

[return to updates](#)

SHERLOCK HOLMES



by Miles Mathis

First written July 15, 2019

I have sometimes been called the Sherlock Holmes of internet research, an appellation I have graciously embraced. Who wouldn't want to be called that, after all? It is almost as gratifying as being called the New Leonardo—besides which it irks my enemies beyond words. . . which is also gratifying. But here I am afraid I will have to turn my Sherlock eye upon Sherlock himself, showing that the Arthur Conan Doyle stories—though clever and entertaining—are not always what they seem.

I have no intention of ruining the stories for you, I hope. I have read them over and over since I was a boy, and have enjoyed the old BBC TV adaptations even more in some ways, perhaps. Certainly Jeremy Brett's brilliant embodiment of Holmes shall never be bettered, and some of the episodes are equally well directed. I would much rather watch them than the pathetic modernizations we have been assaulted with in the past decade, including the wretched Cumberbatch* series and the even worse Downey film. And we know we are in the maw of the worm when someone casts Lucy Liu** as Dr. Watson. Now we just need Paris Hilton as Mycroft and Sylvester Stallone as Mrs. Hudson.

For several months my internet connection has been blinking out, and about ten days ago it died altogether. Could be nefarious interference, but more likely it is just my 2009 Mac mini or equally old router on its last legs. I have ordered a 2014 Mac mini from ebay, with new cables and router, and we

will see if that fixes it. But the reason I mention it is that my normal sources of easy information and entertainment have been taken from me, leaving me to return to my books and DVDs to fill the summer hours when I am not on my bicycle, at the volleyball court, or on the golf course. In digging through my video files, I came across an old collection of Granada adaptations of Sherlock, starring Brett. My research for this paper started when I noticed that in *The Adventure of the Priory School*, Holmes says twice that the Duke of Holderness was of a family that had been connected to the Hellfire Club. I didn't remember that from the book, so I checked my *Complete Sherlock Holmes*. Sure enough, it wasn't there. They added it for the TV adaptation, for some reason. They also added the part about the Dukes getting their wealth from stealing cattle. Why would they do that? Rereading Conan Doyle's story closely, I could see that it might benefit from some slight editing, but not of that sort. The Duke was already being put in a bad light in the book, and more slander seemed to me to be pointless. Then it occurred to me that making the Duke look bad WAS the point of the story, a point that the producers or writers at Granada apparently wished to put an even finer point on. If true, this would mean that the propaganda hadn't changed in over a century, with the same families continuing to run the same projects they were running in the time of King Edward.

But why blackwash the Holdernesses? Well, if we check the peerage, we find the Earls of Holderness dying out in the 18th century, when a **Darcy** died without male issue. More research takes us to David Hume, who tells us the Holdernesses came over with William the Conqueror, so this Darcy was from one of the oldest lines on the Isles. I tried following the daughters of this Darcy, hoping to find late 19th century descendants who could be the target of Conan Doyle, but didn't have any immediate luck. Still, I suspect that is what is going on here.

One clue given us by Conan Doyle is that this Duke was the “greatest and perhaps wealthiest” subject of the Crown. Another is that he had a long wispy red beard, which would have been uncommon among the top dukes. A long hook nose, yes; a red beard, no. And the connection to the Hellfire Club is likewise telling, though it isn't Conan Doyle's connection. It would be John Hawkesworth's, or that one of the other writers of the Granada series. Of course, in connecting us to the Hellfire Club, we are being given the nod toward Intelligence again, since the HC was a famous den of spooks. We have already seen Ben Franklin's ties to it [in my paper on him](#). The HC was a sort of Bohemian Grove of its day, a place where the top spooks could let down their hair (and shorts). The difference being that the HC was later embellished for the public to make it look far scarier than it was—to create fear. We have seen somewhat less of that with Bohemian Grove, though some (including of course Alex Jones) have tried to convince it was a place of Satan worship and child sacrifice. I for one don't buy it. I buy the widespread buggery, but don't buy the child sacrifice.

So why would the writers at Granada TV want to take Conan Doyle's blackwash of the Holdernesses even further than he did? Probably because they are from competing families and bloodlines, and they enjoy pissing on the remains of this Holderness bloodline. Since they live in Modern times, when all subtlety in writing (and everything else) is extinct, they have no problem inserting jibes into the works they are adapting for television. Who but some of the peers and a couple of guys like me will ever notice?



Realizing that, I continued reading and watching, looking for more examples. I soon found them. In *The Adventure of the Abbey Grange*—starring the gorgeous Anne-Louise Lambert (above)—we find a Baronet Eustace Brackenstall depicted as a vicious drunk and wife beater, whose murder Holmes covers up as a job well done. So we seem at a glance to have another instance of a peer being blackwashed for some reason. Remember, the Sherlock Holmes stories were published in *Strand Magazine*, which was not a cheapsheet. It was read by the upper and upper-middle classes, and it was at them Conan Doyle's insinuations would have been aimed. My guess is they knew who this Baronet Brackenstall was meant to represent, though by changing the name Conan Doyle was able to avoid a charge of libel. He was also able to avoid it, since the insinuation was no doubt true, and could be proved true in a court of law.

I looked up the Brackenstalls in the peerage, but there are none. It is probably a slur of one of the other Bracken- names that *are* in the peerage. None of those were baronets, so he must have changed the title, too. Conan Doyle had to change this name more than the Holderness name, since I assume his targets were still alive under that name.

In *The Adventure of the Six Napoleons*, the story concerns the Italian Mafia in London, and includes a Godfather-type figure, organized crime, vendettas. . . the usual. I didn't know what to think of that twenty years ago, but now I do. I have shown you in several previous papers that Hollywood has been selling you the mafia for many decades in films like *The Godfather*, *Goodfellas*, *The French Connection*, and so on and on, as part of a long program of misdirection. They want you to think it is the various mobs that are behind organized crime, to keep you off the real culprit: your own government, and the people who control it. It is the billionaire and trillionaire families that control all business worldwide, legal and illegal, not these Dons in loud suits with thick accents. *The Adventure of the Six Napoleons* simply tells us this misdirection predates Hollywood.

The Adventure of the Red Circle also concerns the Italian mob, but this time Conan Doyle includes the Pinkerton Agency as well. We have seen it in previous papers, including my papers on [Lincoln](#) and [Eugene Debs](#). The Pinkertons are made to look like heroes, which is not surprising seeing that they were the CIA of the time, and therefore Conan Doyle's US counterpart.

Of course the long *Valley of Fear* also features the Pinkertons, with the lead being Birdy Edwards, brave Pinkerton hero. This is not considered one of Conan Doyle's finest, but up to now it has been dismissed as a blackwashing of the Freemasons (whom Conan Doyle's calls Freemen). It is just the opposite, since Conan Doyle is sure to tell us several times the Freemasons in all others parts of the US are honest and upstanding. Only in this little mining town have they gone over to the dark side. [And Conan Doyle was himself a Freemason, remember.] But the misdirection is even greater, since—through the comments and actions of Birdy Edwards—we are led to believe the Freemasons are opposed to the capitalists and police. We are sold the incredible idea that these lodges are Republican in some sense, battling for the rights of the little guy. A reversal of the truth, of course. Through my research you now understand that the Freemasons—including the Freemasons that managed [the French](#) and [American Revolutions](#)—were one more front for the aristocrats and the East India Company. The lodges were always just a project—one of many—to control the middle and upper middle classes via infiltration and a bit of feigned trickle down of power. We were thrown a few crumbs and fooled with some fake rites into thinking we were invested in the system. When the only thing we were ever invested in was our own disempowerment and secret rapine.

But even that was not the main point of *The Valley of Fear*. Conan Doyle wasn't assigned this topic mainly to promote the Pinkertons or to misdirect on the Freemasons, though those are potent side effects. The main point was. . . the creation of fear. The story itself is a little valley of fear, since it sells you the idea that these mobs at the end of the 19th century were real. Conan Doyle is salting in the decades of newspaper reports of murders and assassinations and beatings. He is also selling you a false idea of human nature, since he tells you again and again that these Freemen had no problem killing their neighbors in cold blood and then bragging about it in lodge. This keeps you in line, just as it kept your 2g-grandparents in line. Problem is, I have shown you that almost all of these murders and assassinations were faked, then as now. Just as they now fake a weekly mass murderer or serial killer, back then they faked a mob shooting, a revenge killing, a barroom shootout or a backwoods battle. Fake news wasn't invented by Trump; it has been around for centuries. The creation of fear has been THE major project of newspapers from the beginning, but that project took a big upswing after the Civil War—with the Pinkertons being a large part of that upswing. It took another big upswing after WWII with the creation of the CIA, and has been in a steep incline ever since. Every decade, sensible people think it must level off: how can it continue to increase at such a rate? But as of this minute, we see no sign of leveling. If Ben Franklin devoted 20% of his non-advertising space to fear and chaos, and Horace Greeley devoted 40% to it, and Walter Lippmann devoted 60% to it, the media now devotes 80% to it . . . the rest being sports.

Before we leave *The Valley of Fear*, it is worth pointing out that Conan Doyle doesn't seem to have understood much about the law. His Pinkerton agent Birdy Edwards wouldn't have been able to make any of the charges stick against McGinty and the other Freemen, since he clearly entrapped them. And his testimony against them in the other cases would have been worthless, since it would have been his word against theirs. Without hard evidence, none of the cases would have gone anywhere. You can't just embed an agent among criminals and then convict them based on his solo testimony. He would have had to get them on tape. . . except that they didn't have tape back then. And even tape is iffy in court, since the defense can always claim it isn't their clients we are hearing. They can claim the tape was faked by the prosecution, and if the prosecution is linked to the government in some way that claim may be true. We now know the CIA and other entities can and have faked tapes and everything else. They have bragged about it for years—which must undercut their ability to use such artifacts in court.

In *The Five Orange Pips*—one of Conan Doyle's earliest and not one of his best—we find the central players are from the Ku Klux Klan. My faithful readers will know what to think of that: the KKK was an Intelligence front from the beginning, organized to create fear through fake events. It is disappointing, to say the least, to find Conan Doyle selling it to English readers.

But Conan Doyle includes Australia as often as the US, as we see in *The Boscombe Valley Mystery*. This mystery concerns Black Jack of the Ballarat Gang, so we are being sold a sort of Australian wild west that never actually existed. Think of it as Australia's answer to Billy the Kid, Tombstone, Wild Bill Hickok, and Bonnie and Clyde—all of which I have deconstructed. Also see my guest writer's [paper on Ned Kelly](#). And why were we sold any of this huffnstuff, by Conan Doyle or anyone else? The usual: the creation of fear and chaos. Without these high levels of fear and chaos, they could not justify their police and military budgets, you know. Same reason they faked Jack the Ripper in England.

India is included as well as the US and Australia, as we see in *The Crooked Man*. There, Conan Doyle appears to be spinning the Indian mutiny in “Bhurtee”, and the exploits of General Neill. We see a similar thing in the long *The Sign of Four*, where the same mutiny is sold in the same terms in Agra. There we are told that Englishmen and Sikhs are honorable, while Hindoos are lying scoundrels. I don't have that much experience with Hindoos or Sikhs, but that has not been my experience with Englishmen. The white European, and especially his Jewish overlord, has turned out to be the greatest and most successful liar and thief in history. No Hindoo or Sikh can compare to him.

In *The Last Bow*, we are taken up to 1914, and the beginning of WWI. So we have to listen to propaganda for that war as well, including Holmes posing as the Irish-American spy Altamont. More of him later.

I also think I can tell you what *The Adventure of Black Peter* is really about. One of the characters, John Hopley Neligan, is the son of a West Country banker of Cornwall, who failed for a million and then disappeared. The son is trying to clear the name of his father, and the story Conan Doyle tells us is that the banker was innocent. He did skip town with a box of securities just ahead of the police, but we are supposed to believe he sailed on a yacht to Norway just to buy time, intending to pay every creditor in full. Now, without knowing anything of the actual case this is based on, I just ask you if that sounds believable. Knowing what you know about bankers, does that fit the profile or the common history of bank failures? No, clearly Conan Doyle is making up a tale of pirates and harpooners and so on as cover for this banker. The banker didn't abscond to Norway with stolen millions, no, he was boarded by pirates and murdered for the securities in the box.

Then we have *The Adventure of the Golden Pince-Nez*, which of course resells us the fake assassination of Czar Alexander II I have unwound elsewhere. That was on March 13, 1881, in case you forgot. 3/13/1881. In the Holmes mystery, Professor Coram the invalid turns out to be a Russian revolutionary from the 1880s, the one who had actually thrown the bomb under the carriage. He then fled to England, leaving his comrades to take the rap. So here Conan Doyle is just salting in some recent manufactured European history.

Which brings us back to the overall point of the Holmes stories, which was the creation of fear—general and specific. Through these beguiling and now nostalgic mysteries, readers would be led to believe that murders were taking place all over London and the Isles, and that dangerous criminals were waiting to molest them everywhere they went. You will remember that Holmes himself takes the time to tell us that the countryside is the scariest place of all, since there the criminals could act with

little chance of being caught. Sort of a “no one can hear you scream” argument. Not only that, but all these crimes were orchestrated for a greater effect by Moriarty, a genius mastermind hellbent on evil. So of course the public would be happy to sink all taxes necessary in maintaining Scotland Yard, MI5, MI6, and whatever other bogus organizations were necessary to guarantee order and civility, and combat the Moriartys, Colonel Morans, Charles Augustus Milvertons, Baron Gruners and other riffraff.

And that is why the Holmes stories have been modernized and inflated for TV and film: the newer series aren't restricted by the requirement for taste or subtlety Conan Doyle labored under. The producers and directors know that you, the 21st century viewer, have been hardened by a lifetime of fake murders and rapes, forced upon you by literature, TV, film, and the news. You can't be kept in line by Conan Doyle's old stories, which are now so tame they could be lumped in with Winnie the Pooh and Mother Goose. They know you are reading Conan Doyle or watching Jeremy Brett to flee the modern world, and that you are more interested in the carriages and cravats, the tobacco in the coal scuttle, or the greatcloaks and the gaiters than you are in the murders or mysteries themselves. That is why they have to take that stuff away from you, replacing it with heightened levels of gore and gristle. They have to find newer and more potent ways to mess with your mind.

But let us return to the individual tales. The first was one of the long ones: *A Study in Scarlet*. It concerns the Mormons, so we are already in a valley of red flags. What, pray tell, does Conan Doyle wish us to believe about the Mormons? Curiously, he all but admits they are Jews, since a lead protagonist (Ferrier) tells us they aren't Christians. He also admits they call outsiders Gentiles. But mainly he sells the Mormons as *very scary people*, who have no problem murdering anyone who disagrees with them about anything. This is what the whole subplot about the Avenging Angels is about. So again, Conan Doyle is selling fear, and through it conformity. We have seen the same project today, substituting the “scary” Scientologists for the Mormons. See [my paper on the Golden Suicides](#) for more on that.

I do beg you to notice the big hole in *A Study in Scarlet*: Brigham Young is sold to us as authoritarian, with a secret military to guarantee agreement with all his pronouncements. But somehow two of the four original elders, Stangerson and Drebber, later left in the schism. This despite being depicted as weak by Conan Doyle. How is that possible? Young wouldn't let Ferrier leave, but he would allow this major rebellion to succeed? Shouldn't he have ordered Stangerson and Drebber killed, to prevent further dissolution of all he had worked for? The story has no continuity, as usual.

Finally I got back online and looked up Conan Doyle's bio again, to compare it to what we have learned here. His mother was a Foley, which may link us to [my recent paper on Scott Foley](#). Doyle was schooled by the Jesuits, both in England and Austria, and we know from Disraeli that the Jesuits were a Jewish front. He was already published at age 20, both in fiction and in a medical journal, which is pretty astonishing seeing he wasn't out of medical school yet. He pushed compulsory vaccination from early in his career, which is telling. He set up as a doctor in London, but they admit he had no patients. *A Study in Scarlet* was published when he was 27, and he became a Freemason in the same year. His wife was Louisa **Hawkins**, which may link us to Stephen Hawking, who came from a prominent line of Hawkins in the peerage, related to the same families we are about to see. Doyle's father was Charles **Altamont** Doyle, scrubbed immediately at thepeerage.com, but listed there as a peer. Note the name Altamont, since we saw above Holmes playing an Altamont in *The Last Bow*. Since Wikipedia admits Doyle's uncles were very wealthy, Charles Doyle was probably the brother of the 2nd Baronet, Sir Francis Hastings Doyle; which would make Arthur Conan Doyle cousin of the 4th Baronet Arthur Havelock Doyle. This would mean he was closely related to the Milners, Howards (Earls of Suffolk), Townshends, **Stuarts** (Marquesses of Bute), Windsors (Earls of Plymouth), Herberts

(Earls of Pembroke), Villiers, and **d'Arcys**. These Stuarts link him immediately to Rear Admiral Lord George Stuart. And of course the d'Arcys link him to the Darcys. Not only does that remind us of *Pride and Prejudice*, where Darcy is one of the main characters; more importantly it links us to the Holdernesses we were looking at above, in the *Adventure of the Priory School*. Yes, Conan Doyle was a Darcy, so he was also a Holderness. Which means he was jostling with cousins or turning the knife in a lesser line. The Granada writers may have also been of those lines, continuing the old feud.

At any rate, through the d'Arcys/Darcys, we can link Conan Doyle to Darcy, 4th Earl Holderness, who was the son of Frederica **Schomberg**. She just happened to be the daughter of the Duke of Schomberg and Caroline zu **Pfalz**, and the granddaughter of . . . **the King of Bohemia, Karl I Ludwig**. And he was the son of Princess Elizabeth Stuart, daughter of Charles I. Holmes fans will know that Conan Doyle's first short mystery published in *Strand* was *A Scandal in Bohemia*. I have a first edition copy of that bound *Strand* edition on my shelves. In it, the King of Bohemia makes an appearance at 221B Baker Street, to beg Holmes to retrieve a photo of him from Irene **Adler**. Note the name Adler, which I never had until now. It of course indicates she was Jewish. As was the King of Bohemia.

So Conan Doyle was related to his character there as well. Through the Darcys, Conan Doyle was closely related to the Kings of Bohemia, England, Russia, Denmark, Sweden, Prussia, and just about every other country of Europe. This would also link Conan Doyle to Mark Twain, and just about every other famous person.

Which tells us that Conan Doyle's later forays into "spiritualism" were also part of a project of misdirection and mystification. We have seen many spooks trying to sell us spiritualism in that period as paranormal wuwu, mainly to keep eyes off other things. They are still doing it, of course, trying to keep you busy with Tarot, Flat Earth, the Mandela Effect, reality as a hologram, geocentrism, trannies, Pizzagate, QAnon, serial killers, fake Buddhism, Scientology, alien abduction, Theosophy, transhumanism, and whatever other absurdity they can dredge up. All to keep you from coming into contact with anything real or learning anything useful.

I said I wouldn't ruin the Sherlock Holmes stories for you above, but isn't that what I have done? No, I don't think so. I haven't ruined them for myself, so I don't see how I have ruined them for you. All I have done is warn you of the propaganda, so that you can enjoy the stories without harm. Yes, some of the mysteries are tainted, but to me they were not among the best to start with. I didn't like *The Five Orange Pips* forty years ago, when I first read it. Not because of the KKK content, but because it was weak in plot and poorly written. Same for some of these others. But many of the mysteries survive the propaganda purge relatively unscathed. *Silver Blaze*, for instance, or *The Man with the Twisted Lip* or *The Norwood Builder* or *The Red-Headed League*. For while Conan Doyle was undoubtedly a spook, he was a spook with some talent for storytelling. Yes, he borrowed from fellow spook Poe, but he took the detective story much further and gave it patina that is hard to deny. His choice of names, locations, characterizations, and ambiance is masterly, and he often peppers his stories with enough close observation, esoteric fact, and charming logic to make them compelling. They weren't popular for no reason, and haven't remained popular only due to constant promotion (as we could say of most others).

I will tack on a few comments about my recent experience at the public library. As I told you above, my internet connection has been out, so to get online I had to go to the library. Much strangeness was afoot there, though you may not be surprised to hear it. The first weird thing is that I wasn't able to access Barnes and Noble to order more of my own books. Could not sign in. I also could not access

thepeerage.com, either using Chrome or Firefox. This again indicates I am being targeted, since there is no reason for the Taos public library to blacklist that site. Even weirder is that although I could access the main page and updates page of my own site, I could not access any of the papers. They either failed to load with Chrome, or I got "another user" message with Firefox. Someone was resetting or closing the page at the same time I was trying to access it. So I went to a librarian and pointed this out. She thought maybe I was being blocked by the library and said she might be able to whitelist me. But when she looked at the firewall message, it turned out that wasn't the case. The library wasn't blocking me, since when that happens a message stating that pops up. That wasn't the message we were seeing. So instead of trying to access the pages from the public computers, she tried to access them from her own computer behind the front desk. From that computer there was no problem. She said that was strange, since the filters were supposed to be stronger on her computer than the public ones. I didn't question that statement, but of course it makes no sense. In short, she wasn't able to help me. So although I have one of the largest personal websites in the world (created, managed and maintained by one single person), the content of that website cannot be viewed at the public library in my hometown.

Although that is kind of sad, I don't worry much about it, since I don't know what good that is doing them. Do they really think the top revolutionaries in the world are doing their work from the public libraries? Looking around at my fellow library surfers, I didn't get the impression they were the cream of the insurgency. They looked like a bunch of deadheads to me. . . but maybe that was just their cover.

I said above that I didn't suspect interference on my internet connection, but it is now three weeks later, and I do. I needed a new computer, since I haven't been able to update my OSX or browser, making my internet experience difficult. So that wasn't a waste of money. However, my internet problem was not with the computer or router. I moved my computer to my ethernet outlet and plugged in directly, but that didn't solve my problem, indicating the glitch was outside my walls. But Century Link refused to send someone out to check their lines, telling me the problem was with my router. It looks like the problem was with the line from my house to the pole, but I guess we will never know. A local ISP was scheduled to come out and install a whole new line and box. And even there I found interference. This new ISP couldn't get through to me on my groundline, telling me they were getting a busy signal. So I had to use someone else's phone. I now believe Century Link and/or Comcast have been interfering with my internet connection on purpose. They are also interfering with my phone line, since I have been told callers are getting a FAX signal, although I don't have a FAX.

Update: more confirmation of that and more weird stories to tell. This local ISP, Kit Carson Electric, took more than a week to get someone out here to check the property, then another week to call me and set up a down payment, then more than another week passed after that. I called and asked what was going on. They didn't call back. So I drove over there. They told me they didn't have a staker, or only had one for the entire county. I questioned the logic of that, asking why they didn't hire more than one. Getting the full run-around, I asked for an estimate of when it would get done. I was told it might be more than another week and a half, and to be patient. I declined and requested my down payment to be refunded. In other words, I fired them before they even got started. During the same weeks, I called Century Link again to disconnect the service, so I would quit being billed for it. The guy at first offered me a free month to stay, plus waiving of various fees and late charges, and promised to get boots on the ground to fix it immediately. He said he was going to switch me over to tech Tom. Grudgingly, I said OK. But then "Tom" came on the line. One problem: Tom wasn't a real person. He was a robot voice, saying "I am Tom, your tech support". The line then went dead. So Century Link is no longer even a possibility. I am now in talks with TaosNet, which is sending someone out here in the

next week. . . hopefully.

TaosNet wasn't able to provide service, due to trees in line of sight. So my last option was to try Xfinity/Comcast. That seemed like going from the frying pan into the fire, but it didn't happen either. When I tried to call their 1800 number, I was cut off over and over. The line simply went dead after talking to the computer for about a minute. So I tried a different number, a 1888 number. Same thing. I was not able to access a representative from my home phone.

So it looks like I am being refused internet service. All these things taken together cannot be an accident. It looks like the enemy, not being able to defeat me any other way, has decided to make it as difficult for me to proceed as possible. It is doubtful moving will solve the problem, since once they figure out my new location, they will just refuse service to that line as well. So I will either have to go wireless, or just upload from a flashdrive on a friend's computer every few months. We will see what they do to prevent that.

August 19: I found out today that Yahoo closed my Paypal email without notification or warning. So I have switched my Paypal email from melisasmithus@yahoo.com to mileswmathis@yahoo.com. Make a note of that for any future book orders or donations.

*Just to remind you, Cumberbatch is in the peerage, from a line of British Consuls in Turkey. He is also a Bowes (linking him to the Queen), a Blakiston (Baronet), a Harvey, and a Congdon. He is 3rd cousin of King Richard III, whom he portrayed in *The Hollow Crown*. Cumberbatch's mother is scrubbed at Wikipedia and thepeerage.com, but she is a Ventham, linking us to the Brisbanes and through them to the. . . Stewarts. These are the Stewarts, Baronets of Blackhall, but they link us to the Stuarts, Kings of England and dukes in many lines. Through his mother, Cumberbatch is also related to the Waters, as in Roger Waters of *Pink Floyd*. Also to the Halyburtons, Livingstons, Morgans, Nicolsons, Elphinstones, Mackenzies, Forbes, and Frasers.

**Liu, who has all the charm of a plate of burned toast, is perhaps the only woman in the world who makes Yoko Ono seem relatively appealing. So how did she get into Hollywood and why is she promoted like this? You already know the answer: family. Her mother is scrubbed on all sites, so I assume she is part Jewish, explaining Liu's entree into Hollywood. Liu's co-star Jonny Lee Miller is also of the Families. His grandfather Bernard Lee played M in the old Bond films, so these are probably the Lees/Leighs of the peerage. Many of them are Levys, and Miller may be one as well. Also notice that Liu=Li=Lee=Levy, so Jonny and Lucy are cousins, explaining why they are appearing here together.