HISTORY'S ACTORS

Now when they were going, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done. And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers, Saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and secure you. So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day. (Matt 28:11-15)

"All the world's a stage, And all the men and women merely players..." (Shakespeare)

"O wicked imagination, whence camest thou in to cover the earth with deceit?" (Ecclesiasticus 37:3)

What do we *know* about history? What do we really know for certain? Well, outside of the preserved Word of God, we know our own history (beyond a certain age). We know what our parents told us about theirs—and perhaps our grandparents... but that's about it. Everything else is just hearsay.

A number of times in past articles I've quoted political demon and former deputy chief of staff, Karl Rove's notorious and cryptic statement that he and his cohorts "were history's actors," who were engaged in "creating realities". I'll leave it to you to read it if you haven't yet. For one thing, I don't think we've ever let that fully sink in. But I want to focus now on who is the "they" and what, perhaps, are their motives.

For any mediocre student of history, it can't be denied that there are certain players behind the scenes that have seemingly moved all the pieces on the board by way of magnets under the table. By their great power and wealth, they've controlled circumstances, kings, presidents, wars and their outcomes... This power they accumulated over generations through intermarriage, the transference of property and concentration of wealth, and by and by, the complete political dominion of the nations they resided in. Eventually, nation-states and their borders became superfluous as they became—as they call it—"global". Today, such distinctions as political and economic divisions are passé and only for the plebes to believe in and bicker about.

Take for example international banking. We like to fixate on that "Creature from Jekyll Island", the Federal Reserve, which begot the U.S. hegemony of the dollar as the "world reserve

currency". And that's what they want us to do. It's hardly relevant, however. The real global banking headquarters is not the Board of Governors in Washington, but inside of an oddly out-of-place <u>building</u> in the sleepy town of Basel, Switzerland. Read <u>this article</u> about the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) to get the bigger picture. Perhaps it could be more accurately described as the back room of the back room, through the "Employees Only" door of the International Monetary Fund... The smoking lounge of the Actors Guild.

Basically, it's an elite Club of bankers whose beginnings go back to 1930. (Actually, *long* before that, but that would be a whole 'nother article). However, a careful look at *why* this was done and the ramifications of it in what we now know as 20th century "history" would be very instructive... Unfortunately, this would require a number of longer articles to follow the bread crumbs, but suffice it to say, it's worth your time to look at the clues therein. As a further aside here for the clue-hunters and rabbit-hole spelunkers, this passage is from the <u>Wiki article</u> on the BIS:

"Between **1933 and 1945** the BIS board of directors included Walther Funk, a prominent Nazi official, and Emil Puhl responsible for processing dental gold looted from concentration camp victims, as well as Hermann Schmitz, the director of IG Farben, and Baron von Schroeder, the owner of the J.H. Stein Bank, all of whom were later convicted of war crimes or crimes against humanity."

Now that's a ridiculous statement, but it's in there to throw you off the scent. However, the highlighted names all share something in common. Let's just say they are "family". I'll give you another hint... Here is a picture of Walther Funk:



You'll see from his name that he was somehow a "Jewish Nazi", whose tenure *lasted the entire war*. Does that make sense? You probably don't know this yet, but the whole "Third Reich"—the whole story, from top to bottom—was an Op. It was concocted. Most of the actors involved—and that is exactly what they were—have pretended to be on the opposite side of the team. Their purpose, I hope you will eventually see, had something to do with the

formation of a certain state over in the old land of Palestine... That is to say, *Nazism = Zionism*. I'll just leave that lying there for now.

You see, Karl left us a big clue when he told us they not only influenced history, but they actually were engaged in "creating reality" out of whole cloth. He wasn't just vocalizing out of his hind-parts.

Interpreting history is not easy. In fact, it's very difficult. We're missing a lot of information, and moreover, we've been fed a great deal of *disinformation*. Some cunning and manipulative people have invented large swatches of history as pure propaganda for reasons that should become evident. And that's not to say that the *history itself* was cunning, or that the story was particularly creative or believable, because mostly it is not. It's rather ridiculous when you really consider it. So let's consider a few things...

How much do you know about the great German Revolution at the end of World War I? Never heard of it? Maybe there's a reason for that. And it may be because it wasn't even invented until rather recently.

The bigger question is, was there a revolution in Germany in 1918 that created the Weimar Republic (which ultimately collapsed and gave way to the Nazis and the Third Reich) or no? Well, because nobody alive today has any actual memory of it, Wikipedia has produced a long rambling article about this very strange event, concluding, amazingly, that "The Revolution of 1918/19 is one of the most important events in the modern history of Germany", yet to this very day, nobody knows what actually occurred, (or if it even did)... I added that last bit in the parenthesis. Does that statement seem at all congruent to you? Well, let's try and follow along a little further.

Quoted in that Wiki article is this curious statement from an eyewitness to the events, an historian and journalist, who wrote 50 years later:

It is often said that a true revolution in Germany in 1918 never took place. All that really happened was a breakdown. It was only **the temporary weakness of the police** and army in the moment of military defeat which let a mutiny of sailors **appear as a revolution**.

Like our own "January 6 Insurrection", right?



Another <u>fake event</u>, a veritable clown act, conjured for the sole purpose of molding the silly-putty of the American public mind. And probably for the same intended outcome. Those of us with real memories of that day—and it's only been a year now—will always know the absurdity of the "Insurrection", but rest assured that is how it will be told in every school textbook, on Google and Wikipedia *until everyone living believes it*.

But back to the German Revolution that never happened. Recall, it was *this revolution* which supposedly created Adolph Hitler and the whole Nazi party, which allegedly caused all of World War II. That story begins with another staged event known as the "Beer Hall Putsch"—the failed coup of Adolph Hitler in 1923. Or so we're told.

And like the events of 9/11, we know that something happened in November 1918, but what we are told makes absolutely no sense. The story goes as follows... It is the end of the Great War and everyone is expecting the epic naval battle between Germany and England to imminently take place as scripted. And then, it suddenly doesn't. Instead, a tiny group of German sailors mutinies on Halloween night, a national revolution of "the workers" then spontaneously ensues (with no leaders named, ever), a "new government" is formed, and within a week, the Monarch Kaiser Wilhelm abdicates and flees the country...in the middle of a war (?) The whole inexplicable thing happens in a matter of days, and the German War Machine simply evaporates in place... Seriously, that's the tale we're told. Remarkably too, the "mutineers" that supposedly spearheaded the revolution "gave up and were led away without resistance"! You may think that how a quashed mutiny somehow managed to lead a national revolt which ended with the removal of the monarchy—and the War—is given at least some attempt at an explanation. You'd be wrong. Neither at Wiki, or History.com, or anywhere else is it ever accounted for. And I'll spare you here, but reading on in the "history", the absurdities are piled on higher and wider. Taken as a whole, the details of this event as told are absolute nonsense. Just like buffalo-man and the D.C. Insurrection.

The narrative they've given us of the so-called World Wars, like the moon landings, when scrutinized becomes preposterous in fantastical proportions. In fact, lest you think this is all satire, I highly suggest you read the play-by-play breakdown of these fictions neatly contained in this article by the infamous researcher, Miles Mathis, here. Therein you will see the absurd rise of the actor, Hitler, explained and revealed in all its glory by way of digesting the entire buffet of Wiki articles in the hallowed halls of the Ministry of Truth in one sitting... a service he provides for free, so we don't have to.

Before we move on from this subject, I'd be remiss in not at least showing you a glance of the bigger picture of this manufactured war. Because it wasn't long after Hitler (real name, Hiller) supposedly conquered France in just *5 days*, when they supposedly drove their tanks through a forest in Belgium, surprising and discombobulating the entire French army which simply laid down and quit, that the British belatedly decided to defend themselves and their European neighbors—by attacking *their French ally's navy* in the senseless <u>Battle of Mers-el-Kebir</u>.

There, in Act Two of the war, we find the British entering the stage. Their first order of business was bombing their own people in London pretending it was a German-led raid, later written down in history books as "the Battle of Britain". A peculiar detail of this is found in a <u>fascinating article</u> published last September exploring the thesis that George Orwell wrote <u>1984</u> as an *allegorical cover* for the fakeries **that he knew were going on during the war**...in particular that the Battle of Britain was primarily the result of the British government shelling its own citizens, as meticulously outlaid in <u>this book</u>.

Like most false flags, people were certainly killed during the bombings of England and the "blitzes", but these were collateral damage and not the intention. The Germans, for their part in the scene, even agreed to put a smallish hole in Buckingham palace with one bombing raid just so the Queen could make the point to the working classes (whose ghettos had earlier been destroyed to 'build back better') that "we're all in this together". Sound familiar?

Unironically, that article concludes with the following revelation about the novel:

Winston Churchill *is Big Brother* – or rather, the symbol that Churchill represents is the same one as does Big Brother. Whether intended by Orwell or not, this is a huge joke on millions of enormously duped Churchill-venerating Britons...

Like all jokes on us, they're generally not funny. We as trusting and gullible people are easily and constantly fooled by Lucy and her football, and even as the pain sets in for falling for it over and over again, Westerners (and nominal Christians) are led deeper into the deceptions of their Handlers.

We want to know who the Handlers are. Who are history's actors, and who is writing the ridiculous script? *Cui bono*?

The globalists are organized in Families, therefore we'll call them that. It will get us closer to the truth. The *Families*, however, are not all of the same heritage as some members have been *adopted* in. Not all bankers <u>are Jewish</u>, for example. But the Rothschild's, the Goldman's, the Sachses, the Lehmans, and a dozen others are, and well explains how 50 percent of all the <u>nation's billionaires</u> are constituted from a 1.4 percent population group.

Mathis sums up our discussion thus far with the following words:

"The World Wars only make sense once we realize all these countries had been occupied centuries earlier by the [Jewish globalists], and that their agents ran all these countries for a few international families. We already know that is true, since they admit all these countries are and always have been run by close cousins. They want you to think the wars are the result of these cousins squabbling for power, but I have shown you that isn't the case. The wars aren't about sharing power, they are about consolidating power, and hiding it. The wars are run as a cover for seizing worldwide treasuries and other treasures, including land, minerals, and even art. They are used to clear slums and rebuild cities. They are used to test weaponry and test theories of control. They are used to hide crimes."

And there you have it, succinctly.

And what we have seen throughout our alleged history of Western Civilization, we have seen in the culmination of more recent history, in particular the Second World War, where the Jews have been recast as eternal victims and casualties of war, instead of the hidden rulers they actually are.

Those actors and movers who have bought up all the best rents on the Monopoly board have much more on their agenda than the pursuit of money—it is the *means to an end*. There is an underlying devious purpose to it; the consolidation of power is what gives them omnipotence over the minds and souls of men. The consolidation of *religion*—in all of its human manifestations—is the holy grail.

The Jews of the Bible may not be the same people as those Jews of today, but they carry the same torch. Jews will say that Jesus is not the Christ because he did not fulfill all of the prophecies—as they understand them. That's giving them the benefit of the doubt, because I am sure that many rabbinical types very well DO understand the scriptures, AND that the real historical figure, Jesus of Nazareth, fulfilled them. But their greatest feat (like the proverbial Devil convincing the world he didn't exist) was in making Christendom fall for this same

historical revisionism. That what actually occurred historically is known and certain—and crucially—that it records *none* of the prophesied events of Christ's Revelation, nor the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecies of the New Heavens and the New Earth, was their playbook... it is in truth a complete fiction. The farther back in time we look, the less is truly known—records have been lost or destroyed, there are very few archaeological details or artifacts proving for certain one thing or another, and we have mountains of evidence that what WAS known historically was deliberately re-written, over-written, or simply buried and denied. In its place has been built a façade of "created reality" which is the Matrix we now mostly accept as truth. Live actors perform parts written for them by people that hate us and want us to believe a Lie to our eventual destruction. If we can't see this by now we are in grave danger of never waking up to it.

It may be easier or more pleasant to believe that honest mistakes were made, memories got muddled, or we've received an accumulation of copyist errors. But the falsehoods were intentional and part of a program. Whether or not the Families or their counterparts in modern seminaries have properly understood the scriptures regarding prophecy is really a HUGE diversion that we should all immediately see. They knew of course that Jesus Himself *claimed* to be the Christ, the Son of God... They knew all the historical facts of Jesus' life and the remarkable "coincidences" of the messianic prophecies which He fulfilled... But they deny one glaring fact more attested to than perhaps any other in history—by many infallible proofs—that THIS Man, who was witnessed by a great multitude dying a very public and a very horrific death, and having been subsequently buried for three days, *vanished from a sealed and guarded tomb*. Moreover, they knew He'd prior claimed He *would* rise from the dead, which is why the tomb was guarded in the first place!

They not only ignore the significance of this inexplicable event, they pretend it wasn't also a historical fact that an earthquake occurred in Jerusalem at the very moment of His death on the cross, and that another earthquake happened three days later which *opened His very tomb*—to which the soldiers guarding it attested was now empty—but furthermore, they blot out the testimony of *thousands* of people who afterwards witnessed the resurrected Christ as reigning King... A great many of whom chose painful death rather than deny their profession and their loyalty. No one willingly dies for a lie.

A look back on all of history, whatever may be known of it, will prove that of every other event, fact or fiction, beyond all disputations, THAT event takes precedence.

Pretending it never happened was the first and Greatest Lie of history they created... **Which they have admitted to**. See our opening quote in Matthew 28. Someone will now say, "well that's what Matthew **said** happened." Well, Matthew was a Jew.

These words stand out: "So they took the money and did as they were taught…" These were the soldiers who were set as guards over the tomb of Jesus. They then became paid actors. And with that, "reality was created".

And that is exactly what was propagated by the Jews during that time—that the resurrection WAS a story, a fiction invented by Jesus' disciples to advance their agenda. And as the text says, "this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day."

What the scriptures are showing us here is the beginning of historical revisionism...perhaps history's first actors. As it was primitive back then, propagated by a spoken lie and nothing else, we are only now beginning to understand the present technology of mind control they have at their disposal, causing us to doubt our own reality and to deny our own eyes.

George Orwell also wrote this in his novel, 1984:

"Those that control the present, control the past. Those that control the past control the future."

It is obvious what he was hinting at. For *nothing* in "history"—even as we've been told it—refutes the prophetic utterances of the Bible, nor does it deny the historical record of the nations, or the account of Creation, or any other factual detail found therein. Well, how can I say that? Didn't I just go through all the trouble of showing we can't trust in history? That's precisely my point. Which I will explain...

There are certain people—certain Families—today who continue in the tradition of their fathers, which practiced the tradition of *their* father, whom <u>Jesus said</u> was "the father of lies", and "a murderer from the beginning". To hide this truth from us, they've concocted a set fables about the past in order to control the present—and if we let them, our future, and that of our children as well.

One thing we *can* be certain of may be found in a single historical accuracy they may have purposely let slip—just to rub it in our faces. It is the following remark made by the French ex-Emperor while allegedly in exile and writing his memoirs, circa 1820... And we should be mindful to recall it ourselves whenever confounded by the enemy's propaganda. When asked to reflect on the truth of history, Napoléon Bonaparte ingeniously replied:

"History is a set of lies agreed upon..."

We will do well to remember that confession.