

[return to updates](#)

# The Zodiac Murders and others were Faked



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published August 23, 2014*


Abstract: I will unwind the Zodiac event, the Houston Serial Murder event of 1973, and the murders of Richard Cottingham, showing they were all faked.

Until my recent paper on the Tate Murders, no one would have countenanced an essay with the title above. But if you have read [my 83-page PDF](#)—which would be about 250 pages in a book—exposing the Tate/Manson hoax, you are likely to be in a position to have an open mind here. Hopefully I can cover this one in less time.

What got me into this one was not photographic evidence, but code-breaking. My regular readers will know I have many unusual skills, but they may not know I can also decode ciphers. Those who have followed my science papers will not be too surprised, since they have seen me crack many long and complex mathematical derivations from the mainstream, including famous equations by Einstein, Bohr, Maxwell, Schrodinger, and Feynman. [Feynman has been sold to us as a safe cracker, but [decoding his convoluted equations](#) was much more difficult than cracking any safe.] Since these equations are often poorly defined and understood, this could be seen as a sort of codebreaking. I tear apart the proofs, showing my readers where the authors have fudged, pushed, contradicted themselves, or simply gone off the beam.

Compared to that, this was cake. As you may know, the Zodiac killer was an alleged serial killer starting in late 1968 in San Francisco. He taunted the police and newspapers with cryptograms like this one:

HER> 9 J A V P K I @ L T G @ @  
 N 9 + B @ @ @ D W Y - < @ K @ @  
 B X @ @ M + U X G W @ @ L @ @ H J  
 S 9 9 @ A J @ V @ 9 @ + + R K @  
 @ @ M + @ @ L T @ I @ F P + P @ X /  
 9 @ R A F J @ - @ @ C @ F > @ @ @  
 @ @ + K @ @ @ @ U @ X @ V - @ L I  
 @ @ @ J @ @ @ @ @ @ N Y @ + @ L @  
 @ < H + @ + Z R @ F B @ Y @ @ K  
 - @ J U V + A J + @ 9 @ < F B X -  
 U + R / @ @ E I D Y @ @ @ T M K @  
 @ < @ J R J I @ @ T @ M - + P B F  
 @ @ @ S Y @ + N I @ F B @ @ @ @ R  
 J G F N A @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @  
 Y B X @ @ @ @ @ @ C E > V U Z @ - +  
 I @ - @ @ @ B K @ @ 9 @ A - @ M @ @ @  
 R @ T + L @ @ @ @ @ + F J W B I @ @ L  
 + + @ W @ @ @ @ @ P O S H T / @ @ @  
 I F X @ W < @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ - @ @  
 > M D H N @ K S @ @ @ @ A I K @ +



The 408-character cryptogram was broken on August 8, 1969. Before I show you the message, I beg you to notice the date. *That is the day before the alleged Tate murders.*

OK, here is the message:

“ I LIKE KILLING PEOPLE BECAUSE IT IS SO  
 MUCH FUN IT IS MORE FUN THAN KILLING WILD  
 GAME IN THE FORREST BECAUSE MAN IS THE  
 MOST DANGEROUE ANAMAL OF ALL TO KILL  
 SOMETHING GIVES ME THE MOST THRILLING  
 EXPERENCE IT IS EVEN BETTER THAN GETTING  
 YOUR ROCKS OFF WITH A GIRL THE BEST  
 PART OF IT IS THAE WHEN I DIE I WILL BE  
 REBORN IN PARADICE AND THEI HAVE KILLED  
 WILL BECOME MY SLAVES I WILL NOT GIVE  
 YOU MY NAME BECAUSE YOU WILL TRY TO  
 SLOI DOWN OR ATOP MY COLLECTIOP OF  
 SLAVES FOR MY AFTERLIFE ”  
 EBEORIE TEMETHHPITI

They tell us the meaning of the final 18 letters has not been decoded to this day. Which is somewhat curious in that it took me only about 30 minutes to crack it. But before I do that, notice we have more numerology here. There are 18 letters at the end, code cracked on 8/8, 408 total letters. As I will show, there are 9 letters missing, which can be filled in from following the easy clues. That means there are 390 letters in the main text, plus 18, plus 9. Beyond that, the codes were received by the newspapers on 8/1. None of that is really important in cracking the code, but it tells us who we are dealing with. The funny thing about the Zodiac event is that all the numerology and astrology involved shouldn't be telling you we are dealing with a new-age killer, it should tell you we are dealing with a spooky subset of the Feds. What we are seeing here is the various calling cards of an entrenched arm of Intelligence, not of any species of serial killer. Given what we now know in 2014, that should not surprise you too much. These spookiest of the spooks are now being outed by everyone, including their fellow spooks. If you don't know what I mean, just study the steep rise in Illuminati references in the past decade.

But back to the message. It is obvious the main text is garbage. It is only there to cover the real message. The real message is in the final 18 letters. But to decode the final 18, you have to follow the clues in the main text. It was noticed from the beginning that the Zodiac appeared to be a terrible speller, but no one followed up on that clue. Or, they actually misdirected on it, telling us things like “the Zodiac purposely injects errors into his messages to throw off police.” But his misspellings here don't look like accidental misspellings, do they? No one misspells “dangerous” with an “e” at the end or spells “stop” with an “a” at the beginning. So we can be sure the misspellings are done on purpose. They aren't done to throw off police, they are part of the cipher. All we have to do is go in and make the corrections.

There are 9 corrections, as I said, and they give us the letters RSITSMWSN. We then simply add those 9 to the last 18, to get the string RSITSMWSNEBEORITEMETHHPITI. This is fabulously easy, since it turns out those 27 letters are just a long anagram or scramble. Using two possible ciphers (methods for ordering the letters), I got initially got two possible messages:

1. SETH, MEET ROB SMITH N WEST PIER II
2. STEPHENS, MEET ROBERT SMITH WIII

You will say, “Yikes! How did you get that? Those 27 letters could scramble out to almost anything.” True, but I knew generally what I was looking for. I wasn't starting from scratch. This is why the reader of the message could also unscramble it so quickly. He knew who it was from and who it was to (within a few people), so he knew the names already. They had probably met at a pier before, since this was San Francisco. So all he had to get from the anagram was the “meet” and the number of the pier.

You will say, “Still, I could produce several hundred messages from that string. Can you begin to tell us how you got to the message you did?” OK. First off, one glance at the string of letters tells you many things. There are a lot of letters not represented, like A, C, D and F for example. So the string actually *can't* be formed into just anything. We also have a lot of letters represented more than once. Four T's, five E's, and four I's, for example. So, again, that narrows it way down. I assumed the string was a message, so it might include numbers. If so, it would have to include roman numerals. Since we have no X or V, the only numbers it could contain are 1, 2, or 3, with 2 or 3 the most likely since you normally don't have to specify the number 1. This would explain why we have so many I's, you see. The same sort of logic applies to the names. Many or most messages include a name, or more than one. Therefore, the odds are the extra T's, E's, and I's are in those names. Same for the S's, M's, and H's, which we also have a lot of.

You may think I assumed SMITH was included in this message and pushed it toward him. But I didn't. Not initially, anyway. Actually, the first name I considered was ROSS. I created a message that included the name ROSS. Since Ross Sullivan is name linked to the Zodiac, I researched that possibility thoroughly. However, I decided against that message for many reasons, only some of which had to do with that research. I ultimately scratched through that message because in order to include the name ROSS I had to compose a message that otherwise didn't make full sense in regard to the scenario and the message. I also couldn't manufacture a cipher that would yield the word ROSS in a sensible message. In composing a message like this, you have to weigh dozens of things at the same time, and then use logic and intuition to come out the other end. Yes, you could produce dozens of messages with that string that make sense in English, but very few of them will make sense in the given scenario. Only a handful of them will be completely sensible for every single word. Therefore, this isn't actually as hard as it may look. You may think a 27-word anagram is too large to limit, but the

opposite is true. We have a large number of pretty tight constraints here, and all of them taken together made this code easy to break. Which is why I doubt that this code hasn't been broken before. More likely is that it has been broken many times, but the solution just isn't published at places like Wikipedia, for obvious reasons.

You will then say, "I thought you said you found a cipher? It sounds more like you decoded the message without one, or tried to." I worked forward and backward to discover the ciphers. There's more than one way to skin a cat. There are almost as many possible ciphers as there are messages, so it often helps if you can intuit a word or two in the message, then find gaps in the message that will lead you to the right cipher. This way often saves time, since you don't have to run through all the common ciphers. Plus, the author may use an uncommon very difficult cipher or may use one so simple it isn't even on the "common" list. I have learned to trust my intuition. In many cases in the past I did solve a puzzle without a cipher, just collating other information. Then I found the cipher after the fact. I won't tell you exactly what I did here, since I don't like to give away all my tricks. Some of you may be able to back-engineer the cipher from the solution.

As I say, I found both messages to be possible solutions, using slightly different ciphers, but I lean to one over the other, both due to the cipher required and due to the message itself. Before I tell you which one, let's look at the possible people involved here.

So who is Rob Smith? That is Robert Graysmith, whose real name was originally Robert Gray Smith. See how little he had to change to fool you? He legally changed his name in 1976, seven years after 1969. That by itself is a red flag. If you go to the Wikipedia page on the Zodiac killer, you will find that almost a third of the footnotes link to Robert Graysmith. This is because Gray Smith wrote two of the most influential books on the Zodiac killer, called *Zodiac* (1986—but written ten years earlier) and *Zodiac Unmasked: The Identity of America's Most Elusive Serial Killer* (2002). He is like the Vincent Bugliosi of the Zodiac murders.

Notice that Smith changed his name in 1976, and wrote his book in 1976. Coincidence? Nope.

Many have been suspicious of Smith from the beginning, since he just happened to be working at the *San Francisco Chronicle* when the alleged Zodiac killer was mailing in his notes. Smith was working as a cartoonist in 1969 at the *Chronicle*, and was in several of the meetings where the cryptograms were discussed. Why would a cartoonist be present for something like that?

Also suspicious is the rest of his *oeuvre*, which includes a 1997 book on the Unabomber, a 1999 book on Jack the Ripper, and a 2003 book on the Anthrax killer. Knowing what we now know, we should ask if Smith is being paid to misdirect his readership on all these cases. It looks to me like his superiors were happy with his work on the first Zodiac book and hired him to create the same sort of mystification on these other cases.

If you don't know, the [London papers admitted in 2013](#) that Jack the Ripper was manufactured by Thomas Bulling in 1888, a journalist who worked for the Central News Agency. He was paid to supply crime stories to the newspapers. The Central News Agency was sort of like our Associated Press, except that, according to Paul Begg, "it developed a reputation amongst newsmen for underhand practices and stories of dubious veracity." No, wait, that is *exactly* like our Associated Press.

So we have yet another reason to look suspiciously at the Unabomber case and the Anthrax killer case. If Graysmith is misdirecting on two of the four, he is probably misdirecting on all of them.

Sticking to the Zodiac case for now, many will know that Smith's fingering of Arthur Leigh Allen has not impressed [any of the other serious researchers](#). His evidence is slender, weak, and pushed, and it has been discredited by police and FBI alike, including a failure to match DNA. Despite that, he has mysteriously benefited from the most promotion. His book was the inspiration for the 2007 movie *Zodiac*, starring Jake Gyllenhaal as Smith.

The movie was directed by David Fincher, which is also a clue here. Fincher also directed the *Social Network* in 2010, which promoted Facebook and Mark Zuckerberg. Facebook is of course a DARPA creation, used for direct and easy intel gathering. Fincher directed *Fight Club*, which was also an Intel production. Fincher has directed two episodes of *House of Cards*, which is political propaganda of the most transparent sort, making *The West Wing* look relatively subtle in comparison. Fincher directed *The Game* (1997), which was produced by Propaganda Films. No, really—**Propaganda Films**. It is about an investment banker who gets involved in a completely faked world. Sound familiar?

What is Fincher's next movie about? It is called *Gone Girl*, to be released this year, and we know the plot from the book. It is about a wife who fakes her diary and death to implicate her husband. And no, she doesn't get caught. Finding her death too hard to fake, she returns to her husband, telling him she had been kidnapped. He doesn't believe her, but since she is pregnant by him, he takes her back. The book ends with the wife writing a memoir about her fake abduction. So, as in *The Game*, we have a fake inside a fake.

Do you see a pattern here, not only with Fincher but with Gray Smith?

Gray Smith has acted so spooky in so many ways over the years that some have even theorized that he is the Zodiac himself, covering his tracks with the lies and distortions in his books. But although I understand how someone could come to that conclusion, it is not the truth here. The truth is, the Zodiac murders were faked from the first day, with the collusion of all the top people in San Francisco. I leave open the possibility that some in the story were ignorant dupes, fooled by the people around them, but unwinding who was who 45 years later is not so easy. As with the Tate event, we may assume the Feds had infiltrated the police, the newspapers, and all the other institutions involved, and that they were in control of the story. Therefore, if we want to point the finger, we should point it first at the Feds, and only later at the locals. The locals were either fooled or coerced, and in either case they would have some excuse.

The closest I have seen anyone coming to this conclusion is Thomas Horan, who has [a blog](#) and a youtube video where he says the Zodiac letters were all faked by Keith Power and Hal Snook. He makes some interesting points, and as I will show he is correct that the letters were faked. But he is either wrong or misdirecting about why and on the orders of whom. Horan leads you to the theory (which he did not invent) that the Zodiac was faked to keep the heat off the real killers, who were connected to the Vallejo PD. This takes us into the drug story, which includes the theory that Faraday and Ferrin and others were involved in the drug trade there. I will show all that is a diversion as well, on a par with the Satanism diversion in the Tate/Manson event. You see, they have to have fake stories planted for everyone, including those who get pretty far into the investigation. Some will get waist-deep like we have already, realize the letters were fake and that a lot of other stuff is fishy, and begin to balk. This drug story is for those people. Those like Horan who tell it admit all the lies you have already discovered, but then they divert you into another set of lies. They want you to think the local police might be involved, since that still keeps your eyes off the bigger dogs: the Feds who really ran this event.

If you have any inclination to believe the Vallejo-police-are-guilty story, ask yourself this: if the Vallejo police were dirty and were trying to cover their tracks with the Zodiac story, how did they have the power or reach to plant stories not only in the *San Francisco Chronicle* and the newswire, but in the detective mags as well? As you will see in just a moment, they would have had to begin planting stories even before the Faraday/Jensen murders. The Vallejo PD simply didn't have that reach. They would have to have been connected to Feds, and were. By 1968, all police departments, like all city newspapers, had been swallowed by the Intelligence squid. The CIA has since admitted that about the media (see the Senate Church hearings), but it was just as true of local police. They could and did plant agents wherever they wished, and most PD's were happy to give them access. Those PD's that weren't happy were ordered to *get* happy about it, which they did.

I do encourage you to read Horan, though, noticing what he says about Gray Smith. He mostly tells the truth about Gray Smith. But even Horan doesn't go far enough in his destruction of Gray Smith, since in his theory Gray Smith only got involved later to make money from the hoax. As we will see, Gray Smith was involved from the beginning, and his main interest or assignment was never making money. Horan sometimes is forced to admit that, when he says something like

Why did Robert Graysmith conceal the fact that he, personally, had handled most of the Zodiac letters and all three pieces of the [Stine] shirt? All alone, in the Chronicle darkroom. Free to help himself to a sample of "Zodiac's" gory souvenir. Free to make his own copies of the photos of the "Zodiac" letters. To be used later.

Horan uses that to imply that Gray Smith had become a sort of moonlighting investigative reporter by 1972, making up stuff to suit himself. But Gray Smith wasn't just sneaking around the *Chronicle* offices at the time of the alleged Stine murder (Oct. 11, 1969), unknown to his bosses. He had already been hired by the Feds at that time as a mole, along with many other people in the same offices, including Avery. That reading of Horan's evidence is much more logical than his own reading, given everything else we will discover below.

Who is Seth? Seth Morgan was the fiancé of Janis Joplin in 1970, at the time she allegedly died. Morgan is normally sold to the world as a drug dealer and sometimes student at UC Berkeley, but he was always much more than that. To start with, he was the son of George Frederick Morgan, founder of the *Hudson Review*. *The Hudson Review* was founded in 1947, year one of the CIA, which should get you on the right track here. George Morgan studied at Princeton under Allen Tate, and was one of his main protégés. Tate was one of the ones [who voted the first Bollingen Prize to agent Ezra Pound](#), remember, in what year?—1948. Tate was published by *Encounter* magazine, which was created and funded by the CIA. He was also in cohorts with Paul Mellon and Stephen Spender. For more on this, see [my previous papers](#) on the CIA's control of Modern art and literature. Or see [Frances Stonor Saunders'](#) book *The Cultural Cold War: the CIA and the World of Arts and Letters*.

The *Hudson Review*, like *Encounter*, *Partisan Review*, *Paris Review*, and all the other literary magazines, was a CIA front. In most cases, this is now admitted, since the cover for all these people has been blown. Given the bio of Seth Morgan, we should assume he was continuing in his father's footsteps.

We get all the same markers if we study the bio of Janis Joplin. Joplin's career also rose out of Haight-Ashbury in the mid-1960's, where the CIA and FBI had a large presence. She ran with the connected crowd: the children of the wealthy and influential whose parents always seem to be in military, Intelligence, or the top of the financial sector. Before she got with Morgan, she is said to have been



sleeping with Kris Kristofferson, whose father was a major general. Kris was also a Rhodes Scholar who attended Oxford. He was also a captain in the army himself. Not your expected bio for a Haight-Ashbury hippie and musician, eh?

As we know, Joplin hung out with and played with the Grateful Dead. Jerry Garcia had also been in the military, although we are told he was discharged. I don't tend to believe that. He was only given an unusual assignment. He went into the military in 1960, was supposedly discharged same year, then a few months later in 1961 he hooked up with Robert Hunter, who has red flags all over him. Hunter is known as a lyricist, and his best-known song may be "Friend of the Devil." Hunter ended up collaborating with both Jerry Garcia and Bob Dylan, but less known is that Hunter was an early volunteer at the CIA MKULTRA psychedelic tests at Stanford in 1962. This puts him with Gordon Lish, Ken Kesey, and many others. They tell you these guys were volunteers, but they now look like recruits. Kesey ended up pushing these drugs on the hippies over the next decade, via various suspicious programs like the Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test. Of course, so did Hunter and the Grateful Dead. So did Joplin and Kris and all the rest.

Speaking of Kris, we are supposed to believe Kristofferson slept with Joplin? This goes against the rest of the story in many ways, as well as against reason and human nature. Joplin herself tells us she was voted "ugliest man" in her highschool class. When she was supposed to be with Kris she was already 26, and no longer looking her best.



That's Janis at her best, in around 1965.



That's Janis at 25. She didn't have a lot of heterosexual male groupies. This is a problem because Kris was gorgeous. He had to be, since he couldn't sing and couldn't act. See him in *Semi-Tough*, with Burt Reynolds. Although he had none of the charm of Reynolds, he was always much better looking (my girlfriend has popped in to assure me Reynolds was sexier, but I don't have an opinion on that score). I hope I don't have to explain the problem beyond that. Assuming Kris was hetero, there would be no reason for him to hook up with Joplin. As a connected and very handsome young man, he would have his pick of the 10's, so why would he be sleeping with a five? I have no doubt he was hanging out with Joplin, but I assume he was her handler or her brains, not her lover. Besides which, we know Joplin was gay herself, no matter what Kris was. She was with Peggy Caserta at the time. Which means both her relationships with Kris and Seth Morgan are not what we are told.

Joplin's producer was Paul Rothchild, who was also the producer for *The Doors*. As we now know, Jim Morrison's dad was the Navy Admiral at the infamous Gulf of Tonkin incident, a false flag used to escalate the Vietnam War. Also take note of the name Rothchild. They will try to deny he is related to the Rothschild bankers, but all the Rothschilds, by whatever spelling, are related to the Rothschild bankers. How do I know? Because the Rothschild name was *made up* by the bankers, and didn't exist until then. It means "red shield", and was chosen by the Jewish bankers in Germany for several reasons, only one of which was to make them seem more German. It is like if you renamed your family Bobafett, because you thought of yourselves as great bounty hunters. Since no one else has a last name of Bobafett, we can be sure that any Bobafetts in the future will be related to you.

So hopefully you begin to understand who and what Seth Morgan was. He may have been a drug dealer, but all these people were drug pushers one way or another. You have to understand, the drug market in the San Francisco area at the time wasn't run by low-life criminals, dirty cops, or the Mafia. It was run by the Feds. It still is, in every city and town in the world. The Feds may use local losers for the lowest rung of jobs, but the market is controlled from the top, and the top goes all the way up. That is why you always find the sons and daughters of the elite—like Seth Morgan—if you take the time to dig. They weren't fallen scions, "angelheaded hipsters burning for the ancient heavenly connection"; they were planted agents, the youthcorp of Intelligence. We saw this over and over in my Tate/Manson paper, and we will see it again here.



None of this is a wild opinion of mine. Tons of research has been done on the Feds' control of the drug market, including—perhaps most famously—Gary Webb's investigation at the *San Jose Mercury News*. See his book *Dark Alliance*, which fully investigates the Fed's control in both Los Angeles and San Francisco.

But back to Morgan. The Joplin event was just a year after the Zodiac event, so Morgan would have been about 20 then. Curiously, even here we have a mystery, since the reports don't match. According to Wikipedia, Morgan was 21 in 1970, when he was with Joplin. But [according to litreactor](#), Morgan was admitted to Berkeley in 1967 with sophomore status. He should have been 18 in 1967, so he appears to be a year or two ahead of his schoolmates. That is a problem because we are also told he was expelled from several ritzy east-coast private schools, and “lost a few years” due to his hell-raising ways. It can't be both ways. He can't lose a few years and still be a university sophomore at 18.

Although Morgan's biography has been whitewashed, overwritten, and manufactured, it is clear his assignment was much the same as Gray Smith's: keep retelling the old stories to keep them fresh. In his book *Homeboy*, Morgan retold all the old manufactured stories from the late 1960's, including the stories of Joplin, Morrison, the Grateful Dead, and so on. In exactly the same way, Gray Smith retold all the lies concerning the Zodiac killer, keeping them up-to-date for the new generations.

Since their later assignments were similar, we should not be surprised to find such similarity in their early assignments, and should not be surprised to find them mentioned together in this cryptogram message. They were both young writers in their 20's, placed in this event as possible future story tellers, but mainly as low-level errand boys and messengers getting their feet wet in Intelligence. It is clear from the message that they were (at first) being used as the CIA's pigeons. The logical thing to do once we see that is to compare Smith's childhood and genealogy to Morgan's. But you can't. His early life has been scrubbed. All his bios start with his time at the *SF Chronicle*, when he was already 27. We aren't told who his parents were or where he went to university or what he did before 1969. With a lot of digging, I finally found [one short bio](#) that stated his father was a Lt. Colonel in the Air Force, stationed in Pensacola. That tends to confirm my analysis above, and matches what we will find below. A disproportionate number of Lt. Colonels in these events.


Who is STEPHENS? In my opinion, that would be HUGH STEPHENS, another writer like Gray Smith and Paul Avery (who we will unwind below). While Avery was telling the story at the *Chronicle*, Stephens was telling it at the *Front Page Detective*. They had to sell the story both highbrow and lowbrow, you know. Or maybe I should say lowbrow and lowerbrow.



streets and out of the alleys. I will murder again and again. . .” They are driving that point home, since it is the main line of the psy-op. They want to scare everyone straight. They want the ladies to go to the malls to buy things, sure, but they want them to go straight home, looking at no one, and shivering in their pumps. Also curious is how similar this quote looks to Islamic sharia code, where women are kept off the streets “for their own good.” You will say that conflicts with the whole empowerment of women code we have also seen pushed since the 1960's. Yes, but the conflict is also purposeful. At the same time they are empowering women, they are scaring them senseless with mass murders and serial killers and a thousand other things. Of course this sets up an internal tension that women have to deal with somehow, and most of the deal with it by having a series of breakdowns. Some of them have a few big breakdowns, and some have little breakdowns every week or every day. This causes them to buy a raft of things they don't need, from junkfood to unnecessary clothing to medical and psychological care to new age treatments to drugs. Of course this also applies to men, but men mostly breakdown from having to deal with these women.

We get confirmation that the events succeeded in creating great fear, since after the Bates murder it was reported that “50 students had dropped out of night classes following the discovery of the brutal murder. Many of the coeds were forbidden from going on campus at night.” But, people being what they are, this fear doesn't seem to last long. The governors found that they have had to accelerate the events, and make them progressively more gruesome, in order to maintain the fear. Somehow, women just keep going out and traveling alone.

So let's return for a moment to the decoded message. Does my decoding of PIER 2 fit the scenario? Again, yes, since the *San Francisco Chronicle* was only about six long blocks away from that pier. If you take Mission street from 5<sup>th</sup> straight down to the ocean, you hit piers 1 and 2. There are currently a lot of shops there, including a Sinbad's restaurant, but they weren't there in 1969. Back then it was an actual pier, more like what pier 7 still is. Of course this applies just as well to pier 3, which is right next to pier 2. WIII would then signify “west pier 3” in that case, I assume, or perhaps “wharf (dock) 3”.



You will say, “OK, that may or may not indicate something was going on here, but why should we think it was a false event? Why not assume these guys were actually connected to the crimes in some way? According to Morgan's bio, he was involved in drug trafficking and armed robbery. He spent

three years in Vacaville state penitentiary for pinning a guy's hand to the floor with a knife. If he can do that, it isn't a far leap to murder.”

That might be true if you accept the standard story, but since I don't accept what they tell me about the Zodiac, why would I believe what they tell me about Morgan or Smith? To figure out what is really going on here, we have to weigh all the stories against each other, and also weigh each one against reason. Only if we do that can we hope to get near the truth. Remember, we know that the government was running a lot of programs in the area, and we know what those programs were. So if we see a media report that mirrors a government program, we have to ask if the two are the same. The Zodiac murders look like the government programs of the time, and look very much like the faked Manson murders we have already unwound, so we should be very suspicious. Since the Manson murders were faked, and since they included many of the same folks, and the same *types* of folks, we should look very hard for evidence the Zodiac murders were faked. To me, the involvement of Gray Smith and Morgan fits that storyline far better than it fits a storyline where one or both of them were murderers, or involved with real murderers. Given their known backgrounds and connections, it is much more likely they were government operatives. We know these government operatives were faking murders, so it is extremely likely the Zodiac murders were faked as well. And since Manson's time in Vacaville was faked, Morgan's probably was, too.

We get more indication operatives in San Francisco were faking the Zodiac story, since the letters—supposed written from NAPA—were posted in downtown SF. Most likely, the letters were posted *to* the *SF Chronicle* from the *SF Chronicle*, or from offices nearby. If the *Chronicle* writers weren't writing the letters in-house, so to speak, then they would have to come from one of the many spook houses in the near vicinity. Not only were (and are) the nearby Stanford and Berkeley campuses stiff with spook labs, SF proper is as well.

Remember, Paul Tate, the overseer of the entire Tate/Manson event, was also tied to San Francisco and Haight-Ashbury in 1968-9. He was placed there on many occasions by many writers, including Ed Sanders (who wrote *The Family*—the second most famous book on the event after Buglioi's *Helter Skelter*). For instance, the Tates, the Folgers, and the Manson girls were all in San Francisco for a benefit for the Haight-Ashbury Clinic of Roger Smith and David Smith in 1968. Notice those names. Smith, Smith. Are these guys related to Gray Smith? Smith is a common name, but who knows. Robert Gray Smith named one of his sons David. Yes, his son is David Smith, the same as Charles Manson's parole officer. I am not saying it is the same guy, since the ages are way off; I am just pointing out it is possible Robert named his son for David.

This clinic was one of the spookiest places in the entire country, but not because the Manson girls were there. It was spooky because it was one of the national centers for drug pushing in the 1960's. We may assume it was also connected to those who were infiltrating and pushing the anti-war and hippie movements in prescribed directions, including the Aquarian direction. This is why the pushed drugs like LSD connect to the Zodiac event: the same people that were pushing the hippies into new lab drugs were also pushing the hippies into the Aquarian/Zodiac/Astrology program of self-absorption and political inaction. In this way, the Zodiac killer served double duty. He scared everyone into a general panic—a panic that could then be mined in any number of ways. But he also blackwashed the hippies, since they too were into the Zodiac. After August 9, 1969, most people in San Francisco just figured “those damned hippies were at it again” whenever they thought of the Zodiac. So the Zodiac event was a sort of mop-up after the Manson event. Any remaining positive hippie influence in Northern California could be finished off by the Zodiac.

Before we move on, I should tell you which message I believe is the correct one. Although I wasn't able to uncover a strong link between Seth Morgan and Gray Smith, I think message number 1 is more likely. I base this mostly on the cipher I used, which was cleaner than the cipher for number 2. I have also learned to trust my instincts, and my instincts tell me Morgan is involved—at a low level—in this Zodiac hoax. He was the right age to be a pigeon (message carrier), and seems made for the job. He was a lot smarter than he has been made out to be, so he could be trusted to complete such a task, maybe even learning something useful in the process. You don't enter Berkeley as a sophomore unless you have something going on between the ears, and so I suspect Morgan's pose as a loser was just that. It was sort of like Paul Tate's pose as a hippie in LA at the same time. We don't know Tate's full cover, but he was probably posing as someone in the drug culture as well, an older burn-out with connections.

---

---

So let us look more closely at the murders themselves. We have red flags popping up immediately. Just checking the gloss at Wikipedia, we find that the first confirmed Zodiac victims in the Bay Area were said to be found by a local *female* resident after 11pm. This resident lived near a lovers lane, where the young couple were parked. Now, ask yourself this: If you were a lone female living near a lovers lane and you heard shots and screams coming from parked cars nearby, would you go out there in the dark and look for bodies immediately afterwards? Not a chance. You would call the police. In normal circumstances, people killed like this would not be found until the next morning, especially by local residents. Remember, lovers lanes are not normally found right on residential streets, with nosy ladies rubbernecking nearby. They are found on deserted streets in the country, or on the edge of town, for quite obvious reasons. That being admitted, it is very curious to hear that bodies were found *after 11pm* by a female resident. You also have to remember that this was winter, it was very cold, and this lady lived on a farm or ranch. Rancher's wives aren't normally driving around after 11pm in the middle of winter. Ranchers and their families generally go to bed early. [See more about this way below, where we will look at this curious evidence more closely].

It is also curious that the Wikipedia entry admits that the story has been compiled from forensic evidence by Robert Graysmith. In normal circumstances, the forensic evidence would have been compiled by a *forensic specialist* working for the local or federal agencies, not by a cartoonist. Given all the money that was said to have been spent working on these cases for decades, it must be extraordinary to see the mainstream story 45 years later told by Graysmith.

If you think that was strange, check out the story of the second murders:


While the couple sat in Ferrin's car, a second car drove into the lot and parked alongside them but almost immediately drove away. Returning about 10 minutes later, this second car parked behind them. The driver of the second car then exited the vehicle, approaching the passenger side door of Ferrin's car, carrying a flashlight and a 9 mm Luger. The killer directed the flashlight into Mageau's and Ferrin's eyes before shooting at them, firing five times. Both victims were hit, and several bullets had passed through Mageau and into Ferrin. The killer walked away from the car but upon hearing Mageau's moaning, returned and shot each victim twice more before driving off. Ferrin was pronounced dead at the hospital. Mageau survived the attack despite being shot in the face, neck and chest.

OK, imagine you are the Zodiac. You have a flashlight and a 9mm Luger (or similar pistol). Your victims are trapped in a car, where they cannot get away and can barely move sideways, both being in the front seat. Talk about shooting fish in a barrel. You hit the nearest one at least three times, the bullets traveling with such velocity they go right through and hit the other person as well. Not content



with that, you come back and shoot the near guy twice more, and this time he can move even less, since he has already been stopped by three bullet holes. And remember, you have a flashlight, so you can see exactly where you are shooting. A 9mm is nearer a .38 than a .22 (being .354), so it is quite powerful. It also imparts a fast bullet speed (high muzzle velocity). Is there any chance that near guy is going to survive? No.

Here is the guy, Michael Mageau, in 1993:



Looks pretty good, doesn't he? I don't see any face or neck scars, do you? No one asked him to show his scars? Curious. Also curious is that Mageau testified at different times that the Zodiac was both 160 lbs and 190 lbs. Also curious is that he later ID'ed Arthur Leigh Allen as the Zodiac, so he was obviously instructed to follow the script of Graysmith. This indicates he was just a hired crisis actor from the beginning. Also of interest is that Darlene Ferrin, who supposedly died in that attack, has a younger sister. The younger sister Christina has said in interviews that Mageau was always a big liar, even before the Zodiac attacks. True, but you know who else is probably a big liar? Christina Ferrin, who is hiding that fact that her sister's death was faked. Christina may even *be* Darlene. Remember how Sharon Tate hid as her fake younger sister? Why else would Christina still be calling Michael a liar decades later? The heat in her interviews is best explained by their earlier relationship. [See way below, where I find more important evidence on Christina and Michael.]

I tried to find some crime scene photos to analyze, as I did with the Manson murders. But I found nothing that was even remotely analyzable, in a normal way. What we get is something like this, which is supposed to be Cheri Jo Bates.





As we see, there are at least two photographers there, one in the picture and one taking it. Neither of those two guys could get anything better than this? They are supposed to be photographing the victim, not each other. That photo looks fake to me. The body doesn't look right around the edges. Study her hip to your right. The line around it isn't right. She is also too flat to the background. Her body doesn't have enough elevation. The lower leg looks two-dimensional, and the upper leg looks broken in two places. I am not aware her legs were supposed to have been broken. Her upper leg looks to be broken above the knee and at the ankle. She doesn't have any arms, either. They could be pinned beneath her, but it is convenient that the photo faker didn't have to put them in. If he made such a mess of the legs, just think how bad the nearer arms would look. Best just to skip them. Same with the head. Convenient we can't see her face, right? That prevents identification. This photo is completely worthless except as propaganda, which is why it is still on the internet.

We see another problem with the dark sweater she appears to be wearing. The problem: she wasn't reported to be wearing one. According to the report, she was wearing a yellow blouse with a ribbon tied at the throat. Is that what you see in that photo? I will be told that entire dark area is blood. She was stabbed in the throat repeatedly. Still, is that how it looks to you? Would both shoulders and all visible parts of her arms be turned near-black? If so, why would the soaking end in a straight line across her back, as if she is wearing a dark sweater that has ridden up? Now that I know this photo was faked, I would say the faker decided this was the best way to deal with the problem area. He needed to indicate some blood around her neck, so he probably put in a limited amount to start with. It didn't look right, so he put in more. It still looked fake, so he put in even more, until it looked like she was wearing a sweater. At that point he quit, because although it now didn't look like blood, at least it looked like *something* real, enough to fool most people.

Even the men in the picture look pasted in. That cameraman is outside, why does he need a flash? Look at his hand with the white card. It doesn't look right, does it? It is too white. The shadow under the card is wrong, also.

We will pause a moment to study this Riverside murder (from Southern California, not from the Bay Area). Many red flags pop up here, including the name and the date. Her last name was Bates, same as the character from the 1960 movie *Psycho*. *Psycho* was filmed at Universal City, which is a suburb of Los Angeles. Riverside is also basically a suburb of Los Angeles, about 30 miles from Universal City. We are told the date was October 30, 1966, but the murder was said to have taken place between 10pm and 1am. A watch found nearby was stopped at 12:23, so that indicates the struggle happened then, *after* midnight. That made it Halloween, so the date could just as easily and accurately be stated as October 31. Her body was found on Halloween and her death was reported on Halloween. Cheri Jo was a thin blonde, like Janet Leigh in *Psycho*. They both had short hair.



Bates' father worked at the Naval Ordnance Lab in Corona and her brother was also serving in the navy. No one (I read) has ever made the connection, but both a military watch and heelprint from a military boot were found at the alleged murder scene. This would point back at her father or brother, obviously, but the police and investigators never went there. I assume they didn't go there because the murder was faked. You don't pursue anyone in a fake murder. The watch and bootprint were only indication her family was in on the scam. They had to give her a ride home, since her car was part of the fake.

It is her father who allegedly reported her missing. This is another red flag. According to the story, a janitor found Bates' body early the next morning. So Bates had only been missing overnight. You *can't* file a missing persons report that soon without cause. Since Bates was a college student, her coming home late one night would not be considered cause and the police would tell her father to get lost. I will be told the waiting period is an urban legend, but that is only true if there is some cause. The father would have no reason to believe mischief had occurred—unless he caused it—and Cheri was not a child. So it is very unlikely a report could have been filed before Cheri was found the next morning. It is simply not logical.

A note was sent to police afterwards, claiming responsibility. It is also very suspicious. Although police accepted it as genuine, the writer appeared to know very little about the actual murder. He said that she did not struggle, for instance, when the crime report indicates just the opposite. He also says this:

I LAY AWAKE NIGHTS THINKING ABOUT MY NEXT VICTIM. MAYBE SHE WILL BE THE BEAUTIFUL BLOND THAT BABYSITS NEAR THE LITTLE STORE AND WALKS DOWN THE DARK ALLEY EACH EVENING ABOUT SEVEN. OR MAYBE SHE WILL BE THE SHAPELY BLUE EYED BROWNETT THAT SAID NO WHEN I ASKED HER FOR A DATE IN HIGH SCHOOL. BUT MAYBE IT WILL NOT BE EITHER. BUT I SHALL CUT OFF HER FEMALE PARTS AND DEPOSIT THEM FOR THE WHOLE CITY TO SEE. SO DON'T MAKE IT TO EASY FOR ME. KEEP YOUR SISTERS, DAUGHTERS, AND WIVES OFF THE STREETS AND ALLEYS. MISS BATES WAS STUPID.

That is mighty suspicious, since serial killers are not known for their empathy or their community spirit or their concern for people's daughters. This note reads like it was written from the police department or the government. The writer is trying to scare young women straight, teaching them to be careful. Serial killers don't talk that way; town fathers do. This reads like a very stiff public service announcement.

To see what I mean, I recommend you watch the movie *The Village*, by M. Night Shyamalan. In it, the town elders concoct a gruesome and detailed series of events to scare the young people from wanting to go into the forest. It is all for their own good, since the "world is a dangerous place." This is precisely what our own community elders were doing with these faked murders. Or, originally this was the intent. Later they began to use faked events to control us in other ways, but up until the mid 1960's, I believe the elders often had good intent. I no longer believe that.

Also curious is that the scene of the Bates event just happened to match the scene of an attempted murder one year earlier. Detective Gren admitted, "The two cases were identical in many ways." They were so identical the police's first suspect was the man convicted of the previous crime in the summer of 1965. Unfortunately, they found he had not escaped from jail. This is a *huge* red flag, since it indicates those in charge of the Bates event chose their location with care, both to give it a dose of authenticity as well as to tie it to previous mischief.

But here is the strangest thing in the entire Bates event:

In the Victims section of the site, there is a picture of Cheri Jo in the Library. The caption says the picture was taken "very shortly before her murder." Who took this picture? Was it taken on the night of her death?

*Moderator Howard Davis:* Justin: We got the picture (I sent that copy to Tom) and I think it was taken by Fred Bauman the photog' who took the desk/ poem shots.

That exchange is from the [Zodiackiller.com message boards](#), June 11, 2001. And here is the picture:



That's the smoking gun an investigator looks for! Everyone didn't have cellphones with photographing capabilities back then of course, so the odds against Bates having her picture taken in that library *before* her murder are astronomical. Whoever the photographer was, we have to ask, "Why was he there taking pictures of Bates right before her murder?" Fred Bauman was a photographer for the

Riverside *Press-Enterprise* newspaper, so apparently the local newspaper knew Bates was going to be a major news story *before* she was murdered. They assigned one of their own people to go down to the library and get a picture of her, so they would have a sort of before and after shot, I guess. That alone is enough to put this fake event to rest, but I will show you a bit more.

Another red flag pops up in the Bates event—something no one else has keyed on, that I know of. Bates is said to have gone to San Francisco the weekend before to be with her boyfriend. He was said to play football for SF State College. A female friend of Bates testified they were to be married. But according to other female friends of Bates, she was going to meet her boyfriend at the library the night of the murder. That meeting couldn't have been with the SFSC guy, since he never left SF that weekend. Now, this is very curious, and it demands we unwind it. Your first assumption might be that Cheri Jo had two boyfriends, one she intended to marry and one she was just playing around with. At her age, that would be a fair assumption. However, given that we have a link to San Francisco here, we should not be content with that assumption.

If we dig a bit, we find police soon discounted the testimony of the girls who said Cheri was meeting her boyfriend that night, although the girls recounted the testimony on TV. On what grounds did they dismiss some of the only meaningful testimony obtained so far: none. They dismissed it as hearsay, apparently because it didn't fit the story they were building. But shouldn't you build your story from witness testimony? Not in this case. This should only raise your suspicion further. It already looks like the police were being controlled, leading the public directly away from any real evidence—especially evidence that might prove a hoax.

Anyway, it isn't the boyfriend at the library that is suspicious, it is the boyfriend in San Francisco. His name was Dennis Highland, and given what we already know, I would guess he wasn't her boyfriend or fiancé. That is just a cover story. The fact that she was there the weekend before indicates she was there receiving training for the event. So Highland was probably her contact or handler. They were probably planning her move from Riverside after the event as well, which may or may not have been to San Francisco. It is doubtful they would move her only that far, since someone might recognize her, but I have shown how easy it is to fool people with wigs. Even so, given the press the Zodiac event turned out getting over the next decade, Cheri would have to be in disguise for a long time, at least until she started aging. So I would guess she was taken further away than San Francisco. Maybe they sent her down to Brazil to hang with Sharon Tate.

To move on, the logical thing to do is look up Dennis E. Highland's dad, to find the expected military link. They have made that very hard to do. All information on this Highland family appears to have been scrubbed, at least from the internet. A people search puts Dennis at age 67 in San Luis Obispo, but I could find no information on his father. I did find a mention that Cheri had traveled to San Francisco the weekend before [with Highland's parents](#). That by itself is curious, because at age 18/19, Cheri and Dennis wouldn't have wanted Mom and Dad along, especially if they were really courting. Cheri had her own car, as we know, so she didn't need to hitch a ride. My reading of this fact is that Cheri had been driven up to SF by Dad, who was military intelligence. Eventually, I found a [grave for Harry Edward Highland](#). Since the grave is in Riverside, the birth year is right, and Harry is a veteran, we may have a match. Harry was a Technical Sergeant in the Air Corps. I had expected a higher rank, so this may or may not be the guy.


---

---

In searching online for crime photos from the Zodiac, I tripped across many other gruesome photos said to be from other murders. This reminded me of two things which I will remind you. One, if we compare these truly gruesome photos to the Manson event photos, we find a huge mismatch. These gruesome photos do exist, but they are nothing like what we see in the Manson event. The Manson event was sold to us along the same lines as these others, but the crime scene photos there simply don't read true like these others do. The Manson crime scene photos are actually pretty easy to look at, since it is so obvious they are faked. Two, although these corpses published for other murders are disgustingly real (see, for example, the Torso murders, the Black Dahlia, etc.), that does not mean these other events are any more real than the Manson event or Zodiac event. These mutilated corpses weren't mutilated by famous murderers, they were probably mutilated by medical students. There is a high probability all these corpses were borrowed from dissecting rooms. Either that or they were borrowed from car accidents. Cars wrecks kill almost 50,000 people every year, and many of them are mutilated. Some of them are pretty young women, of course.

So why would I think that these photos are borrowed from dissections or wrecks? Well, one reason I think that is that I have done the research. At first I thought these mutilated corpses were evidence the murders were real. But then I took a deep breath and studied them. Most of them look like dissected corpses, since they have the telltale damage. We have a lot of corpses from the Ed Gein murders, for instance, but it is admitted by the mainstream that he stole most of them from graveyards. He is supposed to have killed only two women, but my guess is the evidence for those two is either slim or manufactured.

However, we don't have to guess. We can go to an even worse guy by the name of Richard Cottingham. I am not going to show you any of the pictures here, don't worry. You can look them up if you want, but I don't really recommend it. It does help if you know they are from dissecting rooms rather than murders, but still. Cottingham is said to have worked mainly in the 1970's and is supposed to be in jail in New Jersey now, claiming 100 murders. Curious that he isn't as famous as many other guys, but maybe you have heard of him. I hadn't heard of him until I wrote this paper, which may be why I can look at this fresh. Anyway, if we go to the interview, we get lots of red flags, starting with that beard.



They have made this guy look as much like Santa Claus as humanly possible, but unfortunately I happen to know beards like that aren't allowed in maximum security prisons. Neither is long hair. It is like being told this guy is in the army. If you were told he was in the army, you might go, "Wait, when did they start allowing people in the army to have beards like that?" You should ask the same thing here. It isn't allowed, so we know this whole thing is a fake. For much more evidence of that, I encourage you to [watch the recent interview](#). We are told the interviewer Nadia Fezzani had to

petition the prison for two years to score this interview, but that is also a lie. Interviews like this are never allowed. It is strictly against policy, for any number of reasons. Such inmates are allowed to speak only to clergy, nearest relatives, law enforcement, and an attorney. They can send out mail, but not to anyone they like, and all parcels are thoroughly checked. So this interview is impossible. It is staged propaganda from start to finish. That is pretty clear in the interview. Watch at minute 3:13 as Fezzani first meets Cottingham. She walks up to him smiling and shakes his hand! This is right after we are told Cottingham is a monster, and are shown pictures of women that he has mutilated, having their heads and hands and breasts cut off. If you were a female interviewer, would you smile really big and shake his hand? No way. I shouldn't say *female* interviewer. If this guy were who we are told he is, *no one* would want to touch him or even look at him, but they certainly couldn't manage a big grin and a handshake.

Cottingham's appearance is fishy in several other ways than the beard. Prisons don't normally issue canes to extremely violent offenders, for obvious reasons. They also don't allow prisoners to get this fat. Prisons don't wish to overfeed prisoners, since that is a sure sign the state is wasting money on food. And even if we suppose this interview was allowed, they would never allow him to sit across the table from Fezzani without a dividing screen. Remember, he has a cane right there. He is supposed to be a vicious killer who loves to bludgeon women. What's to stop him from standing up and whacking her on the side of the head? He isn't in cuffs. No guard is standing close. You have to be an idiot to accept this as real.

Who is this Nadia Fezzani? A top criminologist, forensic expert, pathologist, or neuroscientist from a major university, hospital or other institution? No. She is a young Canadian reporter who started out interviewing athletes, movie stars, and music stars. She was in charge of media relations for the Montreal Matrix, a professional basketball team. I encourage you to trip over that name: MATRIX. Also "media relations." She specializes in media relations. She promotes media personalities, so our assumption should be Cottingham is just another media personality, in a different medium.

Also ask yourself this: do you think Fezzani is the sort of person they would choose to talk to a serial killer when he "breaks his silence after 30 years"? Beyond that, supposing the prison warden had the authority to relax the rules to allow such an interview, do you really think they would do it for Nadia Fezzani, media relations bunny for a defunct Canadian basketball team?

We find out more about Fezzani from the interview. At age 32, she now teaches a class on the psychology of murder "at the University in Montreal." I suppose they mean McGill, which is a notorious hangout for spooks in Canada, sort of like Columbia University is in the US. But what you should be asking is, "what qualifications does Fezzani have for teaching such a class at McGill?" Weren't we told she was an interviewer of sports figures and a media liaison for the Montreal Matrix? How exactly does that qualify someone to teach in the psychology department at McGill? I don't remember reading anywhere that she has a PhD in psychology, which would normally be required to teach at the university level. According to Wikipedia, she is a journalist, which would normally require a journalism degree. According to the very short bio on her own site, she was in the field of sports for five years and then spent some time interviewing famous musicians. So let's do the math. Say she spent two years in music in between sports and serial killers. That's seven years total. She is 32 at the time of the interview with Cottingham. She must have spent several years specializing in serial killers in order to gain the resume to qualify for this interview. You don't just decide to specialize in serial killers one day and the next day you are interviewing Cottingham. Say a minimum of three years specializing in serial killers. That's 32 minus 10, which makes her 22. Are we supposed to believe she got both a degree in journalism and a PhD in psychology by the time she was 22. If so, why isn't that



on her resume or her bio? If I had a PhD by the time I was 22, I think I would put it on my resume.

The documentary shows Fezzani teaching her class at McGill. She says, "In the West, there are 50-100 serial killers free each year, killing between 300 and 400 people." Most of the students in the class are very young women. Fezzani shows them pictures of the mutilated corpses of Cottingham. This is not surprising, since most of those who show an interest in serial killers and follow the forums online are women. Young women are also the main audience for slasher films as well. They have been targeted from a very early age and they respond strongly, as you might expect.

But Fezzani's numbers are completely manufactured. Even if you accept that all the convicted serial killers in jail are real and guilty, there is no way to get the number up to 100 active at all times, or even 50. I encourage you to do the research yourself, and see what numbers you find. Fezzani's numbers are at least a factor of 10 too high. And once you figure out that most of the serial killers have been manufactured by the government to scare you, that number drops drastically again. I haven't researched every serial killer known, but having researched many of the top ones, I can tell you there is a possibility the actual number is very close to zero. If they had real serial killers to scare you with, they wouldn't have to manufacture these guys like Cottingham, would they? Logic.

This is not to say that people aren't cruel to each other and don't murder one another. Of course they do. But the serial killer thing has been way oversold.

It is pretty obvious Fezzani is a spook. Only spooks waltz around from one sexy job to another without any qualifications. Only spooks score lecturing positions at major universities without any qualifications. Only spooks score interviews with serial killers despite the fact that prison policy doesn't allow it. Only spooks smile and shake hands with "torso" killers, since only spooks understand that these guys are just actors like themselves.

We get more strange things from the Cottingham documentary, when Fezzani interviews Dr. Louis Napolitano, who is supposed to be one of the forensic pathologists who originally examined the victims of Cottingham. Unfortunately, I could find no evidence such a person exists. No Louis or Lewis Napolitano is listed as having anything to do with Cottingham, forensics, or pathology.

Even stranger is the next segment, where a French specialist in serial killers is coming to the US. We see him getting on a plane, and the narrator says,

French law forbids interviews with serial killers behind bars, so Stephane Bourguin has to cross the Atlantic to conduct his research interviews.

Wow. So that confirms what I said before. It is also technically true in the US, but over here you are allowed to fake interviews, as long as you are in the Intelligence communities.

Which brings us to a short diversion in the documentary to the Houston mass murders, which Bourguin is researching. This serial spree started in 1970, around the same time as the Tate Murders and the Zodiac Murders. This was a busy time for fake events, just like now. The Houston event was alleged to involve boys instead of girls, and there were three killers, led by this man, Dean Arnold Corll.



That photo is the one known to most, but I hope you can see it is a terrible fake. It doesn't even match other photos of Corll:



What happened to his eyebrows and lips in that last photo? No doubt you see what I mean with the eyebrows, but the lips are very weird, too. You can see that the third picture is washed out (white) like the second, but for some reason his lips avoided the light. Either that or he has really dark lipstick on. We also have clear evidence the head was pasted into that background, since there is a dark line where his collar meets the white object. If this event was real, why were they faking photos?

You will say he *did* have lipstick on: he was a gay psychopath, remember? But that isn't the only problem with his lips. They simply don't match the other two photos of Corll. The other guy has a wider mouth and a natural curve up at the corners. Lipstick-guy doesn't.

Also curious about the story is Corll's stint with the army, which we have evidence of from photo 1. We are supposed to believe that after being drafted, Corll was given a special discharge after 10 months of service because his family candy business needed him. Right. Supposing the candy business couldn't hire someone to replace this 24-year-old, why didn't he tell them that immediately, instead of waiting ten months? As it is, they sent him all the way from Texas to Fort Benning in Georgia for special training. Special training in what? Radio repair? Right.

When his family candy business failed in 1968, Corll went to work at Houston Power and Light as an electrician. And when did he learn to be an electrician? In a few months in the army? Remember, he had to go through basic training first, which is almost three months including travel time. So in just six months or so in Georgia Corll learned to be an electrician, good enough to work for the city? Besides the fact that apprenticeship to be an electrician normally takes three or four years, I thought Corll was studying radio repair at Fort Benning. Not a lot of radios at Houston Power and Light.

The whole story reads like this. Hole after hole after hole. It is shot through with numerology as well. Corll was said to have been killed by one of his co-killers. What day? August 8. But wait, that's 8/8 again, isn't it? That's the same day the Zodiac code was cracked. That's one day before the Tate murders and one day before Nixon resigned. How old was Corll when he died? 33. What, just like Jesus? Just like the highest level of the Freemasons?

But the biggest problem of all with Corll is that name. It is a fake. No one has a last name of Corll anymore. They chose it for that reason. I am now convinced they have a playbook that includes unused names, that they can go to for their fake events. We saw that with Elliot Rodger recently, the alleged Santa Barbara shooter, where a people search showed no one by that name in California. Why? Because Rodger with a "d" and no "s" isn't used as a last name. Rodger is a first name. The last name is normally Rogers or less often Rodgers. As far as the name Corll goes, all you have to do is a people search on Dean Corll. These people searches include people that died in the past 50 years, so he should be there. He isn't. What is stranger is that there are almost no Corlls listed at all. In the Dean Corll search, no Corlls come up at all. So I searched on John Corll. One old guy came up, age 86, but I suspect that is another CIA fake person. In a country as large as the US, you wouldn't expect a family to be this close to extinction. Any real last name pulls up thousands of entries, and usually tens of thousands.

The very fact that the Houston murders are included in the Cottingham documentary is also strong indication they were faked. This clown Bourguin wouldn't be included in all this unless he were also a spook, and the spooks are going to choose their own faked events to continue the old propaganda.

If you have any inclination to believe the Houston murders were real after all this, just ask yourself this: if 30-50 boys disappeared from your local area, do you really think the local police wouldn't have done anything about it in three years? Do you think the Feds wouldn't be involved big time? These weren't runaways or orphans or prostitutes: we are told these were boys with families and schools and jobs. Any yet we are supposed to believe they were just buried *en masse* in boat sheds or something. We are supposed to believe that no one in this big group of candy boys ever wagged a tongue? And we are supposed to believe that the police didn't even believe them when they finally talked? Fifty missing boys in a single area and the police and FBI hadn't brought in plants and infiltrators and spies? All they have to do to solve something like this is hire *one* pretty boy as bait and have him hitchhike—armed and mic'd and monitored—for a couple of weeks in the area. He could have ferreted out someone like Corll in no time. The army trains thousands of young men in their late teens and early

twenties, and some of them are “pretty”, or can be if they are instructed to be as part of their assignment. I still looked about 16 when I was 25, for instance, with curly blonde hair. Train me in combat and stow away some mics and weapons on me and send me in. Since nothing remotely like that ever happened, and since the mainstream story is absurd in all other ways, I don't know why anyone believes it.

I am not the only one who thinks this way, obviously, since *Texas Monthly* ran [an interview in 2011](#) with Skip Hollandsworth, the author of *The Lost Boys*. He was planted to ask and answer questions like mine. Here is what he said:

**TM: It seemed like Houston law enforcement believed that every missing person was a runaway. How much blame did they deserve for not properly investigating these disappearances?**

SH: I never try to paint people either black or white. I always think we're way too complicated for that. And I simply kept thinking that there had to be a better explanation for why the police completely missed the murders altogether. “Not all the officers were that dense,” I thought. “At least one of them had to figure that one of the boys didn't really run away,” I said to myself. I pored over those ancient, fading, yellowed police reports, looking to find some officer who sensed something was literally amiss—some cop, for instance, who worked the Heights beat and who might have wondered why there were so many missing persons posters tacked to a telephone pole. But I just couldn't find that cop. . . . But you have to understand what that time back then was like. There was no FBI Behavioral Science Unit in the early seventies warning citizens of a certain type of killer who went after a particular group of people (like boys), killing them one by one, with a “cooling-off period” between each murder. There weren't even missing children pictured on the side of milk cartons. As hard as it is for us to understand today, people in 1973 didn't snap to the idea of a serial killer.

What a load of crap! This was four years after the Manson and Zodiac murders. All sorts of weirdness was going on in the late 60's, early 70's, and I do believe they were reporting on it in Houston. There wasn't a media blackout in Houston. Houston hadn't fallen into a black hole. And the FBI and other Feds were active then—you might say hyperactive. So Skip Hollandsworth is just misdirecting you. The reason the Houston police ignored this event is that they were instructed to ignore it. It was all theater.

You may think Hollandsworth is just dense. Here's what he says soon thereafter:


And one of the most stunning quotes in the entire story I wrote came from the retired homicide detective who said that his superiors wouldn't let him and other detectives keep digging for more bodies. Why? Did the top brass really cut off the investigation after 27 bodies were discovered because of pressure from civic leaders? Could that really be the case? So far, I have to say, that's the only answer I've been able to come up with.

That's the only answer he has been able to come up with? Pressure from civic leaders? C'mon Skip, turn on the braincells. They didn't want any more digging because they didn't want to have to plant any more evidence. They didn't want to have to buy any more bodies from the morgue or make up any more names and histories. [There is more on the Houston event below].

So let us return to the Cottingham documentary, on our way back to the Zodiac. This whole event is really sick, since the Santa Claus resemblance is not an accident. They are now really messing with women's minds. They want to sully every last memory you have in your head, including your image of Santa Claus. The only thing they haven't done yet is create a serial killer who looks exactly like the Cookie Monster, but they will get around to it.




This is also very strange:



If you search for photos of Richard Cottingham on Google, these pictures comes up as “Harley Richard Cottingham.” He is *not* supposed to be the same guy, since this Cottingham was allegedly killed in the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995. He is on the list. He is said to have been a special agent of the Dept. of Defense Investigative Services. This is strange for several reasons before we get to the name and photo. To start with, the Department of Defense didn't have any offices in the Murrah building. The tenants of the Murrah building are said to have been:

the regional offices for the Social Security Administration, the United States Secret Service, the Drug Enforcement Administration (D.E.A.), and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (A.T.F.).

No DoD there, as you see. But the greater problem is that this guy looks an awful lot like the other Richard Cottingham.




Strange that we don't get any better pictures of Harley Richard Cunningham. Both pictures are blurry and undersized, so we can't compare those obvious moles or look for signs of tampering. But I confirm the eyes are very similar. The eyebrows also match, the nose matches, and the face shape matches. The wide thin lips match. Obviously the hair color, fullness, and part match (the second photo of Harley is reversed). This by itself is enough raise our eyebrows, and my eyes opened wide the first time I saw the photo of Harley. When I read who he was supposed to be, they opened even wider.

If we return to the Cottingham/Fezzani documentary, we find the narrator telling us that only the one photo survives of Cottingham as a young man (above), so we are surprised to find them giving us another one at minute 8:23.



So let's compare this new one to Harley:



Do you still think there is no resemblance? Well, there's yet another one in the documentary:






So let's do a death record search for this Harley Richard Cottingham. Nothing at SSDI, as listed at FamilySearch and Genealogy.com. At Checkmate, they have a listing for this guy, but he has an alias of Harley E. Cottingham. Why would you alias your middle name? Maybe because his real name is actually Edward or something and these Cottingham people are just his stage presences.

Curiously (I suppose) he *is* listed at Findagrave.com, since he has a memorial at the OKC Bombing Site. But that doesn't mean he is in it. All that means is there is a golden chair there with his name on it. Ancestry.com has some death record on him, but since I suspect it is just this memorial at OKC I don't feel like paying for the privilege of seeing it a second time.



But let us return to the documentary with Nadia Fezzani. At minute 21:30, Fezzani and the detectives who arrested Cottingham go to his old house. They go into his old room, which he supposedly kept locked from his wife. This is where they found incriminating evidence. We are expecting bones or severed heads or something, but we are only shown jewelry and keys—jewelry and keys that were never assigned to any victim! They are playing spooky music, but there is nothing in the least spooky about a couple of necklaces and a set of keys.

Then we see pictures of Cottingham with his family (see minute 22:28). But the man in the pictures has dark blonde hair. That is sort of confirmed by the first and second pictures here, but what of the third?



That's a pretty big difference from arrest to trial. And why does his chin dimple come and go? We see it in pic 2 but not in pic 1. Do we have more than one actor playing this role? To be sure you are truly confused, they give you a second mugshot from a week earlier:



Why two mugshots a week apart? I will be told because this first one is bad, with his chin up and his glasses on. Yes, it is, but it wouldn't take them a week to figure that out. Also curious that he is still at the same county jail (Sheriff's Office) a week later, although he is a multiple murderer. Since there was a known serial killer at work in the area, the FBI and the Feds should have already been involved, in which case they would not like to see this thing rotting in a local Sheriff's Office. They would have taken over both the investigation and the prisoner.

It is at this point in the documentary that we are reminded Cottingham was a family man, with a normal job, a wife, and three young children. This was part of the script from the beginning, since the sickos who wrote it wanted women to be scared all men, even the devoted fathers with three babies. The Bundy event was to make sure young women were suspicious of handsome men, and this event was created to be sure young women were suspicious of rolypoly guys with glasses on, standing next to

their wives, with multiple children in their arms. “Loving father by day, sadistic killer by night.” Yes, it actually says that.

Then we get the trial, in which more strange pictures arise:



The first one is Cottingham at trial, the second two are from a few years earlier. The question you should be asking is why was Cottingham blonde up until his arrest photos, but suddenly at trial he has brown hair? I will be told it is because he was a bottle blonde, and he lost his peroxide in jail. But we have a lot of evidence against that here. Notice that in pic 2, Cottingham's boy is very blonde. You will say he got it from the mother, but the mother's hair is dark brown (see pic 3). Beyond that, in pic 1, Cottingham's hair is rather long, as they wore it at the time. Well, if he lost his peroxide in jail, his ends should still be blonde. They aren't. But Cottingham didn't look like a bottle blonde in the other photos anyway. It is almost impossible to dye from brown to that natural shade of dark blonde, and most people wouldn't try for that anyway. To get brown hair blonde, you have to hit it pretty hard with the chemicals, and what you get is a lighter white-blonde that never looks natural. See someone like Sting, as an example. Cottingham's sideburns, eyebrows, and mustache all match the blonde shade exactly, which you never see except in natural blondes. Even Hollywood can't fake this natural look now, with all the tricks in the book, and they certainly couldn't achieve it over-the-counter in 1975. This indicates to me that they changed actors for the trial. The two guys look similar, but I don't think they are the same.

If you want to see something amusing, go to minute 25:20, when the actor we are told was the prosecuting attorney starts crying when relating testimony from 34 years earlier. It's all a show. You might want to remind yourself that the Feds should have been involved with this, which means the district attorney wouldn't have been the prosecutor. In a real trial of this sort, they would have brought in the big guns to prosecute this guy, not some raw local guy. Why do I say raw? Because in 1980 this guy wouldn't have been much more than 30. When they want to assure a prosecution, they don't use young district attorneys.

Fezzani starts fake-crying then as well, and she tells us she feels like “I am the only one who can help the victims' families.” Please. Help them how? If we suppose any of this happened, the thing is done. Getting more spooky commentary from Cottingham isn't going to help anyone. Can you imagine the victims' families watching this documentary and getting any sort of release or closure from it? No, just the opposite. The spooks are trying to induce and continue the trauma for everyone, including you.

Fezzani then tries to get Cottingham to admit how many he really killed. Why? To inflate the already fake numbers? Amusingly, the script continues to make no sense. Cottingham chuckles evilly and says “Oh, I know exactly how many.” Fezzani says, “How many.” Cottingham replies, “Over 85, under 100.” So he *doesn't* know exactly how many. Exactly would be one number, not a spread of 15. There is no reason for him to hedge on this. There is no death penalty hanging over him for admitting more victims. He is serving hundreds of years with no hope of parole. The spread 85-100 doesn't serve any possible purpose. It is simply a sign of multiple irrational scriptwriters who can't decide on a number. Someone on the committee doesn't want 100, since that looks preconceived. Someone else wants the spread, in case they decide to change it later for some reason. So this actor is forced to say things no one—sane or insane—would ever say.

We have more proof of that in what he says next. Fezzani asks if Cottingham would be able to kill her. He says no, because she is tough and he respects her. This shows the scriptwriters know nothing about psychology. When arrested, Cottingham is supposed to have said, “I have trouble with women.” Neither one of those remarks fits what we know about psychology, they only fit the confused faux-feminist interpretation of psychology and human nature that is being pasted over this event. This event was scripted and still is scripted for young women in the audience, and the words “tough” and “respect” are there for them. They are supposed to think that only weak “girly” women fall prey to the serial killers, since serial killers can't face tough women. First of all, that conflicts with the story, since Cottingham's victims were supposed to be prostitutes. Prostitutes are normally pretty tough. They have to be. They are certainly tougher than the doughy little rich girls in Fezzani's class at McGill, feeding greedily on this story and believing everything they are told. The truth is, supposing a man like this were to become violent toward women, it is the *authority* of women that he would be responding to. It wouldn't be their submissiveness that would piss him off, it would be them saying “no” to him, or judging him. In other words, it is their “toughness” that would set him off.

As a simple analogy, think of a tough woman like a lion tamer. She is caught in a cage with animals much larger than herself. If she is either really nice or really tough, she can keep them at bay. Lions, like men, don't attack for no reason. But if she mistreats these lions and also lets her toughness fall a bit, she risks an attack.

So it is Fezzani's toughness that would irk him, especially if he thought he could call her bluff. Clearly, Cottingham isn't trying to fool Fezzani in this interview, telling her he respects her when he doesn't. He knows he will never have a moment alone with her, so what's the point? He says what he does because it is in the script.

We have quick proof of my assertion in the following segment, where the French researcher Bourguin says that “serial killers are impersonal, treating their victims totally as objects.” Well, Cottingham isn't following that script with Fezzani, is he? He is engaging with her personally, with empathy, telling her what she wants to hear about being tough and so on. He is supposed to be a psychopathic monster, but isn't doing a very good job acting like one. I've seen people at the DMV who are a lot scarier than this.

Despite the fact that Cottingham has just said he wants Fezzani as his girlfriend, as he walks away she again shakes his hand and gives him a big smile. If this were real instead of a big fake, I would read her reaction not as “tough” but as submissive in the extreme. She even giggles when he says he wants her to be his girlfriend. The actress Fezzani is a strange bird, and certainly isn't adept at creating the proper responses.

Finally, the documentary takes us back to Houston, for more on the Dean Corll case. We are taken first

to the police station in Pasadena, where they bring the torture board out of storage. Problem is, we see it is pristine plywood, with no stains on it. It should have blood and other stains all over it. You will say they washed it. It is very hard to wash stains out of plywood. Try it. Go soak some blood stains in a piece of plywood and try to get them out. You would have to bleach and sand it. It is very doubtful they would have done that with this board, since the stains would have been part of the evidence. Wash it, yes. Bleach and sand it, no. So the board should be stained. It isn't. Same for the ropes. The ropes are also pristine. That is impossible.

Then Bourguin interviews Henley, who allegedly procured boys for Corll and helped kill them. This actor is much better, and he may even be a real inmate who they hired for his acting skills. If you are wondering what this segment is all about—and what the main event was about—they soon tell you. Bourguin says he wants to know “how a quiet teenager can suddenly flip and sell his own friends, his classmates, neighbors, living just a stone's through away? How could he lose interest in the money and continue to supply the victims and take part in the murders?” You see, they want young men, like young women, to be afraid of everyone, even their own friends, classmates and neighbors. This was Henley's role. Corll's role was to demonize homosexuals, as they did later with Jeffrey Dahmer. They had already created heterosexual serial killers, so they needed to do a couple of homosexual ones as well, to cover everyone. But Henley's role was to demonize the teenager next door. They want to drive wedges between all individuals, because once all personal relationships are ruined, you only have your government to turn to. Since you can't trust those around you, you have to rely on Oprah to give you advice and be your friend. You have to trust Obama to solve your problems for you. You have to look up to Ironman and Captain America. You have to make friends with Eminem and Kanye West and Bono and Sting and Beyonce and Taylor Swift, and they will tell you what to do and what to buy and how to act.

[**Added October 17, 2020:** A reader just informed me that back in May Stephan Bourguin [admitted to \*The Daily Mail\* that his whole career as a serial killer expert was a lie](#). Including the alleged murder of his wife, whom he now admits **never existed**.]

And similar problems arise with the photographic evidence they give us on Corll in this segment of the documentary:



Anybody can tell that is a blonde guy with wavy hair and a tan. Looks like a surfer, mid-20's. We can't



see his face, as usual, which is convenient. But we also can't see any bullet holes, though he was said to be shot three times in the back and three in the front. Since bullets shot from such close range often go all the way through, his torso should be riddled with holes. And yet all we see is a few lines of blood, which could have been dripped on. The picture has been tampered with beyond that, since no photo taken by a police photographer would be this blurry, especially one kept in the files. It has either been rephotographed to add a lot of blur, or taken into photoshop and blurred that way.

Regardless, it clearly isn't Corll. Corll never had hair like that. He wasn't a blonde and his hair wasn't curly.

Henley's story doesn't add up, either. He says Corll had him on the torture board with the two other victims and let him off. But Corll is sold to us as smart and ruthless. We are told by Henley that Corll had told him that if he had to shoot someone to continue shooting until the person was on the floor. So why would Corll let him off the board? Corll had to know that once you start you can't stop. Plus, there is an even greater problem: the board has room for only two. Back up a few minutes to where the police are showing you the board. They say that one victim could be strapped to the front and one to the back. The board is two-sided, not three-sided.

The story fails in yet another way. We see that the blonde guy hasn't been shot in the back of the head. But we are told that Henley shot him three times in the head and three times in the body. So the three head shots must have been in the front. Many problems with that. If you shoot a guy three times in the head from point black range, you don't really need to shoot him three times in the back also. For evidence of that, we just have to return to the Zodiac killings, where the first male victim Faraday was supposed to have been killed with one shot to the head with a .22. But the problems are much greater than that. You *can't* shoot a guy who is running at you three times in the face. You don't have time. The first shot will drop him, and after he has fallen with his face to the wall, you can't shoot him again in the face, can you? And yet another problem. The narrator and Henley don't have their stories straight. The Henley actor is good, but not perfect. The narrator tells us Henley shot Dean three times in the head, which, as we have seen, must have been from the front. In the photo, there are no bullet holes and no blood in the back of the head. And yet when Henley is describing the scene, he says, "I shot Dean three times in. . .in front." Notice he pauses right there, as if he is unsure what to say. Why didn't he say, "I shot Dean three times in the face?" I think I would remember that.

This is also a big problem:





That's supposed to be a dead Dean Corll. Where are the bulletholes? You will say all three are on the other side of his head. Maybe, but the odds of that are low. In fact, the odds are only 1 in 8 that if you shot someone in the head three times, all three shots would be “on the other side.” If there is real evidence in this case, why not show it to us? They showed us wounds in the Tate and Kennedy cases. Why not here? Actually, they do give us this:



But again, they are relying on you to be a big dummy. They are relying on the fact that almost no one watching this documentary—especially the young girls—will know anything about forensics or about wounds. Those aren't bullet holes. Those are knife wounds. Entry holes from bullets are round, of course, and smaller than that. This was a .22 caliber pistol, and it was not shooting 2-inch disks. Those are slits, and knives make slits.

Then, we get another helping of numerology. They take us to the boathouse where the bodies were allegedly buried. Guess what the number of the boathouse is? My first guess would be 33 and my second guess would be 11. The answer: 11. They make sure to flash it to us fullscreen.



We are told there were 17 decaying bodies in there. Right. No one noticed the smell coming from there? No one noticed stray dogs sniffing around there? No one noticed a rat problem?

You literally won't believe what happens next in the documentary. It is far stranger than any serial killer story. After telling us Henley is serving 600 years in prison, we are then told some serial killers are free. We go to Germany, where we find Wolfgang Langer, who killed at least ten people. He is dressing up as Santa Claus, to pass out presents to children at the Christmas market. When I say this is stranger than anything we have seen, I don't mean because Langer is out. I mean because the propaganda is so heavy and so transparent here. This is for those who didn't get the Cottingham as Santa theme the first time. They are really going after Santa here, defaming him twice in one hour-long documentary.



The lesson here: fear everyone, children! Even Santa Claus. Even Barney and Grover and Big Bird. They are probably serial killers in disguise.

The documentarians also use Langer to slander religion. We are told Langer has become religious, and if you are buying the story, this would make you as queasy about Langer's religion as his playing Santa Claus or being free. This is done on purpose. This part of the documentary is coming from German Intelligence, obviously, and they are pursuing the same goals as we are, if less blatantly. The attack on Santa Claus and the attack on Christianity are related. They need to break these old ties and these old relationships, just like all the others. They want government to be your only religion, the mass media your only friend.

As you see, there is a mountain of evidence the whole Cottingham event was faked, as well as the Corll event. I think it was a big mistake to air this later documentary, with photos and interviews. As you have seen, it was spectacularly easy to pull apart.

So let's return to San Francisco and the Zodiac event. All these events were almost simultaneous, so if the Manson event was faked and the Corll event was faked and the later Cottingham event was faked, the likelihood the Zodiac event was faked goes way up. We have seen all the same markers in each event, with blatant numerology, stories with huge holes, and the military always hovering just on the periphery. For more of the same, we can analyze Paul Avery, the writer at the *San Francisco Chronicle* who kept the Zodiac story in the headlines for months and years. Did you know he was also the writer who pushed the Patty Hearst story? Since that story is at least as suspect as any of these you should be very suspicious of him. So let's study his family. If my method pans out, we would expect his dad to be career military. Yep, a "navy officer" and pilot, although the mainstream sources don't give his rank. For that, we have to dig. Turns out he was already a Lt. Commander in 1943. By 1945 he was the Commander of Night Air Group 91. He then retired as Captain, which in the navy is a much higher rank than in the Army. In the Navy, Captain ranks just below Admiral. So Avery's dad ranked almost as high as Jim Morrison's dad. Why don't they put that in Paul Avery's bio? Why the misdirection about his dad being "a navy officer." By that title, he could have been a midshipman. Why not tell us his dad was a Captain, the highest officer in the navy below Admiral?

Avery joined the *Chronicle* in 1959, but in 1966 the *Chronicle* gave him leave to go to Vietnam, where he is supposed to have co-founded Empire News. We are not told who the other co-founder was, nor is there any corroborating evidence online of anything called Empire News in either Vietnam or Hong Kong. But it looks like Avery went to work for the Pentagon or the CIA, who stationed him in Saigon. He returned to the *Chronicle* in 1969, where it appears he was still on government assignment from the CIA, for he dove *immediately* into the Zodiac series. Given the timeline, it appears he was shipped back specifically to run that event. Avery was played in the movie *Zodiac* by Robert Downey, Jr., which is apropos. One spook playing another spook.

So much easy information pouring out of the internet. The whole world is out there, waiting to be read *right*. All you have to do is ignore the lie you are being told and see what is directly in front of your face. And I've saved the best for last.

We have seen that Robert Gray Smith, Seth Morgan, and Paul Avery were all insiders involved in this scam. But we now have evidence they weren't the top of the food chain. This evidence didn't come in until the 1990's, when the FBI accidentally declassified some documents. These documents included a third copy of the letter the Zodiac sent to the Riverside police and the *Daily Enterprise*, after the Bates murder. Until then, only two copies were thought to exist. This would be a non-event except for one

thing: **The third photocopy doesn't match the other two.** Obviously, that is a smoking gun, because there is no way the FBI could have been in possession of a variant copy, *unless the FBI itself composed this first draft.* You will say maybe the Zodiac made two drafts and accidentally sent this other draft to the FBI. Then why didn't the FBI report it at the time? The FBI could have used that fact to take over the case, which they loved to do. But the bigger problem is that scenario doesn't work either, because the type doesn't match on the two drafts. We would have to believe the Zodiac was switching typewriters between drafts. And even that wouldn't explain it, because both of the first two copies *were copies.* He didn't type out two or three drafts. He typed one and photocopied it. If he wished to send a copy to the FBI, it would be just as easy to order three copies at the Xerox place as two. No, the logical explanation is that the FBI has a second draft because someone there wrote both drafts. They then forgot to destroy the unused draft, or saved the wrong one for their files. There is also the possibility this copy was leaked on purpose, by a whistleblower inside the agency wishing to give you the clue. I hope you got it.

Hard to believe I am the only one who has keyed on this game-ending evidence, since many others admit it. For instance, it is admitted at [crimelibrary.com](http://crimelibrary.com), which ranks number two after Wikipedia on the Zodiac murders. But he gives you the information [at the end of one page](#), and moves on at the top of the next page. In other words, he utterly ignores it and goes on as before. He calls it an “unexplained turn of events.” Astonishing, since “unexplained” does not imply “inexplicable.” I have just shown you it is easy to explain it, and that there is only one way to explain it. The FBI solved its own case against itself, and the only thing lacking was the report. I wouldn't wait for that if I were you. This is the only report you are likely to get.

Thomas Horan doesn't mention it either, although it is the best proof of all that the letters were faked. I suppose the reason he doesn't mention it is that it ties the Feds to the fake. He apparently wants to keep the event local.

Supposing you need more, I will give you more. In the first murders on Lake Herman Road in December of 1968, two hunters “[noticed a white four-door](#) hardtop 1960 Chevrolet Impala parked by the entrance to the Benicia Water Pumping Station.” Of course no one takes that evidence anywhere, though it is easy to do so. My first question was, could that be a government-issue unmarked vehicle, there to set up this event? The clues are “all-white,” “hardtop” and “4-door.” That might be an unmarked police or FBI vehicle. And the answer is yes:





That's a 1959 Chevy Biscayne, but it might easily be mis-identified as an Impala, since the cars were similar. This was in 1968, so the hunters were trying to identify an 8-year-old model. That car, unmarked and all white, is what was seen before the event. But why would the Feds use an 8-year-old car? *So as not to be too obvious.* A newer unmarked police cruiser or agency car would be too easy to identify as just that.

The same can be said for another mysterious car seen that night. Two kids saw “possibly a blue Valiant” acting strangely in the same area. The clue here is that the Valiant acted strangely only around this boy and his date. That's right, another young boy and girl parked on the side of the road in the same area on the same night. The FBI agent in the Valiant probably mistook these two for his assignment, saw his mistake and moved on. Here is probably what he was driving, not a Valiant:



That's a 1968 Plymouth Satellite, used by the government rather than the dowdier Plymouth Valiant:



But, as you see, from the rear they look very similar. The kids ID'd the car from the rear. The dark blue unmarked Satellite wouldn't look too much like a police cruiser or FBI car—unless the windows were tinted—so they figured they could blend in. In short, it looks like we have at least two unmarked government cars patrolling the area the night of the event. Here's [more indication](#) of that:

11:10 p.m. – A worker from Humble Oil in Benicia was on his way home when he passed the Rambler at the gate. He noticed both cars, but the make and color of the other car failed to register with him.

So he just forgot the make and color of the second car? That's convenient, right? We should ask him how much money he was paid to forget the make and color of the other car. If this were a real murder, the police would never accept testimony like that. Once a witness says something like that, he is automatically a suspect. He would be grilled for days and might even be jailed as a suspect for saying something like that.

I would be willing to bet that Stella Borges was in on the scam. She is the one who supposedly happened to flash her lights on the scene driving by, seeing the dead bodies. At Wikipedia they only tell you a woman found the bodies, but if we go to the details we find she was driving by in her car. Even so, this scenario makes no sense. The full report is even less sensible than the short report, which may be why they shortened it. If you are going to take the time to drive out to a lover's lane, you aren't going to park in a spot where everyone that drives by on the main road can see you. According to the mainstream story, several people drove by, and in doing so their lights fell across the parked Rambler. That is illogical. For instance, we are told Peggy and Homer Your passed by a few moments earlier, at about 11:00. Their lights also passed across the loving couple, enough so that the boy had to put his hands on the steering wheel. Talk about a lousy place to park. You might as well try to neck downtown under a streetlight. Obviously, this spot was chosen *because* it could be seen from the road, which means the boy and girl didn't choose it themselves. They were *also* there on assignment.

So we should ask who David Faraday's dad was. If we go [to old newspaper clippings](#), we immediately find we are on the right track, because that information is mysteriously denied. David is said to be the son of Mr. and Mrs. Jean Faraday. But wait, this was 1968, and they didn't describe a married couple as Mr. and Mrs. “wife's name” surname. Jean is the mother. They are hiding the father. Before we get to him, we find [the mother herself worked at Travis Air Force Base](#). So we have our red flag and military link even before we get to dad.

The dad is Thomas Arthur Faraday. We know that from [a Google search](#) on “David Arthur Faraday Jean Faraday”, which tells us “father. Thomas Faraday”. However, if we take that link, Thomas has been scrubbed from the page. Curiously, the Wayback Machine has failed to crawl that page. We do have confirmation of his name, however, from [a genealogy search](#). Apparently [he is still alive](#) and 88 years old. [This may be him](#):

The Heartland Forum -> temporary GH flag - InvisionFree  
z1.invisionfree.com/The\_Heartland/index.php?showtopic=208  
Mar 26, 2003 - 8 posts - 3 authors

The featured speaker will be retired Marine Sergeant Major Thomas Faraday,  
the most decorated living enlisted man in the Grays Harbor ...

So both of Faraday's parents are connected to the military. What about the girl, Betty Jensen? Her father was “[Lt. Col. Verne Jensen](#), retired in 1967 and now employed by the General Services Administration in San Francisco.” *Another* Lt. Colonel! Remember, Sharon Tate's father Paul Tate was also said to be a retired Lt. Colonel, although he was only 46. Robert Graysmith's dad was a Lt. Colonel. What is the General Services Administration? The GSA was “established in 1949 to help manage and support the basic functioning of federal agencies.” Hmmm. CIA was established in 1947, so this is curious. This is also curious: one of the functions of the GSA is “federal vehicle fleet management.” Didn't we just see unmarked federal vehicles above? Convenient that Betty's dad



worked for federal vehicle fleet management, wouldn't you say? He is the one who procured the Chevy and the Plymouth for them.

As you see, that first case is simply littered with red flags, red flags no one else has apparently ever seen. What about the next event, the alleged murder of Darlene Ferrin? Remember, this is the girl who was allegedly shot with Michael Mageau, pictured way above.

Name of Deceased: Leo Suennen Jr. (Darlene's father)

Gender: M (Male)

Age at Death: 83

Death Date: 18 Jun 2009

Obituary Date: 21 Jun 2009

Newspaper Title: Reno Gazette-Journal

Newspaper Location: Reno, NV, USA

Birth Date: 15 Jun 1926

Spouse's name: Norma Jean Hightower "Jeannie"

Children's Names: Darlene Ferrin of Vallejo, CA and Linda Bowman of Stockton, CA; Leo Suennen, III; Pamela Huckaby of Sandy, OR, Kris Chambers of Sparks, NV, Leo Suennen, IV of Vallejo, CA, Frank Suennen of San Diego, CA, Johanna Suennen of San Diego, CA

Military: U.S. Navy

Hoo boy! Could this be any easier? Suennen didn't just serve during WW2, he was career navy, working in Shop X38, which is ship repair. He was probably a machinist's mate or something like that, which may have put him on one of the San Francisco docks. But the real mystery here is not his rank, it is his list of children. Remember how I talked about Darlene's sister Christina above? On just a wild hunch, I guessed that Christina might be a ghost. Well, what do we have in the listing above? No Christina as a child of Leo Suennen. Darlene didn't even have a sister named Christina. And why is Darlene's last name different than that of her father and mother? We are told it is because she was married at the time to a Dean Ferrin. Dean Ferrin has testified he didn't notice any unusual behavior on his wife's part in the time leading up to her murder. So going parking with a younger man at "a teenagers cruising spot" wasn't unusual behavior for a 22-year-old married woman with a small child?

But the answer may lie in her birthdate: March 17, 1947. St. Patrick's Day, Year one of the ole CIA again. She is the CIA's own baby, I guess, born in a green test tube in Langley.

I will be told that Kris Louise Chambers is Christina Louise Suennen. She just shortened her name and got married. Then how do you explain [a people search on Kris Chambers of Sparks](#), NV, age 61 (which age is correct), with no alias as Christina Suennen, and no link to any Suennen, or to anyone in CA? Her only alias is Kris Gibson, and she is related to a lot of Gibsons. I will be told that is because she has been married twice, once to Chambers and once to Gibson. That would make sense [except for this](#):

Nevada, Marriage Index, 1956-2005

Marriage & Divorce Name: Christina Louise Suennen

Spouse: Willis Anderson Bebinger

Marriage: date - city

Notice that is also from Nevada. So how many husbands in Nevada does this lady have? Another search turns up a Christina Louise Suennen-Gibson, so Kris Chambers and Christina Gibson may be

the same woman. But where does Christina Bebinger fit in? To figure it out, let us follow Willis Bebinger. [According to a websearch](#), Willis A. Bebinger, age 65, takes us back to Vacaville, Benicia, and Vallejo, CA! He is the right age for either Christina, age 61, or Darlene, age 67. But Willis A. is just an alias for this guy, who also goes by Willis B. Anderson and Bill Bebinger. Looks like he can't decide on his last name. Ask yourself this: what sort of people have aliases? Have you ever been unsure of your own last name? Oops, can't remember if I am Miles Williams Mathis, or Mike M. Williams. I'll just tell some people one name and other people the other.

Just to muddy this up as much as possible, we find that Darlene was married *before* she married Dean Ferrin.



That's in Nevada again. She was 18. A year and a half later she divorced this James Phillips. She soon married Arthur Dean Ferrin and had a daughter, Deena Lynn Ferrin, in 1968. She is now Deena Pontious.

So how do we clear up this mess? We can see that Darlene liked to get married. She was married twice by the time she was 20. But I don't think there ever were two sisters. There are two birth certificates, but one or the other was inserted into the data files later by the spooks. What evidence do I have for that, other than all the marriages of "Darlene/Christina/Kris"?



Those are four pictures *said to be* [from the Hogan High School yearbooks](#). The first is Darlene, 1965. The second Christina, 1971. The third, Christina, 1969. The fourth, Betty Jensen, 1969. Notice anything strange? Compare the last two, from the same yearbook. Why is Betty's photo so great and Christina's so awful? Because if Christina's were better, you could tell she was the same person as photo 1, Darlene. Study the chins. All they have done is stretch the face a little. I can make the correction right here, without even having to take the photos into photoshop:



All I did is lengthen the first photo a tad and squash the second one a tad. Same person. But let me take the second one into photoshop and help it a bit more.




I just darkened it and added some color, to help you read it. Same person, very different hairdo. But what about the 1971 picture of Christina? All they did there is stretch her chin. Otherwise it is the same person again. With that big chin, she no longer looks so much like Darlene, so they don't have to blow the photo out (remove the focus and the detail).



See, that's just Darlene again, but with a new hippie haircut instead of the old 60's hairdos.

To help you see it, I encourage you to compare the first and second pics of Christina directly.



Compare the chins. That's supposed to be the same girl at age 16 and age 18. How did her chin double in size in two years? Are we supposed to believe she was on high doses of steroids? No, they simply tampered with the first one, pulling the whole chin down.

But let's go back to the hairdo of Christina, 1969, and compare it to Betty, 1969.



That should remind you that Christina has the wrong hairstyle for 1969. She looks ridiculous next to Betty, doesn't she? Again, those pics are supposed to be from the same yearbook. They had to fake one or the other, didn't they? I think we know which one looks faked. Now, study Christina's hair closely. See how the hair near her head actually looks like Betty's hair? It is a down do, parted in the middle. But then they just piled some hair on top, to confuse your ability to read a likeness from the photo. I encourage you to take that photo of Christina into your hairstylist and ask her to study it. She will tell you a hairstyle like that isn't even possible. This photo must have been faked by a man. You can't have straight hair going down near your face and then wavy hair going up above that. This looks like a wavy up-do wig just pasted on top of someone with a down-do, and we can see four inches of the real hair under the wig. Ridiculous.

I will tell you what is really going on there. Notice how the ear also looks fake? The girl in this picture originally had a down-do, parted in the middle, but going over her ears. They took out the lower hair, added an ear, and then cut and pasted an up-do very sloppily right on top. We can also date the picture.

Notice the style of dress she is wearing. It has a white collar with a bow in front. That is a style for a young teen, so this is a picture of Darlene when she about 14. If we accept the other picture of Darlene as 1965, this would be about 1961, not 1969.

But we find even more problems. All these photos were posted by a Tahoe27 on the Zodiackiller.fr.yuku.com message boards. Her icon is the Earth being eclipsed. Under her icon it says DOJ. What is that? Department of Justice? Whatever it is, why can't these people post under their own names? Are we supposed to believe they are scared of the Zodiac Killer? C'mon. All these people are either spooks or dupes, and most of them are spooks, still planting disinfo. For more indication of that, we find that Tahoe27 has the wrong year for Darlene's picture. She says she was a senior in 1965. Nope, [according to this other site](#), Hoganhighschool.org, she was class of 1966. So it looks like they may have planted her photo in the wrong yearbook. Also, it is interesting that Tahoe27 has access to these yearbooks. Lake Tahoe is in Nevada, remember. And Sparks, NV, where Kris Chambers is now living, is part of Reno. Both are just up the road from Lake Tahoe. Coincidence? No. And of course Kris Chambers would also have old pictures of herself that she could do anything with she liked in photoshop. Now maybe we understand why Tahoe27 isn't posting under *her* own name.

There was only one girl. I would guess they faked Darlene, so that when they “killed” her, the real girl could go on living as Christina. We would have to get a real yearbook, or talk to someone that was in that class. But my guess is the spooks already visited all those people years ago and told them to keep quiet. Which is why I don't bother with that. We have to figure this out from the clues they left in plain sight, and that really isn't that hard to do. “Darlene Ferrin” never existed, but the girl they used for the event is now living in Nevada, apparently, as Kris Chambers. She has been married at least five times. No use bothering her, since she just did a job for her government. I am sure that is how she sees it. No one really died, so what would you charge her with? And nothing will ever go to trial, since we have the same government now we had then. Do you think the government is going to try itself?

We have a little more evidence concerning what year Darlene/Christina was really pictured in the yearbooks. It wasn't 1969 and it wasn't 1965 or 1966. If we go to [vhs62.com](#) (vallejo high school 62), we find that yearbooks are available for purchase.

Yearbooks currently available

Vallejo Sr. High School: 1921, 1929, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1954, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, \*1964, 1975, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1986, 1987, 1988

Hogan Sr. High School: 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1969, 1970, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1985, 1986

St. Vincent's High School: 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1967, 1969

Vallejo Jr. High School: 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960

But you can't purchase Hogan HS yearbooks for 1967 or 1968. I wonder why?

I can give you one last piece of interesting evidence as I conclude. Turns out [Mike Mageau is said to have had a twin brother Steve](#). They were both class of 1968, Hogan High School, Vallejo. Taken with our previous finding on Darlene/Christina, that is telling. What this means is that Mike was also supposed to die in the event, but he messed up his part somehow. What was supposed to happen is this: They create a fake Mike Mageau, just like they did the fake Darlene. Then, when they “kill” him, the real boy lives on as Steve Mageau, his twin brother. Brilliant, right? But someone made a mistake. An outsider saw the boy in the event alive after the shooting, so they had to keep “Mike” alive. This was a big problem, because now they had both Mike and Steve alive, but only one boy to play both parts. They had to get rid of one or the other pretty fast. This explains why Christina was so mad at



Mike later, calling him a liar and so on. He had goofed his part. This made her mad because if he goofs his part, he jeopardizes the whole event. This would also affect her. Fortunately for her, the Feds were able to whitewash the whole thing. They were in control of all parts of the story and no one on the outside was very curious. Everyone was and is so gullible the Feds don't have to worry about neatness. But I will tell you this: you will never see a photo of Steve and Mike together. You will never find them in the same room at the same time.

You will say, "Why not create a twin for Darlene, too? Why go to all this trouble of a fake sister?" Well, if you manufacture two sets of twins in the same event, you are just begging for suspicion. It is a brilliant method, but you can't overuse it.

So there you have it. Three major events, all faked. There is a whole lot more research one could do, following my clues, but I have already uncovered compelling evidence and don't see any reason to waste anymore time with this. I have never seen my job as exhausting all evidence. My job is to show you the right path on a lot of problems, and you can then go as far on that path as you like.

By now, you are either with me or you're not, so I am going to use this last page to go even further out on a limb (for some). I have decoded these events for you, so now I am going to decode numerology itself for you. I have said above and in other papers that although I recognize numerology in these events, I am not into it myself. That is hedging, since I do think numbers can be very significant. As a mathematician, I obviously believe in the importance of numbers. But as a human being living in this strange world, I also recognize the significance of number in the physical world. That is to say, I believe in numerology *in a way*, just not in the way these people seem to. In short, they seem to believe they can use numbers to force the universe to give them things they want. For instance, they appear to believe that if they do things on certain dates, at certain times, in certain multiples, they can influence the Fates in their favor. But this is just wishful thinking. What they don't seem to comprehend is that number is used by higher powers to order lower powers, not the reverse. In other words, if you believe in gods of some sort, the gods use number to order and influence *you*. You do not use number to order or influence the gods. If you don't believe in gods, substitute your own system or semantics here: my point is the same. To put it another way, you either have lucky numbers assigned to you or you don't. Say you think the number 33 is lucky. Well, that number either appears in your life naturally or it doesn't. You can't manufacture it. You can't assign the number 33 to yourself.

Let me give you a different example. I have seen people have pencils made up that say lucky things on them, like "failure is impossible" or "blessed" or something. Well, printing up your luck or blessing won't work. On the other hand, if you were just walking along, minding your own business, and you looked down and picked up a pencil that said "lucky man" on it, you could take that as a sign from somewhere that you have a bit of luck. But *buying* a lucky-man pencil won't help you.

You can't finesse the Gods or Fates or Muses, however you conceive them to be. They either like you or they don't. If they don't, your trying to finesse them will only piss them off further. If you find yourself on the wrong side of your Fates, don't get involved in numerology to try to force their hand. Rather, your best bet is to work to become the sort of person they will like better. You won't do that with numerology. You will do it most efficiently by understanding more about your assigned place in this world. And you will understand more by *listening*. There are signs to be read, but your job is to read them, not write them and post them.

I will be told that numerology seems to work for these people, since the mighty of this earth often seem



to dabble in it. Money and power does seem to come to these folks. Yes, but that isn't because of numerology. These folks get money and power because they are ruthless bastards who spend every waking hour chasing money and power. And they feed off one another and off of the masses. There is a longstanding network in place for these climbers, and most of them were born on it. So you don't need numerology to explain their success. Numerology actually explains why they are miserable despite all that. They are miserable because they are off the numbers, and they are off the numbers because they are not in sync with the powers of this earth. The earth doesn't like them, to put it personal terms. As the natives would say, "They do not know where the center of the earth is."

They *think* the earth likes them because they have a lot of money, but the earth doesn't care a flip about money. The Gods, Fates, Muses, or any other powers or influences you could name care nothing for money. Money doesn't put you in sync with the numbers, it puts you *out* of sync with the numbers. Why? Because large amounts of money are a sign of lying and thieving, and lying and thieving are out-of-sync. If you are out-of-sync with the earth, you cannot have lucky numbers assigned to you, since they are the same thing.

The only way to be in-sync and on-the-numbers is to be on the proper path—the path you were born to walk. I assure you, you were not born to walk a path of lying or thieving or making huge sums of dirty money. No one was. No matter what some religions have said, the earth does not create evil people just to make things interesting. These people got where they are not by being the children of some devil, but by making bad decisions—decisions they can reverse any time they like. Some of them do reverse these decisions, which proves my point. If they were the spawn of some evil force, they could not remake themselves no matter what. A cat can not remake itself into a dog. But a person out-of-sync can get back on the numbers.

Some will not understand why I would finish such a paper with such a strange sermon. It is because I know you aren't the only one reading it. As we have seen, the spooks have tried to push us in a given direction over the past century. Well, I am pushing back. They sell their worldview. I sell mine. They say their life is better. I say mine is. They say "come join us." I reply, "No, thanks. Come join me." My world is a better one than you have yet imagined, and it is not just a theory. I live it every day, and always have.

You have just read 44 pages PDF. Since a standard book page is normally considered to be about 250 words, and since a PDF page is more than three times longer than that, you have just read about 140 book pages, including 61 graphics and 35 weblinks.