

The Holy Grail



by Miles Mathis

First published April 16, 2021

Just my opinion, as usual

No one has seemed to notice that I have long since solved the Holy Grail mystery. Yes, all my genealogy work combined with my disinterment of the Phoenicians has put this one to rest as well. Did you get it? If not, I am here to connect the dots for you.

You should have realized that Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code* was just the latest attempt to misdirect on this. Before that, *Raiders of the Lost Ark*, *Monty Python and the Holy Grail*, and many others did the job. But in every decade and every century we have seen similar misdirection by the same people for the same reason. As with thousands of other things I have since unwound, they have to keep you off the right answer.

I now think Dan Brown was assigned his project specifically to answer my arrival on the scene in 2000. That's when *Angels and Demons* hit the shelves. It was also when I began working on my important papers. Once again, they appear to have seen me coming. Dan Brown (same age as me) has an empty Geni.com page, with no ancestors listed. Geneanet has no page for him. Geneastar scrubs the Brown line completely, and the Gerhard line also quickly dies out. This tells me he is probably a Kohen, possibly through the Markleys. But whoever he is, we know his project was primarily one of diversion.

It was a necessary diversion because I would soon show the importance of bloodlines, an importance they had been keen to hide from the beginning. That is precisely why we are always misled by the same sob story, with famous people in government, science, art, or Hollywood being said to be from poverty, the sons or daughters of truck drivers, milkmaids, or possum trappers. That is why they deny

that famous people with the same names are related, though I have always been able to show you they are, getting the information straight from posted genealogies or from thepeerage.com. They are all very closely related and most come from one or two very important lines. For instance, I have shown you that all US Presidents and most Hollywood stars are closely related, and that they all come from the direct line of William the Conqueror and before that from Charlemagne. In many instances, they now admit it or even brag about it, while denying that it is important. They try to tell you everyone living comes from that line, but of course they don't.

As just one example, do you know who they admit comes from that line? Tom Hanks, the lead in *The Da Vinci Code*. They not only admit he is a third cousin of Abe Lincoln, they admit he comes in direct line from William the Conqueror and Charlemagne. They always tell you Hanks is a distant cousin of Lincoln, but third cousin is not distant. It is very close.

But let's take it back even further. Charlemagne was a Carolingian. Where did the Carolingian bloodlines come from? From the earlier Merovingians. Hmmm. That name rings a recent bell, doesn't it? It comes right out of *The Matrix*, where they dangle other clues right in front of our faces. The Merovingian was a top character there, where he was a sort of Godfather. That too is a diversion, because they want to have a lot of deadends for you on the internet if you do a search on Merovingian. They don't want you to arrive on the page for Merovech, first Merovingian king, who just happened to be the son of **Chlodio**. They don't want you to remember that Merovech's grandson was Clovis. Because if you do, you may start putting two and two together. All you have to do is drop that "h" to make Chlodio into Clodio, which becomes Claudio, which becomes. . . **Claudius**. Clovis is also a respelling or fudge of Claudius. Clovis=Clodis. And they hope you don't know that Julius Caesar's full name was Julius Claudius Caesar, of the Claudian aristocratic dynasty in Rome. They were of the gens Clodia, who had ruled Rome from the beginning. Which indicates the Merovingian bloodlines come from Rome.

The patrician Claudii were noted for their pride and arrogance, and intense hatred of the commonalty.

Sound familiar? We are supposed to believe gens Clodia were Sabines, that is Italian natives, but that is very unlikely. They hope you don't know or have forgotten that Rome was founded by Aeneas, a noble who fled from the sack of Troy. He was the great-grandson of the founder of Troy, Ilus. So Rome's ruling bloodlines were Trojan. And they hope you don't know or can't figure out that [Troy was founded by... Phoenicians](#). Ilus descended from Dardanus, a son of Zeus. Anytime a family comes from the line of Zeus, you can assume they are Phoenicians. Most Phoenicians like to trace themselves back to Zeus or Poseidon. When they are tracing themselves to the sea, they come from Poseidon; when they are tracing themselves to the sky, they come from Zeus. So Tom Hank's bloodlines don't just go back to Charlemagne, in around 800AD, they go back to Troy, in 1000BC, and to Tyre in 2000BC.

And before that? There, history becomes mythology. The first Phoenician king is said to be Agenor, son of Poseidon. His twin brother was Belus, who was a king of Egypt. He may be the same as Ro, first known ruler of Egypt. So according to mythology, both Phoenicia and Egypt were founded by gods who came from the sea.

We see more proof of that from the admitted fact that Charlemagne was crowned emperor in 800AD wearing a Tyrian purple robe. They all but admit he was a Phoenician.

To get you off those bloodlines, Dan Brown and his precursors waltz in and admit that *San Greal*, “Holy Grail”, should be *Sang Real*, “Royal Blood”, indicating not some stupid chalice, but an aristocratic bloodline. So he takes you close to the right answer, as they do, and then diverts you quickly right back out into the bushes, by making you think this has to do with the bloodline of Jesus. Except for one very important fact: Jesus wasn't royal or aristocratic. He was supposed to be the son of a carpenter. You will say his real father was God, which is as royal it gets, but that isn't what “royal” means. It means being from a line of Earthly kings, and Jesus wasn't.[†] To make this diversion as diverting as possible, Brown pulls you into the Catholic Church, the Papacy, the Vatican, and all that glitz. He also pulls in all the King Arthur pageantry, double dipping you in mythology as far away from Judaism and the Phoenicians as possible. No one but my readers would ever think of the Jews when they think of the Papacy or King Arthur, much less the Phoenicians. So the secret remains safe.

And, as we saw with many other mysteries, including the fake JFK assassination, when lie #1 isn't working or is getting old, it is time to create lie #2. They always back up the fake mainstream story with a second alternative story, and maybe a third and fourth one. So when people started questioning the grail story, they came up with a “body or tomb of Mary Magdalene” story. That was just sexy enough to do the job, and do the job it did. A lot of people bought it. They brilliantly tied that into the bloodline story, since Jesus supposedly had a child with Magdalene, creating the Godly bloodline that exists to this day.

They also created a lot of symbology, numerology, and reading of puzzles in these new stories, apparently because they knew I would be using all of them to reach the correct answer. Yes, even while Dan Brown was selling out books crammed with fake puzzles and mysteries, I was solving a series of even greater *real* puzzles, using symbology, numerology, bloodlines, fake photo reading, onomastics, anagrams, and every other trick in the book. So their only hope was to preempt my blockbuster with a sexier and brighter and louder one of their own. Although my story was much better, and true, I didn't have Hollywood, the *New York Times* bestseller list, A-list stars, and a thousand TV channels to promote it. I couldn't salt my solutions in with car chases, CGI, supermodels, evil albinos, and tours of Europe.

Just to be sure you are getting it, the big mystery of the Holy Grail never had anything to do with a cup or chalice. Even Thomas Malory admitted that back in the 15th century. It had to do with bloodlines. But not the bloodlines of Christ. That was always a red herring, one that paralleled the right answer. It had to do with **Judeo/Phoenician bloodlines**, pointing to the top families still living. In other words, **the Holy Grail was the genealogies I have done for you.** Those complaining about how “boring” the genealogies are have been stepping right over the Holy Grail, missing it in their rush to see what I might say about Trump or Covid. Trump and Covid will be forgotten in a few years, but the Judeo/Phoenician bloodlines go back 5000 years and more. It is these lines that tell us how the world now works, and exactly who is working it. As charge is the key to everything on my science site, these bloodlines are the key to everything on my history/art site.

Which tells us the similar Ark of the Covenant mystery probably has the same answer. The ark was just a container, and it didn't contain some weapon of mass destruction, a meteorite, the bones of Moses, or a scientific treatise. It contained lists of the ancient bloodlines. It was a collection of genealogy books, like Burke's peerage, but far earlier, more direct and more extensive. I would assume it—or a copy—still exists, probably in the Vatican archives or some place like that. Right next to all the Phoenician and Viking texts that were supposedly lost or destroyed. They gave us a clue at the end of *Raiders of the Lost Ark*, when we saw the Ark being stored at the Smithsonian or somewhere. The Ark was just a box, probably long since rotted away, but we can be sure the contents survive in some

form, being among the most sacred things on Earth. We have discovered the Jews/Phoenicians take these bloodlines VERY seriously.

You will say they already have that, with the bloodlines in the Old Testament—all the begatting. That is just a taste of it, but it does confirm the importance of bloodlines. The full lists must be much more extensive, of course, and my guess is the ones in the Bible are purposely fake anyway. They were probably changed long ago to hide the real lines.

For instance, although we are now told the matrilineal lines are most important to the Jews, in the Biblical lists, all the women are unknown or hidden, which hides most of the main lines. For example, if you want to know who Abraham's ancestors were, this is the list you get: Terah, Nohar, Serug, Reu, Peleg, Eber, Salah, Arpachshad, Shem, Noah. We get only one woman in that list, Ora, wife of Reu, and she is scrubbed. We don't even know the name of Noah's wife. So how is that matrilineal? Even worse, Abraham's wife is given as Sarah, daughter of Terah. So Abraham married his sister? Unlikely. I have seen tortuous explanations for this, but the best explanation is that they don't want to tell you who his wife was, so they just throw his sister in there to fill a slot. As in the current genealogies at Geni.com, they try to hide all the important stuff, or fudge it.

And why would these bloodlines be so important? I can only guess, but the first of these lines—who I assume were not Adam and Eve—must have been extremely important. They must have been markedly superior in many ways, even godlike. Were they really gods or aliens? I can't tell you since I don't know. I will tell you that I don't think the alien hypothesis is off the table. We have gotten recent clues—again from Hollywood—that this may be the case. See *Prometheus*, as just one example. An awful film, but with a few clues buried in it, as usual. I wouldn't accept clues from Hollywood, except that they happen to confirm my own hunches.

As just one example that I haven't seen anyone else mention, think of the amount of water humans have to drink. I tripped across this clue as a cat owner. Cats are mammals, of course, so you wouldn't expect them to be that different from us. We share a lot of DNA. But cats drink almost nothing. I studied the question, and it turns out no other mammals need anything like as much water as we do. Other primates drink far less water. They are also far more sturdy. We are told that we are so delicate and weak compared to other primates because of civilization, which has pampered us, but human civilization isn't that old. Darwinian evolution shouldn't work that fast. It should have taken more than a few millennia to turn us into what we are. This suggests we may have come from a planet with far more water. Also one markedly warmer, explaining why we are the only hairless primates. And this suggests that global warming may not be a bad thing for our species, and that it may not be an accident. It may be a planned outcome of terraforming specifically for us, by the Phoenicians. As with other things (like porn, say), they may only be pretending to be concerned about it. This is not to say I trust their judgment. . . just the opposite, as you know. But it is a thought I have had.

We don't really fit here, do we? Even tribal people didn't really fit, being totally unlike any other animals. But the Phoenicians and their cohorts *really* don't fit. Even the American Natives—pretty advanced for tribal people—considered them to be aliens. And most still do. Perhaps they aren't wrong.

Where did we come from? I am still just speculating, but the best guess is Saturn. I know, I know, but hear me out. It is just a theory, but I try to publish everything I think of, no matter how speculative. If I am wrong, I am wrong, so what. Saturn shares a lot of characteristics with the Earth, starting with its charge profile*, and there is a lot of mystery about Saturn. The hexagon on the north pole, the “music”

we hear from there**, and the lies we are told about it. What lies? Well, to start with, the lie that there is very little water there. We are told Saturn is mostly hydrogen and helium, with ammonia clouds. But that is unlikely given that the moons and rings of Saturn are predominantly ice. That is, water. They admit that. Given that the rings were almost certainly sloughed off from Saturn, it makes no sense that they would be made of ice while Saturn has almost none. Same for the moons, most or all of which were probably accreted from material sloughed off from Saturn. So Saturn probably has a lot of water, and for all we know it may have a surface covered in water.

Plus, the mainstream admits these watery moons of Saturn may have life. They purposely avoided crashing the Cassini probe there due to concerns of “biological contamination”. Or due to wanting to avoid crashing into a crowded neighborhood.

For the misdirection, look no further than Wikipedia, which skips right over a surface for Saturn. It has sections on the core and atmosphere, but none for a surface. We are supposed to believe the surface is liquid hydrogen, but that would make the temperature there below -253C. That is highly unlikely. Remind yourself how wrong the mainstream can be with these models by returning to their predictions for Mercury and Uranus. Mercury was supposed to have surface temperatures of about 500C, but they have recently discovered ice at the poles of Mercury. Uranus' upper atmosphere was thought to be about -250C, but they have recently discovered it on fire, at about 600C. That's a miss of only 850 degrees C. Uranus is more than twice as far away from the Sun as Saturn, so if Uranus' upper atmosphere can be 600C, anything goes for the surface of Saturn. Cloud cover on Venus is supposed to cause a huge rise in temperature, via the greenhouse effect, so don't assume Saturn's clouds are reflecting all incoming heat. Saturn proper is also much brighter than it should be, like Uranus, so Saturn's atmosphere must also be on fire. What that indicates for its surface, no one knows.

Also remind yourself that science is run by Jews and always has been. All the famous scientists of the 20th century were Jewish. Why? So that they can control this narrative and all others. You know only what they want you to know. Apparently they don't want you to know anything about Saturn, except that it has pretty rings.

I will be told Saturn's mean density is less than water, and eight times less than the Earth, but that doesn't indicate anything about its surface density. If its surface was far far beneath its visible atmospheric surface, that would be explained; and there are many other ways to account for it.

So mainstream models are garbage and always have been. We have no probe data for the surface of Saturn, although Cassini was allegedly crashed there in 2017. That was suspicious in itself, since they chose to crash on the night side of Saturn with all cameras turned off. Although the craft was allegedly collecting other data during the plunge, I could not find any of it. All the announcements conspicuously fail to report any data.

Anyway, that was a bit of a diversion, but an interesting one, I think. So, what does that have to do with the Phoenicians? Well, the symbol for Saturn is this:

again. The letter L stands for the word El, the highest god of the Phoenicians, aka Ba'al, later the god Saturn. So the symbol in Langdon's notebook stands for the god El.

That symbol in Langdon's notebook also links us to the symbol for the East India Company. The heart with the 4 as the stem:



Do you see it? You just mirror the lower part of Langdon's symbol to create the heart. The EIC then put a bar on the cross to make it look like a 4. We find the same symbol in old paintings of Jesus, which should make you feel a bit nauseous:



It is yet another indication the Vatican was infiltrated by the Phoenicians by the time of the Renaissance, if not long before. The symbol for the god El is hidden in that representation of the heart. That is also the Rosy Cross, which led to Rosicrucianism. That also takes us back to Israel, since Israel was known by the rabbis as the *mystical rose* long before the Virgin Mary borrowed that term.

Still, what does this have to do with Saturn the planet? Well, the chief deity of the Phoenicians was. . . Saturn, aka El. His son was Hadad, who is the same as Jupiter. So why would the Phoenicians name the larger and nearer planet after the son and the farther and dimmer planet after the father? Jupiter is

much larger and brighter, so it makes no sense. You will say the Phoenicians aren't the ones who named the planets, but of course they are. They and their bloodlines the Jews have named everything. Saturn/El is also the highest of the gods, and the source of all things. He, not Yahweh, may be the One God of the Old Testament. Yahweh is the national god of Israel, not the maker of all things. The Israelites were originally Canaanites, and they borrowed their theology from them. The highest god of the Semitic peoples, including the Phoenicians, was El/Saturn. Which might be read that Saturn is the source of all things, especially the source of man.

The Saturn symbol may also be a pointer to Ahriman, the destructive god of Zoroastrianism and the foe of Ahuru Mazda. Here is what his name looks like in Middle Persian.



Notice that the main large character there looks a lot like the Saturn symbol, just reversed. We even have the cross at the top. You can't normally see that similarity in Persian, since that script is upside down. Ahriman's name is written upside-down. Only written upside-down can you see the match to the Saturn symbol. Also remember that is read from right to left. That is, backward for English readers. That reads HLMN, and the M and N are to your left. So if you flipped it to read left to right, it would match the Saturn symbol even more. Ahriman is another very old Middle-Eastern god, going back to the second millennium BC and before. This may indicate a link between El/Saturn and Ahriman, which would go some way to explaining the historical disposition of the Phoenicians/Jews. It would indicate their highest god was always a destructive god.

I also remind you that I have recently [torn up Anthroposophy](#), where Rudolf Steiner used Ahriman as one of his two main gods. And who was his other main god? Lucifer. He positioned Christ between them, as a balancing or mediating force. That's very strange. Which one of his opposing gods was positive? Not Ahriman, who was an evil spirit. And not Lucifer, either, whom he called a delusional, psychotic, and otherworldly force who had incarnated in China in 3000BC. How exactly could Christ create a balanced path for humanity between such a person and Ahriman? No sensible answer to that question was ever forthcoming, since no sensible answer was possible or desired. Steiner's project, like that of Theosophy, was to break you away from Christianity by destroying any last links to rationality. Steiner, like Ahriman, was a foe of both science and positive religion.

Speaking of Lucifer, I remind you that another of his names was. . . Shalim or Salem. Salem was a god in the Canaanite pantheon, a son of El/Saturn, representing the evening star, or the planet Venus. So all the towns of that name may point back to El. Also of interest is that while there are four Salems in the UK, two in India, two in Germany, and one in Sweden, there are 42 in the US. There is only one in Israel, not counting Jeru-salem.

We will look at that more in future, but this paper was just to make sure you were up-to-speed on the Holy Grail hoax. The hidden mystery there is Phoenician bloodlines, not some chalice that caught the blood of Christ. Though even that is a clue: note that they both have to do with **blood**.

Addendum April 17: Several readers wrote in with varying levels of alarm, telling me I was paralleling David Icke here on Saturn. Here was my initial reply on CuttingThroughTheFog.com:

I almost hate to ask, but what does he say about Saturn? . . . Never mind, [I looked it up](#). Amazing he is, able to blackwash everything I say even before I say it. I am tempted to take down my comments on Saturn because they match Icke in some ways, but I won't. Because although I show you some new things, everything he says is just a regurgitation of previous research by others. And we disagree on a lot, even the initial stuff. We disagree about the Rothschilds there, for one thing. We disagree about where the symbol for Saturn comes from. He doesn't link to the Phoenicians, that I know of. And many other things. But mostly we disagree in where this is all leading. He uses it all to take you to life as a virtual reality beamed in from Saturn and the Moon. Life as a hologram and all that. As you know, I have been screaming against that theory for many years, long before I even mentioned Saturn. But this is his project: pre-blackwashing any and all speculation on a wide range of esoteric theory, by allowing a comparison to him. All someone has to say is, "Oh, Icke agrees with you on X, therefore you are a nutjob like him". I already have readers pressuring me to take it down for that reason. Which tells me there is something in my comments they don't like. For the millionth time I have hit a nerve. So we should ask what that is. Where do I diverge most obviously from Icke? What have I said he is not allowed to? Probably the Phoenician angle, but it may be something else.

What we do know without too much comparison is that Icke is trying to pass the buck. Your reality isn't being distorted by the CIA, paid by the Phoenicians to create a million fake events: no, Icke says, your reality is being beamed in from Saturn, using the Moon as a megaphone. It isn't your own leaders brainwashing you with TV, Hollywood and other media, fluoride, antidepressants, opioids, new pot, and a million other things, it is those pesky Saturnians, who have you captured like a brain in a tank. But you see what Icke is doing, right? He is making revolution impossible. You can't fight advanced aliens on Saturn, can you? So your position is hopeless. You can't solve it voting, petitioning, boycotting, passive resistance, or even open war. Even though he exhorts you to wake up and break your bonds, he gives you no idea how to do that. If breaking Earthly bonds looks like a steep hill, what is breaking bonds from Saturn like?

But that is not what I am teaching you. It never was and it isn't now. The ruling families are here on this Earth, and like you they cannot get off. They cannot hide, though they try. They cannot even hide their assets. Their bank accounts may be offshore, but they are not offworld. In a revolution, those assets could easily be seized. Beyond that, which is just a matter of things and money, you can throw off their power anytime you like, and it wouldn't require attacking Saturn or blocking radio waves from the Moon. It would require doing things you are fully capable of doing right now, today, on a human and Earthly level, like SAYING NO. Say no to masks, vaccines, fake events, taxes for nothing, media whores, Hollywood phonies, fake science, non-art, pretend poetry, fake history, and illegal governance. The current system cannot proceed without your participation. So don't participate. Do not believe what you are told. Do not do what you are told. JUST DON'T DO IT. Like Bartleby the Scrivener, you only need to know four words: "I prefer not to".

Start with saying no to Icke. Your thoughts and emotions and choices are not scripted from Saturn. Your thoughts and emotions and choices are your own, even now, even with all the negative input you get from media. You can turn off all that input with the flick of a switch. You choose your input and you always have, so take responsibility for that. You could have killed your TV like I did 30 years ago,

but you probably didn't. You could have cut off all your magazine and newspaper subscriptions long ago like I did, but you probably didn't. You could have quit watching new films many years ago, but you probably didn't. You could have quit reading new books long ago, but you probably didn't. No one forced you to let any of that into your mind, much less people from Saturn. And after you let all that into your mind, it was still up to you to sort it: what to keep, what to jettison. *You* made yourself, not the media or holograms from Saturn. If you have let yourself be led, then you have LET yourself be led. You let it happen. Which means you can *stop* letting it happen. It remains your mind and your spirit, and you are fully capable of resisting corrupted information, no matter where it is coming from. Or at least I am.

Addendum April 20: I am back to distance myself from David Talbott and *The Saturn Myth*. Also Velikovsky. Many sites are already spinning me, trying to make it look like I am confirming them, but I am definitely *not*. [I have previously outed](#) both Talbott and Velikovsky as controlled opposition spooks. This is what Talbott was working on back in 1980, before he got involved in the Electrical Universe thing. We know it is all another project just by looking at those involved, especially Alfred de Grazia, commanding officer of the psychological warfare propaganda team for the CIA. De Grazia and his CIA buddies were also pushing the Saturn Myth, so we know it must be false. The idea is that the Earth used to orbit Saturn in historical times, when Saturn was a star. Saturn collapsed, ejecting the Earth into its present orbit. All patently absurd. There is absolutely no physical evidence for it, and lots of physical evidence against it, which is why Talbott and these other frauds had to rely on squishy reports from mythology, trying to build a case from a few gathered comments about Saturn in old texts. If you don't believe me, read *The Saturn Myth* for yourself. It is complete garbage. Ancient texts might be used as supporting evidence for a well presented physical theory, but Talbott and the rest reverse that, using nebulous descriptions as a starting point, and only after the fact trying to cobble together some physics to support it. This they utterly fail to do, and we must assume their failure is due to the fact they never thought of succeeding. The project was a blackwash from the start, as you will see in a moment.

That said, the mainstream criticisms of *The Saturn Myth* are no better than the myth itself, as you can see [here](#). There, Leroy Ellenberger, whom I assume is also a spook playing the other side, quotes mainstream theory to the effect that

Velikovsky's allusion to magnetic fields powerful enough to cushion planets during a near-collision, thereby avoiding "an actual crushing collision of the lithospheres" (Worlds in Collision, p. 382, and Velikovsky & Establishment Science, p. 30) is ludicrous because planetary magnetic fields are simply too feeble. Everyday experience with the effect of 100 gauss horseshoe magnets on iron filings is no reliable guide for what happens between planets with comparatively miniscule magnetic fields.

But we now know that is wrong due to Trojans and [horseshoe orbits](#), among other things, in which magnetic fields (or more precisely the charge fields that cause them) do in fact "cushion" celestial bodies and prevent collisions. In approach, these fields do increase in their power of repulsion, due to increasing densities of those meeting fields, and they are easily able to turn bodies in certain configurations, like the Trojans. So the critics of Talbott and Velikovsky are actually using outdated and disproved mainstream ideas. They weren't disproved by Velikovsky or Talbott, but by me. Only I have done the actual math and field theory. Velikovsky only made the suggestion.

At any rate, though Talbott and Velikovsky were generally right about that, it doesn't even come close to saving the Saturn myth. As perhaps the biggest clue this was another huge conjob, just notice what Talbott chose to name his book: *The Saturn Myth*. If you had written the book, would you have chosen that title? I wouldn't. You would call it the Saturn Theory, or the Saturn Hypothesis, or at worst the Saturn Revolution. Calling it the Saturn Myth is to admit it is still no better than a myth: that is, *not true*. Our next clue is found in Talbott's chapter and subchapter list for the book, which you can see

[here](#). You would expect him to lead with some historical evidence, then proceed to at least an outline of the physics. But he never does, and you can see that just from his chapter headings. In his conclusion, he is still repeating the same broad generalities of his preface: he had made no progress in his argument in 306 pages.

For instance, to convince any real scientist that his theory had any merit at all, he would need to pretty quickly explain how a star could devolve into Saturn so quickly, where the extra mass went, where the heat went, why Saturn's other moons weren't affected, how the asteroid belt fits into this or how the Earth traversed it, how Jupiter fits in, and so on. You would have expected Jupiter to be the second sun in this system, not Saturn, so where was Jupiter in the previous configuration? Which sun was he circling? A planet that size caught between two suns would be very conflicted, to say the least. And since Saturn is so much like Jupiter, Uranus and Neptune in current composition, those three must also have been stars recently. Or if not, why not? If Saturn was recently a star, why does he have so much unfused hydrogen and helium? Why did he stop fusing and why does he not fit the profile of a dwarf? A burnt-out star should be neutron rich, but we have no evidence Saturn fits that profile.

Also, the move from one star to another and from one orbiting position to another would actually be far more traumatic than what the Earth is known to have experienced in the recent past. We can see that just from things like the ice core samples, which proceed like clockwork for millions of years. We see no evidence of a total overhaul of the mechanisms there. And that is just one example of thousands.


Occam's razor tells us that the myths and stories Talbott and Velikovsky quote are much more likely to be explained by comets, asteroids, or volcanic eruptions, so why would they rush to hypothesize such outlandish things, upon so little evidence? As far as the main contention of the Saturn myth, a first-time reader thinks up much better explanations without much effort: if there was indeed a bright object at the pole assigned to the primary god of ancient peoples, it was probably a supernova or similar object, not Saturn. After the object faded, it somehow got conflated with the planet Saturn. But Talbott never considers other possibilities: because these people called something at the pole a name we now associate with Saturn, he tells us the current planet must have been there. We have never seen a faster or less logical rush to a conclusion.

Another theory Talbott ignores is this interesting one, which I haven't seen anywhere: What if these ancient stories are actually retellings of stories from when our ancestors lived on Titan? Maybe that is the golden age. If you lived on Titan, Saturn would look more than **eleven times** larger than the Moon looks to us now. And since Titan is in tidal lock, like our own Moon, if you lived on the Saturn side of Titan, Saturn would never set. He would seem to hang in the sky, motionless. From that near, the brightness of Saturn would be incredible, making him seem like a second star even though he wasn't. This would explain Talbott's data, without moving Saturn at all. **Neither Saturn nor the Earth moved. . . WE DID.**

It would also explain other ancient stories, like the ones concerning night. Night would be very different depending on which side of Titan you lived on. If you lived on the far side, away from Saturn, your night would be dependent on the Sun, and so would last about eight days. If you lived on the near side, your night would be dependent on reflection from Saturn, so night would come only when the Sun was behind you and Saturn was in a new phase. Since that is impossible, there would be no night on the near side.

We have even more data in favor of this hypothesis. The mainstream now admits that Titan has liquid water oceans, though it thinks they are very cold. Cassini confirmed liquid oceans with the reflection of ELFs. According to the latest theories, this liquid ocean is supposed to be supercooled down to -97C by being mixed with ammonia, but they actually have no evidence for that. That theory was created only to explain the cold they assume is there, based on old gravity-only models. Those are the same

models that can't explain the burning atmosphere of Uranus or the ice on the poles of Mercury. But given a unified field, charge, and magnetic reconnection, we can explain much higher temperatures at the distance of Titan. So the temperature of the liquid ocean on Titan could be anything, including being *warmer* than the Earth's oceans. In fact, I have shown the mechanism for that [in my paper on the Moon](#), where I showed that the Moon has a **denser** charge field than the Earth, simply because it is smaller. The charge field gets more compressed by moving through a smaller body. Unlike Talbott or Velikovsky, I do the math there. Since Titan is smaller than the Earth, there is a straightforward mechanism for charge compression, and therefore for heat generation. Plus, Titan is recycling charge from both the Sun and a very near Saturn, while the Earth is only recycling charge from the Sun (and very distant planets). Raising Titan's charge profile again. And since Titan is also known to have a heavy atmosphere of 1.5 bars, 50% higher than on the Earth, we have a mechanism for heat trapping. This indicates the mainstream theory of a thick layer of ice on the surface of Titan is probably wrong. In fact, composite pictures of Titan in infrared from NASA do not confirm it.



A layer of surface ice 62 miles thick would look nothing like that, in false color or not. I would say the choice to use white as their main false color is suspicious, since it automatically pushes you to seeing snow or ice there. But they had no physical reason to choose white or orange, and could have just as easily used blue and brown like the earth. Why didn't they? That would be bit revelatory, wouldn't it?

Cassini also found significant shifting of those surface features, indicating the continents on Titan are moving. In other words, they are floating freely in the oceans, unconnected to the mantle. That would explain other curious comments in the ancient stories.

NASA also admits mountains and volcanoes exist on Titan. What? On a surface of miles-thick ice? Also a few impact craters? Impact craters on a shifting surface of ice? We seem to have a lot of contradictions there. Like the CIA, NASA needs to hire a continuity editor. Or, to deal with me, maybe a large team of continuity editors.

And at Wikipedia, we actually find this astonishing admission, taken straight from NASA:

The climate—including wind and rain—creates surface features similar to those of Earth, such as dunes, rivers, lakes, seas (probably of liquid methane and ethane), and deltas, and is dominated by

seasonal weather patterns as on Earth. With its liquids (both surface and subsurface) and robust nitrogen atmosphere, Titan's methane cycle bears a striking similarity to Earth's [water cycle](#).

Again, surface features including dunes, rivers, seas, and deltas, on a surface of ice? If the seas are liquid methane, what are the dunes made of? What are the continents made of? And if the atmosphere is robustly nitrogen, like here on Earth, with huge amounts of oxygen (in the form of water) present, why do they go out of their way to hide any oxygen in the atmosphere? I think you know.

A reader also pointed out that there is a hexagon on Titan, though not at the pole. But he was wrong: there are actually *two*. Blow that last image up and you will see a larger one in the inset at 4 o'clock, and another smaller one in the inset at 6'clock.

But, I will be told, if Titan's atmosphere is so thick, inhabitants couldn't have seen out at all. Saturn itself would have been invisible. Yes, assuming that atmosphere was there thousands of years ago. But if we assume the atmosphere was created by environmental degradation of the sort currently happening on the Earth, that too is answered. That atmosphere is precisely why our ancestors had to leave. Not coincidentally, Titan's orange smog is hydrocarbons, just like you see in Los Angeles. We are told it is caused by methane being broken up by sunlight, but that is ridiculous. It is much more likely that it was created in the way it is created here, by pollution from industry. That pollution then somehow destroyed the oxygen content of the atmosphere, making the place uninhabitable for us.

The atmosphere of Titan provides many clues of this, including the presence of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, created by the burning of coal or oil deposits. Even the high levels of methane on Titan are a clue, since if the hydrocarbons were created by decomposing methane, sunlight would have long since decomposed all the methane. Indicating the methane is also residual from just a few thousand years ago. Meaning it too was released by the inhabitants somehow. We may assume it wasn't from farting cows, so again it was probably from burning fossil fuels. On the Earth, human industry creates [far more methane](#) than cows, termites, wetlands, and the oceans put together.

We are told that high winds exist on Titan, with the atmosphere moving much faster than here. Except that Cassini also contradicted that, getting specular reflections from lakes. This indicates calm waters.

If you read all the theories of Titan at a place like Wikipedia or NASA, you soon get the impression of a cover-up. Nothing makes any sense and most of it reads like misdirection. It contradicts itself and mainstream physics in a thousand places. Even now that the data has been sitting around for a while, nothing sensible is ever said about. The scientists seem to go out of their way to misread it or push it.

I trust you see what all this means: my theory isn't a theory of aliens. There are no aliens in this Saturn theory. WE ARE THE ALIENS. It doesn't get any weirder than . . . us. We are the outsiders, and it looks like we are doing the same thing to the Earth that we did to Titan. So the big question is, why didn't we learn our lesson? In the time it took us to reinvent industry, did we really forget our old mistakes? Or are we just incapable of anything better?

So why *did* these guys like Velikovsky and Talbott rush to such idiotic conclusions? I have already told you in that previous paper: they did it in order to blackwash any non-mainstream theories. They purposely made their non-mainstream theories as ridiculous as possible, *in order to bolster the mainstream*. It is just one more in a line of controlling the opposition. They saw people like me coming and they didn't want to have to address me directly. So they manufactured these people like Velikovsky, Talbott, Icke, and many others, so that they could lump me in with them and dismiss me by kind. NASA does the same thing with its creation of Flat Earth and other projects. It wants to lump all critics in with Flat Earth, dismissing them as a group. This prevents any and all discussion of real theory.

Anyone can see I have almost nothing in common with these people. My output alone should tell you that. I have published over 10,000 pages on my science site alone. That's 33 volumes of groundbreaking research. And my papers are dense with math and page-by-page, line-by-line critiques of mainstream theories and equations. I show specific cheats and mistakes in math by Feynman, Einstein, Gell-Mann, Weinberg, Maxwell, Bohr, Newton, Kepler, Landau, and dozens of current and living physicists. This is something Talbott, Velikovsky, Icke, and all the rest have *never* done.

My critics dismiss me as they dismiss Velikovsky: neither of us have the right degrees, the right framed papers on our walls. So they don't have to respond to my line-by-line mathematical destructions of Landau, Feynman, or anyone else. These destructions PROVE I am a better mathematician than these famous mathematicians, but my critics are paid to say that because I don't have a PhD in math or physics, I can't possibly be either a mathematician or a physicist. Argument by misdirection. Notice that they dodge me far more fully than they dodge Velikovsky. Lots of people have responded directly to his arguments, but no one has ever responded to mine. Yes, they respond, but only by *ad hominem* or other misdirection. I have never once seen a sensible response to my mathematical critiques of Bohr, Feynman, Landau, Maxwell, or anyone else. Just total radio silence. This while my papers are ranking on the front page of the search engines, sometimes above Wikipedia.

And, like the Grail Myth, the Saturn Myth misdirects by taking you close to the truth but then dodging you back out into the bushes. As I said, I do think there is something going on with Saturn. The ancients *were* telling us something about Saturn, but nothing like what Talbott, Icke, or Velikovsky would have you believe. I don't know exactly what that something is yet, but it is much more likely to be a colonizing or a genetic experiment than Worlds in Collision. Assuming we can already send probes to Saturn, it wouldn't take much of a technological advance to transport live beings back and forth. It doesn't take near-light speeds or time-dilation or hibernation—a la *Planet of the Apes* or *Alien*—to imagine travel from here to there. It would only be a matter of months. Plus, travelling toward the Sun should be much easier than travelling away from it, since we can use its gravity to move toward it. Everything not in orbit will move directly at the Sun, and accelerate while doing it. So travel from Titan to the Earth would have been a lot easier than travel from the Earth to Titan.

And, as I said above, the high temperatures we are discovering on planets far from the Sun make this all the easier to propose. Life on the moons of Saturn was pretty hard to sell a few years ago, when we thought it was necessarily bitter cold out there. But now that we know more about how heat can be generated by planets and moons, [via my charge field](#), the possibility of life goes way *way* up.

One more thing, on the way out. Anyone claiming I have jumped the shark or outed myself with this paper is immediately suspect, in my opinion. My enemies have been champing at the bit for any new reason to dismiss me, and we see them pissing themselves in elation over this one. But I have bad news for them: the attempts to blackwash me will fail like all the ones before. At this point, I couldn't jump a shark if I tried. What's done is done, and my work up to now is unassailable. Even if I lost my mind tomorrow and began publishing absolute gibberish, it wouldn't matter. People do get old and they often do lose their minds (especially these days, in the time of fluoride, aluminum, and glyphosate), but that doesn't justify jettisoning their life's work. My papers up to now can be answered only by cogent critique, not by any broadbrush dismissals. Which is to say I am not too worried.

And as for outing myself, there is nothing to out. I am exactly what I claim to be, so there is nothing for anyone to “catch” me at. The only thing anyone has ever caught me at was a misspelling or a typo or a bad hair day, which I can live with. Which is precisely why I feel free to say anything about Saturn or anything else I like. Besides, those who wish to blackwash me for saying things they don't like hardly need any new ammunition. My comments about the Phoenicians, Hitler, serial killers, trannies, or a thousand other things are far more controversial than Saturn or aliens. If I were worried about saving my physical theories from knee-jerk dismissal, I would have kept quiet about any number

of things. But that isn't my way. In the future, it will be appreciated how all my revolutions hang together, but for now that is hard to see, I know.

As this has unfolded, we have seen something droll. My peanut gallery and opposition really should have kept their mouths shut here. That was their only hope. Every little peep from them only made me look at this longer and harder, which was the last thing they wanted. We have seen that same progression play out over and over, so I don't know why they can't learn that lesson.

*Saturn looks the same size as the Earth, from the Sun, so it captures the same cross section of charge, despite being so much larger.

**The hexagon and the music are linked, since both the shape and the radio waves follow the same period of 10.6 hours.

†They tell us Jesus was of the line of David through Joseph, but Jesus got no blood from Joseph. We are told Joseph was legally the father of Jesus by Jewish law, but this isn't a matter of law, it is a matter of nature. Jesus got no genetic material from Joseph. Mary was not in the line of David. You will say she was in the line of Levi and Aaron, but that's all as maybe, and even if she were, that line hadn't been noble for a long long time. One of the points of the gospels is that Jesus *wasn't* a priest or noble of any other kind, being of lowly birth. Which is why his statements were so shocking. Being a carpenter, he wasn't supposed to be questioning anything. And besides, the ones pushing Jesus in the line of David hardest are Jews. Just do a Google search on it if you don't believe me. Jewish sites come up first. It is as if they are claiming Jesus, which, given history, is pretty odd.