

Who are the Rothschilds?



by Miles Mathis

First published September 30, 2020

Or, more precisely, who *were* the Rothschilds? In other words, where did they come from? We are told they arose from nowhere as bankers in the 1760s in Frankfurt, and that the name means “Red shield”. There is no proof of that one way or the other: it is just the usual Phoenician fake-out story. But I think it is false. You don't come from nowhere to become the top bankers in Europe, so we may assume they were already top bankers in Europe long before that. We may assume Mayer Rothschild didn't come out of the Jewish ghetto, as we are told. Most people would agree with that assumption, and it is agreed they changed the name from something else. What is not agreed is what they changed it from. The historians dodge mightily on this question, and Wikipedia has nothing to say about it. Thepeerage.com tells us they were previously Herz, but that doesn't really help us.

We are told that Mayer Rothschild's father Amschel had a small money lending shop in the ghetto, with total assets of 1,375 guilders, but we are also told he traded with the Prince of Hesse. So we are supposed to believe the Prince of Hesse went to the Frankfurt Jewish ghetto to borrow money? Oivay!

We are always assured they had a German background, but there is no evidence of that. They certainly had ties to Germany in the 1700s, but they had admitted ties in many other places, including England before the end of that century. Nathan was in Manchester by the 1790s, just 30 years later. Therefore, we may assume earlier hidden ties to the British Isles, since you can't just waltz into a country and take over its banks. There were already huge banks in England in 1800, so it was not like Rothschild was filling a vacuum. And yet by the early decades of the 19th century, Rothschild was already one of the top banks in the Isles.

The simplest answer to this question would be that the family was already a top family of Europe, and that they simply changed their name in the mid-18th century or earlier to hide their past. And that is

indeed what I found. But to get there, we have to first throw out the “red shield” story as a cover. Remember, the Rothschilds don't pronounce their name that way. They pronounce the name like Roth-child. Child of the Roths. That turns out to be a big clue, since we can add only one letter to the name and get where we want to go. Like this: Rothes-child. Child of the Rothes.

Some will say, “No it isn't. It is pronounced in the German way, with a short 'i', not a long.” Except that [only philistines and spooks](#) pronounce it that way*, and they do so as more misdirection. They continue to want you to believe the old stories. But [British peers do not pronounce it that way](#), and neither do the Rothschilds themselves.

But who are the Rothes? They are the Leslies, Earls and Dukes of Rothes.



Doesn't really look like an Angle or a Saxon, does he? Rothes is in Scotland, where it is both an ancient town going back to 600AD and a ruined castle. The castle was built around 1200 by Peter de [Pollok](#), and that name is another huge clue. Pollok=Pollock/Pollack, which we know is a Jewish name. The Leslies were top nobles, connected to the Stuarts from the very beginning. Soon after the arrival of William the Conqueror, Bartholomew Leslie married the daughter of Duncan I, King of Alba (Scotland). We are told Leslie came as a nobleman from Hungary with English King Edgar Ætheling, who was also from Hungary. His mother Agatha may have been the daughter or niece of the King of Hungary, which takes us back to the [Arpad](#) dynasty and the [Komnenes and Phoenicians](#) again.

As for the Kings of Alba, they had names like Constantine, linking them back to Byzantium and the Komnene Emperors as well. So this is where the Leslies came from. By the 1300s, the Leslies had married into the royal Stewart house. In about 1370, Sir George Leslie married the granddaughter of King Robert II Stewart, also linking them to the Hayes, Keiths, Grays, Bruces, Setons, and Sinclairs. By the 1350s the Leslies were already linked to Rothes, both by name and location. John Leslie of Rothes was born in 1318.

Strangely, we aren't told what Rothes was named for, though it is spelled *Rathais* in Gaelic. This tells us that Roth doesn't indicate “red” and never did. Even Wikipedia tells us it more likely indicates “wood” or “fame”. But if we spell it with an “a” like the Gaels, we have an even better idea where it came from. The word *ratha* in Sanskrit means “hero”, so that seems to link us to the “fame”

translation. And since Sanskrit and Hebrew are linked, we can feel ourselves getting closer. Rath is a Hebrew name, see Meshullan Rath, a famous rabbi from the early 1900s. Also Ernst vom Rath, a German Nazi diplomat allegedly assassinated in Paris by a Jewish teenager in 1938, leading to Kristallnacht. This was of course faked, since Rath was Jewish himself. And, not coincidentally, vom Rath was from Frankfurt, same place the Rothschilds were from. This tells us to look up *rath* instead of *rot*, where we find it means “wise person”. All this makes sense, and feels more right at a glance than the “red shield” nonsense.



Amusingly, we can link this paper to [my Titanic paper](#), since a later Countess of Rothes, wife of the 19th Earl Norman Leslie, was an alleged heroine (*rath*) of that fake disaster, taking the tiller of her lifeboat and steering it to the rescuing *Carpathia*. You may also be interested to know that she was traveling with her husband's cousin Gladys **Cherry**, since we saw that surname [in my paper on Woody Allen](#). Woody is also a Cherry. Also a Stewart. Real name Alan **Stewart** Konigsberg.

In 1440 the Leslies married the Stewarts again, when the 1st Earl of Rothes married the granddaughter of the 1st Duke of Albany. This also linked him to the Grahams and Haliburtons. This Earl later married a Campbell.

The 7th Earl of Rothes was a banker, since he was appointed Lord High Treasurer of Scotland in 1663 and was later elevated to Duke. His history is heavily pawed, since although he was a supporter of Charles I, was captured in battle, and held in the Tower by Cromwell, he was very soon released and suffered no permanent inconvenience. He was one of the ones who led Charles II back in, and it was Charles who appointed him Treasurer. He carried the sword of state at Charles' coronation, which is pretty amazing considering he was a Scot. Charles later made him Lord Chancellor of Scotland *for life*. Wikipedia conspicuously fails to tell us what he did to deserve any of this, but we assume it had much to do with finances. It always does. He married into the Lindsay clan, increasing his wealth and influence once more. This also linked him to the Hamiltons. His daughter married a Hamilton of the Earls Hamilton.

This Duke of Rothes is given no sons in the history books or genealogies, but I suggest he may have had a son who was sent to Germany during the English Revolution, changing his name to hide his connection to his temporarily disgraced father. The dates confirm this possibility, since he married the

Lindsay in 1648. His first daughter was born in 1650, two years later, so we have a 2-year gap. When the Duke was in the Tower in 1652, a first son might have been 4 years old. This “Roths-child” may have been hidden to prevent his capture during the Revolution, then heavily financed by his father after the Restoration. Remember, there was much to-ing and fro-ing between England/Scotland and Germany at that time, and the two royal houses were always closely linked. More evidence in this direction is that by 1663 this 7th Earl had already obtained a new charter for the earldom conferring it through his daughter. That's rather odd, since his wife was just 31 at that time, and the Earl himself was 32. How could he have known at that early a date that he would have no sons, either through her or through a second wife? He would live another 18 years, so his health couldn't have been too bad. Here is your next clue:

Leslie died at [Holyrood Palace](#) in [Edinburgh](#) on 27 July 1681. He was awarded a [state funeral](#). The funeral procession was more elaborate and impressive than either Wellington's or Churchill's. It stretched over seventeen miles (27 km) long. The cost of whole regiments of ceremonial guards, soldiers, banners, trumpets, heralds and coaches effectively ruined the family finances forever, and he left behind a huge debt to his daughter, [Margaret Leslie](#).

That doesn't make any sense, either, and reads like another cover story. Note the numerology, with the number 27 coming up twice for no reason. This was one of the richest guys in Europe at the time, and we are supposed to believe one funeral ruined his family forever? Besides, if it was a state funeral, the state would pay for part of it. What this is covering is probably a huge transfer of money somewhere, possibly out of the country. Leslie was hiding assets and this is one of the ways they do it. Since Leslie was only 50, it is possible he faked his death and moved with a large part of his assets to Germany, seeing a big business opening there. We can be sure he didn't leave his daughters and wife in debt, since the Leslies remained wealthy after that, but he may have left them only a fraction of his total wealth, taking the rest with him or transferring it to his hidden son.

Do you see how the pieces of the puzzle are coming together? This would explain why he conferred the earldom on his daughter: that was his foothold in the British Isles, while he left to pursue banking in Germany. But he knew his Roths-childrens heirs would be coming back fairly soon, perhaps within a few decades, and he needed a peerage slot he could marry right back into. That is exactly what happened, as we are about to see.

The scene in Germany also confirms this, since Germany was just coming out of the Thirty Years War. So there *were* many vacuums in Germany just at that time. That is to say, many business opportunities, including in banking. The end of that war would be the perfect time to fill a created slot. You see, the Civil War in England started just as the Thirty Years War was ending, so businessmen like Leslie would naturally be looking to Germany, where things were gaining stability rather than losing it.

Another clue is that the 7th Earl became 1st Duke of Roths, died a year later, the dukedom ended, and the earldom passed to his daughter. Her son became the 9th Earl. **So who was the 8th Earl of Roths?** You will tell me her husband the Hamilton became the 8th Earl. But he didn't. He was already the Earl of Haddington, and when the earldom of Roths was rechartered in 1663 to the daughter, it was stipulated that the two earldoms of Haddington and Roths *must remain separate*. So Hamilton couldn't legally have been both earls, and the peerage confirms he was never the Earl of Roths. This indicates a hidden 8th Earl of Roths somewhere, confirming all my guesses one more time.

To see how prominent the Leslies were, note that when the Duke supposedly failed to have any sons, and his daughter married an Earl of Hamilton, their *first* son took the name Leslie instead of Hamilton.

So the Leslies outranked both the Hamiltons and Lindsays, which is saying a lot. This 9th Earl of Rothes immediately married back into the Stewart clan when he married the daughter of a Hay and a Maitland. The Maitlands were Dukes of Lauderdale at that time, and like the Leslies had already long been a cadet branch of the Stewarts. They came from **Levington**, telling us immediately who they were. They weren't hiding it. We can also tell where these Leslies came from, in that whenever their male line faltered (and it often did), they didn't continue the line through a cousin. They continued it straight through the daughters. They had no problem with female succession.

When this Leslie went to Germany and changed his name to Rothes-child, he must have also embraced his Jewish roots, which up to that time had been partially buried. But this would be easy to explain if once in Germany he married a Cohen. The Rothschilds were marrying Cohens at that time, and that much is admitted. That by itself tells us a lot about who the Rothschilds really were, and are, but it doesn't tell us where the name came from. This link to the Rothes would explain that, as well as their easy (re)entry into England as top bankers.

If this theory is true, you would expect that when Nathan Rothschild came to England in the 1790s, he would have hooked up again with his Leslie relatives. Instead, if we believe the mainstream history, the Rothschilds apparently began the biggest experiment in close inbreeding ever attempted, surpassing even the Bourbons of Spain. For several generations they married almost no one but other Rothschilds, so they should have all been imbeciles by 1900. Not saying they weren't, but there is another possibility: the Rothschild genealogies are faked like everything else.

Actually, a little digging shows the Rothschilds in England *did* very soon marry into the Leslie clan. Nathan married a Cohen, but his daughter Hannah married a **Fitzroy**. The Fitzroys were Dukes of Grafton, the 1st Duke being the son of Charles II and Barbara Villiers. So the Fitzroys were really Stuarts, proving my point: the Leslies and the Stuarts are the same extended family. Almost the first thing the Rothschilds did when they came to England is marry the Stuarts, which I am telling you means they were Stuarts to start with. No matter how rich you are, you don't arrive in a country and within one generation marry into the royal line. ***Unless you are already of the royal line.***

Also take note that the name Villiers links us back to Woody Allen a second time. Mia Farrow is a Villiers. Her brother's middle name is Villiers. [And Woody and Mia are cousins.](#)

Nathan's granddaughter in another line was also named Hannah, and she married a Primrose, Earl of Rosebery. His mother was a Stanhope, and the Stanhopes were also Hamiltons, of the Earls of Haddington. As we just saw, this is the precise Hamilton line that was closest to the Leslies, since the Earls of Haddington and Earls of Rothes were basically equivalent. The two Earls were originally brothers. See the 9th Earl of Rothes above: his brother took the name Hamilton instead of Leslie, and became the Earl of Haddington.

The Rothschilds also very soon married into the line of the Smiths of Nottingham bankers. In fact, this link to the Stanhopes also linked the Rothschilds to the Smiths, since they were all one big happy. Hannah's mother-in-law was the great-granddaughter of the Abel Smith we have seen in many previous papers. This links us to the *Titanic* story once again, since Captain Edward Smith of the *Titanic* was from these same lines. Which explains how the Countess of Rothes got involved in that hoax.

The Fitzroy marriage also immediately linked the Rothschilds to the Seymours, Somersets, Scudamores, Montagus (George Washington), Cosbys, Bennetts, Lindsays, Chetwynds, Walpoles, Falconers (Faulkners), Nugents, Pitts, Trotters, Allens, and Warrens. The Lindsays link us to the

Leslies again. Brad Pitt is both a Pitt and a Trotter. Helena Bonham Carter is related to the Rothschilds through the Smiths. The Bonham Carters are also Erskines, linking Helena to Andy Murray through his mother.

*Note how that guy pronounces "claret" as well. He mispronounces it like the British, sounding the "t" at the end. The French of course don't pronounce the "t", and it is a French wine. So this is sort of a signal to you that he is mispronouncing both words on purpose, both to mimic British snobs and to misdirect on the Rothschilds. If you think I am wrong, just ask yourself this: is "Bordeaux" properly pronounced "Bordy-ox? It reminds me of the British pronunciation of Don Juan. They actually pronounced it Jew-an. Talk about in-your-face.