

[return to updates](#)

The Case of AGATHA CHRISTIE



by Miles Mathis

First published March 11, 2018

I wonder what would happen if we hired Agatha Christie's own sharp-eyed character to investigate her? What if Hercule Poirot looked at her bio? What might he discover? You are about to find out.

I twist my Belgian mustaches at the first clue: her surname was not Christie but **Miller**. Think Mueller. Christie was her first husband's name. Her maternal grandparents were **Boehmer** and **West**, and her paternal grandparents were Miller and Messerney ([Mecenery](#)). However, this Messerney is scrubbed, so we may have some hijinx here. Why? Because Agatha's step-grandmother (grandfather Miller's alleged second wife) was also named West. In fact, she was the sister of the other grandmother. So it is possible this Messerney name was inserted to prevent us from discovering that Agatha's parents were first cousins. This is normally illegal, but among the nobility such things are commonplace. The peers don't have to obey the laws: they do whatever they wish. You will say we have no indication Agatha was from the peerage. Not yet we don't.

We already have some clues though, since both Boehmer and Miller may be Jewish. Adding to that possibility, we find Agatha's great-grandmother was a Martha **Hillman**, her 2g-grandfather was a Jacob Miller, and her 3g-grandmother was a Hannah **Bush**. Note the first names as well as the last. If we stay in the Bush line, [Geneanet](#) takes us back to Reynold Bush of Messing, Essex, England, in the 1500s. His son married a **Saunders**, whose son married a **Goodenow**, whose son married a **Taylor**. We also find **Hitchcocks**, **Lees**, **Barnes**, **Deweys**, **Nobles**, **Bartletts**, **Fords**, **Billings**, **Allens**, **Judds**, **Freemans** and **Clarks**. Several of these lines pass through Salem, Massachusetts. This tells us we are once again among the same families we have been studying in every paper of the past five years. In other words, [these aren't just any Bushes](#).

At this point we get some more misdirection on the grandmother Messerney. While Wiki and Geneanet told us that was the spelling, and the Dutch website tell us it was Mecenery, [Wikitree tells us she was a Messervey, niece of a Kelsey](#). These three spellings or misspellings of the same name indicate something being hidden, and I already told you what I think that is.

That was all on Agatha's paternal side. On the maternal side, we find an immediate scrubbing of the

Boehmers and Wests at Geneanet, which is peculiar. It indicates the flags were even redder in those lines, and considering what we just found that is saying something. Something even worse than the Bushes on the maternal side? What would that be? Hitler perhaps?

No, I'm not joking. We already found a Hillman, remember? Also remember that Miller is probably a fudge of **Mueller**. If you aren't following me, just hang on.

Anyway, Agatha is sold to us as coming from an “upper-middle-class English family”, but that is the usual misdirection. She was from fantastic wealth on both sides, and they even admit that in the very next paragraphs. Her grandfather Nathaniel Miller was a wealthy **American** businessman, a partner in H. B. Claflin and Co. [This is misspelled Chalfin at some sites, to throw us off.] Agatha's father Frederick Miller was schooled in Switzerland with other children from great wealth. Claflin was a major dry goods (mainly textiles) company based in New York, but it also had a branch in Midlands Manchester. It started in 1843 and was named for Horace Brigham Claflin—who was also a banker. We are told they were originally **MacLachlans** from Scotland. In around 1870 a William Claflin was Governor of Massachusetts. His father was the millionaire Lee Claflin, who got his money from the New England boot factories of that name.



A cousin of his, Tennessee Celeste Claflin, is famous for being the first woman to open a Wall Street brokerage firm (with the help of Cornelius Vanderbilt). Strange, since she was short, boyish, and rather lumpy. She was not the sort normally set up by men. But perhaps it was her boyishness that made her name with these particular men. She later married Francis Cook, 1st Viscount of Monserrate. Of Cook, Son and Co., he was one of Britain's three richest men in the late 1800s. His company was the largest clothier and draper in the British Isles. So you can see the link to Claflin and Co. You may be interested to know that Cook owned the fake Leonardo painting *Salvator Mundi* back then, before it was repainted. [See my paper on that fraud](#). Amazing how all this fits together, isn't it? His daughter married a Sartorius, son of Admiral of the Fleet Sir George Rose Sartorius. His mother was a **Rose**, which is probably Jewish.

A bit later (1930s) a [William Claflin](#) was President of the Boston Stock Exchange, President of the Soledad Sugar Company, Treasurer of Harvard, Trustee of the Rockefeller Institute, and “director of many companies and banks”. Strange that Wiki doesn't want to tell us which banks and companies. But note the sugar company, since it will come up again below.



You may also be interested to know that Tennessee Celeste Claflin's sister was **Victoria Woodhull**, early suffragette and spook. As you can see, she was little better looking than her sister, so we don't know exactly what her charms were. Probably they were vastly oversold, and possibly completely manufactured, as with most famous people we have studied. Nonetheless, we are told she was a medium, an escort and possibly a call girl, a free-love proponent, and a newspaper editor. Any glance at her bio leads one to also peg her as an Intelligence agent. As just one pointed example of that, we find her paper published the first English language version of the Communist Manifesto in 1871. She allegedly ran for President of the US in 1872, though she was too young to do so. She was arrested during the campaign for outing Henry Ward Beecher as an adulterer, but was of course acquitted on a technicality. After her projects failed in the US, the Vanderbilts set her and her sister Tennessee up in England, bankrolling them on more spook projects. Victoria soon married the British banker John **Biddulph Martin**. Note the name Martin: we are about to see it again. Also note the name Biddulph. The Biddulphs are the Baronets of Westcombe and the Barons of Biddulph. The Baronets are related to the **Chases**. The Barons are related to the Gibson-Watts (Barons), the Reids, the **Campbells**, the Murrays, the Agars (Earls), the Byngs (Earls), the Peels (Baronets and Prime Minister), the Palmers, the **Maitlands** (Viscounts Maitland), the Yorkes (Earls), and the Kennedys (Marquesses of Ailsa). The Campbells and Maitlands are about to come up again.

Anyway, despite being a spook, a nutter, and mostly a fictional character, Victoria Woodhull is the subject of the 1980 musical *Onward Victoria*, starring Jill Eikenberry (yes, the babe from *LA Law*). The script was written by Charlotte Anker and Irene **Rosenberg**. Note that last name, since it appears in this short paper twice. Also worth pointing out is that **Naomi Wolf** founded the Woodhull Institute in 1997, in honor of this person. Which tells you what to think of Wolf, provided you didn't already know. The name Wolf also comes up again below. Amazon Studios is currently working on a biopic of Woodhull, to star Brie Larson. I can't wait.

[Here](#)* we discover Agatha Christie's great-grandfather Boehmer was “of the Argyll Highlanders”. What does that mean? Well, the only Boehmer in the peerage is his granddaughter Clarisa, Agatha's mother. Yes, [Agatha Christie is listed in the peerage](#). Clarisa Boehmer's parents are not listed, so we are led to believe the nobility is on the Miller side. But Frederick Alvah Miller's† parents are also not listed. So why are any of these people in the peerage? Well, the “Argyll Highlanders” are probably the **Campbells**, Dukes of Argyll. At that time they were also Bourkes, Drummonds, Kers, **Lewis**, **Hamiltons**, Clough-**Taylor**s, Sutherland-Leveson-Gowers, and Villiers by marriage. So it looks like the Boehmers who were related to the Campbells have been scrubbed from the peerage. Why? To find out, we simply go to the Wiki page on that surname.



The first thing we notice is Hasso von Boehmer, a German **Lt. Colonel** who allegedly participated in the July 20 plot against. . . Hitler. And you thought I was boasting, didn't you? Since we have already discovered [Hitler was a fraud](#), we may assume this entire plot is another fraud. This Boehmer has a slender bio, but it is full of numerology. He was supposedly born August 9 and died March 5. August 9 was the date of the Manson murders as well as the date of Nixon's resignation. March 5 adds to 8, and 8 was a favorite number in these hoaxes concerning Hitler, as we have seen again and again. Boehmer's superior was Henning von **Tresckow**, another strange name for a German. His father had been a general and he was Chief of Staff of the 2nd Army. His wife was a von **Falkenhayn**, whose father was a general and Chief of the German General Staff in WWI. General Falkenhayn's mother was a **Rosenberg**, which is Jewish. We saw [in a previous paper](#) that the mainstream now admits that many German generals were Jewish. I wonder if Falkenhayn is on that list? If not, the list is too short.

[Just to jog your memory there, a Jewish researcher named Rigg [discovered](#) at least 140 high-ranking Nazi officers who were Jewish, including 23 colonels, 15 generals, and two field marshals. However, I discovered [Wikipedia has a page for this category](#), and yet lists only *eight*. Not 140, but eight. The list was WWII, and Falkenhayn was WWI, so I guess someone needs to make a second list.]

We have more indication this is all a hoax when we discover Tresckow had been in the Reichswehr in WWI, taking part in the faked **Spartacist** suppression. The Spartacists were all Jews as well, as we saw in my paper on the Beer Hall Putsch—including primary spook Rosa **Luxemburg**. Finding a Boehmer involved in this is just what I expected coming in.

There is a current Justus [Henning von Boehmer](#), German lawyer, publisher, and *banker*. He was Secretary General of the International Chamber of Commerce, which has over 6 million members in 100 countries. He was COB of Stillhalter, a subsidiary of Sal. **Oppenheim** Bank (and the Oppenheims are closely connected to the Rothschilds). Note his middle name, which of course ties us to Henning von Tresckow, and also ties together Boehmer and Tresckow by blood. It is admitted he is the nephew of Hasso von Boehmer. But perhaps the most telling thing on his page is that he started the Jerusalem Foundation with Jerusalem mayor Teddy Kollek. Now, why would a good German Protestant do that, I wonder? Well, Boehmer's mother was a **Poensgen**, and her father was on the board of Vereinigte Stahlwerke AG, the huge industrial conglomerate that included Thyssen AG. See my papers on Hitler for more on that. We have seen that the men behind this conglomerate, including Fritz Thyssen, were the ones who founded and funded the Nazis. So it is curious to see the Boehmers so closely tied to them by marriage. If Justus Henning von Boehmer's uncle was Hasso von Boehmer, and if his grandfather was on the board at VSAG, that must mean that Lt. Col. Hasso von Boehmer's father-in-law was on the board of VSAG. They forgot to tell us that on his page, didn't they? So why would he be plotting against Hitler, a man VSAG created? The answer. . . He wasn't. The whole thing was

theater, and the industrialists created both sides of the theater, both upstage and downstage. All to keep your eyes off themselves.

So, what did we learn there? We learned the Boehmers are definitely Jewish, related or closely linked to the Oppenheims, Rothschilds, Poensgens, and Thyssens. And if we keep reading on Henning von Boehmer's page, we find the link to Scotland we were looking for. We are told his father's Scottish grandmother was Mary Barbara **Rennie**, so we go back to the thepeerage.com to discover that she was actually [Mary Augusta Rennie](#), granddaughter of Stewart **Paget**, of the Earls of Uxbridge. These Pagets are also related to the Lewises, Percys, and Robinsons. Mary Augusta married a Col. **Martin**, whose mother was a Hamilton, scrubbed at thepeerage but probably of the Dukes of Hamilton. We saw a Martin above, remember? This fits perfectly with what we surmised already, since we also saw the Percys, Hamiltons and Lewises linked to the Campbells of Argyll. It fits in another way, since the Earls of Uxbridge are also the Marquesses of **Anglesey**. So we are able to link Agatha Christie back to Anglesey—something that will not surprise my best readers. In fact, we would have only been surprised if we had *not* been able to trace this famous person back to Anglesey. In almost all cases, these genealogies pass through both Salem and Anglesey, and we have seen that again here.



The only thing we have left is Agatha's husband, Archibald Christie. That is supposed to be the couple on their wedding day. But it is a fake. Ask yourself if it makes any sense. Why would she be standing while he is seated? Why would she have on that oversized frumpy coat on her wedding day? Shouldn't she be wearing a wedding dress, or at least something fancy? But the most obvious clue is that they are mis-sized relative to one another. Her head is larger than his. As a portrait painter, I know that almost never happens. Men's heads are generally $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$ larger than women's heads. Here they allegedly are surfing in Hawaii:



Does he look like a shrimp or a pinhead? No. He is half a head taller than the woman and he appears to have a normal sized head. So we already have a problem. Notice that photo is also a fake. It is pieced together, so we have no proof those two people were there together. We are told that Agatha despised photographers, which accounts for the relative lack of good photos of her, especially young. That's convenient for the story, isn't it? We will look at some more photos below.

Although Archie's bio is scrubbed and we are told he was unable to fly due to sinus problems, somehow he made the rank of colonel in the Air Force and became CMG and DMO. That first is an order of chivalry, Order of St. Michael and St. George. So there is something we aren't being told about this Archibald Christie. Wiki alludes to it when it says he was “a director on the boards of several financial and investment companies”. I wonder why they don't tell us which ones? He was also appointed to the board of the Rank Organisation. This is a big clue since it was started by billionaire industrialist Baron Arthur Rank, of the flour mill Ranks. More importantly, Rank took over the movie business in England after 1920, owning 619 cinemas by 1942. He also bought the **Bush** Radio company in those years, adding it to his pile. Gee, I wonder who that radio company was named after? Don't ask Wikipedia, since they skip over it. When Christie was at Rank, it was the largest media conglomerate in the UK, including film, radio, records, and even Xerox copiers. So if you wondered why and how Agatha Christie made the jump to film so easily, now you know.

But there is more you should know about Archie Christie. We have also seen one link to my recent paper on the Leonardo painting *Salvator Mundi*, and we are about to find a second. In my paper on that fraud, we saw the auction house Christie's involved, didn't we? There we saw Christie's linked to the Christies in the peerage, specifically James Christie of Durie, who married Mary Turner Barclay-**Maitland** in 1783 in Scotland. Oho, that name Maitland just came up, didn't it? The Maitlands were closely related to the Biddulphs, who were related to the Campbells and Martins, who were related to the Claffins, who were also the MacLachlans, who were related to the Hamiltons and Lewises, who were related to the Millers. So once again we have one big happy family here. But can we link Archibald Christie to the earlier Christies of the peerage? Well, we already did that through his wife, didn't we? As usual, they were cousins. But we can do it more directly by going back to thepeerage.com. Archibald is there, but only on Agatha's page. No parents are given. But we do find an Archie Christie in the peerage, of the right age to be his father. This Archie Christie is given as a

solicitor, which is also a match, or close enough. Wiki tells us Archibald's father was named Archibald and was a barrister. Archie married the daughter of Baronet Synge, which sounds right since this immediately links us to some Boyers, **Wolfes**, **Saunders**, Irwins, Jelleys, etc. We saw the Saunders above, and the rest of those names are Jewish. So although the direct links have been broken in the peerage (specifically to keep us from seeing how Agatha Christie was connected), we can walk around the blocks without much effort. It is clear that Archibald Christie also came from these peerage Christies. Why else would he have been awarded the Order of St. Michael and St. George? Do you think they award the CMG to Gentile commoners? This links him to the Lindsays, the Bonhams, the Livingstones, the Morrises, the Baines, the Bathursts, the Barclays, the Fortesques, and the Turners.

OK, now let us graduate beyond the genealogies. Now that you know better who Agatha really was, maybe you can read her bio and her fiction in a different light. We will do her bio first, then look at a few of her writings. Like Victoria Woodhull above, Agatha's mother Clara (or Clarisa) was supposed to be a psychic. I guess that made her twice a spook. Agatha had no real schooling, being brought up in pension schools in France which were little more than finishing schools for young ladies. Her early bio is sparse and unconvincing, both in books and biographical entries. Most of it looks manufactured. It has the same feel as J. K. Rowling's bio—as if it was written in a hurry in some MI5 offices. Most events are only glossed and many are missing dates. This suggests to me that like Rowling, Christie may have simply been the front for a writing committee. Somehow, with no schooling and little writing experience, she produced her first novel in 1916, at age 25. She had married in 1914 and in 1919 she had her only child. In 1922, when the child was only 2, she and Archibald went on a round-the-world tour, allegedly to promote the British Empire Exhibition. So she sounds like a lousy mother, if nothing else. But since this was an exhibition at Wembley Park in 1924, I am not clear on how their travelling around the world in 1922 could promote it. Plus, we are told the Christies surfed in South Africa and Hawaii on this tour (see pic above). South Africa was independent in 1922, and Hawaii was a US territory. So neither were part of the British Empire, you see. And how exactly does surfing in Hawaii promote the British Empire? When they returned to England, the Christies apparently played a lot of golf, winning trophies at the club and so on. This doesn't really fit my old impression of her, how about you?

In 1926, Archie left her for a younger woman and she allegedly had a breakdown. In 1928 she took the Orient Express to Baghdad, where she met her second husband Sir Max Lucie Edgar Mallowen, CBE. CBE means Order of the British Empire, making him a knight. He was a wing commander in WWII, not resigning his commission until 1954. This indicates he may also have been Intelligence. In **1947**, while still in the military, he was “appointed” Professor of Archaeology at the University of London. That is the wording at Wiki. Not “hired” but “appointed”. At the same time he was director of the British School of Archaeology in Iraq, a position he held until 1961. Archaeology has often been a cover for spying.

Strange, isn't it, that both of Agatha's husbands were knights of some kind? One CBE and the other CMG. What are the odds? It makes one wonder if anything has ever been published in the US or UK that wasn't funded and promoted by Intelligence. According to my research, the answer is no. Nothing has ever appeared since the dawn of time that wasn't rubberstamped by the spooks. Furthermore, it looks to me like nothing has ever appeared that didn't come from their own offices. In other words, they not only fund it and promote it, they *create* it. Which might explain why it is all the same sort of garbage.

Even MI5 thought Agatha was a spook in 1941, when they investigated her in the Major Bletchley incident. But this just indicates to me that one arm of Intel hadn't received the memo on Mrs. Christie.

They were soon brought up to speed. She became CBE herself in 1956 and DBE in 1971. From 1968, she was styled Dame Mallowen, due to her husband's knighthood. Strangely, in that same year she sold a controlling interest in Agatha Christie Limited to Booker Books (which now runs the Intel-front Booker Prize). They own 64% of the company. Why would she do that? Did she need the cash? No. But it reminds us of the actions of the Beatles at the same time. Remember, they also sold the bulk of their publishing rights for a pittance in the 1960s. I would say Christie, like the Beatles, sold because she was *told* to sell. As project fronts, Christie and the Beatles weren't meant to keep the rights to "their" works. The real owners were the families that owned and ran Intelligence.

So what or who is behind the Booker Group? It was founded by the Bookers in 1835, and they owned a fleet of ships. They imported sugar from plantations they owned in Guyana, Barbados and other places, linking them to many others we have investigated. Basically, they were an arm of the East India Company, but trading mostly West instead of East. In 1952, Booker was taken over by Jock **Campbell**, whose last name you will recognize. He was a Fabian, which links us to the London School of Economics and that nest of spooks. By that time, Booker-McConnell was the largest food wholesaler in the UK, as well as branching out into publishing, shipping, etc. This year (2018) it was bought out by Tesco. There are 32 Bookers in the peerage, though the original ones are scrubbed. However, we do find them related to the Morrisises. In 1956, Patricia Booker married **Rupert Murdoch**. Yes, that Rupert Murdoch. Prudence Murdoch is their daughter. The Bookers are also related to the Liddells, the Fawcetts, the Tennants, the **Pagets**, and the MacKenzies. We saw the Pagets above, related to the Boehmers and Millers. Most importantly, through the Liddells the Bookers are related to the **Bowes-Lyons**, and through the Queen Mother to Queen Elizabeth II. So we have linked Agatha Christie to the Bookers, and through them to the Queen herself.

OK, let's look at some more pics of Agatha Christie. As it turns out, they don't match, and we have evidence the older Christie isn't the same as the younger. We also have several old ladies playing her after the War. We start with her standard book jacket photo:



We then compare that to a photo allegedly taken in her late 20s. The younger woman has a longer face, a stronger chin, and a more pointed nose. The nose we might be able to explain: noses do get larger and flabbier with age. But your face normally gets longer with age, not shorter. Same for your chin. Your chin does not rise with age.

But we can go back even further:



That is her in her teens. It does resemble her later pics, but what you should notice is the heavy fold *under* her eyes. She had that even as a child. But for some reason she has less of it in her 50s than in her teens. Does that make any sense? You will say she had surgery. Possibly, but normally you can tell when someone has surgery of that sort. There are minor scars, and the lower lids resag as you get older, causing newer and stranger wrinkles. We don't see that with Christie. Also, why would she have that surgery but never fix her teeth? Both you and I would have fixed the teeth first, which would indicate she probably didn't have the surgery at all. Her face shows no other signs of surgery later on, which is also strange. Someone who had bags under her eyes removed in her 30s, say, would be prone to have other surgeries later on.

This is also curious: it is the photo published when she allegedly went missing after her husband left her:



I wouldn't recognize her from that photo, would you? And I am very good at face recognition. It looks like none of the women above. Agatha rarely smiled for photos, since she always had bad teeth. So why would they publish a pic of her smiling? Would she be smiling after her husband left her? No, so again, why would they publish that if they wanted people to recognize her?



Here's a better copy. Still doesn't look like her to me. The face is heavily retouched, especially around the mouth. Why?

But here's the strangest one, from her 80s. I got it at thestage.co.uk, clearly tagged as Agatha Christie.



You will tell me that when people get really old, their faces change a lot. Yes, that is true, but not like that. That isn't the same lady. Let's compare it to the photo under title, where she is also quite old:



Look at the noses, to start. In the first, the nose slopes up on the bridge; in the second, it slopes down, in the Jewish way. In the first, the end of the nose is now gigantic and bulbous. In the second it isn't. And Christie never had eyes like that, with heavy lids and high eyebrows. Her eyes always sloped down at the corners, not up; her lidfolds were low; and her eyebrows were low over her eyes. As with everything else, your lidfolds don't become higher with age, do they? No, they droop down over your eyes, and sometimes require surgery. But in the first photo, her lidfolds are way above her eyes, and

her eyebrows are way above that. If you study the photographic record, you will see we have many people playing Agatha Christie over the years.

Now for the reason I hit on Agatha Christie today. I was told by one of my readers to watch the new *Murder on the Orient Express*. I looked it up, but since it involved a lot of actors I despise, I decided to watch the 1974 film instead. I had never seen it. Except for Jeremy Brett's Sherlock Holmes, I have never been a fan of mysteries. I was shocked to find it began with a pre-story involving the earlier kidnapping and murder of a little American girl. This story was clearly borrowed from the Lindbergh baby kidnapping of 1932. Since *Murder on the Orient Express* was written in 1934, it was obvious to me that Christie or her writing team was trying to resell [that recent hoax](#). The flimsy and ridiculous murder on the train plot was simply pasted over that story to make it seem plausible in comparison. I mean, if twelve people were going to conspire to murder a man, do you think they would do it on an expensive train with few stops? No, they would hire a professional and it would be done with no effort. Yes, the film was well-produced and watchable, but it, like the book, took a load of believing. The plot holes were piled one on top of another, as usual. You really had to want to be entertained.

As *Murder on the Orient Express* resells the Lindbergh baby kidnapping, the earlier *The Secret Adversary* resells the Lusitania sinking and other events of WWI. Also note that in the latter mystery, Tommy and Tuppence meet early on with Mr. Carter, a leader in British Intelligence, and go to work for him. We find that Tommy had previously been in Intelligence, and Carter is described glowingly as “like steel, all keen and flashing”. So you can see that by 1922, in her second book, Christie was already writing about MI5/6—although the book is otherwise little better than *Oliver Optic* for the post-WWI flapper crowd. Tuppence and her short skirts, you know. And Tommy is described at our first meeting as a gentleman and a sportsman—another clue as to where this story is being written, and by whom. In the first pages, we trip across the names Lyons, Cowley, Beresford, Lewis, Peel, Edgerton—also clues. Directly after that, we get a letter from a Julius Hersheimmer, to which Tommy says, “do a smell a Boche, or only an American millionaire of unfortunate ancestry?” A Boche is a German, by the way. By “unfortunate ancestry” we may suppose is meant “Jew”. In any case, another clue as to who is writing this. The Jewish Hersheimmer ends up being one of the heroes of the story. A last clue I will mention here is in chapter IV, where Mr. Carter tells us a Labour government would be “a grave disability for British trade”. Funny how that line got into this apolitical mystery, eh, allegedly written by a twenty-something young woman with no education. In the next lines, it gets even better, since we learn that Bolshevik gold is pouring into the country to procure a Revolution. Mr. Brown—a kind of Moriarity—is behind the Bolsheviks, and “most of the Peace propaganda during the war was originated and financed by him”. So our authors are clearly against Peace propaganda. Do I need to say more?*

As for *Death on the Nile*, this has been sold as an unsolvable plot twist, but I had figured it out before Mrs. Otterbourne was shot. I had suspected it from the first chapter.

What about *Ten Little Niggers*? Great title, one worthy of MI5 in 1939. Figures that one of the best selling books of all time would be entitled *Ten Little Niggers*. It was sold under that title until the 1960s in the UK. Though you probably know it as *And Then There Were None*. Notice that the action takes place on an island off the west coast of England. We are told it is off the coast of Devon, but of course it makes one think of **Anglesey**. Why? Because the characters are invited by the **Owens**. Also curious are the other characters, including General MacArthur. Remember, in 1939 Major General Douglas MacArthur was considered by some in US and British Intelligence to be a buffoon, retroactively awarding himself purple hearts for bravery in WWI. He was hated by others for viciously quashing the Bonus Army in 1932. More specifically, he was hated by Colonel Robert Sharon **Allen**,

who is now alleged to have been a Soviet agent or double-agent. In 1933 Allen and his newspaper strip partner Drew Pearson accused MacArthur of unwarranted brutality in the Bonus Army suppression, and MacArthur sued them. They threatened to call MacArthur's mistress to the stand, and MacArthur was forced to back down, eventually secretly paying *them* \$15,000 to drop a counter-suit. This is important here because we have already seen the Allens above. They were among the families related by marriage to the Judds, Bushes, and Millers. So it looks to me like General MacArthur was not included in this mystery by accident. And it is very doubtful that 20-something Agatha Christie inserted him into the plot. The name was chosen by British/US Intelligence specifically to embarrass Douglas MacArthur, and to cleverly accuse him of murder. I would guess we could say the same of the names Brent, Marston, Lombard, Claythorne, Rogers, Armstrong, and Blore—if we only knew the key to this transparent *roman a clef*. Rogers probably has something to do with H. H. Rogers, number two at Standard Oil. George Armstrong clearly refers to the Armstrongs of the peerage, including George Armstrong Custer. But Christie is probably referring to a more recent Armstrong, possibly one of the Baronets Armstrong. We also find a George Henry Blore in the peerage, whose father-in-law was a Colonel Smith, CBE. Possibly Smith inserted his son-in-law Blore into this story for some reason. Lombard is a Jewish name and it may refer here to Carole Lombard, who allegedly died just three years later in mysterious circumstances at age 33. You will say maybe the spooks got her, as in *Ten Little Niggers*. I doubt it. More likely she retired and faked her death, possibly to avoid some manufactured project of the spooks. She allegedly died on January 16, which adds to eight.

I could do more of Christie's books, but you see the method. They are amazingly transparent, and in *Ten Little Niggers* they didn't even bother putting the names in some sort of code, or at least anagramming them. The other books are almost equally transparent, and we see the agents signalling each other in broad daylight. It is incredible how brazen it is.

As more indication of this, we find Agatha saying in later interviews that she loathed Hercule Poirot. She called him a “detestable, bombastic, tiresome, ego-centric little creep”. What author would say that about her most famous character? She allegedly created him, and did so—we assume—to sell books. Agatha would say that only if she *didn't* create him. The actress Agatha is telling us she doesn't like being connected to this character she despises.

Also curious is that newer homages and sequels to Christie's books have come out, and that they are all by Jewish authors. See Sophie Hannah and Anthony Horowitz. Hannah's father is Norman Geras, a political theorist most known for his articles on Marx and Marxism. Her mother was born in Jerusalem and is also an author, although Wikipedia refuses to tell us her maiden name. Horowitz is not only Jewish, he is OBE.

We have seen in previous papers that the sales figures of other books have been inflated by huge amounts, as part of the effort to sell this propaganda to the public. See my papers on Fitzgerald, Hemingway, and Hawking, for instance. I suspect the same thing here. We are told that Christie has sold around 2 billion books, being the most popular novelist of all time. Believe that if you must, but I don't. She is inarguably one of the most promoted writers, but I have told you why that is. She is hard-sold by Intelligence because her books resell the recent hoaxes of history, confirm a modern view of life, and keep your eyes off more important things.

*Judith Hurdle, *The Getaway Guide to Agatha Christie's England*, p. 4.

I suppose I could say a bit more. See chapter VIII, where Tommy overhears a meeting of the Bolsheviks, presided over by a Russian. They are talking about the local Labour leaders, and he says “They must have no inkling that we are using them for our own ends. They are honest men—and that is their value to us. It is curious—but you cannot make a revolution without honest men. The instinct of the populace is infallible.” He paused, and then repeated, as though the phrase pleased him: “Every revolution has had its honest men. They are soon disposed of afterwards.” The authors are admitting this is how it is done, you see, but trying to make their readers think it is Bolsheviks doing it. As we now know, the Bolsheviks themselves are fronts for the Industrialists, so it is **British Trade undermining Labour leaders, not Bolsheviks.

†Compare his middle name to that of Thomas **Alva** Edison, whose ancestors also passed through Salem. This indicates they are relatives.