

[return to updates](#)

MARTIN LUTHER



by Miles Mathis

First published May 6, 2021

I have touched on Luther in previous papers, but here I will hit him more heavily. If you will remember, I reminded you that Monty Python had given us a rather obvious clue with [their skit on him](#) in their 1983 film *The Meaning of Life*. There, Luther is depicted as a Jew, with an outrageous New York Jewish accent. One thing I didn't notice the first time is the fake opening credits, where we are told this "Adventures of Martin Luther" is a production of the Protestant Film Marketing Board, in association with Sol C. [Ziegler](#), Andy Rotbeiner, and the people of Beirut. Jewish producers, of course. You have to laugh at how in-your-face this is, especially considering how few Gentiles got the joke. In the skit, Luther runs into the garden of [Mamie Mayer](#) and her daughters. Mamie is played by Graham [Chapman](#) in drag, with his big Jewish nose.



Mamie's husband is named **Hymie**, dressed like a rabbi, and he forgot to bring home the suet. Again, note the Jewish names. They are all saying things like *oivay* and *vai vai* and *voosh*.

Which just goes to remind us that Luther's mother's maiden name was **Lindemann**. A Jewish surname. They admit Luther's father was very wealthy, though they rush you by it as usual. He owned copper mines and smelters. They also rush you by Luther's mother, and misdirect by telling us of the rumor she was a whore and a bath attendant. They say it wasn't true, assuring us she was of "trading class stock and middling means". The usual sob story. They did a very similar thing with Tiger Wood's mother, as we saw [in my paper on him](#). In both stories, they try to get you off the "wealthy and Jewish" scent as quickly as possible, by stacking a list of rumors, diversions, and denials.

And now for the kill shot. If you think Lindemann wasn't a Jewish name, we can go to Luther's [maternal grandmother, who was a . . . Ziegler](#). Were you paying attention? We just saw that name, didn't we, in the Monty Python skit. The producer was Sol Ziegler. Short for. . . Solomon Ziegler. Do you think the Pythons didn't know that? Just a coincidence? No, those are all Oxford and Cambridge guys, crypto-Jews themselves from peerage families, so they know exactly what they are doing.

But there's more. Margaretha Ziegler's maiden name was **Rosenzweig**. Her mother was a von Saalfeld, not only Jewish but noble. If we keep going, we find von Meiningen, von Monningen, von Meldigen, **von Apolda**, and von Bornstedt of Bornstedt Castle. The von Meldingens were Grafs (Counts) of Thuringen. Proving Luther's mother was not middle class, but from many noble lines. We also find the Kellners and Hutteners. I don't really understand why Wikipedia bothers lying to us about this, when Geni.com is posting the truth. Geni is run out of Israel, so why not hide this better?

I saved the best for last: through the Ziegler line, Luther was also a . . . von der **Sachsen**. These Sachsen were the **Dukes of Saxony**. Yes, these von der Sachsen are the same as the Saxons, direct **ancestors of the current Queen Elizabeth**. Remember, Luther's mother died and was buried in Saxony-Anhalt. Her grandmother was a von der Sachsen, so Luther was that close to the Dukes of Saxony. Geni finally scrubs this, refusing to list children of these von Sachsen, so we can't find out there who Luther's noble cousins were. But his contemporary was Duke Magnus I of Saxe-Lauenburg, grandson of Frederick II, Elector of Brandenburg. Magnus married the Princess of Brunswick-Wolfenbützel. Their daughters became Queens of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. It looks to me like Luther was a third cousin of these people, tying him very closely to the ruling houses of Europe. They never tell us that, do they?

For more proof, they admit Luther's parents were painted by the most famous German portraitist of the time, Lucas Cranach:



That tells us how rich and prominent his family really was. It may also interest you to know that Lucas was the court painter to the [Electors/Dukes of Saxony](#). This explains why he was a close friend of Luther, standing as a witness at his marriage. We don't know Lucas' real name, since Cranach just tells us he was born in Kronach. Wikipedia tells us he was born Lucas Maler, which is absurd since that just means Lucas Painter. Maybe his real name was Lucas Kohen. His mother was a Hubner, confirming that guess, since the name is Jewish. Lucas' bio has been scrubbed up to age 33, when he was allegedly discovered directly by Frederick III, Elector of Saxony—the same guy who prosecuted Luther. It doesn't work like that, so all this is very suspicious. Lucas' wife was allegedly the daughter of a burgher in Gotha, which I see as another veiled clue. Since the Saxons and Gothas are closely related, as in the Saxe-Coburg-Gothas (aka Windsors), I assume they are telling us Lucas was a Saxe or Gotha as well. That would make Luther and Lucas cousins.

Luther married Katherine von Bora, whom the historians try to pass off as a rescued nun and nothing more. Except that her name again indicates nobility. That is what the “von” means. She was nobility on both sides, her mother being a von Haugwitz. And that's where it gets really interesting, since the mother's mother was a . . . [von Schonberg](#). Her father was a von [Hirshfeld](#), which is also a clue, but let's stick with the Schonbergs for now. They were another noble family of counts, producing up to then several bishops of Meissen. Also see Nikolaus von Schonberg, a contemporary of Luther who was archbishop of Capua. He was also closely linked to the Dukes of Saxony, since George, Duke of Saxony, appointed him as his procurator for the Fifth Council of the Lateran. He later became a papal legate for Pope Leo X—who was a Medici. Another contemporary of Luther was Johann von Schonberg, Archbishop-Elector of Trier. A bit later, Count Hans von Schonberg was Master of Household to Frederick V of the Palatinate. And the Schonbergs soon became dukes themselves, when Hans' son Friedrich became the first Duke of Schomberg, a Marshal of France, and [Knight of the Garter](#). How did this German count become a British Knight of the Garter? I am glad you asked. It is because his mother was Anne Dudley, daughter of Lord Dudley, and granddaughter of Edward Sutton, Lord Dudley. Her grandmother was Lady Jane Stanley, daughter of Edward [Stanley, 3rd Earl of Derby](#), and Lady Dorothy Howard, daughter of the [Duke of Norfolk](#). It is the Stanleys that invented the Garter, since it is how they captured the crown of England, supplanting the Plantagenets.

These Schonbergs are also descended from Heinrich Pflug, Knight of the Holy Sepulchre of [Jerusalem](#).

Also from Joseph Levin von Metzsch, proving the Jewish link again.

Anyway, what all that means is that Luther was not only very closely related to the Dukes of Saxony through his mother, he was also closely related to them through the Schonbergs and his wife. They hide his wife's ancestry just as they hide his, and it is because they don't want you to ask how this excommunicated priest managed to marry this noblewoman from a line of counts. But the answer is the usual: they too were cousins, since the Schonbergs were counts of Saxony, linked to the Sachsens for centuries.

And I bet you didn't think coming in that I could link Luther so closely to the Stanleys and Howards. Honestly, I didn't either. I never saw that coming. That is just how it goes.

Before we move on to other things, I should point out now the other obvious link to the Dukes of Saxony. Luther was ordained at age 23 at Erfurt Cathedral by the Bishop of Brandenburg. We have just seen that Luther was a Brandenburg through his mother. The Dukes of Saxony owned Brandenburg. Luther allegedly got his masters degree at age 21 in 1505. Strange, since we are later told he got two bachelor's degrees in 1508-9. So he got his masters before getting either bachelors? He got his Doctor of Theology in 1512, four years later at age 28. But he had already been picked to lecture on theology by the Dean of Wittenberg University four years earlier, at age 24. Immediately after being awarded his Doctors, he became chair of the department of theology, at age 28.

Another problem is fitting in the lightning story with this timeline. In 1505, at age 21, he was allegedly nearly struck by lightning. In fear and trembling he decided to devote his life to God and to become a monk. He immediately entered the monastery. But if he was in the monastery from 1505 to 1507, when he was ordained, how did he get the two bachelors degrees in 1508-9? Are we supposed to believe they were they just honorary degrees? And are we supposed to believe he was pulled right out of the monastery by the Dean to lecture on theology? Based on what credentials and experience? Is someone who hasn't spoken for two years the best person to be a paid lecturer?

Moreover, we are told Luther became provincial vicar of Saxony in 1515, at age 31. In that position he had to oversee eleven monasteries in his province. While at the same time lecturing and chairing his department and writing treatises?

None of that makes any sense, indicating the usual: his entire resume was faked. He was just a von Sachsen planted in his position, to run this big project.

But let's skip ahead. On Halloween, 1517, he allegedly nailed his 95 Theses to the door of All Saints Church in Wittenberg. How old was he? That's right, 33. And who ordered Luther examined at the Diet of Augsburg? That would be Frederick III, Elector of Saxony, whose maternal grandfather was Duke of Bavaria. His paternal grandmother was Margaret of Austria, sister of the Holy Roman Emperor. As I just showed you, Luther was closely related to this Elector of Saxony, once again indicating this was all staged. Frederick was just pretending to prosecute a cousin. Why? Because it was a big project against Rome, similar to the upcoming project against Rome in England, led by Henry VIII in 1527—just nine years later.

As more indication this was all staged, we find that the Papal Legate Cardinal Cajetan had been ordered by the Pope to arrest Luther if he didn't recant, but this did not happen. Frederick allowed Luther to escape. And you know who else allowed Luther to escape? Pope Leo X, who was also in on the scam. Remember, his real name was Giovanni de' Medici, and the de' Medicis were *also* crypto-Jews who

had infiltrated the papacy in order to destroy it. What most people still don't understand is that the Reformation came about by Jews attacking Rome both from within and without. As usual, they had their people playing both sides. This is precisely why the Reformation *succeeded so easily*: at that time the papacy had already been infiltrated by the Medicis, so the attackers outside the cathedral were guaranteed to win. The Medici pope put up a false opposition, which explains why Henry VIII was able to succeed where his grandfathers had failed. It explains why the Holy Roman Emperor Charles was able to succeed where his predecessors had failed. It explains why Rome continued to crumble up until the French Revolution, when it finally suffered its *coup de grace*. It has been nothing but a front since then.

In 1519 Luther was again called before a papal nuncio in Altenburg, and the nuncio just happened to be another cousin. What are the odds? This papal nuncio was Karl von Miltitz, a Saxon noble closely related to Frederick, Elector of Saxony. Also strange is that they admit that before this second hearing, the Pope awarded Frederick the Gold Rose of Virtue. We are told the Pope was trying to make Frederick an ally by softening him up, but this makes no sense. The worst attack on the papacy ever was coming from one of Frederick's citizens, with Frederick refusing to turn the heretic over, but the Pope is going to be awarding him the Golden Rose?

Also suspicious is that although Luther promised the Pope at this time to remain silent if his enemies did, he immediately entered debate with Johann von Eck, who was really Johann Maier. We are told he was the son of a peasant, but also that he entered university at age 12. Really? So peasants' sons entered university at age 12 back then? He took his masters degree at age 15. Nine years later he got his Doctors in Theology. We seem to have a gap in the bio there. What was he doing from age 15 to age 24? Military Intelligence maybe? Obviously he wasn't the son of a peasant. He was a Mayer/Maier, meaning he was Jewish. Remember Mamie Mayer, above? Probably another cousin of Luther, paid to pretend to debate him.

In 1521 Luther was excommunicated and called before the Diet of Worms. Frederick was still Luther's protector. Neither the Pope nor any cardinals were prosecuting Luther. Instead the Emperor Charles V was presiding. He was a Habsburg, but his mother was a Trastamara, making him also a Pereira and a Carvalhal. We have seen them in many previous papers, since they are Marranos/Jews. Charles was also a Burgundian, making him a Capetian, a Savoy, a Plantagenet, and a Carolingian. In other words, Jewish in many more lines. Also descended from Judhael Berengar, who they pretend not to recognize as Jewish despite that first name. Probably a Komnene. Since we just saw that Luther was a cousin of Frederick, and Frederick was a cousin of Charles, the Emperor Charles was yet another cousin of Luther.

At the end of the trial, Charles allegedly declared Luther an outlaw and banned all his works. Except that. . . it is never explained why Luther couldn't be seized at court. What did he do, slip out a ventilator shaft? And although the Emperor decreed that anyone could kill Luther on sight, no one did. No one needed the money, I guess. They try to explain this by telling us Frederick once again planned Luther's escape. I hope the Pope didn't send him any more Golden Roses after that.

We are supposed to believe Luther hid out at Wartburg Castle, disguised as Junker Jorg (see picture under title). But less than ten months later he was back in Wittenberg, preaching eight sermons for Lent. I guess the Emperor didn't read the papers and didn't realize Luther was ignoring his decrees. Emperors are like that, you know: they ignore the little things like Reformations. Since Luther continued publishing his attacks while the Emperor looked the other way, we may assume there was no bounty on Luther's head. Just the reverse: the Emperor, like the Elector, must have been protecting

him. It was all an Intelligence project, same as we see today.

It all began to get out of hand when the peasant and minor nobility took it as a signal to revolt, backfiring somewhat on Frederick and Charles. Luther was ordered to come out against the rebels, telling them to obey the temporal authorities. Render under Caesar, in other words. So much for Luther the revolutionary. He even bragged:

I, Martin Luther, have during the rebellion slain all the peasants, for it was I who ordered them to be struck dead.

Charming. If you ever wondered who Luther really was, now you know.

They admit Luther's fake reformation took place under the auspices and protection of the secular powers. Which is as much to say it was always just a project of the government. So the governors used Luther's fake Reformation as yet another excuse to crack down on the peasants and to steal from the minor nobles. The usual flow-up economy.

Here's another big clue everyone misses: after his wedding, Luther and his wife moved into a former monastery given to them by John, the new Elector of Saxony, brother of Frederick. Ask yourself this: how was this a "former" monastery? Must have been stolen from the Catholic Church, eh, like all the monasteries soon to be stolen in England. And yet all the fake historians just waltz right by that admission, never reading it how it begs to be read. Who do top aristocrats give monasteries to? Poor Gentile priests of no lineage? No. They give them to their cousins, right? Proving once again Luther was a close cousin of the Dukes and Electors of Saxony. And proving he was already fabulously wealthy: only the already wealthy get to move into stolen monasteries. These monasteries were huge and very lush, which is why the aristocrats wanted to steal them. Yes, there would be a lot of fairly useless cells, but the gardens were extensive and the decorations were usually costly. Lots and lots of portable property, collected over centuries.

As we go down the page at Wikipedia and the years continue to tick by, the whole Diet of Worms is completely forgotten. What about the Emperor's death-sentence against Luther, the arrest warrant, the lifetime ban of his writings? It all evaporated, I guess.

The page is very strange, since it is many paragraphs later that this admission is dropped, almost invisibly:

He worked closely with the new elector, John the Steadfast, to whom he turned for secular leadership and funds on behalf of a church largely shorn of its assets and income after the break with Rome.

Wait, what break from Rome? That is just glossed over. Did the German states break from Rome or did Rome break from them? And why? Was it just over this excommunication of one priest? Really? You won't get an answer to any of that on Luther's page. Did the Emperor just change his mind, deciding instead to appoint Luther to the position of creating a new model for the church? That seems a bit odd, doesn't it? One priest disagrees with Rome and the entire Holy Roman Empire supports him against itself? And if that is what happened, why can't the history books be clear on it? Why such misdirection?

Also, who sheared the church of its assets and where did they go? On Luther's page, you might think

the bishops took all the assets when they left, carting them back to Rome. Or maybe they transferred them to French monasteries and cathedrals. But we know they didn't. As in England a couple of decades later, the church assets in the Holy Roman Empire were stolen by the top local aristocrats and bankers. [As in the French Revolution](#) 260 years later, the First Estate (church) was fleeced by the Second Estate (nobility), which was then fleeced by the bankers.

If you don't believe me, try reading the Wikipedia page for [Reformation in Germany](#), where you would think you might get more information about the subject than on the page of Luther. But no. None of your natural questions are answered. The whole section is six short paragraphs. Even the Wiki editors admit the section needs expanding. I'll say. [So they send you to the German page](#). But that is just more misdirection. There we are told Charles couldn't resist the Reformation because he wasn't in the Empire and was busy with wars against France and the Ottomans. Charles was allegedly out of the country from 1521 to 1530, allowing Luther to proceed unhindered for nine years. The Empire “was fragmented and the Reformation was decided at the territorial level”. And Charles didn't have the power to take on Luther. Really? So we are supposed to believe this all just sort of happened, while the Emperor and the Electors were busy with other stuff or were looking away. Who could possibly believe that? What “historians” could possibly write that with a straight face? God do they think we are stupid!

So we see that the German article is much longer, but it is just more garbage. It tells us nothing and answers none of the begged questions. It is poor misdirection from first to last. This by itself is indication the Reformation is not what we have been sold. Like everything else we have studied, it was a grand hoax, staged by the government and then papered over with a barebones story concocted for children and the mentally deficient. It contradicts itself and all logic in a million places, and no effort is even made to fill it in or make it believable. They figure why bother. The idiot Gentiles have bought it for centuries, so why go to any effort now?

But obviously the Reformation was just the manufactured and scripted excuse to pillage the monasteries and churches of all monies and valuables. In English history, [they sometimes admit that](#), as when Henry VIII looted all the monasteries in England and Ireland via his henchmen Rich and Cromwell. But on the pages of Luther and the German Reformation, this is more hidden. You aren't supposed to remember that although England and Ireland had huge ecclesiastical wealth, the German States had even more. They were the Holy *Roman* Empire, remember? They had been the primary ally and enforcer for the Vatican for years, and their armies had often been the Pope's armies. As such, they had been able to loot all over Europe and Asia for centuries, stockpiling incredible wealth. Which is precisely why the “reformers” targeted the German States first.

Of course this had always been a huge danger for the Catholic Church. The Vatican didn't have its own large armies, so it had to rely on alliances with kings or emperors who did. Only they could protect its extensive assets. But in the early 1500s, these alliances suddenly shattered, as the top Phoenicians realized Rome was a Golden Rose ripe for the picking. The Southern Phoenicians and the Northern Phoenicians—who we will call the Medicis and Komnenes—decided to call a temporary truce, allying against Rome. With the Medicis installed in the Vatican, this war was won without a shot being fired. Which is why the Reformation happened blisteringly fast by historical standards. The only question was the spin out: would the two sides abide by the agreements, or would they fall back into squabbling, both wanting all the spoils? You know the answer to that.

So the Reformation wasn't actually about religion at all, at least not from the viewpoint of the governors who pulled it. From their perspective, religion was just a cover for the real machinations,

which were entirely financial. Again, same as now. Same as always. Reform was simply the excuse for them to seize church assets. Once seized, the Church couldn't just be eliminated, since it continued to perform an important function at the time: more misdirection. It kept the citizens' eyes looking up to heaven, and while their gaze was so diverted, they could be robbed the more easily. So the governors needed to “reform” the Church, making some cosmetic changes that would appeal to the citizenry, while keeping the main planks in place. In pursuit of that, some real improvements were made—such as the “more direct line to God” idea of Luther—but the governors were more interested in the idea of weaning the audience off of expensive furnishings, which they wished to steal for their own castles. In that line, they needed to accustom church goers to more spare surroundings: much less gold, fewer paintings and sculptures . . . in short a stripped-down worship. That is the true source of all Puritanism and Amishness: more for the rich and less for the poor. To achieve that, the poor had to be convinced that it was more Godly to build simply and dress simply. They had to be convinced that all decoration was sinful. Those decorations were wanted by the Phoenicians. If the Phoenicians were going to hire artisans to make things, from then on those things were to go to private residences like Versailles, not to public cathedrals.

Of course this also explains why all religions are now being phased out by these Phoenicians. They aren't needed, since media now does what religion used to do. It diverts the eye and the attention. With media now drumming on people's outer meridians 24/7, the governors see religion as an outdated competitor, and they hate to see us tithing anyone but them. The governors have a bevy of new religions for you: Hollywood, TV, sports, politics, and fake science. Given that, they had thought religion would have died out long ago, and they are continually shocked by how persistent it is. It is one of their greatest bugbears. Which is reason enough to defend it. I often consider returning to church just to spite the Phoenicians, and if I had a gorgeous cathedral to attend, I probably would. When in Europe, I do attend masses occasionally (although I am not Catholic), just for the artistic thrill of it. And I am not too concerned with someone stealing my wallet while I am gazing up at the decorations . . . since I don't carry a wallet. I have nothing worth stealing, and am impossible to divert anyway. My gaze goes exactly where it wants to go, and is constantly questioning. So I am not a good mark.

I will be told Luther couldn't have been Jewish, since he is known as one of the most anti-Semitic authors ever. See his *On the Jews and Their Lies* as just one example. Wikipedia has a long section on Luther's anti-Semitism, and they link it directly to the Nazis. But this is just more of the same misdirection. We have seen it a million times, as Jews pretend to be anti-Semites in order to control the opposition and deflect suspicion. What better way to hide the truth here than to have Luther rail against the Jews. We saw it first in my papers [with Ezra Pound](#), a covert agent who did the same thing centuries later, but we have seen it many times since then, with [the Nazis being the ultimate examples](#). Hitler, Himmler, Goering, Eichmann, and all the rest were crypto-Jews appearing to denounce their fellow Jews. But as with Luther before them, it was all scripted and staged by the top aristocrats and merchants, as misdirection. The Jews were made out to be victims, when in fact they were the instigators of everything. But if you allow yourself to be convinced they are victims, it never occurs to you they are really the rulers. All of history has been flipped on you, as I have proved many times.

You will say that Luther denouncing the Jews was a dangerous gamble, since it might reverse on them. But they never had any fear of that. Especially in places like Saxony, they were in such total control of the government and media and military, there was no chance of an uprising against the Jews. As I just

showed you, the peasants didn't even understand these people *were* Jews. They didn't understand all these nobles with big noses were Jews. They didn't understand these creeps in the clergy like Luther were Jews. So there was no danger they would be targeted.

Same thing as now. Most Gentiles couldn't spot a Jew from six inches away. Most people I talk to don't even know Cohen is a Jewish name. They don't know Hoffman is a Jewish name. It never occurred to them that John Lennon was Jewish, or that their favorite actors are. Graham Chapman of Monty Python Jewish? Couldn't be! Sure, he looks so Jewish they couldn't help but pick him to play Jesus, but

And in other news, I have an update on my health, for anyone who cares. Josh from CuttingThroughtheFog generously set up a hair mineral analysis for me, and the results were surprising. I was very high in cadmium, to the point of a minor chronic poisoning, which happens to match my symptoms very well: morning nausea and chronic fatigue being the worst. You may think it was coming from my paints, but it wasn't, since I don't use cadmium red. I use red earth and alizarin. It appears the culprit is my pots, pans, and dishes. I had been foolishly using some cheap old enameled pots and an iffy iron skillet. I was also using my grandmother's china, which—as it turns out—may have been slowly killing me. I have thrown the whole lot in the garbage (except for the expensive china, which I have stored) and started over, as a precaution, and we will see if it helps. I am also doing some natural chelating, mostly herbal. Let us hope I discovered this before my kidneys were completely ruined.

In fact, I encourage everyone to get their heavy metal levels checked and to look closely at their pans, dishes and utensils—even those who don't have fatigue or nausea. I was forced to study this, and as it turns out, most people are probably eating off substances that are not safe for one reason or another. A far greater percentage of people than you would think are, like me, accidentally poisoning themselves in this way. This is because it is pretty difficult to find kitchenware that *isn't* compromised for one reason or another. I just ordered replacements for everything I had, and most of what I ordered was glass, including plates and mugs. I will prepare a more extensive paper on this soon.

Many have been amazed at my productivity, with some even accusing me of being a committee. But just think of what I might have done over the past five years without chronic fatigue! Or, it is possible the chronic fatigue made this all possible. How? If I had felt better, I might have been up and about, chasing the girls, gadding about the country, and who knows what else. But this way, I only had enough energy to sit at my desk, churning out paper after paper. Who knows? *Es muss sein.*