Germany after the war, where it rolled almost non-stop for two years. It wasn't released in the US until 1979, and you probably haven't seen it. Why not? Because with your trained modern eye you could probably pick it apart not only as propaganda, but as a complete fake. We are told that Lorentz “was the leading advocate of government-sponsored documentary films”. Let's see, wouldn't that be the definition of propaganda? In 1936 Lorentz promoted the Tennessee Valley Authority in *The River*. It should have been subtitled *Or What Used to be the River*. Although Lorentz came from this superwealthy set of families that included the Meyers and Grahams, he is still sold as some sort of filmmaker for the downtrodden masses. See his Wiki page, which ends with his film *Rural Co-op*. Gag.

Katharine Graham's husband Philip Graham is also worth looking at, although he appears in the film only as a previous suicide in 1963. He was the half-brother of Bob Graham, former Governor of Florida and US Senator. They were also from wealth of course, since their father Ernest made a bundle **mining** in South Dakota. [This ties us back to [my paper on Custer](#), though I won't pursue that here.] Despite that, all sources, even EIR, continue to claim Graham was a “commoner”. Was he? Of course not. These Grahams are scrubbed at Geni, with Ernest's father given as <private>. But we know from the scrubbed Geni pages that they were also **Proctors**, which of course takes us back to. . . Salem. I had to fit it in here, didn't I? Wasn't hard, as usual. And we can also connect these Grahams to the peerage, since Ernest's great-grandparents were cousins. So we can walk around the blockade at Geni. His great-grandmother was also a Graham of the same family, and they were from Ingleton in North Yorkshire. Ingleton is the center of the coalfields, owned at the time by the Walkers. These Walkers are closely related to the 1700 Grahams in the peerage, including several Baronets and the Dukes of Montrose. This also links us to the Manners, Carnegies, Montagues, Beresfords, Douglas-Hamiltons and just about everyone else. The Duke at the time of our story was the 7<sup>th</sup>, James Angus Graham, active in Rhodesia and South Africa, including at. . . **Rand mines**. Since we just saw mines and the Rand corporation, that should jump out at you. Both the Rand mines and the mines in South Dakota were gold mines. It is worth looking at a list of Randlords—those who first controlled the gold and diamond mines in Southern Africa. Among other names, we find **Hammond**, Joel, Eckstein, Lewis, Marks (Marx), **Meyer**, **Philips**, Rhodes, Robinson and Taylor. All Jewish, I assume. For kicks, let's click on Sir Carl Meyer, 1<sup>st</sup> Baronet, died 1922. Family painted by John Singer Sargent.



From Hamburg, son of a **Hahn**, moved to London, married a Levis. [Which reminds us Levis may be a variant of Lewis. Never thought of that.] Worked for Rothschild and DeBeers. Governor of the National Bank of Egypt and board member of HSBC. Any relation to the Meyers of the *Washington Post*? Of course. I am not finding these links by accident. It is way too easy.

Most people don't know that Graham [was also a spook from way back](#). In 1942 he was already working as assistant to Wild Bill Donovan in the OSS. In 1944 he moved to Special Branch under Col. McCormick. Special Branch was even more secret than OSS. In China, Graham just happened to be working closely with E. Howard Hunt and Richard Helms, among other top spooks. In the 1950s Graham was in Washington hobnobbing with the Georgetown set, including the Alsops, Wisner, Acheson, Bissell, Barnes, Clifford, Rostow, Cord **Meyer**, Angleton, Harriman, Frankfurter, Reston, Dulles, and Nitze—most or all of them Jewish spooks.

You also may wish to look closely at Phil Graham's most quoted quote, used in the film: **The news is a first rough draft of history**. Not only is that not deep, it is spooky. It implies the newspapers aren't reporting history, they are *writing* it. Which requires a rough draft: straight reportage, or fiction?

If you are thinking Phil Graham was another faked death, you aren't alone. He was only 48 and had stated for the record he was seeking a divorce so that he could marry Robin **Webb**. My assumption is that he did so, leaving the *Washington Post* and all those crazy bastards behind for good. He had enough money from his own family and didn't need the Meyer money. He probably moved to South America or the Caribbean, being much happier. If you want to know where he went, track where Robin Webb went after 1963. We are told she went to Australia, but did she stay there? Curious that the death certificate and medical examiner's reports were never released. This alone points to either a fake or a cover-up, and probably the former. Anton Chaitkin, Larouche's righthand man (both Jewish and related to all the same people), [sued for release](#) of the documents in 1986, but was apparently rebuffed by the judge (no follow-up report was available at EIR).

Also remember that Phil Graham had recently gotten involved in COMSAT, which may have interested him more than *The Post*. He had done the newspaper thing for 17 years and was probably weary of it. COMSAT was incorporated in 1963, same year Graham supposedly committed suicide. It has branches in Mexico and South America. Curiously, we have links between COMSAT and McKinsey & Co. See

footnote below, where we find the screenwriter of *The Post* Josh Singer working at McKinsey before becoming a screenwriter. In researching that, I stumbled across Ragat Gupta, the managing director of McKinsey from 1994 to 2003. It stood out because he was the first foreign-born director of the company. He has also been on the boards of Goldman Sachs, Proctor and Gamble, American Airlines, and the Gates Foundation. In 2012 he was convicted of securities fraud and allegedly spent two years in jail. Well, a Ramesh Gupta was also the director of COMSAT from 1995-2000. After that he was Managing Director of Lockheed Martin Global Telecommunications. And that isn't all. We have a third link to the Guptas in this paper, since Wiki has a page on the Gupta family, where we learn they are connected to. . . South African mines. They have vast estates there and in Dubai. They are also linked to Texas. They are closely tied to former South African President Zuma, and have been accused of vast corruption, including being part of a shadow government. Their mining company is Oakbay, which mines gold, diamonds, and other resources. Of course this links them to the Rand mines and Randlords.

Another possibility is that after 17 years at *The Post*, Graham wanted a juicier assignment. The faked death may have been cover for that. He needed to disappear completely and arise under an alias—with a different haircut and beard perhaps? Given that he was buddies with E. Howard Hunt and Richard Helms from way back, Graham may have even been involved in Watergate personally, as a director of that program. Wouldn't that be rich? Phil Graham as a sort of Deepthroat, director of the CIA project beneath Watergate, feeding manufactured info to his own paper as his own ghost?

So how could RAND corporation fit into this? We are told that stands for **R**esearch **a**nd **D**evelopment. Does it? I don't think so. I think it refers to the Rand in South Africa. Why? Because RAND was started by **Douglas** Aircraft, founded by Donald Wils Douglas. But wait, didn't we just see the Douglasses related to the Grahams in the peerage? Yep. They are Dukes of Hamilton. Graham, the 6<sup>th</sup> Duke of Montrose married the daughter of Douglas-Hamilton, Duke of Hamilton, in 1906. It is admitted that Donald Douglas of Douglas Aircraft came from bankers of Scotland, though his Wiki page expects us to believe his father was just an assistant cashier at National Park Bank. Instead he probably ran the place. In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, that bank in New York did more commercial business than any other bank in the country. In 1901 it was reported to have almost a billion in surplus—which was a lot of money back then. Although Fish and Astor were early directors, James **Hamilton** Fulton was the president of the bank in the 1920s, and his name links us to the Douglas-Hamiltons. The bank merged with Chase in 1929.

The 7<sup>th</sup> Duke of Montrose's wife was a Sellar, which name we just saw in my previous paper. Andrew Lang's father was a Sellar on his mother's side, which is not surprising since Lang was connected to the Dukes of Sutherland.

Which brings us back to Tom Hanks. They admit Hanks is the third cousin of Abe Lincoln, which is a very close relationship. Of course that ties us to all the Presidents, since they are all closely related—far more closely than is usually admitted. For instance, Tom's grandmother is named Gladys **Ball**, which links us right to George Washington. Tom is also related to the Denchs, linking him to actress Judi Dench—who played Queen Victoria. Apropos, since Dench is related to that queen as well as the current one. Dench claims to be a Quaker, which fits with everything else here, doesn't it? Geni scrubs Tom's mother, but she is a Frager. See for example [Robert Frager](#), Jewish, founder of the Institute of Transpersonal Psychology in Palo Alto. In other words, another spook. Also see [Joseph Frager](#), Jewish doctor and community Orthodox leader in New York City. Also, according to *Forward* in a 2018 article, a paid agent of the nation of Qatar. Tom Hanks is also a Rowlands and a Vaughan. The name Vaughan may link him to David Vaughan Icke. The name Rowlands may link him to J. K. Rowling,

since her family was Rowlands. See [my paper on her](#) for more on that. If we go way back, Tom is a FitzHugh, a Strange, a Willoughby and a Grey, taking him straight to the top of the peerage in the 1400s and linking him to kings. One more generation back and he is a FitzAlan, meaning he is descended in direct line from William the Conqueror.

All this means Tom Hanks is related to Ben Bradlee and the Grahams. Bradlee was a Boston Brahmin, and his middle name was **Crowninshield**. So you see why I laughed at his little Ford Falcon. He was from huge wealth and privilege, being descended from Choates and Crowninshields and de Gersdorffs, so he also has many kings as ancestors—and they are the same ones that are ancestors of Tom Hanks, the kings of England, Germany and Denmark. We have seen that over and over. Remember how Mel Gibson is related to several of his characters, including William Wallace and Fletcher Christian? Remember how Brad Pitt played Benjamin Button, and one of his recent ancestors is a Button? Warren Beatty is related to his character John Reed from *Reds*.

Also interesting to discover Ben Bradlee's great-uncle was [Isaac Rand Thomas](#). Do you still think RAND stands for Research and Development? No, these are the Rands who founded Charleston (part of Boston) in the 1600s, before that from Ipswich, Suffolk. They were related to the Clarkes of Finningham. Before that they were from Bedford. Geni lists the de Rands in Bradlee's line back to 1250 in Lancashire, which indicates to me that the Rand in South Africa was named for this family. All the women in this line are scrubbed by Geni, but my guess is the Rands are related to other top families like the Stanleys. They try to break this link at Geni, since Isaac Rand Thomas' grandfather is given as a Read, not a Rand. But his father is a Rand, so something strange is going on. Also remind yourself of Rand-McNally; Remington Rand/ Sperry Rand typewriters, ledgers, and computers; Frank Rand of the International Shoe Company; and Ayn Rand. Since Geni takes the Rands back to 1250, we would expect more information from thepeerage.com, but we get nothing. So, nothing on why the Rand in South Africa is named that, and nothing on the Rands at thepeerage? Strange. However, we do get one clue. Rand means edge or **shield** in German. Which reminds us of Rothschild, which is supposed to mean red sign or shield. Since the Rothschilds were active in the Rand, we may have a connection here. The Rands may be Rothschilds, or the reverse. Ayn Rand was really a Russian-Jewish Rosenbaum, meaning roses-tree or red tree. We are told she chose the name Rand because it sort of matched her Jewish name when written in vowelless Cyrillic. That is a clue everyone has missed. She chose it because she already had the roses or red and needed the shield. Rosenrand=Rothschild. Her paternal grandparents are scrubbed in the genealogies, and I suggest one of them was a Rothschild. That would explain a lot, wouldn't it? For one thing, it would explain why Dorothy Parker took the time to trash *Atlas Shrugged* with the famous quote (which Parker apparently borrowed): “This is a novel that should not be tossed aside lightly. . . it should be thrown with great force”. True, but Parker was also a Rothschild. Only competitive cousins can be so catty.

Something else occurred to me moments later. The old name was not Rand, it was *de* Rand. Alternatively, Durand, Durrand, Durrant, or Durant. The Baronets Durand were created in 1892, but they were actually Percys, Earls of Beverly, who had taken their mother's name. This Marion Durand is scrubbed and comes out of nowhere. The earliest Durant I could find in the peerage was a George Durant, otherwise scrubbed, whose daughters married peers. One married a Blakett son of a Stewart, and the other married the son of General Norcott, whose mother was a Gordon. The 1<sup>st</sup> Baronet Durrant was created in 1784. They are related to Randalls and are traceable back to about 1550. They later married the Steenbergens and the Stracey Baronets. So we can't trace any of these families back to the de Rands of 1250. Our only clue here is the Randalls, so the Rands may have been Randalls.

This allows me a short diversion (within a diversion). Some of you will remember the poem *Lord*

*Randall*, which some of us read in school. It is anonymous from the 1600s. Fewer of you will know that Bob Dylan's song *A Hard Rain's a-Gonna Fall* is based on it. Since it was allegedly written in 1962 when Dylan was only 20, that is somewhat hard to believe. Since he only had one year of college, it is even harder to believe. Is this another one that Leonard Cohen penned for him? Who knows? But it is something to consider.

Now, if we return to Ben Bradlee's genealogy, we find out why John Singer Sargent painted the Meyer family portrait above. The Sargents are in Ben Bradlee's recent lines. We can also tie the Singer to Josh Singer, screenwriter for *The Post*.

As for Hanks, let's just admit he stunk the place up in *The Post*. He wasn't convincing as Bradlee for a second: he was just Tom Hanks in a bad toupee faking a gravelly voice and wrinkling his brow. I don't really like saying that since I used to like Hanks. Who didn't like him in *Big* or *Splash*? Those are the roles he was made for, not the late-period agitprop he is now known for. I perhaps shouldn't say "late-period" since he went this direction as early as he could, with the awful *Bonfire of the Vanities* (Tom Wolfe) in 1990 and *Apollo 13* in 1995. He apparently had no qualms about being an actor/agent from the beginning. Like the rest, he accepted it as his birthright, or birth destiny. I assume he knows he is selling fake history, although it is remotely possible some of them don't know that. If Hanks doesn't know he is selling fake history, he is certainly aware of his links to all these people and events.

I would say the evidence is strong many of them do know they are selling fake events, since we see how it effects them. Remember when Anthony Hopkins went into a funk after *Silence of the Lambs*? I saw him in interviews and read him perfectly: what he didn't say to the camera I saw in his eyes. He was ashamed to be involved in that, and rightly so. He knew he was selling fake serial killers, and he knew he was too good to be doing it. He even quit the business for a while, remember, but that didn't last. Something was stronger than his scruples.

What about Meryl Streep? You are going to love this. At Geni her mother is said to be Mary **Wolf** Wilkinson, daughter of Harry **Rockafellow** Wilkinson. Not Rockefeller, but Rockafellow. Again, the shit they expect you to believe. Geni gives us no clue how Harry came by that middle name, since none of his ancestors are Rockafellows. The name Wolf, though given, is also scrubbed. Mary Wilkinson's mother is a Wolf and her father is given, but it stops there. The McFaddens and Strains also go nowhere. They do admit Streep is related to William Penn, but although the Penns are now Jewish, they try to deny Streep is Jewish. I'm sorry, has anyone *seen* Meryl Streep? I had always assumed they admitted she was Jewish, but they don't. Amazing. The reason they scrub the name Wolf is because it is Jewish. And the Rockafellow dodge is just pathetic. Streep is obviously a Rockefeller and they just fudged it. How did they think this would work?

But it gets deeper. Wiki doesn't tell you this, but Meryl *does* think she is Jewish. Before she went on Faces of America and was DNA tested by Henry Gates, she said she thought she was Jewish and Dutch. That's a bit refreshing. Funny then that Wiki sells her as German and English. Maybe they do that because Gates informed her she wasn't Jewish at all. He said she was related to Stephen Colbert, Eva Longoria, and Mike Nichols, but was not Jewish. Right. Except that they are *also* Jewish, and so is Gates. Gates told her she was also descended from Quakers, and we know what that means. But Gates pretends not to know what it means. No doubt that is her Wolf line, since the Wolfs and Foxes are closely related, and a Fox (Fuchs) founded the Quakers. Anyway, this tells us what to think of these DNA tests and of the Faces of America program. More misdirection. Did Gates tell her anything about the name Rockafellow? Of course not, since it is an obvious fudge. With more digging, we discover Streep is also an **Amsberger** and a **Zeltmann**. A Zeltmann, but no Jewish blood? Oivay! Also a

Scarborough. [Also a Walker and a Lacy](#). . . which links us to the people above. Specifically, it links us to the Grahams, Dukes of Montrose. See for example [Col. John fforde](#) (sic), son of Maj. Charles **Ford** and Constance de Lacy, who married Violet Graham, daughter of the 6<sup>th</sup> Duke of Montrose, in 1947. I guess you see what that means: Streep is also related to her character in the film. She has to know that.

Of course Streep's acting skills are not in question. I don't like her anymore, but I still think she is the greatest actor/actress of all time, by a wide margin. Anyone who has seen *Sophie's Choice* will find that hard to deny. Streep can disappear into a role like no one else, not even Daniel Day Lewis. [The only competition she has is from herself, in films like *Out of Africa*. Or maybe Bronson Pinchot as Balki Bartokomous. Just kidding.] Kevin Kline also did his best work in *Sophie's Choice*, trying to keep pace with Streep. He has admitted that. However, finding out later the book and film were propaganda sort of ruined the whole thing for me. Oh well. Fortunately my life is not defined by watching movies. I can let go of even my favorite films with hardly a whimper. Giving away a kitten is far harder than losing a famous actor.

*The Post* reminds me so much of 2015's [premier spook film \*Spotlight\* it is scary](#). I can just see the same Langley writing team behind both—a top team admittedly, not without talent. In the first, Ben Bradlee, Jr. was made into a hero. Here, Ben Bradlee, Sr. is the hero. But that isn't suspicious, is it? And guess what, a quick search on that shows that Josh Singer is credited as one of the top two writers for both films. Singer, Singer. Isn't that one of the pseudonyms of Woody Allen? Yes, he was Alvy Singer in *Annie Hall*. Make of that what you will.\* Singer also wrote *The Fifth Estate*, about Wikileaks—more proof that is a controlled leak. He is also top writer for the upcoming *First Man*, where Neil Armstrong will be the big fake hero. That one is meant to prop up another dying franchise. So Singer is in the very highest echelon of Intel scriptwriters. He is the best they've got, so any time you see his name in the credits you know you are in for grade-P Propaganda of the finest quality. But you already knew that when you saw Steven Spielberg's name on *The Post*. He will be the executive producer of *First Man* so oil up the plastic suit and get ready for another fantastic dunking in kitschy goo.

More proof this was a spook script is the way it falsified history to the benefit of *The Post*. This has been commented on before me, mostly from *Times* reporters. Although *The Times* is also a spook newspaper going back more than a century, *The Post* holds a special place in the heart of Langley, since it is just across town and is connected by actual tentacles. So the film goes to great lengths to glorify *The Post*, while subtly denigrating *The Times*. They are the secondary opposition in the film after Nixon, and almost come across as the bad guys in a couple of scenes.

I will be told that many of the other top newspapers published the Papers right after *The Post* did. Weren't they patriotic, at least? No. They were also owned by the CIA. You aren't keeping up. This was 1971. The CIA had owned all media since the early 1950s. All media had been owned by the plutocrats and their agencies since the founding of the country, and even before. [[See my paper on Ben Franklin](#) and remember that he was a newspaper man and admitted spy.] And was the Supreme Court decision in favor of *The Post* and *The Times* also part of the project? What do you think?

In the courtroom scene, a government witness states with great gravity that “nothing less than the integrity of the Presidency is at stake”. Yes, precisely, since the Pentagon Papers project was aimed directly at Nixon. It was *meant* to bring him down by attacking the integrity of the Presidency. The fact that the office of President would be permanently tarnished was not thought to be a problem. In fact, we may assume it was another desideratum of the CIA, which was flush with power and was by then just toying with Presidents. Besides, they probably figured they could rebuild trust in the

President anytime they needed to. The President was a plastic punching clown they could deflate and reinflate at will. In that they turned out to be wrong. Nor did they see that losing trust in the President was the first step in a slide to losing trust in everything, which would end up biting them in the butt. Propaganda can't work without trust, so that the entire propaganda machine they spent centuries building and perfecting is now in jeopardy. In fact, I would say it is irreparably broken, which leaves them in quite a pickle.

Some still won't understand why the government would out itself in such a prominent project. How could that not backfire? Well, it *did* backfire in the longterm, as we are witnessing now. But at the time it was not seen as a great danger because the government *wasn't* outing itself. The government was blackwashing Nixon and some of its previous actors, but since all these actors were just unimportant frontmen—hired to receive such flack—this was little more than business as usual. They have always wanted your eyes on the Presidents and Congress and all the other actors, to keep your eyes off the real governors and real projects. Whether you like your Presidents or not didn't matter anymore, as long as they drew your attention. It was found that negatives were more sexy and better drew attention, so after Eisenhower, say, they moved more and more to that plan. We are still in it, as you see with Trump, chosen as a towering negative.

Plus, as I have shown before, we have always seen signs of splits in Intel. We saw them in Watergate and we see them in current events. In Gerry's recent exposé on the Ancient Spooks, he states that the ruling families merged and allied thousands of years ago, which is mostly true. Very few of the wars of history have been what we have been told. But that doesn't mean there isn't squabbling at lower levels. These families do jostle for power in agencies and among agencies. We have seen that the CIA was finalizing its hegemony in the 60s and 70s, stamping out some late resistance from the Pentagon, the White House, and the FBI. That is what the Pentagon Papers and Watergate are really about. To achieve this coup, the CIA used some tactics that some may now regret, though the heads seem still not to have learned the lesson. Remember, the strongest arm of CIA at the time was the arm that was involved in Operation Chaos, and those guys apparently fell in love with Chaos for its own sake. It has been accelerating ever since. They saw it as an incredible cash cow, which it is. However, because they were so flush with power, they ignored the longterm downside, which becomes more obvious every year. Once people stop believing the news, they are harder to manage. Even in a time of manufactured chaos, the governors still need to herd people around at will. Or, to say it even more strongly, in times of manufactured chaos it becomes *even more important* to be able to control people. Fake chaos has the danger of quickly devolving into real chaos, which the governors want no more than you do. They also don't want to have to resort to violence to maintain order, one because it doesn't work that well financially, and two because it makes them look bad. It blows cover. The ideal spot for spooks is a society like the US in the 1950s, where everyone is completely oblivious to the machinery around them. The profits then were high though not astronomical, and stability was also very high. Now, profits are higher, but stability is barely holding. What will they do? Probably what they always do: push too far and precipitate a real crisis for themselves. The plutocrats never lose as a whole, you will say, and that too is true. But given families and given factions do lose in times like this. We can only hope the worst faction loses big and loses soon. The signs are it will.

\*As you are making it, notice Josh Singer is given no parents at Wikipedia. Also notice that he studied economics and mathematics at Yale and has an MBA and JD from Harvard. He seems a little overeducated to be a scriptwriter, doesn't he? He has worked at McKinsey, which had revenue above \$10 billion in 2018. It is one

of the largest management consultant firms, and we soon find this: “McKinsey was the first management consultancy to hire recent college graduates, rather than experienced managers.” I smell a rat. Or, what I smell is another CIA front and agent recruiting center. More evidence is found on its Wiki page. All employees are called “partners” and operate under a one-firm policy. Each partner is assigned a mentor. Is he also assigned a codename and a security clearance?