

[return to updates](#)

The English Revolution



by Miles Mathis

First published June 25, 2020

I have wanted to do this one for some time, but until now I didn't have the keys to get through all the doors. But since I have previously exploded the [French Revolution](#) and the [Russian Revolution](#), I now understand how these things work. I have also pretty thoroughly exposed the [Tudor/Stanley connection](#), which is the [skeleton key](#) to understanding all the history here.

The English Revolution I am talking about is the revolution of Parliament against Charles I, ending in his alleged beheading in 1649. Like the previous history of England we are sold, this history never made much sense. If we look broadly at the given history of Charles I, it seems like he did pretty much the same thing his father did, shutting down Parliament whenever he liked and stealing freely from all those around him. So why did he fail where other kings succeeded? Should we believe the mainstream historians who tell us he just made more mistakes than previous kings? No, we shouldn't. I have proved to you again and again that we shouldn't believe *anything* mainstream historians tell us, and least of all things like this.

But to get through this maze, there are many things you have to know, and those things are generally quite well hidden. The historians have told you a sexy fiction, as usual, and to get you to believe it they have to hide most pertinent facts. The facts here start way back, but we will only go as far back as the

so-called Wars of the Roses. Here are the first two sentences at Wikipedia on that subject:

The Wars of the Roses were a series of English civil wars for control of the throne of England fought between supporters of two rival cadet branches of the royal House of Plantagenet: the House of Lancaster, represented by a red rose, and the House of York, represented by a white rose. Eventually, the wars eliminated the male lines of both families.

Two sentences, two towering lies. The War wasn't between cadet branches named York and Lancaster, as they want you to believe. It was an attempted coup upon the Plantagenets by outside forces—as I will show you. The York line comes from Edmund of Langley, Duke of York, son of Edward III. The Lancaster line comes from John of Gaunt, his brother. But Edmund wasn't a York, and there was no “House of York”, since York was just a title. Edmund was a Plantagenet, and had no “York” blood. No one was named York here. Edmund's mother was French, and was a Capet, not a York. Edmund's wife was Castilian, and she was of the house of Ivrea. Same for John of Gaunt, who was just as Plantagenet as anyone, according to the mainstream. Gaunt's wife was Blanche, who they now call Blanche of Lancaster to support the given story, but who descended from Henry III through her father and a Beaumont through her mother. So she was also a Plantagenet, not a Lancaster. Again, Lancaster was just the title of her father, but it wasn't anyone's real name here.

Also, the War of the Roses didn't “eventually” eliminate the male lines of both families. It didn't eliminate them ever, or at all. The Plantagenets in both lines always had plenty of males, and still do. Only if you mean male to male to male lines is that true, but families don't proceed only male to male, since that would mean females can't carry bloodlines. According to the Jewish/Phoenician lines these people are actually forwarding, just the *opposite* is true, and the Plantagenets always had lots of fertile daughters. As proof of that, remember that as soon as the Stanleys/Tudors took the Crown, they ditched this King-only rule, putting several queens on the throne almost immediately (Jane, Mary, Elizabeth, Mary, Anne).

So why were the historians so keen to sell this fiction? Because they were hiding something. And what is that? It is that they want you to think this is York versus Lancaster, when it is actually Plantagenet versus some hidden party. And what party is that? Well, the first place to look is John of Gaunt's wife. She is our first key here. She is where Gaunt took the name Lancaster from, since her father was Henry de Grosmont, the Duke of Lancaster, the wealthiest and most powerful peer in the realm. The title Earl of Lancaster had been created long before, in 1267, so Gaunt didn't invent it. But here is the money shot: Grosmont was also titled the Earl of Derby. Do you recognize that? That is the title the Stanleys took up in 1485. So how could Grosmont still have it as late as 1361? We are told the Ferrers* were the previous Earls of Derby, first creation, up to 1266, but there is no mention at Wiki of this title passing to anyone else in the interim. A little more digging shows us that when the title was taken from the Ferrers by Henry III, he gave it to his son Edmund Crouchback. His sons then became Earls of Lancaster. So that is how Grosmont got the title Earl of Derby.

Is there a link between the Stanleys of Isle of Mann and the Dukes of Lancaster? Yes, because Thomas Stanley, 1st Earl Derby, second creation, married Eleanor Neville, whose grandmother was Lady Joan de Beaufort, who was the daughter of. . . **John of Gaunt**.

Once the Stanleys took the title Earl of Derby, one of their subsidiary titles was Baron Stanley of Preston in the Palatine of Lancaster. They didn't take that title until much later (1886), but it is interesting that at that time they decided enough time had passed that they could tip their hand to us more fully. Not only are they now admitting they were behind the Lancasters, but they are admitting

that Cromwell's big win at Preston was actually due to them as well (see below).

So what we are seeing is a linking up of previous research. [I have recently shown](#) that the Stanleys took the Crown of England in a secret coup at the Battle of Bosworth Field (1485), with the Tudors being fictional. They were really Stanleys. Henry VII Tudor, supposed to be the son of Edmund Tudor, was really the son of Stanley, Earl of Derby. Stanley married Henry's mother Margaret Beaufort in her 20s, which is a huge clue, but they deflect us by telling us she was previously married to Tudor from age 12 to age 13. But she wasn't: it is all fiction, made up later to hide the Stanleys. 12-year-old girls couldn't have children in the 1400s. They hadn't gone through puberty.

But as we are seeing, the infiltration of the royal lines started long before that, and John of Gaunt is a central character in that, as I show [here](#). There, we find John of Gaunt may be a plant in the royal lines, not actually being a son of Edward III. It turns out John was born in Holland, and his father took little interest in him from the first. He looked far more Jewish than his brothers. As a third son behind surviving brothers with sons, he was lost in the shuffle. . . until later. But through his mother Philippa, Gaunt was descended from **Komnenes**. They were Byzantine Emperors, originally from the area of ancient Armenia. So, Phoenicians or Jews. Of course all the ruling lines of Europe were also Jewish/Phoenician, but the Komnenes are a particularly powerful branch, infiltrating royal houses both north and south, east and west.

I will be told Edmund of York's mother was the same woman, Philipa of Hainault, but the difference between Edmund and Gaunt would be in the father. According to English law, Edmund's paternal line would trump the maternal line, making him a Plantagenet. But if Gaunt's father wasn't the King, that local law wouldn't pertain. If his father was also a Jew from Holland, his "blood" would be determined by his matrilineal line, making him a Komnene. So it looks to me like the Wars of the Roses were the early attempts of these Komnenes to take over the Crown from the Plantagenets. For about a hundred years they made some progress but mostly failed, until the Stanleys fully succeeded in the way I have shown. Therefore, we can now answer a question I previously couldn't answer: where did the Stanleys come from? They were obviously Phoenician navy, but who were they before they were Stanleys? We can now see it doesn't really matter, because we should have been following the women, even with the Stanleys. It was the 1st Earl of Derby's *wife*, the Neville, that we should have been following, since it is she who links us to this previous action, and back to John of Gaunt.

You will say, "Great, but what does that have to do with Charles I, almost two centuries later?" As it turns out, almost everything, because there again, it is what we *aren't* told that matters the most. The key figure in the English Revolution is George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, whom they admit was the lover of James I and best friend of his son Charles I.



But I encourage you to read [the Wikipedia page](#) of Buckingham. It is total mess, even by Wiki standards. Large parts of it don't even scan. The page reads like it was written by a computer on the fritz, or pieced together in fragments.

Here is all they tell us of Villiers' ancestry:

Villiers was born in [Brooksby](#), Leicestershire, on 28 August 1592, the son of the minor gentleman Sir [George Villiers](#) (1550-1606). His mother [Mary](#) (1570-1632), daughter of [Anthony Beaumont of Glenfield](#), Leicestershire, widowed early, educated her son for a courtier's life. She sent him to travel in [France](#) with [John Eliot](#).

The son of a minor gentleman? Pshaw! As usual, they left out all the good stuff. They forgot to tell you that through his mother Mary [Beaumont](#), he was a direct descendant of King Henry III, through the Earls of Lancaster. However, that line was turned 180 degrees over two generations, first when the 3rd Earl married a Chaworth, daughter of a [Beauchamp](#) of the Earls of Warwick; and second when their grandson married a [de Vere](#), daughter of the Earl of Oxford. The de Veres returned us to the original English lines, which were from France (including the Guises and Dukes of Normandie). Same for the Beauchamps, who were from the same French lines. The Beaumont/Lancaster line was also watered down by Ferrers, Despensers, Darcys, Talbots, Armstrongs, and so on. So by the time it reached Buckingham, it was mainly French again.

As in the line of the King, what we have here is not mainly a War of the Roses, but a War of the Marriages. You have many Jewish foreign lines trying to capture the English crown by marriage. So to unwind the early history of England, you have to follow the nearly hidden queens. The historians do everything they can to prevent you from doing that.

Also important is Buckingham's wife, always neglected here and rarely mentioned. The fact that

Buckingham was gay doesn't negate the fact that he had four children, and that his wife was a . . . **Manners**, daughter to the Earl of Rutland, **the richest family in England outside the royal family**. The Manners were Nevilles as well, see above, but in the main lines they were **FitzAlans**, same as Stuarts, same as William the Conqueror. So, again, French. Further back the Manners are **Middletons and Strothers**, taking us to the same place. Same for Buckingham's Villiers line, which also goes back to France.

So what does all that mean? It means that Buckingham was on the FitzAlan/Stuart/Plantagenet side of this long feud, not the Komnene/Stanley/Tudor side. And though Charles was a Tudor through Mary, it looks like the Crown had left the Komnene/Stanley/Tudor rails somehow. Charles was a Douglas through his grandfather, and the Douglasses link us to the Tudors a second time. But remember, Charles was also a Bourbon through Mary's mother, and was from the Oldenburgs, Kings of Denmark, in at least two recent lines. They also link us to prominent Catholic lines. So the problem appears to be that Charles and his first mate Buckingham had both left the Tudor ship, deciding to embrace their southern and Catholic roots rather their northern/Protestant/Stanley/Komnene roots. To put it in the old fake terms, they were York not Lancaster.

This is why Charles wanted to marry the Infanta of Spain, and when that failed he married the daughter of the French King. All the while the Stanleys, through the Parliament, were telling him he needed to marry someone in their lines. This is why Buckingham also refused Stanley orders. They wanted him to attack Spain and fight to liberate the Protestants in Germany. Instead, he let the Spanish fleet escape and fought *against* the Protestants in Holland, as an ally of France.

And that is why all hell finally broke loose. The Stanleys had been in control of the Crown since the time of Henry VII. They had controlled Elizabeth and then James I. But Buckingham arrived and began trying to turn James back to the York side. He succeeded with Charles. And *that* is why Parliament acted completely different with Charles than with James. Parliament was controlled by the Stanleys, and the Stanleys were used to the King doing what he was told. Charles failed to get that message.

Buckingham was allegedly stabbed to death at age 35 at Greyhound Pub in Portsmouth by Lt. John Felton. Felton just happened to be related to Thomas **Howard**, 21st Earl of Arundel, telling you what to think of this story. See my previous paper on the **Ridolfi Plot** for much more on the Howards. But if you are prone to believe this story, just ask yourself this: if Buckingham was "hugely unpopular", as we are told, both in the military and among the public, do you really think he would be hanging out unguarded in a pub? No, of course not. Dukes don't drink in pubs, then or now, but especially not when it is known that they are the target of plots. So this story couldn't be more absurd.

More indication it is fiction is that it was *fictionalized* by Alexandre Dumas in *The Three Musketeers*. If you will remember, Felton was a character in the novel **under his own name**, portrayed as a Puritan. This is just Dumas' way of admitting Felton was a Lancastrian/Tudor/Stanley. In the book, Felton is ordered to guard Milady Winter (Faye Dunaway in the famous 1973 film), a French spy working for Cardinal Richelieu. This is the French connection, since Buckingham and Charles *were* linked to the French, not only through Queen Henrietta Maria, but through their Catholic sympathies and "Yorkist" leanings. So in the novel, Buckingham is assassinated on the order of Richelieu, **but this is a reversal**. Richelieu would have no reason to assassinate Buckingham, since Buckingham was France's greatest ally. Dumas wants us to believe Buckingham was having an affair with the French Queen Anne, but of course this is impossible, seeing that Buckingham was gay. Therefore we see how Dumas is continuing the old propaganda, but from the French side. Even in 1844, the French still didn't want the

world to know they had anything to do with the English Revolution of the 1640s. So we may assume Dumas was also linked to the Stanley/Komnene faction. ☺



In the 1973 film, directed by Richard Lester (real name Liebman, Jewish), Buckingham is sold to us as a Protestant, **another reversal**, as you see. It was Buckingham's Catholic and Yorkist ties that made him dangerous in England, and of course the French were well aware of that. When Buckingham first meets Queen Anne in the film (in the laundry), he says the French Protestants were asking for help from England. Another reversal, since Buckingham himself was a Catholic Englishman seeking help from the French. But the producers of this (admittedly entertaining) movie don't want you to know that. Who were they? Salkinds, born in Danzig to Russian-Jewish parents.

At any rate, if Buckingham was so unpopular, his life and death should have been a huge black mark on his family, but we don't see that. His son became the 2nd Duke and fought for the Royalists in the Civil Wars. After St. Neots he was allowed to escape to the Netherlands. His lands were not confiscated, simply being given to his future father-in-law, Lord Fairfax. Typical. That was so it would be easy to return the lands to him when he came back. Which begs the question how they knew he would be coming back. Did Parliament have a crystal ball? No. Parliament should have banished people like him permanently, seizing all lands permanently, and revoking titles. But they didn't. Just a few years after the First Duke's death, his daughter Mary married a Herbert, Earl of Pembroke. Three years later, after Herbert's death, she became the Duchess of Richmond and Lennox by marrying James Stewart. She later married a **Howard**. This confirms once again that Buckingham's death was faked.

For more proof of that, we have the ridiculous story of the 2nd Duke of Buckingham's return to England in 1657. Since Cromwell was still around, why on Earth would this top Royalist come back? We are told it was to marry the daughter of Lord Fairfax, but that doesn't begin to explain it. He was arrested on **August 18**, aces and eights, Chai, and sent to the Tower. For some reason, Cromwell didn't pursue his death for treason, and when Cromwell died he was released. So, just more shenanigans. You can be sure he was never in the Tower for a moment. By 1662 he was Privy Council, and was the richest man in England outside the Royals, all his lands and titles being restored. So tidy.

The 2nd Duke feuded with Lord Chancellor Edward Hyde, wanting his position. He got it a few years later when Hyde was prosecuted for. . . pretty much nothing. For disliking Buckingham and Barbara Villiers, mainly. Buckingham then became the head of the aptly named **Cabal** Ministry, a quincunx of crypto-Jews, and did fine until he tried to undermine one of the other ministers, the more popular

Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington. Arlington** won that round, and Buckingham was forced into retirement.

But I still haven't answered one question: if the 1st Duke of Buckingham's assassination was faked, he must have been in on it. Why would he agree to disappear in 1628? Well, Parliament had been trying to impeach him as Lord High Admiral since 1625. They tried a second time a year later, failing only because Buckingham was actually *popular*. Not unpopular, but popular. Anyone resisting the Protestants was popular at that time, because the peasants and gentry were still mainly. . . Catholic. Remember, this was still only a few decades after Henry VIII kicked Rome out of England and stole all its wealth and ornaments. People don't forget that so fast. At the ground level, the Protestants were still looked upon as invaders and thieves, since that is what they were. Your basic citizen didn't understand that the Jews were behind the Protestants, but he understood the Protestants were thieves nonetheless. His parents and grandparents had watched it happen. So if Buckingham was unpopular, it was only with the Stanleys and their allies, who now had him targeted. Buckingham knew he was targeted, and he knew by whom. They had recently taken out his personal physician, Dr. Lambe, and had published pamphlets prophesying that

**Let Charles and George do what they can,
The Duke shall die like Doctor Lambe. [33]**

That is how it currently appear on Buckingham's page at Wikipedia. Notice anything? How about the footnote number? It is just accidentally the number 33?

So my guess is Buckingham agreed to step aside, rather than face a worse fate. At 35, his looks would be fading, and so his hold on Charles. He probably saw he hadn't the allies in England to ultimately succeed, and retired to France. As we can see, his only hope was an alliance with France and/or Spain. They were the only ones who could hope to counter the power of the Stanleys. But that wasn't in the cards in 1628. Why? Because both France and Spain were already up to their necks in wars, including one with eachother. When both countries got involved in the new War of the Mantuan Succession in that year, Buckingham probably threw his hands up in despair and gave up. He knew this would have been the perfect time for France to take England, since they already had a Queen on the throne and a King who was sympathetic to them. I believe Charles would have welcomed a French army to overthrow the Tudors/Stanleys, and this is tacitly confirmed in many histories, which admit Charles was dominated by his French wife Henrietta Maria. Her brother was Louis XIII, and we may assume she begged him to intervene. But by 1628 it was clear that wasn't going to happen. And why not? Richelieu and Louis didn't want England? No, of course they did, but they were simply outmaneuvered by the Stanleys/Komnenes in this case, who deftly kept their eyes elsewhere. Who do you think was pushing the Thirty Years War against the Habsburgs? Same people. They were behind Frederick V, King of Bohemia. Who do you think kicked off the intrigue in Mantua? Same people. Francesco IV, Duke of Mantua, was married to a Savoy, so when he died the Savoyards claimed Mantua. The mainstream wants you to think this means France was claiming Mantua, but it is deeper than that. This is because Savoy wasn't really French.† Its blood goes back to. . . are you ready. . . Joan of Valois. Remember her? The mother of Philippa of Hainault and grandmother of John of Gaunt. Cue tense music. Bom-bommm. As we have seen, they hail back to the Kings of Hungary and then to the Komnenes, Byzantine Emperors. So the “Stanleys” were sparking this war in Mantua as well.

Yes, Savoy was a Komnene territory, which is why it allied tightly to England in WWII. Remember how we saw in [my paper on Mussolini](#) that there were two main factions behind him: 1) MI5 out of London, and 2) King Victor Emmanuel III, of Savoy. That is because they were both led by

Komnenes.

The war in Mantua was a brilliant ploy, as you now see, since it not only forced the Habsburgs to fight on yet another front, it also drew French and Austrian attention away from England at a time when she was weak. The historians hired by the Stanleys always extol Richelieu as a genius and the English as bumblers at this time, but the exact opposite was the case. Richelieu was a fool, always running in the wrong direction, and the “English” were so savvy you don't even know about their existence until now. I would now say it is possible Richelieu was a Komnene agent, failing in France on purpose, but that is another paper.



We see more proof of this with Oliver Cromwell, who, like his ancestors, was a tool of the Stanleys. Cromwell's mother is scrubbed everywhere, and we are supposed to believe she didn't know who her parents were. We are supposed to believe she was a Steward. But thepeerage.com admits her grandfather was a Stuart from Scotland, not a Steward, so they don't hide this very well. These are the Stuarts, baronets, related to the Ingoldsbys, Palmers, Worsleys, and Sanders. Through the Worsleys, they are related to the Nevilles. The Nevilles link us to the Windsors, **Bacons** (yes, those Bacons), and . . . Stanleys. In the Cromwell line, Oliver comes from the Cromwells who also produced Thomas Cromwell, Henry VIII's Chancellor of the Exchequer and Earl of Essex. Oliver was a cousin of the Earls of Ardglass, and is related to the Seymours, Willoughbys, Flemings, and **Russells**.

Cromwell is sold as “middle gentry” and as a Puritan, but both are lies. They admit his grandfather was the richest landowner in Huntingdonshire, but assure us that his father was of “modest means”. The usual sob story. They also admit he was *not* brought up a Puritan and that he went to Cambridge, but try to tell us his college, Sidney Sussex, was a recently founded college “with a strong Puritan ethos”. No it wasn't. Its founder the Countess of Sussex *was* Protestant, but the college was not Puritan at all. Dissenters weren't even allowed to matriculate at either Oxford or Cambridge, at any of the colleges. Besides, Puritanism wasn't an “ethos”. It wasn't even a real movement. Like Marxism later, it was nothing more than an Intelligence project. But that is another paper.

For now it is enough to say that Cromwell *was* a Puritan in one sense: all top Puritans were Intel assets, and Cromwell was an Intel asset. Puritanism was both his project and his cover. Puritanism was simply an extension of Calvinism, taken several steps further to cause more dissension and to allow more splintering of Christianity. Mainly it was used as a further tool against Rome, since job one was blocking the southern Phoenicians like the Medicis, Bourbons, etc, from regaining any foothold in Britain.

To divert you away from discovering any of that, we are told nothing is known of the first 40 years of his life. Right. But they do admit Cromwell went to Lincoln's Inn, though they say his records are lost. That's convenient. This connects him again to the Nevilles, since Lincoln's Inn was originally on their estates. We also know Cromwell married a **Bourchier**, daughter of Sir James Bourchier, a wealthy London **leather merchant** with extensive lands in Essex. Wiki and the peerage scrubs all links out from the Bourchiers, but they were actually **Earls of Essex and Earls of Bath**. Funny that the history books don't bother to tell you that when talking about Cromwell. The 1st Earl of Essex had married Isabella **Plantagenet** in 1467. She later married Sir Thomas **Grey**, whose cousin was the Earl of Kent. Isabella was the daughter of a York, which is a bit confusing, but her husband Thomas was also a **Neville**. So you are seeing proof of what I told you above. The Plantagenets didn't die out. The Bourchiers *were* Plantagenets, through Isabella.

Amusingly, the 1st Earl of Essex, Henry Bourchier, had a son Humphrey, who became the 1st Lord Bourchier **of Cromwell** in 1461. So the Cromwells and Bourchiers were connected long before Oliver married one. That is because this Humphrey married Joan Stanhope, daughter of Maud de Cromwell. Maud's brother was the Baron Ralph de Cromwell, who was Lord High Treasurer under Henry VI. He is now sold as a Yorkist, but as you see he was more likely a Lancastrian. As a banker, he was probably another mole of the Komnenes.

Also interesting is that the 1st Baron de Cromwell married Maud de **Bernake**, the daughter of a **Berkeley**, Baron Marmion. [The Berkeleys are also related to the Earls of Derby.] This should remind you of banker Ben Bernanke, Chairman of the Federal Reserve under Obama. Some things never change.

We are supposed to believe that Oliver Cromwell finally discovered Puritanism at age 39. More likely he was finally assigned his first major project (that we know of). Two years later, in 1640, he was an MP in the Long Parliament, standing for Cambridge, though we aren't told why Cambridge. They do however admit that he was mysteriously linked to a set of aristocrats in the House of Lords, including the Earls of Essex, Warwick, and Bedford, the St. Johns, and the Viscount of Saye and Sele. They forget to tell you why he was connected to the Earl of Essex, but I just did: he was linked to him through his wife, since the Earl of Essex was a Bourchier. Warwick was Robert **Rich**, which again probably links us to the bankers and the Komnenes. The Riches are scrubbed, but I have previously shown they were likely bankers from Germany, previously Reichs, and my guess is they lead us to Jagiellons, Vasas, or the like. Bedford was a **Russell**, who links us back to John of Gaunt. The Viscount Saye and Sele was a **Fiennes**, who links us to the Beauchamps, earlier Earls of Warwick; and through Fiennes' wife we link to the **Spencers**. Fiennes was also a descendant of the sister of William of Wykeham (Longe), who came out of nowhere in the time of Edward III to become Bishop of Winchester, Lord Chancellor, founder of New College, Oxford, and one of the richest men in England. So we may assume he links us to the invading Komnenes as well.

So, finding Oliver Cromwell linked to these people is informative, to say the least. As “middle gentry

of modest means”, Cromwell had no standing to be hanging out with dukes and earls. So this is just another sign of the project, and another indication Cromwell was an agent. There is no chance these Lords were serious Puritans, and we can be sure they promoted it only as a wedge against Rome.

Suddenly in 1642, Cromwell joined the Parliamentary Army and his bio came alive. But again, it is not clear what his qualifications were. Now 43, he had no military experience prior to that, other than local county militia. He arrived too late for the Battle of Edgehill. But by later 1643 he was somehow already a colonel. I guess he was promoted for missing battles. By the next year he was already a general. On the page for the First English Civil War, Cromwell isn't mentioned as a participant until 1645, when we are told he defeated Royalist positions at Basing House and Winchester. We then have to go to the Second English Civil War for more reports of him. We have to scan down to 1648, for Cromwell's victory at **Preston**. After that we get a mention of him (previously) reducing fortresses in South Wales. In July he won at Pembroke in West Wales in another lightning victory, which of course looks suspicious.

And that's it. Not really a convincing report of an important and extended Civil War, even for an encyclopedia entry. Going in, one would expect Cromwell's heroics to be extended and detailed, but we get almost nothing.

Was Charles I really beheaded? Of course not. I have previously shown you hundreds of fakes, including the faked deaths of Louis XVI, the Romanovs, Kennedy, Mussolini, and MLK, so you should go in here looking for clues it *didn't* happen. They are easy to find. Here is the biggest: we are told a large crowd was present to witness the execution, but many lines of soldiers surrounded the scaffold, keeping the public at a great distance. They admit the public was too far away to hear any of the speeches, which means they were also too far away to make a positive ID on Charles. Although it was common practice to hold the head up and cry “Behold the head of the traitor”, this was not done. Why? I assume because this was *not* the head of the traitor Charles. It was the head of some recent corpse they had taken from the morgue. Charles II, his son, planned a huge royal mausoleum to be erected for his father in Hyde Park, but it was never built. Why? Because at that time his father was still alive, and Charles I probably thought it was bad luck to have an empty mausoleum in Hyde Park calling out to him.

He was allegedly buried in the Henry VIII vault at Windsor Castle, but that also makes no sense and is another tall clue. We have just seen that Charles was killed for going against the “Tudors”, so the last place he would wish to be buried is with Henry VIII. Of course his family would have known that. So this part of the story was obviously written by the Stanleys, as a final twist of the knife. Charles wasn't really buried anywhere at the time, so they could make up whatever story they wished. They placed him with Henry VIII to make a Tudor out of him at last.

So where did he go? He went wherever his wife and children were, so look where they were. I don't think he was ever in England after 1642, which would mean he was in the Hague with the Prince of Orange—who had just married his daughter Mary (she was 9 years old).

If Charles was gone, why have a war from 1642 to 1649? Why have a war at any time?—*because it was profitable in a multitude ways*. It gave the Stanleys the pretext for pillaging the country freely for almost seven years. Need I say more? It gave them the pretext for raising taxes. It gave them the

pretext for pillaging Ireland. And it kept the Spanish and French armies and navies away, since they were scared away by reports of the ferocious Parliamentary forces, capable of defeating a king.

We have proof it was Charles and not the Crown that was the problem for the Stanleys and Parliament, since a king was back on the throne very soon with Charles II. The Stanleys were perfectly satisfied to have a king front them, as long as that king did what he was told. So the idea this was all about replacing a monarchy with a fairer form of government obviously doesn't fly. Neither Cromwell nor anyone else ever cared about making the government more representative of the people, and Cromwell soon became a dictator anyway. So Parliament apparently never had any problem with the monarchy as such. The problem was always that Charles, under the tutelage of Buckingham, had chosen his Plantagenet side over his "Tudor" side, refusing direct orders from the Stanleys. That couldn't be allowed, because the Stanleys knew it would end up with the country backsliding into Catholicism, which would allow Rome back into the country.



Of course this leads us back to Mary I Tudor, who tried to do just that. Why did the Stanleys allow it? Well, they *didn't* allow it: they did everything they could to prevent it, including trying to put Lady Jane Grey on the throne instead. But the problems of Henry VIII in siring a son put them over a barrel. The death of Edward VI at age 15 was like a stake through their hearts. Even worse was Mary's marriage to Philip and the alliance with Spain. And when the Emperor Charles V ceded the Kingdom of Jerusalem to Philip, making Mary Queen of Jerusalem as well, the Stanleys' worst nightmare came true. Fortunately, Mary was young and stupid and Philip wasn't apprised of the deep politics of England. Mary didn't realize who was really behind the Grey plot, and at first she executed only Dudley. After the Wyatt Rebellion a few months later, she also executed Grey, her family, Dudley's family, and allegedly and eventually Cranmer. But she still missed the main players, since these trials were actually chaired by Thomas Stanley, Earl of Derby, and John Bouchier, Earl of Bath. Those two were the top conspirators against her, so she had let the fox back into the henhouse.‡ She should have executed all of Edward's Privy Counsellors, but she didn't. And her new Chancellor Gardiner was no help, though he must have known the lay of the land. He had been imprisoned in the Tower by that Privy Council, so he should have known them for who they were. Did they pay him off? They must have, since I can't find any other way to explain it. He was still considered too dangerous, paid or no, and he conveniently "died" the next year, 1555, possibly poisoned, but probably just banished to

France or somewhere.

Mary didn't last too long, either, you know, ruling for only five years and dying mysteriously at age 42. Also mysterious is that all her pregnancies weirdly came to nothing, not even miscarriages. We are told they were false pregnancies, but that is highly unlikely. More likely is that she was being poisoned, killing her fetuses, and finally succumbed to it herself in 1558. Her mainstream bio confirms that suspicion, since it so markedly fails to ask any questions, treating a death at age 42 as completely normal. Her bio reads like it is still being controlled by Stanleys to this day. Go read it yourself if you don't believe me.

Given what [we learned recently about Mary Queen of Scots](#), there is another possibility here, and that is that Mary Tudor didn't die at all. The Stanleys had been running plots against her all along, and maybe one of them finally succeeded. Maybe that plot was to fake her death while Philip was away, bundling her off to Germany or Poland or somewhere. You will say this would be impossible, but Philip cared very little for her, especially after she had failed to produce a son for him for five years, and the Stanleys probably figured he wouldn't look too hard for her. Even Mary's Catholic allies in England had lost patience with her, as they knew she couldn't have a child at her age. That guaranteed she would be followed by Elizabeth, so they figured they might as well get on with it. Drawing out the inevitable would only make things worse, since the Protestant faction wasn't going to go away or be defeated. The Catholic faction would have to actually kill thousands of top Protestants, including Elizabeth, the Stanleys, and many others, and they weren't prepared to do that—or couldn't. So most of them likely thought their best option was to parlay with the Stanleys, giving Mary up to them for a guarantee of her life and safe transport to Germany. That is my best guess what happened, though of course it is impossible to say how far the Stanleys kept their promises. I wouldn't even put forward such a theory here, where there is so little to go on, but that we have seen strong evidence in cases that are just as high-profile as this one that this is the way it is done. For whatever reasons, these people are not as bloody as they would have you believe, and they *do* strongly prefer fake deaths over real ones—especially where their own royals are involved. Mary may have been a Catholic, but she was still a Tudor. . . meaning, she was a Stanley. These people don't poison their own, if they can possibly avoid it. They *say* they do, but all my research has shown that they don't.

This means to me that the Marian executions, all 283, were probably faked or completely manufactured, existing only on paper. We are told Mary had many prominent Protestant theologians burned at the stake, but this was not the form of execution practiced in England, as we have seen. That was hangings or beheadings. Mary's history looks to have been later rewritten by her enemies, to prevent any sympathy for her and to prevent anyone from being interested in questioning her bio. What better way to move people on than to call her Bloody Mary and teach that she loved to torture the innocent clergy?

That would mean Cranmer's death was also faked, which, honestly, I always suspected. There is no way the Stanleys would allow Cranmer to be burned at the stake. We have many signs of this in the mainstream history, starting with Cranmer leading Edward's funeral on **August 8, 1553**. Aces and eights Chai. To me that is just the admission that everything after that was fake. The Star Chamber that allegedly sent Cranmer to the Tower was led by. . . Lord Stanley. For some reason not given, Cranmer was transferred to Oxford for a second trial, though he had already been sentenced to death. Obviously this was done to get him out of London and out of the public eye. It would be far easier to fake a death in a smaller town. We are supposed to believe that he was tried for heresy in Oxford, under Papal jurisdiction. An outrageous claim, since the Pope had no jurisdiction over a Church of England Archbishop. Cranmer wasn't Catholic, remember? Nonetheless, we are told:

On 4 December, Rome decided Cranmer's fate by depriving him of the archbishopric and giving permission to the secular authorities to carry out their sentence.

The Pope cannot deprive a Church of England archbishop of anything, since that archbishop is not Catholic. Nor can the Pope give permission to secular authorities to do anything, since secular authorities could not ask for his permission, or desire it. That is what secular *means*. So this is history for the thinking-impaired.

Rome didn't decide Cranmer's fate, since they had no authority here. This is just the absurd attempt to make you think Rome was to blame. Next, we get an even more ridiculous story of cat and mouse, where we are supposed to think Mary toyed with Cranmer before murdering him. He was taken out of jail in Oxford and housed with the Dean of Christchurch. And we are supposed to believe that? Although Cranmer allegedly submitted himself to the authority of Mary and the Pope, we are told the bishop of London Edmund Bonner wasn't satisfied. So they set a date for execution. Cranmer then repudiated all Protestantism, participated in Mass, and received absolution. That should have been the end of it, since recanting heretics are reprieved. And by the definition of absolution, he should have been absolved. But we are supposed to believe that Mary broke all her own laws, and those of the Pope, in order to kill Cranmer anyway, out of spite.

So, you can be sure it never happened. I can even tell you where Cranmer ended up. After his alleged death, he went to Germany, where he took the name Edward Whitchurch. Yes, he pretended to be his old publisher, who had fled to Germany when Mary came to the throne. As Whitchurch, Cranmer then remarried his own wife and returned to England, living in opulence in Surrey. In 1555, Cranmer's daughter Margery married Thomas Norton, secretary of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset. Not a bad marriage for someone whose father had just allegedly been burned at the stake as a heretic and traitor. Cranmer finally died for real in 1562, at age 73.

Of course this means Latimer and Ridley were not burnt at the stake in Oxford, either. No one was. My guess is these stories of burnings didn't even find currency until 1563, when the fraud John **Foxe** published his *Actes and Monuments*. We just saw him in my previous paper, as the tutor of the children of Henry **Howard**, Earl of Surrey. There, we found Foxe described as a martyrologist, which means he was an expert in the creation of martyrs. Which means he knew just how to manufacture them from whole cloth, via fake burnings at the stake. Under Edward VI, Foxe lived in the mansion of the Duchess of Richmond (Mary Howard, wife of Fitzroy, illegitimate son of Henry VIII), meaning Foxe was an agent of the Stanleys and their allies—including William Cecil, Baron Burghley, who would be Elizabeth's Lord High Treasurer. His son would be Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury. Another of Foxe's overseers and handlers was John **Bale**, who had denounced the monastic system at the behest of the Tudors/Stanleys. He had fled at the rising of Mary, but was protected all along by the Stanleys. I would assume Bale is an ancestor of actor Christian Bale.

While we are looking at the Howards for the 100th time this month, you may find this amusing: in the 1989 film *The Return of the Musketeers*, starring the same people (Michael **York**, Richard Chamberlain, etc.), do you want to guess who plays the part of Oliver Cromwell? Alan **Howard**. You can be sure that is not a coincidence.

We can be sure that John Foxe (b. 1517) was related to the later George Fox (b. 1624), who founded the Quakers. They both have the same stench on them. There are no Foxe in the peerage, telling me they added the “e” at the end to throw us off. But there are over 1,000 Fox. George's father

Christopher was a wealthy weaver, meaning a Jew. In the time of George Fox, the peerage Foxes were related to the Blayneys, Barons of Monaghan; Moores, Viscounts of Drogheda; and Loftuses, Viscounts of Ely. They were also related to the Comptons, Earls of Northampton, which links us in the time of John Foxe to the Sackvilles, Noels, Cliffords, Spencers and Beaumonts. See above, where the Beaumonts link us to the Lancasters and Stanleys. Also see William Fox of the peerage—a contemporary of John Foxe—whose son Sir Stephen Fox managed Charles II's household. He later became Lord Commissioner of the Treasury. Sir Stephen's son became a Fox-Strangways and Earl of Ilchester. His other son became Baron Holland and married a Lennox, daughter of the Duke of Richmond. See just above, where John Foxe lived in the house of the Duke of Richmond, and further above, where Buckingham's daughter married a Lennox. Different Richmonds and Lennoxes, yes, but all allies of the Stanleys.

But let's return to the main lines here. What a lot of people don't know is that the Stanleys used Cromwell's rise to also destroy Catholicism in Ireland and steal large parts of the Church's wealth there. Any practice of Catholicism was banned and all priests were defrocked. So the fact that the Royalists hid out in Ireland was the worst thing that ever happened to that island—which is saying a lot. In fact, the hiding out of Royalists may have just been a pretext, allowing for a long-planned invasion. The mainstream now admits this about Drogheda, one of the places hit the hardest by Cromwell. Cromwell said its destruction was in revenge for the 1641 murder of Protestant settlers in Ulster. . . except that in 1641 Drogheda hadn't been held by Irish rebels. So they couldn't have murdered any Protestant settlers. In fact, at the time Drogheda was held by strong English garrisons. So the Stanleys must have been in Drogheda for another reason. I think think they were there to clear the area for their man Moore, a Protestant, whose son became the 1st Earl of Drogheda. We just saw him above, related to the peerage Foxes. Moore's wife was Lady Spencer, sister of the 1st Earl of Sunderland.

This Spencer Earl is sold to us as a Cavalier (Royalist) who died in battle at age 22 in 1643, but the problem there is that his son, born two years earlier, somehow dodged punishment for his family's Royalist ways. Another problem is that his wife was a Sidney and a Percy, linking him to the Dudleys, Greys, and Nevilles. All these people, including the Spencers, were “Lancastrians”, or allies of the Stanleys.

Spencer, the 2nd Earl of Sunderland, was raised a Calvinist by his mother, so it is very unlikely his father would have fought for Charles I. If he had, Cromwell would have come down on the family hard. Instead, in 1645 he inherited all his father's titles, neither he nor his mother being inconvenienced in any way.

This confirms that the Spencers were allies of the Stanleys, and that the Moores were as well. This tells us Drogheda and the rest of Ireland was being invaded to claim it for the Protestant aristocratic allies of the Stanleys. And again, the casualties look highly inflated, since in one account Cromwell admits that 9/10's of those captured at Drogheda were sent to Barbados. That would immediately drop the death toll by 90%, but even that story sounds manufactured. Shipping that many men to Barbados would be quite expensive, and wouldn't be profitable since they couldn't be sold as slaves. Barbados was certainly using slaves at that time, but not Irish ones. It wasn't buying white slaves. As with burnings at the stake, selling whites into slavery as a result of these wars is a just myth, told to create fear at the time and high emotion now.

We see this on the Wikipedia pages for Cromwell and the Irish conquest, where we are told the Irish were transported as indentured servants to Bermuda and Barbados. Which just means the authors don't know what an indentured servant is, or assume you don't. An indentured servant *agrees* to be a servant for a period of time in return for transport across the sea. That's what "indentured" means. So if England was transporting Irish to Barbados, it wasn't as indentured servants. And unlike Australia later, Barbados and Bermuda didn't have room for 50,000 Irish transports. Those islands couldn't have taken that number of people, even as slaves. Barbados wasn't settled until 1627, so in 1650 its population was far lower than now. It simply couldn't support thousands of incoming white people.

Now let's look at Cromwell's own death, just as fishy as that of Charles. In 1658, at age 59, Cromwell allegedly got sick from kidney stones. He died very quickly, and they admit the Venetian ambassador was very suspicious of the speed of Cromwell's death. Although Cromwell was replaced by his son as Lord Protector, he had no support and had to resign within a few months. That is also very suspicious, since if Cromwell had support his son or other successor should as well. Under normal circumstances, Cromwell would of course have prepared for his own death, appointing a successor. If his son was unliked and had no support in the army, he would have known that and appointed someone else, to assure continuance of all he had worked for. But we don't see that, indicating this was all planned to bring Charles II back. The Stanleys had decided this was the time, and all Cromwell could do is step aside, letting them continue to write whatever script they wished.

Conveniently, George Monck, soon to be 1st Duke of Albemarle in 1660, was able to march directly into London and immediately begin proceedings to bring Charles II back. And who was this Monck? Well, our first clue is that his name is Jewish, of course. Cromwell loved the Jews, even more than usual, since he is the one who conspicuously invited them back to England. They had always been there, running the country, but now they didn't have to pretend to be Gentiles (except for the nobility). Although Cromwell knew Monck wished to restore Charles, they were "good friends". What? To understand this, you have to back a few years. Monck had been one of Charles I's generals, fighting in Ireland. But he was viewed as suspicious by Royalists, including the Duke of Ormonde, especially after refusing to take a Royalist oath. To make him look like a Royalist, he was allegedly captured by Parliamentarians and put in the Tower after Charles fled. This effectively whitewashed him. But strangely he was out in a short time (1646), and the Parliamentarians then immediately promoted him to major general. Make sense of that. If you can't, I will tell you: *this just proves he was an agent of the Stanleys all along*. Monck switched sides again three years later, becoming a supporter of Charles II. A year later, he fought with Cromwell in Scotland at the Battle of Dunbar. Cromwell then promoted him again, making him Commander-in-Chief of Scotland, and later Governor. By 1654, Monck was back on the Royalist side, scheming to bring back Charles. Cromwell knew this, and the mainstream history admits he sent a letter to Monck in Scotland, saying,

"There be [those] that tell me that there is a certain cunning fellow in Scotland called George Monck, who is said to lye in wait there to introduce Charles Stuart; I pray you, use your diligence to apprehend him, and send him up to me." Monck's personal relations with Cromwell were those of sincere friendship on both sides.

Why didn't Cromwell order his arrest? I think you now know why: they were both agents of the Stanleys, and Cromwell knew that Monck was just playing his part.

To make this look somewhat less like a *fait accompli*, the Stanleys manufactured a little thing called Booth's Uprising in 1659, though it is unclear at this distance in time whether they faked it on the ground or just on paper. Booth, 1st Baron Delamer, was a Lancastrian (agent of the Stanleys), mainly

through his grandmother, who was an Egerton, daughter of the Viscount Brackley—who had been Elizabeth's Attorney General. The Queen sold him Ashridge House, one of the largest country houses in England. He is the one who found against Devereux, Earl of Essex, in that fake rebellion. James I then appointed him Lord Chancellor and Lord High Treasurer. Anyway, in 1659 Booth allegedly moved against York with a small army at the behest of Charles II. He was defeated by Lambert and allegedly escaped the field by dressing as a woman. Right. I guess they caught him shopping for pantyhose at Beatties. He spent about five minutes in the Tower before returning to Parliament, where he received £10,000 and his title. He died August 8, of course. Chai.

Monck has the same family markers as Booth, since his 2great-grandfather was Arthur Plantagenet, 1st Viscount Lisle. Arthur's wife was Elizabeth Grey, and she was also a Talbot and a Ferrers. His father was King Edward IV. You might think this would make Monck a York, but it didn't. He was a Lancaster though Elizabeth Grey, who began turning the family in that generation. It was turned in the same way by the next three marriages, although thepeerage.com scrubs those women. We do know George's mother was a Smith of Holditch in Devon, and these Smiths were related to Arundels of Trecice, Cornwall, who were also Stewarts.

The biggest clue here is that the Parliamentarians hired Monck as their Commander-in-Chief in late November, 1659. What? Even Cromwell knew Monck was a Royalist, so why would Parliament make him their top man? It makes no sense. Again, it is perfect indication this was all planned years in advance. It is also proof that Booth's defeat was faked, since why would Parliament bother fighting against Booth and then hire Monck? Another clue is that Lambert, Parliament's previous top man, switched over to Charles' side at this time, taking Fleetwood with him. So we are supposed to believe the Parliamentarians are now Royalists and the Royalists are now Parliamentarians. The usual stirring of your brain, so that you don't ask questions.

While Monck “decided what to do”, Parliament made it easier for him by dissolving itself in the Spring of 1660. That's convenient. I am sure the Stanleys had nothing to do with that. On April 4, as Charles' agent, Monck announced the Declaration of Breda, and the monarchy was restored.

To celebrate, a few months later Charles had Cromwell's alleged body exhumed from Westminster Abbey. He was both hanged and then beheaded. The head was exhibited on a pole outside Westminster Hall for 24 years! Fortunately, it wasn't Cromwell, just some stiff from the morgue, but still.

This ties into recent news, since Cromwell's statue in Manchester has been vandalized and Lord Adonis is calling for the removal of his statue in front of Parliament. This looks like a spin-off of the manufactured BLM protests in the US, where the Governors are creating every division they can to prevent citizens from concentrating on the massive theft from worldwide treasuries that just accompanied the Coronahoax.

By the way, a head on a stick left out in the weather wouldn't last 24 years. It would be skeletonized within a short time, picked apart by birds. So I am not sure what they expect us to believe. Did they replace the head at night every few months, to keep up the charade? Did they install a waxwork head? Who knows. I am not the only one who has asked that question, though. The mainstream history admits many people didn't think the head was Cromwell's, or the body in the beheading, either. We are told a lot of people didn't fall for it, even at the time.



John Milton was Cromwell's biggest literary supporter in his lifetime, and has remained so. This is *apropos*, since Milton is also hidden in the peerage. Thepeerage.com lists him as a peer, but with no dates on the main page and no links out to other Miltons. Not even his mother and father are listed. He is also scrubbed at Wikipedia. Geni has a bit of information for us. Milton's maternal grandmother was a Melton, which is the same name, meaning his parents were first cousins. Even weirder: she was previously married to Richard Milton "the Ranger". Geni tells us he was the maternal grandfather of Milton, but they also list Paul Jeffreys as the maternal grandfather. So, major hijinx, as usual, 400 years after the fact. It looks like this is to avoid admitting that Milton's mother was a Milton. They want you to think she was a Jeffreys, so that it isn't so obvious his parents were first cousins. This also prevents people like me from following the lines of this Richard Milton, since he was Milton's real grandfather. But that is what I am going to do.

His mother was an Edson, linking us forward not only to Thomas Edison, but to Pete Seeger. The Edsons were originally Addisons, and they link us to Dulanys and Graftons. The Graftons are a big find, since they were later FitzRoys, Dukes of Grafton. Charles II's son was the 1st Duke of Grafton. We aren't told where the name for that dukedom came from on his page, but Richard Grafton was the printer for Henry VIII. He later printed the announcement of Lady Jane Grey as Queen, linking us to the current question. He also printed the famous Matthew Bible of 1537. Tellingly, he was a member of the Worshipful Company of Grocers, and they were number two on the list of City of London livery companies, due to the fact that they were really the Worshipful Company of Spice Merchants. Telling us who they were. The Graftons remained big merchants and industrialists through the centuries, in Manchester and elsewhere. A bit more digging finds that Grafton was an Honour in Northamptonshire, dating back to the 1540s at least. Grafton Manor had been the home of the Woodvilles, who produced the Queens of Henry VII and Edward IV. Henry VIII's mother was therefore a Woodville. So, wherever you see Grafton, you can insert "Woodville". It links us to the Tudors/Stanleys. Which is why it is so interesting to see it in the genealogy of John Milton. This is exactly what they didn't want us to find.

In Milton's Edson line, one step closer to him, we find Juliana Bustard. She is important because her mother was a Fox. Her father was William Fox of Barford. See above for more on these Foxes.

Another problem is that Milton's maternal grandmother is given as both Ellen Melton and Elizabeth

Milton. Richard the Ranger married both of them, but they must be the same woman, since they are both listed as the mother of Milton's mother. Since Richard's sister is *also* named Elizabeth Milton, it looks like what they are hiding is that Milton's grandparents weren't just cousins, **they were brother and sister**. Ouch.

So, I found quite a bit more than I was looking for there. What I was looking for was blood links of Milton to the rest of this mess above, and found it, via the Graftons and Foxes. But there is more. In the Milton line, we only have to go back another two steps beyond Richard the Ranger to find the Milton knights, of Ashton, Kent, and the peerage. They got there by marrying the Baron FitzHugh in about 1450. Before that they were Middletons, related to the Beauchamps, Earls of Essex; and the Cliffords. This also linked them to the Bowes, knights of Streatham Castle, Durham. Remember, the current Queen is a Bowes. It also linked them to the Willoughbys, Beaumonts and Greys. A bit further back and we link to the Percys. If we go back to the time of William the Conqueror, the FitzHughs were Dukes of Brittany, related to Richard I, Duke of Normandy.

So that's where John Milton came from. Strange they don't find any of that worth mentioning in his common bio.

*The Ferrers had come over from Normandy with William the Conqueror, and they were originally Ferrieres. They were linked to the Ferrieras of Spain. Later, the name became Ferris, Farrow, and Faris. Think actress Anna Faris, who is also a Bathurst.

**Arlington's father-in-law was Louis de Nassau, Prince of Orange. These Princes would soon become Kings of England.

†Savoy was also the home of King Victor Emmanuel III, the King of Italy and lurker behind Mussolini in WWII. It is always the same people, as you see.

‡Seeing that Stanley and Burchier were leading these trials and executions, we may assume they arranged for their allies like Dudley and the Greys to escape, replaced by hooded actors and corpses from the morgue. My analysis of Cranmer confirms this.

© In fact, a quick check of his genealogy confirms it. He is from noble houses in many lines, including the Counts of Holland, who then take us back to the Valois and Savoy as well as the Salms (Solomons). The Savoy take us back to the Salian house of Holy Roman Emperors as well as to the Burgundians and Ivreans, who we saw above (see the Duke of York's wife). He also appears to be a cousin of Gustav Flaubert, since he is a Flobert.