

[return to updates](#)

LOOKS LIKE THE BUSHES ARE JEWISH



by Miles Mathis

First published September 26, 2017

As usual, this is just my opinion, based on research using mainstream data at mainstream sites.

I could just make this easy on us both and tell you *all* the Presidents of the United States were Jewish, but very few would believe me. I think that many of those who have read all my previous papers might believe me, since I have shown evidence of it with hundreds of famous people already. These readers have watched me uncloak each person by going to the mainstream genealogy sites and compiling pages and pages of proof. But for the rest of you, I will have to prove it person by person. I have already been at it for many years, and it will take decades yet to come, but with the help of my guest writers we may get to all the big names eventually. We may out every President individually. Today we look at the Bushes, which will drop two Presidents at once.

I know, Bush, Sr. above doesn't look Jewish, with that little bitty nose. But as I am told all the time, you can't judge just by noses. Which is true. I never judge just by noses, although I include them as a clue if they are there. I look away from nothing. It is only logical, you know. Refusing to look at a person's face shape or nose in trying to identify him would be like refusing to look at the color of a bird's plumage or the shape of its wings in trying to identify it.

As a lead-in, I bought the book *Lincoln and the Jews* recently and finally got around to reading parts of it this week. It is a big glossy book with lots of pictures, written in 2015 by Sarna and Shapell and published by St. Martin's Press. [Unlike *When Scotland was Jewish*, you can get this book at a steep discount at Ebay and other sources. Don't take that as a plug. I will let you know what I think once I have read the whole thing.] Both Sarna and Shapell admit they are Jewish, by the way. Some early clues in the book are what led to this paper. For example, prior to page one, there is a two-page map of Lincoln's Jewish connections. It is drawn as a target, with Lincoln at the center, Jewish friends in the first circle, Jewish associates and supporters in the second, Jewish acquaintances in the third, and Jewish appointments and pardons in the fourth. Five names are in the first circle, 14 names in the second, 55 names in the third, and 48 in the fourth. That's 122 total. That's a lot of Jewish connections for a one-term President who allegedly wasn't Jewish, especially given that there were allegedly far fewer Jews in the US back then. The authors tell us that when Lincoln was born in 1809, there were

only 3,000 Jews in the entire country. Of course, knowing what we now know, we can tell that isn't right. What they should say is that there may have been only 3,000 *admitted* Jews in 1809. But we can be sure there were tens of thousands of crypto-Jews going back to the founding, since we have already outed many of the most prominent in previous papers.

Curious that Salmon Chase isn't on this target. He was Secretary of the Treasury and then Chief Justice, appointed by Lincoln. These Chases are sold to us as Episcopalians, but it is hard to believe anyone believes it. To see what I mean, there *is* a guy named Edward S. Salomon on the target, so they admit he is Jewish. Well, Salmon and Salomon are just variant spellings of Solomon, of course. Salmon Chase's paternal line goes Ithamar Chase, Dudley Chase, Samuel Chase, Daniel Chase, and Moses Chase. One of his ancestors, also Samuel Chase (not his great-grandfather), was a signer of the Declaration of Independence and was appointed Supreme Court Justice by Washington. He was the only Justice ever impeached.

The Chases are related to all the same families as the Bushes, including the **Rogers, Ayers, Spragues, Whitneys**, Woods, Warrens, Shermans, Baldwins, Walkers, Carters, **Morses**, Sawyers, Cheneys, Palmers, **Wises**, Owens, and Bullocks. Through the Owens, he is related to the **Stanleys** (see below). Several lines go back to Salem or Ipswich, including the Hulls we saw in my paper on Salem. We also find the name **Sayre**, which we saw in [my paper on F. Scott Fitzgerald](#). It was Zelda's real name, remember? Also the name **Jellye**, which is in the peerage. It is an anglicizing of Jelnik or **Zelnik/Selznick**.

Salmon Chase's *mother* is scrubbed at Geneanet, with no parents given. At Wikitree and Geni, the maternal line goes back one more step, with his grandmother given as Janette Ballock, but that is it. That is a variation of Bullock. Chase's paternal great-grandmother is the end of that female line, and she is given as Sarah Sawin at Geni and Sarah Jones at Wikitree. That may be a fudge of Sawyer. Tim Dowling at Geneanet takes us back a few more generations, to Bridget Bellamy. But we have to wonder why Chase's ancestry is so scrubbed, especially on his mother's side. Do Episcopalians really need to scrub their women like this? Would you expect the Chief Justice's grandmother to be unknown to history? This wasn't in the time of Caesar, this was only about 150 years ago.

This means that Chase was a cousin not only of the Bushes, he was a relative of Lincoln himself, and of his wife Mary Todd. Although we are told Chase was a lawyer, he was from the great banking family, which is why he was appointed to Treasury. At Wiki we are told,

Chase ensured that the Union could sell debt to pay for the war effort. He worked with [Jay Cooke & Company](#) to successfully manage the sale of \$500 million in government war bonds (known as 5/20s) in 1862.

Jay Cooke & Co Investment Bank was founded by Jay Cooke, William Moorhead, H.C. Fahnestock, and Edward **Dodge**. Cooke's mother was a Carswell and his wife was Dorothea **Allen**. Michael Meir Allen and Julian Allen are listed on Lincoln's target in the book *Lincoln and the Jews*, in the circle Appointments and Pardons. An index search finds Michael Allen was a liquor dealer and alleged army chaplain—*although he wasn't ordained*. That's an interesting combination: liquor dealer and Jewish chaplain. We aren't told what he was appointed to or pardoned from. Same for Julian Allen. Jay Cooke's daughter-in-law was a Moorhead, explaining that connection. Think actress Agnes Moorhead, who played Endora on *Bewitched*. Cooke's sister was named Sarah Esther. Another sister married Charles **Barney**, think SmithBarney. Among their children we find an Esther **Watts** and a Emily Bronaugh von **Hiller**. Oho! See [my paper on Hitler](#), where I show he is actually a Hiller. Emily's

husband was Friedrich von Hiller (d. 1931), of course scrubbed at Geni. But he may have been a son or grandson of Jewish composer Ferdinand von Hiller (originally Hildesheim). [A further search](#) on this Jay Cooke finds his granddaughter Caroline married Robert Wilden **Bush**. So you see how these things come together. Their descendants include Walters, Kings, Franks, Nixons and **Judds**. As for the name Dodge, we have seen that many times, first in my paper on Mabel Dodge Luhan. They were one of the families as well.

Jay Cooke sold almost 1.5 billion in war bonds to fund the Civil War, becoming so obscenely wealthy he was later accused of corruption by Congress itself. However, Treasury successfully blocked any investigation. Who was Treasurer? Salmon Chase. It was tit for tat, since Cooke later backed Chase when he ran for President.

Which brings us back to him. Chase's face appeared on the first US Federal currency. This because he introduced the modern system of banknotes. Of course they sugarcoat all this in the common bios, but what Chase really was is the bankers' main man in DC. The Civil War, like every other war, was a racket. It was used to loan money to the country to wage war, and these loans were of course at high interest, vastly enriching private banks and banking families like the Chases. We are told Chase Bank was named after Salmon Chase but that he had nothing to do with its founding in 1877. Believe that if you must, but for myself I believe the bank goes further back and that Chase was one of its founders. Wiki admits that Chase "collaborated with" John Purdue, founder of Lafayette Bank in 1869, so it isn't like Chase had nothing to do with banking. Purdue had been the main pork supplier for the Union Army, so you see how that worked. Wiki admits that the establishment of the US National Banking System was Chase's "own particular measure", so Chase wasn't just an attorney. As with everything else, this whole history has been scrubbed, and we will have to unwind it another time. But we can be sure the Chases were involved in banking before Salmon Chase was born.

The point of all that was to show you that many of the Jewish friends and associates of Lincoln didn't make it onto the target in *Lincoln and the Jews*, including the most prominent. So you have to understand that while the number 122 looks large, it is actually only a fraction of the real number. Since the book was written by Jews, we may assume the main reason it was published was as misdirection. It outs some of the smaller players as Jewish while keeping your eyes off the big dogs like Salmon Chase. Of course it also keeps your eyes off Lincoln himself, since few readers will think to ask themselves if Lincoln himself was Jewish.

Anyway, the 48 appointments and pardons may be the most telling. In four years and one month in office, Lincoln appointed or pardoned 48 Jews? Did you know that? Can you fit that in with your previous knowledge of Lincoln? I can't. We can assume many or most of them were involved in banking or finance, so why would Lincoln be pardoning so many Jewish bankers? Doesn't really fit the whole Greenback story we are told, does it? But [I have previously proved to you](#) Lincoln was not who you were told, so let us move on.

What leapt out at me were some of the individual names on the target. Yes, we get the expected Levis, Mayers/Myers, Kohns/Cohens, Hirshes, Liebermans and Isaacs. But we get some other names you might not expect (unless you are a faithful reader of mine): Miller, Lewis, Jones, Rice, Hart, Wise, Philips, Joel and Foreman. Most people don't think of those names as Jewish. However, the target itself tells us how to read one of those. There are *ten* men with the surname **Jonas** there, and they are bolded (for reasons at first unknown), so we may assume Jones is a variant of Jonas. In my previous research on the Jones from Wales, that connection had not occurred to me. My readers will recognize that Miller is a variant of Muller, and that Philips is connected to the Dutch Philips (Philips Electronics,

which family is related to Karl Marx, etc.). Lewis we hit in my paper on C. S. Lewis. Rice we have hit several times. Hart, Foreman, and Wise we haven't studied previously. The surname Joel belongs to an Ephraim Joel, but it reminds us of Billy Joel—who used to pass for Italian but who they now admit is Jewish on both sides.



Another interesting find on the target is Charles Bernays. This tells us what to think of propagandist Edward Bernays, provided we didn't already know. Of course, Wikipedia admits Edward was the grandson of the chief rabbi of Hamburg, which should have been a clue, but not everyone reads Wiki pages.

But the reason I am here today is the most interesting name on the target: **Isidor Bush**. He is listed as a Jewish associate of Lincoln. Ooooo! What could it mean? Of course the mainstream historians will tell us he is not related to the current Bush clan, but when have they ever told us the truth about anything? What are the odds we can catch them in another lie?

We start by pouring over the genealogy of George Bush (either one). Although it is partially scrubbed at the mainstream sites like Geni, the fullest expression [can be found at Wargs.com](#). Or it could until the site was taken down recently. The site was up until I linked to its page on John Kerry, at which point it suddenly left the internet. Fortunately, you can still find these pages in the Wayback Machine.

I want to remind you of Kerry's page at Wargs.com before we move on, which I linked you to in my paper on [Marx's wife](#). There we found him closely related to just about every famous person of the past two centuries, including most of the Presidents. More than that, the Jewish magazine *Forward* admitted that Kerry was actually **a Kohn, from the priestly class**. His grandfather changed the name from Kohn to Kerry. Interesting, since we saw an Abraham Kohn on the target around Abraham Lincoln. That Kohn was listed as an associate. He is also an ancestor of Kerry. There was also a Jacob Cohen and a George Kuhne on the target. Furthermore, Kerry is Jewish through his paternal grandmother Lowe. Also through his mother Forbes. They deny that last part, but I showed the maternal line goes back to a female **Symonds** from Salem. Symonds comes from the Hebrew *shim*, and is a variant of the surname Simon. Think Paul Simon, Carly Simon, etc. Further back in the same line we find a Shattucks, which is more confirmation. We also find the Fischers, the **Chases**, the Robinsons, the Ayers, the Phelps, the Frosts, and the **Sheppards** in Kerry's lines. Why does that matter here? Because Kerry is also related to the Bushes. If Kerry is Jewish and related to all these people, so is Bush. And if Kerry is Jewish in many lines and related to them, they are probably Jewish as well.

OK, back to Bush. Before we get to other names in the genealogy, notice that the name Bush disappears very quickly as we go back. Although the genealogy goes back to 12g-grandparents, the Bushes are gone by 4g. Number 128 Timothy Bush, who died in 1815, is the last Bush listed. Curious, since that is the same time that Isidor Bush arrives on the scene.

Notice that Timothy's wife is listed as Deborah **House**, and that the locations at this point are **Lebanon**, CT, and **Hebron**, CT. Just a coincidence, right? That sends us to thepeerage.com, to check the surname House. Guess what, not only do we find 26 Houses in the peerage, we find [this Deborah House](#). We also find *this* Timothy Bush. So why are George Bush's 4g-grandparents in the British peerage? From taking the links on those names, it is impossible to say. The only clue we find is Deborah House's mother Deborah **Guild**, daughter of **Israel Guild**. He is the end of the line, but we may assume he is Jewish. Guild is a variant of Gold/Gould/Goold, etc. But if we go to other Houses in the peerage, we find them linked by marriage to the **Seymours** and **Stewarts**, including Admiral Keith Stewart, the 6th Earl of Galloway. Also to the **Russells** and **MacKenzies**. Also to the Leveson-Gowers, Noels, Montagus (Dukes of Montagu), and Manners (Dukes of Rutland). The Montagus link the Bushes to George Washington.

Of course this leads us to check the Bushes in the peerage. There are 112 Bush/Busches. **Including George Herbert Walker Bush**. Why is he in the British peerage? Impossible to tell. It may be through his wife Barbara **Pierce**, though she is scrubbed. There are 101 Pierces in the peerage, including President Franklin Pierce. Why is he in the British peerage? No clue. All the Pierces are well-scrubbed, and they don't go back very far. The earliest listed is Ephraim Pierce of Rehoboth, MA, b. about 1670. His wife was Mary **Low**. As we saw from John Kerry's genealogy, Low/Lowe is a Jewish name. Ephraim's son Mial Pierce married **Judith** Round. But again, no clue why these people from MA are in the British peerage.

So let's return to the Bushes. We find another link of Bushes in the peerage to the Russells, indicating they are the same as the Presidential Bushes. Remember, we found the Bushes and Houses in the States linked to the Russells above. Well, in about 1870, we find a Reverend Paul Bush in the peerage marrying [Avarilla Cromwell Russell](#). [Which of course links us to the Cromwells as well.] Unfortunately, these people are pretty well scrubbed, with no parents for either one and no locations. But we do know their son James **Graham** Bush married a cousin, Esther Hastings **Warner**. We know she was a cousin because her father was Maj. Ashton **Cromwell** Warner. A bit more digging finds these Grahams are the Graham Baronets, since they are linked by marriage to these Bushes. This takes us to some major action in the peerage, since the 2nd Baronet married a **Johnstone**. The Johnstones were Earls of Hartfell at the time. They link us immediately to the **Douglasses** and **Kerrs**. The Douglasses were the Earls of Queensbury and the Kerrs were the Earls of Lothian. And this takes us immediately to the Flemings, Gordons, Scotts, Maxwells, **Kennedys**, Hamiltons, Leslie, Keiths, Lindsays, Crichtons and Montgomeries.

So we have seen that the US Bushes are in the peerage now and have been for many centuries. But where did the Bushes come from before Timothy? At the peerage, we are given his father Richard, who died in 1732 in Bristol, Rhode Island. Then a deadend. We have to switch to his wife, Mary Fairbanks. Her mother is Mary Penfield and her grandmother is Deborah **Shepard**, which may help us—since we saw Sheppards in Kerry's lines. Otherwise, we hit a complete wall, which looks like no accident. These sites saw us coming.

In searching on the Shepards in the peerage, the first interesting hit we get is on Finlay Johnson Shepard, who married Helen Miller **Gould** 1913. She was the daughter of Jay Gould, railroad tycoon and industrialist. Remember, we already hit on the name Guild above, in the genealogy of George Bush. We also saw the name Miller in the Jewish target around Lincoln. Jay Gould was the son of John **Burr** Gould and Mary **Moore**. Burr links us to Aaron Burr and Moore is another name from the families I have been studying. Finding Burr linked to a prominent Gould is yet another reason to believe *he* was Jewish. Jay Gould's daughter married the Duc de **Talleyrand**. His grandson married a

Bacon.

The next interesting thing we find in our search on Shepard is Oscar Shepard of the peerage, who married Georgina Cerise **Eyre** in 1899. She was the daughter of John Eyre and Clara **Dunham**. Remember, Obama's mother is a Dunham. The Eyres/Ayres were have seen again and again, including at Salem. We also just saw them in John Kerry's genealogy. John Eyre's great-grandmother was Anne Daly, daughter of Joanna **Gore**. Joanna Gore's parents were Arthur Gore, 1st Earl of Arran, and Jane **Saunders**. Jane's father was Richard Saunders, b. about 1680. Remember, [I recently showed that Ben Franklin](#) not only signed his *Poor Richard's Almanack* as Richard Saunders, he *was* a Saunders from the peerage. The Saunders were not only closely related to the Gores, they were also related to the **Goolds**. We have seen in previous papers that Arthur Saunders Gore, 2nd Earl of Arran, married Christiana Goold, daughter of Caleb Goold. So some of the Saunders/Gore money comes from the Goolds. Notice that this is the third time we have seen that name, in three different variants. Guild/Goold/Goold.

In the time of the first Bushes, we find another Shepard in the peerage, and this time he is marrying a . . . **Pratt**. This was about 1650. These Pratts are scrubbed, but a search on the Pratts of the peerage finds 333 of them. [They were marrying the Hamiltons](#) back then, confirming we have the right folks. Those were the Hamiltons, Earls of Abercorn. Also related to the Hannays and **Stewarts**. The ranking Pratt of the time was Charles Pratt, 1st Earl Camden, who was Lord Chancellor 1766-1770, right before the Revolutionary War. He was also Lord President of the (Privy) Council from 1782-1794. This Charles Pratt collaborated with Benjamin Franklin in the writing of at least one major speech (New England Trade and Fishery Bill of 1775).

So let's go back to George Bush's genealogy. In about 1800, two of his 3g-grandparents were Samuel Prescott **Phillips** Fay and Harriet **Howard**. Note the Phillips. Also note the name Howard, which is another big one in the peerage, with about 1,600 listings. The Howards in George Bush's line go back to Edward Howard, b. about 1664 in Devonshire. At that time, the Howards in England were the Dukes of Norfolk, but the family owned land all over England. They were also the Earls of Arundel, the Earls of Carlisle, and the Earls of Suffolk. I found no definite link between them and our Edward Howard, but that doesn't mean there isn't one. At any rate, these 3g-grandparents of Bush are interesting for another reason. Their granddaughter Lillie Moulton married Count Frederick **Raben-Levetzau**. Obviously Jewish. Not only that, but [a search on him](#) tells us he was the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs and one of Denmark's largest landowners. He was the director of Landmann Bank, now Danske Bank, Denmark's largest bank.

Wild Bill Hickok was a cousin of the Bushes through the Butlers. Remember the picture of Hickok:



This time I do draw your attention to the nose, which might be called standard-issue Jewish. Compare it to John Lennon's nose, for instance.

Via his ancestor Simon Newcomb, George Bush is related to genealogist John Sparhawk **Wurts**. Wurts is a variant of the name Wertz, which is often Jewish. Which reminds us of Wirt Walker, a close relative of Bush. This reminds us that the name Wirt also probably comes from Wirtz/Wertz.

Through his ancestor John May, Bush is related to Charles Bonaparte, US Attorney General and Secretary of the Navy under Teddy Roosevelt. Of course this also links the Bushes to Napoleon, who I showed you was Jewish [in my paper on him](#). Through Samuel May, the Bushes are related to the Duc de Richelieu. Richelieu married May's great-granddaughter Elinor Douglas **Wise**. Do you remember that name from above? It was in the Jewish target around Lincoln, where we saw that Isaac Mayer Wise was Jewish.

Through his ancestor Gilbert **Livingston**, Bush is related to Hamilton **Fish**. Fish is a variant of Fisch, and we should now suspect it of being Jewish in this case. Especially given what he looked like:



Through ancestor John Fay, Bush is related to Eli Whitney (below). This links him to the Whitneys more generally, of course, which again gives us many Jewish connections.



There's that John Lennon nose again, very long with a high bridge and a drooping septum. He also has Paul McCartney's eyes, doesn't he? Not a coincidence: they were all related. Don't believe me? See the Whitneys in the peerage, starting with [Elizabeth Whitney](#), d. around 1763. She married Joseph Keeler, whose maternal grandmother was Elizabeth **Stanley**. No clue at thepeerage.com why these Whitneys are in the peerage, since the Stanleys are scrubbed. But we have to assume these are the prominent Stanleys of the peerage, including the Earls of Derby and Kings of Mann. John Lennon's mother is a Stanley. The Whitneys were also closely related to the Eyres/Ayres, Boleyns, Fetherstons and Hamiltons. Through the Fetherstons they were related to the Fitzgeralds. Also related to the Bushes. See lines 693 and 1386 in Bush's genealogy. Even weirder, #693 in Bush's genealogy is the same Elizabeth Whitney we just saw in the peerage, married to Joseph Keeler, grandson of Elizabeth Stanley. In fact, a search on Stanley in Bush's genealogy returns 29 instances, including Charles Stanley Gifford, the father of Marilyn Monroe; Erle Stanley Gardner; and Stanley Ann Dunham, Obama's mother. You will say they are all first names, but they aren't. 26 are surnames.

We find that some of these Stanleys are related to Harts. You will remember that name from the Jewish friends of Lincoln in the book *Lincoln and the Jews*. A search on Hart in Bush's extended genealogy pulls up 22 instances, including the poet Harold Hart Crane. Also a Mary Hart married to a Leavitt; three Elijah Harts (the last of whom was the great-grandfather of publisher Charles Scribner); and a Samuel Hart, son of **Rhoda Judd**.

Now, back to Bush's genealogy. In his all-important maternal line, we have another quick scrubbing. Even faster than the Bush scrub. His 3g-grandmother is given as Mary Jane **Sprague**, but her parents are not listed. [Sprague is a common Jewish name](#).

Also notice that there are many obviously Jewish names in Bush's genealogy, and that these names are more likely to be women. For instance: line 243, Maria Suzanna Klein; line 1233, Alida Schuyler; line 1589, Ruth Gold; line 1673, Mary Moss; line 2237, Deborah Jacob. Because women's names usually change with marriage, and because the matrilineal lines are the most important in Judaism, these lines in the genealogy are very important. The fact that we see more Jewish names as we go further back means that newer patrilineal lines that look less Jewish are covering older matrilineal lines that are obviously Jewish. We have seen this same phenomenon in all the families we have been studying, and the closer we get to the present the more the old Jewish lines are covered over with name changes, scrubblings, and other cryptography.

So let's start at the far end of Bush's genealogy and work our way back, noting all the red flags. The next to the last name is **Manning**, which we have seen before. That family has been involved with hoaxes since the beginning, and still are. Think of Bradley Manning, aka Chelsea Manning, military intelligence agent now running a double project. He allegedly leaked classified data to Wikileaks, and is now allegedly transgender. I don't believe in either one. Wikileaks is a controlled leak, so the whole thing is a diversion; and the same can be said for the transgender promotion skyrocketing now. Manning was probably just ordered to crossdress as an extension of his notoriety, to make double use of his time in the press. They have found that the sexually confused spend more money, so they are pushing this simply to maximize profits.

The next name is **Hurst**, which we have also seen many times. It is a variant of **Bathurst** and it later was spelled **Hearst**. See my paper on Chris Pratt for more.

The next name is **Morse**, and we saw that in the [Lizzie Borden hoax](#). Lizzie's uncle was a Morse. The next name is **Sherman**, and there were also Shermans in the Borden hoax. Also think of General Sherman, one of the biggest creeps in US history. Then we hit the **Kings** and **Hutchinsons**. In my paper on Marx's wife Jenny we looked at the Kings of Texas, who were from crypto-Jewish lines in Germany. Jenny's brother was one of them. The Hutchinsons were involved in the witch hoaxes in Massachusetts.

Next we find Jacob Godon/Goudon, obviously Jewish, with the name obviously a variant of Gould or Gordon.

Next we find James **Waters**, which surname we saw when I outed Roger Waters of Pink Floyd. We found that it was likely a variant of Walters.



As with John Lennon, I never really looked closely at Water's face until recently. But study the length of that nose! Water's eye-to-mouth distance is really remarkable, indicating Semitic roots. Compare his face shape to someone like Sacha Baron Cohen. Very similar.

The next name moving up in Bush's genealogy is John **Stanley** from around the year 1600. We have hit the Stanleys exhaustively in many papers, and they are probably the biggest red flag anywhere. They have run many of the big shows from the 14th century forward, and still are. Think of

MorganStanley.

Moving up, we find the names **Ruggles, Eddy**, and Allen. See **Sherman Booth Ruggles** in my paper on Folk Music. This links us to the Booths, including John Wilkes Booth. *Lincoln and the Jews* admits the Booths were Jewish (p. 206). They traced their ancestors back to Spain, and were thereby Marranos. John Wilkes Booth's sister admitted their father attended synagogue, read the Talmud and davened. There is also a Ruggles in my paper on Mabel Dodge Luhan. Ruggles is Thomas Pynchon's middle name. Eddy we have also seen many times, going back to the Salem Witch trials and forward to the Theosophy project. Allen is a common Jewish surname.

Next we come to the name **Pratt**, which we delved into somewhat in [my recent paper on Chris Pratt](#). They are high up in the peerage, related to all the top old families, including of course the Whitneys. Think of Pratt Whitney.

Then we hit the **Lowes**, whom we have already talked about in the section above on John Kerry. Then the **Pierces**, who were involved in the Lizzie Borden hoax. Of course Barbara Bush is a Pierce.

Next, in line 9770, we find Robert **Pepper** of Roxbury, MA. This reminds us of Maj. John Pepper, head of the BSC, the American arm of MI6, British Secret Service. He was the namesake of Sgt. Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band. See [my paper on Lennon](#) for more.

Then we find the **Clarkes** and the **Robinsons**. George's grandmother was a Robinson. The Robinsons were involved in Salem *and* in the Lizzie Borden hoax. We have hit them so many times I finally suggested Mrs. Robinson in *The Graduate* was a pointer to them.

Then we hit another Goudon/Gouton: Abraham Gouton of Threadneedle Street, London. More clues there, with the name Abraham and the street. Threadneedle was the center of the cloth district, as you can guess by the name. So it is another pointer to Jews.

Then we get the Baldwins, the Moores, and the **Todds**. We have hit them all in previous papers. The Todds link us to Mary Todd Lincoln, of course. She was at the center of one of the greatest hoaxes in American history, since she was closely related to all the conspirators [in the faked assassination](#). All the people in Bush's genealogy at this point are from Salem or nearby Ipswich, by the way, including Richard Waters and his wife Joyce -----.

Next we find the **St. Johns**, another name from the peerage, where it is pronounced Sinjin, as in the volleyball player Sinjin Smith. His real name is Christopher St. John Smith, and yes, he is from these families as well. There are about 1,000 St. Johns in the peerage, including the Baronets of Woodford, the Baronets of Lydiard Tregose, the Baronets of Longthorpe, the Viscounts of Battersea, and the Viscounts Bolingbroke. They are related to the Hamiltons, Beauchamps, Montagus, Beauforts, Nevilles, Tudors, Cecils, Gordons, Spencer-Churchills, Mowbrays, Flemings, Molyneaux, Cavendishs, Pierrepoints, Gibbs, Seymours, Herberts, Russells, and Stanleys. In fact, the Mark St. John in Bush's genealogy is married to Elizabeth Stanley, and [they are both listed](#) in the peerage! Since they are supposed to be from Norwalk, CT, I don't know why they are listed in the British peerage.

This leads us to look at these other people in Bush's genealogy, to see if they are also from the peerage. We start with John Stanley in line 11084, married to Susan Lancock. Yep, [he is in the peerage](#). So are their children and grandchildren, including the Elizabeth Stanley we just saw, married to Mark St. John. Their daughter married a Keeler and their son married a Whitney. All in Bush's genealogy.

What about the Thomas Morse (line 19548) and Margaret King we already looked at? [Yep, they are also in the peerage.](#)

Next we find the Peabodys, Rhodes, and Bullocks. We have seen them all before, covered in red flags. The Peabodys were involved in Salem and in the start of Morgan bank. You know about the Rhodes. The latest Bullock is of course Sandra Bullock, of course from these families. She is actually related to her co-star in Speed, Keanu Reeves, which may be why they were paired. Of course everyone in Hollywood is closely related. Is the Zachariah Rhodes in Bush's genealogy from the peerage? [You bet.](#)

I think that is enough to go on. It looks like almost everyone in Bush's genealogy is from the peerage. So let's just gather a few more names from the list: **Clements**, which takes us back to Salem again and forward to Mark Twain [Samuel Clemen(t)s]. **Goldstone** (line 4398), a Jewish name. **Warren**, which we already saw above. **Gates**—which takes us back to Salem and forward to Bill Gates. **Lippincott**, of the publishing family. **Saul** (line 3999), also Jewish. **Hopkins**, another prominent name from the peerage—think Anthony Hopkins. **Ford, Gibbs, Mortimer, Pope, Hinckley**. Note the last name, which links the Bushes to John Hinckley, who allegedly shot Reagan. I say allegedly because it was another hoax. But the Bushes and Hinckleys have been related for centuries. And guess what, the Mary Hinckley (line 689) in Bush's genealogy [is in the peerage](#). She was married to Samuel Bangs, which sounds like another Jewish name. Her father is also in the peerage, and her grandfather as well. This Thomas Hinckley was Governor of Plymouth colony. His wife was **Mary Richards**. That was the name of Mary Tyler Moore's character on her show of course. MTM is also from these families. No clue why these Hinckleys are in the peerage, since they aren't linked to any peers. But it may be through the Popes. The Popes are a prominent family in the peerage. Think of the famous poet Alexander Pope.

More names in Bush's genealogy are **Rogers**—linking him to the Rockefellers and Standard Oil. Also **Atherton**, another name from the peerage we have seen before. David Icke's wife was an Atherton. The Athertons are related to the Kennedys. Wyatt Earp's sister married an Atherton, and I showed you evidence Earp was Jewish [in my paper on the OK Corral](#). Also **Carpenter**, see [my paper on Karen Carpenter](#) for a taste of their genealogy. They go back to Salem as well.

To wrap this up, let's take a quick look at Bush's extended genealogy at Wargs.com. These are people he is closely related to, but not in a direct line. They are cousins, so they require at least one turn in the ancestry. Emily Dickinson, George Gallup, Calvin Coolidge, Richard Byrd, Count Orlowski, Kirk Douglas (Issur Demsky), Montgomery Clift, David Crosby, Jane Wyatt, Hans von Schweinitz, Henry Pellow 6th Viscount Exmouth, Prince Oblensky, Bernard Forbes 8th Earl Granard, Gordon Hinckley (President of the Mormon Church), Joseph Smith, Howard Dean, Brian Wilson, Mike Love, Orrin Hatch, Herbert Hoover, William Taft, Henry Longfellow, Robinson Jeffers, Humphrey Bogart, Jamie Lee Curtis, [Christopher Guest](#) (who is 5th Baron Haden-Guest, by the way—his grandmother was a Goldsmid, admitted to be Jewish, which confirms the main lines of this paper), Winston Churchill, Kevin Bacon, Edie Sedgwick, Rutherford Hayes, Mary Baker Eddy, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Lillian Gish, Richard Bennett (1st Viscount Bennett and Canadian Prime Minister), Grover Cleveland, Pierre DuPont IV, Sigourney Weaver, Steve Young, Tennessee Williams, Dick Cheney, Walt Disney, Amy Lowell, McGeorge Bundy, Alan Sheppard, Ralph Waldo Emerson, John Hancock, Ben Bradlee, Brigham Young, FDR, Margaret Fuller, Buckminster Fuller, James Baker, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Archibald Kennedy 1st Marquess of Ailsa, Garry Trudeau, Millard Fillmore, Dan Quayle, Cole Porter, Laura Ingalls Wilder, Thomas Edison, Stephen Douglas, Herbert Dow, Prince, Jennifer Aniston, John Forbes Nash, Richard Nixon, John Kerry, JPMorgan, Lizzie Borden, Glenn Close, Brooke Shields,

Norman Rockwell, Harvey Firestone, Wright brothers, Teddy Roosevelt, General Sherman, George Clemenceau, Barack Obama, Christopher Reeve, George Eastman, Clint Eastwood, Hugh Hefner, Douglas MacArthur, JDRockefeller, Tip O'Neill, Pat Buchanan, Henry Folger, Clara Barton, Georgia O'Keeffe, USGrant, Mitt Romney, Hart Crane, Allen Dulles, Kate Hepburn, Bette Davis, Anne Bancroft, Abe Lincoln, Tom Hanks, John Tower, Donny Osmond, Orson Welles, Anthony Perkins, Winona Ryder, Alec Baldwin, James Lowell, Jonathan Swift, Taylor Swift, Bing Crosby, and Johnny Carson. And many more. Basically, all famous actors, all famous politicians, all famous scientists, all famous artists, all famous writers.

I encourage you to visit [that page at Wargs](#), to see how close all those relationships actually are. In the mainstream sites, if they admit these relationships—which they rarely do—they try to convince you they are very distant. But they aren't. For instance, Bush is related to Abe Lincoln through his 11g-grandfather Edward Gilman. His daughter married Edward Lincoln, who was the 5g-grandfather of Abe. It may look like a distant relationship, but it isn't. By genealogical standards, it is *very* close. It is hard to tell, but it looks like they are 2nd cousins 6 times removed.

Some readers have written me after going to thepeerage.com or Geneanet. They say something like, “Gee, Miles, the peerage is huge. Your surname and mine are both there, so the question is, who *isn't* from these lines. It just proves we are all related, right?” No. As I have said before, we are all related, but not closely like these folks. Yes, the name Mathis is in the peerage a handful of times, but all are recent and none link to major lines. So the question is, if your name is there, how many times is it listed and who does it link to. Also, you can't just find your name there and stop. You actually have to link yourself to these nameholders through your own genealogy. When I do my research, I show you the links from the real people I am studying to these nameholders in the peerage. Usually it is pretty easy to do, and the links are short and direct. If you and your ancestors are not famous, then you probably can't say that. Most likely, you probably come from “nobody” lines, and there are a lot more of those lines than there are of these famous lines. Yes, there are thousands of famous lines, and we see many of them in Bush's genealogy. But there are millions of nobody lines, and you are far more likely to be from those.

Think of it this way. Go back in time to any period, say the time of Shakespeare. There was only one King in England, right, and only a few dukes. There were a few thousand rich and famous people. But there were hundreds of thousands of regular people, and they bred just as much or more than the famous people. So we can't all be descended from kings or rich people, can we? These genealogy sites tell us the further we go back the more likely we are to be related to royalty. They say that everyone in the world is related to King Edward or something like that, so my research is meaningless. Or they say that every Irishman is descended from Niall. But that is only true to a very limited extent, one that doesn't matter. Yes, the further we go back, the bigger your ancestry is, since we double it in each generation. So mathematically you have a better chance of having one ancestor that was rich or famous. But that is just one guy out of hundreds in your ancestry at that point, so it doesn't do you any good. For instance, Bush doesn't just have one guy in his ancestry in the 16th century who was rich and famous, he has hundreds and hundreds.

Plus, if your lines were poor at the time, the odds are they won't snag *anyone* famous, no matter how many lines there are. As now, the rich married the rich and the poor married the poor, so you won't find one noble among hundreds of peasants. One of your poor ancestors didn't just get lucky and marry a prince. It doesn't happen. We have seen that the rich were always rich, and if that is true, then the poor were always poor. They don't want you to recognize that, so they just lie to you.

We have seen that these rich kids from the families are guaranteed success, whether they are talented or not. Well, that coin has to have two sides, doesn't it? It is a zero-sum game, which means that if they are guaranteed success without talent, then you are guaranteed failure even with talent. Every dimwit like George Bush must displace some person with real ability. In my field, every fake artist destroys a real artist. That's what got me on this tear, remember? I was brought up to think we had some sort of limited meritocracy in this world, but finally realized that wasn't true. I realized that the real world has very little use for or interest in the truth or in talent. What it has a use for is profit, so the only way to succeed as an artist is to make a quick and easy buck for some jerk in the artworld—usually a Jewish gallery owner who doesn't know art from Garfunkel. And the same can be said for every other field, including science, literature, music, history, politics, reportage, etc. They can't really stop you from doing anything real, but they aren't going to underwrite it, support it, or promote it. In fact, they are going to do their best to bury you, because you threaten their hegemony. If they are selling fake art, the last thing they want is some real artist setting up shop next door.

For this reason, I don't recommend you waste your time entering contests, applying for grants, or seeking any other mainstream confirmation. I did that to no real effect except heartache. No matter what you are trying to do, that isn't the way to do it. Go your own way early on and expect no stroking from the mainstream. You will find some positive feedback and encouragement from the margins, but since there is very little money in the margins, don't expect much in the way of finances from there. Like Thoreau, learn to live on less and learn to value your own judgment. You are your own best critic, not some stuffed shirt from the big city. Being surrounded with good work is a much greater reward than any figure in a bank account.

What you will find out sooner or later is that it always comes down to a variation of this question: would you rather be a real artist and poor or a fake artist and rich? I saw a long time ago that that was the actual split in the road, whether I liked it or not, and that I had to choose. I made my choice, and I have never regretted the choice.

You will say, "Then why do you continue to complain?" Because I am a problem solver. I don't regret my choice, but I see the fact that such a choice had to be made as a problem. The world works that way, but it *shouldn't* work that way. The future doesn't have to be like the past: that is another lie they have told you. If we all decide to do better, the future will be better. If not, not. At some point, the future will be better, the only question is when. Will it take a hundred years, or a thousand, or a million? I don't know, but since I want it to be better I try to make it better. So while I am trying to paint the best pictures I can, I am also trying to make it so the next generation doesn't have to live in the same world I did. If I am reincarnated, I don't want to come back to this mess, so I better do what I can to make sure I won't have to. Think of it like that. I actually believe in reincarnation, but if you don't, think of your kids or grandkids instead. If you aren't here in the near future, they surely will be.

To be honest, I am not afraid of death. But I am deathly afraid of having to return to this culture in the near future, as a recycled spirit. Yes, it will be great to have a new body, if it is a good one, but would anyone look forward to going through this shit again? I am being serious, since I really think that is the question. We have this fear of death pounded into us by the mainstream media, but shouldn't we really be afraid of something else entirely? Life is a cycle: a circle, not a line. Rain comes back and leaves come back and the summer returns, so logically we will, too. Do you really want to come back and live in this crap movie again? I don't. This is what Nietzsche was up to with his eternal recurrence, I think: he was trying to scare you into doing better next time. He wanted you to think, "Oh god, I can't live this same life over and over through eternity, so I better do something interesting immediately!" The Hindus and Buddhists were onto something similar, but they wanted to escape from the cycle

altogether. Not to improve it, but to ditch it. Not a terribly brave response, is it? My feeling is that a bit more is expected of us. We don't have to come back to the same D-movie, since we are free to make any movie we like. That is to say, we can change any time we like. We don't escape from the cycle, we *improve* it.

When you have problems at home or at work, do you just give up and leave town? No, you *fix* them. Humans are problem solvers: that's what they do and what they are meant to do. They create order. I have to imagine gods do the same thing, on a larger scale. They don't flee the cycle, they *embrace* the cycle. So if you want to become more godlike, try to create order on a larger scale.

And using that logic, we do not have to wait until our next lifetime to do better, we can do so immediately. Your next lifetime is tomorrow. Think of your sleep as a death and your waking as a rebirth (which is literally true, just on a smaller scale). Stop doing all the things you don't want done in your next lifetime and start doing all the things that must be done to make it better. If you can do that, you can dissolve your own fear. If I thought my next lifetime was going to be much much better, my greatest fear would be gone.

You will answer me, "But Miles, my greatest fear isn't of my little life, and that isn't your fear either. Your greatest fear is having to live in a world of assholes again, and I don't see what you can do about that. You only have control over your own life, and maybe of a few things within your reach. You can't fix the whole world. Problem solver or not, that problem is too big for you."

Maybe. The thing is, everyone wants to live in a better world, even the assholes. They are just lost when it comes to actually achieving that. They think money is going to do it for them, or privilege, or fame, or a new house, or a new car. But many of them already have a great deal of that, so they know the promise was empty. So they are seeking just like you are. They are just as afraid, probably moreso. In my experience, the rich are the most afraid of any of us. Assholes are assholes *because* they are afraid. But this fear leads them to desperate measures. Although they are snake-oil salesmen themselves, ironically they get tagged by other snake-oil salesmen, who convince them eternal life is the answer, or eternal youth, or something equally absurd. Or maybe they are just trying to sell immortality to us, as part of the long confusion.

Regarding immortality, I have news for them or you: it is the scariest concept of all. It should be the thing you want *the least*. Immortals don't get to have children, which means they don't get to have sex. Two of the nicest things about life are gone off the top. Immortals don't get to be reborn, which means they don't get to be children again themselves: the best time of your life is gone. Truly, the gods or muses look down upon with the greatest pity and wonder at our fascination with immortality. Gods are not immortal and aren't stupid enough to want to be. That is my best guess.

Gods are a part of Nature like we are, and because they are far smarter than we are, they understand how Nature works. It cannot work with immortality, it goes without saying. Immortality and cycles are mutually exclusive.

Don't read the Buddha, read Lao-Tze, who understood this.

At any rate, because the rich are as lost as anyone, or moreso, they are as ripe for a solution as you are. They hate themselves far more than you do, and for good reason. They have far more to account for, in real terms, and they know it. The secret is, there is no such thing as an atheist. Atheism is just the denial of a bad conscience. It is the pathetic attempt to dodge karma. The moderns have tried to

convince us that belief is the ultimate in bad faith (see Sartre, for instance), but that is just another reversal. *Lack* of belief is the real bad faith, since it is a pretense. Everyone is born knowing that life is not meaningless and that not everything is allowed. It is not taught, it is innate. But a profession of atheism seems to free some sad people of this responsibility, at least superficially. It makes them think they are unaccountable for their lies and thefts.

You will say I am sounding like an old-style preacher, and maybe in some ways I am, but you have to understand that even the old-style preachers were fake. We have seen that the rich have infiltrated and corrupted everything, and we saw it again in this paper, with the Jews pretending to be Episcopalians. But this has ended up biting them in the butt, because they can no longer tell the real thing from the fake. What they need is a good dose of real morality, but that word has lost all meaning for them. They think of Billy Graham or someone preaching morality and just chuckle to themselves, knowing his entire spiel was a project. They have created so many fake prophets they can't recognize the truth when it bites them. They have spun and respun everything so many times they can't abide stillness.

Well, they can do as they wish, but for myself I know that there is a truth, and a reality, and a better and worse. I have not lost contact with my Muses, and they tell me to continue on my path, counting no costs. I have been given an assignment, as I see it, and that assignment is not to save the world, it is to simply tell the truth and do good work. If that helps save the world, fine; if it doesn't, fine. The truth is, I don't really know what is too big for me, and you don't either. None of us knows how big we really are, so the measurement isn't possible. We can't know what the outcome of our work will be, so we can't possibly judge the work by the outcome. That is, we can't refuse an assignment because it seems impossible. We don't know what is possible. We do what we do because we deem it necessary, and let the outcome fend for itself. Yes, saving the world is too big for anyone, but doing right can be fit to any size.