

RT. HON. SIR JOHN MAJOR



by Miles Mathis

First published June 14, 2019

As usual, this is just my opinion, protected as free speech by the US Constitution. In this country, I am allowed to read and study mainstream history and *disbelieve* it. I am not required by law to accept mainstream stories that do not make any sense.

Being a Yank, I never knew much about John Major—certainly never studied his bio for sense. But guess what? There isn't any. I will start by pasting here my recent footnote from the Lundy paper, where I made a start on Major's Wiki page:

Which brings up the curious fact that Sir John Major is not his real name. Wikipedia tells us his father is named Tom Major-Ball, but [Geni.com contradicts that](#), telling us his father was Abraham Thomas Ball, with only a stagename of Tom Major. So why is Wikipedia giving us the alias or stagename of the father of a Prime Minister as his real name? Doesn't that seem highly suspicious to you? And why would the Prime Minister of the UK be allowed to use a stage name? It reminds us of Stalin and Lenin and Hitler, who also existed under codenames or stagenames. They obviously scrubbed the name Abraham to keep you from asking if Major is Jewish. None of his grandparents are Majors either. The name isn't in his genealogy at all. And why did they scrub the name Ball? To keep you from linking him to Lucille Ball? No. To keep you from linking him to George Washington, who was the most famous Ball of all.

We are told John Major is the name on his birth certificate, with no middle name and a fake last name that does not match his father's or mother's or any of his grandparent's or great-grandparent's. Does that sound likely to you?

We have a Rhodes scrubbing these pages at Geni for us. Major is also a Leeson and a **Marrah**, pretty much confirming he is Jewish. Marrah is from Marah, meaning “bitter” in Hebrew, and it was one of the places on the Exodus. The Leesons are the Earls of Milltown, related to the Douglases, the Crosbys, Leighs, Stanhopes, and Greens. Major is also a Smith, and given all these other links, this may possibly link us back to Abel Smith, Nottingham banker. Also a Sewell (twice), a Coates, a Moore, a Crust (probably a fudge of Cust), a Palmer, and a Shepherd. And who was Major's

stepmother? Kitty **Grant**. That doesn't link us to anything in this paper, but it links us to [my other update](#) of today. Remember this: **Let me diagram it for you: Jahanbani → Kaminski → Graham → Grant → Khosrowshahi**. This is also interesting:

He would later regale his family with tales of [Harry Houdini](#) and [Marie Lloyd](#).

That's on John Major's father's Wikipedia page. I trust you caught the name Lloyd, linking us back to Darryl Lundy of thepeerage.com.

One of Major's stepbrothers is named Tom Moss, for reasons not given. He may have taken his mother's name, which would indicate she was Jewish. The bios refuse to tell us her name, listing her as "a dancer". Major's brother Terry Major-Ball also took the stagename as his real name, and we are told he was both a meter installer and a banker. Really? Terry also has ties to Christchurch, NZ. That is where he started some gnome business.

You may also like to know that Sir John Major's wife Norma Wagstaff is in the peerage, though she changed her name to Johnson. Another name change, what do you know? She is also a de **Wolfe**. Her Wagstaffs are very conspicuously scrubbed at thepeerage, but other Wagstaffs there tell us more. See for example John **Kennedy** Wagstaff, who married the daughter of Lt. Col. George Holt Innes of Bermuda. This links us to the **Levin** Marshalls of Mississippi, as well as the Dunbars there. This also links us to the Harpours (Harpers), Isle of Man. On the island, we link to the Earls of Annesley through the Biggs. They link us to the Vaughans, Taylors, Beresfords, Powers, etc. The Innes also links us to the Butlers.

End of footnote. Today I decided to expand this. Why? Because I read this at Wikipedia:

After a period of unemployment, Major started working at the [London Electricity Board](#) in 1963 which is where incidentally his successor as Prime Minister, [Tony Blair](#), also worked when he was young. He later decided to undertake a correspondence course in banking. Major took up a post as an executive at the [Standard Chartered Bank](#) in May 1965 and he rose quickly through the ranks.

Red flags all over the place, being thrown directly in your face. Both Major and Blair came out of the London Electricity Board? Major started working there when he was 19, with no degree in anything. He had dropped out of highschool at age 15. Nonetheless, we are told he was previously hired at age 16 to be a clerk at **Pratt** and Sons, a major brokerage firm. Really? So Pratt was hiring highschool dropouts, were they, just to be nice?

Next we are told it was misreported that Major failed to be hired as a bus driver in this period because he failed a math test. We are assured that he passed the test, but was not hired because he was too tall. Too tall to drive a bus? Those London busses have high ceilings, don't they? Most busses do. And how tall is Major? He is listed as 6'0", which means he may be that tall in shoes. So again, no sense to that story.

Plus, if he was landing jobs at Pratt and Sons and the London Electricity Board as a very young man for no apparent reason, why would he be applying to drive a bus?

Which leads us back to the London Electricity Board. Why were they hiring 19-year-old highschool drop-outs who couldn't even qualify to drive a bus? To figure it out, let's look at Blair as well. He

dropped out of highschool at age 18, with no degree of course. Note the language at Wikipedia, which says he “left Fettes” at the age of 18, not that he *graduated* at age 18. Left, not graduated. He spent the next year trying to be a rock music promoter. At age 18? Why would he think he was qualified to do that? Well, like Major, Blair came from a family of entertainers (actors). Major's father was an actor and both of Blair's paternal grandparents were actors/entertainers. So keep that in mind. That career didn't pan out, not surprisingly (given Blair's inability to entertain anyone), so he decided to enroll at Oxford, reading for the law. What? He didn't even graduate highschool, so why would Oxford, the most prestigious university in the UK and maybe the world, accept him? Nonetheless, we are told he graduated Oxford in only three years, gaining a BA. Pretty hard to believe. Blair was supposedly a Trotskyist while at Oxford, also improbable, since this was in the 1970s, not the 1930s. He joined the Labour Party right after graduation.

You're waiting for me to get to Blair's time at the London Electricity Board, right? Well, guess what, it isn't mentioned on Blair's Wiki page. Only on Major's Wiki page. Strange, eh? But both of them being there early in their careers would suggest the position was some sort of MI5 sinecure or testing ground for young recruits. Otherwise we can make no sense of it. Blair's entry there may have been greased by his family, since we find with little research that the Chairman of the LEB in the 1960s had been **David Blair Irving**. Does that also link us to David Irving? It is a question to ask, but I will not get to it here.

So let's return to Major. Yes, Wikipedia says he took a correspondence course in banking at age 20, and by age 21 he “took up a post as an executive” at a bank. Hmmm. I didn't realize becoming a bank **executive** was that easy. With no degree or experience, they simply appoint you as an executive at age 21, based on a correspondence course? And what bank had such a rigorous application process? Standard Chartered Bank, 28th largest company on the London Stock Exchange with assets of 689 billion in 2018. With that sort of cushion, I guess they can hire people off the streets with no worry: if they lose a few million here and there it won't matter. They have dealt with stuff like that over the years. See the 1992 scandal in India, where they allegedly lost £350 million when executives in Mumbai (no doubt hired from the correspondence course lists) invested clients' money in the stock market without their knowledge. In 1994 another executive bribed officials in Malaysia and the Philippines. In the same year executives in Hong Kong inflated the prices of underwritten shares. In 2012, the bank was charged with money laundering in New York and paid a \$340 million fine (for laundering \$250 *billion*). Treasury continues the investigation on this case, and it is reported at Wikipedia that Standard Chartered may have to pay another \$1 billion fine. Even if they do, that will be a fine of .5% of the money laundered.

In 1967, at age 23 or 24, Major was sent by the bank to Nigeria to work in their offices there. Which sort of clashes with the next section, on Major's political career. We are told he stood as a candidate for Lambeth London Borough Council in 1964, at age 21. I guess that is while he was doing his correspondence course in banking. Good thing he didn't win, or he would never have become a banker. He was elected to that post in 1968, so he must have rushed back from Nigeria to campaign for it. How do you “quickly rise through the ranks” of executive banking, while at the same time being a London City Councillor and Chairman of the Housing Committee? Don't tell me. Let me guess. He is a twin?

Next we hit something really strange at Wiki:

Major was an active Young Conservative, and according to his biographer Anthony Seldon brought "youthful exuberance" to the Tories in Brixton, but was often in trouble with the

professional agent Marion Standing.

Can you make sense of that? I can't. Why would a banker and city councillor be in trouble with a professional agent? Does such a person need an agent? A search on Marion Standing pulls up nothing, so maybe one of my British readers can clue me in here. But for now, I remind you who does need an agent. **An actor.**

Next they admit that Major was groomed or handled in this period by a Jean Kierans. And who was she? Well, she was 14 years older, which is strange on the face of it. We are told she was a stunning 30-something, which might explain it, but—guess what?—there are zero pictures of her. The only picture tagged [Jean Kierans](#) online does not appear to be our lady, and besides she is not stunning. Given what we have already discovered, my guess would be that Jean Kierans was Major's MI5 handler, or something like that. He was chosen for his haircut and his links to the peerage and his zero personality, groomed to be a political front for the people really running the country. When his connections to her were later discovered, a story was manufactured about them being lovers. But the story doesn't really fly, for many reasons. If she *weren't* MI5, she wouldn't be such a ghost. There would be pictures of her and a bio. We would know something about her. Instead, all we know of her is what we are told in these later mainstream puff pieces, which tell us nothing we can verify. For instance, [this story](#) at the *Independent* from 1995 tells us nothing useful or verifiable about Kierans, though it does admit Major faked his residence for the 1969 council elections. Note the name of the street he (didn't) live on: **Templar** Street. These people never quit.

Besides, if she was his groom and lover during his time as a London Councillor, there would be pictures of them together. He should have been a minor star in the city, becoming a councillor in his 20s, and if she was so hot the photographers would have been all over her as well. There were cameras back in the 1960s, remember? But we find nothing. A search on “John Major young” pulls up only one photo from the 70s. I have a far greater photo presence on the web through the years than this PM of England, which you should find very suspicious.

Tying in here is the later story of Junior Health Minister Edwina Currie (nee **Cohen**), who claimed in 2002 to have had an affair with Major in the 1980s. This one also doesn't pass the sniff test. Why?



Would you risk your career for that? You will say she was probably more stunning back in the 1980s.



So . . . not really. Like the Monica Lewinsky thing, this one doesn't look plausible to any heterosexual man. Major was already Thatcher's government whip, so a bit of a bigshot. If he had wanted to fool around on the side, he should have been doing it with dancers and models and artists, not this plastic Jewish lady. He could get that at home.

Which leads us down the usual path. If you aren't following me, maybe this will get you on track:

In February 1994, (as MP) she tabled an amendment to the [Criminal Justice and Public Order Bill](#) to lower the [age of consent](#) for homosexual sexual acts [from 21] to 16.

Why would a Conservative party member do that? Before that, in 1988, as Junior Health Minister, she allegedly appointed Jimmy Savile to head up a task force to run Broadmoor psychiatric hospital. This is actor and TV host Sir James Savile (of the peerage Saviles we assume), who, after his death in 2011, was outed as one of the greatest sexual predators in England. So exactly what qualifications did he have for running a psychiatric hospital? And does a Junior Minister even have the power to make such an appointment?

Savile was given extraordinary power and a set of keys with complete access to every part of the hospital. He mingled repeatedly with the 800 or so patients, many teenage girls, some severely disturbed and medicated.

Nothing suspicious there, right? Also worth noting: Savile was allegedly born on Halloween.

For the record, I don't believe the Savile story. No doubt he was a creep, but I don't believe he molested all these girls. I find it suspicious none of these claims ever made it to trial while he was alive. The story looks too much like many other stories I have exposed, including the [Boston priest](#) fake scandal and the [USA Gymnastics](#) fake scandal. I see it is as part of the huge men-are-pigs project

to split the sexes.

Not only were Savile and Major actors, but Currie became one, too. By 1998 she had her own talk show. She later appeared on a string of reality TV shows on the BBC. Is that the normal career arc of an MP?

So what does it mean? I would guess it means that both Major and Currie are gay, and that she claimed to have an affair with him to make him look straight. Possibly a gay scandal was on the near horizon, and she was trying to snuff it before it hit daylight. His legacy would be tarnished much less by an affair with her than by his outing as gay. I have no proof of that, of course. It is just conjecture, but it is supported by the research above and by what we have discovered in previous papers. It fits the plot of many many other stories, including of course the [Bill Clinton story](#) and the [JFK story](#).

As more indication of that, we find Major also pushed for the lowering of the gay age of consent, after [meeting with Ian McKellan](#). Like Currie, they wanted it lowered to 16, two years lower than the average age of consent in the US. Without getting into that whole can of worms, I simply point out how strange it is for the Conservatives to be pushing this. You would have expected the one of the more liberal parties to do so.

And why are you hearing any of this from me first? Because in the UK you can be hauled before a court for reading historical evidence like this in a new way. I could be tried for defamation for coming to my own conclusions, even though I admit it is just my opinion. They don't have a Constitution exactly like ours, you know, or a history of free speech. Here, I would have to be *lying on purpose* to be convicted of defamation, when it is clear I am just compiling mainstream evidence and questioning it.

So let us continue to question. Major first entered Parliament in 1979 at age 36, but was almost immediately appointed to be a Parliamentary Private Secretary. And what is that? It is someone

designated by a senior [minister](#) in government or shadow minister to act as the minister's contact with MPs.

And why was this fellow who had been an MP for about 1.5 years chosen for that? We aren't told. And who was his senior minister? We aren't told. Two years later, he was already an assistant whip. That's after being in Parliament for only 3.5 years. After 6 years he was already a Minister of State, and after 7 years he was in the Cabinet. By 1989, Major was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Wikipedia admits this was extraordinary:

This meant that, despite only being in the Cabinet for little over two years, Major had gone from the most junior position in the Cabinet to holding two of the [Great Offices of State](#).

Does anyone bother to tell us why? Not even. We are left to believe it was simply due to his genius. Or maybe it was once again [a matter of blowjobs](#).

But Major was only Chancellor for one year. When Thatcher stepped down in 1990, Major stepped in, winning the second ballot. If you don't think this all looks scripted, I don't know what to say. Major went from MP to Prime Minister in just 11 years. Major, the son of a music hall performer with no known connections, rose like a meteor due to. . . we aren't told. However, they do admit Major was a cousin of Thatcher. Just a coincidence: nothing to see there.

This also conflicts with his 6.5 year tenure as Prime Minister, where he was “weak and ineffectual”. He basically did nothing except get low approval ratings. This man who rose like a rocket through the ranks became Prime Minister and fizzled out completely. Does that make any sense? No. Nothing about his story makes any sense, as I told you coming in.

The Conservatives and Major himself were so uninspiring, the UK immediately entered a recession in 1990. To divert attention from that (and other things elsewhere), Bush and Major quickly manufactured the First Gulf War. Even more obviously manufactured was the ridiculous [Downing Street mortar attack](#), allegedly done by the IRA. Here are the clues:

The first shells were launched at 10:08am. Chai. Aces and eights. The launch site was 180m from the target. Chai again. One shell exploded in the back garden of 10 Downing, 30 yards away from the offices. So if the IRA were trying to kill anyone, they had terrible aim. But if they were trying to land the shell in the most conspicuous but safe place, their aim was perfect. They killed several feet of grass. My assumption is no mortar was involved. MI5 simply detonated something there as part of a plan. Do we have anything against that assumption? No. In fact, we have lots in favor of it, including the claim that the launch site was just outside the **Ministry of Defence** headquarters. If you were IRA, is that where you would launch? Why not just launch from the front lawn of the police station? We are supposed to believe these guys set up a mortar at the corner of Whitehall and Horse Guards Avenue, and no one noticed? Plus, from there you would have to fire over Dover House and those other buildings, with no line of sight. Why wouldn't IRA come in from St. James Park, where it would only have to fire over a few trees? They would have much better cover in the Park, and a far easier escape out the back, down Marlborough Road or others.

The response from Major is also odd. Allegedly under mortar attack, he only suggested they move to the COBR Room to continue the meeting. This is the planned response to a military attack on 10 Downing? Move to another room nearer the fire?

But what you should notice in scanning the encyclopedia pages on this event is that no perpetrators were caught. None are named. No investigation is even mentioned. We are told of no manhunt. Police sealed off the area, but we are not told about helicopters being called in immediately to scan for these IRA guys. Witnesses were quoted as seeing the car and the men, but we aren't given any features. They were just blobs dressed in gray, I guess, who immediately disappeared into the convenient snowstorm. So how do we know the IRA did this, supposing it even happened? They said they did. And how do we know that those who said they were the IRA really were? How do we know MI5 didn't call into the newspaper, pretending to be IRA? We don't. No one was ever caught and tried for this, so we know nothing that doesn't come from the media. Since the media is controlled by the government, we only know what they tell us, which is very little. I urge you to read closely the page on this event at Wikipedia. It tells you nothing of importance, nothing verifiable, and nothing that couldn't have been done much more easily by the Ministry of Defence itself. Some Brits may answer me that they have far more trust in the government than in the IRA or in my research. My answer: well, good luck to them then. Unless they are in the peerage, it hasn't really worked for them so far, but I'm sure the future will turn sunny all on its own.

Next, we are told opinion polls after the mortar attack showed Major as the most popular PM since Macmillan in the 1960s. But the story refutes itself in the next sentences, where we are told opinion polls showed the 1992 election a dead heat, and exit polls on the night of the election indicated a slim Labour lead. However, when the votes were (allegedly) counted, Major won by 7.5 percentage points.

So the election was not even close. That can mean only one of two things: either the election was stolen, or opinion polls and exit polls mean nothing. They must have a margin of error of around 8%, which means they are useless. Knowing a bit about exit polling, I will go with the first scenario. Exit polling has been shown to be quite accurate, far more accurate than 8%. But if you think the election wasn't stolen, then you have to believe opinion polls are useless, which means you have to dismiss the opinion polls that said Major was as popular as Macmillan.

How does the mainstream explain this discrepancy? Same way it explains similar discrepancies in US elections in the same period: it doesn't. In the US, the media dealt with fishy election results by badmouthing exit polls. For a time in the early 2000s, it discontinued them almost entirely, since they were showing up the steals. However, they soon discovered the US was not a nation of mathematicians. Most people couldn't put two and two together, so it didn't matter. Finally realizing that, the governors became evermore brazen in their steals, culminating in the Trump election—which was [a statistical absurdity in every possible way](#). In that one, they didn't even pretend to take the numbers seriously, simply making them up as they went along. The Great Oz doesn't even use a curtain anymore: he just takes a dump right in front of you.

Next we come to Black Wednesday, which they are still trying to sell you as an accident. It wasn't. It was another planned rape of the taxpayer and the treasury. Remember, the UK had just joined the ERM in 1990 at the urging of Major, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer. So do you think it was just an accident that only two years later, with Major as PM, the UK suddenly lost £3.3 billion? Thatcher entered the pound into the ERM on October 8, 1990. That's 10/8, Chai. They normally don't tell you where that money went, but it went to people like George Soros, who made at least £1 billion selling pounds on the exchange market. They don't tell you where the other billions went, but we may assume they went to other peers and bankers. The strange thing is that according to the deal, the UK government had to purchase any pounds put on the market. They surround that with a lot of noise to keep your eyes off it, but it is where the steal is. In a free market, no entity should be required to buy something it is not in its interest to buy, but here the UK treasury was “forced” to buy deflated pounds, which created a great loss to taxpayers. Anytime you see a big loss to taxpayers like this, where they aren't even in the loop, you should be suspicious. It is NEVER an accident or a result of bad policy. It is the result of a plan. Soros and these other rich people might as well have walked into the treasury and stolen the money at gunpoint: that is the only way the steal could have been more obvious. But no one was convicted of theft, because the government was an accessory to the crime. It was like the government had left the vault open, invited the thieves in, declined to prosecute or even notice the theft, and then covered it with a complex economic story, so that no one could understand what had happened. You are led to believe it had something to do with exchange rates. It had nothing to do with that, and everything to do with a conspiracy to defraud taxpayers. A large part of government is nothing more than a conspiracy to defraud taxpayers, as you should know by now.

Next we come to the section on “Sleaze”. While Major was supposedly trying to reinstate conservative family values, many members of his own party were discovered to be sleeping around, either with women or men. You may think this was just an ironic outcome, but it wasn't. It was planned as well. It was an early salvo in the men-are-pigs project. Since MPs don't really do anything except rubberstamp military budgets and welfare for bankers, they have a lot of free time on their hands. Being actors and fronts, they are expected to perform, and this is the performance required of many of them. They manufacture these sex scandals to keep real news off the front pages, and to continually confirm to women that men are not worth the prices of their haircuts. It works in conjunction with the serial killer project, the mass murderer project, the one-in-four rape project, and many others, acting to split the sexes, destroy the heterosexual relationship, and create sexual chaos. Why? Because this

sexual chaos is fantastically profitable to the billionaires and trillionaires. Miserable, confused people spend far more money on compensating products, and they are far easier to control as well. Because they are miserable, they are desperate for someone to help them, and that someone is the merchants, who have drugs, programs, gym memberships, porn, medical care, therapy, body alteration, tattoos, booze, guns, and many other things to sell them. This is the New World Disorder in a nutshell.

As a tack-on, I learned something about actress Justine Waddell today. I was rewatching *Wives and Daughters* this evening, which I know will fan the rumors of my gayness, but whatever. If you must know, I do enjoy these period pieces a lot, but not from any gayitude. I enjoy them because I am a throwback to another time. I am completely unfit for Modernity in all its forms, and have no truck with Futurism of any kind. I dread the future, and mostly dread the present. Plus, well, I like to see pretty women in pretty dresses, and I wish women still wore clothes like that. Honestly. I would rather see a woman in a pretty gown than in spandex yoga pants any day. It is called old-fashioned good taste—which is all but extinct. It is also called being artistic.



At any rate, I have had a bit of a crush on Waddell for years, but her career sort of went off the rails soon after that, so I have had to keep going back to the early films. Every time I watch this miniseries I Google Waddell to see if she has got her career back on track. I am always hopeful to find something new. No luck. It just keeps getting worse: see 2011's *Killing Bono*, a film where Waddell wears a white-blond wig and her voice is dubbed. I am told she gets topless, but I couldn't bear to see it. Seeing little Molly Gibson in a sordid sex scene might turn me off sex forever. But this time—cued by my new research abilities—I did think to dig a bit deeper. Turns out her father was a billionaire from South Africa who had married into the Oppenheimer family. Justine's stepmother is an Oppenheimer, of the DeBeers diamond family. Gordon Herbert Waddell ran Oppenheimer for a while, as well as the huge platinum mining firm Rustenberg (also Jewish, of course). And, given his names Gordon and Herbert, I suspect he is from those big families in the British peerage as well. He isn't listed at

thepeerage, but I suspect he has been scrubbed. Not just anyone marries an Oppenheimer and takes over the business. Only a duke does something like that, and the Gordons and Herberts are both dukes.