

STEPHEN HAWKING'S GENEALOGY

by Miles Mathis

But the disproportion between the greatness of my task and the smallness of my contemporaries has found expression in the fact that one has neither heard nor even seen me. I live on my own credit; it is perhaps a mere prejudice that I live. I only need to speak with one of the “educated” who come to the Upper Engadine for the summer, and I am convinced I do *not* live.

—*Friedrich Nietzsche*

First published September 24, 2018

You may tell me Hawking's genealogy is no longer important, since 1) he is dead, 2) [I have exposed him](#) as an impostor since 1985, 3) genealogies are boring anyway. But you can be sure he will live on in the media. They will continue to promote him as a genius for many decades. . . unless I can keep chipping away at him. If my readers and I do enough damage, the governors may retire the Hawking project *in toto* at some point, to keep from further embarrassing themselves.

On his mother's side Hawking was a **Walker**, a Morris, a Stevenson, a Scott, and a Law, linking him to the Families we have been studying. I suspect this links him to Jude Law, the Bushes, and many others, including top British spook William Stephenson.¹ On his father's side he is extremely well scrubbed at Geni, indicating something is being hidden. However, we do find his grandparents being cousins, both coming from the **Atkinson** family. Hawking was also a **Lund**, and according to his genealogy they also married first cousins. Interesting to discover that Hawking's first cousin Gillian married the father of [Anthony Kleanthous](#). Kleanthous, from Cyprus, is now a London billionaire, being the head of both NAG Telecom and Samsung Telecom. He also owns at least 28 other companies, including CareDeal and Ryman. He built the Hive London and is the head of Barnet Football Club. He is also involved in the auto industry as well as oil. More information about the Kleanthous family and its sources of wealth are actually sparse on the internet, leading me to believe something is being hidden here. It would probably be a good subject for further research, if any of my readers want to dive into it.

Another recent cousin was Michael **Duroff** Hawking, which is a peculiar middle name. It probably links us to the Russian **Durovs**, involved in various plots and intrigues. [They are related](#) to the Petrovs and Tulyakovs, which may link us to [Alexander Tulyakov](#) and United Aircraft Corporation—one of the largest Russian **aerospace** and defense corporations. You can see how this might tie into Hawking.

Another thing not scrubbed at Geni is Hawking's ancestor Sir Barrington Bouchier, who was a regicide (he signed the death order for Charles I) and who joined in **Booth's** uprising in 1659. Going back two more generations through the Barringtons, we find Henry Pole, 1st Baron **Montagu**. He married a **Neville**, linking us those Barons as well. Also to the **Fiennes**. Think actor Ralph Fiennes. Pole's mother was Margaret, daughter of the Duke of Clarence. He just happened to be the son of George

Plantagenet, 1st Duke of York, whose brother was **King Edward IV**. This leads me to believe the name Hawking was changed from **Hawkins**, linking Hawking to those two baronetcys. Why? Because if we now go to thepeerage.com, we find [Mary Anne Hawkins](#), niece of the 1st Baronet Hawkins, marrying a **Johnstone**, son of a **Cholmeley**, in 1842. Not only were the Cholmeleys [related to the Booths](#), they were related to the Montagus as well—linking us to George Washington. They had previously been the Cholmondeleys, Lords of Cholmondeley, related to the Breretons. They were later related to the **Philips**, Lacys, Sondes, Hartopps, Drydens, Brownlows, Mordaunts, Warburtons, and Cheneys. In fact, if we return to Geni, we find that Barrington Bouchier's wife was [Frances Strickland](#) of the Baronets Boynton, and her mother was Margaret Cholmeley, daughter of the 1st Baronet of Whitby. That proves my guess was right, and means Hawking comes straight out of the peerage. Not only does he descend in direct line from the Hawkins baronets, he descends from many barons, earls, and dukes, including the Duke of York.

We can also look at the Hawkins, Baronets of Kelston, for more information. They were related to the other Hawkins baronets, as we see from their marriages. They were also related to the Conyers, Pakingtons, Perrots, **Ridleys**, **Russells**, Websters, Surtees, **Stephensons**, **Lewis**, **Villiers**, St. Johns, **Bells**, **Saviles**, and **Maxwells**. This links Stephen Hawking to many more people in the peerage, including several we have looked at recently. It likely links him to Daisy Ridley, H. Ross Perot, Jimmy Savile, Griffin Bell, Linda Kasabian, Sterling Lord, and Jeffrey MacDonald, among many others. Also note the name Stephenson, which again may link us to William Stephenson.

We can make more recent links to the peerage by looking up the Atkinsons there. We find an Annie **Johnstone** Atkinson who died in 1923. Since the daughter of the 1st Baronet Hawkins married a Johnstone in 1842, we can link Hawking to the Hawkins via that name Johnstone. Remember, two of Hawking's grandparents on his father's side were Atkinsons. This links us to Baron Atkinson and his grandson Brigadier John Godfrey Atkinson, CBE, d. 1994. And yes, this probably links us to Mr. Bean as well, [Rowan Atkinson](#), who has a namesake in the recent peerage. More evidence is found with [Lt. Col. Guy Montague Atkinson](#), d. 1956. Note his middle name, which links us to Hawking. He married a **King**-Harman of the King Viscounts, and her mother was a Johnstone of the Johnstone Baronets. Her grandmother was a Cholmeley, doubling our connection to Hawking. In fact, this Cholmeley goes directly back to Hawking's Cholmeleys, via [Montague Cholmeley](#) and Elizabeth Booth. We saw them above in Hawking's genealogy.

Also see Maj. Gen. Sir Leonard Atkinson, KBE, d. 1990, Master of the Worshipful Company of Turners. Also Maj. Gen. Allan Cholmondeley Arnold, d. 1962. He links us to Benedict Arnold, who was his 2g-grandfather. Geni tried to break that link by scrubbing Allan Arnold's grandfather Edwin Gladwin Arnold, but [it is admitted](#) elsewhere on the internet. Allan Arnold's grandmother was a Barons (think Barents), and his wife was a Hamilton and a Webster-Wedderburn. This links us to Hawking once again. She was the granddaughter of a Grove, proving that once more, since Hawking was a Grove. [According to Geni](#), this Harriet Grove's father-in-law was a Hawker, which now looks like a fudge. This means Hawking is related to Benedict Arnold. Also worth reporting is that Edwin Gladwin Arnold's sister Georgiana Phipps Arnold married [John Stephenson](#). Geni scrubs him immediately, but we have seen that surname several times already. And guess who scrubbed his Geni page? Page manager Richard **Atkinson**.

And who was Benedict Arnold's step-father? Absalom **King**. This Captain King is scrubbed thoroughly in all history books, but we may assume he is of the King Baronets and Viscounts, since we saw them above related to the Johnstones. Evidence for this can be found in the peerage, where we find [James King marrying Judith Rawson](#) in about 1640. Her mother is given as Elizabeth Lawrence.

Well, the Arnolds were also related to the Lawrences. Also to the Chases, Rhodes, Clarkes, Updikes, and Turners. Of course they come from Salem (or Lynn, about two miles away) in several lines.

We can also link Hawking to the Walker Baronets through his mother. If we check the peerage, we find the 2nd Baronet married a **Philipps**. As we saw above, the Philips are related closely to the Cholmeleys, and thereby to the Hawkins. The 2nd Baronet Walker of Castleton, Monmouth, was named in full Sir George Ferdinand **Radzivill** Forestier-Walker. Note the name Radzivill, which is a respelling of Radziwill, which we have seen before. They were linked centuries ago to the **Jagiellons** and **Vasas**. More recently they are related through the Walkers to the Townshends and the Morgans. George's father was a Lt. General and GCB. George's brother and nephew were also Major Generals.

This should make you think of Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker, who has a curious history. President Kennedy accepted his resignation in 1962, and he was soon arrested for promoting riots in Mississippi against black college students. He was allegedly sent to a mental asylum on the order of Attorney General Robert Kennedy, but this makes no sense since the AG has no authority to send ex-generals to mental asylums. Especially since Walker was arrested but *never tried* for any crimes. The grand jury did not indict him, so you should ask on what grounds Kennedy was ordering him to a mental asylum. The entire event was an obvious hoax. We find proof of that when Walker's pension was mysteriously restored in 1982, the moment he needed it. Since he had resigned rather than retired, he was ineligible for a pension. The same can be said for what happened next: someone tried to assassinate Walker in 1963, a few months before the Kennedy assassination, and the Warren Commission decided it was Lee Harvey Oswald. Yes, that is the Lee Harvey Oswald from the peerage, [who just happened to be related](#) to the Kennedys and Bouviers. His real name was probably Leigh Hervey Oswald, being from all three families in the peerage.

So anyway, that was to show you who these Walkers are, and what they have been involved in, on both sides of the pond. I assure you that it is no accident Hawking's mother is a Walker. We even see the connection on Edwin Walker's page, though you have to look closely. At the bottom, we get a list of his awards. Although he was a US General, somehow he was awarded the OBE, Order of the British Empire, making him a British knight. In fact, we can tie the Walkers to Lee Harvey Oswald, since Oswald was really a Hervey. I have shown he descends from Herveys in the peerage. Well, another son of the 2nd Baronet Walker was Col. Roland Forestier-Walker, and his second wife was Norah **Phipps**, daughter of . . . Clare **Hervey**-Bathurst. This likely ties Gen. Edwin Walker to his fake assassin Lee Harvey Oswald. You can now see why they were paired in this story. Clare Hervey-Bathurst was the daughter of the 3rd Baronet, who was descended from the Bathurst Earls and the Villiers. We saw the Villiers above, related to the Hawkins Baronets. The 1st Earl Bathurst's father was Governor of the East India Company in 1688/9. The 2nd Earl Bathurst married a Russell, of the Dukes of Bedford.

The name Phipps also leaps out at us, since we already saw the Phipps above, related to the Stevensons and Arnolds. It is also a variant of Philips/Philipps. And of course a Phipps was involved in the [great Salem Witch hoax](#), since Sir William Phipps was Governor of Massachusetts Colony at the time. We are told he was an orphan and a shepherd boy, but that is the usual joke. They admit his younger cousin became Lord Chancellor of Ireland. Was he also a poor shepherd boy? Shepherd boys sure were connected back then, eh?

With that in mind, we can return to the Walker Baronets. The brother of the 1st Baronet was Captain Charles **Montagu** Hudleston Walker, d. 1833. Remember, Hawking was also a Montagu. The other brother of the Baronet was General Frederick Walker, father of Maj. Gen. Edward Forestier Walker. He married the daughter of Ogilvy-Grant, Earl of Seafield. That Earl married a Maunsell of Maunsell

Bank and the East India Company. His father was a Grant of the Grant Baronets, and they were related to the **Hamiltons**. Edward Walker's sister married a **Stuart** of the Earls of Bute. The 2nd Baronet's sister Anne married a **Paget** in 1851, she being the daughter of Gen. Paget, 4th son of the Earl of Uxbridge. His older brother was Field Marshall Henry Paget, Marquess of **Anglesey**, telling you exactly who these people are. The 3rd son of the 1st Baronet Walker married a Liddell, daughter of the Earl of Ravensworth. This of course links us to Alice Liddell, child friend of Lewis Carroll.

Hawking's close links via the peerage to so many British actors leads me to believe he was little more than an actor himself from the beginning, even before he was replaced by the actor/impostor we have come to know and despise since 1985. Remember, he never did anything real back to the beginning, in either mathematics or physics. His PhD thesis was on singularities, which are just idiotic mathematical misinterpretations. The entire idea of the singularity is a bold reversal of Simon Stevin's brilliant work of around 1600, whereby the zero is given a physical reality—against all the rules of reason and real math. Stevin had shown that the nought was not a possible entity in applied mathematics, and he replaced it with the one or the integer. I later did the same thing to clear up the foundations of the calculus, but Hawking and his cohorts were doing the opposite: purposefully muddling everything they touched, in order to cloak real physics—which I assume had become a military secret by that time. He won the Adams Prize in 1966 for his work on singularities, which indicates to me that Cambridge was completely compromised by that time—though it was likely compromised long before. Hawking then began working on Black Holes, which I have shown means he was just hiding out in a data hole, blowing smoke. Although many real problems existed at that time, and still exist, Hawking never got near any of them, preferring to camp out near the asinine singularity, where he could propose anything he wanted without fear of contradiction. In the early 70s, Hawking was working with Brandon **Carter**, Werner **Israel**, and David **Robinson** on the equally asinine no-hair theorem of Black Holes. But rather than tear that up again, just note the names: other Jews and crypto-Jews from the same families. These guys were all phonies of the highest order, promoting rampant irrationality and equation finessing as math as physics.

By 1973, Hawking was already working on quantum gravity, which should make you guffaw even if you are in the mainstream and believe Hawking was real. Absolutely no progress has been made on quantum gravity in the past century, and that is because the mainstream has never gotten near a unified field equation. They pretty much admit that, so how can anyone work on quantum gravity without any idea how gravity and quantum mechanics meet? The answer: they can't. Again, any and all work they do is just masturbation, and we have seen confirmation of that since 1973. Outside of my books, the field hasn't advanced one tiny step since that time, and in fact it has continued to self-destruct in spectacular fashion. In his later years, we saw Hawking waffling or backpeddling on his early claims, and it now looks to me like his impostor was instructed to implode on purpose, to add to the chaos. Hawking dissolved his own earlier fame with his later pronouncements, although most pretended not to hear that.

As another example of how the Hawking puppet was created to manufacture confusion, we can look at his promotion of the many-worlds interpretation of QM. This was a continuation of the old Schrodinger's Cat hoax, which Schrodinger always hated but which mainstream physicists loved for its ability to confuse and confound. Basically it confirms that a cat hidden in a box doesn't have to be either alive or dead: it can be both. Reality doesn't jell until you open the box. No, seriously, that is what mainstream physics is still trying to sell you, and it is what Hawking signed onto early in his career. What it proves to me is that mainstream mathematicians and physicists either don't know the first thing about math, physics, or logic, or that they are purposefully messing with our heads. Probably the latter. If we are kept in a permanent state of confusion, we are less likely to question their

science budgets, which are just as illogical and fanciful as their math.

So that is who the real Stephen Hawking was. These are the people that are promoted via a mountain of lies, going back many centuries. Therefore, you will have to forgive me if I believe anything I might have to say, down to a weather report or shallow boasting, is more worthy of publication than anything these geniuses of the mainstream are posting or have been posting for many decades. I could be writing about my own earlobes and it would be more compelling and poignant than anything we have seen from the promoted prodigies of science, art, or history for about a century. Honestly, I say that not because I think so much of myself, but because I think so little of them. I would rather listen to birds chirp, dogs bark, or children mumble than listen to another word of boring mainstream misdirection. And, lo and behold, I am not alone in that. My readers would rather have me write about the sex lives of dust mites or count the hairs on my arms than have to read another pinched sentence from the lying messengers of Modern doom.

In researching Hawking today, I ran across a page [here](#) providing us with a list of the 30 smartest people in the world. Many other sites have similar pages. This particular list is topped by Stephen Hawking. Since I have proved Hawking was an impostor, we may assume the other 29—though not yet replaced by look-alikes—are equally fraudulent in their own ways. In fact, that is precisely what we find without much digging. Number two on that list at SuperScholar is Edward Witten, Jewish of course. His father was a feted physicist in the very same fields as Edward, which is curious enough. This Louis Witten allegedly wrote some exact solutions to the Einstein field equations, but [I have shown](#) that is impossible. Since those field equations are compromised in dozens of important ways, no solution—much less an exact one—is possible. If he were as smart as we are told, he should have corrected them instead. . . but he left that to me. Edward Witten's genealogy is super-scrubbed, of course, with his father listed as private at Geni! But for a laugh see his grandmother given as Mindle Rendel. His other grandparents are given as Wollach and Maloch. I guess that's better than Moloch. I suspect the name should be Malach, and it may link us to Rabbi HaCohen, making Witten a Kohen. It doesn't really matter, because no matter his ancestry, he is a towering phony like the rest of these people, one who has never done a real day's worth of physics or mathematics in his life. He has been promoted heavily by Michael Atiyah, who is from the spooky Atiyah/Atiyeh/Attiyeh family we have seen before (and will see below). They claim to be Lebanese: believe that if you will. But you may wish to know that his mother is named **Levens**. Anyway, both Atiyah and Witten perch upside down at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, one of the top spook enclaves in the US. The first important thing we are told Witten did is invent the topological quantum field theory, in which expectation values encode information. More brain-stirring and busywork, in other words, with absolutely no possible use or application. Even the mainstream admits this math is based on Feynman's path integrals, which “are ill-defined notions” and “not mathematically rigorous”. But that didn't stop anyone of course. The budgets of the math and physics departments had to be justified somehow, and this is how it was done in the 1980s. To win the Fields medal, Witten applied supergravity theory to the positive energy theorem, supposedly simplifying the solution of Schoen and Yau. Unfortunately for him, supergravity theory disproves itself from the first word. See the Wiki page for this, which starts out by telling us

Like any field theory of [gravity](#), a supergravity theory contains a spin-2 field whose quantum is the [graviton](#). Supersymmetry requires the graviton field to have a [superpartner](#). This field has [spin](#) 3/2 and its quantum is the [gravitino](#). The number of gravitino fields is equal to the number of [supersymmetries](#).

Mechanically, that is nothing more or less than jactation. The first sentence is patently false, since lots

of gravity theories don't include a graviton, including the theories of Newton and Einstein. I have no use for a graviton, either, since the whole idea is non-physical. Attraction cannot be explained by a field of particles, and no one has ever shown that it can be. Beyond that, no evidence of a graviton has been produced, while piles of evidence against the idea continue to come in daily. But supergravity doesn't just have a graviton, it also has a gravitino, which is even more illogical. Supergravity is “supersymmetric”, so the gravitino is proposed simply to round out this mythical symmetry. Like string theory, supersymmetry is bald mathematical game playing, with no necessary (or even possible) link to the real physical world. These guys just propose whatever they like, with no question as to whether there is any evidence for it, and no question as to whether it is sensible at all. They then award themselves prizes for it. The inventors pretty much admitted that from the beginning, calling their manufactured connections “monster moonshine”. That is apt, because this is all no more than moonshine and fairydust.

You will say all this “advanced” math may find an application someday, but it won't. It won't because I have proven the solutions to all these problems are much simpler than they thought. For instance, because these guys were jacking around with “higher” non-applied and non-applicable math, they missed seeing that [Newton's gravitational equation was already unified](#). They missed seeing that the [Lagrangian was already unified](#). They missed seeing that [Maxwell's equations were already unified](#). Therefore none of them needed to be unified with one another by manufacturing symmetries and complex operators. What was necessary was not building new equations, but better understanding the old equations. The key wasn't higher math, it was figuring out what G was really doing in Newton's equation, what k was doing in Coulomb's equation, and so on. My solutions immediately made all their work obsolete. Not only obsolete, but awful.

Also on the list of smartest people we find Chris Hirata, who is supposed to have an IQ of 225. We are told he won an International Physics Olympiad gold medal at age 13, but since physics was not an offered course in my schools until grade 12 (age 17-18), we have to wonder how contestants are chosen. No information is available on this online, but it appears contestants are insiders of some sort. Hirata allegedly did research at age 16 for NASA on the colonization of Mars. Since that is a propaganda project, I don't know why NASA needs child prodigies for it. His PhD was on Weak Gravitational Lensing, [another manufactured topic](#). He now works on CMB and dark matter, but hasn't figured out that [dark matter is charge](#). So his prodigious intellect is apparently being squashed in some way, preventing him not only from seeing what is right before his eyes, but also from being able to read my website.

Another guy they often promote as “smartest person” is William James Sidis, d. 1944, Jewish of course. His parents were prominent psychologists who promoted him as a genius from the cradle. By age 11 he was lecturing on 4D bodies at Harvard. The only problem: there are no such things as 4D bodies. 4D math, yes; 4D bodies, no. He took five years to get his undergraduate degree, then was thrown out of his graduate studies at Rice for reasons not given. He enrolled in law school at Harvard but quit before graduation. At age 22 he postulated the existence of dark matter, but since he did not connect it to charge, he sort of missed the boat. He wrote that the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics was upside down in between galaxies, meaning such space was unentropic. It could not produce light for that reason. He was wrong.† He ended up quitting mathematics, and later wrote a book on streetcar transfer tickets, calling himself a peridromophile. OK. Although it is claimed his IQ was on the order of 250, no test results for that are ever offered. Apparently it was just an estimate based on. . . nothing. Again, his actual achievements are pretty much nil. Actually, his greatest “achievement” indicates he was another spook, since he was arrested in 1919 at a Socialist parade and allegedly sentenced to 18 months under the Sedition Act of 1918. Note that number, which is aces and eights, and see [my paper](#)

[on Eugene Debs.](#)

A Google search on “world's smartest person” leads with a guy named Christopher Langan. For some reason, he seems to be promoted heavily by the mainstream as the world's smartest living person. However, if you research Langan, you find his intelligence is based solely on his IQ, which is said to be 195. That is, it is based on taking a single test. It is not based on any of his achievements, which are about nil. I say this is curious, because if you are basing intelligence solely on this test he took, a lady named Marilyn vos Savant scored about 35 points higher (230). Since she is still living, why is she buried in searches of this sort? I will tell you: she got crossways with the mainstream gatekeepers in mathematics about twenty years ago, and they purposely decided to bury her. As I have pointed out before, they often misreport her score online, using her raw score rather than her net score, while reporting the net scores of others—including Langan. Her Wikipedia page is libelous in my opinion, since it accuses her of falsely reporting her own score—which is not the case. She has always simply reported the score given to her by the test makers at the time. The Guinness World Book of Records confirmed her score before they went to print, so why would Wikipedia accuse her of some kind of fraud? I just told you: Marilyn disagreed with the mainstream and was therefore targeted. As we know, these people will say anything. The truth simply doesn't matter. They are masters of blackwashing. And they have a ubiquitous reach, even convincing Guinness to drop its IQ category, simply because they didn't wish to continue listing Marilyn at the top of that page. So it looks to me like they promote this Langan guy so that they don't have to promote Marilyn. His promotion is actually part of the “bury Marilyn” project. Sidis is part of the same project, since he is often listed above Marilyn, despite having never taken an IQ test. I suspect she knows that, but is too “modest” to admit it.

This is not to say that I think the IQ tests accurately rank intelligence. It is just to say that I think we should demand some consistency from these people. If they are going to list people based on these tests, they should do it honestly. They should not later downlist people for disagreeing with mainstream dogma. That said, Marilyn also has some spook markers in her bio, the biggest being her fellowship on the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry‡. That is another Jewish organization of pseudo-scientific gatekeeping, which pretends to be protecting us from astrologers and other dangerous people of that sort, but is really protecting us from ideas which don't make them any money. See my previous comments on Michael Shermer. So it is possible Marilyn is allowing herself to be blackwashed online as part of a larger project that I haven't yet unwound. Maybe she disagreed on Fermat only so that she could later come back and admit they were right. But I think it is more likely we are just seeing another squabble among the Families. Some of them promote Marilyn, some promote Langan, some promote Hawking, and some promote Sidis; but you will never see any of them promoting anyone doing anything real or important.

I also find it curious that I am about the only person who has ever questioned anything these people have done. I have gotten called to the carpet by hordes of anonymous trolls on just about everything I have ever said, down to the smallest claims on my website. My posted bio has been nitpicked word for word, and I can't even tell a story about my childhood without being asked for proof it happened. But with these famous and promoted people, nothing is ever questioned. No one ever looks closely at their bios, asks for proof of their claims, or checks their math. All we see is a constant barrage of shallow promotion from thousands of mainstream sites, without ever a hard question asked. People like Hawking, Witten, Wiles, and Feynman have a million allies and groupees, but not a prominent enemy in the world. How likely is that? In a multilateral world of differing opinions, that should not happen. These guys should have to field some serious criticism. But they never do. Their debates and interviews are canned and their online pages are policed. Forums are cleansed of any against-the-

mainstream opinion, and the major sites admit that. They actually give demerits to anyone who asks a serious question, and ban anyone who doesn't immediately pipe down. Again, how likely is that in a real world? I have made the same point in art. How likely is it that all mainstream sites would cheerlead for Modernism, and none would have a nice word for contemporary realism? Of all the movie stars and pop stars buying and promoting Modern art, not one is buying or promoting realism? Really? And you think the media isn't totally controlled?

We should know the media is manufactured because it doesn't match our real-life experience. Whenever I talk to real people, I find most of them like realism and hate Modernism. If normal people were suddenly made rich, they would buy realism, not Modernism. So how is it that almost all rich people buy Modernism? I will tell you: they are part of the racket and we aren't.

It is the same with science. Most people who study the main components of quantum mechanics or other new science just shake their heads. And not because it is so hard, but because it is so utterly irrational. They know it can't be true no matter what the math says, so why bother with the math. They have taken enough courses in high school to know that you can't prove a contradiction with any math, so they rightly walk away. So how is it that these child prodigies can't figure that out? How is it that our senators can't figure that out? How is it that the billionaires funding these projects can't figure this out? I will tell you: they are part of the racket and we aren't.

Plus, as we have seen, famous people don't need to promote themselves, since they are the beneficiaries of a constant mainstream promotion, from literally thousands of sources. Because they are from the Families, they are promoted from the cradle. A large portion of the media is given over every day to making sure we know who these people are and how important they are. The promotion is so excessive, they can even pretend to be humble and it doesn't matter. But with people like me, the opposite is true. Not only can we not seem to find any promotion, if we make any headway nonetheless we are immediately swamped with noisy and false *anti*-promotion. Hundreds of people arise out of nowhere to slander us. Obviously, this is to protect the franchise. These people are hired to quash any competition.

So those of us not from the Families have to promote ourselves. No one else is going to do it, are they? Earlier this year, we finally saw some people saying nice things about me online, but even so, those comments are on a private blog. Those comments are not being published widely by the media, and it is very unlikely that anyone but my choir will ever read them. So the levels of promotion are still very low compared to my mainstream competitors. And for years I didn't even have that. For a long time, the only one who believed in me was me. Is it any wonder I developed the tone I did?

But of course my detractors won't even give me that. They have slandered me and then tried to shame me for fighting back. According to them, self-promotion is always unseemly. It is a sign of megalomania. Believing in yourself when others don't is apparently the greatest modern sin, and is proof by itself of delusion. That has been one of their primary gambits, and they learned it in debating101: the cleverest thing you can do is trap your enemy in a no-win situation, of the "have you stopped beating your wife" sort. They deny you promotion, then accuse you of being anti-social if you self-promote. The only way you can avoid attack is if you accept their terms on everything.

First, they trap everyone not in the Families outside the gates. Those of us on the other side of the moat are pre-defined losers. Any idea we have must go through their channels, so we rely on them to rise beyond a certain point. If we don't do as we are told, we will never make it across the drawbridge. But some of us will not accept that situation, and we begin talking directly to our neighbors, ignoring the

accepted channels. When that happens, the response from the castle is immediate, punishing, and twofold: one, the miscreants are accused of transgressing all societal rules. We are said to be trampling on all the sanctified and holy norms like peer review, majority rule, Christian humility, and groupthink. Two, the castle floods the peasants with new handbills and new tasks, to keep them so busy they haven't time to converse among themselves. Those in the tower may also turn up the daily music, add a lot of new festivals to the schedule, and send spies into the populace, for the same purpose. And if all that fails, they will pay an enemy to attack the city.

You will say have I made these points before and am just repeating myself. True, but these points bear repeating. I have not made them in years, and nothing has changed. Despite my greater online numbers and new levels of support, the situation in general has not changed a whit. If anything, those anti-promoting me have only increased their funding and turned up the volume on the lies. As long as they keep attacking, I have to keep defending.

As a tack-on, I want to say something about Taos and what is going on here locally. This weekend we will see the now annual event “Paseo”, which is a continuation of the attempt to take over Taos for the Moderns. It is going on right now, as I write this. This takeover started in 2009 with Dennis Hopper coming to town with his buddies and taking over the Harwood Museum for a month. [You have seen my commentary on that.](#) That failed, but the same people (I assume) came back a few years later with this Paseo project. I know (or know of) some of the locals involved, since I sometimes take yoga with them at Shree. We pass like ships in the night, and I have no idea how deep into this project they go. In other words, I don't know if they are CIA or just local dupes. But I do intuit this is an Intel project, since it has all the usual earmarks. It is probably run out of the Mabel Dodge house, since—as we have [seen](#)—there are major spooks hanging out over there to this day, including Bob **Attiyeh**. For instance, this year's Paseo event has the theme “Space”, not as in artspace, but as in NASA or SpaceX. If you think that is just a coincidence, I don't know what to say, except that you may need to watch less TV. The “nexus” for this event is a “Spacecloud” erected in Kit Carson park—which is just another way of saying a big ugly plastic bubble. Inside they will be selling laser light shows, electronic music, robotics, coding and gaming, and “microscopic video paintings” as art. Why? To promote their own larger projects like virtual reality, AI, NASA, SpaceX, and so on, while at the same time making sure real art stays in its shallow grave. The only good news is that Paseo is also a massive failure. I rode my bike through there in the middle of the afternoon on Saturday and the place was empty. Not a soul.

But it may be successful in another way. The traditional Taos art scene has been obliterated in the past two decades, with the old artists dying off and no new young ones coming in to take their places. You can see this obliteration is no accident, since the organizers scheduled Paseo the weekend before the Taos Arts Festival. Twenty or thirty years ago, the Taos Arts Festival was still a big deal, and you might expect to see the top realists in the area involved. Not any more. The ones that are still alive don't bother to show up, and it has devolved into a show run by local grandmas and Sunday painters. While it used to be housed in top venues, it is now housed in the old grade school gymnasium, with the sorry lighting that implies. The town refuses to support it, insure it, or otherwise promote it, leaving it to private channels to see that it continues at all. I suspect these private channels are also polluted on purpose, and I predict the festival won't last much longer. It has been targeted for destruction or cooption. And, truth be told, it will be no loss to the community, since it has been an embarrassment to the art community for several years. It now only works as a venue for local amateurs and art students,

but its top end has been lopped. It could be rebuilt, but I don't see that happening. The town and newspaper are owned by the Moderns, and they only wish to promote the New World Order, and the lack of true art that implies. They have no wish to promote art of the old sort, since their people aren't capable of it. They only wish to promote light shows, electronic music, diddly robotics, and other tech as art, since that is what they can do.

As more proof Taos Fall Arts has been targeted, the committee hired old minor Modernist insider Carl Coker as judge, and he gave Best of Show to another old Modernist insider Jameson Wells.



This is especially galling because Taos Fall Arts was originally created to promote Taos Realism, not this horrible and pointless Modernism. I mean, who could possibly like that and why? Why would any judge pick it out for commendation, and on what grounds? We can only assume Coker and Wells are old friends, possibly from the same families, and that we are witnessing some sort of fix here. There is no other way to explain it. That choice should have caused a riot among the other artists, but of course they are all zombies. Like everyone else in Taos (and the world), they are only partially lucid. After having been squashed their entire lives, it never occurs to them to demand more of the world. It never occurs to them that their entry fee bought them an expectation of fairness in judging. Not that it really matters: the show offered *no* prize money, which in my experience is a first. Despite the fact that the show took \$25 from several hundred artists, had fifteen corporate sponsors, and is reporting 80 sales (of which they take 40%), the total prize money was \$0.

Actually, that isn't completely true. This year they created two Visionary Artist Awards, in the amount of \$1500 each. This year's first winner was gallery owner Rob Nightingale. You read that right. Nightingale is known locally not for his art, but as a gallery *owner*, who is supposed to be promoting his artists. And how was he chosen? We don't know. We aren't told how these winners were chosen, since there is no listed judge. The process was almost completely hidden. This is all we get:

The TFAF Board accepts nominations from Taos County galleries, businesses and board members. This year's nominees were selected from 15 nominations.

Hmmmm. That's a small hat of nominations. Since there are nine TFAF board members, that leaves only six outside nominations. And note that TFAF accepts nominations from *itself*. That's sort of strange right off the bat, isn't it? And how did they narrow that down from 15 nominations to two winners? No idea, but I assume the TFAF board just made the decision—which means it was *not an artistic decision*. An artistic decision would be made by an artist-judge, one chosen on the merit of his work. That isn't what happened here. Also note that Rob was nominated by galleries, and he owns a

gallery? Did he nominate himself? Regardless, it is very strange to see an award created by Taos Galleries, and they give the award to one of their own owners instead to a local artist.

The same can be said of Maye Torres, the other winner. She is from an old family of Taos gallery owners, and she also has strong ties to Modernism, being a student of Larry Bell (who I have mentioned before—he is on the cover of *Sgt. Pepper's*, exhibited the “Snot on Swede” piece in Dennis Hopper's show, and is a major spook). She recently opened a Modernist gallery, 107-B, on the Plaza to show experimental art. So, again, it is very strange to see prize money being given to people like this in the Taos Fall Arts Festival.

With a bit more research, I found that Judge Coker had been a guest lecturer at the Harwood Museum and had given several talks at the Taos Art Association. He is a retired professor from the University of Tulsa. That figures. All that simply stands as more proof that Taos has been targeted by the Moderns, since the Harwood is one of the main points of occupation. Coker isn't as obnoxious as Dennis Hopper and his buddies, but he is selling the same tepid Kool-Aid. I don't know why any real artist would be interested in hearing what he had to say about anything.

We can also see the targeting in the fact that local school children were bussed to previews of Paseo, and it has been sold heavily at all levels as something both cool and important. While no school children will be bussed to the Fall Arts Festival, and no one will be encouraged to paint in the old ways. In fact, they will be browbeaten if they so much as mention wanting to paint in a traditional style. They will be told that that is no longer what art is, as I was at that age.

Of course, this is happening all over the world, and has been for more than a century. It is probably happening in your home town. I have been screaming about it for more than thirty years, to little avail. I don't seem to have the allies to get anything done. The sad truth is that art has been killed on purpose, everybody knows that, but nobody cares. They are too overdressed to get off the couch and complain about anything, much less art.

I know that, since when I tried to cause an uprising here in 2009, all I heard was crickets. I wrote an explosive letter to the editor, demolishing Hopper and his bunch, but I got only one peep of support. Two of the oldest artists in town, a sweet ancient couple, phoned me with a word of support. But even they advised me to be more cautious and less noisy. Not the proper response, as you understand. We all need to be far more noisy. The only proper response to the billions spent on art propaganda is to force it back down their throats, telling them we don't want it. We want real art, not this New World Order promotion posing as art.

In conversation, I have been told by some locals that this is just an unavoidable outcome of a democratized art. It is not just ruling-class bozos that can't create real art, it is most people, and the new art is an art for the masses. It allows a far larger number of people to call themselves artists, which is important to them. That sounds great on the face of it, but it is just pathetic if you look at it harder. I have no problem with people wanting to be involved in the arts. If they knew their places, it would be great. But what has happened is that this “art for the masses or by the masses” or whatever you wish to call hasn't just coexisted with real art, it has displaced it. Or replaced it. To say it clearly, these people don't exist in the field *along with* those such as me. They exist in the field *instead of* those such as me. Especially when they are rich kids from the families, they benefit from promotion I can't possibly find, so they end up taking **the entire field**. But it is even more than that, as we have seen, since—in order to guarantee the success of his children—Daddy Warbucks destroys their competitors on purpose. In other words, the billionaires install their own sons and daughters as artists and then use the owned

media to destroy what was previously understood to be art.

You see that even here in a small-town art show, which was historically realist. The rich families couldn't leave it alone: they had to ride in and take it for themselves, awarding themselves the prize money. They drove the realists like me (and there are many others) out, by treating us like garbage and passing over us for prizes, then coopted the show for themselves. It doesn't matter to them that the show had to be brought down several notches to include them. It doesn't matter that the show now isn't worth viewing. It doesn't matter that there isn't one exceptional work of art in the entire exhibit. It doesn't matter that the current show brings a tear to the eye of anyone old enough to have seen the show thirty or forty years ago. They get the money and attention and that is all that matters to these people.

This is why Modernism didn't just co-exist with the old traditional art from the beginning. It totally displaced it. The markets were taken, almost *in toto*, leaving nothing but a few dregs for those such as me. The owned mainstream media was used for an entire century to badmouth the kind of art I do and promote the kind of art they do. So there was no level playing field. In fact, we weren't allowed on the field at all, after about 1916. We were just defined out of the game. And the game continues to this day, as we saw in 2009 when Hopper and his buddies pushed this project in Taos, saying the same old things: realism was uncool and out-of-date, done only by the ignorant and tasteless. These falsehoods continue to be the talking points in the media across the board, in all magazines, on TV, in the movies, and everywhere else. Everyone is promoting Modernism and no one has anything nice to say—or anything to say at all—about painting or sculpture of the old sort. Or, it was great for Raphael and Rembrandt and those old guys, but is not to be done by anyone living. Mysteriously and unaccountably, what was good for them is bad for us. That talent made them famous and continues to do so, and no problem. But that same talent now is not wanted. It is only cause for a clicking of tongues or an ostracism. Here in town, I often get the cold shoulder or a biting glance from someone I hardly know, and I always think to myself, “Ah, they must have read one of my papers.” Could be the Jewish thing, but it is just as often the art thing. I have been ostracized for my art since the 1990s, and I imagine it still makes me more enemies than the Jewish question, especially in a town like Taos. The heavy lesbian population tags me and all like me as regressive and sexist. They are allowed to like women, but I'm not.

So those who don't understand where I am coming from simply haven't considered the question in any detail. Or perhaps they just don't give a crap. Like the Moderns, they truly wish those such as me would go extinct as fast as possible, leaving the meek (and the promoted and the trashy and the vulgar) to inherit the Earth.

† If the space between galaxies was of that sort, light could never pass through it, and we couldn't see Andromeda, for instance. Entropy is really just the tendency of matter to move into free space, so it can never be upside-down. Decreasing entropy would imply matter moving from less dense spaces to more, so it would be a sort of gravity without gravity. Not only is intergalactic space not unentropic like that, it is the *least* unentropic space there is. Because it is the least gravitational, it is also the least unentropic.

‡ CSI, formerly CSICOP, which is curiously close to PSYOP.

¹ You will tell me Stephenson was born Stanger, but that is an obvious cover story. Note how close that fake name is to “stranger”. I think Stephenson was really Stevenson, and that he was the same as his own author William Stevenson.