

[return to updates](#)

The Salem Witch Trials

were not what we have been told



by Miles Mathis

First published October 19, 2015

As usual, this is just my opinion, based on my personal reading of the facts given to us.

As my best readers will remember, I suggested [in a recent paper](#) that the famous witch trials of history may have been faked as cover for Intelligence projects. In this paper, I will show evidence that suggestion is true, at least regarding the Salem event.

In that paper on the Occult, witchcraft in the 17th century in Europe came up as a tangential topic, and through that I was led to remind myself that it was also a topic in this past century (the 20th). I remembered that Arthur Miller debuted his play *The Crucible* in 1953. This reminded me that the Witchcraft Act in England was repealed in 1951 and that Gerald Gardner started Wicca in 1954. Those close dates seemed more than a coincidence, so I suggested maybe they weren't. If *The Crucible* came out at that time as support for current projects, then it was possible that the Salem Witch trials were also a project. I didn't have time to pursue it in that paper, so I am going to pursue it here.

Of course, if *The Crucible* play was part of a project in 1953, then the 1996 film—which Miller also wrote—would also be a project. We will look at that possibility near the end of this paper.



The first bit of evidence getting us into this mystery is the bio of Reverend Samuel Parris. He is our first skeleton key, as it were. If you will remember, Parris was the new minister in Salem. His daughter and niece were two of the three girls who started the whole affair with their antics and accusations. In addition, the slave Tituba was in his household. Parris brought her and her mate John from Barbados, where they had been family servants. Curiously, Parris' bio before Salem is almost never studied or mentioned. Only one book deals with the Parris family to any extent, that being Larry Gragg's 1990 book *A Quest for Security: the Life of Samuel Parris, 1653-1720*. Since 2013 there has been [a Master's Thesis by Melinda Baker](#) posted on the internet which quotes from this book, and I will link you to it.

Samuel Parris has red flags all over him. I count four already: 1) two of the girls were his, 2) Tituba was also his, 3) he had not been long in Salem, 4) his bio has been suppressed in most stories. But there are many more. He came from London, where his father was a rich merchant.

Thomas [Parris] was a “London cloth merchant with peripheral interest in commerce and real-estate on the island colonies of Ireland and Barbados.”

Samuel and his family had been living on large family plantations in Barbados, which were used to grow sugar. [You may remember we have seen sugar come up twice in recent papers: once with John Reed's billionaire grandfather, who was importing sugar from Hawaii to Portland, Oregon, in the mid-1800s. Then with Charlie Bluhdorn, the financier behind the movie *Reds*, who owned large parts of the Dominican Republic.] The Parris family was involved in the slave trade, and not only owned many slaves on their plantations, but dealt in slaves for profit.

We are told they were “radical Protestants”. Since Samuel is sold to us as a Puritan, I find it strange to hear his family called radical Protestants. Puritans were *Reformed* Protestants, not Radicals. It is also worth noting that Puritans were Millenarians, which we studied [in my recent paper on the Kabbalah](#). What this means in this context is that the Puritans in this century were influenced by 17th century Jewish prophecy, by which this specific end-time belief had been promoted by those such as Menasseh ben Israel. In that paper, I showed you how Millenarianism was tied to British and Jewish Intelligence and the various schemes of the day. In that context, the words “radical Protestant” are already *potential* red flags. That is to say, they *may* be indication of Intelligence.

Other early red flags on Samuel Parris include his matriculation at Harvard, which had opened only 30 years earlier. We have seen in previous papers that Harvard has been a spook school from the beginning, and we will see it again here. A couple of years before Samuel entered Harvard, his uncle John died, leaving his estates to Samuel's father. That uncle was also rich, being a merchant and partner in the family businesses. We are told by Melinda Baker [p. 16] that the family fortune had plummeted in the 1650s due to Royalists expelling planters from Barbados and claiming it for Charles I. But Royalists had *not* just taken over England in 1650, and Charles I was dead. She must mean Charles II, but even so Royalists weren't taking over anything in 1650. In the early 1650s Cromwell was crushing the Royalists everywhere, including Scotland, and the Empire was in the hands of the Protestants. So there is no reason for Protestants to have been thrown out of Barbados during those years. You will say Baker meant 1660 instead of 1650, but that can't be right either since she admits in the next paragraph that Samuel's father Thomas was living permanently in Barbados at the end of the 1660s. Plus, if the Parris family had just been ruined financially by Royalists, how did Samuel get into Harvard? As now, Harvard was both expensive and very exclusive. They wouldn't have let a ruined Puritan in.

None of what Baker tells us makes any sense, though I assume she is just copying it from Gragg. She tells us the uncle John was thrown out of Barbados in 1650, while the father Thomas wasn't. But they are brothers in the same business: why would one be thrown out and the other not? Then she admits uncle John still had his land at his death in 1660, and bequeathed it to Thomas. But if he had it 1660, then it couldn't have been confiscated by Royals in 1650, right? It appears Gragg and Baker are trying to convince us the Parris family fortunes fell in those years, but they aren't doing a very good job of it.

Also a red flag is a quote by Samuel's father to the effect that he decided to send Samuel to Harvard "rather than expose him to the prelacy or lewd temptations at Oxford or Cambridge". Why is that a problem? Because after 1662 Puritans in England had completely separated from mainstream society. In that year most Puritan clergy quit their positions, and this dissent lasted for the rest of the decade. There was no separation of church and state at that time, or church and college, and both Oxford and Cambridge were still religious institutions, graduating many clergymen. Since Samuel's father was sending him to college to study for the clergy, he would not wish him to go to Oxford or Cambridge for that reason, not for the reasons stated. At Oxford or Cambridge he would be expected to "conform", that is, not be a dissenter. Neither college would admit a dissenter, and no dissenter would wish to enter a conforming divinity program. For this reason, the quote of Thomas is a big clue. It indicates the Parrises were either not serious Puritans, or were not Puritans at all. To me, they are already looking like pretenders.

You will tell me Samuel wasn't interested in divinity at that time, but it doesn't matter whether he was or not. My analysis is the same either way, since all real Puritans at the time based almost every action on religious ideas. "Radical" Puritans wouldn't have considered sending any son to Oxford or Cambridge in those years, since walking through the doors would have been considered an act of conformation. And dissenters were excluded by law from English universities. This was true even after the Toleration Act of 1688, by which King William loosened some of the restrictions of the previous decades. The Act did not apply to dissenters, that is, Puritans.

Ms. Baker tells us Thomas died in 1673, leaving his estates in England and Ireland to Samuel's brother John. But to Samuel he left the estates in Barbados. These estates included the estates of the uncle as well, remember, so Samuel should have been very wealthy. We are told his wealth from these estates was about £7000, and since we are told you could buy a house for £50, you can see how much money

that was in those days. I suspect he was far wealthier than that.

In 1681, just a decade before the Salem event, Parris was living in Boston and was listed as a merchant. Not a minister, a merchant. He then married Elizabeth Eldridge, a great beauty. This explains that mystery, since some have wondered why a great beauty would be married to a small-town Puritan minister. Well, she *didn't* marry a small-town Puritan minister. She married a rich Boston merchant.

Gragg and Baker then try to make us think Parris hit hard times in 1683, but again don't do a very good job. We are told he was sued for failure to repay a £420 loan (+ £50 penalty). Baker tells us Parris dragged it out, taking 3 months to repay. But wait, that is the price of almost ten houses he paid back in three months. Sounds like he wasn't really up against any wall. Any person in hard times would have been completely ruined by a suit like that, but it doesn't seem to have affected Parris much at all.

The next red flag is a doozie. We are up to the year 1685, and Parris is still in Boston with no BA, much less a Masters of Divinity. He never graduated from Harvard. But he is supposed to be preaching in Salem by late 1688. This is a problem because a Masters normally takes *at least* 3 years of study. Baker admits that in her text. When and where did Parris get the requisite degrees to be a minister? Rather than address that question, the histories rush by it. We are told that Parris began preaching in the frontier community of Stow in the summer of 1685. However, he vacated that position by the fall, "and no evidence exists to show whether or not Parris secured another ministerial position over the next three years" [p. 23]. What is more, "while pursuing his ministerial career, Parris maintained his mercantile business in Boston".

What? None of that makes any sense. You couldn't ask for a bigger series of red flags in this event. Just so you know, [to be an ordained minister normally requires a seminary degree of some sort](#). Baker tells us it can be done in three years (*after* getting a BA or BS), but the standard time is four years. Those studying part time will take up to eight years. Although the rules in 1685 were not precisely what they are now, they were similar. In no case could someone who dropped out of Harvard just start preaching immediately. He could start preaching on street corners, but no congregation is going to hire a college drop-out with no Church experience, much less ordain him.

Elizabeth Eldridge is another red flag, but she has been hidden by her name. The name changed from Eldred to Eldredge to Eldridge, so to find her and her ancestors you have to [search on Elizabeth Eldred](#). Her great uncle was the famed John Eldred, an East India Company merchant hired to found Virginia Colony. Through him we again have ties to the Jewish merchants, since the East India Company was stiff with them. Her father was [Samuel Eldred](#), which may explain why she also married a man named Samuel. The Eldreds were also extremely wealthy, and they founded Chatham [Cape Cod], among many other places. So in 1689, Samuel Parris not only had his own considerable fortune, he also married into the Eldredge fortune. The history books have taken some effort to scrub this information.

So basically, we haven't got toe-in on this event and already the whole thing has fallen apart. We are supposed to believe that this rich asshole slave trader from Boston with a rich gorgeous wife is going to waltz into a town of almost 2,000 people and convince them he is a minister? In the books and movies, they lead to you believe Salem is a farming community of maybe 50 people, but it wasn't. It had almost 1,000 people by 1640. It is and was only about ten miles from Boston, so the people weren't rubes. Boston itself only had about 8,000 residents in 1692, so Salem wasn't small. It was about one-quarter the size of Boston. It wasn't a "frontier community" that would allow a minister to preach without a degree or any experience. And being that large, it wouldn't be desperate for ministers, grabbing anyone who showed up. A candidate would have been checked. I will be told Parris was in

Salem Village, now Danvers, but my point is the same. Even if Salem Village was only a few hundred people (Baker tells us around 500), the church in that village was under the control of Salem, and Parris couldn't have snuck in without their notice. [Even a town of 500 wasn't small in those days, as you can again see by comparing it to Boston. Boston was only 16 times larger than Salem Village. In my opinion, Salem Village is misnamed—probably on purpose. They want you to think it was small, when it wasn't.] In fact, we are told four magistrates from Salem proper were present at Parris' ordination, and we are given their names: Nicholas Noyes, John Hathorn, Jonathan Corwin, and Bartholomew Gedney. Despite that, we know Parris couldn't have been ordained by anyone, since he hadn't any qualifications.

At this point in her narrative, even graduate student Melinda Baker is smelling smoke, and in a footnote she begins to question some of Gragg's earlier implications. See footnote 92, where she admits Parris was still in a very high tax bracket in Boston in 1685, despite Gragg trying to imply he was financially strapped. Baker says,

Perhaps what Gragg was trying to convey earlier was that Parris was looking to change careers because he was tired of dealing with lawsuits. It's possible that when he said his 'good fortune had run out' he was referring to the large number of lawsuits that Parris [was] a party [to].

Yes, or maybe Gragg is being paid to spin.

Really, what I have discovered already is enough to kill the entire story, but I will continue. Did you know that one of the original accused skated completely? Do you want to guess who? It was Tituba, the slave, who allegedly taught the girls to conjure and pleaded guilty. "Someone" paid a fine and she walked. I really want you to stop and think about that for a while. The person you would think they would string up first is the only one who skates? We weren't told that in the play or movie, were we? Do you think it might be because the whole event was manufactured by Parris, and Tituba was in on it? That's what I think.

The backside of the trials also makes no sense. We are told Parris prosecuted these people for being witches, with 19 being hanged in 1692-93. In 1693 the village brought charges against him for his part in the trials, he apologized, but Increase Mather—a higher judge—vindicated him. He then resigned his position in 1696. Do you really think the village would bring charges against him but not dismiss him? We are supposed to believe he stayed in that local Church for *four years* after that?

Records in the *Suffolk Deeds* indicate he returned to business in Boston in 1697. I suspect he returned long before that.

Now let's comb the story for other red flags. We are told that although Salem Village contained almost 500 souls, only a small part came to the small meetinghouse to hear Parris preach. What? These are supposed to be Puritans. What were the rest of the 500 people doing on Sundays? Watching football? This doesn't make any sense. Puritans are very religious people, so why would they build a meetinghouse that could hold less than a quarter of them? This indicates to me that the group under Parris is only a splinter group. The entire group was therefore small enough it could have been gathered and groomed for the event. Actually, we will soon find that many of the players were imported just for this project.

Now let us ask what was really happening with this event. If it wasn't what we have been sold, what was it? Well, we get clues simply from the date. Parris was sent to Salem in late 1688, and that is the

date when the Massachusetts Bay Charter was up for grabs. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England deposed James II and elevated William and Mary, who were from the Netherlands. This revolution had rippling effects all over Europe, and it also caused great ripples in the colonies, since the appointments of James II were now out the window. Sir Edmund Andros was ousted as Governor of New England in 1689, the same year Parris began preaching in Salem. Sir William Phips remained as Governor of Massachusetts, and he is the one who established the court in Salem. My working hypothesis at this early point in the investigation is that Parris was an agent of Phips or of Phips' overseers, and that the goal of the project was to weaken the control of the Church in the government of New England. Wikipedia gives us a powerful clue in this direction in its second paragraph on the trials, which ends with this sentence:

According to historian [George Lincoln Burr](#), "the Salem witchcraft [trial] was the rock on which the theocracy shattered".

Note the historian's name. Lincoln and Burr. Two of the most prominent hoaxing families in American history. But anyway, theocracy is rule by God; or, more realistically, by the Church. If the Salem trials are indeed the rock on which theocracy shattered, we should ask if the Salem trials were *designed* for that purpose. We have found more recent events that at first appeared to be accidents or natural outcomes were not. They were manufactured by those who had interests in the outcomes. So our first and most logical assumption would be that the Salem trials were also manufactured to cause a desired outcome. It looks like that desired outcome was the removal of Puritans from the top government positions in Boston and New England. To achieve that, they were blackwashed by a manufactured event, just as it would be done today.

To pursue this possibility, let us study some other players in the event. Reverend John Hale was also involved, and he also went to Harvard. He looks like another stooge hired to advance the event. . . that is, until his wife got accused of witchcraft by Mary Herrick. At that, he immediately switched sides, giving us one of our best clues (and one of our most amusing ironies in the story). This indicates to me two things: 1) The coordinators lost control of the girls. It was a mistake to use children in the event, as they also learned later at Sandy Hook. 2) The witchcraft claims were never taken seriously by any of the judges (except Stoughton), since they ignored them whenever they wished. Although Hale's wife was accused in the same way and by the same people as the others, she mysteriously skated any prosecution or even any questioning. If the judges doing initial questioning had been taking any of this seriously, they could not ignore the claims against Sarah Hale.



Increase Mather is another pivotal character, since he not only vindicated Parris after the fact, he was also a friend of Governor Phips. Mather went to both Harvard and Trinity College, Dublin, both later prominent spook colleges. He was licensed as a minister by Oliver Cromwell himself, so he may have been involved in the Jewish intrigue in England from his early years. In 1664 he became minister of the North Church in Boston, which was like becoming a cardinal. In 1685, he became president of Harvard College and then in 1686 Rector (Chancellor). In these positions he had far more power than the mayor of Boston, and may have had more real power than the Governor. It is said that Governor Phips owed his position to Mather. This fact probably rankled Phips. Since Phips was not a Puritan, we can put him in the opposition camp for now and see how that looks as we proceed.

William Stoughton was appointed chief judge of the court in Salem by Governor Phips. Stoughton was the Lieutenant Governor. He was also from Harvard, and—like Mather—was a top Puritan minister. Since both Mather and Stoughton were Puritan ministers, they look like the marks. Mather is the primary target of this manufactured event, but they will get to him through Stoughton. As we see from the trials, Stoughton was more rigid and far less clever than Mather. He had all the qualities of a perfect dupe, being very sure of himself without any good reason for being so. Although he thought he could see through a brick wall, in reality he couldn't see through thinnest glass. Governor Phips chose him for the position of Chief Magistrate precisely for that reason.



[Addendum, November 30, 2016: Then there is Phips himself. That name is just a variant of Phipps, and in [a later paper](#) I discovered the Phipps were prominent in the British peerage, related to the Russells, the Liddells, the Simpsons, the Lyons, and the Barclays. See for example Constantine Phipps, 1st Baron Mulgrave and Foreign Secretary under William **Pitt**. His mother was Lady Catherine Annesley, of the Earls of **Anglesey**. This would link the Salem Witch Project to Anglesey in Wales, which we have seen in many later papers as the source of much mischief, [including the Tudor dynasty](#). But is our Phips here really related to those Phipps? In fact, yes, and Wikipedia admits it. We even get a footnote: Baker and Reid, 1998, p. 5. We are told an earlier Constantine Phipps was his cousin. This Phipps was Lord Chancellor of Ireland at the time of Salem. It was he who married the Anglesey woman. On her page, we find out she was a granddaughter of King James II. For more, we find at Geni.com that our Massachusetts Governor William Phips was married to a Mary Sergeant. That is what it says on his page, so you would think her maiden name was Sergeant. Was it? No. Her maiden name was **Spencer**, linking her to the Spencer-Churchills, Dukes of Marlborough, the richest people in England after the Kings. Incredibly, we find Bennetts on her page as well. Her sister Rebecca Spencer

married Dr. David Bennett. He was descended from Richard Bennett of Clapcote, whose wife was Elizabeth Bennett. She was the mother of two Members of Parliament and the Sheriff of London, Thomas Bennett. His uncle had been Lord Mayor of London and his son would be a Baronet. These Bennetts descended from the Earls of Tankerville, previously Barons Ossulston. Also the Dukes of Grafton. And finally the Earl of Arlington of the Cabal Ministry. Oho, what is that? These were five councillors of Charles II in about 1674. We are told they were called that because it was an acronym of their names: Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley-Cooper, and Lauderdale. But, given what we now know, we can see it was a bigger clue than that. Buckingham was George **Villiers**, and I have linked that family to the top crypto-Jewish families in the peerage, along with the Bennetts. I would guess we would find the same of the other three. So the name Cabal had another meaning, the one you would expect. Finding Phips related so closely to all these people just confirms once again Salem was a hoax. Also confirming it is the fact that these relationships of Phips are—like the relationships of Parris—generally hidden. You can dig them out, but they aren't given to you.]

Who else might have been involved in this project? Might it have gone higher than Governor Phips? Yes. We need to look more closely at Sir Edmund Andros, Governor of New England, who you will remember was ousted in 1689 with the fall of James II. However, with more research, I discovered Andros wasn't ousted at the request of King William. He was ousted by local Puritans. *Andros didn't like Puritans*, being an Anglican himself. He got crossways with Mather and the other Puritans of Boston early on, asking to use their meetinghouses for Anglican meetings. It was also during Andros' rule that the Declaration of Indulgence was forced on Boston (1687). Andros didn't draw it up; it came from James II. But since Andros had to enforce it, and since it concerned toleration of Catholics (whom the Puritans hated above all others), it was a bone of great contention. But mostly, Andros wished to weaken the theocracy that existed in Boston, and the only way he could do that was by weakening the power of the Puritans like Mather. We find that he was already fighting the theocracy before 1688, so he looks like our man.

This suspicion is given support by subsequent events. Andros was ousted by an uprising in Boston in 1689, arrested and sent to England to stand trial. However the English court simply released him. As it turns out, King William was on his side in all this, but couldn't interfere more directly because he was already up to his neck in revolution in Europe. He wasn't about to waste troops in Boston. William also had no love of Puritans, as we have seen. His Toleration Act did not include Toleration of Puritan dissent. Nor was William in favor of theocracy. Theocracy was what they had in Rome, and William wanted none of that in London. The Catholics were also not included in the Toleration Act. So while William could do nothing for Andros in Boston directly, he could afford to do something *indirectly*. In other words, it looks like he couldn't send troops, *but he could send spies*. In support of that, we find that Andros had offered to be a spy for William in France in 1690. William apparently refused that offer. Instead he sent Andros to be the new Governor of Virginia. However, that appointment didn't start until September, 1692. What was Andros doing between 1690 and 1692? His bio is a blank. I suggest he was involved in planning the con in Salem. But we can be sure he held a grudge against Boston, since they not only kept him in jail for many months—ten months of it in solitary—but he also lost his wife there in 1688, just a few months before his arrest.

For this reason, the Salem witch trials begin to look like a cloaked attack on Mather by Andros and King William, with Governor Phips as their agent in Boston and Samuel Parris as their agent in Salem. But if this is so, why would Mather vindicate Parris? Well, I think “vindicate” is too strong a word. If you read the findings of Mather, what you see is a refusal to continue to give the event legs. You see, those promoting the trials wanted to keep them in the papers for as long as possible, which is why we saw counter-charges against Parris by Salem Village. Those counter-charges look manufactured like

the rest of this, since Parris had nothing to lose and everything to gain. Remember, Parris had been born in London. So even if Mather had found against him, he would have been returned to England like Andros for final hearings. No doubt King William would have freed him like he did Andros. But by manufacturing these counter-charges against himself, Parris was able to keep the event in the papers for another year. The event was so damaging to the Puritans in general and to Mather and Stoughton in particular, that Mather simply wished to bury it. The best way to do that was to question the outcome as little as possible. Any reversal of previous findings would create a new firestorm. So Mather did his best to sweep it under the rug. I assume he knew by then the event was manufactured, and by whom, but he couldn't very well blow the event open, since that would just be adding fuel to the fire. It would lead to another round of trials, trials which—even if they led to convictions of the conspirators—would not rehabilitate the Puritans. The Puritans would then look twice as stupid, since they had not only sentenced these people based on false evidence, they had fallen for a plot by their enemies. By 1693, the Puritans were in a lose/lose situation, and Mather no doubt recognized that. His only option was to throw a blanket on the entire event and hope for it to die down. It never has.

But how far did the con go? Were people really hanged? It's possible, but I doubt it. We have seen with more recent events how easy it is to fake deaths, and it was even easier in 1692. They didn't have cameras or TV or internet then, so you only had to fool a few local people and then get it into the papers. The only man on the ground they really had to fool was Stoughton, and he was a moron. Given his temperament, it is doubtful he showed up for the hangings. This means the entire event could have been faked by a few dozen people. They created an isolated community in the country, hired a fake minister, and then manufactured a series of events. I will be told that the prosecutors Thomas Newton and Anthony Checkley would also have to be fooled, but they were more likely part of the con, as we will now see.

This brings us to [a document on the web from Cornell University](#) that greatly aids my thesis here. It is a pdf by Anne Powell. Like Parris, Checkley had been born in England. He was also a merchant. He had been in the counting house of his uncle, but then started a mercantile business of his own. A counting house is a bank, just so you know. And of course Checkley was also supposed to be a lawyer, although there is no record of him having a law degree, or *any* degree. So Parris was a minister with no divinity degree and Checkley was a prosecutor with no law degree. Interesting, I think you will admit.

Thomas Newton is likewise interesting. He was also born in England. He didn't arrive in Massachusetts until 1688, the year Parris arrived in Salem. He had legal training, but as Attorney General of Massachusetts colony, he was a servant not of Massachusetts but of *the Crown*. That is, the King of England, William. This is admitted at Wikipedia, where Newton is called “the Crown's attorney”. This means he could have been planted in the Salem trial by William and Andros and Phips. We are told he was appointed by Governor Phips, but Phips was also under orders from King William, of course.

And Anne Powell has more interesting connections for us. It turns out that Checkley the prosecutor knew one of the accused. Checkley's wife was named Hannah Wheelwright. Her father John Wheelwright had an assistant at his home in Salisbury in 1679, one George Burroughs. This same George Burroughs was accused of witchcraft in 1692 in Salem and was allegedly executed. Checkley was his prosecutor. This indicates to anyone awake that both Burroughs and Checkley were planted in the event (I will show you more evidence below). It is also strong indication the hanging of Burroughs was faked. He would agree to be planted in the event as an actor, but not as a corpse.

Powell found even more connections in the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of

Massachusetts. Both Newton and Checkley were in this Company, and so was Elisha Hutchinson, the Boston magistrate who sent the order for George Burroughs to be apprehended. Hutchinson was later a pallbearer for Checkley. Samuel Sewall, who was assistant magistrate under Stoughton in the Salem trials, was also in the Company. His younger brother Stephen was the clerk of the Salem trials.

It is exceedingly strange to find the judge and clerk as brothers. Even stranger is what we are told at Wikipedia about Stephen

opening up his home to one of the initially afflicted children, [Betty Parris](#), daughter of Salem Village's Reverend [Samuel Parris](#), and shortly afterward Betty's "afflictions" appear to have subsided.

What? The clerk of the court allowed one of the accusers and prime witnesses into his home? Shouldn't that have caused a mistrial? It certainly would today (or would if current trials weren't also fake).

Samuel Sewall is worth looking at more closely. He was a Harvard man, but not a Puritan or minister. So he looks like another plant in this plot. In support of that, we find that he married Hannah Hull, the rich daughter of merchant and Mintmaster John Hull. On his Wiki page he is called "the leading" merchant of Massachusetts, and as Mintmaster he was also a sort of banker. As we have already established in previous papers, these merchants were always opposed to all the religions, be they Christian, Jewish, Muslim, or Hindu. Why? Because all the religions stood in the way of free trade. Religions tend to have rules of conduct, you know, and those just get into the way of trade. Well, we have seen (or will see) a cartload of top merchants involved in this event, including John Hull, Samuel Parris, Anthony Checkley, Robert Calef, John Hathorne, Jonathan Corwin, and John Eldred. Puritans like the Mathers were interfering with trade for religious reasons, and so they had to be countered.

Sewall later apologized for his role in the Salem event, but I suspect he was apologizing for his role in the con, not anything more sinister. The trials were faked to remove the Puritan influence of Mather and Stoughton from the government of Massachusetts, so that free trade could proceed without their religious blockades. With the Puritans successfully blackwashed, those promoting trade in the colonies could proceed with their long-term plan of further secularizing New England—which is precisely what has happened up to the present time.

George Corwin, High Sheriff of the county, is also worth studying. He was only 26 in 1692, which seems young to be High Sheriff of the county. He is said to have died only four years later, but I suspect another faked death. Why? Because he was the grandson of the Governor of Connecticut, John Winthrop the Younger, and great-grandson of John Winthrop the Elder, Governor of Massachusetts Bay Colony until 1634. His uncle Fitz-John Winthrop was a major general in the army who also became Governor of Connecticut in 1696, the year George Corwin allegedly died. In other words, George Corwin was more local royalty in disguise.



John Winthrop

I really want you to pause and chew on this information a while. It is another game ender. The local Sheriff in Salem Village just happening to be a Winthrop is like discovering Sheriff Andy Taylor (Andy Griffith) was really the son of President John F. Kennedy. Could you ever look at Mayberry the same way?

Sheriff George Corwin was supposed to have presided at the pressing of Giles Cory, but that whole thing now looks like another fake. Why would you press an old man to death? This is the only instance of pressing in all of American history. Cory was 81, which was ancient for the time. Due to the presence of this obvious spook Corwin, we can say with some assurance the pressing never happened. Corwin wasn't High Sheriff of anything, except maybe of Military Intelligence. For more indication of that, Corwin was married to Lydia Gedney, daughter of Bartholomew Gedney, another assistant magistrate of the court under Stoughton. That's right, we are supposed to believe the Sheriff was just accidentally the son-in-law of one of the appointed judges. Oi, the things they expect you to believe! With all these relationships I have uncovered (and you will see even more below), we now have strong evidence this group of players didn't just accidentally come together for this trial. The group was gathered to *create* the event.

Another of these things they expect you to believe is that Robert Calef was a witness to the pressing of Giles Cory. Calef is sold as a Salem local, but he was another rich Boston merchant. He was also author of *More Wonders of the Invisible World*, a direct attack on Increase and Cotton Mather. This of course acts as more confirmation of my thesis. That book damaged the Mathers as much as anything, and Increase Mather had the book burned publicly in Harvard Yard. Wikipedia admits,

Mather does not directly dispute the particulars of Calef's book but accuses Calef of being a follower of Satan.

Sounds like Increase Mather was a bit desperate. He knew the opposition had beaten him, and he didn't know what to do about it.

John Hathorne also requires a closer look.* He was another assistant magistrate in the trials, though he

was not initially appointed to the court. Like many others in the event, he was a rich merchant. He was also from a very prominent family, his father being one of the settlers of the Colony back to 1630. His father was a major in the army, which is important in this context. John later became a colonel and superior court judge. When I say Hathorne was a merchant, I don't mean he owned a small store in the village. No, as Wikipedia tells us,

Hathorne expanded on the successes of his father in building a small empire based on land and merchant trade to England and the [West Indies](#).

An empire. So he must have been very wealthy. Strange then to find him interrogating child witnesses in this small village. Why would someone who owned large parts of Massachusetts and Maine and ran a mercantile empire be working as a justice-of-the-peace in this rural area? Do you think he needed the salary? It looks like Hathorne is one of the ones who set up the hoax, along with Parris. He was on the ground early, preparing documents for when Stoughton arrived from Boston.

His cohort as “local magistrate” was Jonathan Corwin, *also a wealthy merchant*.

His father was a wealthy merchant and shipbuilder in Salem, and Jonathan continued in the mercantile trade.

Note his last name, too. We have already seen a George Corwin as High Sheriff, haven't we? That Corwin turned out to be related to the Winthrops, Governors of Massachusetts and Connecticut. Jonathan's father and his son were both named George Corwin as well. So it would be very surprising if these two Corwins were not related. [In fact, Jonathan was George's uncle](#). Jonathan was related to the Winthrops through his brother, John, who had married Margaret Winthrop. So the judge was the uncle of the sheriff. Convenient.



Furthermore, yet *another* Winthrop scion was involved in this event. Waitstill Winthrop was on the board appointed by Governor Phips to investigate the accusations in Salem. He was a son of John Winthrop and therefore a cousin of Sheriff George Corwin. Since he was then Chief Judge of the Superior Court of Massachusetts (the highest judicial seat in the Colony), it is somewhat surprising to find Waitstill Winthrop [appointed as one of nine investigators in Salem Village](#). That would be like Obama appointing the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court John Roberts to a panel in Great Falls, Montana, investigating the face of the Virgin Mary in a banana cream pie.

Do you want to know who else was related to the Winthops? John Proctor, who was played by Daniel Day-Lewis in the movie. Although Proctor was portrayed in the play and film as a poor farmer living in a shack, his father was one of the richest men in nearby Ipswich. Ipswich was founded by John Winthrop the Younger in 1630, and John Proctor, Sr. was there by 1635. They were both Ipswich city elders. John Jr. being the first son, he should have inherited a considerable fortune at his father's death in 1676. His wife, the character called Goody Proctor, was also from a prominent family. Her maiden name was Elizabeth Basset, and her father was Capt. William Basset, Sr. of Lynn, MA. For this reason and others, John Proctor now looks like another plant in this story, which makes it easier to believe his death was faked. In support of that, we find curious wording [in the will](#) of Capt. William Basset, 1701. In it he leaves 40 shillings to his daughter Elizabeth Basset *alias* Richards. According to the mainstream, she married Daniel Richards in 1699. But that wouldn't make her *alias* Richards. Your husband's name isn't an *alias*. It isn't an *assumed* name, it is a *legal* name. It appears Elizabeth's father knew something we don't. Or didn't until now. I suggest John Proctor and Daniel Richards **are the same person**.

In support of that, we find this Daniel Richards [has almost no genealogy](#). He has a father but no grandfather or other kin. This despite the fact that the Richards family was very prominent, [having married into the Winthrop family in around 1670](#). All the other Richards listed during that time period have extensive genealogies, since records of the early settlers of these Colonies have survived.

For even more indication the Proctors were planted in this event, we find that Elizabeth Proctor [was eventually awarded £150](#) as compensation for the false prosecution. Not only is that the value of three houses, it is “much more” than others were compensated. If the Proctors were in no way special and were just poor village farmers, then why were they awarded so much?

In this way, we see more analogies to current events. Remember how the families at Sandy Hook were awarded millions of dollars in compensation without even having to sue the school district? How does that work? It worked that way because they couldn't afford to have the event go to trial, where inconvenient facts might come out in testimony. So the families were given huge sums of money without even having to ask for it. That bilking of the local and State treasuries was a planned side-effect of the hoax. Well, you see it was also a planned side-effect of the Salem hoax, by which these early crisis actors could collect handsomely from State monies.

So, adding John Hathorne and Jonathan Corwin, that's at least seven wealthy merchants I have uncovered with direct ties to this event in a small village. I think Arthur Miller forgot to tell you that little Salem Village was a row of mansions paved with gold.

[Addendum, October 29, 2015. A reader just sent me more ammunition for this paper, linking me to the Wikipedia page for T. S. Eliot. There we find that Eliot's direct ancestor Andrew Eliot was chosen as a juror for the Salem witch trial. I think you will admit that is curious, given that I have outed T. S. Eliot as an asset of both US and British Intelligence in previous papers (actually, he had been outed by others like Frances Stonor Saunders before me, and all I did is republish and circle the evidence). My reader suggested that the Eliot family had been prominent in Intelligence for centuries, and given that the family has been one of the Boston Brahmins all along, he is probably correct. If he is, it would mean that the Eliots weren't and aren't just agents, they are original *founders* and controllers of Western Intelligence. That is, they are just *in* Intelligence, they are *behind* Intelligence.

Addendum, November 24, 2015: I have found that Jack London's ancestors were also involved in the Salem Witch Trials. London's mother Flora was née Wellman, and three Wellmans of this family—in direct line—testified against Sarah Cole.] As you see just below, we also have a Burroughs playing a prominent role in Salem. Remember I have written previously about William S. Burroughs, a probable agent in the Beat events after 1950. And finally, we have seen Thomas Newton as prosecutor. We should ask how he is related not only to Isaac Newton, but also to Nigel Newton, the publisher of *Harry Potter*. The mainstream tells us that lots of people have the same name, and that there are no important connections. But that is not what we have found.

Addendum, November 19, 2016: In the year since that last addendum, I have found dozens more major links to Salem, and almost every one I have researched or outed seems to link back to this seminal event. See my [paper on Nathaniel Hawthorne](#) for just the most obvious example. Also see my paper on [Lizzie Borden](#), where I show most of the major players in that hoax had ancestors in Salem.

Before I sum up, we need to hit one other major alliance here that hasn't yet raised its head. To uncover it, we have to return to George Burroughs. We have even more curious information regarding Burroughs. This same George Burroughs who was an assistant to Wheelwright in 1879 was the minister of Salem Village from 1680 to 1683. Yes, we are told he was brought back to Salem by accusations by his former flock. He was accused *in absentia* for witchcraft ten years after the fact and dragged back to Salem by deputies. This is curious because the witchcraft outbreak was supposed to be recent, starting with the young girls learning spells from Tituba. If the devil was called in at that time, how could Burroughs be involved? As you see again, none of this makes any sense.

Like most of the rest, Burroughs wasn't a country bumpkin. He graduated from Harvard with distinguished honors. This is important because it means that Salem Village wasn't just hiring anyone with a mouth to be their preacher. Unlike Parris, Burroughs had a degree. But it goes far deeper than that. To see how deep it goes, we have to return to John Wheelwright. Since we have seen that Burroughs was a protégé of Wheelwright, and since the magistrate Checkley was also connected to Wheelwright (through marriage), we have to ask if all these players may have had another motive for being part of the Salem event, apart from the desire to bring Mather down and to promote free trade. After all, Wheelwright was not a merchant or an Anglican. In fact, he had long been a raving Puritan, possibly even more radical than Increase Mather. He had been so doctrinally contentious back in the 1630's they had to throw him out of the colony. He went off to New Hampshire and then Maine.

The argument back then was the old grace versus works argument, Wheelwright taking the grace side while the majority in Boston were on the works side. So when we see Wheelwright's protégé Burroughs involved in the Salem event, we can be pretty sure this old issue has raised its head once again. Finding “Sheriff” George Corwin involved just confirms that idea, because his grandfather John Winthrop had been involved in the trial and expulsion of Wheelwright back in the 1630s. Winthrop had been in favor of letting both sides think what they wished, but Wheelwright's pigheadedness and other factors had made this solution unworkable. Winthrop had not been in a position to overrule the expulsion, but afterwards he came to look more harshly on the expellers than the expelled. I assume this is why we find Corwin and Burroughs working together against Mather 50 years on. Mather's father Richard Mather had been involved in the so-called antinomian controversy at the time, preaching against both anabaptists and familists, Wheelwright being accused of the latter. Mather's father was one of the ones that got Wheelwright expelled, and Wheelwright's students now wanted vengeance.

What this means is that in the Salem event we are seeing an alliance of several factions, all of them working against Mather and mainstream Boston Puritanism for their own reasons. We have the wealthy merchants, whom I suspect as the primary conspirators. Then we have the governors like Phips and Andros, Phips trying to weaken the power of Mather to increase his own, and Andros also out for vengeance. Behind them we find King William, opposed to the Puritan theocracy for the same reason he was opposed to the theocracy in Rome. And then we have the “grace” faction of Puritanism, also holding a grudge like Andros for their expulsion from the Colony. This may have been the least powerful faction in terms of money or obvious power, but at the local level these antinomians or grace-Puritans could be formidable. Although some of their leaders had been expelled, their beliefs remained strong and were still widespread. They could be found everywhere and could be trusted to propel any local event with fervor. Say what you like about the Puritans, they never lacked fervor.

As bonus material, we will look at a couple of events in the 1990s. In 1992 the Massachusetts House passed a resolution honoring those who had died at Salem, proclaiming them all innocent. It was signed into law by Governor Jane Swift on Halloween. Really? On Halloween? If the Salem event was what we are told, a natural event of mistaken prosecution, why pass this resolution on Halloween? It seems like the last thing those passing a proclamation of innocence would wish to do is tie the proclamation—and thereby the original event—to Halloween.

[Even Governor Swift is a red flag, because I have since tied the Swift family to these hoaxing families. See my [recent paper on Obama's genealogy](#), where I also do the genealogy of Taylor Swift, among others. The Swifts are another crypto-Jewish line, going back to Jonathan Swift and before.]

In 1996, the Hollywood film *The Crucible* was released, starring Daniel Day-Lewis and Winona Ryder. It is well-crafted movie and I have watched it several times. It is quite entertaining. But knowing what we now know, we may ask why it was released in 1996. We may assume the date was not an accident. What else happened in 1996? Well, the O. J. Simpson trial opened in Los Angeles. I have already [outed that event as another hoax](#). JonBenet Ramsey was allegedly murdered in Colorado, although I also suspect that of being a fake. Amber Hagerman was allegedly murdered in Arlington, TX, and I haven't studied that one. It was used to start the AMBER Alert and the Sex Offender Lists, so it is suspect. However, a people search using Intelius and InstantCheckMate finds no Amber Hagerman in Texas of any age. The Dunblane Massacre in Scotland presages the later Sandy Hook Hoax. It was also a hoax. The Unabomber was arrested. [I have proven that was a hoax](#). The Port Arthur Massacre was staged in Tasmania. The controlled (I assume) Manchester bombing was blamed on the IRA, but was really done to rebuild downtown Manchester and benefit rich real estate developers (as was also one of the primary uses of the WTC Demolition in 2001). The Menendez brothers were given life sentences in another fake trial.

For this reason, the film now looks like a Hollywood tie-in to this ramping up of fake stories in 1996, commemorating the new hoaxes by reminding us of old ones. Or, to put it in mainstream terms, it was using historical events to support current events. For those having difficulty believing the mess of the Modern world, Hollywood could point to history, showing us that it was always a mess. The world had always been a realm of madness, so why expect anything different now?

Still, why was 1996 such a banner year? Why not 1995 or 1997? One reason may be that this was year 5757 of the Hebrew calendar. Intelligence loves dates like this. The last such date was 5656, or 1895. That was the year Morgan and Rothschild “saved” the US Treasury by loaning it \$65 million in gold. That's around 20 billion in today's dollars, and of course we aren't told what interest the US had to pay

for this “saving”.

In concluding this paper, I wish to draw your attention again to how little these projects have changed in four centuries. In the Tate/Manson event of 1969, we saw the hippies and anti-war protesters being blackwashed with a manufactured project that relied heavily on the occult. While it looked like several people died in the event, I have shown that no one did. The entire story was created from the ground up by Intelligence, using actors. It fooled absolutely everyone for over four decades, despite the public release of (very poor) photographs, film, books and documentaries by the dozens.

Going back to 1692, we find the Puritans being blackwashed with a manufactured project that relied heavily on the occult. While it looked like several people died in the event, I suggest none did. The entire story was created from the ground up by a few dozen prominent people posing as government officials (and some real government officials). Local people were used and we may assume actors were imported. A couple of prominent Puritans—who were the marks—were fooled, as well as everyone who read about the event, for over three hundred years. This despite the fact that the story was a swiss cheese of inconsistencies, contradictions, and flapping red flags. Anyone who had bothered to study the bios of those involved should have been able to see the event was staged in some fashion for some political reasons. Those living at the time should have been able to intuit the political reasons even more easily than I have here, due to their proximity to the event in time and place. But if some did, their voices have not survived, being buried by the same Intelligence that promoted the event as real.

And once again, I point out that I have been able to penetrate this mystery by doing no original research. I have not uncovered any documents or dug up old bones. I have simply compiled evidence that is sitting in plain sight on the internet, most of it from uncontested mainstream sources.

Addendum, October 26, 2015. It didn't take long for *Smithsonian* magazine to prepare a response to this paper. In their upcoming November issue, [they have an article on Tituba](#). The article is already posted online as of yesterday. That is strange enough, but even stranger is that they only add fuel to my fire. They not only admit that Tituba was a master storyteller and the central character of the early testimony, they admit she later recanted all her testimony, saying she had been bullied into it by Parris. These are all direct quotes from the article:

More than anyone else, she propelled America's infamous witch hunt forward, supplying its imagery and determining its shape.

Her nine conspirators soon became 23 or 24, then 40, later 100, ultimately an eye-popping 500.

One gets the sense of a servant taking her cues, dutifully assuming a pre-scripted role, telling her master precisely what he wants to hear—as she has from the time of Shakespeare or Molière.

Tituba would retract every word of her sensational confession, into which she claimed her master had bullied her.

They also admit that those who later told the story of the Salem Witch trials, writers such as Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, George Bancroft, William Carlos Williams, and of course Arthur Miller,

seemed to make Tituba into any character they wished her to be, from a South American Native to a North American Native to an African slave. To my readers, this will look like just more proof of my outing, since it is indication that not only the original story was manufactured, the later stories of that story were also manufactured—by the same people for the same reasons. In other words, they are all agents. I have already outed Williams in previous papers, and that wasn't hard to do since he had already been linked to various Intel projects via various historical documents by Frances Stonor Saunders and others. Saunders actually tries to whitewash Williams with information that appears to have been added to the book later, telling us he failed a government security test, but information in the rest of the book has already doomed him, since he was connected to many of the people she helps to out there. He was outed for me when [I found him linked to the writers](#) of Gertrude Stein's Paris Salon, including Ezra Pound and Ford Madox Ford. He is also linked to Marianne Moore and Marcel Duchamp via "The Others." Moore was a recipient of the Bollinger Prize, another prize started by the CIA. Its first honoree was Ezra Pound in 1948, year two of the CIA. Duchamp we know about. Later Williams [would be linked to Allen Ginsberg](#), as a mentor. All these people have ties to Intelligence. Beyond that, Williams went to Horace Mann and University of Pennsylvania. Pound also went to U of P, as did Noam Chomsky.

We have seen evidence above Miller was an agent, which now sends us to Bancroft and Longfellow, to pursue what now begins to look like their inevitable outing.

In the final three paragraphs, *Smithsonian's* author Stacy Schiff tries to misdirect us into flushing all the evidence she has just given us as inconsequential, but does a terrible job at it. She starts by telling us a lie about liars:

"And it was thought that if she [Tituba] had feigned her confession, she could not have remembered her answers so exactly," an observer explained later. A liar, it was understood, needed a better memory. It seems the opposite is true: The liar sidesteps all inconsistencies. The truth-teller rarely tells his story the same way twice.

Talk about a red flag! That is a precise *inversion* of the truth, as anyone who has been alive for more than about eight years knows. But why would Schiff bother saying that? Because she has just flipped the article on you, and that sentence is where the flip starts. She is about to tell you several others squishy untrue things, and she wants to be sure your brain is already upside-down. She brings up the Boston Marathon bombing, saying we initially pointed the finger in the wrong place. I paused on that one for a moment, wondering if she were admitting the recent trial was a fake. But of course she isn't: she is just reminding us that other suspects were paraded in the papers before Dzhokhar was picked as the crisis actor. But again, notice she is using her article to try to cement in your mind a recent mainstream hoax, trying to convince you to take the given outcome as given, simply because she has mentioned it as something now decided. She immediately does the same thing with MAS17, the Malaysian airliner, trying to use her article's summation to convince you that is also decided.

Why divert this article in those directions at the end? What does either event have to do with the Salem witch trials (other than that they were faked)? Schiff's intention is to link them as events that have already been decided. You have already been told what to think about them all, so don't let anything she has said above make your mind turn back on.

I also draw your attention to the writer's last name: Schiff. Think she might be related to billionaire Jewish banker Jakob Schiff, the head of Kuhn, Loeb until 1920? If not, she is acting like it.

*This Hathorne was a direct ancestor of Nathaniel Hawthorne of *The Scarlet Letter* fame. Which should lead us to look at that book again. [I later did so, in my paper [*The House of the Seven Psy-ops.*](#)]