

[return to updates](#)

## Why I No Longer Believe in the Abductions of Elizabeth Smart or Kristin Smart



*by Miles Mathis*

*February 9, 2020*

Given that every previous case I have researched has collapsed into a heap of fatuous and injudicious lies, why would I believe in these? But let's pretend that isn't true and try to look at these objectively. Basically, the mainstream media blew its own cover this week through sheer carelessness. It decided to resurrect both stories on consecutive days, and I noticed the "coincidence". Yesterday they reported on updates to the Kristin Smart kidnapping of 1996, telling us **18** new search warrants had been issued. Really? *Eighteen* new search warrants on a case cold for 24 years? They just discovered 18 new places to search after 24 years? One or two might be believable. Eighteen isn't. It was included in the story only because it is aces and eights, Chai. This was my first clue, and it got me started. Today, all of 24 hours later, we find that Elizabeth Smart is also back in the news, again pushing the men-are-pigs project. She is the one allegedly kidnapped and repeatedly raped by fellow Mormons in 2002. She is [now claiming](#) some guy groped her on an airplane last summer. So why are we just hearing about it now, some seven months later? We are told she filed a report with the airline at the time, but that is pretty hard to believe. If so, it should have made headlines then. This story, like the older ones, makes no sense.

If that happened to you, would you let the guy get off the plane and then report it to the airlines, without even getting a name? No, you would call a stewardess immediately. The guy would be met by airport security and be questioned by authorities that same day. I mean, this is Elizabeth Smart. The airline would be jumping through hoops to promote their zero tolerance policy, using Smart as headline candy. But no, we hear nothing for seven months, and then are given no specifics. Smart

again plays stupid, saying she didn't know what to do. And the mainstream media uses this non-event today to remind us the FBI issued a report saying that claims of assaults on planes had increased 66% between 2014 and 2017. Hmm. At least it wasn't 666%. Does this FBI report mean anything? No. If *convictions* for these assaults had gone up, that might mean something, but claims of assaults are meaningless, since they are so easy to fake. Should we believe the FBI, which has been caught lying millions of times? No. Job one of the FBI, CIA and DHS is now faking these reports and events, so any report from them should be met with a resounding raspberry. All the alphabet agencies now have nothing better to do than manufacture events, to justify their bloated budgets.

Just think about it: if you were a groper, do you think you would practice your art on an airplane, where you can't run and you can't hide? They already know your name from your seat assignment, and all the stewards or pilots have to do is radio ahead to have police meet you at the top of the ramp. The airport itself is stiff with security, and given the fake #Metoo movement, the woman is going to be believed, not your denials. Men aren't groping anyone on airplanes: they are sitting there in abject terror lest some woman falsely accuse them of it.

So let's go back to the original stories and see if they make any sense. We will start with Elizabeth Smart. I started by looking her up at InstantCheckmate.com. She is there, but we do get some information we don't get elsewhere. She has also lived in Dallas, Cincinnati, Kalamazoo, and Park City. Those locations don't come up in her common bio or Intelius profile, which has her living only in Salt Lake City. If we Google search on "Elizabeth Smart Intelius", the first listing at the top of page one is for Simah A. Smart, age 51, of Houston and Richmond, TX, Baltimore, and Raleigh, NC. She is related to Emmanuel Smart and Elizabeth Smart, age 24. But why does Google take us to this page first? The computers must know something we don't. But we do get another hit on Park City, UT, at Intelius, since there is another Elizabeth (Oakes) Smart, age 29, from there. She has worked at University of Georgia. And we find a *third* Elizabeth Smart of UT, *also* 29. She is from Centerville, a suburb of Salt Lake City. She has also lived in Athens, GA, which just happens to be where the University of Georgia is. So it looks like these last two Elizabeth Smarts are the same person, and all three may be the same person.

I would say Elizabeth Smart is not who they say she is. Any other evidence of that? Yes, since Wikipedia tells us many more strange things. Smart later married a guy named Matthew Gilmour of Scotland, whom she allegedly met in Paris while serving as a Mormon missionary. Sounds dubious already, since Paris would not be fertile grounds for Mormon missionaries. We have previously seen that the Gilmours of Scotland are peerage—think David Gilmour of *Pink Floyd*. Matthew Gilmour's father just happens to be Stewart Gilmour, President of the St. Mirren football club, which is Premier League level. Or is he? [Google tells us](#) Matthew Gilmour, husband of Elizabeth Smart, has a father named Stewart Gilmour, and his picture is (twice) given as this President of St. Mirren. But then Google says in the sidebar that Matthew Gilmour's father died in 2008. So the world's largest computers seem very confused about this, and no one from the Smart family has set them straight in all these years? Curious. Elizabeth Smart and Stewart Gilmour are famous people, and Google doesn't care to get this right? My guess is Matthew Gilmour *is* related to this guy, but whether the relationship is father/son is impossible to say. Either the picture could be an error or the death of Matthew's father could be a cover.

We get a second hit on the name Stewart very quickly, since Elizabeth Smart's biography *My Story* was co-written with Christopher Douglas Stewart, US Congressman from Utah. The Douglasses are also peerage and are also from Scotland, remember. So you might ask why this guy is co-writing Smart's biography. He spent 14 years in the Air Force before becoming CEO of Shipley Group, which

according to his Wiki bio “participates in government anti-terrorism training, corporate security, and executive preparedness consulting”. His brother is US District Judge Ted Stewart, who was also Chief of Staff to Utah Governor Mike **Leavitt** in 1998-9. Wow, that's not suspicious at all, is it?

This Christopher Stewart had been a professional writer as well, back to 1998, when his first novel was published. He also published several historical novels. So it is convenient we have a Mormon fiction writer and government anti-terrorist trainer being involved here, isn't it? I suggest he was involved from the beginning, and wrote large parts of the script. The fiction in this story is only a little more poorly written than his “professional” fiction, so we may assume he needed his editors.

This also ties us to Kristin Smart below, since her sister married a Stewart (surname).

Another book about Elizabeth Smart is called *In Plain Sight*, and it was co-written by Lee Benson, whose brother just happens to be Dee Vance Benson, chief judge for the US District Court in Utah at the time of the event. Directly afterwards, in 2004, Dee Benson was appointed to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISA). Nothing to see there, right?

Since Smart's captors were of course tried in Utah, it is convenient she was connected to several high-ranking judges there. I assume this was useful when faking the trial.

More strangeness is that Elizabeth Smart was married to Gilmour at the Laie Hawaii Temple in Oahu.



That's a red flag because your average Mormons are not married at this exclusive temple. It indicates these Smarts are both wealthy and high up in the LDS hierarchy.

Also strange is that Elizabeth Smart's dad Ed came out of the closet last year, divorcing her mom Lois and leaving the LDS church. My guess is he was just an actor from the start, and now wants out of his part permanently. He doesn't want to be called in for any more interviews or photo ops. Or maybe he wants a *bigger* part, and will transition later this year into some third or fourth sex yet to be determined.

In another mad coincidence, one of today's lead stories was on how the Mormon church had kept a \$100 *billion* dollar fund intended for charities. Since that is just one fund, it should remind you how rich the Mormon church is. There are no reliable figures for total assets of the church, but I would guess it has to be over a trillion. The only way any organization gets that rich is by theft of some sort, and this current story confirms that. Sort of conflicts with the basic message of Christ, doesn't it? Didn't Christ teach you should give away all your belongings and wander the world doing good deeds for free, or for a meal and a cot? So I am not really prone to believe anything the Mormon church tells me, or any other trillion-dollar church. Any story concerning Mormons should be taken with a grain of salt. Or maybe two grains of salt. Make that a pillar of salt.

Also strange is that I couldn't find mother Lois Smart's maiden name anywhere. It is conspicuously suppressed at Wikipedia. Finally I discovered it is Francom. That leads us to [this old article at the AP](#), where we find it admitted that the Smarts descend directly from Charles **Rich**, one of Brigham Young's twelve apostles. We also learn that Ed Smart is both a realtor and banker, being owner of First National Mortgage. In 2002 one of his houses was listed for \$1.2 million. Which may explain how he was able to post a \$250,000 reward within 30 hours of the kidnapping. This AP article is dated June 7, which is only two days after the fake kidnapping. Just so you know, in your home town you can't even file a missing person report until they have been missing for 48 hours. That is confirmed in the Kristin Smart story below, where her parents couldn't file reports until the third day. But in this event, we are supposed to believe that within 30 hours the huge reward had been posted and the whole town had been mobilized for the search. The story had already gone national. The entire story was already in the news, with full backstories, as here at the AP. Smart was allegedly abducted on Wednesday, and we are told that *on that same day* LDS President and prophet Gordon Hinckley had personally telephoned Elizabeth's grandfather Charles Smart and asked if there was anything they could do. *That very evening* Gordon's son Richard led a prayer meeting attended by 300 people. Only **one day** after the kidnapping, Ed Smart was already on TV publicizing the event. Only manufactured events work like that.

Which sends us back to Wikipedia, where we start again at the top of the page, looking for inconsistencies. They come fast and heavy, so strap yourself down. Smart was gone for 9 months before she was found **18** miles from her home with her captors, who were arrested. Chai. Her primary captor, Brian David Mitchell, was born **October 18**, 19**53**. 10/18/53. Chai again. He called himself Immanuel, thought he was Christ, and dressed as Christ in white robes and sandals, with long hair and a beard. And yet we are supposed to believe this unemployed drifter and nutcase in white robes calling himself Immanuel had been hired recently by the millionaire Smarts to work on their roof and rake leaves. Yeah.

The other captor was Mitchell's wife Wanda Barzee, who called herself Hephzibah and was allegedly well-known for panhandling in downtown Salt Lake City. So you should again ask why Ed Smart would hire this guy known to be borderline insane, with a borderline insane wife, to rake leaves. Ed has two pretty young girls at home, but he thinks it is a good idea to have insane guys in white robes raking leaves in the front yard and climbing around on the roof of his million-dollar home?

Mitchell and Barzee were clearly hired from the LDS theater department. There is no chance they are or ever were in jail. Which means the trials were also faked. We will look at them below.

The only witness to the abduction was Elizabeth's little sister Mary Katherine, age 9. She gave a full report to the police, but it was wrong on almost every point and it had to be changed in the script later. She said he was wearing light clothes and a golf hat, but that was changed later to dark clothes and no



golf hat. The golf hat didn't fit with the Mitchell-as-Jesus bit, I guess. She said he had a gun, but he didn't. She reported she heard her sister was being kidnapped for ransom. That story changed too. She never got a look at Mitchell's face, though in the early years police pretended she had, I suppose to give the story some ballast. She reported that the kidnapper's voice sounded familiar, but for several months she could not pinpoint it. Again, this isn't the way it works. Nine year olds don't fail to place a voice immediately, then suddenly remember months later. Only bad fiction works like that.

No fingerprints, DNA, or other physical evidence was found at the house, other than a cut screen. Bloodhounds picked up no scent, which is not surprising seeing that bloodhounds cannot be paid to lie.

The first suspect was supposedly Richard Ricci, another druggie and ex-con Smart had allegedly hired to work around the house. Notice the fake name, which nonetheless points at the peerage, as a joke. Richie Rich. Also think Lionel Richie, Christina Ricci, Guy Ritchie, etc. Chris Stewart must have given himself a chuckle coming up with that one. Also remember *the Smarts were Riches*. See above, where I told you they were descended from LDS apostle Charles Rich. Conveniently, Ricci died within two months of a brain hemorrhage. What are the odds?

Elizabeth was told to change her name to match her crazy captors, and she chose Esther. That name is another joke/clue inserted by the scriptwriters. If you remember your Biblical history, Esther was the wife of King Ahasuerus, who ordered all the Jews of his kingdom killed. Esther cajoled the King into reversing his order, allowing the Jews to instead kill their enemies. The story is the basis for Purim, the Jewish holiday of revenge. Leave it to the Jews to have a holiday celebrating revenge and mass murder. It ties in here because the Elizabeth Smart hoax is just one of a thousand current hoaxes, all being a part of the grand Jewish project of reversal and planned chaos.

We are told that Smart traveled with her captors to San Diego and back, often appearing in public with them, but no one recognized her due to a head scarf and veil. Right. They blended right in in their dirty robes and veils, and with their panhandling, public camping, and outlandish names. "Shearjashub, get over here and eat your goddamn pancakes before this nice waitress at IHOP feeds them to the dog!" Possibly the stupidest subplot in this sorry fiction came before the trio even left Salt Lake City. Two months after the kidnapping, they all went to the SLC public library to research towns to move to, when a library patron got suspicious due to the veils and robes. We are told she looked through the veils and saw Smart's eyes. So the implication is she thought this might be Smart. The police were called and arrived to question the three. Given the timing and the fact that Smart's picture was on every telephone pole and milk carton, you would think the police would demand Smart lift her veil. Nope. We are told the police accepted Mitchell's claim that they could not lift their veils on religious grounds. Really? So the police thought these three people at the Salt Lake City library were devout Muslims? Do you know how many devout Muslims in veils there are in Salt Lake City? Can you say. . . zero? And Christians and Mormons don't use veils, remember? They have no religious laws of that sort. But even if they did, they wouldn't apply to Mitchell, who *was was male*. With a missing girl on the loose, police have the right to demand identification, in Salt Lake City and everywhere else. Do you really think the SLC police were so worried about a probable cause lawsuit from this nutcase in robes that they wouldn't insist on seeing if the girl was Smart? If you believe this, you will believe anything. And you have. That story was a test, and it is still up at Wikipedia. Almost everyone has failed it.

Also, all Smart had to do is lift the veil herself, say "It's me" and stand next to the policeman. It was over. There was nothing Mitchell could have done at that point. But we are supposed to believe Smart was so stupid she couldn't figure that out. She was supposed to have Stockholm Syndrome. But Smart

herself has denied that. She said her actions were logical, and are what saved her life. I beg to disagree. You might also remind yourself that Smart was taken by police back to the places she was held captive, to identify them (and to further publicize the story, of course). Amazingly, she was not traumatized in the least by that, and admitted it. To explain it, she said those places had not been bad, only her captors had been bad. You may want to study real cases of kidnapping, rape, and torture, which—surprise!—are traumatizing. Real victims have a strong aversion to returning to the scenes of their crimes or reliving them, for obvious reasons. But we saw none of that from Smart, who was always as cool as a stupid cucumber.

How about this little subplot: “In the fall of 2002, she attended a party with Mitchell and Barzee and was photographed wearing a veil and robe with Mitchell and another party guest.” What part of that makes any sense? Who is going to invite these people to a party? And they are going to go to a party, stand in the corner in robes and veils, not say anything, but just let people take their pictures? I have news for you: people in robes and veils don't go to parties. They aren't invited, and if they are invited, they don't go. They aren't invited because they literally stink. They have been living on the street in tents, and Elizabeth has been not only living in garbage, but *eating it*. So they don't sound like the best party guests.

Finally, on October 12, four months later, Elizabeth's little sister remembered that the man's voice was like the handyman Immanuel, who had raked leaves and such. This just tells us that the scriptwriters were ready to move the story into the next stage, with a nationwide search for this paid actor. Nonetheless, it took another four months until Immanuel was actively sought. On 2/3/3 the Smarts released a **sketch** of Immanuel. A sketch. I guess this guy had never been photographed in his entire life. Mitchell was “actively involved in the LDS church”, but no one had ever gotten a photo of him. He attended parties, but no one had ever gotten a photo of him without a veil. He had a driver's license, but I guess it didn't have picture on it. Just as a little reminder, you release police sketches of people whose identity *is unknown*. If the person is known, someone somewhere will have a picture of him. This was 2002, not 1802.

We are told the sketch was recognized by relatives of Mitchell, who then supplied the police with photos. But wait. If Mitchell had relatives in SLC, that would be known by police and other government authorities. The police would have gone to them for photos to start with, so the whole thing about a sketch artist is doubly ridiculous. It just proves this is fiction and that the writer is a moron, or thinks you are.

Finally, on 3/12/3, Mitchell was spotted in nearby Sandy, UT, and Smart was rescued. Mitchell was allegedly incarcerated at Utah State Hospital, and Dr. Stephen **Golding** was hired by the defense to test his sanity. The court found Mitchell sane over Golding's testimony, though Wiki doesn't tell us on what grounds. The court is supposed to decide this on evidence, you know. Anyway, we are told the trial was stalled based on changing findings of sanity as well as lack of plea bargain. But that makes no sense, given that the case was already a slam dunk. The State didn't need Mitchell to plead guilty. He could plead whatever he wanted and the case should have still been open and shut. Not only had he been caught redhanded, but his co-defendant Barzee had turned on him. Any jury in the US would have convicted him in a matter of days, and would have to be prevented from giving him the death penalty. But we are supposed to believe that rather than going to immediate trial, the judge allowed Mitchell to be judged insane and to return to the hospital on 8/11, Chai, and *to remain there for three years*. Hospital staff later reported Mitchell never showed any signs of insanity. True, since he was never there, except to sign in and for photo ops.

On 10/10/8, Chai again, his case was transferred to federal court, though the court waited an entire year for its initial hearing. We aren't told why it was transferred to federal court or why the federal court couldn't get on it. Almost seven years after Mitchell's arrest, and they are still stuck in competency hearings? Finally, on 3/1/10, "Mitchell was found to be mentally ill per the defense, and deemed competent to stand trial." Yes, those are the exact words at Wikipedia. Can you make sense of that? You aren't supposed to. It is meant to stir your brain, so that you give up and just accept the story. You would think that if he was mentally ill, he wouldn't be competent, right? And that if he was competent, it was because he *wasn't* mentally ill. But that isn't what we are told. We are told his mental illness made him competent to stand trial. Of course that contradicts what we were told in previous paragraphs, where he had been ruled "mentally incompetent" to stand trial back to 2005.

Mitchell's trial began 11/8/10. Chai again, of course. His defense was insanity, but the jury rejected that and found him guilty. He was sentenced to life with no parole.



That's Elizabeth with President Bush, of course, at the signing of the PROTECT Act of 2003. Since she was found in March of that year, you are probably thinking that picture was taken months later. No, it was taken in April, just a few weeks later. Boy, she recovers fast from being raped up to four times a day, eating garbage, living on a chain, and cohabiting with two crazy and violent people for nine months. She doesn't have a mark on her. And how short is President Bush!

More high weirdness ensues if we do a people search on Brian David Mitchell of Salt Lake City. At Intelius, we find this Mitchell, age 66, but he is listed as also having lived in St. Louis and Festus, MO, and Clinton, NC. He studied at University of North Carolina at Pembroke and worked at Jefferson Community College. No mention of New Hampshire, where he is supposed to have been a Hare Krishna. His Wiki page does not mention Missouri or North Carolina, much less these two colleges. There are Jefferson Community Colleges in Kentucky and Watertown, New York, but not in Salt Lake City. There is a *second* Brian David Mitchell of Salt Lake City, age 72, also connected to Georgia, New York, Texas, and Mountain View, CA. He has worked at Google, Associated Press, the *Star Tribune*, and 3M and studied at Emory University. A third Brian David Mitchell of Salt Lake City, age 45, is listed, and he may be a junior since he is also linked heavily to Georgia. His relatives include Sothsavaths and Ordynas. If we check InstantCheckmate, we find something curious. They have never heard of the second Brian David Mitchell of Salt Lake City, age 72, telling me he is the same as the Mitchell age 66, our man. That means our actor Brian David Mitchell is the one who has worked at Google, 3M, Associated Press, etc. Indicating he is an Intelligence agent of some sort.

What about Wanda Barzee? InstantCheckmate has never heard of her, but their computer for some reason (W. stands for Wanda?) takes us to the page for Maxine W. **Feiger**, age 69, aka Fuger, Seiger, Corum, Waldkirch, and Corumfuger. So this lady is fond of fake names and may be our actress. She is not from Salt Lake City, but from Portland, OR, and Palm City, FL. Feiger is of course a Jewish name. So is Seiger, think Pete Seeger, etc. Intelius has never heard of her either, though there are a lot of Barzees in UT. So according to the big computers, Wanda Barzee doesn't exist and has never been in any jail. Jail records are some of the easiest for computers to pull up, and if she had even been in jail they would know it.

Judge Judy Atherton, who presided over Mitchell's state trials and declared him unfit for prosecution, also presided in several other questionable cases, including those of the axe murderer Leonard Gall and the mass murderer Edgar Tiedemann. Given what we just discovered, I think we can mark those as fakes as well. As just a final indication of that, we are told Gall sent Atherton a Mother's Day card in 2013, wishing her well.

---


Now let's move on to Kristin Smart, assumed to have been kidnapped and murdered in 1996. . . Except that there isn't a scrap of evidence she was. According to the given story, she was at a late-night college party and was found passed out on the front lawn by some friends at about 2am. They took her home to her dorm and she hasn't been seen since. The event has been used to create a lot of fear and pass useless laws, but—given the story—the best guess is she either died of alcohol poisoning, with her body being hidden because it didn't match her life insurance policy clauses; or she went into Intelligence, with the faked death as her entree. The second guess is the better one, given that she was born in Augsburg, Germany (and given that 19-year-old girls don't normally have life insurance policies). Augsburg was the site of [Gablingen Kaserne](#), which was used for signals intelligence up to 1998. This indicates her father was career military, probably Intelligence. Her hometown of Stockton, CA, is more indication in that direction, since Stockton is the site of Defense Logistics as well as Echo Base—which Google doesn't want to give us any information about. It is listed as a military base, but then a picture of a house in the suburbs is listed on its location. More indication is Kristin's listed height, which is 6'1". Intel likes tall, athletic girls, for obvious reasons: they fit male specs, for one thing. So either Kristin was recruited for a secret basketball team, or she was recruited by CIA. You decide. We get even more indication in that direction from a people search on her father, Stan Smart. Wiki tells us he and his wife were teachers, but Intelius tells us he worked at Spaceref.com, a cohort of NASA that produces—according to its own website—"Intelligence products". He has also lived in Reston, VA, headquarters of Spaceref. He is linked to Carters. InstantCheckmate tells us his name isn't Stan but Merle. That would be Merle **Stanley** Smart. As I said above, one of his daughters married a Stewart, linking us to that again. He has also lived in Saginaw, MI. His son Matthew, Kristin's brother, has lived in Brisbane, Australia, and has worked at Smart Broadcasting Company. He is also related to a **Novak**, which is a Jewish name.

[This elaboration](#) of the story at the *California Register* is also a red flag, since not only does it make no sense, it appears to be a hamhanded attempt by someone to sell a story not selling itself. The website looks like a front used by Intelligence simply to sell the Smart story. It tries very hard to convict Paul Flores, but fails miserably. It posts a picture of him two days after the event, supposed to be a booking photo, saying he has a black eye in it. But there are two big problems. One, he doesn't have a black eye. Two, it isn't a booking photo, since he was never booked. He is holding up a ridiculous



handprinted sign, as if police departments use those. So it looks like Flores is a part of the hoax. We are told that Cheryl Anderson, one of those who walked Kristin back to her dorm with Flores, was very suspicious of Flores. Flores even tried to kiss and hug Anderson while a drunk Kristin was on his arm. Not believable. And besides, if Anderson was so suspicious of Flores, why did she abandon Kristin to this guy and walk off to her own dorm? Shouldn't she have escorted the helpless Kristin to her dorm, making sure was safely deposited?

Also notice that it is admitted that Flores was inches shorter than Smart. She was not skinny, either, being a strapping lass of probably 160 pounds or more. So, not the sort of girl most guys prey on. Especially guys who are only about 5'9". He looks in no way imposing in his fake booking photo, and also does not look like the kind of guy a pretty girl like Kristin would be hanging around with. That is to say, he looks like a bonehead.



More indication in this direction is that the local police didn't seem interested in pursuing the case. This points at a stand-down ordered by the Feds. The CIA no doubt informed the locals that there was no case here to pursue. Which explains why the police and FBI never did anything you would expect them to do, other than halfheartedly pursue this guy Flores, who was no doubt planted in the story for that purpose.

See, no black eye, just a minor shadow under one eye due to the lighting. But the scriptwriters decided to use it to create confusion. Also notice his hair. See anything strange? At first it looks like it is shaved on the sides and long on top. But if you look closer, it starts to look like a toupee. The seam to your right, where long hair meets short, doesn't look right. And if you continue to look, you finally realize the toupee was pasted into the photo later. Why? Because Flores actually had a buzz, which is a military cut. But they don't want you realizing Flores was military, since that gives the story the military link I have been showing you.

The Smarts never sued the University, City, or State, but for some reason they sued Flores for wrongful death. That was all misdirection for the newspapers, since although they had a ton of evidence against the City, State, and University for obstruction of justice, they had nothing against Flores. If what we are told is true, they could have won millions from the City and University for obstruction of justice. But they weren't interested in that.

Also notice this story admits that the missing persons report at Cal Poly prepared two weeks later states that the mother Denise Smart said her daughter was on a camping trip. What? Denise later said that was a lie, but if it had been a lie why didn't the Smarts sue the University? Also strange is that neither Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, nor the FBI made any attempt to search the rooms of Smart, Flores, or anyone else. The whole thing was covered up, which our author at *California Register* tries to spin as the University putting a lid on the case. But that doesn't explain the non-appearance of the FBI or the non-appearance of the City and State police, including the Sheriff's Dept.

What about the fact of the missing earring? Supposedly, one of Kristin's earrings was found at the home of Flores' mother. The police then failed to inform the Smarts of this, failed to try to identify the earring, and when asked by the Smarts about it, claimed to have lost it. That isn't incompetence, it is more evidence of a stand-down. But why would the police stand-down on this? That is what the *California Register* never explains. It insinuates the Flores were a protected family, but there is no evidence of that. Rather, I take this earring caper as more indication Kristin faked her death, with Flores as a military accomplice known to all the Smarts. We are told that Flores admitted to friends Kristin was at his parents' house, which our author at the *Register* spins to mean her dead body was there. But I take it to mean the Flores home was used as a halfway house of some kind, due to convenience. Kristin no doubt needed a place to crash for a couple of days nearby, since her parents didn't live in San Luis Obispo. The CIA couldn't very well pick her up at the dorm, could they? Someone would have seen her drive off with men in black. So Flores squirreled her away in the middle of the night, maybe in a golf cart, and the spooks picked her up from his mom's house. In the bustle, she lost an earring, which was found later and had to be "lost", i. e. returned to her. It was her favorite pair and she wanted it back. That is the logical reading. Remember, we saw a similar sub-plot play out in the [Jeffrey MacDonald hoax](#), and I read it in the same way. MacDonald's wife, supposed to be dead but really just hiding somewhere, lost her wedding ring in the bustle. It was found and catalogued by police, but since she wanted it back, they had to claim to lose it. They actually just gave it back to her. So the "lost" ring was proof she was still alive. Same thing here.

And another thing we learn at the *Register*: the name of the police officer who allegedly searched Ruben Flores' home was? Henry **Stewart**. Badge #**335**. Another Stewart in a Smart story. That is four now, if you are counting.

So who are these Smarts? Well, there are 80 of them in the peerage, including an Elizabeth Smart who married a John **Loxley** in about 1890. That would link us to Robin Hood, you know, who was a Loxley. More importantly, their son married a Heath, daughter of a **Byron**, and their son Rev. Arthur Smart Loxley married a Duncombe. Their son married a Brooke-Hunt, and their son Peter **Noel** Loxley married a Dawnay, daughter of a Buxton. Why do I mention it? Because this Dawnay's brother was Lt. Col. Christopher Payan Dawnay, and he married Patricia Wake, daughter of the 13<sup>th</sup> Baronet, Maj. Gen. Sir Hereward Wake. And now for the money shot. Sir Wake's wife was Margaret Winifred **Benson**, sister of Lt. Col. Sir Reginald **Lindsay Benson**. Does that name ring a bell? We saw it above. Who wrote the book on Elizabeth Smart? That would be Lee Benson, brother of Dee Vance Benson.

Margaret Benson's other brother was Guy Holford Benson, and he married Lady Violet **Manners** in 1921. She just happened to be the daughter of the Duke of Rutland, and her maternal grandfather was a Lindsay, Earl of Crawford. This also links us to the Forbes, the Murrays, and the Flemings. And those are just the closest links. It links us to the entire upper level of the peerage, including all the various Dukes. And remember, I have shown you in previous papers all the Dukes are variations on the names. . . Stuart/Stewart. Which is why you keep seeing that name here.

Margaret Benson's other brother married a Ward, linking us to the Earls of Dudley. Through them we link to the Tennants, the Leveson-Gowers (Dukes of Sutherland); the Charteris; the Claire-Erskines (Earls of Rosslyn and cousins of Andy Murray's mother); the FitzGerald; and the MacDonalds.

We find many Smarts in the peerage coming from Angus, Scotland, which goes a ways to explaining our Elizabeth Smart's marriage to a Gilmour from Scotland. He is probably a cousin. We also find the Smarts directly related to the Stewarts through the Maitlands. See Agnes Smart of the peerage who married Alexander Maitland. The Maitlands are very close cousins of the Stewarts, think actor Jimmy *Maitland* Stewart. These Maitlands also link us to the Hamiltons.

The Smarts were also related to the Thynne Viscounts, and through them to the Villiers, Earls of Jersey; the Percys, Dukes of Northumberland; the Howards, Earls of Suffolk; and the Stewarts, Earls of Atholl.

How did these Smarts get to Utah? Well, we do find a Smart in the peerage from Springfield, OH, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. See Curtis Herman Smart. This links us to the Mormons, who had a large community in Springfield/Kirtland, OH at the time. Kirtland and Springfield are adjacent on the map. These Smarts of the peerage have been scrubbed, and we have no idea why they are listed. I would say someone doesn't want us to make a link between the British peerage and the Mormons, though we already have.

I also remind you of actress Amy Smart, who we saw involved in my paper on the [DeepWater Horizon hoax](#), via the film *The Big Fix*. Also actress Jean Smart, whose mother is a **Sanders**. She was on *Who Do You Think You Are*, where it was admitted she was a direct descendant of Dorcas Hoar of the Salem Witch Trials. This links her not only to her cousin Jennifer Aniston, but to everyone else in Hollywood and the peerage. Also Ben Smart, involved in a similar faked death in New Zealand on January 1, 1998. He and his friend Olivia Hope were allegedly murdered but their bodies were never found. Once again the story makes no sense, as you will see if you read it. All witness statements were ignored and the police proceeded on air. We may assume the trial there was faked and that Scott **Watson** is not in jail.

Also Pamela Smart, who supposedly murdered her husband in 1990. We know this is fake because she has appeared on HBO and ABC news from jail, which is impossible. We also know it is fake because she and her co-defendants were almost immediately transferred from New Hampshire jails out of state, for no given reasons. We also know it is fake because scantily clad photos of her were allegedly leaked from jail, which would never happen. We also know it is fake because Smart worked in a writers workshop from jail with Eve Ensler, with Smart and her writing then appearing on PBS. Again, impossible, since level one prisoners are not allowed such contacts. We also know it is fake because Intelius and InstantCheckmate have no listing for a Gregory Smart of New Hampshire, of any age. That spelling indicates a fake name.



That's supposed to be Pamela Smart in jail. So tell me why it isn't.

Look closely at her hands. Level one prisoners are considered dangerous. That is why she was allegedly transferred out of New Hampshire and down to New York. But as you see, she is wearing long fingernails and jewelry, including a large ring, at least two bracelets, and a long pendant necklace. None of that is allowed in jail, for obvious reasons. She could scar a guard or fellow inmate in a fight with those things. The necklace could be used to choke her or someone else.

In closing, I want to comment on my title above. I said I no longer believe in these events, but on second thought I find that imprecise. I never did believe in them. I accepted them and moved on, but that doesn't mean I believed in them. I didn't care enough before now to research them. But like most other people, until recently I simply *consumed* the news, as I would consume information for a test in school. I took it in, memorized it, but never really digested it. It seemed to be my duty as a human being and citizen to follow these events and catalog them, but the question of belief never came up until I began *disbelieving* them. Once I began disbelieving them, it became clear to me that I had never been invested in them one way or the other. I never really cared about Elizabeth Smart or any of these other alleged victims, which made it fabulously easy for me to come in later and look at them objectively. Some will say that makes me a psychopath, but I don't think so. I can care a lot about some things. The reason I think I didn't really care about these high-profile historical and media events is that subconsciously I knew they were fake. I could intuit immediately that they didn't make any sense, but because I didn't wish to spend a lot of time questioning them and researching them, I just moved on. If someone asked me about them, it was easiest just to repeat the common lines and slowly move the conversation elsewhere. This is what most people do, and it is quite understandable. Most people are far busier than I am, with families, jobs that take up too much time and energy, and many other obligations. And, although they may not wish that all these promoted tragedies are true, they do wish history and the news were true, generally, because the implications of their *not* being true are frightening. They think, if my government is feeding me a lot of bad information, where am I going to



get good information? If the news is one big lie, can I get along without it?

My answer is that you can. You don't have to be like me, researching every event in history and discovering the truth about it. You can research a few, the ones that seem most interesting to you, if you like. But the important thing is that you turn off the current lies. Either pull the plug completely, or continue to read it, knowing it is a lie. That can be empowering as well. Spotting the lies is empowering, and it helps clear your head. As the new lies are spotted, the old lies evaporate with them, and you come out a cleaner person in all ways. What you will soon discover is that your existence as a human actually requires very little in the way of "news". Most people have no real need for news at all: they have far greater need for protection from it, in fact. If the news were genuine, it might act as a sort of social grease: something to talk about, you know. That was its original function, before that was replaced by propaganda delivery. But you can find other things to talk about. Take all that time you used to devote to reading and watching the news and apply it to creating things, then talk about the things you have created. Talk about your new painting, or your garden, or the bicycle you built, or the kittens you are raising, or the meal you cooked last night, or the song you just learned. You will be so much smarter and *so* much more interesting.

You will be a real person instead of a media bot. You won't be a reader of mine anymore, but that is fine. My job wasn't to capture you as a reader, but to free you as a spirit.