

# THE UNABOMBER WAS ANOTHER PSY-OP



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published September 13, 2014*

*As usual, this is all opinion, protected as free speech under the US Constitution.*

Yes, I too bought this one for years. Until now, even. But my recent discoveries caused me to return to this event for a fresh look. And Oh! how transparent it now seems.

I bought it because, like you, I didn't analyze it closely for sense. I assumed it was what it was sold as without really questioning it. If I thought about the event at all, it was to ask why he did it, how an intellectual could murder in such a senseless manner, how his manifesto fit into his profile, and all the other things they lead you into. They set these questions up for you so that you don't ask the fundamental question: did it happen at all? So let us just waltz down the [Wikipedia page](#) for Ted Kaczynski and watch the red flags pop up. We can share our embarrassment as we realize how blind we have been. Sentence two is this:

He is known for his wide-ranging social critiques, which opposed industrialism and modern technology and advanced a nature-centered form of anarchism.

Just as they did with Ezra Pound, Charles Manson, and many others, they have created an Anti here. In [my paper on Hemingway and the Paris Salon](#), I defined an Anti as a disguised agent who espouses theories, ideas or politics that the government wishes to discredit. Ezra Pound was the example in that paper. He was instructed to attack Jews, the US military, banks, and so on. He was then “proved” to

be a madman and sentenced to a mental institution. The lesson? Those who speak out against Jews, the military or banks are madmen. Manson was another Anti, posing then as a hippie and still posing today as an environmentalist. Once he was locked away as a madman and murderer, the audience learned the lesson that those who are hippies and environmentalists are madmen, and may be murderers.

And we see the same here with Kaczynski. Remember, he published a long, mostly cogent critique of Western civilization and especially US corporatism. And [just as Manson and Lynette \(Squeaky\) Fromme still do](#), Kaczynski recommended environmentalism. Manson, Fromme, and Sandra Good are said to be proponents of ATWA: *Air, Trees, Water, Animals*. Could you imagine a better way to blackwash the environmental movement? Or a more transparent way?

One of the government's main targets in the Unabomber event was EarthFirst!, a “radical” environmental group that actually wanted to save the environment instead of just talk about it. EarthFirst! was making some headway in the late 80s, early 90s, which is why they were linked to the Unabomber. The FBI had been harassing EarthFirst! for years, including the car bombing and libeling of Judi Bari and Darryl Cherney in 1990. Bari and Cherney won a \$4.4 million judgment against the FBI and Oakland Police in 2002 for First Amendment violations. On March 21, 2011, a U.S. federal judge in California ordered the FBI to preserve evidence related to the car bombing. The FBI was planning to destroy all evidence in the case. Although EarthFirst! is still around, they were seriously hurt by the Unabomber manifesto and Kaczynski's trial, where he quoted from the EarthFirst! journal.

Kaczynski graduated from Harvard, which beats even Columbia as spook central. You will say, “Oh, don't start with that! Lots of normal people go to Harvard.” Yes, I assume they do, but Kaczynski wasn't one of the “normal” people, and they admit that. They admit he was enrolled in a CIA program at Harvard called MKULTRA, one of the spookiest things ever. So Harvard definitely counts as a red flag here.

After getting a PhD at the University of Michigan, Ted was hired by the University of California at Berkeley as an assistant professor in 1967. Berkeley is also a big spook lab. Most people don't know all the nuclear facilities are run out of Berkeley, including Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore. In addition, both Berkeley and Stanford were tied to spook programs in the 1960s, including the drug pushing we saw in my papers on the [faked Tate murders](#) and the [faked Zodiac murders](#). Both Stanford and Berkeley were involved in MKULTRA, for instance, as well as COINTELPRO and CHAOS. In fact, the Unabomber event was just a continuation of CHAOS, which was supposed to have ended in 1970. How do I know? Because—as you will see—it was clearly created “**to expose, disrupt, misdirect, discredit, or otherwise neutralize**” any and all leftist groups, including hippies, anti-war protesters, and environmentalists. Real environmentalists were and still are considered dangerous leftists—since they threaten the profit margins of large parts of corporate America.

That date is also a big clue. 1967 was when the Feds were infiltrating Haight-Ashbury (and many other “liberal” centers) in force. For instance, that is when Roger Smith and David Smith opened their fake clinic there, gathering around them all the actors that would be the Manson family players.

It is also when the Tussman Experimental College was in full swing at Berkeley. This was actually an Intelligence project at Berkeley from 1965 to 1969, run by Joseph Tussman. Tussman served in army intelligence in the 1940s, and this is admitted by the mainstream. I assume Tussman was still serving in Intelligence in the 1960s. One of those who came in on the ground level of this experiment was Terence McKenna, who was recruited for the Tussman Experimental College in its first year, 1965. He was still there in 1967 when Kaczynski arrived at Berkeley. You may know that McKenna later

became a new-age guru and LSD pusher, in the mold of Tim Leary or Ram Dass. You may also be interested to know that McKenna later *admitted* he was an Intelligence asset. Last year (2013), [Gnostic Media uncovered and published audio of a December 1994 lecture](#) by McKenna at Esalen. Here is what he said,

And certainly when I reached La Chorerra in 1971 I had a price on my head by the FBI, I was running out of money, I was at the end of my rope. And then they recruited me and said, “you know, with a mouth like yours there’s a place for you in our organization”. And I’ve worked in deep background positions about which the less said the better. And then about 15 years ago they shifted me into public relations and I’ve been there to the present.

Good to know. But McKenna is still hedging there, since we can put his recruitment back to 1965. Being under Tussman means he was already a recruit then.<sup>[OBJ]</sup>

We also have a clue in that both Berkeley and Stanford are part of the greater San Francisco or Bay Area. Stanford is famous for its MKULTRA program, since it is admitted that Gordon Lish, Ken Kesey, Robert Hunter and several other high-profile people “volunteered” there in the early 1960s. But it is admitted that Kaczynski was also a volunteer or recruit of MKULTRA at Harvard. Curiously, that fact is scrubbed from Ted's Wikipedia page, but it is admitted that he took part in Henry Murray's tests from 1959 to 1962, and on Murray's page we are told the tests were sponsored by the CIA, under its MKULTRA program.

From the fall of 1959 through the spring of 1962, Murray was responsible for the ethically questionable, CIA-sponsored MK ULTRA experiments in which twenty-two undergraduates were used as guinea pigs.

So is it a just a coincidence that Kaczynski seems to have traveled from one MKULTRA center (Cambridge) to another (Bay Area)? Actually, he traveled between *three* MKULTRA centers, since the University of Michigan has also been tied to CIA Bluebird and Monarch programs. [According to a Feb. 5, 1975, CIA document](#) entitled “Behavior Drugs, and Testing”, the University of Michigan was involved in early stages of Project Bluebird, which is similar to MKULTRA in its uses of drugs for brainwashing or mind control.

In searching the terms “Berkeley MKULTRA”, I also stumbled across this quote from the book [Acid Dreams](#) (p. 173)\*:

It was a typical sixties scene: a group of scruffy, long-haired students stood in a circle passing joints and hash pipes. The setting could have been Berkeley, Ann Arbor or any other hip campus. But these students were actually FBI agents, and the school they attended was known as “Hoover University.” Located at Quantico Marine Base in Virginia, this elite academy specialized in training G-men to penetrate left- wing organizations. To cultivate the proper counterculture image, they were told not to wash or bathe for several days before infiltrating a group of radicals. Refresher courses were also held for FBI agents who had successfully immersed themselves in the drug culture of their respective locales.

That is useful not only for this paper, but for my [Tate/Manson paper](#), where we saw Sharon Tate's father Paul—a colonel in army intelligence—dressed as a hippie in Los Angeles in 1969. But do we have any evidence this “Hoover University” is true? Lots, actually. These authors didn't make it up. It comes from Congressional testimony in the 1970s, especially from testimony in the Church Committee hearings and the Rockefeller Commission of 1975. Even the *New York Times* admitted these things were true, and that “in 1973 the CIA destroyed 152 files documenting LSD testing to prevent public

knowledge of illegality.” That's straight from the Wikipedia page on “*Acid Dreams*.”

There is also something else curious in that quote from *Acid Dreams*. Notice that we are told that this setting “could have been at Berkeley, Ann Arbor or any other hip campus”. What college is in Ann Arbor? That's right, University of Michigan. Strange that Ann Arbor should have been used as the example here by the authors, right next to Berkeley. Do you normally think of Ann Arbor and Berkeley in the same thought? I don't. Or, I didn't until now.

But let's return to Kaczynski's CIA initiation at Harvard in 1959. The mainstream tells us,

In the experiment each student received a code name. Kaczynski was given the code name "Lawful". Among other purposes, Murray's experiments were focused on measuring people's reactions under extreme stress. The unwitting undergraduates were submitted to what Murray himself called "vehement, sweeping and personally abusive" attacks. Assaults to their egos, cherished ideas and beliefs were the tools used to cause high levels of stress and distress.

Hmmm. That doesn't sound so extraordinary, now that we know what was going on. Sounds a lot like bootcamp, or normal CIA initiation. This is how they test normal recruits. That codename is also curious. You wouldn't need to give codenames to “unwitting” volunteers, would you? Wouldn't your stupid volunteers become *witting* once you started giving them CIA codenames? Don't you think these Harvard geniuses might have caught on they weren't just testing cherry lifesavers and gumdrops when they were given codenames and forced to sign secrecy documents?

I red-flagged the name Murray there. Why? Because this Henry Alexander Murray is from the peerage Murrays. [He is listed at thepeerage.com](#). I have shown these Murrays are the same as the Stanleys, and they link us to the very top of the peerage, including all the dukes and kings. His mother was of the New York Babcocks, and his father's mother was a Poitiers, linking us to Sidney Poitier. More importantly, these Murrays go straight back to Airth, Scotland, where they were the Earls of Dunmore. They didn't come to the US until about 1880. The 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Dunmore died in 1809, and his wife was Charlotte Stewart, daughter of the Earl of Galloway. This links us directly to the Keiths, Drummonds, Montgomeries, Cochranes, Hamiltons, Herberts, Cokes, Campbells, and so on. Henry Murray's close cousin was the 7<sup>th</sup> Earl of Dunmore, Charles Adolphus Murray. The 4<sup>th</sup> Earl had been the Governor of New York, Virginia, and the Bahamas. These Murrays are also the Dukes of Atholl.

Henry Murray joined the Harvard Psychological Clinic as assistant director at age 33. During the second World War he joined OSS as a **Lieutenant Colonel**. So he is an admitted spook.

**In 1943 Murray helped complete *Analysis of the Personality of Adolph Hitler*, commissioned by OSS boss M. Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan. The report was done in collaboration with psychoanalyst Walter C. Langer, Dr. Ernst Kris, New School for Social Research, and Dr. Bertram D. Lewin, New York Psychoanalytic Institute.**

How many red flags just piled up there? So Murray helped create the fake persona of this [Austrian actor](#) which was then fed to the American people. Amusingly, Murray admitted in his profile that Hitler was gay. That had to later be rewritten or played down. Murray did *not* admit he (Hitler) was a Jewish actor. Murray also did not admit that he (Murray) was a gay Jewish actor.

Murray also supervised Timothy Leary, and was responsible for his rise in 1960.

Before we go any further, I want to pause and be sure you understand my thesis. Some have said that Kaczynski was a patsy, or that he was mind-controlled. No. He was a CIA actor. All these connections to MKULTRA aren't indication of brainwashing, they are indication Ted was an operative, all the way back to 1959. He was recruited at Harvard, just as Terence McKenna was recruited at Berkeley. These weren't brainwashing programs, they were CIA recruitment programs. The people in them weren't volunteers or guinea pigs, they were just raw CIA recruits being put through their early paces.

Then the story skips ahead to 1969. Ted resigns his teaching position at Berkeley after only two years, and by 1971 he is already in his Montana cabin, being a recluse. Since this was an isolated cabin, we have and can have no evidence he was there all the time he was said to be there. All we have is verbal testimony of Ted, his brother, and some federal agents. As supposed evidence, we are given the actual cabin, which they now exhibit at the Newseum in D. C.



But that isn't evidence of anything. It is just a pile of wood. They could have dragged that in from anywhere. Actually, it *is* evidence of a psy-op, since you should find it very strange to find an alleged serial killer's cabin in a D. C. museum. The entire Newseum is obviously a museum of propaganda. It was opened in 1997, while the Unabomber trial was still going on, and looks to have been built just to promote the continuation of the Unabomber story (and others). For instance, one of the other top exhibits at the Newseum is its 911 Gallery sponsored by Comcast. “Sponsored by Comcast”? You have to laugh. Not only is corporate sponsorship at a museum a big red flag, but the Comcast name is, too. Comcast is just another of many CIA fronts, and it has long been mining data for the government. Just check out [this 2006 article](#) with the title “Comcast uses technology from CIA-backed CallMiner to mine data from every recorded customer service call in its Midwest call center.”

But it isn't just Comcast. The entire Newseum is corporate-sponsored, and was founded by Al Neuharth, the man behind *USA Today*. Like Comcast, *USA Today* is CIA-sponsored. All the newspapers and magazines now are, but *USA Today* was created from whole cloth by Intelligence. The other major newspapers controlled by the CIA—like the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*—were once semi-independent. They were engulfed slowly over more than a century. But *USA Today* didn't arrive until 1982, many years after Intelligence had completely swallowed the media. So it could be built from the ground up to deliver propaganda in the most efficient manner.

I encourage you to study the list of rooms and exhibits at the Newseum. The Atrium is dedicated to the enshrinement of the Ochs-Sulzberger family, who used to control the *New York Times* before the CIA swallowed them whole. We get the Bloomberg Gallery, named for you-know-who, and it includes a shrine to CIA-operative Edward R. Murrow. Although it isn't mentioned in his Newseum bio, they admit Murrow came out of army intelligence and OSS, and that he was glad to act the mouthpiece of Intelligence. In the photography rooms, we get lots of prize-winning staged photographs, including

dying babies at the Oklahoma City bombing.

Then we have the Cox Enterprises First Amendment Gallery: 45 Words of Freedom. “This gallery explores the role that the First Amendment’s guarantee of rights (religion, speech, press, assembly and petition) has played in the United States over the past 200 years. ‘Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press,’ said Thomas Jefferson, ‘and that cannot be limited without being lost.’” Who is the corporate sponsor of that room? Monsanto? Blackwater? Exxon-Mobil? “The US Constitution, brought to you by our corporate sponsor, Halliburton!”

Finally, we get the Bancroft Family Ethics Center, where you can debate journalistic dilemmas. We aren’t told if you can debate the topic of whether or not it is a good idea to have fascist ownership of a “freedom of the press” museum.

Who goes to Washington D. C. and pays \$22 to visit a propaganda museum? Anyone? Here’s an easy assignment for some young truther. Go sit across the street from the Newseum and count the number of actual tourists who go in each day. I would be willing to bet that the attendance numbers are faked by a large margin.

[**Added December 31, 2019:** apparently I was right, since the Newseum just closed today from bankruptcy. It is admitted it always had very poor attendance.]

But back to Ted. We are told the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* agreed to publish his 35,000 word manifesto in order to avoid more bloodshed, but no one should have believed that. They clearly published it as part of the psy-op. It was one of the most important facets of the event. It was their best opportunity to blackwash leftists since the Manson/Tate event.

Pause to notice that although you are told on a daily basis that the media is “liberal” (by Rush Limbaugh and ten thousand other embedded agents), one of the main jobs of the media is blackwashing real leftists. The media isn’t liberal, it is run by the government, which—by definition—makes it fascist.

But let’s look at the manifesto. First of all, they lie about the length, telling you that word count comes out to “50-plus pages”. Yes, *plus* a lot. A book page is normally about 250 words, so that comes out to 140 pages, not 50. They are just counting on your inability or disinclination to do math. How many have not been too lazy to pull out their cellphone and use the calculator function to do that division?

Although the manifesto is mostly cogent (by today’s standards), it does have very large signs of telling on itself. They are trying to blackwash leftists here, so Ted should stick to being a leftist: his conviction as a crazed murderer will be the true blackwash. But the real author can’t resist the urge to slander leftists even while he is supposed to be one. And so we see the author spending many pages explaining to you how leftists are oversocialized and suffer from inferiority. That’s curious, wouldn’t you say? Most leftists I know attack those on the right, not themselves. That is why they are considered leftists or progressives. But the author can’t keep his proper hat on. He keeps reverting to his true opinions. You have to read the manifesto closely, but it is clearly the work of a rightist pretending to be leftist, and constantly backsliding into his true nature. I encourage you to reread the manifesto with that idea in mind.

For instance, Ted refers to Eric Hoffer’s book *True Believer*, which no true leftist would be reading. It is often sold as an academic study of mass movements, but it is actually a transparent and shallow

blueprint for fascism. Any real progressive intellectual in 1995 would have found much better books to reference than *True Believer*. But the CIA has been promoting the book from the beginning, since it was probably written by one of their own. As evidence for that, we only have to notice that Hoffer endowed an essay prize at UC Berkeley in 1970, a year after Ted left the University. 1967 is also an important year in Hoffer's bio, since we are told he left the docks of San Francisco that year to retire from public life. Remember, that is when Ted arrived in San Francisco.

We are supposed to believe Hoffer was working as a longshoreman on the Embarcadero from 1945 to 1967? Sure he was. That's what all best-selling intellectuals did at the time, right? *True Believer* was published in 1951, which was during the quick rise of the CIA. From 1947 to 1952, CIA began its full-court takeover of the press, engulfing the literary magazines and the publishing houses as well as the major newspapers. It placed its people everywhere, as we have seen [in my papers on the Beats](#) and [the Paris Salon](#). Many of them posed as leftists but were actually fascists. The fact that Hoffer was in San Francisco, came from nowhere with a bio that made no sense, and had no qualifications to be doing what he was doing, indicates he was another placement of Intelligence.

Hoffer continued to write typical CIA propaganda to the end. See his 1968 *Los Angeles Times* article on Israel's Six Day War, where he argues that throwing all the local Arabs out of land they had legally occupied was fine, since Russia, Poland, Turkey and Czechoslovakia had done worse, throwing out millions of people, and “no one said anything about refugees.” Really? No one said anything? All those things were historical non-events, and no one among those millions made a peep? I didn't know that.

Also amusing is that all of Hoffer's papers, including the notebooks he carried in his pockets, were acquired by the Hoover Institution. Hah. Is that anything to do with Hoover University, where they trained fake hippies? No, that was named after J. Edgar, we assume. This Hoover Institution was named after President Herbert. But the Hoover Institution is nearly as transparent and ridiculous as Hoover University. It is on the grounds of Stanford University, but has its own board of overseers. We suppose that means it is run by the Feds as a little castle of conquest. If the locals get uppity, I guess the grounds of the Hoover Institution is where they will copter in the troops. Laugh if you must, but we have evidence of just that. Hoover Institution Fellows include Edwin Meese, Condoleezza Rice, George Schultz, and former commander of US Central Command and four-star general John Abizaid. I am sure we all sleep better at night knowing the Pentagon has a beachhead at Stanford University. So re-assuring to know the military and State Department have taken hostages at all institutes of higher learning, just in case things get ugly.

The Institution's “mission statement outlines its basic tenets: representative government, private enterprise, peace, personal freedom, and the safeguards of the American system”.

The Institution is housed in three buildings on the Stanford campus. The most prominent facility is the landmark Hoover Tower, which is a popular visitor attraction. The tower features an observation deck on the top level that provides visitors with a panoramic view of the Stanford campus and surrounding area.

Again, good to know that the Feds control the tallest building on campus. If any real instance of “representative government, private enterprise, peace, or personal freedom” breaks out in the area, snipers on the observation deck can suppress it before it threatens the safeguards of the American system.

But back to Kaczynski. One of the funniest things he says in his manifesto is this:

In spite of all its technical advances relating to human behavior the system to date has not been impressively successful in controlling human beings.

You have to be kidding me! That is the *one* thing the US system has been most successful at, precisely because it has spent so much time and energy on it. The US system perfected this control far beyond anything the Nazis, Russians, or Chinese ever imagined. What is the sign of perfect propaganda? Its invisibility! The American system of propaganda, though not terribly subtle in hindsight, was infinitely subtle compared to Nazi or Russian propaganda. It has been so successful it has required very little violent coercion. The staging has fooled almost everyone, and most Americans over the past 60 years have actually believed they were living in a free, democratic, and fair society. Only since 911 have the lights begin to flicker, the audience becoming suspicious of the Great Oz behind the curtain. Before that, the audience was drinking in the show with ever greater abandon. Oh! how some would like to return to the 1990s, and Oh! how some are trying to achieve just that trick. But as long as DHS is around, it will never happen. DHS has no knack for remaining invisible, since they enjoy the *visible* jackboot above all else.

Without 911 and all the ridiculous failed psy-ops since then, I would never have looked twice at the Unabomber or anything else, and neither would anyone else. I (probably) would have remained in my 1990s intellectual cocoon, right where they wanted me, and so would you.

After Kaczynski misdirects you on your levels of past control, he then recommends a sharp *increase* in the future:

If the system succeeds in acquiring sufficient control over human behavior quickly enough, it will probably survive. Otherwise it will break down.

This from the leftist Kaczynski. Leftists always demand total top-down control, right?

In this way, the manifesto was an epic fail on the part of Intelligence. The guys at Langley who wrote it didn't stick to the script. They actually *want* the audience to beg for more control, but putting the words in the mouth of Kaczynski can only confuse the audience. Remember, Kaczynski is being created as an Anti, so he supposed to be mouthing ideas the government wishes to blackwash, like environmentalism, autonomy, self-reliance, the Constitution, and so on. They *don't* want to blackwash control over human behavior. They want to whitewash that.

This is why the manifesto reads like it was written by a committee—a committee who refused to all show up on the same days and who forgot to hire a final reader for continuity. Some on the committee are following the script, having Ted says progressive things that need to be blackwashed. But others on the committee aren't so clear on the concept. They simply wish to directly sell the neocon agenda one more time in the *New York Times*. When are they going to get the chance for 35,000 words there again? So they just put their far-right ideas directly into the mouth of the Unabomber, forgetting he is the Unabomber. I guess they hoped the audience would selectively blackwash the environmental stuff and gulp down this control stuff.

This analysis matches what is admitted by the mainstream to this day: many (most) experts consulted by the FBI said that the manifesto was not written by Kaczynski. This is why they had to plant a copy of the manifesto in Kaczynski's cabin when they raided it. If you tell me there is no evidence they did that, I tell you there is no evidence they did *not* do that. See below for improprieties in collecting



evidence.

Fortunately for them, almost no one had the stamina to read 35,000 words of anything. They were too busy reading about Madonna and Mel Gibson and watching season 6 of the Simpsons. Like Homer and his “Bacon, goood!” these dutiful citizens just got the main message: “Unabomber, baaaad!” You can't successfully blackwash any idea in the mainstream media anymore, because that would require the audience being able to have two ideas in their heads at once, and being able to link them. As in “Unabomber—environmentalism. Unabomber bad, environmentalism bad.” Most Americans were already on too many pharmaceuticals by 1995 to achieve that syllogism. They only got this far in: “Unabomber—environmentalism. Unabomber baaaad, uh, doh, where was I? Oh yeah, mmmm, bacon!”

Red flags are also thrown up by the Unabomber's alleged victims. We are told one of them, Thomas Mosser, was an executive at Burson-Marsteller, but he wasn't. For some reason the story has changed since 1994. According to the [\*New York Times\* \(Dec. 12, 1994\)](#), Mosser had just been promoted the week before to general manager of Young and Rubicam. He was also still its executive vice-president. Young and Rubicam owned Burson-Marsteller, but Mosser no longer worked in that subsidiary. Why has that information been changed or scrubbed? It is wrong both on Kaczynski's page and on Burson-Marsteller's page, and it doesn't appear on Young and Rubicam's page *at all*. And guess what we get from another *NYT* article dated the next day?

“His Navy background was written all over him,” Mr. O'Dwyer said, referring to Mr. Mosser's four years of service as a Naval officer during the Vietnam War.

Red flag. I wonder if ONI\*\* was written all over him, too. At the end of the same article, the *NYTimes* quotes two people on Mosser's death, Anthony Cardinale and John Hanchette. Were these close friends of Mosser? No, they didn't even know him. We are told they went to St. Bonaventure University with him, but they weren't even in the same class. Curiously, both Cardinale and Hanchette are top journalists, Cardinale with the *Buffalo News* and Hanchette with Gannett News Service. Why is the *New York Times* interviewing other journalists for this obit and memorial? They also quoted Jack O'Dwyer, as you just saw, who published the New York advertising directory. What? That's like you dying and the local newspaper going to the publisher of the phonebook for a quote about your death. Very weird.

Even weirder is that Mosser is said to have worked as a newsman at the Philadelphia Bureau of the Associated Press. His degree was in journalism, not advertising. Since according to these mainstream accounts he graduated in 1965, was in the navy for four years, and was in advertising for 25 years, dying in 1994, that doesn't leave much time for the stint with the Associated Press. *Do the math*. I guess we are supposed to believe he was with the Associated Press for only a few months in 1965, between graduation and the navy.

A lot of information on Thomas Mosser appears to have been scrubbed, but his death is not listed in the Social Security Death Index. And curiously, PeopleFinders tells us there is a Thomas J. Mosser, related to Susan Reilly Fedyck (his wife), living right now in West Palm Beach, Florida. I don't remember that location coming up in his bio. All his other residences were in New York, New Jersey, or North Carolina. Even his few months with the Associated Press were said to have been in Pennsylvania. Given what we already know, we can guess Mosser's death was faked, and they simply relocated him.

More indication of this is provided by the fact that Burson-Marsteller is known to be *the* top propaganda firm in the US, working closely with government, military, and Intelligence. Top clients of Burson-Marsteller include Monsanto, Phillip Morris, and Union Carbide. They ran PR for the Indonesian government during the genocide in East Timor. They also worked with the junta in Argentina in the 1970s, whitewashing its brutal image. What are the odds that Mosser would work for such a firm and also be involved in the Unabomber psy-op? They just assume you don't know what Burson-Marsteller really does, since they don't advertise it on their own website or at places like Wikipedia.

Next let's look at David Gelernter, is who supposed to have been injured by a Ted-bomb in 1993. The first red-flag we find is his interest in “what he sees as the destructive influence of liberal academia on American society.” Strange that Gelernter is saying the same thing Kaczynski was saying in his manifesto. If Kaczynski hated Gelernter enough to send him a pipebomb, why are they both selling the same kool-aid? A post-Unabomber book Gelernter published on the subject is called *America-Lite: How Imperial Academia Dismantled Our Culture (and Ushered in the Obamacrats)*. Charming title. I bet Ted loves it. For the record, I don't like Obama, either, but I can see that Obama was not ushered in by liberal academia. He was ushered in by Goldman Sachs and all the other usual suspects, who are fascists, not liberals. Obama, like Gelernter, is another Intelligence creation.

We are told that Gelernter lost the use of his right hand and that his right eye was permanently damaged. And yet on Wikipedia, we are given a picture of him:



Do you see any damage to his right eye? Here's a high-res picture:



Again, do you see any damage to his right eye? Does this look like the face of a man who had a bomb blow up in his face? I don't see any scarring at all, much less permanent damage to the right eye. I have seen permanent eye damage, and it is visible. The eye is very delicate, and permanent damage shows.

As for his hand damage, he wears a black glove in public, but that doesn't mean anything. Anyone can wear a black glove. [In this video](#) [minute :56], we see him holding a microphone with his gloved hand, so apparently he has not lost all use of that hand. And besides, he could have had some congenital damage to that hand, or other damage from before the event, damage which they simply used for the faked bombing. We know from his books and interviews that he misdirects about everything all the time. That is his job. So why would one more misdirection make any difference?

Gelernter's various claims to fame are all smoke. His book *Mirror Worlds* led to the company Mirror Worlds, which created a product that did nothing and that no one bought. They tried to salvage something from this fake technology by suing Apple for copyright infringement, but lost. It is said that Gelernter prophesied the rise of the web, but it didn't take much prophecy to predict that in 1991, especially when you were working for the CIA. In 1991, Microsoft had already launched Microsoft Office and Windows 3.0. Strangely, Gelernter's book *Mirror Worlds* has no page on Wikipedia, though it has links. All links for the book go straight to the company Mirror Worlds, which does not discuss the content of the book. This will not surprise you after you have read the book, since it lacks all real content and is extremely poorly written. Although the book has been out since 1991, it has only 6 reviews at Amazon.com. Here is one of them:

Usually, I value the writing of scientists for the clarity, reason and sometimes poetry found. But this is just awful. It almost seems like one of those self-help books with BIG letters and about two paragraphs per page. The idea is that we can create "mirror worlds", identical but virtual representations of any entity - social, geographical, testable

- that we desire. At first this sounds exciting but as he explained it, I slowly got the idea that it was nothing more than (pardon the pun) "smoke and mirrors". I just could not understand the ultimate use of such a structure except perhaps for traffic control or future predictions of population trends or growth.

So ask yourself this: if you are Ted, with an IQ of 170 or whatever, would you choose this schmuck to send a bomb to? Gelernter was only 38 and had done nothing of importance. His book had no content and wasn't selling. Are you telling me the genius Ted couldn't find a better target than that? If Ted wanted to target computer people, there were much better targets in 1993, targets much nearer him than Gelernter at Yale. Remember, Ted was supposed to be in Montana, and just a skinny state over was Washington, where existed a city called Seattle, where existed a little company called Microsoft. Ted could take his pick of executives over there. But we are supposed to believe Ted didn't know anything in 1993 about Redmond or Bill Gates or any of those people over there? Instead, he was mailing bombs to nobody professors and attacking computer store owners in Sacramento and Salt Lake City? C'mon, computer store owners? Talk about targeting the bottom of the food chain.

Clearly, Gelernter was chosen by Intelligence because he was handy. He was a low-level operative eager for more attention, he had an existing cubicle at Langley, and he was willing to play the part. And he may have already had a withered hand. I peg him as another actor here.

[**Addendum October 30, 2017:** in a more recent paper on Jack Ruby, I learned more about the surname Gelernter. That family is closely related to Rubinsteins, Oppenheims, Schiffs, Herzes and Rappaports. This means David Gelernter is probably related to Jack Ruby, Helena Rubinstein, the Schiff bankers, and on and on. This helps us understand why he was chosen for the Unabomber project.]

Then we have Percy Wood, supposedly burned by a Ted-bomb in 1980. We are told Wood was President of United Airlines, which is interesting because [Edward Carlson](#) was also President and Chairman of the Board of United Airlines in 1980. They try to hide that on the current Wikipedia page by giving you no information on Carlson in that period in the body text. The information is there, but it is hiding on the sidebar, where instead of United Airlines, it says UAL.

president, UAL 1971–  
Chm. of board, United Airlines 1979-90

See what they did there? They just failed to include the final date on presidency, but since he was COB until 1990, we may assume he was still president until 1990 as well. There would be no logical reason for him to remain as chairman while giving up the presidency. Percy Wood is another ghost. If you don't believe me, type in Percy Wood at Wikipedia. Edward Carlson has a page there, so this other president of United Airlines should have a page there, too, right? Nope. He exists only on Ted's page.

I will be told that UAL and United Airlines were separate entities, with UAL as the parent company. Yes, UAL was the parent company, but they were not separate entities. The officers of UAL ran the airline, and there were not separate presidents. It is difficult to find online proof of that from 1980 to show you to, but I found [this NYT](#) article about Richard Ferris that may do the job for you. It says he was CEO of UAL until 1987, and that "he ran the airline". For current proof, you can also consult the bio of present head of United Jeff Smisik, who is CEO of *both* UCH (formerly UAL) and United Airlines. We are told he is CEO, President, and Chairman of both, confirming what I just told you.

Now let us return to Ted's pathetic little cabin, stripped and sitting in the Newseum in Washington DC.

The way it got there is rife with red flags. According to the local press in Montana in 1996, the warrant for search of the cabin was improperly executed, with no involvement of the local sheriff. “Truckloads” of evidence were supposedly removed from the cabin, but no one was there to witness that but the Feds. Although the FBI reported all sorts of bomb-making equipment, Ted's neighbor Gene Youderian was quoted in the *NYT* [April, 1996] to the effect that wasn't true. He claimed to have seen nothing out of the ordinary in the tiny one-room cabin, where nothing could be hidden. To prevent any other outside witnesses, the Feds secretly trucked the cabin away in the middle of the night just one month later.


All this was strictly against the evidentiary rules, and should have compromised the prosecution. All that evidence should have been thrown out of court as compromised. But Ted's appointed attorneys never made a peep. As in the Manson trial, there was no defense. Ted didn't have a defense attorney, he had two prosecuting attorneys, one at the table across from him and one at his own table. The Montana *Missoulian* admitted in April of 1997 that Ted's attorney Donahoe was subsidized by federal grant monies, so basically the Feds were both prosecuting and defending Ted. In one motion to the court, Donahoe stated that evidence from the cabin was “highly incriminating.” With such a savvy defense, the FBI didn't even need a prosecutor.

The sequence of events from capture to trial is very suspicious, and follows the Osama bin Laden script five years later. Remember how they knew it was bin Laden within hours of the 911 attacks, despite the fact that there had been no investigation and despite the fact that Condeleezza Rice and George Bush later said they had no prior warning that anything like this might happen? We see the same thing with Ted, where they knew he was guilty from day one, that he worked alone, that that he fit the profile perfectly, and so on. As usual, the press tried and convicted him based on FBI hearsay, publishing long gushing stories within days of the capture that assumed his guilt. *Newsweek* led the way, pulling a cover story out of their hat only a week or so after the arrest. The story reads like it was written by the FBI, and probably was. A movie was also produced almost overnight. *Unabomber: The True Story* was released only a few months after Ted's arrest, long before the trial had reached any conclusion in 1998. So how did they know “the true story” before the evidence had been decided in court? Where did the filmmakers get their information? The FBI must have been feeding them information, right? Wouldn't that be proof of my assertion that the FBI/CIA control Hollywood?

Want to see something else strange? Go to IMDB and look when *Unabomber: The True Story* was released. September 11, 1996. Five years to the day before 911. Cue *Twilight Zone* music.

While that music is crescendoing, let us look at the alias Ted is said to have used in the Mosser case, “H. C. Wickel.” How can we decode that? I bow to [Michael Hoffman](#) on this one, since he has made an important connection between the Mosser event and an event three days later (December 13) in Salix, Iowa. What happened there was similar to what happened in West, Texas on April 17, 2013: a huge explosion at a fertilizer facility. But Hoffman failed to read the main clue: Salix means “willow.” Had he seen this, he could have tied it to his other nice discovery: the Son of Sam killer used a similar alias, “Wicked King Wicker.” And in Maury Terry's book *Ultimate Evil*, we are told a German shepherd was shot on Christmas Eve, 1976, on Wicker Street. All this might have gotten Hoffman on the right path. Instead he jumps the shark and wanders off into a bogus connection between “serial” and “cereal”, which is highly embarrassing. It is so ridiculous we have to ask if he is misdirecting on purpose. However you may feel about that, we can ignore that dead-end and try a different path. It is clear the similarity of the aliases of the Unabomber and Son of Sam are not an accident. Nor are they indication of some “bending of reality” by primal forces, as Hoffman would have you believe. They are yet another “we are here” message from the spooks, who like to see if you can follow their clues.

Can you?



If you can't, I will help you. Start by looking up Gerald Gardner. Gardner was a British Secret Service spook like Aleister Crowley. They tell you Gardner was a civil servant, but the Secret Service is a type of civil service, so they aren't exactly lying, just hedging. While Crowley hid behind “magick”, Gardner hid behind the Wiccan movement, which he founded in 1954. I showed you in my Tate/Manson paper that the Intelligence communities love to hide behind Satanism and magick and the occult. I suggested you ignore these feints as purposeful dead-ends. Satanism works as perfect cover for Intelligence, since most researchers love to be diverted into it: it is much sexier than the truth.

Not only was Gardner the high-priest of the Wiccans, he was from a family in the timber or lumber business. Joseph Gardner and Sons was the oldest private company in the timber trade in the British Empire at the time of Gerald's birth in 1884. They specialized in importing hardwood from America and the Far East. So you can already see where the willow and wood terms are coming in. This also explains why the Unabomber put twigs on his packages.

Since Gardner was British and died in 1964, you may wonder why we see these references in US events in 1979 and 1996. Two main reasons: one, British and US Intelligence have long been linked; two, US Intelligence, like British Intelligence, has long had a wing that specialized in using the occult as misdirection. But since the British wing had a headstart in this, US Intelligence often borrows terms and feints from the top British spooks like Crowley and Gardner. The US later developed some of their own spook-spooks like Anton Lavey, but these guys were just offshoots of the older British guys like Crowley and Gardner.

As further indication of this, we find that England repealed the 1736 Witchcraft Act in 1951. Why would they do that? You will say it is because the Act had been in mothballs for centuries, but that isn't true. There were two convictions under the Act in 1944 and another witch was threatened with prosecution in 1950. They tell you that spiritualists pushed for repeal, but the real reason the Act was repealed was to allow Intelligence to expand its faux-occult events without fear of interference from Parliament or Scotland Yard. This is precisely the time that US and British Intelligence were expanding enormously, and Gardner used the repeal to immediately found covens and publish books promoting witchcraft. His first book, *High Magic's Aid*, came out in 1949, so it actually preceded the

repeal of the Witchcraft Act. It is very likely his publisher and MI6 were much more active in the repeal than any spiritualists.

As further indication of that, we find that Cecil Williamson had already opened his Folk-lore Center of Superstition and Witchcraft in 1951, within months of the repeal of the Witchcraft Act. These people don't waste any time, you know. By 1954 there was second Museum of Witchcraft in Cornwall.

Gardner's first coven was the Bricket Wood coven, so, again, you can see the Wicca, Wicker, Wickel, Bricket connection. The reason we are seeing these words come up in these Unabomber and Son of Sam events is that we have a wing of Intelligence telling the rest of the Intelligence community it is there. The faux-occult wing of CIA, say, is inserting these words to tell FBI, ONI, DIA, and the rest of CIA that this is its event. It is saying, "We are here! We did this. The event is not real, it is a manufactured event and we manufactured it. Stand down." The weird terms like "Wicked King Wicker" do double duty, since those outside the Intelligence agencies will naturally read them as something more sinister. They may even think real witches or Satanists are involved, which of course is fine with Intelligence.

I can even tell you what H. C. stands for in H. C. Wickel. It means High Coven. It is a codename for this faux-occult wing of Intelligence.

We will take a quick look at Gardner's bio before moving on. We are told that by age 17 Gardner was living in Ceylon, in a bungalow Aleister Crowley and Charles Bennett had just vacated. That is sold to us as some sort of coincidence, but it isn't. There is no chance that was a coincidence, so we may conclude that Gardner was already being groomed as an apprentice of Crowley by 1901. The young Gardner was supposed to be a tea tree planter, but that isn't believable. They had "coolies" for manual labor, and Gardner was an asthmatic rich boy. All his other activities at this time look like a fantasy, so we may assume Gardner was already a recruit of the British Secret Service by 1901. It is admitted that he was initiated as a Freemason in 1910, at age 25. We are told he soon resigned, but that isn't believable, either.

Gardner skirted WW1 due to ill health, which also isn't likely. More likely is that he avoided combat because he was already busy doing worldwide jobs for British Intelligence. Most likely he was directing the opium trade in Malaya. Even Wikipedia admits he was involved in the opium market, adding to his family's fortune with a mountain of bribes.

By 1927, Gardner was again a Freemason, and although they admit that, they tell us he retired again in 1931. Right. Since we are told Gardner was a close friend of curators at the British Museum and Victoria and Albert Museum, we may assume that one of his assignments while traveling the Far East was the acquisition of artifacts (by any means necessary). He seems to have specialized in acquiring rare antique weaponry, but since he also worked at many excavations, including that of Starkey at Lachish and Petrie at Tall al-Ajjul, we may assume he brought back whatever came into his hands.

In 1937, Gardner purchased a Doctorate of Philosophy from an Electronic Institute in Nevada, which indicates who we are dealing with. Agents now often do a similar thing, but since the universities are all owned by Intelligence, they don't have to mail order their degrees online anymore. They can get them straight from the President of the University, who is also an agent.

Primed with his fake degree, Gardner began infiltrating several occult societies in England in 1938, hoping no doubt to use them for Intelligence purposes. He joined more than a dozen groups, from the

Folklore Society to the Rosicrucian Order to the Ancient British Church to the Ancient Druid Order to the Society for Psychical Research. He mined all these groups for his own initiates. Finally, on May 1, 1947, Gardner was (re)introduced to Crowley, who almost immediately made him a 7<sup>th</sup> degree OTO master, and within a year—upon the death of Crowley—Gardner was head of OTO in all of Europe. Curious, to say the least. Not only was Gardner's rise in OTO beyond meteoric—which tends to prove he and Crowley were co-conspirators from long before—but notice that date. 1947. Year one of the CIA. Not a coincidence. Neither is May 1, which is Mayday.

We saw British Intelligence opening museums of witchcraft immediately after the repeal of the Witchcraft act in 1951, but this rush to promote the occult backfired on them with the real witches, who have a vow of secrecy. Gardner's media circus after 1955 caused many of his Wiccans to bail on him, which of course proves he was fake, more interested in using witchcraft to promote various brainwashing campaigns than in the thing itself. We have more proof of that in May of 1960, when Gardner was feted with a garden party at Buckingham Palace for his years of service to the British Empire. For more in that line, Wikipedia admits Gardner was a supporter of the right wing Conservative Party and an avid reader of the arch-Conservative *Daily Telegraph*. One of his coven members, Fred Lamond, admitted that for someone at the head of a religious movement, Gardner was “surprisingly lacking in charisma.” All those things fit my interpretation to a T: Gardner was another tory fascist agent/actor pretending to be a progressive in order to undermine any real progressive movement.

So was (is) Ted Kaczynski. The main difference being Gardner didn't have to pretend to be a murderer, but Kaczynski did.

You will say, “But wouldn't Ted have gotten bored up there in his cabin all those years? The Unabomber was active from 1978 to 1996. What CIA agent is going to agree to sit in a one-room cabin for 25 years?” Again, we have no proof he was in that cabin for 25 years. He probably spent some time there, since I would assume it was his base while he was infiltrating various groups in the region, including the environmentalists. His assignment wasn't just to send a phony bomb to someone every few years. It was probably to manage and co-ordinate a whole slew of projects in the Northwest. My guess is Kaczynski was probably involved as an early man on the ground in the Ruby Ridge incident, and he may have been the one who co-ordinated the early stages (by another alias). Even more probable is his role in the Freeman raid at Justus Township, Montana, a week before his capture. I would be willing to bet that Kaczynski was involved in the set-up for that, under another alias. Someone should have asked the Freemen if they recognized Ted. But once washed and shaved, he was unrecognizable. And once the Freeman event was done, his assignment there had ended and they were ready to move him onto his next role in the courtroom. Anytime CIA needed someone to do undercover work in the rural Northwest, they probably went to Kaczynski. The rest of the time he might have been passing time in any other location. He could have spent months or years in Langley or Iron Mountain for all we know. More likely he was involved in projects in the numerous military bases in the general area of his cabin, including the [eight listed military bases](#) in Montana, Mountain Home in Idaho, Warren AFB in Wyoming, or even Edwards Airforce Base. We only know what they have told us, and everything they have told us is a lie.

You will then say, “Maybe, but what CIA agent is going to agree to sit in a maximum security prison for 16 years?” Oh, and you have 16 years of video of his cell, proving he was there? They fake these things. [We have caught them at it before](#). Johnny Hovey, Charles Manson, the Aryan Brotherhood ghosts, [Richard Cottingham](#), Ted Bundy, John Hinckley, Mark Chapman, and so on and on.



Except for his belief that Kaczynski is a scapegoat rather than a hired agent, Michael Hoffman seems to understand much of this. He says,

Studying how the cryptocracy fabricates and packages the 'Unabom' ritual on the stage of public affairs, reveals a virtuoso performance of masonic psychodrama, wherein terror, symbolism and code language synthesize to form the alchemical elixir for the processing of humanity.

Yes, precisely so. They have played us on their mighty Wurlitzer one more time, to the tune of some Wagnerian tragedy. And we only hum along and blink.

Hoffman is also onto something when he tells us that the only witness to the "accidental" death of FBI agent Kevin Kramer at the Freeman town in Montana in 1996 was an employee of NBC television. Given what we now know, I think we are going to need more than that.

---

---

Since Hoffman has already linked the Unabomber alias to the Son of Sam alias, and I have confirmed his reading, we should probably look quickly at that event, if only as confirmation of my reading here. One of the first things we find is the involvement of the Process Church in the Son of Sam literature. In my paper on the Tate/Manson event, I have already shown you that the Process Church is another front for Intelligence. The easiest clue there was the Church's connection to Xtul, which is in Merida, Yucatan. Merida is now known to be the CIA's second home. So anytime you see the Process Church, substitute either CIA or MI6.



Other early evidence of that, never read properly, is that the notes from the Son of Sam killer were from a professional writer. Journalist Jimmy Breslin admitted that from the beginning:

He had that cadence. I remember when I read it, I said, this guy could take my place with a column. He had that big city beat to his writing. It was sensational!

No one thought that was a red flag? What serial killers write like this?

Hello from the gutters of N.Y.C. which are filled with dog manure, vomit, stale wine, urine and blood. Hello from the sewers of N.Y.C. which swallow up these delicacies when they are washed away by the sweeper trucks. Hello from the cracks in the sidewalks of N.Y.C. and from the ants that dwell in these cracks and feed in the dried blood

of the dead that has settled into the cracks

David Berkowitz was a semi-literate blob who never went to college. The writer of that is probably the graduate of a writer's program. He toned it down for the SoS letters, but the signs are there. Remember, Intelligence owned all the literary magazines in the country. They had taken them over in the 1950s or earlier, including *Partisan Review*, *Paris Review*, *Encounter*, *Ramparts*, *Hudson Review*, *Poetry*, and all the rest. When they needed writers, they had their pick.

The whole Roy Radin story needs to be unwound as well, but just notice he was said to have been killed at age 33. RED FLAG! That number is another “we are here” signal from Intelligence. It also pays to check footnotes at Wikipedia, since on the page for Radin we find this:

1. Wick, Steve. *Bad Company: Drugs, Hollywood and the Cotton Club Murder*. New York: Harcourt Publishing, 1990.

I bet you don't see it even after I have put it in front of you. That is the author who wrote the book on the Roy Radin contract murder, which was sold in the press for months as the Cotton Club Murder. What is his name? Steve Wick. Really? I guess Steve Wickel would have been too obvious.

If you don't know who Radin was, he is supposed to have been the bad guy who supplied the .44 bulldog pistols to the Westchester Cult in 1976, in preparation for the whole Son of Sam event. There was supposed to have been all sorts of Satanic stuff going on, but it was just the CIA jokers again, manufacturing fear on the East Coast this time. Radin, along with Bill Mentzer and the Carr brothers, was an agent. None of them died and none went to jail. They were just relocated and re-assigned.

For evidence of that, we note that [John “Wheaties” Carr](#) was said to have been born October 13, 1947. That's Aleister Crowley's birthday, plus the birthyear of the CIA and the deathyear of Crowley. Why doesn't [Dateline NBC](#) tell you that? That leads us to the faked death of [Arlis Perry](#) in 1974 at Stanford University, inside a church. We have seen Stanford above, haven't we? The date of the Arlis Perry event is again October 13. Do you see it? October 13, 1947. October 13, 1974. 47. 74. The numbers are just reversed, giving you the clue. They didn't just accidentally run a faked murder in a church on October 13, 1974. They chose that date on purpose. And we have even more clues. Son of Sam murderer David Berkowitz told an interviewer from jail that John Carr was connected to the Perry event. Carr was said to be from North Dakota, and so was Perry. So let's go there.

[It is admitted](#) John Carr was in the Air Force in North Dakota (Minot AFB) in 1976, so we know he came from the military. Minot is one of two Global Strike Command bases in the US, the other being Barksdale in Louisiana. These bases used to be called SAC, and they are important because that is where the nuclear missiles are stored and controlled. This is important here because Intelligence also has a presence at GSC bases, although this isn't normally admitted. Remember, the Pentagon is not the top of the food chain, and the military does not run on its own steam. We are taught that the President is the Commander-in-Chief, but of course that is hogwash. The President is just a puppet in a suit. Much more powerful people actually run the country, and they use Intelligence to oversee the military. That has been true for many decades. So the fact that we have pointers in the Son of Sam event back to Minot is very important. It points again at the CIA (or DIA).

We are told John Carr returned to North Dakota after Son of Sam was caught in 1978, where he allegedly killed himself. Where was his body found? In the home of an Air Force Sergeant. The body was unidentifiable, but the coroner admitted the body was two inches shorter than John Carr. Another

faked death. Where did they get the name? From the history books in North Dakota. A John W. Carr was Lt. Governor of North Dakota in the 1920s. Since in most bios, the W. is not assigned to anything, those in Intelligence who borrowed the name thought it would be funny to make it “Wheat”, since North Dakota is the number one producer of durum and spring wheat in the entire US, supplying over 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total for each crop. Yes, John Carr is another ghost. It is simply the event alias of some youngish agent sent to New York from Minot AFB to take part in the spook-event-of-the-year.

So, as we have seen, there *was* a connection between the Manson/Tate event, the Son of Sam murders, and the Unabomber. Maury Terry made the connection between the first two in his famous book *Ultimate Evil*, but his theory was that the Process Church was the connection. No, the connection was Intelligence, which manufactured them all, and many others. The Process Church wasn't a Satanist organization, it was just another silly front for Intelligence, like Scientology†, Esalen, Findhorn, OTO, Wicca, and a hundred others.

The anonymous *Spawn of the Sphinx* author even gives us more events to doubt, admitting that the Process Church opened recruitment offices in maximum security prisons in the mid-1970s. In my Tate/Manson paper, we saw how they did that with the manufactured Aryan Brotherhood, and we may assume they had other methods. We are then told,

The [Process] cult's prison recruitment program went exceedingly well – producing such notorious serial killers as John Gacy and Henry Lee Lucas.

Although the author doesn't intend for you to read that as “John Gacy and Henry Lee Lucas were probably faked”, I do. Since we know the Process Church was just a CIA front, any recruitment was for agents, not Satanic murderers. In upcoming papers we may take a closer look at the evidence there, although I have to admit this line is losing its fascination for me. I have shown you the method and you don't really need me to spell everything out for you in every event.

I will close by giving you one more important clue that everyone has missed. No one has seen the obvious in the Son of Sam killings, and Intelligence has been laughing about it ever since. According to the mainstream story, Sam is a demon that possessed Berkowitz's neighbor's dog. Alternate theorists tell us that the father of John and Michael Carr was named Sam. Both those theories are misdirection, since the correct answer is right in your face. Read again the first part of the first letter that Son of Sam sent to the New York papers:

When father Sam gets drunk he gets mean. He beats his family. Sometimes he ties me up to the back of the house. Other times he locks me in the garage. Sam loves to drink blood. "Go out and kill" commands father Sam.

Still don't get it? Try changing one word. Change “father” to “Uncle”.

When Uncle Sam gets drunk he gets mean. He beats his family. Sometimes he ties me up to the back of the house. Other times he locks me in the garage. Uncle Sam loves to drink blood. "Go out and kill" commands Uncle Sam.

We are all Sons of Uncle Sam. We are all products of our country. That is all he is saying. The Vietnam War had just ended two years earlier. So it is clear that Uncle Sam likes to drink blood. “Go out and kill” commands Uncle Sam.

You will say, “But why would Intelligence wish to slander Uncle Sam?” They didn't. They were

creating a serial killer here, and the guy they had chosen to act the part had been in the military. David Berkowitz, like everyone else in these plays, was ex-military. So this was just part of his profile. He was supposed to be a discontented soldier gone berserk. Problem is, once the story hit the papers, the Pentagon complained. They phoned Langley and said something like, “Hey, what is this shit in New York City! You guys can't be slandering soldiers and Uncle Sam and war, not even as part of some psy-op! What's wrong with you people!” Langley admitted its mistake and suppressed that reading of Sam. That was hard to do, since it was so obvious, but they hired many writers to create many diversions. As usual, they were almost completely successful, since most people can't see what is right in front of them.



Speaking of which, if anything here makes you want to see the film *The Wicker Man*, don't. Nothing is clearer evidence of how Intelligence controls the media than the reviews of the film you will find online. And I don't mean the 2006 version, which everyone admits is garbage. I mean the original 1973 version, which is also garbage. You will be told it is the 6<sup>th</sup> greatest British film of all time, among the scariest ever made, and other planted reviews, but the truth is the film isn't scary at all. It is just annoying from the second scene, and flops from there. It is poorly written, poorly acted, poorly directed, and a cinematic disaster in every conceivable way. If you are a Christian, it will make you sick; if you are a pagan, it will make you sicker; and if you are a cineast, it will make you even sicker. Its only possible use to the world might be as future fodder for Mystery Science Theater 3000: Tom Servo and Gypsy might find a few laughs in it. I kept thinking the *Wicker Man* created the amazing sensation you would feel if someone shuffled scenes between *Heidi*, *Breaker Morant*, and *What's New Pussycat?* All we needed was Peter Sellers rushing around tripping over hares or something.

I had mean to end with that, but I figured if the online reviews of the 1973 *Wicker Man* were so wrong, they might be wrong about the newer one from 2006, so I watched it. Although it is far better as a matter of direction and cinematography and editing and so on, it still has “spooks” written all over it. And I don't mean because it is supposed to be a horror movie. For one thing, they aren't satisfied to try to slander pagans and Christians with this one: within the first minutes it becomes clear they are also slandering the Amish and organic farmers. Which is not so surprising. We have seen Intelligence running many events in the past decade to slander the Amish, though it is difficult to see how the Amish are a great threat to the US Government. Apparently, those who run this country can't take any tiny opposition, no matter how passive. The blackwash of organic farming is easier to read, since we may assume that opposition was purchased directly by Monsanto. It is sort of like product placement, but in reverse. Then there's Kate Beahan, who has the fakest face I have ever seen on such a young actress: nose, lips, eyebrows, everything. Nicholas Cage has a ridiculous tan-from-a-can and plastic

teeth, but even he looks normal next to the Stepford-wife Beahan. You will say that everyone on the island of Summersisle is supposed to be weird, but it is the wrong kind of weird. Organic farming and paganism don't really go with plastic surgery. Beahan looks mighty strange walking around barefoot in the fields with a plastic head. Even her arms look strange. She's obviously on the Hollywood fat-stripping drug the rest of them are on, but, again, this conflicts noticeably with her part. She is supposed to be eating organic foods, not Nitrix and steroids. Didn't the casting director or the director notice this?

The script and acting are just as stupid and full of holes as the original, which is also strange. Why would you do a remake and not correct any of the problems of the original? It seems as if Neil Labute thought, "Hey, I think I'll remake *Wicker Man*, but just update all the blatant miscalculations of the original, down to miscasting the major female roles (think Britt Ekland in the original, who was a worse actress than Beahan—by a tad—but who at least had a real head). Oh, and while I'm at it, I think I'll go ahead and blackwash the Gaea and goddess movement, as a nod to the new century. I'm already known as the anti-feminist director *par excellence*, so no one will find it strange."

I am not a great fan of the goddess movement—since women as goddesses can hardly succeed where men as gods has failed—but that logic is entirely too subtle for the *Wicker Man* script. The scriptwriters can't simply show the obvious fallacy of the goddess movement; no, they have to try to make women seem *evil*. That is so much more effective as cinema. And so all the men on Summersisle are not just drones, they have been lobotomized. This plays into the hands of Intelligence one more time, since making women think men are evil and men think women are evil has been a central program for decades. Divide and conquer, you know.

Nice to see Ellen Burstyn here, playing the head Witch. She was the mother in *The Exorcist*, remember. A spooky lady, not afraid to take the most obvious disinfo roles of the past 40 years. At the end of the movie, I looked at all the actors chanting their lines as the Wicker Man burned, and I thought, "is there any part these actors wouldn't take? Any part that would be beneath their dignity as human beings?" Apparently not. Also interesting to see James Franco in a small part at the end, in one of his first roles. His involvement here should have pegged him from the beginning, and now it does.

I also love the scene where Cage has nearly died from bee stings—being allergic—so in the very next scene he goes back out into the bee fields with the Lady Summersisle, swatting bees off his neck while she fills in the backstory of the island. The scene is so absurd I began to think Labute didn't really have anything to do with this movie. I watched *Your Friends and Neighbors* [1998] and found it very well written and directed. Did the CIA just tie Labute up and lock him in a closet while they put his name on this film? If so, they must not have bothered to hire any human scriptwriters, just letting their supercomputers produce the lines for the actors from day to day.

I kept *hoping* Labute (or whoever) would have the guts to rewrite the ending, but I didn't expect it. The original was too successful as propaganda to tamper with. Still, I would have loved to see Cage pump a few rounds into the witches, including Beahan and a few of the others, before tackling Burstyn and taking her into the sea with him, both drowning on the rocks below. The Wicker Man could then collapse into nearby hay bales, setting the whole island alight. Finally, a tsunami could roll in, created by a chance earthquake, inundating all of Puget Sound. That was the ending I hoped for, but no luck.

Still, as incredibly awful as *Wicker Man* 2006 was, I think *Wicker Man* 1973 was even worse. It's a tough call. *Wicker Man* 1973 had the gravitas of Edward Woodward, which should have kept it afloat way above anything Nicholas Cage could manage, but somehow Robin Hardy was able to swamp

Woodward nonetheless under a sea of utter absurdity and bad direction, a sea so cold and deep not even Ekland's fine ass could warm it.

Beyond that, neither film creates fear in a normal way, as horror movies do. They are only scary as transparent products of an Intelligence that doesn't see how transparent it is. Which is why I have taken the time to analyze them here. Just as the Son of Sam and Unabomber products were signals of a government desperate to manufacture fear by any means possible, so are many Hollywood movies and TV shows—as well as your nightly news. It appears that Intelligence has brainwashed even itself, to the point that its scriptwriters can't see when they are giving themselves away in plain sight.

Here's one last thing to think about: many conspiracy theorists buy the Satanism story, telling us that these bad people behind the government and Intelligence really are Satanists. But I suggest you go back and read the Bible, or any other old history. Satan and Lucifer were always pro-sex, weren't they? They weren't for marriage or monogamy, but they were all about men and women getting together in the way of Nature. Same for the pagans. Even the *Wicker Man* movies admit fertility was the major theme. But Intelligence isn't following that script, is it? Does *Wicker Man 2006* make you want to go out and hook up? No. It makes you want to buy a six-foot rubber and crawl into it permanently. All the government ops of the past decades have been anti-sex. They are keeping men and women apart, to create trauma, to prevent free gratification, to sell more products, and for population control. That's not the MO of Satan or Lucifer or of any of the pagan gods. The people destroying your world aren't Christians, Satanists or pagans. They have no connection to any gods of the Earth or Sky, good or bad. They are just shallow psychopaths, organisms whose innate functions have badly misfired. This is why Nature will be forced to wipe them out.

\*Martin Lee and Bruce Shlain, 1986. Grove Press.

\*\*Office of Naval Intelligence

†I recommend you study L. Ron Hubbard's [service in the navy](#), which has been whitewashed. They say he was a lieutenant, but also admit he commanded two anti-sub boats, including the PC-815. Lieutenants are junior officers and don't command ships: captains or commanders do. It is also admitted he was with Office of Navy Intelligence, although they claim he was discharged after only a few months. Not believable. He was obviously ONI all along, assigned after the war to domestic covert ops.

‡If that link gets broken, look for the documentary entitled [PsyWar](#). Go to minute 24 for Burson-Marsteller. However, it is ironic that this documentary is itself part of the PsyWar. The documentary is part of opposition control, and you are being controlled by Chomsky, Zinn, and all the rest. Notice, for instance, that not once in 139 minutes do any of these guys mention Intelligence. The main thesis of the film is that PR firms are to blame for the PsyWar. Right.

☞ I don't know what this special character is meant to signify, but I am troping it to mean “Old Blowjob”. I will use it instead of an asterisk here and in future papers when I need to footnote something/someone especially shady. Think of the term [as used in Animal House by John Belushi](#). Despite McKenna admitting he was recruited as an agent, some are trying to misdirect by claiming he meant he was “recruited by the Mushroom”. Please. Not even worth a response. However, it did lead me to do some more research on McKenna. They claim his father was Irish, but of course they scrub his mother at Wikipedia. Don't even mention her, as if a person can have a father but no mother. Red flag. Turns out Geni.com admits she was a **Kemp**, and *then* they scrub her. But it is already enough. It links him to the crypto-Jewish Kemps we have seen before. And besides, McKenna looks very Jewish, so I don't know why anyone would be surprised by this.



Let's see, Irish or Jewish? It's so hard, right? And we now have McKenna and Jim Carrey trading red flags, with Carrey playing McKenna in *True Hallucinations*. Man o'man, could Carrey be any more obvious about running a project? I guess you have heard him talking about Jesus and how we are all one and how we have nothing to do in this life but play? Sure Jim—those of us with \$100 million in the bank. Carrey is leading you directly away from all the real problems, isn't he? Carrey: **you don't need to revolt, infinite beings that you are, you only need to smile and play. Don't look at that man behind the curtain, he cannot keep you from being happy. So what if he is stealing all your money and crushing you with everything he does? That doesn't matter. Take a pill and contemplate your lovely navel.**



That's Carrey talking out of his butt in *Ace Ventura*. And this is the guy they are now trying to sell you as a guru. Beware, he is saying some things you want to hear, like that vaccinations are bad, but it is just a confidence game. These people tell you the truth to hook you and then lead you off out in the bushes.

But back to Terence KEMP McKenna. As usual, we can link him to the British peerage and all the people we have unclocked before. See [George Kemp](#), 1<sup>st</sup> Baron Rochdale, who married Beatrice **Egerton** in 1896. Her father was the Earl of Ellesmere and her mother was Katharine **Phipps**. Phipps was the daughter of George Phipps, Marquess of Normanby, and Laura **Russell**. She is scrubbed at thepeerage.com to make you think she wasn't of the famous Russells, but she was. Her great-aunt married the 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Cleveland. Beatrice Egerton's grandmother was Mary **Campbell**, daughter of Earl Cawdor. Through the Egertons, the Kemps were also closely related to the **Grevilles** (Barons Brooke), the **Leveson-Gowers** (Dukes of Sutherland), the **Macartneys**, the **Somersets** (Dukes of Beaufort), the **Cavendish-Betincks** (Dukes of Portland), and the **Gordons** (Earls of Sutherland). That's a lot of Dukes in a short space, isn't it?

Anyway, Baron George Kemp was a Brigadier General and director of **Barclays Bank**. His son John Kemp became a Viscount and lived until 1993. He was governor of the BBC in the 1950s and was also the chairman of several banks, a large cloth mill, the Cotton Board, and an iron mill. His son St. John Kemp was a contemporary of McKenna. St.

John married Serena Clark-Hall, whose grandmother was Mary Margaret **Kennedy**. They were also related to the **Forbes**.

There are also 63 McKennas in the peerage, including a **Terence Morell McKenna**. Just a coincidence, right? A morell is a mushroom. Not a chance. He was born about 1894, only about 50 years before our Terence McKenna. Which reminds us McKenna was born in **1946**, year one of the CIA. Although in the British peerage, these early McKennas were also from the US. **Philadelphia, in fact**. Terence Morell McKenna's brother Gerald married Emily **Burns**, the daughter of Baron Burns of Castle Wemyss. They were also related to the Baronets **Arbuthnot** and the **Nugent-Dunbars**. Emily Burns' sister married into the **Macleans** of Ardgour, and her sister-in-law **Heather** married Ian FitzRoy **Douglas**, of the Earls of Morton. Douglas' mother was a **Somerset** (Barons Raglan), which links us back to the Kemps above, proving the McKennas and Kemps were closely related in the peerage. Since our Terence Kemp McKenna is both, we have strong indication he comes from these lines.

[**Added February 14, 2018:** I was rereading my paper on Hitler's genealogy, when I tripped across Hitler's personal physician Theodor **Morell**. The mainstream now admits he was Jewish. So Hitler had a Jewish physician! Anyway, the name Morell links us to Terence Morell McKenna, and through him to Terence Kemp McKenna. So it would appear Terence McKenna was closely related to Hitler's personal physician.]

Through the Somersets, we can link the McKennas to the **Hamilton** and **Hicks-Beach** families. Think David Icke and “comedian” Bill Hicks. You didn't think Hicks got famous for being funny, did you? No, because he wasn't. He was just obnoxious. He was tapped to control the opposition, like McKenna and now Carrey. Remember, for some reason never explained, Bill Hicks first got famous in England. Britain's Channel 4 currently ranks him #4 of the 100 greatest stand-up comics. Hmmm. I guess now you know why. Hicks was sold as the new Lenny Bruce, which is apropos since I have previously **outed Bruce in the same way**. The Hicks-Beach family goes back to the Baronets **Hicks** of Beverston Castle. The 1<sup>st</sup> Baronet married a **Paget**, daughter of **Lettice Knollys**. We have seen that last name many times in my papers, always linking us to the **Riches**.



That's **Bill Hicks on Letterman** in 1993. If you watch that, not only will it help you see who Hicks really was—a pasty upper-class asshole with no timing—but also you will never think he is Alex Jones again. As I have said before, they may be related through the Jones-Hicks families of the peerage, but they aren't the same person. Not even close. Oh, and of course Hicks faked his death. He had to because his project wasn't going anywhere. He is actually more promotable now he is dead, since he is easier to edit. Alive, it was too obvious he wasn't funny and wasn't who he was sold as.

And now for the final turn of the screw. We saw the Hicks related to Lettice Knollys. Want to guess who her grandmother was? Take your time. **Katherine Carey**. I guess you remember Jim **Carrey** above? Do you think he is just accidentally involved in the McKenna project? Nope. As I have told you, all these people are related, and they are all working on THE SAME BIG PROJECT. Katherine Carey's mother was Lady Mary **Boleyn**. Her grandmother was Margaret **Spencer**, and Margaret's grandfather was Edmund **Beaufort**, 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Somerset.



Katherine Carey's other grandmother was Elizabeth **Howard**, whose father was the Duke of Norfolk. At the same time, Katherine's brother Sir Edmund married Elizabeth **Neville**, daughter of the 4<sup>th</sup> Lord Latymer and Lady Lucy Somerset. The Somersets were the Earls of Worcheste, and we already saw them related to the McKennas and Kemps. The Somersets also link us to the De Veres, Earls of Oxford, which links us to my recent [paper on Shakespeare](#).

If we take the Careys forward instead of back, we find them becoming Earls of Monmouth in 1625. Even then they were [closely related to Morgans and Whitneys](#). In 1627 the Careys also became the Earls of Dover.

And if we search on Jim Carrey's genealogy, we find that he did indeed change the spelling of his name. His paternal grandfather [is allegedly Frank Carry and his paternal grandmother](#) is given as Angelina Carre dit Larouche. Say what? "Dit" means "called" in French. It is like an alias. So we are being told she was called **Larouche**. Why? My assumption is this ties us to Lyndon Larouche somehow, but they don't want us making the link. Even stranger is that Jim Carrey's grandparents are a Carry and a Carre. Looks like a big fudge of some sort. Especially if we click on the Carry, finding he is also a Carre dit Larouche. So are we being told Jim's grandparents were siblings or cousins or what? At any rate, Jim's 2g-grandmother is a Clement, which is also interesting. It may link him to Mark Twain. Further back, Jim is a Joly, which I would assume links him to Angelina Jolie. Remember, his grandmother is named Angelina. But frankly, Jim's genealogy looks like a complete hack regarding the name Carrey/Carry/Carre, and I would guess this is to hide the fact that he is indeed from the Careys/Carres of the British peerage. More indication of that is found with Maj. Gen. Constantine **Phipps Carey**, no dates given, but late 1800s. Note his middle name, which links us back to Terence McKenna. The British McKennas of that time—including of course Terence Morell McKenna—were closely related to the Phipps through the Egertons. This gives us a second possible link between McKenna and Jim Carrey. More indication comes from General Carey's son Captain Leicester William **le Marchant** Carey. Le Marchant is a French name, and Jim Carrey's Canadian ancestors are said to be French. Also [Venerable James Gaspard-le-Marchant Carey](#), born about 1830, who married Anne **Knox**, daughter of Louisa **Robinson**. Louisa was the daughter of the 1<sup>st</sup> Baronet Robinson and Mary Anne **Spencer**. This of course links us to the Spencers we saw above, showing that the Careys of the 19<sup>th</sup> century were still marrying the top families 400 years later. But in the 19<sup>th</sup> century they are far better scrubbed. No parents are given for Venerable James Carey, despite being so venerable. I think we can guess why this Venerable Jim Carey is scrubbed both forward and backward. They don't want you to link him to Jim Carrey.