

[return to updates](#)

LIKE EVERYTHING ELSE, CHESS IS FIXED



by Miles Mathis

First published December 21, 2017

As I have said before, I don't play chess, although I know how. Why? Because I consider it the biggest waste of mental energy ever invented. I always suspected it was rigged at the top levels, but until today I didn't know for sure. I simply didn't want to waste time researching the question. But for some reason I snapped today: I got tired of hearing about Bobby Fischer and decided to study some of his big wins. It didn't take long to discover that his opponents were taking a dive. It was so obvious I can't believe I am the first to say it. I researched the question and found no one else saying these games were rigged. But I guess I should have expected that. I seem to be the only one blowing the cover of many other things, including the Lincoln Assassination, the Salem Trials, Custer's Last Stand, Hitler, Mussolini, and dozens of other events. So why be surprised I am the only one outing Bobby Fischer?



I am going to be uncharacteristically brief here, because, again, chess is not only not worth playing, it is not worth thinking about. It is only worth outing as another fraud. I am going to analyze four games, and you can follow along at Youtube. The first is [his famous game](#) at age thirteen against Donald Byrne (above). Byrne starts out very strong while Fischer starts out very weak on black, and I now

think this is to disguise the throw of the game by Byrne coming up. This game has been called a brilliancy, but since Byrne set Fischer up for it, it lacks something of brilliance in my eyes. The throw starts at 6:20 when Byrne conspicuously wastes a move with his queen, proceeding to C5 though this threatens black not at all. Byrne's next move is even worse, moving his bishop to G5 even though Fischer just began his attack on Byrne's king side with his own bishop. Byrne not only mysteriously fails to castle, he fails to accomplish anything with that bishop. So not only is the move wasted, it precludes several other far better moves. You will say everyone makes mistakes, but these are beginner mistakes. It is not really credible that an international master would be throwing away big moves at the most critical juncture of a game like this. Not only has he failed to castle, he has allowed his three pawns to get locked in there, so that if he does castle, his king won't be able to move. So not only is bishop to G5 a bad move, it is a horrible move, one that can't really be explained in hindsight.

We are then told that Bobby Fischer's next move was one of the greatest in the history of chess, but I'm not buying that. The youtube guy Kevin tells us to pause the game and see if we can predict what Fischer did next, as if it is pure genius. I did predict it, but I don't think it was pure genius. As I have said, I haven't studied chess, but even I saw it immediately. Byrne's king is out in the breeze, and if Fischer can attack quickly via E4, Byrne is in big trouble. The only piece Byrne has protecting E4 is his knight, so Fischer naturally needs to attack that knight. With his knight, Fischer can attack Byrne's knight and queen at the same time, so it is a pretty obvious move at that point. In fact, it is so obvious that Byrne can't even take Fischer's offered knight, refusing to do so. Instead, he moves his queen out of the way. But this move is just as stupid, since he moves her to A3. That is totally unnecessary since the pawn at B2 is already covering C3. Since by refusing to take the knight, Byrne is giving up his own knight, he knows he is going to lose his coverage of the pawn at E4. So he should be trying to cover that pawn with his queen. He can't possibly do that from A3, even in two moves. We are told he is at A3 to menace Fischer's pawn at E7, but he shouldn't be trying to play offense at this point. He is seeking the best defense with his queen, not the best offense. So A3 is another horrible move. He ends up getting his queen blocked by his own pawn, and he should have seen that coming since it was only one move ahead.

Fischer now takes the pawn in the center with his knight, and Byrne makes his fourth bonehead move in a row. Although the move of the knight gives Fischer two pieces pointing at Byrne's pawn at D4, including his queen, Byrne still refuses to play any defense, instead continuing his attack on E7. This attack is futile, since it is against a mobile queen instead of against the king. It simply allows Fischer to throw his queen into a new and better attacking position. But the back row is still as defended as it was before, since moving the queen frees up both rooks. Even more amazing is that Byrne is still refusing to move his bound bishop or castle his king. Because of those four awful moves, he is already beaten, as we will see.

But he isn't finished with his stupidity, since he now makes a fifth awful move, finally freeing that bishop but moving him too far. He again tries to be offensive when he should be playing defense. He moves the bishop to C4, where it poorly menaces F7 but is in no position to play defense. It is another wasted move. The next move is even worse, and is the sixth horrible move in a row from a supposed master of chess. Rather than finally castling his king, he moves his bishop back to menace and block Fischer's queen. This is both poor offense and poor defense, since it allows his king to be immediately put in check. Byrne therefore has to move his king back, wasting another move. That makes seven in a row.

Of course the next moves are the most famous, and Byrne now goes from idiot to moron. Fischer moves his bishop backwards to put it on Byrne's bishop. Although that bishop is on C4, inline with

Byrne's king, we are supposed to believe Byrne didn't see that. So rather than play defense, Byrne again tries offense, taking Fischer's queen. Unbelievable. He learned nothing from seven bad moves in a row, and we are led to think he is still underestimating the young Fischer. But are we supposed to believe Byrne had never played defense from white before? I guess we are supposed to believe he won every match in his life, and never had to play defense. He never noticed that his queen was lost on the sidelines, being completely out of play defensively for eight moves?

Yes, Fischer played a nice game, especially for a youth, but let's face it, Byrne made it easy on him. It isn't that hard to beat someone who makes bad move after bad move. From minute 6:20 Byrne never made a good move, and except for the late queen sacrifice by Fischer, it isn't like Fischer was really tricking or pressing him. In the middle of the game, Byrne was making his own mistakes, with little pressure from Fischer.



OK, let's move on to an even more famous game, [Fischer v. Spassky, game 10](#). Spassky, playing black, plays well until minute 4:26 in the video, when he moves his queen to E5. At that point he seems to have a better board than Fischer. But then Spassky's game begins to fall apart. When his queen is menaced by Fischer's bishop, he moves her to F4, a move with no backup. After an exchange, Spassky makes another stupid error, moving his rook from E8 to D8. This is a wasted move, because we see he has allowed his king to get boxed in. Moving the rook won't fix that. F7 is now vulnerable, but Spassky pretends not to see that, instead attacking weakly with his queen to achieve a worthless pawn.

But the worst move is yet to come. When Fischer attacks F7 with his bishop, Spassky fails to block with his pawn at C4, instead covering F7 with his rook. This is where he threw the game. No grandmaster would have failed to block that bishop. The youtube guy Kevin misdirects his audience here, saying the rook move was just as good, but that is a lie. As we can see in the event, it was a terrible move. Notice that Spassky fails to block *even after* Fischer moves his queen to menace F7 as well. So no one can claim Spassky failed to recognize the menace to F7. Until he puts his rook in line with F7, Spassky has no pieces defending that square at all, which is beyond belief. Even his queen is completely out of the action, pretending to menace a rook on E1. But since that rook is protected by the other rook, that menace is empty. The queen is completely out of the action and arrives too late to defend F7. Besides, it cannot be argued Spassky didn't see what Fischer was up to. Spassky takes the pawn at E5 in preparation for the block at C4, so he had to see the threat and the block. So there is no excuse for his failure to block. Plus, leaving the black pawn at C5 just guarantees his bishop at F8 can't get involved in anything that might happen in that part of the board. That black pawn nullifies any possible participation by that bishop in any upcoming action. Very suspicious. To see what I mean, Spassky's offense was lining up against E1, so his queen will need the support of that bishop. But leaving the pawn on C5 blocks that, so not moving that pawn is doubly strange.

But if we go back, the whole black attack of Spassky starting from the queen move to C3 at 6:20 makes no sense. If Spassky's back board had been strong, with all pieces in play, that might have been clever, but both his first rook and bishop are blocked and out of play. His b-row bishop is also basically out of play on that side of the board, so once he locks his queen in on the side board behind those pawns, Fischer knows he is a goner. Spassky can't respond to an attack from that side. Even the proper pawn block at C4 would have been difficult to follow up on, since Spassky's entire board is a mess. All his pieces are out of play. Even his rook at D8 is misplaced, since it is sitting on an empty row, menacing and defending absolutely nothing.

Spassky is already beaten at that point, since Fischer then attacks F7 with three pieces, and his rooks are also well-placed. After the exchange Fischer is down a pawn but still has two rooks, while Spassky only has a rook and bishop. So Spassky can only win if Fischer makes a bad error in the play out, which he doesn't. Given the disarray of Spassky's board at 6:20, Fischer should have been able to achieve an even greater advantage before the play out, but apparently he was satisfied being up a rook to a bishop. And since the game looks faked to start with, he had nothing to fear in the play out, did he?

As I said, it is beyond belief that Spassky wouldn't spot or defend a threat to F7. Spassky was playing black and was known for his defense. Any midlevel player would be looking for threats to F7, especially with a king blocked in back there, so the fact that Fischer was so easily able to line up three pieces including his queen on that square is not believable. It is also not believable that Spassky would allow his black-square bishop to sit there completely useless the entire game. If we reverse the game, we actually see him backing the bishop into that square after taking it out to E7. He did that to allow the rook full access in E, but as soon as he moved his queen up to E5, he should have gotten that bishop out of there, taking it to, say, E6. If he had, Fischer could never have lined up three pieces on F7 to start with. Only that bound bishop could allow something like that. So it looks like he did that on purpose, and is another way he threw the game.

All grandmasters are masters of defense. You don't get to that level attacking wildly in front of weak boards, do you? So I encourage you to study Spassky's back board at 6:20 and ask yourself if it is really credible. If you were playing Bobby Fischer in the match of the century, would you attack wildly with your queen while a rook and a bishop were completely out of play in the back row?

Now let us look at [game six](#) of the same series. We will start at minute 4:10, when Spassky blocks a bishop attack that isn't really menacing anything, with his pawn at A6. Kevin points out how curious this is, since Geller was one of Spassky's seconds and had defended this attack recently with queen to B7. The next strange move is with that queen at 5:52. He moves her back one row, but that achieves nothing. He then moves her forward to the same spot three moves later. So he has just wasted two moves at the most important juncture of the game. This turns out to be decisive.

By moving that queen back and forth, Spassky has failed to set up his board—which becomes really obvious about minute 8:00. Fischer has already locked in Spassky's remaining knight, and that could have easily been avoided if Spassky had got it out earlier. In addition, Spassky's queen is still out of the action, which is not really understandable, seeing that he has moved her twice for no reason. And while Fischer's rooks are on the proper rows, Spassky's are again misplaced. One of them is menacing a pawn at B2, but Fischer is utterly ignoring it for the moment, since Fischer can already see his own attack is far more progressed. Spassky will have to respond to him, and won't have time to attack that pawn with any real result.

Yes, the game is already over, and Spassky might as well resign. His defense has been so pathetic he has no chance. His board is like the board we saw in game 10: a shambles. All his pieces are out of position, allowing Fischer an easy win. Spassky adds to the embarrassment by moving his knight back to F8 but then failing to move it forward to G6 before Fischer blocks that with a pawn at F5. And yes, Spassky had that chance, but instead moved his own pawn to A5, a bonehead move. In fact, that is the most obvious throw of the game, in my opinion. Why would someone who needs to get his knight and queen into better position be moving pawns out of all action on the far side of the board? Does he really think he can attack with his rooks over there before Fischer demolishes him? No. He has been paid to take a fall.

As proof of that, Spassky then moves his knight. . . to H7. What! Why not to G6, where it and the queen can worry the rook and pawn? If Spassky does that and moves his rooks over, he may actually be able to salvage something, with a Fischer mistake. But with the knight to H7, he has just locked himself out of the action again. It also boxes in his own king. Spassky then wastes another move with his queen to D8. After thoroughly embarrassing himself with a string of bad moves, do you think Spassky would then stand up and applaud when Fischer beat him? He shouldn't have applauded, he should have slunk off with his coat over his head.



So let's look at one last game, Fischer's brilliancy against Robert Byrne. We already saw one against Donald Byrne, so we have to ask if these guys are related. Yes, they were brothers. Curious that two of Fischer's most famous games were against these brothers, isn't it? Well, it is also curious that we see the surname Byrne. Remember William Byrne, who presided over the fake Pentagon Papers trial? Also David Byrne, *Talking Heads* frontman. No biological info is given on these brothers who played Fischer, other than that they were from New York. The name Byrne is a variant of Burns, and the Burns were Barons of Inverclyde of Castle Wemyss, in Scotland. They ran the Cunard Steamship Co. They are related to the Arbuthnots, the Nugent-Dunbars, the Howard-Tripps, the Simpsons, the Mcleans, and the McKennas. Anyway, this Fischer/Byrne game was played in the 1963 US Championship. Fischer is on black. The problem begins at about 7:10, when Byrne begins wasting moves. He should see that Fischer has beat him to a strong board, and if he doesn't shore up very fast he is in big trouble. Instead of moving his pawns or knights, he moves his queen one square and then his rook two squares, achieving very little. Due to the pawns and knight on E2, he has blocked himself in. His queen is stymied except in the d-row, while Fischer's queen is set to pounce. Byrne can neither pounce nor defend with his queen. And the importance of getting that knight to F4 is made apparent after Fischer attacks with his own knights. With a white knight at F4, Fischer would not have been able to take his first knight into the gap at D3, and would not have been able to take his second knight to G2, since Byrne's knight would have been covering both. Of course Fischer would then move his queen to C7 to menace F4, but Byrne has his own queen to cover. And if Fischer moved the queen, his pawn at

D5 would be vulnerable, freeing the center of the board for Byrne to take. So Byrne actually has to do very little to throw this game to Fischer. Since Fischer is admittedly playing very strongly, all Byrne has to do is waste a few early moves, boxing himself in on purpose. Nor does he ever think to pull his farside rook and bishop into the fray, once he realizes he can't attack from that side. As you see, Fischer's a-row bishop is helping his attack, but Byrne's a-row bishop isn't helping his defense. So he needed to pull it back to C1 to use in his defense. He never got around to doing that because he was wasting moves with his queen and rook. The commenter says Byrne should have moved his far rook over instead of his near rook. But that isn't true. The pieces Byrne needed to be moving at that point were the knight at E2 and the bishop at A3. With those and a proper queen position he could have hoped to defend against Fischer's knights. But with all his pieces blocking one another, he had no chance, and lost ridiculously fast. Again, you wouldn't expect such ineptness from such a player, and to me it looks almost as suspicious as the other losses.

I will do one more as a bonus, since I happened to trip over [the Immortal Game](#) while researching this paper. I actually took the time to play it out myself, setting up a board at the point of the last moves. This was between Anderssen and Kieseritsky in the 19th century. It is one of the most famous games of all time, apparently, although it looks like another obvious throw to me. Just notice the ending, where Kieseritsky has a chance to put Anderssen in check with his queen, by capturing his rook. Instead he sends his bishop in first. This makes no sense, because the bishop doesn't put Anderssen in check, allowing him to ignore the attack and finish out his own attack. Black has to leave that bishop back to protect, and he can't get both rooks with his queen, but since she is right in line with the white attack all along, she foils it even while taking the first rook. According to my play-out, she has to come back up and sacrifice herself to stop the attack, but can do so. This may or may not mean white wins anyway, and I suspect he does, since all black's pieces are locked in. But why not show the real play out instead of this faked ending? How is a faked ending an "immortal game"? More to the point, how is a game where one side plays like garbage an immortal game? Kieseritsky's early game is awful, and he is obviously just Anderssen's chosen patsy. He gives up his b-pawn for no reason, moves his queen and knight backwards several times, and generally plays like a four-year-old girl. He then fails to attack the knight at F5 with his g-pawn, another mystery failure (as Kevin admits). I have never seen a game more obviously thrown, so why do we still have to hear about it? There is nothing beautiful about it in my eyes. Just the reverse. I have played more "immortal" games against a level-one computer.

So what am I saying? Am I saying these guys aren't great chess players? No. They are very good players, as one would hope given that they have devoted thousands of hours to a stupid game. I am saying that the top players appear to be anointed. Fischer was another creepy asshole from the top Jewish families, promoted as a genius as part of his birthright. But I for one don't accept that sale. Chess players aren't geniuses, since they don't even have the intelligence to see that chess is a completely meaningless skill. As usual, the game is promoted heavily for two main reasons: 1) to promote these children of the wealthy as fascinating when they aren't, 2) to promote a meaningless game to intelligent people as a viable use of their intelligence, to divert them from more meaningful uses. They don't want intelligent people learning anything that might be useful to them later, or seeing through all the veils, so they have to misdirect them with an avalanche of petty and shallow shunts. Chess and other games are one such shunt. Sports are another.

I know because they have been trying to divert me all my life with these things, and I have to think they are very sorry not to have succeeded. As you know, they teach chess to "brainy" kids ostensibly as a form of mind sharpening; and although it can do that in moderation, anything beyond that moderation will be not a mind sharpening but a mind narrowing. I was pushed into chess as a kid, and although I was quite good in short bursts, I never really accepted the main premise: that it was laudable to devote

many hours to a limited game. I always started with a barrage of offense, almost always including a queen gambit, but if I didn't win in the first thirty minutes I got bored. For me, there were always many more interesting things to do than push little pieces around in a square. It didn't seem like a great test of my intelligence, to be honest, and I always considered myself too good for the game. I don't say that as a form of ego, since I consider *all* people too good for the game. In short, I just couldn't make myself care. If I got up two big pieces and my opponent didn't resign, I quit. I considered my opponent a moron. I also hated the stalemate rule, for the same reason. It is the stupidest rule in all of games and sports. For myself, I had no interest in winning by stalemate. I resigned if I was down rather than run up and down the board trying to force a draw that way in an ugly endgame. So I couldn't understand why my opponent didn't do the same. A stalemate is an unmanly win. If you are down at the end, you are *supposed* to lose. That is what the game is about. Which is perhaps why all the people at the highest levels are pussies. Everyone with any native self-respect and virtue quit at age 10. I was told that patience was one of the things to learn, but I never bought that line, either. I have great patience when necessary, but I couldn't convince myself that in the second half of a chess game it was important. What was more important was getting up and getting on with my life.

At Wikipedia, it says "In the 19th century, chess was occasionally criticized as a waste of time". Yes, and that is because in the 19th century a few people still had some sense. But no one in the 20th or 21st centuries has thought chess is a waste of time? Really? Well, let me be the first. Some of my friends used to call me NC, for "Nineteenth Century". I embraced that, and I embrace it more full everyday. This is just one more reason why.

I never got very far in chess, but I came up against the question more strongly in golf, which I had pretty much mastered by the time I was sixteen. I was a tournament golfer like my father, and there was some early talk of playing in college and maybe someday playing professionally. But already by sixteen I had exhausted my patience with the game. I just didn't care if I was better than the next guy, and the thought of playing golf all day every day bored me stiff. It was great a couple of times a week in the summer, but devoting a lifetime to it smacked of idiocy. I had more important things to do with my life.

Plus, if you play golf for a living you have to hang out everyday with a bunch of upper-class country club nitwits, most of them Republicans. Life is enough of a torture without that.

I know that some will say that art is also a waste of time. The business world considers art a pastime for blue-haired old ladies and those in therapy, and if it weren't an investment for the rich guys it would be useless to history. But those who say this are obviously very limited persons, probably without a shred of creativity and certainly without a shred of taste or depth. What they think or say has never concerned me. For those who would lump art in with sport as a meaningless leisure activity, a footnote in the game of life, I simply ask them to name an important sportsman before the 20th century. Most people won't be able to come up with a single one before, say, Babe Ruth. But even the most ignorant can name dozens of famous artists. Do we have any museums of ancient or classical sport? No, but every city has a museum of art, and the big cities have many. That is to say, the importance and power of art is generally recognized.

For that matter, can you name any famous **businessmen** before 1900, famous for business alone? You may be able to name a few rich guys, famous just for being rich, but most of them were born rich and the others were robber barons, with a totally negative influence on the world. Which is why there are no business museums devoted to showcasing the great work of businessmen. There is nothing tangible to put in such museums, for a start, and if you did have to come up with something you could only dig

up all the dead bodies these guys were responsible for in wars and manufactured depressions. The museum would only house a pile of bones.

You will tell me they were responsible for building all the great cities of the world. No they weren't. Those cities were built by architects and artists and stone carvers and real workers. The rich guys only provided the money, which they stole from other workers the world over. Do you think Louis XIV built or even designed Versailles? No, he simply hired it out. He gets zero creative credit. Most of the value of Versailles is in the interior decorations, which were created by . . . artists. To see this in even brighter light, look at the wealthiest businessmen now, who are the wealthiest people in the history of the world. Look at the houses and cities these guys are building: some the most atrocious monstrosities since the dawn of time. And they can't even hire artists or artisans to decorate them beautifully, since they destroyed art and architecture on purpose many decades ago. All the real artists joined the pile of bones long ago.

But back to sport. I am not saying sports or exercise should be avoided as a complete waste of energy. I am involved in many to this day, including golf, volleyball, yoga, and others. I don't regret the time spent. But sports and games as professions are perverse. Even more perverse is the selling of these professional sports and games as something laudable and important, with top figures promoted as heroes and geniuses. Nothing could be more absurd. Setting these people up as heroes is simply the inversion of sense, and the burying of real achievement by fake achievement.

For example, notice that Fischer's Wikipedia page is nearly endless, with 672 endnotes. Compare that to Isaac Newton's or Leonardo's pages, which are about a fifth the length. Leonardo did something with his genius besides play chess, remember?

If you still don't believe me, let us return to Fischer, to drive the point home with a real person. There have been at least six major flims about Fischer, though he never did anything important in his life. The most famous of these flims is probably *Searching for Bobby Fischer*, which came out in 1982. It is based on the life as a child of Joshua Waitzkin, Jewish of course, and it tries to make heroes out of both Waitzkin and Fischer. Another flim is the documentary *Bobby Fischer against the World*, which you can judge from its exclamatory title and not lose anything. There Fischer is sold as some great warrior of freedom against the evil Soviets, despite the fact that Fischer was of Russian Jewish extraction and later was listed as a terrorist by the US. You may assume that whole thing was another charade, Fischer's late assignment, but I will not hit that here. Another flim is the 2014 *Pawn Sacrifice* starring Tobey Maguire. This flim turns up the volume on the propaganda, flashing back to Fischer's childhood and trying to sell you Socialism as a real movement instead of the CIA project it was. However, we do get one clue, since they remind you of all the absurd demands Fischer made when playing Spassky in 1972. You should now read those demands in terms of the hoax being pulled. Neither Fischer nor Spassky wanted the hoax to be penetrated, so they needed to create this diversion with Fischer's paranoia. Notice that they moved to a back room **away from the cameras**. In this flim we also see Spassky rising to applaud Fischer after losing game six to him—something that would never happen in real life but that now makes sense.



As it turns out, we now know Bobby Fischer's biological father wasn't Hans Fischer, but Paul Nemenyi, above, a Jewish mathematician from Hungary who worked on the Manhattan Project. Nemenyi's father was director of INA, a Hungarian oil company. The family name had been changed from **Neumann**. Not only was Nemenyi closely related to John von Neumann, he was descended from the surnames **Heller, Halasz, Schlesinger, Koppely, Hatvany-Deutsch** and Fischer. So Bobby was a Fischer through his 2g-grandfather if not through his stepfather. Note the name Heller, [which is a variant of... Hiller](#). Bobby Fischer's mother was a Wender and an **Abramson**, both scrubbed at Geni.

Through the name Hatvany-Deutsch, the Nemenyis were closely related to major Jewish industrialist Baron [Sandor Hatvany-Deutsch](#), originally Deutsch, one of the wealthiest men in Hungary at the turn of the century (1900) due to his sugar empire. Remember, we have seen these sugar magnates in many previous papers. The Baron was also a banker. His vast art collection was allegedly seized from his son by the Nazis, but we have seen those seizures were other hoaxes, probably run to hide assets or launder money in some way.

Curiously, Wikipedia fails to mention that Paul Nemenyi worked on the Manhattan Project, and we have to dig up the info elsewhere. Wiki admits Nemenyi worked for the Naval Ordnance Lab in White Oak after the war, but doesn't mention anything about Nemenyi's whereabouts during the war. We also find more connections when we go to the Wiki page for Peter Nemenyi, son of Paul and half-brother of Bobby. There we find Peter was sent to the **Isle of Man** during the war, allegedly interned for being a Socialist. Strange place to intern rich Jews, isn't it? Well, we now know how to read that, too, since Isle of Man is the ancient stronghold of the Stanleys and other crypto-Jewish peers.

So this is who Bobby Fischer really was. We are told Bobby had an impoverished childhood, but this is the standard sob story. His father was from a wealthy European family, with oil money, sugar money, banking money, and money from the State, and he was then living in Hanford, Washington. Being an Abramson, we may assume Bobby's mother was from wealth as well. Otherwise how did she meet the privileged Nemenyi? See the coiner and banker Abraham Abramson, of the court of Frederick the Great. We also probably link here to founder of Atlantic Records, Herb Abramson, who came out of Brooklyn in the 1940s. Also to Jill Abramson, former editor of the *New York Times*.

I wish to remind you that Fischer became involved with **Herbert Armstrong's** Worldwide Church of God in the late 70s in Los Angeles. You may remember it as the later falling place of Garner Ted Armstrong. The mainstream bios pass this off as part of Fischer's eccentricity or madness, but that is to miss the story here. I could point to this as another sign of Fischer's lack of any real intelligence—since what intelligent person would get involved in such an enterprise?—but it goes even deeper than that. This church was itself another CIA front, part of the continuation of the [Theosophy Project to](#)

[damage Christianity I have outed elsewhere](#). Note the names Herbert and Armstrong, which are both from the families. See the Herberts, Earls of Carnarvon, as well as the Armstrongs, as in [George Armstrong Custer—also from the peerage](#). This indicates Fischer was recruited to add his prestige to this project, which tells me he was some sort of agent all along. You will tell me Fischer later quit the church, calling it Satanic. Yes, that was his assignment. They set these churches up for spectacular failure, usually with gigantic sex scandals—which blackwashes Christianity like nothing else could.

But you ain't seen nothin' yet.



I was searching the net for images of Herbert Armstrong when I came to that one. Glancing at the thumbnail, I thought, “Oh, there is Fischer posing with Herbert and his wife”. No. That guy in the middle is tagged as Garner Ted Armstrong. But he does look very much like Fischer, with the same head shape, long nose, and eyes. Problem is, he *doesn't* look like Garner Ted Armstrong. So is that photo generally mistagged across the internet, or did they have multiple people playing Garner Ted? Regardless, we have to ask, “**Who is that guy with the Armstrongs**, and why does he look so much like Fischer?” Judging from the age of the Armstrongs and the fact that the picture is black and white, it looks to be from the 1960s. Therefore, it would match Fischer's age at the time. So it could be Fischer. Hard to tell for sure, since I could find no other pics of him smiling. He wasn't a happy guy. But if that is Fischer, what was he doing with the Armstrongs back in the 1960s? He was supposed to be Jewish at the time, refusing to play on the Sabbath. My guess is that IS Fischer, and that it has been mistagged to hide that fact. They are trying to hide the connections of both Fischer and the Armstrongs, since it cuts both ways: Fischer was a spook even at that age, and the Armstrongs were crypto-Jews running a project against Christianity.

[A reader sent me indication the above photo is the Armstrongs with their other son Richard, not Garner Ted. Which means the photo *was* mistagged in several places on the internet. I still find it curious that Richard looks so much like Fischer, with that long face and nose. He doesn't look at all like his brother Garner Ted. I also still assume that Fischer was not accidentally later linked to the Armstrongs. All these families are related, and I believe Fischer was brought in as a cousin to work the project. These Armstrongs are likely related to George Armstrong Custer, and these families have been running hoaxes for centuries. Curiously, my reader is apparently a fan of the Armstrongs, and he defended them against the crypto-Jewish claim by telling me they actually bragged about being descended from King David. In other words, they *admitted* they were Jewish. Good to know.]

But let us return to Fischer and his chess record. As more indication I am right about Fischer, see the Wiki section on his record against other grandmasters. It is very thin, going into the double digits only with Spassky, and being negative against Tal and Geller. He was even against Korchnoi, Botvinnik, Bronstein, Euwe, and Polugaevsky. Which makes Spassky's throws that much more important.



What about Garry Kasparov? Is he for real? Nope. To get us started, you may like to know his real name is Garik Kimovich **Weinstein**. So why the name change? Why can't these people exist under their own names? Probably because he wanted to be known as a Russian, not as a Jew. Kasparov's mother is scrubbed, being given as only as Klara Shagenovna **Gasparian**, no parents. She is supposed to have been Christian, but see Comendador **Levy** Gasparian in Rio de Janeiro, and note the name Levy. Kasparov has other red flags on him, starting with his high-profile loss to the chess computer program Deep Blue, selling computers as intelligent. This might seem like an isolated event, not meaning what I am implying it means, except that Kasparov went on to do a [TED talk](#) this year, the subject of which was “not fearing intelligent machines”. TED is the exclusive format of spooks. This ties Kasparov to the sale of AI and to such people as Ray Kurzweil. I also discovered Kasparov is married to a Tarasova, full name not given. This is interesting because the name Tarasov is prominent in the Russian “left”. See Alexander Tarasov, self-styled post-Marxist. He started the Party of New Communists in 1973, which indicates to me he was a spook. Like Kasparov, Tarasov has been propped up as an enemy of Putin. Both of them are supposedly on neo-Nazi lists for extermination, having spoken out against Putin and the current Russian regime. Kasparov was one of the founders of The Other Russia, an anti-Putin organization, so it is probable Kasparov and Tarasov are linked, and that they are both agents. The Other Russia is clearly a manufactured organization, created as a release valve for anti-Putin sentiment, but otherwise intended to be ineffectual. Compare it to the fake leftist organizations in the US like Occupy Wall Street, etc.

Kasparov wrote an op-ed for the *Wall Street Journal* in 2013, the outward point of which was questioning whether the FSB had cooperated with the FBI on the Boston Marathon bombing case, but the real point of which was confirming that the bombing was real and the the Tsarnaevs were real terrorists. In other words, Kasparov was hired to make the event seem real, [though it was a hoax from top to bottom](#). This again indicates Kasparov is an agent of worldwide Intel.

The same thing can be said of Kasparov's comments on the Syrian Civil War, where he claimed Putin was behind Assad. That is more misdirection, since these wars are manufactured and managed by worldwide Intelligence, to keep the militaries properly fattened. Assad isn't a front for Putin; rather, Assad, Putin, Obama, and Trump are *all* fronts for Intel, which is a front for the wealthiest families.

Kasparov's 2015 book *Winter is Coming* should have been entitled *A Fake War with Russia is Coming*,

since he warns against “appeasement” and argues for immediate confrontation. That alone should peg him.

As for his chess record, you will have to study that yourself. I have analyzed four games already and have no desire to do more. But your suspicions should have been raised.



What about Magnus Carlsen? First thing to ask is, who is his mother? Her maiden name is Oen. I will put you on the chess clock to figure that one out. Tick, tick.

Try saying it outloud. And then try adding a “w”. As in **Owen**. Think I made it up? Go [here](#).

I am already weary of this, but my guess is that although Carlsen is sold as a blond Scandinavian beast, he is actually Jewish as well, and is related to the famous Owens of Wales, including the early promoters of Socialism. They tell us Carlsen is scattering the Jewish chessmasters, but remember that they also tried to sell us Fischer as an anti-Semite—although he was a practicing Jew. Kasparov (Weinstein) has called himself a “self-appointed Christian”. You have to laugh.

Addendum January 23, 2018: a reader sent me to look at the newer computer v. computer games for more indications of throws. I went straight to the recent 100-game match of AlphaZero against Stockfish8. Stockfish is supposed to be able to analyze 70 million positions per second, but Google's AlphaZero allegedly [beat it easily](#) after studying the game of chess for only four hours. The score was 28-0 with 72 draws. Stockfish didn't win one game. When explaining how AlphaZero is so good, they tell us it is because it makes use of “deep neural networks”, allowing it to perform like the human brain. What? That makes no sense on any level. Computers don't have neurons, so nothing they contain could be called “neural”. Plus, why would computers wish to perform like humans? Humans allegedly suck at chess compared to computers, and no one can beat either Stockfish8 or AlphaZero. The smartest humans can analyze, what, 4 moves a second? So we already know we are being snowed just from the PR package here.

But then we go to the games, a few of which are published at Youtube by the ChessNetwork. If you thought you were going to watch the equivalent of Federer/Nadal or Nicklaus/Woods, with amazing moves at each point, you will be disappointed. The games look very much like mid-levels games at the park, minus most of the obvious blunders. What is more, the games are so transparent we can once again see Stockfish being paid to throw these games to AlphaZero.

Before we get to it, I have to wonder how long the games took in real time? I guess all 100 games took place in under one second? Not much of a spectator sport. Hard to sell many mint juleps or strawberries and creams in that time. And 70 million positions seem a tad much, doesn't it? I mean,

chess has some complexities, but nothing like that. The aliens watching us have to be laughing. It would be like being told that a computer playing tictactoe was analyzing 70 million moves a second. Overkill.

The first game is at the last link above, and it is narrated by Jerry. AlphaZero is playing from black. Jerry admits the current preconception that white has an advantage from playing first, but as we watch Stockfish throw away move after move, we can see how little foundation that idea has. By the time that computer has moved its King side to side several times for no apparent reason, any advantage it had by moving first must be flushed.

Also curious is that these computers haven't discovered any unused openings, since we watch standard openings and defenses. Stockfish runs a Spanish opening and AZ replies with a Berlin defense. Really? These computers are so smart, but they run standard human openings and defenses all the time? Kind of curious, isn't it? Stockfish then trades a bishop for a knight after just three moves, so I would be curious what information it is basing that on. It can't be based on the board, since nothing has happened yet. So Stockfish must be telling us Knights are worth more than Bishops. And yet I haven't seen a general re-assessing of the piece values based on that new knowledge. In fact, if we go to the current page at Wikipedia on piece values, we find a chart of 23 lines, and in all but one line the Bishop has the higher start value. Fischer rates the Bishop a quarter-point stronger. Philidor rates the Bishop almost a half-point stronger. Horowitz and Berliner also rate the Bishop over the Knight. Do you want to guess what the one dissenting line is? The computer, which tells us the Knight is a full half-point stronger. Has there been a general reassessment, bowing to the computer? No.

Also curious is that before the exchange, the running computer tells us white is up by .27. After the exchange, it is up by .24. So if Stockfish was losing ground on the exchange and knew it, why would it make the exchange? Isn't it basing its decisions based on these numbers? That is what we are told. What else would it be making its decisions on, if not numbers? The computer had a hunch? Again, it makes no sense.

Jerry then admits Google has made only ten of 100 games public, which is also suspicious. Maybe the other ones were faked in even worse fashion than the ones we will see.

The first sign I saw of the throw was the creation of a strange wall in the middle of the board, and it was mainly created by white—*not* to its advantage. The main reason white loses this game is that the central pawn configuration hugely benefits black. White should have been able to predict that and avoid setting it up, but instead we see the opposite. See minute 4:00 as this falls into place. Both sides have to conspire to set up this central blockade, with neither taking material you would expect them to take. White's actions are particularly suspicious, as he moves to D5 past two pawns he should want to take. A computer capable of seeing 70 million moves into the future should have seen that this configuration would doom all his mobility. And yet he blithely moves there anyway.

After this juncture, Jerry even admits white goes to sleep. At 6:16, he says, “Unfortunately for white, we're going to observe a lot of nothing moves, non-committal shuffling of King moves, Bishop moves. . . .” Yeah, Jerry, we *are* going to observe that, from a supersmart computer. And you don't find that suspicious?

Next we see some more ridiculous posturing on the H-side of the board, as white pretends to menace F6 with his bishop. I say pretend, because all of black's pieces are already on that side of the board, surrounding the King. There is no possible entry there, so this is all just theater for the ignorant. And

yet black plays along for the nonce, moving his rook back and forth as if he is really threatened by that bishop. We come one move short of a stalemate, which looks to me like a planned diversion. They want you analyzing these asinine moves instead of noticing that the game is being thrown by white. What white obviously *should* be doing at this point is using his Knights to jump pawns on the A-side of the board, swinging his rooks over there once an opening has been forced. For instance, B5 looks like a good attack point. He could also bring up that B-pawn, for the same reason. Instead, he moves his King over to H1. Even Jerry can't figure that one out. He can't figure it out because it is the second most obvious instance of throwing the game—after that pawn blockade in the middle. The obvious move is the B-pawn to the fourth row, but anything is better than moving that King. White might as well have just passed.

At 9:30, white then moves his Bishop back and his Knight back. The Knight should have been attacking on the A-side, but now it has to return to cover that stupid Bishop. You will tell me that is why white moved his King to a white square. He predicted he would need to circle his Bishop around those pawns to free it. But why not just avoid the problem to start with? White caused these problems himself, with no pressure from black. Black is threatening nothing at this point, since he can't move any better than white. Yes, we now see that white has allowed himself to get locked in over there, and it's mostly due to that pawn blockade in the middle. Someone is going to have to make a runaround on the A-side, and white is instead huddling on the H-side. He doesn't need to be covering that bishop with his back Knight, since if he moves his front Knight the Queen will cover. Both those Knights need to be moving to the other side of the board, which is why he needed to move the B-pawn up. Once the Knights are gone, white doesn't need to circle the Bishop around the pawns, he needs to keep the Bishop over there to guard during the attack. So, again, the King move to H1 was wasted.

You will say I am second-guessing computers that are a lot better at this than I am, but I don't think that is what is happening. I think these computer programs are largely faked, so all I am doing is analyzing a game manufactured by humans. Supersmart computers would never play this way. I will show you more evidence of that in a moment.

At minute 10:30 black finally prepares to attack, but white responds by again doing nothing. At 10:32, white moves his Rook to E2, and at 10:55 he moves that King back to G1. Both absolutely pointless moves. White finally moves his front Knight, but not until it is pushed by black's advancing pawn. But instead of then attacking via B3, he moves that Knight back to B1, where it is useless as either offense or defense. Also note that hanging pawn in the B-row, which still hasn't moved. It is doing nothing there. By not moving it, white is begging black to attack on that side, which he now does, moving rook to A8. Jerry can't understand that move, but it looks pretty obvious. Black doesn't need it on the left side, especially if white is just going to stand around with his hands in his pockets. So he might as well attack via the A-row, drawing off white's pieces in that direction while the main attack proceeds on the other side.

In response, white moves King to H2! Brilliant. The very next move he moves King to G1. How could anyone not see this game as thrown? It's funny, I just went and played a few games against the computer at Chess.com, and I never saw it playing like that. I was playing at level 10, but my computer never waffled around, moving his King back and forth for no reason. They don't even do that at level one. At the lower levels, they are programmed to give you a piece now and again, but even then they don't lose by idiotically moving the King back and forth. At the higher levels the computer attacks you viciously in the early stages, and if you don't have a strong defense set up they will find a way through it, making you feel stupid. We saw nothing even remotely like that in these games with AlphaZero. Do you think the computers were scared of each other, and that they just held back from

timidity?

Now, notice what happens at 11:45, which Jerry jets past. White moves his F-pawn to the 4th row, which allows black to capture *en passant*. This is a terrible move, as we see in the play-out. Although the pawn is taken by the White rook, this frees black to take the white Knight. The black Bishop is taken, but the computers know that is a good trade for black. The running computer now tells us the board is even, but any fool can see that isn't so. Black's King is well protected, with all pieces in play, while white's King is out in the breeze and his Queen is locked in. Black has two pawns on the 6th row ready to attack, while white's only free pawn on the B-row is still asleep or dead.

Now for the next level of the throw, which Jerry again jets past. At minute 13:00 we get two exchanges, which white initiates with his Rook. Before this exchange, white is down .56. After all four Rooks are lost, white is down 1.35. So, again, why would white initiate an exchange like that? Stockfish forgot how to do math?

Next we have a Queen exchange, and amazingly Jerry jets past it as well, with very little commentary. At 14:40, white *initiates* the Queen exchange. Before the exchange, white is down 1.4. After the exchange, white is down 1.62. So again, why initiate the exchange? You will tell me it is because Jerry's computer evaluation isn't the same as white's. But it is. Jerry is running a Stockfish8 evaluation while Stockfish8 is playing white.

So none of this makes a lick of sense. Both sides now have exactly the same material, but white is down about 1.6. That's pretty hard to accomplish. Normally equal material will provide a close game at this point, and you would have to work pretty hard to create a board where one player was up 1.6. I have shown you that they did indeed have to work pretty hard to put white in this position. It didn't happen naturally. White had to go against its own numbers most of the game, and when it wasn't bucking its own odds it was twiddling its thumbs. Computers don't play that way, by definition.

Another thing you should notice is the prevalence of pawns up to the end. At the midpoint of the game, we still have seven pawns on both sides, and even after the Queen trade, we still have six. That's extremely odd, but it shows us how they kept white bottled up the whole game. White bottled himself up by refusing to take pawns he should. As we saw, white only initiated trades that hurt his math, not trades that helped it.

OK, I said I would give you more evidence outside this game. In the sidebar at Youtube, we find videos by Suren, one of which is entitled, "Why do engines fail to solve 400-year-old chess puzzles?" Why indeed. He shows us a puzzle from 1623 with only 8 pieces left on the board. A computer that could analyze 70 million moves a second should make quick work of this, but Suren admits the computer gets it wrong by the third move. He then tries to explain why. He is clearly reading from prepared copy, which is interesting. We have to ask who is slipping him this white paper. Anyway, he says that engines are "brute forces", which—beyond their ability to compute—are "just stupid but hardworking machines". He says they are perfect tactically, but "in positional chess it is difficult to find a correct evaluation". He admits we have to go to "tables", which solve endgames for up to six pieces.

But wait. This contradicts what we are sold in the media about computers being more intelligent than humans. One minute they are brilliant, the next they are stupid. Besides, we had tables like that before computers ever came along. You can draw them up by hand, though it is very time consuming. My guess is these tables have just been fed into computers, which means the computers aren't any smarter

than the tables. They also aren't any better at chess than a pile of tables. The only thing computers really have is speed and the ability to avoid gross errors. But in positional chess, they apparently aren't flawless, or they would have spotted the correct moves here. It isn't difficult, as Suren shows us: it simply requires a Bishop sacrifice, at which point the white pawns are nullified—leading to a draw. A monkey could solve it. Which of course indicates that to beat computers you have to sacrifice pieces in stunning gambits. Computers aren't programmed to deal with rash suicidal human moves.

So what does it all mean? It means that this big computer match was manufactured to make Google look good. In other words, another piece of propaganda. On a larger scale, it was meant to sell AI, which they have been pushing for years. We see this in the comments sections, where paid agents are lining up to bloviate about the wonders of technology and the wetdream that is the future—just like the stuffed shirts in your local Chamber of Commerce selling you their next boondoggle. They want you to be very impressed by these machines, so that you will buy one. You will start by buying a hockey puck to run your fridge and your dryer and your electric testicle warmers, but you will soon graduate to the full Jetson's household, at a fantastic profit to them. Once your house burns down and floods several times, you will also invest in more insurance, so we can be sure they are tied to that as well.