

# Alfred Russel Wallace



Singapore 1862

*by Miles Mathis*

*First published February 22, 2024*

This series on Darwin is turning out to be very popular, for obvious reasons, and I have already gotten many emails suggesting sub-topics for me to pursue. However I will continue to follow my own nose, as anyone who knows me would predict.

Given what we have discovered about Darwin, we see that Wallace must have been the same sort of fraud. And indeed his Wikipedia page confirms it, since a close reading explodes it into little pieces, as usual. We will start with his early bio, which is sparse and completely unconvincing on all points. Despite the peerage names **Russel and Wallace**, we are told Alfred's parents were middle class. Although Alfred's father claimed descent from William Wallace (*Braveheart*, you know), the mainstream historians rush you by that with all possible speed, implying it either wasn't true or didn't mean anything. But if we go to the ancestries, we quickly find more clues Wallace *was* peerage, with ties right to the top. Alfred's father was Thomas **Vere** Wallace, with Vere being yet another peerage name pointing in the same direction. Geni immediately scrubs Thomas, giving no parents, which is a big red flag. There is no way his parents are not known. Alfred's mother is also scrubbed, and we aren't told her mother's maiden name. Geni also scrubs all his siblings except John, who we are told married a Webster. Same for Alfred's wife, who was a Mitten, but her parents are scrubbed. No

mother's maiden name. So we can already see something BIG is being hidden here.

Just so you know, Mitten was previously Mytton, though they figure you won't look it up. The Myttons are peerage, related to the Leighs and the Wilbrahams. As the Wilbraham baronets, they soon married the Myddletons, also linking them to the Cholmondeleys and Saviles. Through the Myddleton baronets they link us to the Bridgemans, including this guy who we saw recently:



That's Orlando Bridgeman, 1<sup>st</sup> baronet of Great Lever, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and Keeper of the Great Seal. Lever=Levi. We saw him in my Bronte paper, where we were looking at another Keeper of the Seal, his cousin George Savile, Marquess of Halifax. I used that portrait of Bridgeman there since his face gives the whole thing away, doesn't it? No other argument needed.

Wikitree does the same thorough scrubbing on Wallace as the rest, though we do learn Wallace's paternal grandmother was a Scott. Another big clue in the same direction. His paternal grandfather is given as William Wallace (though we are about to see that is fudged). Findagrave has a page on Wallace but doesn't even list his parents. And that's it, according to Google and Bing. Geneanet has no listing, and neither does Ancestry.com. That leaves thepeerage.com. We quickly discover that the Baron Wallace in those years was *also* named Thomas Wallace, no middle name given. Same as Alfred's father. Wiki admits this father was a lawyer and landowner, though they say he didn't practice the law. At any rate, the Baron Thomas Wallace died in 1844, and he came from a family of . . . lawyers. Wiki tells us Alfred's father died. . . 1843. Hmm. But the clincher is the Baron's wife, Lady Jane Hope, daughter of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Hopetoun. If you are like me, you see the clue already: the Hopes are closely related to the Veres, with a famous peerage family being the Hope-Veres. See Admiral Sir George Hope-Vere of this period, d. 1818, who was Lord of the Admiralty and Order of the Bath. He married his cousin Jemima Hope Johnstone, daughter of the Earl of Hopetoun and Lady Carnegie, daughter of the Earl of Northesk.

Which is why Daryl Lundy at thepeerage.com has to scrub this Baron Thomas Wallace, giving no

parents for him. Very strange, since there is no way a Baron's parents would be unknown, and you always list the parents of a Baron. We will come back to this Baron Wallace, since he has a page at Wiki, but while we are at thepeerage.com, let's see who he is related to through this Hope wife. Her father was married three times, once to the daughter of an Ogilvy, Earl of Findlater; an Oliphant, also Colville, Lords of Rossie Hill; and Lady Leslie, daughter of the Earl of **Leven**. Leven=Levi. I find the Leslie link there is red, meaning I have been there recently on another hunt. Which one? Well, we link to the **Erskines, Monypennys, and Hopes**, so not only did the Baron Wallace marry a cousin, these people link us to? **Darwin, of course.** Darwin the Stuart was not only a kissing cousin of his captain Fitzroy, he was a near cousin of these Erskines and others. These Erskine's take us in direct line to Lt. Gen. Sir James Erskine of Torry, 3<sup>rd</sup> Baronet, who married Lady Louisa **Paget** in 1801. Do you remember who else was a Paget? **Darwin.**

So this is just what I expected coming in: Darwin and Wallace were very close peerage cousins, with Darwin outranking Wallace. Which is actually saying a lot, as we just saw, Wallace being the son of a baron in a line of the Stuarts. But Darwin was a Stuart in a shorter cleaner line. This is why Wallace so kindly stepped aside and let Darwin get most of the glory: Wallace not only realized the whole thing was a project, **he was part of it from the beginning.**



It looks to me like Wallace's father *was* the Baron Wallace, so let's see what Wiki tells us about him. Turns out Alfred's grandfather was James Wallace, Solicitor General and later Attorney General under George III. Alfred's grandmother was Elizabeth Simpson, daughter and **heiress** of the very wealthy Thomas Simpson of Carleton Hall, Cumberland. So Alfred didn't grow up in Wales, as we are told, he grew up in Carleton Hall, Cumberland, and Featherstone Castle [above], Northumberland, both of which were inherited by his father. In addition, we learn from the [History of Parliament](#) that Baron Wallace's wife the Lady Hope had previously been married to Henry Dundas, Viscount **Melville**, pulling those hoaxers in here as well. They have come up in many of my papers. The Dundases and Melvilles link us immediately to the Gordons and Hamiltons, who link us to the Stuarts. We also learn that Alfred Wallace's father the Baron was not only Attorney General, he had been **Lord of the Admiralty** up until 1800. I guess you see how that plays in here, and why Wikipedia and thepeerage hide it. He was also Master of the Mint in the late 1820s, a position Isaac Newton also held. Baron Wallace was also a famous pawn of the East India Company, arguing in Parliament for continuing their monopoly. He was head of the Board of Control, which oversaw the East India Company.

So you now begin to understand the picture of Wallace under title, which I wager you have never seen before. Not what you were expecting, I guess. They usually lead with pictures of Wallace as a cute old man, sort of like they do with Ben Franklin. The year is 1862, so he was no longer a young man, being 39, but as you see he still dressed like a dandy, not like a naturalist grubbing in the jungles. Yes, the photo is a fake, but even so it is very curious, since it tells us that Wallace and his promoters were and still are happy to see him presented that way. It looks to me like it was taken from a real photo, but he was pasted into that background with the chair for some reason. Probably to excise something in the original photo. Maybe he was leaning on a naked native boy or something. You will see what I mean by that before we finish.

But let's return to the Baron Wallace. He was a fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, which also plays in here. This is the "science" connection. Baron Wallace was also Privy Council. We are told his wife the Lady Hope was already 48 when he married her and that they had no children. But that makes no sense and now looks like a cover story. There is no possibility this is all just a coincidence, with Alfred's father middle name being Vere and the Baron Wallace of the exact same years marrying a Hope of the Hope-Veres.

Almost buried at Wiki is yet another clue. Without giving us a picture, they admit the noble crest of the Baron Wallace was an ostrich with a horseshoe in his beak. What? If we look that up, we find this:



This imagery originates from the bestiary tradition, which supposed that the animal had remarkable digestive abilities, enabling it to consume and process iron. What does the ostrich's presence on a coat of arms mean? According to the *Deidis of Armorie*, it signified that the first bearer of these arms ate hard things — in other words, they were as tough as nails — and that they had a defiant nature ('eite hard thingis and [wes] diffailand of natur').

That's obviously misdirection, since it makes no sense. The ostrich isn't famous for eating iron, is it? What is it famous for? Burying its head. **Hiding. Covert operations.** And the key and the horseshoe? Well, notice the top end of the key, which looks like the horseshoe, reminding us it isn't the metal we are interested in, it is the shape. As we have seen in previous papers, that shape isn't a horseshoe, it is a Hebrew letter.



Remember that photo? I published that in [my paper on Bob McIlvaine](#), the crying 911 parent. That's Jennifer Middleton, who allegedly took Bob Jr's diary. But look what she is wearing around her neck! As I reminded you there, that is the Hebrew letter *Teth*, which stands for the Phoenician goddess Tanit, same as Astarte, and she rode a . . . Lion. Like the one in the royal and noble coats of arms. She is announcing to other Phoenicians that she is one of them. Which we should have already known by the name **Middleton**. Wikipedia admits that infants were sacrificed to Tanit, and her other symbols include the triangle/delta and the rose—hence the Rosicrucians, etc. This is the real esoteric connection Dan Brown was covering up with his *Da Vinci Code* nonsense.

So, we got in very deep with Wallace very fast, didn't we? What else can we learn about these Wallaces at [thepeerage.com](#)? Well, there was another Wallace baronet at the time of Darwin, Sir Richard Wallace, born illegitimately in Paris. He took the name Wallace from his mother, Elizabeth **Dunlop-Wallace**, of the Lords of Dunlop, Ayrshire. His father was much higher ranking, being Richard **Seymour-Conway**, Marquess of Hertford, whose grandfather was William **Douglas**, Duke of Queensbury. That links us forward to [the Oscar Wilde project](#), of course. Wallace's other grandmother was Isabella Ingram-Shepherd, mistress of King George IV.



That's her, painted by Joshua Reynolds. Her husband was Seymour-Ingram, grandfather of Seymour-Conway, and his mother was. . . Lady Isabella Fitzroy. She was the great-aunt of the captain of the *Beagle*! So this is all coming together nicely, isn't it?

Her sister Frances married Lord Gordon, son of the Duke of Gordon. That Duke married his first cousin, the daughter of the Earl of Aberdeen, and her mother was a Murray, daughter of the Duke of Atholl. And her mother was a Hamilton of the Dukes of Hamilton. So we are hitting them all now. I told you in my papers on Darwin the dukes were behind the project, and we are seeing more proof of it here. The 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Atholl's mother was Amelia Stanley, daughter of the Earl of Derby, so this originates with them, as with most other things we have studied. The spider at the center of all webs. The Stanleys were just Earls, but that was to fool you. They actually outranked all the Dukes and Kings, being the Lords of the Isles.

There was another Wallace baronetcy far older, created around 1660. These were the Wallaces, Lairds of Craigie, Scotland, so very closely linked to the Scotsman Alfred Russel Wallace. They were tied by recent marriage to the Kennedys, Earls of Cassilis, as well as to the Campbells, Maxwells, Douglasses, Hamiltons, Drummonds, and Stuarts. [And yes, that links us forward to JFK, who was from these Kennedys.] So all the same names we have already seen, proving this is where our Wallace came from. These Wallaces of Craigie come in a short line directly from Mary Stewart, Princess of Scotland, daughter of James II.

So who was the Earl of Derby at the time of Darwin? That would be Edward Smith-Stanley, the 13<sup>th</sup>. His maternal grandfather was the Duke of Hamilton. And where do the Smiths enter? According to thepeerage.com, it is a mystery, since we go back two steps to a Hugh Smith, which is the end of the line. But best guess is these are the Smiths, bankers of Nottingham, linking us forward to the *Titanic* hoax and many others. Edward's half-sister Mary married Thomas Egerton, Earl of Wilton, and his brother was Richard Grosvenor, Marquess of Westminster.

Guess who these Egertons were marrying in those years? None other than the Russells. See Laura Russell, granddaughter of the Marquess of Tavistock, being also a Villiers and a Campbell. She married Seymour Grey Egerton, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Wilton, in 1862, the Earl's mother being a Stanley. Do I

need remind you our man in the title is Alfred Russel Wallace. So we have now traced that name as well.

Let us continue to dig on those pesky Smiths. Stanley's bio at Wiki admits Hugh Smith was extremely wealthy, with Stanley's wife Lucy being his heiress, and that he lived at Weald Hall, Essex. That should help us place him. Weald Hall was bought in the 1600s by Erasmus Smith (below), a billionaire who provisioned the armies of Oliver Cromwell. He and his father stole huge parts of Ireland via the Adventurer's Act of 1640, which was allegedly passed to suppress the Irish Rebellion, but which in truth was the usual false flag, by which a fake rebellion was manufactured from London in order to allow English billionaires another chance to march in and confiscate land and property.



These particular Smiths, related to the Goodmans, were apparently Dutch/Spanish Jews named Heriz who came over in the time of Henry VII and afterwards to help rape the monasteries. Erasmus' uncle was the famous “Puritan” preacher Henry Smith, hugely popular in Elizabethan London:



*The lively Portraiture of the Reverend Faithfull and  
worthy Minister of Jesus Christ, M<sup>r</sup> Henry Smith borne at  
Witchak in Leiceſter ſhire*

Just look at the length of that nose! Wiki admits his bio is the usual fudge, and that there is no evidence he ever had a divinity degree or anything like it. Of course not, since he wasn't even a Christian. Missing the cross around his neck, isn't he?

But back to Erasmus Smith, who also pretended to be a Puritan, despite that ridiculous face. His eyes remind us of Nancy Pelosi, don't they?



*Erasmus Smith Esquire, Son of  
Sir Roger Smith of Edmondthorp in  
the County of Leiceſter. Baronet.*



Separated at birth? That's what Nancy would now look like without the nose job and a better wig.

Smith's nephew was Edward Smith, a Chief Justice in Ireland who promulgated more land confiscations. And on his page at Wiki we get a different story of these Smiths, who came from the Smythe baronets and Elizabeth's Secretary of State Thomas Smith.



He had also been Secretary of State under Edward VI, working with Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset, the Protector. Obviously Smith was another old crypto-Jew, not even bothering to dress to hide it. He thinks he is still living in Venice. He is of the Smiths of Essex, who are said to come from Roger Clarendon, an illegitimate son of the Black Prince, making them Plantagenets. And have seen that name Seymour already, haven't we? See above, where we found the Wallace baronets at the time of Darwin were also these Seymours. So we are closing all sorts of circles here. Well, here's another one: this Thomas Smith had no children, but he did bring up Edward de Vere, the Earl of Oxford, who lived with him from boyhood. That's very strange, and is hard to explain until you see a picture of Edward de Vere.



Ah, got it.

I remind you that Alfred Russel Wallace's father's middle name was Vere. Edward de Vere first married a 14-year-old girl for her money but never slept with her but possibly once. She died at age 31. Their daughter married William Stanley, 6<sup>th</sup> Earl of Derby, so we have that again. De Vere remarried at age 41 to Elizabeth Trentham, again for her money. In case you forgot, this Edward de Vere was not only Lord Great Chamberlain of England, he was the de Vere many think was Shakespeare. I have shown [he was only part of the writing team](#).

Before we leave the Smiths, let's look at the Smythe baronets of Acton Burnel Castle, Shropshire. They must be important since Daryl Lundy at thepeerage.com finds it worth his time to scrub the first two, starting with the 3<sup>rd</sup> baronet. All Wiki has to tell us is that the father of the 1<sup>st</sup> baronet married an Eshe of Eshe Hall in around 1570. The 1<sup>st</sup> baronet married a Lee of the Lee baronets of Langley, who were also Wrottesleys, Allens, and Bennetts. The Bennetts link us to the King. Their seat at Acton Burnell tells us more, since that came down to them from the Howards, Dukes of Norfolk and first cousins of the Stuarts. The most interesting Smythe by far was Maria Smythe, granddaughter of the 3<sup>rd</sup> baronet. She became the wife of the Prince of Wales, later George IV, but the marriage was illegal and ignored.



As you see there, the very Jewish Sir Joshua Reynolds was not afraid to paint her looking very Jewish.

I still have not been able to unambiguously connect any of these Smiths/Smythes to the Smith bankers of Nottingham, previously of Witham, Essex, other than by locations. These bankers hail from John Smith, d. 1547, Baron of the Exchequer, so also a banker. His parents were cousins, both being Smiths, and his mother was from Shropshire, possibly linking us to these other wealthy Smiths of Shropshire. These Smiths moved to Nottingham in the 1620s. Another clue as to who these Smiths were is their ownership of Cressing Temple, a property that goes back to the Knights Templar in 1136. So they were very proud of their Phoenician heritage.

But here is where it gets really interesting. This 13<sup>th</sup> Earl of Derby was a . . . anyone? . . . a **naturalist**. That doesn't mean he liked to go nude. It means that, like his protégé Darwin, he liked to be involved in covert operations concerning biology. To put it in their own terms, he liked to chase ostriches with horseshoes in their mouths.

**He had a large collection of living animals: at his death, there were 1,272 birds and 345 mammals at Knowsley, shipped to England by explorers such as Joseph Burke. From 1828 to 1833 he was President of the Linnean Society. From the Earl of Derby's Collection, the State Library of NSW purchased six volumes of exquisite Australian natural history drawings dating from the early days of British settlement in NSW and this Library publishes talks and exhibitions of its research on this collection.[7] He founded in 1851 with his natural history's collection a museum in Liverpool, the Derby Museum, the current World Museum, the oldest of the National Museums Liverpool group.**

We looked at the Plinian Society in part I, so now let's look at the Linnean Society. It was founded in 1788, not long before Darwin, by Sir James Edward Smith, the son of a wealthy wool merchant.



So we have this one pegged already. Wiki scrubs his parents, a big red flag. He is also hidden at thepeerage, though we can be sure he is a peer. Probably of the same Smiths as the Smith-Stanleys, since he was tight with Smith-Stanley, Earl of Derby, at the Linnean Society. Wiki tells us he was from Norwich, but that is an obvious fudge since he came out of the University of Edinburgh, where he was a protégé of the same John Walker we already saw in part I. The Walker who was head of everything in Edinburgh: the Royal Society, the Church of Scotland, and the natural history department at the University of Edinburgh. Oh, and who was the wife of this John Walker? We didn't get to that in part I. It was Jane Wallace Wauchope. Haha! How many circles can we complete here?

A second one immediately, since this Jane Wallace Wauchope was from the Wallace baronets of Craigie we already saw above. So by marrying her, John Walker had just married into a main Stewart line, linking him directly to the King.

And here's another brief circle completed that may interest some of you. These people have a link to the US in those years, and we find that at thepeerage, almost hidden in the stacks. If you go to the Wiki page for Natchez, Mississippi, millionaire banker Levin Rothrock Marshall, you are told he married twice, to a Chotard and to a Ross. But thepeerage.com admits he also married Charlotte Dunbar, who was closely related to the Dunlops we saw above. And those Dunlops were also Smiths, linking us to Sir James Smith of the Linnean through his cousin Horatio Nelson Smith.

But let's hit John Walker again on our way back to the Linnean. This guy is among the best scrubbed people I have ever seen, again indicating something huge is being hidden. We just saw him linked to the Stewarts through his wife, so he must be linked to them in his own lines. Nothing on him at Wiki, Geni, thepeerage, or anywhere else. A complete information embargo on one of the most famous people in Scottish history. So we are left to guess. He has to be linked to the most famous and richest Walkers of that area at the time, which would be the Walker-Drummonds of Dalry, Midlothian. These Walkers came out of nowhere in the mid-1700s to marry the Hay-Newtons, who were also. . . Stuarts. They come from the Hays, Marquesses of Tweeddale, who were also Maitlands, Dukes of Lauderdale. The Maitlands are same as Stewarts/Stuarts. They also link us directly to the Murrays, Earls of Dysart, whom we have already seen above. They became Tollemaches, linking us also to the Cavendishes,

famous Dukes of Devonshire, one of whom became a famous scientist. Once the Walkers had married the Hays, they were then free to marry the Forbes-Drummonds, since the Drummonds were also Dukes, and that is when they became the Walker-Drummond baronets. However, it seems these new baronets were keen to quickly bury the name Walker, since the 2<sup>nd</sup> baronet renamed himself Williams-Drummond. That was possibly to break the link to John Walker, and certainly to break the link to who they really were: the billionaire Walkers of the coal fields. The only people that can come out of nowhere to marry dukes and duchesses are these billionaires, as we know.

Just to be sure you got it: John Walker was—like Darwin—a Stuart. They were cousins, of course.

So, back to the Linnean. James Smith purchased the manuscripts and specimens of Carl Linnaeus directly from his grandson in 1784 for just £1000, and this bought him into the Royal Society the very next year. Three years later he founded the Linnean, with the Earl of Derby lurking behind him. Anyway, this indicates the Linnean wasn't just named for Linnaeus, it came right out his work.



Linnaeus was actually Carl von Linne, another cloaked noble who was gifted all his degrees. They admit that at Wiki, conceding he got his doctorate in a matter of weeks at Harderwijk in Holland. This was like the Tijuana of Northern Europe, where you could get any diploma you wanted for the right price, with a Meisje (Madchen/Muchacha) thrown in for free. Like Darwin and the rest of these people, Linne wasn't interested in Madchens, but he was happy to take the fake doctorate. He also had no undergraduate degree, his college experience fading out into nothing. We are told he was one year at Lund and one year at Uppsala, and then began lecturing in his second year at age 22. What? Two years later, still with no degree, he was awarded a grant by the Royal Society of Sciences in Uppsala to visit Lapland. Two years after, still with no degree, he led a student trip to Dalarna, which they admit at Wiki was a cover for spying. Ostensibly they were there to study plants, but they were really there to assess Norwegian mining operations at Roros. Was he doing the same thing in Lapland?

This is important, and I suggest you pause and chew on it a while. With Linnaeus they admit the naturalist thing was actually a cover for Intelligence, like missionary work, anthropology, archaeology, and so on. It gives us yet another key to unlock the whole Darwin project.

After getting his fake doctorate, Linne was immediately tapped by a publisher for his book *Systema Naturae*, allegedly written several years earlier. It popularized the Linnean system of binomial nomenclature, but guess what? They admit he stole it from Gaspard and Johann Bauhin. So we are

starting to see why Smith and Stanley named their society after this guy. These people should put this on their coat of arms:



They could also name new elements after themselves. If they discover a big fat new element that mimics a more basic element, stealing all its characteristics, they could call it Stanleum. Another element that faked everything around it and lied and stole all the livelong day they could call Cohenium. You know that as soon as I kick off they are going to steal all my ideas and flip my bio, making me look like the opposite of what I was. They are already trying to do it and I am not even dead yet. Same thing they did to Tesla and thousands of others.

You will say all is fair in love and war, and that the winners write history. But those sayings also came from the Phoenicians, and are therefore inverted like everything else they touch. Almost nothing these people do in love or war is fair: it includes the most heinous crimes against the gods and humanity. And the winners don't write history, the Phoenicians do, and they are the biggest losers of all time. Only losers have to lie, cheat, and steal to prosper. That's how the real gods look at it.

OK, I think we have beat the genealogies to death, so let's return to Wallace's bio. Like Darwin, Wallace left school as a young teen. Darwin dropped out at 15 and Wallace at 14. We are told this was normal for a working class guy like Wallace not planning to go to college, except I have just disproven that. He was the son of a baron, so not working class or middle class. At this point his bio mirrors that of several others I have exploded, most notably Mark Twain. Wallace allegedly apprenticed himself to his brother for six years as a surveyor. Problem is, surveyors are not unskilled labor, and Wiki admits on their own page:

**Surveyors must have a thorough knowledge of algebra, basic calculus, geometry, and trigonometry. They must also know the laws that deal with surveys, real property, and contracts.**

You don't normally get that before age 14 in public schools or from apprenticing to a brother, either. You go to some sort of school. And yet we are told that he was already working as a land surveyor at age 17, after at most three years of apprenticing. Three years later his father died and he gave up surveying, just as his apprenticeship was supposed to be complete. We aren't told if he had become a master surveyor, so I assume not. If he had been middle-class, the death of his father should have required he look for other work, but instead he apparently retired to chase beetles with a younger friend. This was Henry Bates, 19, who, we are told, had already published a paper on beetles in the journal *Zoologist*. That sounds fishy since Bates, like Wallace, had no education past 13. He supposedly learned everything he knew from the public library at the Mechanics Institute, including how to get published at 19 without knowing anyone. Equally fishy is Wallace being hired at the same time by the Leicester Collegiate School to teach drawing, mapmaking, and surveying.



Really? A 20-year-old 7<sup>th</sup> grade dropout and failed apprentice was hired to teach surveying? That's the Collegiate School in Leicester. Wiki and Google have nothing on it but it is just as fishy as the rest of this. Others who went there include Bishop Henry **Stewart** O'Hara, of Waterford, Ireland. He was from Coleraine, Northern Ireland, and went to Trinity College, Dublin, so what in the world was he doing at Leicester Collegiate School in the Midlands? Also Sir Henry Norman, 1<sup>st</sup> baronet, b. 1858, who went to Harvard and became an editor, Chairman of the War Office, and MP. So what was he doing at the Leicester Collegiate School? Think about it and get back to me. You already have enough clues to solve it.

OK, you're back. Did you get it? Well, Norman is the big clue, since—like Darwin—he was a fake Unitarian. And like others we have seen above, he was linked to coal, being the director of a number of companies in coal and iron. And like these other people, he was also a world traveller, devoting the last forty years of his life to it. Do you have it now? **He was in Intelligence.** Like the others, he was a spy. Which means? **Leicester Collegiate School was a front, an Intel school.** And they admit Wallace was there.

Two years later he was lecturing on science and engineering at the Mechanics Institute in Neath. Both these positions were just moonlighting, not for money, as was soon proved when Wallace again retired to travel. He and Bates had read Darwin and wanted to go to Brazil themselves. So they left aboard the trader the *Mischief*. Hmm. The *Mischief*. I guess that's better than the *Psyop* or the *Fraudster*. I couldn't find any confirmation this ship ever existed, other than these stories of Bates and Wallace, but the name looks like the usual Phoenician joke.

Wallace allegedly spent four years charting the Rio Negro, and we are told they underwrote this mission like this:

**After reading *A voyage up the river Amazon*, by **William Henry Edwards**, Wallace and Bates estimated that by collecting and selling natural history specimens such as birds and insects they could meet their costs, with the prospect of good profits.[9] They therefore engaged as their agent **Samuel Stevens** who would advertise and arrange sales to institutions and private collectors, for a commission of 20% on sales plus 5% on despatching freight and remittances of money.**

Unfortunately, we already know from our studies of Darwin that is all bollocks. They admit that by the

1830s England was overflowing with these amateur bug and flower collections and the institutions couldn't house what they already had. Hundreds of major collections were already rotting in sheds and warehouses, bugs being eaten by bugs. By the 1840s the museums were more likely begging rich people NOT to go abroad, and if they did to leave the fossils behind. So whatever Wallace, Bates, and others were doing, it certainly wasn't profiting from sending specimens back. More likely they were spying on the Natives, figuring out how to steal all their minerals while paying them nothing. Same thing we did to our own Natives in the US, you know. First we stole all their game, then all their furs, then all their land, then all their minerals. It is still going on.

And the mystery continues. On his way back to England in 1852, Wallace's ship the *Helen* caught fire and burned to the sea, Wallace and the others spending ten days on the open ocean in lifeboats. They were allegedly picked up by the *Jordeson*, sailing from Cuba to London. Do you see a problem there? Grab a map and pay attention. Wallace left from Brazil and had been 25 days at sea. So they would have already crossed the Atlantic and would be moving their way up the coast of North Africa or Europe. So their route wouldn't be anywhere near a ship sailing to London from Cuba. The route from Cuba would be up the coast of North America and then across with the heavy traffic from the US, going directly to the British Isles from there. Plus, after 25 days the *Helen* would be near Africa or Europe, near some coast, not on the "open ocean". These routes are planned specifically to prevent things like this from happening. They like to sail near landmasses, for obvious reasons. And then we have the other clues this was fake: the name *Helen*, which makes us think of Helen of Troy, Troy being Phoenician. We are told the *Jordeson* reached London October 1, aces and eights, Chai. Wallace lost four years of specimens in the fire, including his journals, which is convenient for the story, since we now have no proof of them. Or very little proof, and none that wouldn't be easy to fake.

**The lost collection had been insured for £200 by Stevens.[30] After his return to Britain, Wallace spent 18 months in London living on the insurance payment, and selling a few specimens that had been shipped home.**

Stevens was their fake agent. Or maybe he was a real agent, but agent in the sense of intelligence agent. Handler. At any rate they make up this story to explain how Wallace continued to live without any source of income. And notice how they work the number 18 in there once again.

Despite his first trip being such a colossal bust, within the year Wallace had found more funding, this time from the Royal Geographical Society, which arranged him free passage aboard Navy and PO ships to Singapore. Where they no doubt required more covert operations. That is proved by the next section, where we are told he collected beetles in Singapore and Malacca, but if so he did it overnight, since by October he was in Sarawak. The following spring they moved him to the Simunjon coal works, operated by the Borneo Company. All this confirms my suspicions, since I guess you noticed the COAL there. That area was also rich in antimony, and that was already known by then. Ludwig Verner Helms was already there raping the place for the West. That area was also being mined for mercury, gold, diamonds, sago, gutta percha, and timber. So it amazing our little bug collector Wallace went straight there.

But we now know why he did. It wasn't to collect bugs. It was because he was a close cousin of these coal billionaires, including the Walkers, and as a rich young man he wanted to tag along for the fun. He wasn't the sort to hang out at the club, read the newspapers, and fritter away his inheritance on gambling. He was an energetic, talkative sort who liked to be on the go with the big boys, and they apparently found him good company. I doubt it was for any actual skills he had, other than BJs, but skills didn't count in that crowd. The lack of all scruples counted first, then the ability to lie and keep

secrets, then—for Wallace's type—the ability to look good in a tight waistcoat and yellow pants. I now think that was Wallace's main function all along. As it is for so many of these people. Nothing particularly wrong with that, you will say, and I will concede that. It takes all sorts and that wasn't the worst trait in that list. I am not here to out him in that way, I am here to out him as another in a long list of prominent frauds, who faked their entire resumes and did almost nothing you are told they did.

As a not unimportant aside, this was Borneo, and it is when the Orangutans were almost wiped out, since they were considered a danger to workers. Wallace personally shot and procured as many Orangutan specimens as he could, since they were among the most valuable. Meaning he murdered them in cold blood, for nothing other than profit. He also liked to shoot and eat monkeys. So when you think naturalist, don't imagine they are animal lovers. At the same time Wallace was hunting and selling Orangs, he was admitting they were almost human and our close cousins. Typical Phoenician behavior.



I would say it is nearly a miracle they aren't extinct, and if the jungles weren't so vast and thick there they would be. Although they used to cover large parts of South China, Indonesia, and Malaysia, their numbers have been dropping for thousands of years. They have been critically endangered for decades and still are. Can you imagine hunting those people for sport or profit? No, but you probably can't imagine wiping out Native Americans, and they that, too. You probably can't imagine enslaving Africans for profit, and they did that, too. Still do in some places, like American jails.

OK, this is spinning out into another book, so I will clip it here and put it up, and start work on part IV in this Darwin series. I will finish up on Wallace and then get back to Darwin and his immediate crowd.