

[return to updates](#)

The Great HARRY POTTER Hoax



by Miles Mathis

First published May 15, 2016

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

There is always a point in my research when I stop and start writing. It usually comes surprisingly early—well before anyone else would start writing. It happens when I find a clue so formidable, so unanswerable, I know I won't be wasting my time writing. It is that point when I am so certain I am on the right track, there is no chance I will discover I was wrong. So I simply start writing—before having done most of the research I will end up doing—knowing it will turn out. In other words, I don't do the research first, and then write it up. I do maybe thirty minutes of fishing on the web, find that *indice formidable*, and immediately start writing. I then research *as* I write, looking for what I need to continue. I always find it.

In this mystery, that clue was the discovery that Nigel Newton's mother was allegedly named Anne St. Aubyn. No doubt you will say, “What?” Who is Nigel Newton? He is the founder of Bloomsbury Publishing, the publisher of J. K. Rowling. Curiously, although he has several online bios, including one at Wikipedia, his mother is not given. He has no genealogy listings. But his father, Peter, does have a [New York Times obituary](#), and there his first wife is given as Anne St. Aubyn. She is stated to be the mother of Nigel. Now, that is curious for several reasons. One, no Anne St. Aubyn, wife of Peter Newton, comes up in any search. Two—and this is the clincher—I happen to know that Anne St. Aubyn is a famous person from history. She is also known as Anne Arundell, granddaughter of William Arundell of Menadarvy. This Arundell family was closely related to the King (Henry VIII, for example), and Anne St. Aubyn was of the Trerice clan of Arundells, seated in Newlyn. So the

Arundell family is very famous—which is why we have complete genealogies going back centuries.

Moreover, according to thepeerage.com, there is no Anne St. Aubyn since about 1800. There have been several, but none in the past two centuries. The family is still prominent, with the writer Edward currently making headlines. But he has no living or recently dead relatives named Anne or Ann. Therefore, we may deduce that the writers of Intelligence are playing games with us once again. If Anne St. Aubyn is a manufactured person, it is likely her son Nigel Newton is manufactured as well. He probably exists, but only as a front for MI6 or the CIA.

The links of this family Arundell to the Newtons are buried but discoverable. The Arundell line ended in the middle 1700s, and Trerice was taken over by Baronet Acland. His mother was the daughter of Henry Hoare, of the banking company C. Hoare & Co. It is still around today, being the oldest bank in the UK and the fourth oldest in the world. One of its famous clients in the 18th century was Beau Nash. Note the last name, which we have seen several times recently.

Around 1920, the Hoares and Newtons intermarried, with Thomas Hoare marrying Daphne Newton. Their son was Alfred Newton Hoare. So it looks like the spooks are giving us clues, knowing we can't read them. In this case, they went to Nigel Newton's real genealogy and pulled up a name, assigning it to his mother. But she wasn't his mother, she was something like his g-g-g-g-great aunt.

If you are wondering who the St. Aubyns are, they were created baronets in 1671, being descended from Arundels and Stewards/Stewarts. After marrying the Knollys (previously Riches), they became barons in 1887, at which point they continued to marry up, to the Marquesses Townshend, who were Stuarts (Marquesses of Bute). The second Baron then continued the rise by marrying into the Hamiltons, Dukes of Abercorn in 1892. His second wife was a Child-Villiers, of the Earls of Jersey. At that point the rise ended, since he had no sons. His daughter is now married to the Earl of Morley. A younger brother married a Phillips and continued to be Baron St. Leven. They are still barons and have recently married into the Kennedys.

If you think that is a stretch, we find confirming clues without much effort. Bloomsbury Publishing has a relatively small author list, but we find [a George Hoare on it](#). He allegedly wrote a 2015 book on [Antonio Gramsci](#). Who is Gramsci? He was the leader of the Communist Party in Italy in the 1920s, allegedly jailed by Mussolini in 1926. He allegedly died in custody in 1937 at age 46. In other words, he was another agent. [Communism itself is a creation of Intelligence](#) back to the 1840s. And of course that is just the sort of book you would expect agents to be writing in 2015.

Before we move on, notice that if either Nigel Newton's mother or distant ancestor is a St. Aubyn, that makes him related to former kings of England and several current peers. You aren't ever told that. Also, note that his last name is Newton. Might he be related to Sir Isaac Newton? Someone else can research that. There was also a Thomas Newton acting as prosecutor in [the Salem Witch Trial hoax](#).

There is something else you should know about Bloomsbury Publishing. Its Chairman is Anthony Salz. Salz was the Chairman of the BBC in 2006, having been for several years on the Board of Governors. He is also a trustee of the trust which owns *The Guardian* newspaper, one of the largest in London. But here's the capper: he is Executive Director of N. M. Rothschild and Sons Limited. This bank was founded in 1811 and serves the Queen, among other extremely prominent clients. Curious to find Bloomsbury Publishing connected in this way, isn't it? Rothschild and Salz are of course Jewish.

Also curious is that Bloomsbury Publishing was so new when it began working with Rowling. It

became publicly registered in the UK in 1994, and in 1998 Bloomsbury USA was established. The first *Harry Potter* came out in 1997. Strange to find a new publishing house taking on an unknown writer and immediately making her book the biggest thing ever. The first book is said to have sold over 100 million copies worldwide, and the series has sold almost half a billion units.

Rowling's bio is also full of red flags. We don't even know her real name. According to the mainstream bio, she has no middle name. The K. is made up. It stands for Kathleen, but she simply adopted it for the books. No one else in her family only has two names. Both her parents are military, with her father being an aircraft engineer for Rolls Royce and her mother also being a technician.



That is the only published picture of them together I could find. One problem: it is fake. It is a paste-up. Both figures were pasted onto that background. All the edges are unnatural. Also compare their chins. His chin and the area under his chin on his neck are black. Hers are not. Impossible. His head is also squashed horizontally, making him look thinner than he was. This paste-up was very poorly done.

For another clue, we can study [this 2012](#) article from the *DailyMail*. In it, Rowling is supposedly reconciling with her father. Notice how old she is in the article: 47. Numerology all the time with these people. We are told she refused to loan him money 9 years earlier when his burger van business hit hard times. Right. Who believes this stuff? The article also admits the father is a retired engineer. England is a cradle-to-grave socialist country, with full retirement packages. Old guys who worked for Rolls Royce aren't left on the streets, begging from their children or running burger vans. He looks pretty dapper for the manager of a burger van, doesn't he?



That is the picture published with the 2012 article. But it is from 2000. They had both people there for the interview in 2012, so why use a picture from 2000? All their cameras were broken?

But there are bigger problems than that. Study the photo closely. Does that look like a woman with her father? I would say no. He is supposed to be 55 and she is supposed to be 35. He might possibly be a well-preserved 55, but she looks awful for 35. Without knowing anything about them, I would guess him at 50 and her at 45. They look like a married couple, not like a father and daughter.

As a girl, Rowling lived in Winterbourne, a suburb of Bristol. Bristol is of course a huge defence hub, now housing the Defence Procurement Agency. It is also the home of Bristol Aero Engines, where Rowling's father was said to have worked (now Rolls Royce).

Another red flag comes when Rowling moved to Wales at age 9. The family lived near Chepstow. That is suspicious because the Mabey Group was also there, building “major engineering structures”. [The Mabey Group](#), like Rolls Royce, is closely tied to the British military, and has been back to 1923, when it bought up spare Bailey bridges from the British Army. Later, Mabey was charged and found guilty of bribing government officials to obtain contracts in Iraq, Jamaica, and Ghana. Best guess is Rowling's first ties to British Intelligence were made through Mabey.

The next red flag is Rowling's time at university. Although many mainstream sources now say she graduated from Exeter in 1986, a few years ago the same sources were hedging by only claiming she studied there. I know, because in 2010 I researched Rowling [for a paper I was writing](#) on women with degrees. Based on that research of online mainstream sources, I came to the conclusion Rowling did not graduate from Exeter. For instance, you may check [the Wayback Machine](#) for snapshots of her Wikipedia page at the time. The bio is careful to say she “read” there, but it does not say she graduated. So what gives? It looks to me like Intelligence is so confident and so in-control of all sources, it decided to just go ahead and claim she graduated. For myself, I am going to need to see some verification from Exeter before I believe anything. And given the reach of Intelligence, I may not believe it even then.

Also curious is the number of snapshots of that page the Wayback Machine was taking in 2015. On August 26, it took 52 snapshots in one day. From June 10-13, it took 195. Why?

The next red flag is Amnesty International, where Rowling worked after leaving university. AI is a [known front for Intelligence](#), the major banks, and corporate interests in general.

[**Addendum January 1, 2018**: Which leads us to check Rowling's genealogy. The first thing we find at Geni is that her sister married a **Moore** and her maternal aunt married a **Fox**. Since those names are from the families and the peerage, we have red flags already. Fox is Jewish, from the name Fuchs, and links us to the Quakers. Her grandmother was a **Watts-Smith** and her grandfather was a **Campbell**. For some reason her mother's maiden name is given as Watts-Smith rather than Campbell. The Watts-Smiths are scrubbed. Her 2g-grandmother was a **Warner**. Her great-aunt was a **Robinson**. Her great-grandfather was Rev. Colin **Fisher** Campbell. Note the name Fisher, which is Jewish. Her grandfather Volant was adopted, but his biological father is not given. But his mother's name is given as **Salome Schuch**, which also looks Jewish. The Schuchs were related to **Hahns, Bergtolds, Goetzes, Neths, Fischbachs, Lobsteins, Mischlers** and **Schneiders**. This may link us to Goldie Hawn, who is really a Hahn.

On her father's side, Rowling is a **Holland**, but that line is immediately scrubbed. So is the **Andrews** line. But her 3g-grandmother is given as Sarah **Abraham**, which is a Jewish name. She is of course immediately scrubbed. However, [we do find Rowlands](#) at this point, indicating Rowling was originally **Rowlands**. This is interesting, since we have seen them before. See the Rowlands in the peerage of this time (1800s), who were closely related to the **Morris** Baronets. This Morris was related to the Byngs and Musgraves. The Rowlands of the peerage [were related to the Warrens](#), which links us Rowling's genealogy, as we just saw. We also find an Eleanor Rowland marrying Sir Henry Aaron **Isaacs** in 1848. He is Jewish, also being a **Levy** and a **Judah**. These Isaacs had been in the peerage for centuries, although we aren't told why; and in 1860 they became the Marquesses of Reading. The 1st married a Cohen, becoming Lord Chief Justice in 1913 and later Viceroy to India. The 2nd married a Goetze and was Treasurer of the Middle Temple. We just saw the name Goetz in Rowling's genealogy, pretty much proving the link.

The name Rowland was originally Rowlands, and they came from Wales, and specifically, [Anglesey](#). But get ready for the clincher, since if we click on John Rowlands from the peerage, we are taken to **Sir Henry Morton Stanley**. Why? Because his birthname is given as John Rowlands, remember? [We've seen him before](#), haven't we? Do you remember where? It was in my paper on [Obama's genealogy](#). He is the one who found Livingstone in Africa, saying "Livingstone, I presume?" He is given no parents in the peerage, and is supposed to have been illegitimate—taking his name from Henry Hope Stanley. However, we have seen what bollocks that is, and since the Rowlands came from Anglesey—ancient stronghold of the Stanleys, Kings of Mann—we can be sure Rowlands really was a Stanley from that set. He probably took the name from his mother.

This means that we have linked J. K. Rowling to the Stanleys, Earls of Derby. That pretty much explains everything, doesn't it?

Still don't believe me? Well, Sir Henry Stanley's grandson married Dorothy Abel Smith, granddaughter of Maj. Edward Pelham Smith, b. 1869. Rowling was also a Smith, remember? Lizzie Volant's brother was Henry Edward Smith, b. 1870. And this means that J. K. Rowling is also related to the Queen. Dorothy Smith's great-uncle married Elizabeth Brownlow, whose father was the Baron Lurgan. And his mother-in-law was Elizabeth **Lyon**, who married John **Cavendish Browne**, Baron Kilmaine. The Queen-Mother was a Bowes-Lyon. Which means we can also figure out who the Hollands are in Rowling's genealogy. They are the Hollands, Viscounts Knutsford and Baronets Holland. The 1st Baronet was the Chairman of the Central Mining and Investment Corporation in the

late 1920s. The 2nd was director of Price and Pierce, a global trading house specializing in paper products. Let's see, what was *Harry Potter* printed on? Oh that's right, *paper*.

These Baronets Holland were the second iteration, the 1st iteration being in the 1700s, where we find the 1st Baronet Holland, whose mother was a **Gould**. Although the peerage gives no parents for her, you know what that means. A bit later, we find a Holland, Baron Rotherham, b. 1849. His mother was a **Robinson**. We already saw the Robinsons in Rowling's genealogy, providing yet another link.

And if we look at the Hollands, Viscounts Knutsford, we find the daughter of the 2nd marrying a **Graham**, of the Dukes of Montrose. The 5th Duke married a cousin, Violet **Hermione** Graham, showing us one place Rowling went to get her names for *Potter*. As is usual with these writers from the families, she took the names from her own lines in the peerage.

We can also search on the name Watts from Rowling's genealogy, using the same method. We find Kay Devereux Watts in the peerage, who married Hugh Fox in 1988. So the Watts and Foxes of Rowling's lines are still marrying. Of course the [Watts in the peerage are also related to the Blairs](#), linking Rowling to Tony Blair—Prime Minister when *Potter* was released. These Watts are also related to the **Cave-Brownes**, and we just saw the Brownes above. Both come from the Brownes of Derbyshire who married the **Greys**, Earls of Kent, in the 1600s. The Brownes are related to the Tates, Jones, Turners, and Forbes. We can also link the Watts to the Smiths this way: in 1787, Eleanor Watts married 1st Baronet Wigram, and their 10th child was William **Pitt** Wigram. He married Sophia Smith. Their son Clive Wigram married the daughter of Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain. And their grandson, the 3rd Baron Wigram, married Gabriela Diana **Moore** in 1974. Could she be the sister or aunt of the Moore who married J. K. Rowling's sister? All links are scrubbed at Geni and the peerage, but my guess is yes.

Also curious is that Rowling's daughter Jessica is admitted to have been named after Jessica **Mitford**. That is a huge red flag, since not only was Mitford the daughter of the 2nd Baron Redesdale, the Baron's real name was **Freeman-Mitford**. Freeman is a Jewish name, originally Friedmann. The 1st Baron took the name Freeman from his cousin the 1st Earl Redesdale, from whom he inherited his estates. The Mitfords were related to the **Crowleys, Percevals, Cecils, Ashburnhams, Ogilvys, Drummonds, Percys** and **Molyneux**. Jessica Mitford was a huge spook, and she worked on many projects in her long life. During WWII she hung out with the Durrs in DC, and we have already outed them as spooks many times. After that she became a Communist, so we have her pegged already as an agent. Communism was one of their oldest and most successful projects, but it was always [no more than a grand hoax](#). We can also tell where Rowling got the name "Potter", since Mitford's publications in the 1950s were influenced by [Stephen Potter](#). In the 60s, Mitford got involved with the MLK project, which I have unwound [elsewhere](#). Jessica's sisters ran different projects, Diana and Unity Mitford being devotees of Hitler. But get ready for this. . . [Jessica's great-grandmother was Henrietta Stanley](#), daughter of the 2nd Baron Stanley of Alderley. His mother-in-law was Henrietta **Browne**, who we have already seen. Her grandmother was Dorcas **Moore**. So I think you can see why Rowling named her daughter after Jessica Mitford. They are closely related.

More indication along these lines is Rowling's current husband, given as Neil **Murray**. I could find no information on him, but there are several Neil Murrys in the peerage. Murray is one of the most common names in the peerage. You will say I need more than that, so here it is: they were married in 2001 in Killiechassie House in Scotland, which we are told Rowling had bought recently. So we should ask, why Killiechassie House?



Well, remember that Rowling is a Campbell. Killiechassie was owned by the Douglasses (Marquesses of Queensbury) in the 19th century, and the Douglasses and Campbells are closely related at the top of the Scottish peerage. More importantly, Killiechassie was owned before that by the . . . **Murrays, Dukes of Atholl**. If you think that is a coincidence, I don't know what to tell you. However, you may want to look up the Dukes of Atholl, who were related to the Percys and Drummonds, just like the Mitfords. The 6th Duke was the son of a Percy and the husband of a Home-Drummond. The 4th Duke married a Forbes. The 8th Duke married a Fanning Stewart. The 11th Duke died in 2012, and his mother was an **Eastwood**. He married a **Leach**, daughter of a **Kleinenberg**. The 12th Duke married Elizabeth **Andrew**. We saw that surname in the genealogy of Rowling, scrubbed.

What all this means is that Rowling is another hidden peer, and her fame is due to all her connections—which go straight to the top, including the Queen. All that rubbish in her common bio about being a commoner, being on welfare and depressed, is just the standard sob story, told by these families to gain your sympathy.]

[**Addendum November 3, 2018**: I just discovered something that ties in strongly here. The Isle of Man passed from the Stanleys, Earls of Derby, to the Murrays, Dukes of Atholl, in 1736, when the Earl died without issue. His cousin James Murray (whose grandmother was a Stanley) inherited the Lordship of the Isle. Since this Murray's mother was a Hamilton, this also brings the Dukes of Hamilton into it. Anyway, this indicates that Rowling's husband Neil Murray is probably a cousin, and that her ties to Killiechassie Castle may be as strong as his through her connection to the Dukes of Atholl.

Also interesting is that the Isle of Man is independent to this day, being neither a part of Great Britain nor of the United Kingdom.† That tends to confirm my analysis in many papers, where I suggest the Stanleys have hidden powers to this day.]

All this is highly suspicious, and leads me to believe Rowling was simply hired to front this project. I would say it is very doubtful she wrote any of it, a better guess being it was written by a committee in Vauxhall, Langley, or elsewhere. In support of that, we find the Harry Potter books selling many of the same points of other Intelligence projects, including the destruction of the family. Harry has no family, being adopted by “muggle” relatives who don't like him and whom he finds both ridiculous and contemptible. He is glad to leave them and go off to a boarding school where he never sees them. So the books are selling an updated version of Plato's *The Republic*, where children are taken from their parents by the State, divided into classes, and raised to serve the interests of the Elders. Children today are being taught to look upon their own parents as contemptible muggles and upon themselves as a superior class of magicians, who can potentially get whatever they wish with the proper spell. They

will be happy to be taken from their witless parents and placed in fortified castles, as long as they are issued fake wands and are presided over by people in black robes. If you think that is a recipe for a healthy society or homelife, you need to cut your fluoride dosage.

Harry Potter is often compared to *The Lord of the Rings*, but the comparison could not be less apt. *Potter* is actually an inversion of *LOTR*. In *LOTR*, the heroes are hobbits—short and unattractive common folk living on the land. They are the muggles of their time and place. But *Potter* reverses this, making common folk less than useless. Without a few high-born wizards like Harry to fight for them, the muggles would soon be wiped out. But in *Potter*, it is hard to understand why this wouldn't be good riddance. Tolkien made the hobbits ignorant and provincial, but through the actions and explanations of both Gandalf and Frodo, we understand why they are worth saving from the Dark Lord. In *Potter*, we have none of that, the muggles as described being completely expendable. This is no accident, since it is exactly how the current Elders see it.

This is also useful in understanding muggles:

If, by unfortunate means, non-magical people do happen to observe the working of magic, the [Ministry of Magic](#) sends Obliviators to cast Memory Charms upon them causing them to forget the event. [From the Wiki page on muggles].

Just substitute “agent” for “Obliviator”, “non-agent” for “non-magical person”, “Intel hoax” for “magical event”, CIA for “Ministry of Magic”, and “propaganda blitz” for Memory Charm.

If, by unfortunate means, non-agents do happen to see through obvious hoaxes, the CIA sends agents to confuse and misdirect them, causing them to forget the event.

As you see, the Harry Potter project is stupidly transparent in a thousand places, and only readers that had been sucking on blue pills their whole lives could fail to see through it.

Once again, we have Intelligence writing about itself, and pretty much telling you what is going on straight to your face, even as they do it to you. They know that, as a muggle, you won't figure out you are being fucked with, even *as* you are being fucked with, and as they *tell* you you are being fucked with. The standard muggle response in such a situation is, “What, you mean I am being fucked with? No way, Dude!”

Throughout the entire seven books in the series, “magic” is always just a pointer to Intel. They are the magicians. The agents are wizards in training, and the muggles are civilians. Everything in all the plots has a pretty transparent analogy to something in Intelligence, with Hogwarts being the Intel Academy, and so on.

You will say I could make analogies like that to Intel with any book. OK, so try it with *The Lord of the Rings*. What is the analogy to Intel there? Where is the academy, who are the agents, where are the competing cadres, etc.? Although Tolkien assured us the book was not an allegory, I agree you can find allegorical elements if you try. But unlike *Harry Potter*, *LOTR* is not just a thin palimpsest through which you can see Intel at every point. *LOTR* is a full-fledged work of fiction, not just an amateurish *roman à clef*. I am sure if we could pinpoint the office of writing of *Potter*, we would find the real Weasley, Hermione, Dumbledore, and so on.

As another example, we can look at King's Cross Station, used in *Potter* for the locus of platform 9 and 3/4's. Why King's Cross? Probably because it is the station used by the writers. And guess what, it

takes very little research to find the Guardian Media Group offices right next door. This is the publisher of *The Guardian* and *The Observer*. We already saw *The Guardian* linked to *Harry Potter* above, didn't we? Anthony Salz is involved in both, as a trustee for *The Guardian* and as Chairman of Bloomsbury.

If we keep [studying a map](#), we find NMR Consulting is also right next door. NMR works with ITV, which I connected to British Intelligence [in my paper on John Lennon](#). The head of ITV Eric Maschwitz was also an employee of BSC, the American arm of MI6.

ACEVO is also there, which is a red flag. I assume large parts of the third sector in England are Intel fronts or fronts for the major corporations. As in the US, the whole “voluntary”, not-for-profit, or non-governmental sector is just a smokescreen. NCVO and Euclid are right next door to ACEVO in the King's Cross Complex.

In the same complex as the others is OMD Worldwide:

It offers a range of services including [media planning](#), [account planning](#), [media buying](#), strategy, digital, [SEO](#), [PPC](#), mobile, [social media](#), [direct response](#), research, affiliates, econometrics, data analytics, content, regional media, sponsorship, retail, ethnic marketing, sports marketing and barter.

It operates in 80 countries but is headquartered in New York. Come to your own conclusions.

Nathaniel Lichfield is also there, another red flag. The son of Jewish immigrants from Poland, Lichfield became the Minister of Housing in the late 1940s and 1950s. After that he was heavily involved in all major urban planning in the UK. He later served on the board at Tavistock.

And of course Tavistock itself is also located just south of these other companies. The University of London is about six blocks [2000 ft.] south of King's Cross and Regent's Wharf, and that is where Tavistock Place is. Tavistock Institute was founded in 1947 and funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. It is and was a center for psychiatric research. It is now said to be a charity, but that of course is a smokescreen. Tavistock is at the center of the well-known [Aquarian conspiracy theory of John Coleman](#). While I can't agree with Coleman on most of the details, including his assertion that Theo Adorno wrote the music and lyrics of the Beatles (they were most likely written by professional teams, who only inserted snippets of propaganda supplied to them by bosses), his main thesis is correct: there was and is a project to destroy the family, and popular music has been a part of that project.* I came to that conclusion independently—as you can see from [my paper on Lennon](#)—and have to admit that today was the first time I read Coleman's article, or even heard of it. I knew about Tavistock, and knew something of the theory through Larouche, but hadn't heard of Coleman. I know my readers will find that incredible, but that is the case. I will have to study his article more closely and report back to you.** I remind you that Lyndon Larouche has a similar theory of the Beatles, but both Larouche and Coleman may be controlling the opposition. Another possibility is that they may be mostly telling you the truth, but offering it to you in an unpalatable form, to make sure you refuse it. That is one of the favorite gambits of Intel: create a crazy person to tell you the truth, so that you will dismiss it as crazy. See Ezra Pound, for instance. I have called such a person an Anti, and there are all levels of Anti, from the obviously crazy to the marginally crazy. We will see.**

Bloomsbury Publishing is also nearby, just past University of London, about a mile south of Regent's Wharf.

Even closer to Regent's Wharf than Tavistock is [IBS Intelligence](#).

Established in 1991, **IBS Intelligence** is the definitive source of independent news and analysis relating to global financial technology markets.

Flanking that is Digital Catapult Center, “developing breakthroughs for the UK's data sharing movement”. Next door is Startup Funding Club, specializing in “SEIS funds, Angel Investing, Mentoring and Advisory, Startup Services”.

It is flanked by Financial Services Forum.

The **Financial Services Forum** is a non-partisan financial and economic policy organization comprising the [CEOs](#) of 18 of the largest and most diversified financial services institutions doing business in the [United States](#).^[1]

That includes JPMorganChase, Citigroup, BankofAmerica, GoldmansSachs, BNYMellon, WellsFargo, UBS AG, Fidelity, DeutscheBank, HSBC, GE Capital, Prudential, MorganStanley, MetLife, and Allstate. FSF is located about 800 feet south of Regent's Wharf.

Strange to find all this right by King's Cross Station, right? You would look for that down in The City. I suggest the Financial Services Forum is The City's liaison with Intelligence, and it is located where it is for a reason.

And those are just the companies listed on the Google map. I assume others are unlisted. In this line, it is interesting to discover all these buildings have access to Regent's Canal. They are all right on one of the most prominent wharfs in London not located on the Thames. Few people even know London has a canal, but it does. It goes north from the Thames at the Narrow, passing through Limehouse Basin. It goes through the Islington Canal Tunnel, where it passes beneath the Royal Bank of Scotland and the Islington Police Station. And it appears the canal is being heavily used by the companies at Regent's Wharf, as you [here](#):



Note all the containers parked in the dock and along the canal.

This all leads me to believe *Harry Potter* was written from offices in this area by a government writing team.

[**Addendum June 3, 2017:** In a youtube video called [Lost World of the Seventies](#), (a BBC production), the opening sequence takes us to a vault “150 feet beneath King's Cross in central London”. It houses a treasure trove of old films, but we aren't told what else it houses. 150 feet is something like 15 stories underground, so there is room for far more than just some old stacks of film canisters. Anyway, the location of these hidden vaults tends to confirm my analysis here, doesn't it? This whole area now looks like spook-central in London.]

For more evidence in this line, we found *The Guardian* and *The Observer* leading the cheerleading for the first book in 1998. Of course the *Sunday Times* and the *Mail on Sunday* concurred, as did most of the Intel-owned outlets in the Western World. *Harry Potter* benefitted from an unprecedented and Tiger Woods' level of promotion—not coincidentally at the same time he was enjoying his. Not only had no children's book ever been promoted on these levels, no book ever written had been promoted on these levels. *Potter* was one of the first books to benefit from a mammoth media blitz coordinated by Intelligence to promote its own productions, although others like *The Da Vinci Code*, *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo*, and *The Hunger Games* soon followed. We may assume Oprah's Book Club came from the same place.

When I say *Potter* was one of the first, I do not mean it was the first book promoted by Intelligence, of course. Intel has been successfully promoting its books from the beginning, and it had already hit early peaks with Bulwer-Lytton, H. Rider Haggard, and many others in the 19th century. I mean that it was one of the first to benefit from a newly upgraded, upsized, and fully coordinated media arm of Intelligence. In the decades leading up to the 1990s, Intelligence had finally realized its centuries-long dream of absolute control of all media. Even after gaining control of “The Mighty Wurlitzer” in the 1960s and 70s, it took a couple of decades for Intelligence and its masters to decide what they wished to do with it. They needed some time to compose their “great songs”. But by the 1990s, they had completed not only the apparatus, but a playlist. Over the past 20 years this playlist has been put into heavy rotation, at first slowly but with accelerating speed. Not only was a vastly enlarged repertoire of faked events made possible, but a vastly enlarged library of manufactured artifacts was as well. Intelligence has dumped an impressive load of pseudo-science, pseudo-literature and pseudo-art on the shores of the world in the past score of years, all of it composed by ghost committees in the bowels and dungeons of the various linked agencies. No “art” or “science” now gets done that isn't imagined, moulded, and promoted to advance some nasty and shallow agenda. That is your New World Order in a nutshell.

Interestingly, we do see a continued turf war within Intelligence, despite its monopoly on the world. That is, although outsiders no longer have a say about anything, we do find agents sometimes attacking each other, for whatever reasons. We have seen many examples of that in my previous papers, and we find it again here. The only truth that still gets told is told when one agent attacks another. Antonia Byatt attacked Rowling—or her team—in *The New York Times* in 2003:

she wrote an op-ed article calling Rowling's universe a "secondary secondary world, made up of intelligently patchworked derivative motifs from all sorts of children's literature... written for people whose imaginative lives are confined to TV cartoons, and the exaggerated (more exciting, not threatening) mirror-worlds of soaps, reality TV and celebrity gossip".

To me, that points at Intelligence and a committee in multiple ways. Byatt most obviously drops the clue when she says “intelligently”. She might as well have said Intelligence-ly”. She clearly doesn't think the books are intelligent, so the word choice is otherwise inapt and inexplicable. Beyond that, *Potter* is “patchworked” because it is composed by multiple authors at a large table. It is “derivative” because anything written by such a committee is going to be derivative. Committees do not create real art, have deep or new ideas, or show any independence of thought. . . because they are not *paid* to do so. They are paid to cobble together semi-convincing propaganda. And of course this propaganda is going to be written for and appeal to artistically limited people: it was *meant* to.

In this way, Byatt's critique absolutely fails to land, because the committee she is critiquing wasn't trying to do anything other than what it did. By both her standards and their own, they were completely successful. So while her statements are true, they are actually more misdirection. They lead a reader to mistakenly think *Potter* is a failure, when in fact it is a smashing success. Judged as literature, it is garbage; judged as propaganda, it is brilliant. So why didn't Byatt state it in the terms I have stated it? Because if she had, her critique would have never been published. Her faux-earnest critique fools its audience into thinking the media is still multi-lateral, while doing *Potter* no real harm. While at the same time Byatt is allowed to present her (losing) case to Intel that her own books will still be promotable in the near future. Sorry, Antonia, they won't be. While *Possession* is superior in every conceivable way to *Potter*, such books will have no possible life in the FutureWorld now being put into place. We are only surprised Intel found a use for it as late as 1990.

Finally, the religious debates have created the same sort of false dichotomy Byatt creates, though with different manufactured opponents. The witchcraft in *Potter* has been attacked by Christians as Satanic, but in my opinion that misses the point—probably on purpose. *Potter* is indeed linked to Wicca, but in the way I showed above: not through Satan but through Intelligence. As I have shown [in previous papers](#), Wicca was manufactured by Gerald Gardner in the 1950s, and Gardner was an MI6 protege of Aleister Crowley. Intelligence has been hiding behind the Occult for centuries, as we saw very clearly with the [fake Salem Witch Trials](#).

The Christian critique of *Potter* mostly doesn't fly, because, like Christianity itself, the books create a battle of good and evil, and Harry *isn't* on the side of evil. Voldemort is the Satan substitute in this story, and he is Harry's opposition. It has been argued that *Potter* blurs those good/evil lines, which is true, but Christianity itself is blurry on most of those same issues and always has been. If you want clear answers on any questions of morality, I don't recommend Christianity (or any other major religion).

That won't win me any friends, and will only score me a mailbox full of attacks, but I call it like I see it. I don't see *Potter* promoting Satanism or even Gnosticism, since either one would imply a depth it doesn't have. What *Potter* is promoting is a shallow fascism, one where all real religions and moralities are eventually jettisoned as getting in the way of business and total control. In the world being made for you, the only moralities that will be kept will be the cracker-jack moralities that propel Hollywood movies: those moralities help them sell products and move people around in the short term. Ironically, both Gnosticism and Satanism are too deep and complex for the FutureWorld: both might require study, discipline, and a belief in something beyond immediate gratification. I have to think that even Satan would require something from his followers. But the new masters don't want any of that: there will be no text for you to memorize, not even any real bows to make. They don't need worshippers or devotees, only buyers. They want you to buy their products, including their art, stories, histories, and bios. Beyond that, they just don't care.

In this way, Satanism would actually be preferable to the FutureWorld. I have no interest in the dark side and never have, but I have to think Satan would be able to create a more interesting world than the one upon us. Being a fallen angel, he would be bored stiff by the flabby life most people now lead. I don't see people rushing out to become Satanists. That isn't the trend. The trend is people becoming slugs. The government is not promoting Satanism, nor does it fear a rise in Satanism. According to Crowley, the first tenet of his fake Satanism was “do what thou wilt”. But that requires courage and decision, something most people no longer have. The government is not promoting that: it is promoting the opposite. It is making sure you have neither courage nor decisiveness. That is what all the propaganda is about, including *Harry Potter*. It is not about making you a Satanist who will do what he wishes. It is about making you a slug who will do nothing important. It is about making you too scared to question anything you are told, so that if you have any residual courage or decisiveness, you will waste it getting a tattoo or piercing your belly button instead of resisting the world in meaningful ways.

I live in a very “liberal” town with lots of “progressive” people, but none of them want to hear about anything I have discovered. They simply don't want to know, and say so. They prefer the blue pill. People like that don't become Satanists. They don't “do what they wilt”, because beyond a few immediate appetites, they have no idea what they wilt. Since all they wish to do is pay the bills, watch movies, and order pizza, the government is not getting in the way of their grandest desires. What do they care if the government is preventing science, art, or literature? Those aren't on their lists of things to do, so what's the difference?

Besides, unless what you wish to do is murder people and feast on their blood, Do What Thou Wilt isn't Satanic anyway. If you are evil, Do What Thou Wilt is evil; if not, not. An angel who does as he wishes will do angelic things, by definition. So even that morality is blurred.

What I mean is, consider this possibility: maybe Crowley set up that tenet and labeled it Satanic *just so that it would be shot down*. He *didn't* want you to do as you wish, and neither does Intelligence. They want the opposite. They don't want you to do what you wish, they want you to do what you are told. Therefore they teach you doing what you wish is Satanic and doing what you are told is Godlike. That isn't the opposite of Christianity, is it? No, it is pretty much the same thing. Yes, Christ himself was a rebel, but mainstream Christianity hasn't encouraged rebels throughout history. It has encouraged obeying God's laws—which are of course the governors' laws put into the mouth of God.

You may think I am blurring, but I am clarifying. You will say, “How do we know what is good or who is angelic without those laws of the governors?” And I answer, “If you have to ask, you are already lost.” As with language ability, morality is innate. You don't have to be taught morality: you have to be *untaught* morality. Most people can tell a good law from a bad law, or a good government from a bad one, which means that neither the laws nor the government create morality. Laws simply codify what people already know. If people didn't have an innate sense of good and bad, you couldn't teach it to them. You may think that God put that innate sense there, and maybe he did, but it doesn't really matter how you think it got there. What matters is that you know it is there and can tap it. Your entire ability to resist a bad government comes from that place. If your entire understanding of good and evil came from laws—either civil or religious—you could never resist those laws. You would be exactly as you were educated to be, and could never question your education.

The current governors aren't promoting Satanism, *they are unteaching innate morality*. They are short-circuiting your inborn abilities on purpose, because those abilities get in their way. You may call that

Satanism if you like, and maybe it is. But in my mind, Satan would not unteach morality. According to my understanding of the various scriptures, Satan preened on his ability to promote evil. You cannot promote evil if it doesn't exist. In other words, Satan and the various demons of other religions accepted the division into good and evil, but chose and promoted evil. They didn't unteach morality, they flipped it.

The current propaganda isn't teaching you to choose evil. It is teaching you to forget that there is any difference, or any division. It is teaching you to not care one way or the other. They are not teaching you to embrace evil, they are teaching you to do nothing as *they do as they wilt*.

Aha, you will say. “So *they* are evil!” If what they are doing is evil, yes. But it isn't evil because they did as they willed, or because everything they do is evil. It is evil because it goes against that innate morality, and they know that as much as you do. But they have *untaught* themselves morality—or tried to—in the same way. In most cases, they aren't *embracing* evil anymore than you are. They are telling themselves that evil doesn't exist. In that way, they can do what they do without calling it evil.

And even as they are doing evil things, they are still not Satanists. Again, there is a big difference. A Satanist does evil things on purpose, and believes they are good. A Satanist will have flipped morality, enjoying doing harm, causing pain, and destroying beautiful things. But as little respect as I have for those running the world, I do not think that applies to them. They don't appear to me to have the character it would take to be Satanic. Satanists don't push moral relativism, for one thing. Moral relativism is for the weak of will, not the strong of will. Satanists would embrace the negative consequences of their actions, but those running the world prefer to *ignore* the negative consequences. They are constantly in denial, telling you and themselves those things aren't really happening. They are only a little less squishy than you are, the major difference being that their births have given them the power to do things, *even while* they are being indecisive and pusillanimous.

There may be real Satanists running the world: I have no way of knowing. But I see no evidence of it. A world run by Satanists would be far less squishy at all levels. It might be a horrible place, but at least it would be firm to the touch.

As I see it, the current Elders aren't Satanists. They are just thieves. They want to steal as much easy money as possible, as far as possible without you noticing. They then use Satanism as another scare tactic, in case you notice. They want you to think they are powerfully evil people, so that you don't even think of taking them on. In other words, it is all a bluff. Yes, they currently control a lot of armed people and may rub you out if they feel they have to. I am not saying they won't. But as individuals, they are not powerful wizards. They are just the opposite. This is what Frank Baum was telling us in *The Wizard of Oz*, though few got the message. They are weak and shallow people in a precarious and vulnerable position, and they know that. Their position will always be vulnerable because they are always fighting that innate sense of right and wrong inside everyone, even themselves. You may think you cannot win, but it is they who cannot win. Because they have set themselves against Nature herself, even as they win they lose. As they reach out to take in their hands all they have worked for centuries to achieve, it slips away like mist. What they had thought would taste sweet tastes only bitter.

*Of course it didn't start with the Beatles. It started in the mid 19th century or before, and was pushed hard by the Marxists, [especially Engels](#).

**OK, I studied it. Coleman couches some things in some terms I wouldn't use, but he is basically correct in all his major theses. Unlike him, I think Intel hired some pretty talented songwriters to back these rock bands, and the performers are often quite talented as well. If they hadn't been, none of this would ever have gotten off the ground. He and Larouche dismissing it offhand as garbage doesn't help their arguments. Some sub-genres like punk and rap have few redeeming qualities, and pop music has certainly degenerated since the 1970s. But in the 1960s and 70s, at least, a large number of musically talented people were tapped to sell the project. I don't think there is any denying that.

†Actually, Wikipedia says it is not, *The Guardian* says it is. I think Wikipedia is actually more believable on this point, and may be giving away some information it shouldn't. There is also some confusion on the status of Anglesey as well. Like the City of London and the Isle of Man, Anglesey is likely independent, being a special demesne of the hidden rulers.