

[return to updates](#)

Kabbalah, Hermeticism and the Occult



by Miles Mathis

First published September 15, 2015

As usual, this is just my opinion, based on independent research.

In diving into this paper, it will help if you have already read [my long paper exposing Karl Marx](#) as a probable hidden agent of the 19th century European financiers, since the fakes I will expose in this paper are closely related to that fake. You should also have read [my paper on the Paris Salon and the Armory Show](#) and my paper on [Theosophy and the Beat Poets](#). But here we will go back much farther, looking at events five and six centuries earlier.

What got me looking at these questions of history was Francis Bacon (the real Francis Bacon, not the fake Modern painter) and Freemasonry, which I have studied [in a previous paper](#) but not fully unwound. The problem I came across was that although modern events tied to Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry seem to be run by financiers, *not* the aristocracy, we are told Bacon was (possibly) the bastard child of Queen Elizabeth I. Since the financiers and aristocrats have been long enemies, this reading of history was inconsistent. But regardless of whether Bacon was the son of the Queen or not, he was definitely known to have very close ties to the aristocracy, and it is difficult to believe he was a tool of the financiers. It is not out of the question, but in my mind it required more study.

My first assumption was that the Freemasons had been infiltrated and turned over the centuries, so the initial goal of my research was to confirm or refute that theory. In support of that, we know both the Freemasons and the financiers were opposed to the Vatican, though for different reasons. The early Freemasons were opposed to Rome because the Catholic Church was anti-science. The financiers were opposed to Rome because it was anti-Jewish, and many of the top financiers were Jewish. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume the two groups might form an alliance very early on. Since all these societies were secret, it would be very easy for one of the allies to infiltrate and subvert the other over time. I have mentioned in that previous paper that secrecy is a two-edged sword, since the dark can hide many things. It can hide good information from a bad party, but it can also hide bad information

from a good party. In other words, it is far easier to infiltrate and subvert a secret society than to subvert a society that is completely open. Since the current secret societies don't resemble the secret societies formed by those such as Bacon in the 17th century, we know they have turned for some reason. Did they turn by natural causes, responding to changes in the world, or were they subverted? We will see.

The further back we go, the more tangled the web is, and I had to slog through many hours of contradictory histories, making little or no headway. But I expected no less, since my method in newer fakes required the same sort of sifting of contradictory evidence. I have found that the only way to discover the truth is to lean many lies against one another, watching how they fall into a heap. It is also useful weighing the lies against the known outcomes. By seeing what the lies lead to, you can often discover the point of the lies. Once you understand *why* the various parties are lying, you can sift out the likely truth.



Oliver Cromwell

The first useful red flags came from studying more closely Oliver Cromwell's revolution of 1648, in which he overthrew Charles the First of England. This was just a few decades after Francis Bacon and his Restoration. What you aren't always told in the common histories is that Cromwell was financed by major Jewish bankers in Amsterdam, who wished to open up England to Jewish settlement as well as interest banking. Since this is my first mention of the Jews, I should probably pause to prevent you from rushing ahead with your own prejudices. None of my papers have been anti-Jewish, and this one won't be, either. I simply wish to know the truth, and the chips will fall as they may. However, since the Jewish financiers *are* going to look pretty bad over the next several pages, it is worth backing up a bit and asking why they did what we will see they did. For many centuries the Jews had been bottled up by the Catholic Church. And I don't just mean that the bankers had been bottled up by rules against usury. I mean that rank-and-file Jews had been persecuted, kept out of entire countries, kept in separate ghettos, kept out of the good jobs, forced to convert, and killed in significant numbers. Hitler certainly wasn't the first to do any of that, and by the year 1600, say, the Jews had already suffered many centuries of holocausts major and minor. [**Added later:** I have changed my mind on this. See [my paper on Hitler](#) and other papers for an update. I let this stand so that you can see how my views have developed.] So you have to understand that the Jews had very real grievances. If they hated both Rome and the aristocracy, I think you can understand why. What we are going to see is a long-running war, one in which the Jews prevailed (in many ways) against ferocious odds. They did this with incredible cunning, long-term planning, and—often—superior intelligence (or should we say, superior *Intelligence*).

This doesn't mean I am on their side. In fact, I am not. I am not on anyone's side, especially a group

that has relied so heavily on lies and deception. But the Jews have no monopoly on lying or deception. All sides have deceived one another and themselves at all times, and to the honest historian history now begins to look like a swamp with very few heroes.

I have shown in previous papers that the financiers and their accomplices have destroyed art in the 20th century on purpose, and I can never forgive them for that. They have destroyed many other things it would have been best to have kept. But we will see here that they have also been responsible for creating other useful and beautiful things, so, again, it becomes harder to judge the more you know. Although I am ferociously opposed to the current schemes and regimes, it may be that the rise of the financiers was a necessary step in the cultural evolution of our species. It has been a swamp, assuredly, but perhaps a swamp we had to wade.

So as we proceed, remind yourself that the actions of the Jews, no matter what they were, were only part of a very long war—a war in which neither side can claim either innocence or a higher ground.

But back to Cromwell and Charles I. The Jews had been expelled from England since Edward I banned them in 1290, but with the rise of Cromwell this finally ended. Cromwell lifted the ban on Jews. He was both a Rosicrucian and a Millenarian, and although we haven't yet discovered whether the Rosicrucians had been subverted by the Jews by the 1640s, we know the Millenarian movement was mainly a brainchild of the Jews. The movement was promoted in England by Menasseh Ben Israel, among many others. Menasseh was a Jewish intellectual from the nearby Netherlands, and he had connections to Jews living secretly in London. One of those others who was promoting Millenarianism was Robert Boyle, promoting the Jewish cause through his Invisible College (a precursor to the Royal Society). Boyle's tutor had been Isaac Marcombes, said to be a Huguenot but probably a crypto-Jew.

Samuel Hartlib may also have been a crypto-Jew, since he promoted a College of Jewish Studies in London and since his ancestry is hidden. His name also leads us in that direction, since the name was originally the German Hartlieb, which could be Jewish like the name Gottlieb. Hartlib was also admitted to be an *Intelligencer*, which is basically an early Intelligence agent. In many ways, Hartlib's famous circle was the direct successor of Bacon's societies, so we are already getting somewhere on that question. We will look more closely at Hartlib below. But even without final proof of any of that, we can tell the Millenarian movement came from Jewish agents due to its form alone. One of the main components of Millenarianism had always been the Zionist desideratum of a return of the Jewish homeland, which by itself pretty much decides the question. Non-Jews would have no reason to put that at the top of their list, and so we see that other parts of the Millenarian movement were created by the Jews to entice Gentiles into doing their work for them. As we know, this is still going on.

I don't have to provide a lot of footnotes for these assertions, since the outcomes by themselves are proof enough of the schemes and schemers. We don't need notarized documents when we have the incontestable facts that the ban on Jews in England did end with Cromwell in 1657. More than that, we have the fact that interest banking in England began its rise at the very same time. It can be no coincidence that all this began after King Charles I confiscated the gold in the Royal Mint a few years earlier. He also confiscated stocks at the East India Company. We are usually told by historians that the Civil War was caused by religious strife or other causes, but in my opinion it was these moves by the King in 1640 against the Mint (which was the bank of time—holding much capital of the merchants and goldsmiths) and against major companies that doomed him. Certainly this is what caused the Jewish bankers in Amsterdam to move against him, bankrolling Cromwell and running other less obvious schemes. Since Charles had just stolen their money in broad daylight, we can understand why

they were a little upset.

Which brings us to the *way* they moved against him. They financed armies and generals like Cromwell, yes, but they did much more than that. As now, they moved in more indirect and clandestine ways. We have already seen that with the Millenarian movement, which they promoted and probably invented. This is where we tie back into Bacon and the Rosicrucians, since this Millenarian movement has many parallels to the Rosicrucian movement. Besides being anti-Catholic, both were said to be interested in Hermetic knowledge or the Occult.

And this leads us back to Samuel Hartlib already. As I stated, Hartlib's Circle was in many ways the immediate successor to Bacon's Restauration, although the movement from one to the other has not previously been uncovered. It is known that Hartlib's Circle was composed not only of prominent British locals like John Dury, but also of refugees from Poland and Bohemia. Who would be fleeing from Poland or Bohemia at that time? Jews, of course. Hartlib and these other Jews who were promoting the Millenarian movement and Bacon's Rosicrucianism at the same time were also promoting a third thing: Kabbalah.

This pushes us smoothly to perhaps the biggest fake in this history of hoaxes and fakes. Although the history of the Kabbalah is said to go back thousands of years, it is also said to have been written by Moses de Leon in Spain in around 1290 AD. That's pretty recent for a major religious work, and the date should surprise you. De Leon tells us he is just transcribing an older manuscript of Simeon bar Yochai from the 2nd century AD, but since there is no reason to believe that and a million reasons not to, I suggest you don't. As just one example, De Leon quotes from many fictitious works, including many Sifras that never existed. He also mentions many things that happened *after* the 2nd century, so the possibility he found the manuscript in a cave is preposterous. But it is even worse than that, since we have no evidence De Leon wrote it, either. The book of Kabbalah is the *Zohar*, which wasn't published until 1557. No manuscript by De Leon survives, and every bit of evidence in the mystery before that is based on word of mouth. You will tell me few manuscripts from 1290 have survived, but that isn't true. It is admitted that De Leon wrote many books, and most of the manuscripts *did* survive, including the *Sefer ha-Rimon* and the *Ha-Mishqal*. In fact, the current Wikipedia page on De Leon is a red flag in itself, and I suggest you visit it. In the section where his known works are listed, the *Zohar* does not appear. Each of his known works has a specific date on it, such as 1287 for the *Sefer ha-Rimon*, but we are given no date for the *Zohar*. It is always said to be from the 13th century ([except when it is said to be from the 11th century](#)), but no year is given.

My conclusion after leaning all the lies against one another is that the *Zohar* was written in the early Renaissance by the same people who faked the *Corpus Hermeticum*, and for the same reasons. Both appear to me to have been written by agents of the early bankers, who wished to weaken both Christianity and mainstream Judaism, since both were getting in the way of trade. To pursue this line of reasoning, we have to go back to these bankers and to the finding of the *Corpus Hermeticum* in 1463. Like the writer of the *Zohar*, the writers of the *Corpus* are a mystery, given to us only as the words of untrustworthy sources. The *Corpus*—the “foundational document of the hermetic tradition”—is said to have been written by Hermes Trismegistus of Egypt in the 3rd century AD. No substantiation of that exists, either of the person or of the date. Mainstream sources now admit this Hermes is mythical at best. Wikipedia tells us a 14th century manuscript of the *Corpus* has been preserved, but when we take the footnote for that, we find this:

Anon, *Hermetica – a new translation*, Pembridge Design Studio Press, 1982.

That's a curious reference for such an important claim, isn't it? Why would such a work need an anonymous author or translator in 1982?

We find that historically nothing is known for sure until a manuscript is found by monks in Byzantium (or Macedonia) and delivered [to agents of Lorenzo de' Medici](#). Could you ask for a bigger red flag? Byzantium is a big place. *Where* in Byzantium? What monks? And why would the monks give the manuscripts to Lorenzo de' Medici? Lorenzo was only 14 at the time, so they must mean either Cosimo or Piero. But again, why a de' Medici? Why would a monk be dealing with a de' Medici instead of, say, the Pope, a cardinal, or a monastery. Any monastery worth its name is a collector of manuscripts, and would not tend to be giving or selling important manuscripts to bankers. None of this makes any sense, until you realize that the *Corpus Hermeticum* was exactly what the de' Medicis needed at the time. Why? Because the de' Medicis were probably crypto-Jews themselves.

One, they were a prominent banking family. Two, they had very semitic features:



That's Cosimo, painted by Bronzino. He doesn't look Italian to me. And I say that as a portrait painter myself. In fact, Bronzino may have been Jewish as well, his nickname indicating his semitic coloration and therefore his heritage. It is curious that both his real name and his ancestry have been lost or more likely suppressed.

Three, as is admitted today at the [online Jewish Virtual Library](#), the de' Medicis and the Jews were expelled from Florence at the same time. Curious, no? In the first paragraph on that linked page, the Jewish Library says this:

The fate of Tuscan Jewry in the early modern period was inextricably linked to the favor and the fortune of the House of Medici. Though a Jewish presence was registered in Lucca as early as the ninth century and a network of Jewish banks had spread throughout the region by the mid-fifteenth, the organized Jewish communities of [Florence](#), [Siena](#), [Pisa](#), and [Livorno](#) were political creations of the Medici rulers. And like the Medici Grand Dukedom itself, these communities took


shape in the course of the sixteenth century.

That pretty much says it all, but we are also given this:

When the Medici returned to power in 1512, the Jewish ban fell into abeyance, until the next expulsion of the Medici in 1527.

Why would the fate of the Jews and de' Medicis be so closely linked, if the de' Medicis were not Jewish themselves?

[**Added May 28, 2022:** Have you ever asked why there is an apostrophe after the “de” in de Medicis? They want you to think de' Medicis means something like “of the doctors”, but that would be *dei medici*. The apostrophe normally indicates something left out, so I now think the name has been garbled on purpose to throw us off. If you run through the alphabet, about the only letter that could be left out is “l” or “r”. Try it. I would say “r” is much more likely, since it leaves us with Dermed(icis), which starts to look like a normal name. If we Anglicize it slightly, we get Dermot, or variously Dermot. As in MacDermot, the famous Irish nobles, see the Kings of Moylurg. They were the Kings of Connacht back to 950AD, the name originally being Diarmad. Diarmad=Dermed. And where did they come from before that? Accord to legend, they came from Spain, see Mil Espaine, Phoenician/Spanish founder of Ireland, and ancestor of all kings of Ireland afterwards. Also see Milo, Archbishop of Trier and Riems in the 700s, a Merovingian and therefore also a Phoenician, with a line going back through Rome, **Italy**. There have always been strong links between Spain and Italy, so you can see the possible link between Dermot and de(r)Medicis. Trier is also not an accidental link here, since [we have seen](#) Trier is also a spooky place, being a Phoenician stronghold from the beginning. Do we have anything else? We do, since we find that Milo of Trier was allegedly killed by a **wild boar** in a hunting accident. As it turns out, the wild boar is the insignia of the MacDermots.



It is also the insignia of the Medicis:



Those are famous Medici sculptures in Florence. So although they want you to believe the Medicis came out of nowhere to take the top spot in banking in Italy in the late 1300s, they had actually been running all of Europe under other names for millennia. But for some reason they decided to change their name at that time, in order to hide. But they had cousins all over Europe even then.]

Once we understand who the de' Medicis were, we understand why the *Corpus Hermeticum* came to them in 1463. It came to them because they paid for its creation. All this Hermetic and Occult stuff, including the *Zohar*, was created in the 14th and 15th century as part of the Jewish bankers' war with Rome. Notice I say Jewish bankers and not Jews. That is because we know the rank-and-file Jews of the time—although always under pressure from Rome—were not in favor of the Kabbalah, the Occult, or any of the other “Hermetic” ideas being promoted. This also applies to the real Jewish religious leaders, who banned the Kabbalah and its teaching as heretical. But since the bankers were not practicing Jews, they couldn't care less about the Bible or the Talmud. They thought they were doing their fellow Jews a favor, but couldn't really divulge what they were up to. They couldn't very well go to synagogue and admit the whole Kabbalah thing was a hoax. We may assume most rabbis at the time weren't in favor of such religious hoaxes, even as part of a holy war. Some rabbis have since changed their minds about this, but in the early days we must assume these hoaxes were a hard sell for those such as the de' Medicis, and they preferred to simply promote the Kabbalah as real, both to Christians and to their fellow Jews. I assume they figured most religious Jews wouldn't bite on it, so no harm done. In many ways that was a just assumption, and to this day many or most orthodox and practicing Jews aren't interested in the Kabbalah.

So why would the Jewish bankers in Italy in the early Renaissance be trying to sell the Occult as part of a holy war? Same reason they do it now. Why are the financiers *still* trying to sell you the Occult on a daily basis, in a thousand corrupt forms? One, because they *still* haven't finished off Christianity. As we saw in [my paper on Theosophy](#), they were still trying to kill Christianity in 1875 with various gambits, including importing a bastardized Buddhism or Hinduism. And they are still doing it today, with Buddhism, Wicca, Satanism, Kabbalah, Isis, and a million other forms of mysticism and misdirection. I say this not as a Christian or Jew, but only as an honest student of history. I can see that is what they are doing, so that is what I report. Personally, I report this not to save Christianity, but to save myself from all the fake projects. I don't like fake projects or being lied to. I like to know the truth.

But killing Christianity isn't the only goal. As of now, it probably isn't even the premier goal. The premier goal for centuries has been the promotion of trade, and *all* the old religions have stood in the

way of that, including Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. All three have been attacked and continue to be attacked on a daily basis. As it turns out, they are all being attacked by the financiers. If you look closely, you find that the religions are not mainly fighting one another, and never have been. The holy wars are not Christian versus Jew, or Jew versus Muslim, or Muslim versus Christian. It is the merchants against all three. The merchants wish to destroy the trio, and to do that they often use cunning to pit one against the other, and one sect against another sect within each religion.

So why aren't they attacking the Hindus or Buddhists? Well, in India, they are. But here they don't need to, since here the religions are just fads. The merchants knew the Eastern religions couldn't take deep root here in so short a time period, and they haven't. Here those religions only act as temporary pacifiers, keeping their adherents confused and passive.

But back to the Renaissance. They try to tell you that Kabbalah influenced the neo-Platonists or even Plato himself, but that is just another reversal. To invent Kabbalah and Hermeticism, the bankers hired many top writers of the time. [Remember, they are still doing it, and we have seen in previous papers that the current financiers have hired most of the top writers of the 20th century, paying them to move the various projects along. They have also taken over all the top literary magazines, the political journals, the museums, and *all* other cultural institutions.] In the Renaissance, the writers hired by the bankers to manufacture the Occult naturally went to non-Christian and pre-Christian texts to crib from. As later happened with Theosophy, they stirred together a crazy pot of the wildest and sexiest ideas they could find and sold it as a variant religion. These writers were instructed to seek out ideas in the past that would cause Rome the most trouble.

One of these writers was Marsilio Ficino. Ficino is the one who supposedly translated the *Corpus Hermeticum*. It is curious that he came into possession of that manuscript, since even before it came to him his mission was to revive the ancient teachings of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, Platonists, etc. We are told in the common history that he was already working on a translation of Plato when the *Corpus* was found. Although this Plato translation was an important project, de' Medici ordered him to pause and concentrate on the *Corpus*. Curiously, no one ever stops to analyze that statement. *Of course* the Kabbalah and other Hermetic works resemble Platonism and neo-Platonism: the same guys were working on both. Plato wasn't influenced by Kabbalists, since we have absolutely no evidence of any Kabbalists working in 400BC, in Athens or anywhere else. As we see, Plato influenced early Italian Renaissance writers, who then manufactured the *Zohar* and other Hermetic texts. That is the obvious source of any parallels, not any link between Plato and ancient itinerant Kabbalists.

We have more evidence of that, since Ficino is known to have *invented* other Occult artifacts, including the Tarot. That's right. The Tarot deck is said to have been invented by Ficino in the 15th century. Ficino was also an astrologer, and he was accused of magic by the Pope in 1489, narrowly avoiding a condemnation of heresy.



Another writer was Pico de Mirandola, a student of Ficino. Pico claimed that Pythagoras had gleaned Kabbalistic ideas from Jews in Egypt, but of course there is not a shred of evidence to support that. He used the parallels between Hermeticism and Kabbalah as evidence, but I have shown you that is inverted. There are parallels between Kabbalah and Pythagoras for the same reason there are parallels between Kabbalah and Plato: Kabbalah was manufactured almost two millennia later by Italian crypto-Jews using ideas they got from Pythagoras and Plato. Pico studied Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic with Elia del Medigo, a Jewish Averroist, which of course was not normal for an Italian of the time. Why would the son of an Italian Duke bother to learn Hebrew and Aramaic? To understand it, it helps to know what an Averroist was. An Averroist was a follower of Averroes, and Averroes was a Spanish Muslim of the 12th century who was widely considered to be a dangerous heretic. He combined the ideas of Islam and Aristotle, famously promoting the idea of monopsychism—that all humans share a single great soul. This idea influenced many, from Spinoza to Jung. But in Renaissance Italy, Averroes ideas were anathema. Bishop Tempier had listed 219 ideas in Averroes that were considered anti-Catholic. *That* is why Pico de Mirandola was studying with an Averroist, and why Pico was a student of Ficino, supported by the de' Medici. It was all about undermining Rome.

Of course it wasn't just through writers promoting Kabbalah and other Hermetic texts that the de' Medicis succeeded in undermining Rome. The de' Medicis were able to achieve more lasting damage by infiltrating the Vatican itself. In 1513, Lorenzo de' Medici bought his son Giovanni the Papacy. Giovanni became Pope Leo X. If you wish to read one of the most incredible whitewashes in the history of propaganda, go read the Wikipedia page for Leo X. We are told that Leo was “one of the most illustrious princes that ever sat on the papal throne. Humane, beneficent, generous, affable; the patron of every art, and friend of every virtue.” That is quoted from David Hume, which should help you judge Hume. In truth, with the possible exception of the Borgia Pope, this de' Medici Pope was the most corrupt, venal, disgusting pervert ever to sit in a chair. What is more, *that was his assignment*. Lorenzo clearly bought the Papacy for the express purpose of corrupting it. He no doubt instructed his son to act as anti-holy as humanly possible. For the record, it is likely the de' Medicis also bankrolled the Protestant response to Leo X. That is, there is some evidence Martin Luther was the controlled opposition, paid to publicize the atrocities of the Pope throughout Europe. Luther was even accused by his Catholic enemies of being a crypto-Jew himself, out to destroy Rome. In support of that, we find that Luther's mother was née Lindemann. Walter Kaufmann, [in his book *Tragedy and Philosophy* says this](#): “Lindemann is a name that would strike most Germans as Jewish.” But rather than pursue that to


its bitter end, I simply suggest to you it is not beyond imagining that the de' Medicis controlled both the action and the reaction. We know the financiers have done that again and again, and are doing it now on a daily basis, so why not in 1517? What could be better for the de' Medicis and their Jewish allies than to create a wicked Pope and then pay someone to list his vices? Even better if that someone is then excommunicated, since it adds to the scandal and gets it in more papers. If TV had been around then, it would have generated 24-hour coverage.

If that reading is correct, it is doubtful the bankers really thought it through. It is doubtful they intended to create a second nest of Christians, one that would become in many ways more zealous than the first nest. Probably they thought Protestantism would be fleeting, a temporary pawn against the Papacy, as Buddhism is now a pawn against American fundamentalism. They must hope Western Buddhism doesn't spin out in the same way, and given a few more centuries, it may. Humans are naturally zealous creatures, tending to overthink and oversell everything, except the truth.

But let us return to the problem at hand. Before I show you other hoaxes, it might be best to pause for a moment and remind ourselves that the Renaissance was not a total loss, to say the least. Since I have thrown the death of art in the 20th century at the feet of the Rockefellers and other merchant and banking families, and since I am a practicing realist artist, it is worth giving the 15th and 16th century banking families credit where credit is due. Obviously, they didn't destroy art. They were patrons of some of the greatest artists in history. Like the current financiers, they fought the aristocrats, Rome, and all the major religions; but unlike the current financiers, they did it without turning art into a nasty burp. Like the current financiers, they were neck-deep in all the culture wars, manufacturing many of them from whole cloth; but unlike the current financiers, they did not feel the need to jettison all high culture in the process, turning their milieu into a vulgar tissue of pretenses, feints, and mirages. One simply has to compare MOMA to the Uffizi Galleries to see what I mean. Anyone who believes in progress will have a hard time explaining that fall.

Not only was the Renaissance not a loss, it was a great gain to humanity, and I would be the last to try to deny that. However, I think we all know the gains of the Renaissance were not due to the rise of the Occult. It was not the forgery of the Kabbalah that led to the Renaissance. A rediscovery of the Greeks certainly had much to do with it, but the Greeks were neither Kabbalists nor Occultists nor Hermeticists. Since all three were mainly manufactured, how could they be? Since Hermeticism is defined by Wikipeida as “a magical and religious movement stemming from the teachings of Hermes Trismegistus”, and since that person never existed, the whole category is a ghost. We have seen the same applies to the Kabbalah, and the Occult is just a broader category that includes all these smaller ghosts.

There is nothing Occult about classical Greek thought or Hellenism. Just the reverse. The Greeks were interested in light and clarity, not the dark and obscurantism. The Renaissance, like the time of classical Greece, was a time of the flowering of science. Science is the opposite of mysticism and the Occult.



Francis Bacon

Which brings us back to Francis Bacon and the early 17th century, just before the time of Cromwell and Charles I. We are told that Bacon was interested in the Occult, but he wasn't—at least not by that definition. He was interested in the Occult only in that he was interested in old knowledge that had been hidden or forbidden by the rules of the Church. But he wasn't interested in the Occult as a cloaking mysticism or as a worship of the dark or, least of all, as a denial of reason or sense. As we saw in my previous paper, the primary use Bacon had in cloaking was in cloaking his science from the Church. Scientists at the time *had* to hide from the Church, since many of their experiments and outcomes were considered heretical. Like Galileo, they could be hauled before the Inquisition.

But in less 30 years, the two senses of “occult” had been conflated, and it appears that Bacon's new science had been subverted by fake mystics and Intelligencers and paid hoaxers. The tricks Bacon had used to hide from the Inquisition were turned and used by his false followers as feints in the holy wars between Jews and Christians, financiers and aristocrats. By the time of Cromwell, Freemasonry had already been flipped. By then the Jewish financiers had already infiltrated it and used it to subvert Christian institutions. In this way it was just an earlier example of later manufactured and subverted movements like Mormonism, the Jehovah's Witnesses, Theosophy, OTO, Wicca, Scientology, and many *many* others. Not all of these were created or subverted by Jewish interests (I assume), but all were created as some form of misdirection. Some of these movements include many earnest followers who I really have no wish to insult, but that doesn't change the fact the movements were created by agents and operatives. I intend to educate, not insult, and if you aren't in a position to hear what I have to say, I suggest you walk away quietly. You may be where you need to be for the time, and I have no intention of suggesting otherwise. You can progress even while existing in a completely fake world, as I know from my own experience. The world being what it is, no one can do otherwise. If we all required a perfect reality in order to exist day to day, we would all be dead on the morrow.

So it looks to me as if Bacon's secret society was subverted about 30 years later by Jewish interests. But was this just a subversion of science by politics, or was more going on? To answer that, it is worth remembering that Bacon was the protégé of John Dee. Dee was a top counsellor of the Queen, an alleged magician, and many other things besides. He had invented the Enochian language, which he said he learned from conversing with angels. Since that looks like a cover, we should ask what the

Enochian language really was. It turns out there is some evidence it was an early code used by British Intelligence. Yes, British Intelligence has existed as long as England has existed: it was not invented in the 19th century. In fact, John Dee of the late 16th century was the inspiration for Ian Fleming's James Bond in the 20th. Fleming came from British Intelligence himself, and that is now admitted, so he was simply giving the nod to previous agents. John Dee signed his letters to Queen Elizabeth as 007, which meant that they were “for her eyes only”.

Well, if Dee was Intelligence, then his protégé Bacon must have been also. Which means Bacon's secret society was not what we have been told. This adds a third meaning to the word “Occult”. In this sense, Bacon wasn't mainly interested in the Occult as ancient esoteric teachings of the Hermetic or Chaldean sort; when it related to his work in Intelligence, the Occult was simply another word for “clandestine”. These were covert operations, in other words. Bacon's secret society was, perhaps among other things, British Intelligence.

Remember, Bacon had his hand in everything. He was Lord Chancellor, the highest position in England outside of court; and, given what we have uncovered, he must have also been head of British Intelligence. This reading gives us the key for unlocking a thousand mysteries of the time. It even gives us another way to read Shakespeare, although we won't go there in this paper.

So, when Bacon's secret society was subverted 30 years later by Jewish interests, we may be seeing British Intelligence changing hands. I would assume that *some part* of British Intelligence definitely changed hands, but whether the whole department was flipped is hard to say. In the same way, it is possible that some Freemason and Rosy Cross lodges avoided the subversion. It is possible we are still seeing covert battles among various secret sects to this day, and these sects go all the way back to this split 400 years ago. From my previous papers, we have seen that Intelligence is split to this day, although I haven't seen the possibility of splits along these lines until now. Undoubtedly, newer alliances and splits have taken place, but the main lines of the old conflicts may still be traced beneath them.

Regardless of what we find there, you can see that the Intelligence reading of history is just as fruitful in the distant past as it is now. I had asked how far back we could trace these strange events, and as it turns out we can trace them as far back as we wish to go. The battle between aristocratic wealth (mainly from land and taxation) and merchant wealth (from trade and interest) goes way back, and we see here probable signs of that battle in early British Intelligence. As I first assumed, the battle was indeed between those parties, but as usual science and philosophy and the Occult were just false fronts, behind which the real battle was raging. These battles were primarily for control of Intelligence. As now, Intelligence was a fundamental tool of governance and statecraft, and governance and statecraft were tools of wealth accumulation. As usual, this was spy versus spy and rich versus rich.

In case you missed it, I wish to draw your attention to the fact we have just seen Intelligence hiding behind the Occult once again. We have seen it more recently and more obviously in my papers on Charles Manson, the Zodiac, Son of Sam, and the Night Stalker, where the CIA hid behind Satanism, OTO, the Process Church, “ritual sacrifice”, and other instances of the manufactured Occult. We have seen that none of those things were really going on. In every case we studied, we found that Occult was always just a curtain Intelligence could hide behind. Well, we just saw the same thing 400 years earlier. The program is very old. This means any time you are being pushed into the Occult as the explanation for anything, you should understand that the real perpetrator is Intelligence. Every time you see the word *Occult*, substitute the word *Intelligence*.

With that in mind, let's look at some other events in this period. Not long before his death, John Dee was sent to Prague to consult with Rudolph II, Holy Roman Emperor. Prague at that time was said to be the center of the study of the Occult in Europe. It was also a Mecca for European Jews, as well as a hotbed of Kabbalah studies. Alchemy and Witchcraft also proliferated at that time and place. But we can now despise all these things. Let's despise the last first. As we know, Witchcraft also proliferated in the middle of the 20th century, and in [my paper on the Unabomber](#), we found out why. There, we saw Witchcraft promoted by Gerald Gardner, the founder of Wicca. I exposed Gardner as protégé of Aleister Crowley, an earlier promoter of Witchcraft and Satanism. Both were British Intelligence agents, and they promoted Witchcraft and Satanism as cover for Intelligence projects, as well as general disruptors of culture. We don't know if Witchcraft was being used as a general disruptor of culture in the 17th century, but we may assume it was. The creation of fear was just as useful to the governors back then as it is now. But we now definitely can see that Witchcraft was used as a cover for Intelligence back then, and John Dee is our proof. John Dee was the Gerald Gardner or Aleister Crowley of his time, promoting the Occult while being a top agent. He wasn't in Prague to discuss the Occult. He was in Prague to discuss a joint Intelligence project with the Emperor.

We get the same clue from the study of the Kabbalah. We have seen that the Kabbalah was created by writers in Italy in the early Renaissance, at the behest of Jewish bankers. So we may assume the Kabbalah was mainly one more Intelligence project. Not only did it provide cover for agents Jewish and non-Jewish, but it provided a means of covert communication between them. I haven't studied the “scholarly” treatises on the Kabbalah of the time, but my first assumption would be that these treatises often contained code—code that allowed for messages to be passed covertly to those who knew the breaker. This would indicate that most gematria was not “sacred”, but rather profane in the extreme, being no more than Intelligence code.

As usual, even those who claim to be providing you with a novel and revolutionary reading of history always fail to tell you the truth. In researching these topics, I found many authors—some of them anonymous or writing under obvious pseudonyms—who pretended to be publishing forgotten history or non-mainstream opinion. But none of them went anywhere near where I am going. They provided some of the same facts, but never succeeded in collating these facts into the most likely conclusions. We have seen the same sort of failures in more recent history, with alternative theories of recent events selling you the same main lines as the mainstream theory. We saw it in my Manson paper, where Mae Brussell divulged some extraordinary facts and opinions on the events, but somehow never got near the obvious truth. We saw it in my Kennedy paper, where hundreds of alternate theorists somehow managed to miss the main pieces of evidence and the obvious conclusion. Both the action and the reaction have been controlled. Both the mainstream theory and the alternate theory have been controlled.

I have shown you that the witch and warlock trials of the 20th century were all faked (Manson family, Night Stalker, Johnny Hovey, Jeffrey Dahmer, Ted Bundy, etc.). Were the witch trails of the past also faked? It is a question to ask yourself. I won't answer it here, since I don't have time. I may look at it in more depth in a future paper. The first witch trials to look at would be the Salem witch trials, of course, since a lot of documentation exists for those. But I see red flags before I even get there or log into Wikipedia, since I remember that Arthur Miller was hired to sell them in the 20th century. Strange that *The Crucible* came out in 1953. The Witchcraft Act was repealed in England in 1951 and Gerald Gardner started Wicca in 1954, so we already see the first signs of a project. Miller was Jewish and he was married to Marilyn Monroe, who faked her death in 1962. Miller was also involved in the House Un-American Activities Committee scam, being called before it in 1956. Since it involved alleged Communists working in the entertainment industry, since the entertainment industry was controlled by

the CIA, and since Communism itself was an Intelligence project, we may deduce that all the HUAC events were manufactured. This would indicate Miller was an agent, which gets us started on the bigger question.

But I must leave that hanging and return to the 17th century. As I do that, I simply draw your attention to the fact that the Salem witch trials occurred in 1692. That is *also* the 17th century. But we are returning not to Salem, but to Germany. Once there, we should find it curious that the Renaissance Church was not interested in witches until after 1484, when the Inquisition suddenly got involved. Up until then, the Church dismissed witches as ignorant pagans. So is it a coincidence that witch trials suddenly became popular at the same time that the Occult began being promoted by intellectuals, government officials, and Jewish bankers? We should ask why the government would promote the Occult via the Kabbalah, Hermetic writings, and mystery religions, and simultaneously convict witches of magic. Why would the same leaders promote the Occult and burn people at the stake for it?

You will say it is because it wasn't the same leaders doing the promoting and the convicting. The Catholic Church was running the Inquisitions, while the enemies of Rome like the bankers and Kings were promoting the Occult. Yes, that is the correct answer, but it requires refinement. We have already seen that the Occult was cover for other things going on, so although we have the right parties, we don't have the right *casus belli*. We lack the correct cause of the war between Rome and the Jewish bankers. Do you really think Rome didn't know who its enemies were or what they were up to? Do you really think Rome didn't know of the Jewish bankers and the State intellectuals promoting the Occult? Do you think they weren't aware of British Intelligence or John Dee or Francis Bacon? The Vatican had its own spies and secret agencies, of course, and they were very well aware of who their enemies were. They knew good and well that long-haired ladies in small villages or pretty wenches showing too much ankle were no threat to them. Nothing had changed in that regard between 1483 and 1484. Assuming anyone was really being tried and hung or burned, the ones being burned couldn't have been witches. That was another cover story. They had to be either spies for the State, or covert operatives working against Rome. As you should read Intelligence whenever you see Occult, you should read Agent whenever you read Witch.

Once we see the right answer, everything clicks. *Of course* the agencies of the time couldn't just admit they were killing spies, since to do that would be to blow their own cover. Until recently, Intelligence was fearful enough of its existence that it had to remain in the shadows. Only now is Intelligence so secure it can write about itself in the movies and on TV. Back then, cover was the first rule of existence, so the public reports could never tell the truth. For the masses, Intelligence wasn't even a word they knew. They knew about government officials, and some knew what spying was, but the idea that an entire arm of government operated completely in the black would never have occurred to them. It doesn't occur to a lot of people now, and if it does occur to them they dismiss it as either fanciful or beyond their comprehension. They would sooner believe in witches, and do. Even today, most people are more comfortable talking to you about Witchcraft than talking to you about Intelligence. So, for many reasons, it was and is easier to tell people events involve the first rather than the second. They are more likely to believe the lie than the truth anyway. They would rather hear about witches than agents, so it works out for all parties.

I also beg you to notice the parallels in terminology. We just saw it when I said "operated in the black". Intelligence operations today are known as *black ops*. Well, the Occult also operates in the black, doesn't it? It is composed of the *black arts*. The parallel in language is no coincidence. As we have seen above, Intelligence and the Occult are the same thing. The Occult has been hiding Intelligence since the beginning.

As more proof of this, let us look at where the biggest witch trials in Germany were in that period. We are told they were in Trier, Bamberg, Fulda, and Wurzburg. These are all highly suspicious places to find major witch trials. For example, Trier was a major intellectual center, with a large university and an educated populace. The Archbishopric of Trier was one of the largest and most powerful in the Holy Roman Empire, and was an electorate. It hosted the Imperial Diet (Reichstag) in this period, which was like a Senate of the HRE. Finding a large witch trial in Trier in the 17th century would be like finding a large witch trial in Boston in the 19th century. But it would be a very likely place to find agents, and a trial of State spies. In support of that, I remind you that Karl Marx was later from Trier, and that [I have outed him as a spy](#). I have also shown you that New Trier High School outside Chicago is named for Trier and has as its emblem the Black Gate of Trier. Many of its prominent alumni are probable spies or agents.

As we have seen, the rise of the German witch trials coincided with the rise of the Rosicrucian movement across Europe. So at the same time witches were being convicted of magic, the wealthiest and most privileged people in the realm were promoting magic. Does that make any sense? Not until you realize that both Rosicrucianism and Witchcraft were covers for Intelligence. There was no Witchcraft going on—at least not in the places or in the levels of society were are told. There was only spy versus spy.

With that in mind, we can decloak another important document of the time, the *Fama Fraternitatis* of Johann Valentin Andreae. This came out in 1614 and was followed by other *Manifestos* soon thereafter. John Dee's trip to Prague was said to have been the antecedent and proximate cause of these publications, and Francis Bacon may also have been involved. The *Manifestos* promoted “Magia, Cabala, and Alchymia”. This is strange because the *Fama* was later published as part of a Protestant treatise called the *Universal and General Reformation*. This linked the Rosicrucians to the Protestant movement, a thing admitted by lodges of the time. This is not to be wondered at, since Bacon was also making alliances with the Protestants at the same time, allegedly to resist the power of Rome against science. It is also worth noting that Martin Luther used a rose and cross as his personal seal, which takes us back to our previous musings about Luther and his true background. Why would those founding the Protestant movement link themselves to magic, Kabbalah, and alchemy? Not only does it not seem to be a very politic move, it seems outright foolhardy. If you really wished to convert Christians away from Rome and to a “cleaner” form of worship, would you link yourself to the Occult? What sense does it make to accuse the Pope of venery, profligacy, and unholiness, and then ally yourself to magicians, witches, and wizards? As with Luther's rose and cross, it smacks of overconfidence and base hypocrisy. Clearly these people were very sure of their positions, and cared nothing for the opinions of the masses. Everything done at the time was done as a shallow political feint, meant to be read by other agents and not by any religious people whatsoever. Luther's rose and cross seal reminds me of Arnold Schwarzenegger's Nazi belt buckle, which he wore on the cover of TIME magazine.



That is a man clearly not posturing for the average voter, in California or anywhere else. That is an agent posturing for other agents. Luther's rose and cross seal indicates the same thing. Someone who was not completely created and protected would have to be more careful than to give himself away like that.

But let us return to the Rosicrucians. Like the texts of Hermeticism and Kabbalah, the texts of Rosicrucianism are suspect in the extreme. According to agents like Gerald Gardner and his companion Idries Shah, the Order of the Rosy Cross started in the 1300's when Christian Rosenkreutz traveled to Turkey and convened with the Sufis. How much positive evidence for that do we have? None. How much negative evidence do we have? Well, we have the word of Gardner and Shah, which is worth precisely nothing. We can dismiss the story based on the reputation of the storytellers alone. And this applies to all the previous storytellers of the Rosy Cross. The story arose in the 17th century from these murky sources, but the murky sources always spring from the same suspicious characters in the same suspicious localities, which indicates it was manufactured by European Intelligence like everything else, as a tool against Rome.

However, from the Jewish perspective, the wonderful thing about these various texts and gambits is that they cut in both directions. They were initially created to use against Rome, and Jewish agents sold the gambits to Protestant Kings, Queens and Princes in the north with that goal in mind. Not only did Elizabeth I and Rudolph II bite on these schemes, many other monarchs did as well, including Queen Christina of Sweden, who became a disciple of Sabbatai Zevi (who we will look at in a moment). As we have already seen with Charles I, these schemes did the Royals no good, whether they became disciples or not. They were not intended to do the Royals any good. They were intended to create havoc upon anyone who handled them. They cut Rome first and the aristocrats second, which left the field to the merchants. We have already seen evidence of that above and we will see more below.



Sabbatai Zevi has so many red flags on him he is a Rosy Cross from the first word. Although from Smyrna (Ottoman Empire, later Turkey), his father was the wealthy agent of a English trading house. The words “agent” and “English” are your first clues. My reading of those clues is that British Intelligence was active in Smyrna, and Zevi's father was their contact or front. This would indicate Sabbatai Zevi was groomed for his role from an early age, and nothing that later happened was an accident. The other clue is the word “wealthy”. We have seen in my recent papers that these young agents are always the sons of wealthy merchants. [See [my paper on John Reed](#) to see what I mean by that.] At age 22, in the year 1648, Zevi claimed he was the Messiah and began flouting Jewish law. He was at first put under *cherem* and then banished. He went immediately to Constantinople, which is also curious. Those banished by rabbis in a smaller town don't normally proceed to a larger town, where they will be even more conspicuous. Even worse, he was immediately taken in by obvious agents like Abraham Yachini, whose published bio makes absolutely no sense. Yachini is supposed to have forged many documents in support of Zevi's claims, but neither the rabbis of the city nor the Muslim officials ever brought him up for this. Zevi then proceeded to Cairo, where he immediately came under the protection of Raphael Joseph Halabi, a very wealthy Jew who held the high position of Mint Master and Tax-Farmer. In other words, he was an Egyptian Federal Banker. You should be highly suspicious of that relationship, since why would an Egyptian Federal Banker take in and promote a 33 year old Messiah claimant? Can you say, “Intelligence Project”?

We are told Zevi then moved on to Jerusalem, where he continued to attract crowds of listeners. By this time he was famous all over Europe and Asia, but we are supposed to believe the rabbis of Jerusalem just left him alone? Instead, we are supposed to believe Zevi was elected as community envoy, convincing his patron Halabi in Cairo to pay Jerusalem's taxes to the Ottomans. Oi, the things they expect you to believe! We can despise that so easily. The reason Zevi was left alone by Church and State officials is that they knew he was an agent of the bankers, just pretending to be the Messiah in order to mess with all the Millenarian boneheads in Europe who were buying into this scam. Remember, we saw the Jewish bankers and Gentile Intelligence agents in Western Europe promoting Millenarianism for many reasons, the main ones being promotion of the Jewish state, promotion of Jewish settlement, and promotion of interest banking. The Gentiles were promoting it because they wanted the backing of Jewish bankers, who were bankrolling their wars. The Gentiles failed to see the deeper and longer consequences of these schemes and were fooled into supporting them. Those Gentiles in the West who were working for the fall of the aristocracy didn't even have to be fooled, since they wanted pretty much what the Jews wanted: open trade and the fall of both Rome and the Royals.

Zevi then married a very young (admitted) whore, but they were even able to work that into the story. She was said to have been foreseen by prophecy. Given the power of his backers, Zevi could have married a 10-year-old boy or 3-year-old donkey and they would have been able to find scriptural justification for it. Soon after, Zevi met Nathan of Gaza, misnamed since he was actually from

Germany. This is the first clue with Nathan, since what are the odds Zevi is going to take up with a *German Jew* in Gaza?

Nathan's father, Elisha Hayyim ben Jacob, was a distinguished rabbinic intellectual who served as an envoy of Jerusalem collecting donations for impoverished Jews. During his travels, he would distribute kabbalistic works, which he had obtained in Jerusalem.

Yes, of course, a German “envoy” collecting donations. They use this ruse as cover to this day. Nathan of Gaza had been a student of rabbi Jacob Hagiz, who had spent ten years in Italy. You remember the connection there, right? We have seen that the de' Medici banking family was there. You will tell me that Italy is large, and contained more than just the de' Medicis and Jews. Yes, but we are given another clue that no one reads right. Hagiz was in what town in Italy? Livorno. Livorno was *built* by the de' Medicis in the late 16th century, and when Hagiz was there in 1646-56, [the de' Medicis still ran the place](#):

In order to populate his new city **Ferdinando de' Medici** passed a number of laws, known as the **Leggi Livornine**, primarily intended to invite **Sephardi Jews** fleeing persecution in Spain and Portugal to settle in the city.

So it is informative, to say the least, to see Hagiz coming from there. While his student Nathan of Gaza was acting Elijah to Zevi's Messiah, Hagiz is the rabbi who banned Zevi. Remember when Zevi was banned in Turkey, above? Well, Hagiz is the one who banned him. So both the action and the reaction were acted by a small group of related characters. How likely is that? How likely is it that one guy would be Zevi's main sidekick, and the teacher of that same guy would be the one to ban Zevi? I would say they should have hired some actors from outside the group if they wanted this to be believable.

At Wikipedia, we are told a lot about Nathan of Gaza's alleged visions, but we now know Zevi wasn't the Messiah. Zevi later converted to Islam. Would the Messiah have done that? No one now believes Zevi was the Jewish Messiah, so why are they still selling these visions of Nathan? The visions were either faked or wrong, so who wants to hear about them? I assume they were faked.

Finally, we are told Zevi returned to Smyrna in 1666 and announced he was the Messiah again. But wait, didn't he already do that in 1648 and get banned? Wikipedia tells us,

Assisted by his wife, Sabbatai became the leader of the community. He used his power to crush the opposition. He deposed the existing rabbi of Smyrna, [Aaron Lapapa](#), and appointed [Chaim Benveniste](#) in his place.

What? What power? None of this makes any sense or is consistent. What power could his wife give him? What power does a known whore confer upon her husband in the eyes of the Jewish community? But it gets worse. In the same year he left Smyrna to go to Constantinople *again*, and we are told he was forced to flee Smyrna by city officials. What about “his power”? One minute he has it, the next minute it is mysteriously fled. Nathan then prophesied that Zevi would place the Sultan's crown on his own head—another failed prophecy. Instead the Sultan threw Zevi in jail and forced him to convert to Islam. Curiously, after he converted, Zevi was hired by the Sultan to be his doorkeeper, with a generous salary.

I will give you ten seconds to see what that means.

It means the Sultan was in on the ruse.† Since Zevi *wasn't* the Messiah, they couldn't go on claiming he was much longer. Even Jewish Intelligence can't create a Messiah. So it was time to end the project. They had accomplished what they wished to accomplish and it was time to ease their agent Zevi into retirement. This wasn't easy to do, given the ruckus they had caused, and they had to very soon fake the deaths of all these people, including Zevi's fake wife-whore. She supposedly died in 1674, at age 33 (of course). He allegedly died two years later at age 50. Nathan of Gaza allegedly died at age 37.

I say that Intelligence had achieved what it wished to achieve. What was that? By 1666, they had achieved major destabilization of both the Vatican and Europe as a whole. The de' Medicis got three more Popes on the throne after Leo X, four if you include Paul V, whom they also owned. At the same time, Jewish agents had achieved the death of Charles I in England, replacing him with Cromwell and permanently damaging the English line. Once the bankers got in, England would never be the same. England was so destabilized by 1666 London was almost in ruins. Remember, 1665-1666 were the years of the Great Plague, in which over 100,000 people died—25% of the population of London. In the same year, the Great Fire burned through London, destroying 13,000 buildings, including St. Paul's. So in 1666 the Jewish agents could afford to call it quits on the Sabbatai hoax. They had won.

Let me be clear: I am not claiming Jewish agents caused either the plague or the fire. They hardly needed to, since they had already won before that. They had created such great levels of destabilization in England that the plague and fire could be seen as a natural outcome of this depression. London was already spinning out of control in 1664, and if there had been no plague and no fire another catastrophe might have occurred. However, it is worth pointing out that the mainstream British Jewish historian Cecil Roth has admitted that both the fire and plague seemed to spare the Jewish quarters of London.* Roth was never accused of anti-Semitism, that I know of. In fact, he was Jewish himself, and [is promoted by other Jewish scholars](#). So I am also not claiming Jewish agents *didn't* cause the plague or the fire. I consider all questions I haven't yet researched myself to be open. As with the Salem trials, I haven't time to get into it here. But before I move on, I point out that the Jews of London certainly had *cause* to light the city aflame, although they lived there themselves. Remember, the Inquisition was still hot at the time, with news of fresh *autos-da-fe* being reported monthly or weekly, with Jews as common candidates for these fiery deaths. You would think they would go burn Lisbon or Madrid, but the poor Jews didn't have that reach, of course. And although London was supposed to be some refuge for them, many of them didn't find it that different than Spain. They weren't immediately arrested for being Jews, no, but they still faced many lesser indignities, including most of the old list short of burning.

In Germany, (HRE) the same sort of collapse was at hand. The Thirty Years' War had decimated the Empire by 1648, with losses of 1/3 of all inhabitants; and, not surprisingly, the Catholic Habsburgs were the big losers. As with WWI, it all started when Archduke Ferdinand of Austria was elected Crown Prince in 1617. [Remember, we are taught WWI started with the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand of Austria in 1914. Add up those numbers. Both dates equal 15. Curious.] This could be because, as with Cromwell in England at almost the same time, the Jewish bankers were funding the Protestants and the revolutionaries. This is one reason we saw the Ottoman Empire as a big player in the Sabbatai Zevi hoax: the Sultan was also an ally of the Protestants in the Thirty Years' War. While Spain was backing the Habsburgs and Ferdinand, Turkey was backing Frederick, Elector Palatine. We may assume the Medicis and other Jewish bankers were bankrolling Turkey as well, as we see from the to-ing and fro-ing between Livorno and Turkey. Curiously, although all the other players in the saga are always listed in the current histories, the bankers are left out. You have to deduce their existence and actions by careless words dropped here and there by historians being paid to misdirect.

Not only were the Jewish bankers bankrolling Frederick and the Ottomans, by the end of the war they had also funded the Danes, the Swedes, the French, and the Portuguese. Then as now, war suited the bankers just fine, since it was an investment that always paid off.

Another reason the Sabbatai Zevi project was ended in 1666 was due to the end of the Austro-Turkish War about a year earlier, which the Turks are said to have lost but which had ended advantageously to the Sultan nonetheless. In Turkish history, *they* claim to have won that war, which is not altogether surprising in that they left the war with more territories than they had coming in. It is admitted in the West that

The noble Croatian families [Zrinski](#) and [Frankopan](#) viewed the treaty as particularly supplicating to the Ottomans, with them actually having to give the territories that had just been liberated back to the Ottomans as terms of the treaty, some of which belonged to them before occupation.

As this was considered a victory by the Sultan, it was also considered a victory by the Jewish bankers, who were glad to see any losses by the Habsburgs or Croats. The Jews especially hated the Zrinskis and Frankopans, since it is those houses that had forced the Jews out of Croatia 200 years earlier. Up until 1456, Jews had lived prosperously in Croatia, but in that year they were suddenly banned and forced from the country *in toto*, and all their possessions were confiscated by the ruling families. You will say that wasn't so singular, since the Jews were being expelled from many cities and countries at the time, and that is true. I didn't say the Jews' hatred was limited to the Croats. They were bankrolling these wars because they had been expelled from large parts of Europe. So they naturally had a grudge against those places and were scheming against them. It isn't hard to understand.

And the defeat of these Croats was complete, since those two families ended up revolting against the Emperor Leopold and being totally wiped out. The formerly wealthy Zrinski family went extinct by the end of that century! I can just see the Medicis licking their lips watching that spectacle.

I will pause to hit the anti-Semitism question again before I move on. We have seen prominent Jews fighting back in any way they could, but my coverage of that could possibly be seen as biased nonetheless. I have spent a lot of time unclocking the machinations of Jewish bankers and Jewish Intelligence in this paper, while spending very little time unclocking the machinations of Rome or the aristocrats. Most will understand this is because the machinations of Rome and aristocrats are already pretty much known. I don't need to tell you what you already know. This paper takes them as given. But do remind yourself I have unclocked John Dee and Francis Bacon as Intelligence here as well, and they weren't Jews, as far as I know. I simply report what I see as I sift through this stuff, and in this case a lot of what I saw turned out to concern the Jews. But because I admit that is true, I am pausing again here to warn you off misreading me. Again, I am not anti-Jewish. I have said above that I understand why the Jews felt as they did and acted as they did. I would probably have done the same thing, and so would you. We are told the Jews deserved the persecution they received, but I don't believe it. We are told they are nasty and avaricious, and while that is often true, it is also true of Gentiles and Christians. In my experience, rich people tend to be nasty and avaricious no matter where they come from. It is the wealthy and powerful I am critiquing in my papers, not Jews or Gentiles specifically.

[Again, I have since changed my mind on this. See more recent papers.] In my opinion, the Jews were mainly persecuted because they were a minority. There were fewer of them, and they were doing different things: dressing differently, cutting their hair differently, going to different cathedrals, and

eating different foods. In my experience, that is enough to explain the persecution, without getting into “the fact that they killed Jesus”, or usury, or any of the rest. Other minorities have been persecuted in the same way, and they didn't kill Jesus or lend money on interest. Blacks didn't kill Jesus, did they, and yet they were treated like garbage. The Huguenots didn't kill Jesus, did they, and yet they were burned at the same stake. Joan of Arc didn't kill Jesus, did she, and yet she was burned at the stake. Native Americans didn't kill Jesus or lend money, did they, and yet we wiped them out like locusts.

All these religious people, Jew and Christian, seem to forget their own scriptures whenever it is convenient, and they quote “you reap what you sow” one moment and then sow discord the next. I have to think that if early Jews and Christians had treated one another as fellow human beings rather than as sub-humans, they would have reaped an entirely different history of Europe and the Americas than the one we have to read about.

By uncovering all these fake events, my intention is not to sow more discord. It is to clear the air. You may not see what I mean by that, since it may seem to you that truth telling is bound to sow more discord, no matter my intention. But think of it this way. If you want to clean a room, what is the first thing you do? *You turn on the lights.* If the sun is up, you open all the curtains, so that you can see what you are doing. To sweep away the dirt, you have to first know where it is. If you clean a room in the dark, you are just wasting your time.

Truth telling is turning on the lights in a dirty room. It is what allows for the clean-up in the first place.

We cannot know where to go if we do not know where we are and where we have been. And we cannot know where we are or where we have been by groping around in the dark, with shades drawn and doors and windows closed. The posted histories are cloaked histories. They read to me like a tissue of half-truths and lies. Half-truths and lies will always sow more discord than truths fully told. At the least, full truths inform you whom you should be most resisting and least trusting. As you have seen, I am giving you an entirely different list than the one you have been sold since childhood.

Having said that, I am going to jump right back into the belly of the beast. If the de' Medicis were crypto-Jews, is it possible the Rockefellers are as well? Only one way to find out: ask the question and seek the answer. As usual, a straight Google search turns up only misdirection and contradictory claims. Many conspiracy sites say they are, but they all link to back to one article that provides no documentation or other evidence. The only early red flag worth anything is the fact that the Nazis claimed the Rockefellers were Jewish, but we are told the Nazis were mistaken. Yes, the mainstream admits the Nazis said it, since we have to be told they were mistaken. If the Nazis never said it, the mainstream wouldn't say “they were mistaken”, they would say, “the Nazis never said it”. So maybe the Nazis were mistaken, maybe they weren't. As we now know, the Nazis worked with a lot of these American billionaires, especially the ones of German heritage—which the mainstream says the Rockefellers were. Yes, [the mainstream debunkers](#) tell us the Rockefellers came from the German Rockenfelters, of the area of the Palatine. Unfortunately, this debunker I link to provides links to Wikipedia for the ancestors of Rockenfeller, and they go nowhere. So that is also a dead-end from the other direction. However, as I was saying, since the Rockefellers were allegedly billionaires of *German* extraction, it is surprising the Nazis were “wrong about them”. This is something the Nazis were normally right about. The Nazis might be wrong about Jews, but they were normally spot-on when it came to knowing prominent German families in Europe and the US. So that red flag has

grown. It is flapping quite loudly, leading us to continue.

Another red flag is that the debunking article is written under a pseudonym: PowerElite. Another red flag is that this debunker refers to a book by Malcolm H. Stern, which conspiracy theorist Henry Makow has claimed outs the Rockefellers as Jews. The book is *Americans of Jewish Descent*. PowerElite tells us the book has been published in full on the internet, and is completely searchable. He shows that the book provides zero proof the Rockefellers are Jewish, which is true. However, the book is not searchable through Google Books, as I had thought, but through American Jewish Archives. And the searchable edition is the revised 3rd edition of 1991, not the 1st edition of 1960. That gives them 31 years to excise any offending references. PowerElite also tells you the 1st edition is rare and that you will have to pay \$3000 for it. Again, false, since Abebooks has several copies for under \$300. So, again, we are being misdirected from both sides. The debunking article fails to debunk, since if there were nothing to hide here, why is the article so full of misdirection? This pushes us on.

PowerElite also tries to make you think there is only one Jewish marriage in the Rockefeller tree, that being the one he admits to in the Stern book: Godfrey S. Rockefeller's marriage to Helen Gratz. However, there is a much more recent one, and it is curious in many ways. [David Rockefeller's daughter Eileen married Paul Growald](#), who is on the board of a synagogue in Vermont. You will say, "So what, Jews and Christians marry all the time now. It is no big deal and proves nothing". Well, the marriages are more common, but it is *not* common for the woman to convert to Judaism. It is much more common in both Jewish homes and Christian homes for the family to follow the faith of the woman, and for the children to take the faith of the mother. Instead, we find that Eileen has converted to Judaism, attending the shul for ten years, and that the children have been brought up Jewish, being Bar Mitzvahed. Again, not definitive, but a definite clue.

But there is a bigger one they may be hiding: Laura Spelman, wife of John D. Rockefeller. You don't hear much about her, and never have. That is because [Spelman is a common Jewish name](#). If we do a genealogy search on her, we find many other red flags. Her grandfather's name was Samuel and her Grandmother's name was Deborah. Her aunts and uncles were named Aaron, Eber, Sarah, Martha, and Daniel. All common Jewish names. Some were also used by Gentiles, but Eber almost never was. [There was also an Ohel](#)** in the family, a Solomon, many Rhodas and Ruths, a Lemuel, an Isaac, an Elisha, an Elias, an Elijah, an Obed, a Heth, several Ephraims, an Ira, multiple Levis, a Moses, a Salome, and a Jerusha. We are told the Spelmans were Congregationalists, but I don't tend to believe it. It looks like some of these histories may have been scrubbed or changed by the Rockefellers. If this is true, it would mean that even if John, Sr. wasn't Jewish, John, Jr. was. In Judaism, the heritage is matrilineal.



John D. Rockefeller

As a portrait artist, I couldn't help sharing that early photo of Rockefeller, Sr. I suggest you study it closely. There looks to be something very wrong with that young man, something we haven't been told. He looks to me like a mental patient. I am reminded of the pictures of Walt Whitman we looked at in my paper on him, which struck me the same way. It crossed my mind that perhaps they have substituted pictures of mental patients for these famous people, to see if any of us would notice. If I am the first, please send me the prize.

Something else is very curious. The old picture of Nelson Rockefeller on the cover of LIFE magazine from 1942 that I published in my Kennedy paper has been scrubbed off the internet searches. It doesn't come up at all on a Google photo search. If the Rockefellers aren't hiding anything, why are scrubbing pictures off the internet in direct response to my papers?

Then we find that David Rockefeller received the World Brotherhood Award from the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in 1953. Very strange in so many ways, not the least of which is that David Rockefeller has never had the least interest in World Brotherhood. But the red flag is not definitive, since the JTS has given awards to other non-Jews, such as George Meany (George Meany? Really? Prominent Jews and Jewish organizations aren't known for being pro-union, especially the conservative ones like JTS).

Also of interest is that John D. Rockefeller gave a half million dollars for Jewish colonization in Russia in 1928. Very few non-Jewish philanthropists give to Jewish causes. Even more important is the [Rockefeller Museum](#) opposite the northeast corner of Jerusalem's Old City Walls. In 1928 Rockefeller gave 2 million for its construction, and it bears his name to this day. It is an archaeological museum, and is an integral part of the Israel Museum. I would say that is a definitive clue, although some will say it still doesn't decide the issue.

For more clues, we go to Rockefeller University and see that the philanthropy goes both ways. Billionaire Henry Kravis [recently gave the University \\$100 million](#). Kravis is Jewish.

Another clue is the [Rockefeller Foundation's assistance](#) to Italian Jewish refugees coming to the US after WWII. This is a clue because there were many refugees after WWII, but the Rockefeller Foundation assisted only the Jews.

[At this link](#), you can see a picture of Nelson Rockefeller with Eleanor Roosevelt at the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York, a fundraising dinner in 1960. This is interesting because the UJA is not a political fundraiser. In other words, they weren't raising money for Rockefeller to run for governor or something like that. The UJA raises funds for Jewish causes around the world. So, again, we see the Rockefellers doing a lot of philanthropy and charity work with Jewish centers.

In a link that no longer exists, we find this in the search title: Stephen Heintz, president of the **Rockefeller** Brothers Fund, speaks at the **Jewish** Funders Network 2005 Annual Conference in Baltimore. There seem to be an awful lot of links between the Rockefellers and the Jewish community. The easiest explanation of that would be that the Rockefellers are Jewish.

There is also [a link](#) between the Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors and the Jewish Communal Fund. The Jewish Communal Fund [made the news recently](#) (2015) for supporting the NIF, New Israel Fund. The problem is that the NIF is anti-Zionist, has accused Israel of war crimes, and so on. The author of that linked article pretends to find this confusing, and assumes the JCF has simply made a mistake. I assume the JCF is controlling its opposition. It looks like the NIF is another fake anti-Zionist organization, created by Zionists to give them an opposition they know they can defeat. The NIF can then misdirect into created controversies instead of real ones. This is how it is now done.

Another clue is Michael Weinstein, the Jewish Air Force Officer who has claimed he was hazed for being Jewish in the military. He created the Military Religious Freedom Foundation, which exceeded \$700,000 in donations in 2013. This is important here because his two biggest contributors are the Jewish Communal Fund and the Rockefeller Family Fund. If the Rockefellers aren't Jewish, why are they contributing to this?

Then we go to [The Berman Jewish Policy Archive](#), where we find this strange quote:

This booklet is the result of a partnership between Jewish Communal Fund (JCF), Jewish Funders Network (JFN), and Rockefeller Philanthropic Advisors (RPA) to serve as a resource to guide funders through their Jewish philanthropic journey.

Hmmm. I would say the evidence is certainly building. We find these three funds working together all over the country, in hundreds of separate hits. Why, if the Rockefellers are not Jewish?

We find another link with Donald Jonas, billionaire Jewish retail executive from New York. He attended Horace Mann, which may interest some of my readers (see the link to Jack Kerouac, for example). [The Jonas Fund](#) and Jonas Center work with both the Jewish Communal Fund and the Rockefeller Family Advisors.

In this same line, we find some useful information in the [New York Times obituary](#) of Herbert Singer in 1996. He was *founder* of the Jewish Communal Fund. He was also director of the UJA-Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. So it is interesting to find him on the Executive Committee of the Rockefeller

University Council. In this capacity, “Mr. Singer was a major figure in bringing together Beth Israel and the university in a research-sharing arrangement”.

In 2013, [*Haaretz* reported](#) that the Rockefeller Foundation is “shock proofing” 33 cities in Israel. Yes, that number was 33. This \$100 million initiative will protect these cities from “extreme weather, cyber-attacks, market crashes and terrorism”. Hmmm. I don't remember the Rockefeller Foundation shock-proofing any US cities, do you? Have they shock-proofed any Christian cities in Europe? Have they shock-proofed those German towns in the Palatine that the Rockefellers supposedly hail from? Not that we know of.

Moving on, we find both the Jewish Communal Fund and the Rockefeller Foundation as major supporters of the Aspen Institute, along with David Rubinstein, Michael Klein, Goldman Sachs, Mt. Sinai, JPMorganChase, Annenberg Foundation, Samuel Newhouse Foundation, and so on.

I could go on indefinitely. The links between the Rockefellers and Jewish “philanthropy” are endless, with literally tens of thousands of hits. This does it for me. They have scrubbed the genealogy sites, but they couldn't or didn't think they needed to scrub the funding links, personal links, and business links. These all indicate the Rockefellers have extremely strong Jewish connections. If they aren't Jewish, then you tell me why they have these connections. You will tell me they are involved in banking, and many of their fellow bankers are Jews. Of course they are going to have Jewish business connections. OK, but that doesn't explain all the connections to Israel and to Jewish charities. It doesn't begin to explain the shock-proofing of Israeli cities. It doesn't explain the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem, all the way back to 1930.

If my readers have other solid evidence I missed, I would be happy to look at it, but please don't send me any links to the websites claiming the Rothschilds and Rockefellers are blood-drinking Satanists, child molesters and baby killers. Those sites are also out there by the thousands, but in my opinion most of them are run by the Rockefellers and Rothschilds as opposition control. They make their opponents look bad, which makes people stop asking questions. Those sites are also useful when someone like me comes along: they can lump me in with all those teeth-gnashers, dismissing us all in the same breath.

I will be told, “What difference does it make whether the Rockefellers are Jewish or not? If you aren't anti-Jewish, why do you care?” Well, in one sense it is true that it doesn't really matter. They are the same people regardless. Being Jewish makes them neither better nor worse. However, knowing the truth is always useful, since we can then better understand who the Rockefellers are, and why they do what they do. Unwinding all the fakes is much easier when we understand the motives of the players involved, and their true histories. I will then be asked, “OK, but why would the Rockefellers hide their heritage? Many other rich and powerful people are Jewish, and they don't hide that they are.” The answer is easy: the Rockefellers wanted to run for office. Most prominent Jewish families weren't interested in running for office, especially if we are talking about the time period before, say, 1950. Although he never ran for office, John D. Rockefeller considered it. We must assume he wished to keep his options open. His grandson Nelson Rockefeller became four-term governor of New York and Vice-President of the United States. He first entered political life in about 1940. At that time, it would have been very difficult or impossible to run for major office as a Jew, even in New York. Joe Lieberman was the first observant Jew to run on a major party Presidential ticket. That was 2000 with Al Gore. They lost. Rockefeller's 1964 run for President didn't go anywhere for other reasons, but had he admitted he was Jewish, it would have exploded even sooner. We may assume his chances of being nominated for VP in 1974 would have also been destroyed by

admitting he was a Jew. In fact, he wasn't nominated, he was *appointed*, which is an important difference in this context. And when Ford ran in 1976, he had to dump Rockefeller from the ticket in favor of Bob Dole, due to opposition in the Republican party. Why? We are told it was because Rockefeller was too “moderate”. Right. Rockefeller was *sold* as moderate—as an inside joke, I guess—but the Rockefellers were always about as moderate as Francisco Franco. Remember, Rockefeller's closest buddy was Henry Kissinger, who is about as moderate as Idi Amin. Wikipedia says, “Kissinger was later to be described as his closest intellectual associate.” Curious that Kissinger was also a Jew, no? Anyway, Rockefeller was dumped from the Ford ticket because he was unpopular, even in the Republican Party. It was known that his name wouldn't help any ticket.

OK, so that was a rather long diversion from this historical paper, but I think you can see why it was pertinent. The Rockefellers were the Medicis of our times in so many ways, except that the Medicis patronized real artists instead of ones manufactured by Intelligence. While the Medicis patronized Masaccio, Donatello, Brunelleschi, Fra Angelico, Raphael, Leonardo and Michelangelo, the Rockefellers patronized Pollock, Mondrian, Johns, Warhol, and Rothko.



Raphael



Warhol

Do I really need to say more?


**A History of the Jews in England*, Oxford University Press, 1941. Chapter 8.

***Spelman Genealogy: The English Ancestry and American Descendants of Richard Spelman*. Fannie Cooley Williams Barbour. 1910.

†Added 2018: these Ottomans are curious themselves. Did you know that Suleiman is a variant of Solomon? Did you know that Suleiman the Magnificent's mother was not an Arab, a Turk, or a Muslim? She may have

been from Crimea or Georgia. His wife was also not an Arab, a Turk, or a Muslim. She was born a Christian and had red hair. Suleiman's chief financial advisor and Grand Vizier was a guy named Frenk Ibrahim (Frank Abraham), known as “the Westerner”.

According to the famous portraits of Suleiman, he also had rather curious features for an alleged Turkish Muslim:



Notice anything strange there? In both he has light skin and a beard that is also not dark. In the first his mustache appears to be blond, and in the second his beard is red. Is that what you would have expected? Also note his nose in the first portrait. John Lennon's nose almost exactly, isn't it? That portrait is attributed to Titian, but it doesn't look like any Titian I have ever seen. It doesn't look Modern, but it is definitely misattributed, probably on purpose. This was 100 years before Zevi, but it is still pertinent.

The Sultan at the time of Zevi was Mehmed IV, who ruled for almost 40 years. Strangely, there is no mention of Zevi on his Wiki page. Mehmed's father was named Ibrahim, which is of course a variant of Abraham. Mehmed's Vizier, who actually dealt with Zevi, was a Koprulu, and he also was not Turkish or otherwise Middle Eastern. His family was from Albania. The Koprulus so dominated Ottoman politics at that time the period is called the Koprulu era. Curious, as I think you will admit. Like Frank Abraham, he was most likely Jewish. It [is admitted](#) that the Ottomans had purposely settled Sephardi Jews in that Sanjak in Albania years earlier, to stimulate trading. In fact, more research at Wiki tells us the Koprulus were from Berat, which was ruled by the Komnenos in the 1300s. You remember the Komnenos from [my paper on the Crusades](#), right? All this tells us how and why the Sultan and his Vizier were involved in the Zevi hoax.