

So I sent off the previous document about Hungerford cobbled together from late-night coffee binges and the mad swirl of internet research – to my delight the Science Wizard a) responded and b) like an absolute gentleman uploaded it for the world to see.

Meanwhile I was back in my office as usual, working and daydreaming about the entire system collapsing into pagan Arcadia so I could do something more useful with my time like stalk deer through the damp canyon forests around the ruins of the Manchester council building. Sitting on the ruined dome of the central library watching the sun set. Shooting arrows at looters. Dying my skin with blue ink and communing with the gods around a bonfire on a hill, that sort of thing. Nothing like this technocrat bullshit where you sit on buses and work at a desk under artificial light all day.

Then I checked on Cutting through the Fog and people were commenting about wanting more UK-based investigation.




'You know people actually enjoyed the last paper?'
'Really!?!'

Dunblane has been kicked around the internet for years so I'm a bit intimidated by this one to be honest. I'm not going to assume the reader knows anything about the topic, I think we should just go in fresh and see what falls apart.

So, let me attempt to parse about 23 years of theories, dead ends and circumstantial evidence to get at some kind of clarity.

Lestrade Investigates: Case #2: Dunblane



The Pitch

First, geography.




County of Stirling

Enhance!



Central Scotland

Enhance!



There we go. I present Dunblane: a small town outside of Stirling, the county town of Stirlingshire. Population roughly **8,811** people as of the 2011 census according to Wikipedia.

(I know Miles is going to see aces and eights and start getting his highlighter pen out...) **Miles:**
done.



Dunblane Primary School, still running today

Before I take another step I want to warn you that this could go off on a LOT of tangents. I'll try and rein that in, but Dunblane is this crazy mess of spaghetti with plot threads going all over the place. Not helpful, elite. I want my psychological operations to be nice and straightforward to unwind in future please. Don't you know how short my attention span is?

I'm primarily using the Cullen Report and Wikipedia:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dunblane_massacre

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/276631/3386.pdf

On the morning of Wednesday, **13th** March, 1996, a man who lived in Stirling named Thomas **Hamilton*** went on a rampage in the gymnasium of Dunblane Primary School and shot dead one teacher, sixteen students and injured a further fifteen students in the process. He was armed with **four** guns – two Smith & Wesson M19 .357 magnum revolvers and two 9mm Browning HP Pistols.



Left: S&W M19 Revolver. Right: HP Browning.

He was also supposed to be carrying 743 cartridges of ammunition in some kind of case or bag, but we'll get to that. It was and is the deadliest mass-shooting in British history, leading to massive press coverage, a major investigation called the Cullen Report and, ultimately, the complete ban on private firearm ownership in the UK.

This was achieved first through the: 1997 [Firearms Act](#), which banned all private firearms except for .22 calibre pistols, but this was soon [amended](#), which meant that even if your handgun calibre was .22 or less then it got banned as well. As a small aside, Wikipedia notes that these laws passing led to an *increase* in gun crime across the UK:

The number of recorded firearms offences in the United Kingdom increased significantly after the law entered force. Excluding offences with air weapons, firearms offences peaked at 11,088 in 2005/2006, compared to only 4,904 in 1997. The number of offences involving firearms subsequently declined, but the 6,492 offences recorded in the year ending March 2018 is still a greater number than that in 1997. Handguns remain the most common kind of firearm used in crime in the UK, with 2,847 offences in the year ending March 2018.

They *more than doubled* in the next decade, in other words. So that's interesting if you were of the belief that banning the guns would lead to a decrease in gun violence.

My point is that Dunblane is the big event: the major UK massacre that lead to gun restrictions. After Dunblane you didn't get to have firearms any more as a private citizen, unless you were some VIP type (or lived in Northern Ireland). It also led to changes in school security and greater vetting/control of who got to work with children under the age of 18 (which is a joke when we get into Hamilton's background but bear with me).

At 08:15 Thomas Hamilton is seen scraping the ice off his van outside his home at number 7 Kent Road in Stirling. The witness is a neighbour who had a brief conversation with him. He left 'soon afterwards' and drives roughly 5 miles (8km) to Dunblane. He reaches the grounds of Dunblane Primary School at approximately 09:30 and parks his van in the school car park next to a telegraph pole. Quite a long time for a short drive if you think about it. He was what, driving five miles an hour?

Hamilton gets out of the van, goes over to the pole and uses a pair of pliers to cut the wires at the bottom of the pole, which disrupts communications for the nearby houses. We are supposed to think, 'OK, so all the phone lines are down around the school'. But would you know which wires to cut? Seems like Hamilton would have to be a professional electrician or work for the town to know which wires went where.

Hamilton presumably puts his pliers back in his van and goes into the school. The Cullen Report says he enters by a door on the north-west side of the school by the toilets and the gym. Nobody sees him enter the school or move through it on the way to the gym. We're told this is because he didn't take the main entrance as then he would have been witnessed. I'm not quite sure how we then know how he actually got **in**. Nobody saw him, right? We know he got in because we found him dead in the gym a bit later... but we didn't actually SEE him go in or walk around or anything. It kind of works. Kind of. It's either logical deduction or they're just pulling it out of their ass. One of the two.

From the Cullen Report:

3.3 The school day had started at 9 am for all primary classes. Morning assemblies were held in the school's Assembly Hall which was situated between the dining area and the gymnasium. The school had 640 pupils, **making it one of**

the largest primary schools in Scotland. The Assembly Hall was not large enough to accommodate the whole school at one time, with the consequence that assemblies were limited to certain year groups in rotation. On 13 March all primary 1, 2 and 3 classes had attended assembly from 9.10 am to 9.30 am. They consisted of a total of about 250 pupils, together with their teachers and the school chaplain. They included Primary 1/13 which was a class of 28 pupils, along with their teacher Mrs Gwen Mayor. This class had already changed for their gym lesson before attending assembly. 25 members of the class were 5 years of age: and 3 were 6 years of age. Mrs Mayor was 47 years of age.

Mrs Gwen Mayor is the teacher of the class who ends up getting shot. It's her class doing PE in the gym at the time. I think it's interesting that Hamilton goes into the gym *after* the assembly finished Wouldn't it have been a more successful for him to go in *during* assembly. More targets, right? But he majored in wiring, not in class schedules, I guess. Note also how it says the school, with 640 pupils, made it one of the largest primary schools in Scotland. I think that's interesting, because if you're thinking 'it's an operation', then it makes sense to choose Dunblane because you're instilling fear by targeting the greatest concentration of children. Although my professional Devil's Advocate (aka The Wife) would say this is just because statistically the most children were in Dunblane so you'd expect an incident to happen there.**

[Miles: Actually, statistically, we have calculated the odds for one of these events and they are . . . zero. Meaning, we have never researched one of these events and found it to be real, which means an event like this has never actually happened, which means there is no way to calculate odds. You cannot calculate odds for an event that has never happened before in the history of civilization.]

From Wikipedia: "Before entering the gymnasium, it is believed Hamilton fired two shots into the stage of the assembly hall and the girls' toilet." From the Cullen Report:

3.4 At the conclusion of assembly all those present had dispersed to their respective classrooms, with the exception of Primary 1/13 who with Mrs Mayor had made their way to the gymnasium, passing the entrance which Thomas Hamilton used to gain access to the school, and entering the gymnasium by the doorway at its north end. A physical education teacher, Mrs Eileen Harrild, had already arrived there along with Mrs Mary Blake, a supervisory assistant, who was to relieve Mrs Mayor in order to enable her to attend a meeting. The children had been instructed to go to the centre and away from the equipment which was at the south end. Mrs Harrild had been talking to Mrs Mayor for a few minutes. As she was about to attend to the waiting class she heard a noise behind her that caused her to turn round. This was probably the sound of Thomas Hamilton firing two shots into the stage of the Assembly Hall and the girls toilet outside the gym. He then entered the gym. He was wearing a dark jacket, black corduroy trousers and a woolly hat with ear defenders. He had a pistol in his hand. He advanced a couple of steps into the gym and fired indiscriminately and in rapid succession. Mrs Harrild was hit in both forearms, the right hand and left breast. She stumbled into the open-plan store area which adjoined the gym, followed by a number of the children. Mrs Mayor was also shot several times and died instantly. Mrs Blake was then shot but also managed to reach the store, ushering some children in ahead of her.

Miles: for an indiscriminate shooter, he sure hits a lot of targets It appears their head writer at MI6 doesn't know what indiscriminate means. Also, 17 victims. 1+7=8.

We will meet Mrs Blake later, via the magic of Youtube. She's supposed to have been shot in both legs and in the head, but here she is 'ushering' the children ahead of her.

Hamilton enters the gym and starts shooting. Start your stopwatches ladies and gentlemen, things are about to happen **very** quickly. Like 4-minutes quick. This is the estimated time for the whole set of events in the gym to go down, according to the government.

Thomas Hamilton fired 105 rounds with a 9 mm Browning self-loading pistol over a space of about 3-4 minutes before committing suicide with one shot from a .357

Smith & Wesson revolver.

-Cullen Report, page 5 section 1.3

I would be interested in how likely it is for a man to shoot so quickly. Later on I'll be using a Youtube link for an interview with a woman called **Sandra Uttley**, who talks about how Hamilton was an overweight, unimpressive little man. Hardly a sharpshooter. She talks about how he fires disabling shots into the children and then finishes them off with execution-style shots to the head after they're on the floor. A Browning has 13-15 rounds in the clip so that makes 7-8 reloads in the 3 minute span as he uses the same Browning 9mm for all the shots in the gym except the last, his self-inflicted S&W revolver shot that kills him.

The list of the dead is on page 4 of the report pdf. Miles may do a name scan on them and find something. I'll just paste them from Wikipedia here:

- Victoria Elizabeth Clydesdale (age 5)
- Emma Elizabeth Crozier (age 5)
- Melissa Helen Currie (age 5)
- Charlotte Louise Dunn (age 5)
- Kevin Allan Hasell (age 5)
- Ross William Irvine (age 5)
- David Charles Kerr (age 5)
- Mhairi Isabel MacBeath (age 5)
- Gwen Mayor (age 45) (teacher)
- Brett McKinnon (age 6)
- Abigail Joanne McLennan (age 5)
- Emily Morton (age 5)
- Sophie Jane Lockwood North (age 5)
- John Petrie (age 5)
- Joanna Caroline Ross (age 5)
- Hannah Louise Scott (age 5)
- Megan Turner (age 5)

Miles: if Hamilton was obsessed with little boys, as we are told over and over, then why did he target so many little girls? Twelve of the seventeen fake victims are female.

Cullen Report:

3.5 From his position near the entrance doorway of the gym Hamilton fired a total of 29 shots in rapid succession. From that position he killed one child and injured others. During this shooting four injured children made their way to the store. In the store **Mrs Blake and Mrs Harrild** tried to console and calm the terrified children who had taken refuge there. The children cowered on the floor, lying helplessly in pools of blood hearing the screams and moans of their classmates in the gym, and waiting for the end or for help. Thomas Hamilton walked up the east side of the gym firing six shots. At a point midway along it he discharged **8** shots in the direction of the opposite side of the gym. He then advanced to the middle of the gym

and walked in a semi-circle systematically firing 16 shots at a group of children who had either been disabled by the firing or who had been thrown to the floor. He stood over them and fired at point-blank range.

He can't have fired 29 shots in rapid succession because he only used one pistol and would have needed to reload after 13-15 shots. Rapid reload! Like Virtua-Cop or something, just shoot once off-screen and you get a full clip again. Also I'm pretty confident that if you shot a five-year-old with a high power 9mm pistol they aren't going to be 'making their way' to cover. They'll be flat on their back crying. I've been a teacher and if little kids hit each other with Lego or a squishy ball or whatever they want to sit down and cry, let alone actually getting a gunshot wound.

Back to the Cullen Report:

3.6 Meanwhile a child from Primary 7 class who had been sent on an errand by his teacher, and was walking along the west side of the gym heard loud banging and screaming. He looked in and saw Thomas Hamilton shooting. Thomas Hamilton shot at him. The child was struck by flying glass and ran off. It appears that Thomas Hamilton then advanced to the south end of the gym. From that position he fired 24 rounds in various directions. He shot through the window adjacent to the fire escape door at the south-east end of the gym. This may have been at an adult who was walking across the playground. Thomas Hamilton then opened the fire escape door and discharged a further 4 shots in the same direction from within the gym.

This is a long three to four minutes. We can't prove any of this because the witness – i.e. the Primary 7 child who 'poked his head in' -- is a child so wouldn't be identified in the court work. We can't get a name let alone **ask**. It's infuriating because a lot of this can either be taken at face value OR can be seen to be embellishment of a story using unfalsifiable elements. 'A kid saw it all.' 'Who?' 'Can't tell you that.' Would a child even recognise Hamilton? Especially if he pokes his head around the door for a few seconds, quite likely gets distracted by the gore and then has to immediately retreat from gunfire? It'll be 'I think I saw some guy'. Then later adults tell him it was Hamilton and he goes 'Oh yeah sure it was him' due to normalcy bias. **Miles: also remember that Hamilton had on a hat and earmuffs, making him hard to recognize.**

Cullen Report:

3.7 He then went outside the doorway and fired 4 more shots towards the library cloakroom, striking **Mrs Grace Tweddle**, a member of the staff, a glancing blow on the head. A teacher, **Mrs Catherine Gordon**, and her Primary 7 class who were using hut number 7 which was the classroom closest to the fire escape door saw and heard Thomas Hamilton firing from that direction. She immediately instructed her class to get down on the floor, just in time before he discharged 9 shots into her classroom. Most became embedded in books and equipment. One passed through a chair which seconds before had been used by a child.

All that in just three minutes. Also: Hamilton is really making it obvious where he is. If he'd walked in, shot several people and walked out again he could very likely have escaped. If he'd worn a ski mask or something all the more likely. Then again Scully will say I'm applying logic to the actions of a madman so... it's actually evidence he **was** crazy.

I will comment that the Gordon class narrative sounds like a **script**, not real life. It's too... action-movie-ish. (Teacher in thick Scottish accent: 'Get dooon!' Kids dive on floor. Bullets smash through chair at angle that allows light to shine through showing chubby-faced ginger Scottish kid to look wide-eyed in surprise).

Cullen Report:

3.8 Thomas Hamilton then re-entered the gym where he shot again. He then released the pistol and drew a revolver. He placed the muzzle of the revolver in his mouth, pointing upwards and pulled the trigger. His death followed quickly.

And time. Suicide, so... y'know... Proof Insane Murderer Was Insane / No-one To Interview. Flip a coin. Also, only two guns used in the event. So why would he carry four in, kill everyone with the Browning, then commit suicide with the S&W. Did he just really like the revolver? Then why two? Didn't want to overheat his baby?

Cullen Report:

3.9 Mrs Mayor and 15 children lay dead in the gym and one further child was close to death. They had sustained a total of 58 gun shot wounds. 26 of these wounds were of such a nature that individually they would have proved fatal.

So he fires 105 rounds with his trusty Browning and hits the targets 58 times, 26 of which were kill-shots by themselves. How exactly is that 'indiscriminate shooting'? More like John Wick shooting.

3.10 In the result the deaths of the victims listed in the left hand column of the Annex to the Foreword to this Report were caused by gunshot wounds caused by Thomas Hamilton's unlawful actions in shooting them. All of these victims died within the gym, with the exception of the sixteenth child, Mhairi Isabel MacBeath, who was found to be dead on arrival at Stirling Royal Infirmary at 10.30 am. While it is not possible to be precise as to the times at which the shootings took place, it is likely that they occurred within a period of 3-4 minutes, starting between 9.35 am and 9.40 am.

As I say – a hell of a four-minute time period. Miles: 105 shots and 8 reloads in 4 minutes, with 58 hits and 26 kill shots on small fast moving targets. Reminds us of man of steel and aimer-extraordinaire Stephen Paddock from the Las Vegas hoax, who hit 600 targets from 400 yards at night with a hopping machine gun aimed out a hotel window.

If you load up the Cullen Report and turn to page 18 of 193 you'll see the way the school staff responded to what happened. The Assistant Headmistress is supposed to have 'heard several sharp metallic noises and screaming coming from the gym.' She didn't poke her head in like the little Year 7 kid did. She runs to the Headmaster's office and finds Mr. Ronald Taylor (let me get that highlighter out for you) on the phone. Old Ron had been wondering about those strange noises coming from the gym but assumed it was construction work, or builders on the premises and suchlike. As you do. The Assistant Headmistress Mrs. Awlson comes crawling into the room ('in a crouched position') and tells him there's a man with a gun on site, so Ron hangs up the phone – he was having a chat with someone the whole time this has been going on – and rings the police.

It's 9:41. That's the point the police get informed of Dunblane. Miles: The rest of the school was in the basement watching Fawltly Towers at full volume, I guess.

Ron runs to the gym (quite brave) and meets a student teacher – David Scott – who explains he's seen Hamilton commit suicide. Did Scott just pop his head around the door? Why wasn't he in a class? Why wasn't he looking after his students? This all happened in three minutes but he got there in time for the climax where Hamilton shoots himself? That's convenient. Otherwise we wouldn't immediately know what had happened.

'Mr Taylor's estimate was that some 3 minutes had lapsed between his first hearing the noises and being told this by the student teacher.'

-Cullen report, page 18, end of section 3.12.

We now go into a room full of corpses, one of which is Thomas Hamilton.

3.13 Mr Taylor burst into the gym. He was met by what he described in evidence as 'a scene of unimaginable carnage, one's worst nightmare'. He saw a group of children on the right hand side of the gym who were crying and obviously less injured than the others. He asked the student teacher to take them out of the gym and give them comfort. He then ran back to his office and instructed the Deputy Headmistress, **Mrs Fiona Eadington**, to telephone for ambulances. That call was made at 9.43 am. He then ran back to the gym calling for adults, and in particular the kitchen staff, to come and help. He moved through the gym along with the janitor **Mr John Currie**. He noticed Thomas Hamilton lying at the south end of the gym. He seemed to be moving. He noticed a gun on the floor beside him and told Mr Currie to **kick it away**, which he did. He **also removed the revolver from Thomas Hamilton's hand and threw that aside**.

So the headmaster disarmed the still-alive killer who we later learned blew his brains out with a revolver at point blank range. He took the gun out of his hand. He got the school janitor to kick a gun across the floor away. I suppose you could shoot yourself and kind of lie there in a pool of blood near death – oh wait, no, that's when you get shot in the gut or something, right? Can you honestly put a revolver in your mouth, pull the trigger and still be alive and semi-conscious several minutes later!? **Miles: also, the kids just sitting there doesn't scan. If I had been one of those kids I would have run out the door into the schoolyard and probably would have run all the way home.**

We then get this interesting bit:

3.14 By this time the police and medical teams had arrived. Attention was turned to the difficult problem of identifying the children. Since Mrs Mayor was dead, help was sought from members of staff, including nursery staff, who had looked after the children during the previous year. However, not all of the children had been through the nursery. This was an extremely harrowing experience for all the members of staff who were involved. **They had to be taken into and out of the gym on several occasions. The record cards were consulted in order to aid identification. Unfortunately the class register had not been marked for Mrs Mayor's class as the class had proceeded directly to the gym after assembly. A further difficulty was encountered when it was discovered that one child was wearing clothing with the name tag of another child. The record card for another child was not in its expected place but this did not delay identification. Mr Taylor and his staff did everything that they possibly could to assist, far beyond what might reasonably have been expected of them.**

I just want that to sink in that the police took the teachers in and out of the room full of bullet-hole-ridden child corpses repeatedly, to look at them and go 'So who's this then?'... with no list of actual attendees to the class... and no-one who knew all the children in the class well... because only Mrs Mayor actually knew all the students. None of that is believable. **Miles: why would staff be expected to identify these children? That isn't normal protocol. You would call the police and ambulances, and parents would identify the children, not staff. Do you think it makes any sense to hold injured children from the ambulances until they can be identified? No, in such a situation the important thing is to get the injured to the hospital as quickly as possible. They can be identified later. So this report was faked by the usual Intel writers, who don't know how the world works beyond the confines of their cubicles and committee rooms.**

3.19 The first action of the police was to put a cordon around the school buildings with an outer cordon around the road access to the school, in order to restrict admittance to those who could be of assistance. By 10.30 am a considerable number of people had approached the school, not merely anxious relatives of school children but also representatives of the media. The emergency services had to make their way through some 200-300 people in proceeding to and from the school.

What? So hang on... the incident finishes at 9:41-ish, the police arrive at 9:50-ish, then by half-ten the whole place is sealed off in a cordon. So who invited the media and how? If the phone lines had been cut by Hamilton and the gunshots were barely intelligible inside the school (remember, the headmaster didn't understanding what he was hearing in his office nearby) then who was ringing up the news? The police? Why? It's an ongoing crime scene less than an hour old.

3.20 The police then gave priority to ensuring that the injured were taken to hospital. A deliberate decision was taken to refrain from noting their names before they left in order to **ensure that they were given medical attention as soon as possible and in order to avoid insensitive intrusion.**

Miles: What? That makes no sense on any level, and it contradicts the previous lines of the story. Why have staff scramble to identify kids then purposely refuse to give those names to the ambulances? Obviously, the screenwriters are prepping you for some sort of switcheroo, where made-up names of fake kids are inserted into the story later.

3.21 As I have already indicated the task of identifying the victims was complicated by a number of factors. In addition it was found that two members of Mrs Mayor's class were absent that day. At one point it appeared that a particular child had been apparently identified as being at Stirling Royal Infirmary as well as lying dead in the gym.

Miles: as I said, all this is completely unnecessary. You don't need to identify the dead at this point. You only need to identify the living. You have the ambulances take all the dead and wounded to hospital, then you do a headcount on the living kids in the school. You then call the parents of those unaccounted for and tell them to go to the hospital. The wounded kids who can talk can identify themselves, so you only have the 16 dead to deal with. They have to be identified by the parents, and would have to be identified that way even if they were previously identified at the school. So this entire part of the story is bollocks, only included to stir your mind.

3.22 In order to determine the identity of the dead it was necessary for the police to obtain identification of the survivors who had been removed to hospital. However, **they had extreme difficulty in communicating with the hospital** or the casualty bureau in the manner intended. Apart from a line in the library which was used for the internet facility **there was only one telephone line into the school.** This was engaged for virtually the whole time by calls from anxious parents or from the media. **When the police used mobile telephones they soon found that they also became completely blocked.** They decided not to resort to their radio system as the information in which they were interested was extremely sensitive and could have been picked up by scanners. The police did not receive information from the hospital until after mid-day when they obtained two or three names at a time with the use of mobile telephones. They requested British Telecom for additional telephone lines into the school but it was not until 3 pm that the first of these was installed.

Miles: Again, complete nonsense. Did Hamilton cut the phone lines of the entire town? Did he disable all police communication? Did he destroy all the files in the school, so that the school

couldn't even identify the parents? These scriptwriters want you to believe all calls had to be made from the school, as if the school had the only phones in town. Absurd, and perfect proof this story is a fake.

3.24 - The police decided that they should be entirely certain as to the identity of the deceased children before informing their families lest any parents be misinformed. Their concern in this respect was increased by the fact that, as I have already narrated a child had been apparently identified as being both in the gym and at hospital. This necessitated a second round of physical identification of the children in the gym by members of staff. **This served only to make their task the more harrowing.** As this doubt had arisen the police took the deliberate decision to withhold information about any of the deceased until all of them had been identified.

Miles: they just go on and on with this crap. They are creating a huge amount of misdirection around these identities, which tells us the identities were faked.

3.25 Although these procedures were protracted for the reasons that I have explained the parents were not told of the problem and were given no explanation of the reason for the delay. The process of breaking the news to the parents of deceased children did not begin until 1.45 pm. It was not completed until about 3.30 pm. In the meantime doctors from the Health Centre at Dunblane had remained with the families in order to give them whatever comfort they could. The families of each child were called out of the staff room and then escorted by members of their liaison team to one of seventeen rooms which had been made available for the purpose of enabling news to be broken in privacy. The last family remained in the staff room with the members of their team. After the families had received the news they were escorted home by the members of their team who stayed with them as long as was required. **It may be noted that at one stage before individual families had been informed there were broadcasts by the media as to the number of children who were thought to have been killed.** This had a serious effect on the credibility of the work of the police.

Miles: will it never end? Again, this is not normal protocol. It is fairyland MI6 fake-event protocol, I guess. You don't "break the news of deceased children" to parents. You ask them to identify a body. You don't "lead them to one of 17 rooms to enable the news to be broken in privacy". You put the unidentifiable bodies in ONE room and ask parents missing a child to identify their child based on things only they would know.

The firearms, ammunition and other equipment carried by Thomas Hamilton (Cullen Report page 23)

3.39 The examination of the scene showed that Thomas Hamilton had fired 105 rounds of 9 mm ammunition by means of pistol A. He had with him 25 extended box-type magazines, each of which was capable of holding 20 rounds of 9 mm ammunition and suitable for use with either pistol. (The standard magazine for such pistols was capable of holding 13 cartridges.) Stickers had been attached to each magazine, a yellow sticker to the front and an orange to the back, presumably in order to ensure that it was inserted into the butt of the pistol the correct way round. The magazines were found to contain a total of 393 cartridges, 18 of the magazines being fully loaded with cartridges and 3 being partially loaded. The remaining 4 were empty. Mr Chisholm and DC Scobie reached the conclusion that Thomas Hamilton had arrived at the school with a total of 501 rounds of 9 mm ammunition which, with the exception of one round in the chamber of pistol B, were contained in the 25 magazines.

Wouldn't he have fired all four guns empty first before reloading? That would be faster than reloading one pistol over and over again while you had three other loaded weapons to hand. This still means he needed to reload eight times in the process. But yeah, special magazines to justify the narrative.

We then have this attempt to justify the time frame:

3.40 Mr Chisholm and DC Scobie later carried out tests on the pistols at the firing range at the headquarters of Tayside Police. These included an exercise in which pistol A, in the cocked and ready to fire position, was used to fire off a full magazine of 20 shots as quickly as possible. The time taken to accomplish this was 5.46 seconds. Also, using pistol A and the 7 magazines which had been used by Thomas Hamilton and the appropriate number of cartridges, they carried out an exercise of firing off 105 rounds and ejecting 6 magazines in the course of doing so, all as quickly as possible. The time taken to accomplish this was 50.4 seconds. Too much should not be read into the evidence about 5.46 seconds. While he had not carried out a similar exercise Mr Paton gave evidence that in general terms it was consistent with his experience for a magazine of 20 rounds to be fired off in 5 or 6 seconds with some degree of accuracy. However, this depended on the expertise and physical make-up of the person firing. It would be unusual for 20 shots to be fired off at any one time. I accept Mr Paton's evidence as a broad indication. However, I note that Mr D J Penn, who is a highly experienced shooter, expressed the opinion that an averagely competent shot could not achieve 20 rounds of aimed fire in 5.46 seconds with an unmodified 9 mm Browning pistol: and that 10 to 12 shots in that time would be a more realistic figure. (This was expressed in a list of points submitted to the Inquiry after he gave his evidence.)

Sure, so a firearms expert can pull a trigger standing still very quickly and reload very quickly and do it all in less than a minute. Sweet. Shame we're actually dealing with a little fat man with minimal skill in firearms who also had to, y'know, **aim** at these small moving screaming targets, whilst walking up and down a gym, occasionally pausing to pop out a doorway and shoot into the distance, then turn back to continue firing.

Now on to the famous class photo. Note there is only this **one** photo of the teacher and her students:



Which is a bit weird because you'd expect there to be a) more pictures of the students and the teacher individually from their lives before the incident and b) this photo to be in colour, because it's a class photo and we're in the 90s not the 1950s. Also in the subsequent twenty years you'd think a couple more pictures would have surfaced. But hey, details.

I suppose if you were a complete sociopath you could just crop 28 kids and a grown woman into an image and make it black-and-white to level it out and hide glitches of tone and shade. None of the kids are touching each other, none of them are interacting. Oh, and they aren't all wearing the same uniform. I mean boys wear different clothes to the other boys. The girls wear different uniform to the other girls. They are all wearing uniforms, just not *the same* uniforms. I count six different styles of sweaters. Rather as if they were random children taken from different class photos and pasted together.

Miles, added January 29, 2019: The reason this photo is B&W is that it is from the 1960s, not the 1990s. A perceptive reader pointed out that the clothing styles, shoe styles, hairstyles, and background contents of this photo all point to the 1960s. Children don't wear shoes like that anymore. Little girls don't wear elbow-length sleeve blouses. One little girl has on a boy's tie with a sweater and skirt! In the 1990s? Another thing I noticed is that this is an extremely blond class photo, with about 20 of 29 people here blond. Even in Scotland that would be very rare. So whoever pieced this photo together seems to have had something against blondes.

You've got a survivor here talking about her experience of being shot in her thigh and back.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Box9xnJSWM>

Here we have a woman who says she was there. This could be genuine, or it could just be an intel agent/actress reading off a script. She has no real content to her memory of the event. She basically doesn't remember it. To be fair she was five.

You've got this:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_ZU5sCmY5Bc

Gotta love Trevor McDonald. You can see all the parents gathering around outside and the press are swarming around taking photos. You can see how the vast majority of people involved would have turned up, found their kid OK, then thought 'thank god!', just grateful their child was unharmed. I like the bit at around 2:16 when there's one ambulance leaving without even its lights and siren on. Then you get some people jogging to the school. Eh?

At 2:57 it gets weird – is that audio of people screaming 'Nooo!' and wailing being overlaid footage of people standing in a close group talking? At 3:09 why are those people being encouraged to run up towards the house? The police aren't going to open up the gym for people to see, surely? The narrator is saying 'the utter heartbreak exposed' which gives us the impression this is the point people are finding the truth of what happened, like they're being let in to view the scene of the crime, but we know that didn't happen.

At 3:20-4:22 they say we're hearing from a school governor, but then the caption reads 'parent'. She wandered into the school... and it was 'quiet' and she knew something was wrong? Why is she walking into a nursery class in the middle of the week? Doesn't she have a job? Is that why the narrator said she was a governor? So we'd think she has a reason to be in the school? How did she get all the way in without finding out what had happened? Didn't anyone at reception talk to her? Were there no police at this point? Is this supposed to have occurred in the ten minute window between Hamilton shooting himself and the police arriving? Then a Mrs Aisles tells her a man has gone mad and shot a teacher and a student, so they sit around for a bit and also go around the school trying to keep the kids calm and unaware of what has happened. Right.

At 4:23 we see a very Scottish boy, who tells us he saw everything through the gym window, somehow. This is obvious bullshit because Hamilton was firing out of windows and doors and everyone outside was either unaware of what was going on or in Hut 7 diving to the floor while their teacher yells 'Get down!' like a Schwarzenegger movie.

I'd point out that both with the Scottish kid and with the blonde girl in the This Morning interview there's a beat where they seem to forget what to say and they get prompted by either the presenter or the journalist, to which they can then go 'yes' and agree. Signs of a set-up.

At 6:26 they tell us the school had 720 students, which is wrong.


At 6:39 they tell us Hamilton waltzed in the front entrance, also wrong.

At 6:54 they tell us **13** children were injured. Nice to see you, Marker 13.

At 7 minutes they give us a timeline that's contradicted by the Cullen Report, e.g. the ambulance crews arriving before 10:15am.

At 8:20 the doctor at Yorkhill Children's Hospital, Alistair Miller, tells us one boy has 'injuries to his foot, his chest and one of his eyes'. Given that Hamilton was shooting the kids, not punching them, I can only assume he means the boy was shot three times including in the eye and is not dead somehow. He's actually in a stable condition.

At 9:15 we talk about Hamilton.



So let's look at this guy more closely. As of ten o'clock on the day the event happened (a few minutes after the last shots) we already have the media giving us the whole exposé on the killer. Bear in mind he was a corpse in a gym under police cordon, who wasn't seen going into the school in the first place. Nonetheless we somehow have photos, we have videos, we have the whole narrative of who this guy was and why he did it. A paedophile! A scout master gone wrong! A creepy gymnastics instructor! With a grudge! Refused from a gun club! Those Scots really do some fast research, don't they? They couldn't identify the kids for hours, but they knew who Hamilton was—including his whole life story—within minutes.

They interviewed his mum, Agnes, who seems a bit simple and doesn't really know anything about what motivated her son to do this. She appears to have no emotional reaction in terms of guilt or grief whatever. When did they find the time to interview her? That afternoon? Had the police located his house and the media located his mum in the space of a couple of hours? So they could find her, interview her on her doorstep and then get the recordings over to the studio in time to broadcast at 10 pm? And again in this bit with the mum there's a lot of prompting from the journalist who wants her to nod and say yes to the narrative. He reminds her that her son has photos of little kids, which somehow the journalist knows. She then acts like 'Oh! Yeah! Now you mention it...' like she's just getting the prompt and remembered that point. So this looks like a total fake.

Originally I was going to try and follow all the little avenues of THE CONSPIRACY. What I mean by this is that if you start reading about Dunblane online there's a lot of stuff like this:

<https://www.bruceonpolitics.com/2016/03/10/dunblane-really-happened/>

Or this:

<http://dunblane.site/index.htm>

Which will take you on a journey involving Queen Victoria School, the Freemasons, The Speculative Society, the Police, the Royal Family, paedophile sex rings, Ted Heath and the Morning Cloud, the Jersey School full of kiddy corpses that got quite heavily covered up, etc.

After chewing on it though, I'm actually of the opinion this is a great quagmire of 'the story behind the story' that just keeps on trucking with no answers and no resolution. You could spend weeks reading all about the little odds and ends. As Miles says, it is created as misdirection. Story two if you aren't buying story one.

Then it hit me: the media is already telling you the Hamilton narrative on day one. That's a red flag. That means a pre-packaged plot. Like 9/11 with building 7 or Bin Laden or a million other examples. Day 1: We know it all. Here's the scoop.

Probably the most useful thing the 'alternative' websites talk about is that the entire affair is under a 100 Year Closure Order.

<https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/11901710.who-is-really-being-protected-by-dunblane-100-year-ban/>

From Wikipedia:

Evidence of **previous police interaction with Hamilton** was presented to the Cullen Inquiry but was later sealed under a closure order to prevent publication for 100 years. The official reason for sealing the documents was to protect the identities of children, but this led to accusations of a coverup intended to protect the reputations of officials. Following a review of the closure order by the [Lord Advocate, Colin Boyd](#), edited versions of some of the documents were released to the public in October 2005. Four files containing post mortems, medical records and profiles on the victims, as well as Hamilton's [autopsy](#) remained sealed under the 100-year order to avoid distressing the relatives and survivors.

Right. So no autopsy report on the dead man. So no... actual record... of there being a body. At all. Or any of the other bodies. The bodies which nobody else would have seen, other than government agents, like those police drafted in from other parts of Scotland to help out who left again afterwards. Or the parents who were led away separately who people wouldn't have known and who didn't talk to the press.

But Andy Murray was involved! He is a man who plays tennis, which I care little about. Regard:

<https://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/650070/Pain-Dunblane-headteacher-school-breaks-silence-20-years>

His mum ran to the school! She abandoned her car! Murray was on his way TO THE GYM! Except he wouldn't have been because, y'know, the class had just started when Hamilton walked in so he would be starting his own class at the time. Don't lie Andy, it's bad.

There's also this:

<https://www.thesun.co.uk/archives/news/278946/torment-of-dunblane-teachers-daughter-im-proud-of-mum-but-pain-never-goes-away-2/>

Which includes this:

“We told this week how survivor Amy Hutchison, who was in Gwen’s class, vowed never to hide her scars. Amy was five when Hamilton blasted her in the leg. The nursery worker, 25, said: “These are my scars, they are on my body. It’s my story and I’m not going to hide them.” Amy told a BBC1 documentary to be broadcast next week she “doesn’t remember” being shot, adding: “We were skipping round the gym hall. I don’t remember the pain. I don’t remember the noises. “I just remember my leg turning to jelly and falling then dragging myself to the cupboard.”

So... is this... y’know... Aimie Adam from the Good Morning interview?

Two Amy’s? Both shot in the leg? Both crawled into the cupboard? Both in the BBC 1 Documentary? https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_ZU5sCmY5Bc Have they got her name wrong? Or did two Amy’s have the same experience?

Thirdly it mentions Hamilton being cremated six days after the incident. So that corpse with no publicly available autopsy for 100 years that was behind a police cordon was ash within the week. No way to pursue that then.

Fourthly it reminds us that the school gymnasium was completely demolished. So we have no way to even revisit the ROOM it happened in. No bodies, no room, no photos, nothing.

Fifthly and finally we have one of the parents of the deceased, Dr Mick North talking about how we’re all safer due to banning guns and the only reason Americans have school shootings is because they allow guns etc.



That’s a weird photo to take of a grieving father. What’s with the lighting and pose? Like he’s a villain in a TV drama? I can’t match the girl’s face to the class photo but there is a Sophie Lockwood North in the casualty list so it must be her. Nice to see a colour photograph for a change. The school takes colour photo’s for portraits and black and white photo’s for group pictures I guess.

Miles: we now know why that little girl doesn’t match anyone in the class photo. The class photo was taken in the 1960s, while that photo comes from much later. *Not one* little girl in the class photo parts her hair on the side, much less on the left side.

If we want to say this was a fake event perpetrated wholly by actors, we’d have to include:

- The thirteen parents
- Gwen’s husband and her two daughters
- The Headmaster

- The Assistant Headmistress
- The Student Teacher
- The Janitor
- The Scottish Police (OK, that one isn't a stretch)
- The Media (Again, not a problem)

So yeah, the two main groups are school staff involved directly in the incident and the families of the wounded. In support of that theory, see

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7pxJj90sIk4>

Where Mary Blake (teacher in the gym) was shot through both thighs **and her head** and she is in a hospital bed with **no visible head wound** and this is only two days later and she's "come to no harm from that".

Hold up. She got shot in the head... and she's absolutely fine. Reminds us of the miracle man from Hungerford, doesn't it?



Need I say more?

Then you have more stuff like this:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SO5-L4kaEFM>

At 2:33 it talks about the experience of Diane Frazer, a parent who managed to turn up in that 4-minute window as gunshots are ringing out, before anyone knew what was happening, but gets informed to run to a music room, then gets roped into helping out in the gym... but "couldn't really see the extent of the injuries at first". Was she blind?

We are then told that five of the corpses were carried into the corridor outside the gymnasium (again, despite this being a crime scene) and stating that the medical services took "at least 45 minutes to arrive" which is contradicted by every other timeline we've read on this thing. She also says that the children "didn't appear critically injured", then contradicts herself saying these same children had gunshot wounds going right through their bodies, also "superficial cuts" (from what? Hitting the floor as they fell over?). She repeats the "only one telephone line" talking point and how this was an impediment to communicating to the parents, which we have seen was bollocks.

At 4:30 she says it was "an hour and a half" before a doctor saw any of them. What? Some kids were at the **hospital** by 10:30! It only finished happening at 9:40 or so! Triage was being done at 10:15!

There's more after that but I got bored watching people lie to my face.

So then the school reopens a couple of days later...

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SO5-L4kaEFM>

...which is a nice moment for Ron the Headmaster to give a brave speech about triumph in the face of adversity etc.

The gym gets demolished, the killer is cremated, the records are sealed and Lord Cullen wraps it up in a bow.

Then there is this article:

<https://gumshoenews.com/2014/12/21/they-shoot-children-dont-they-a-retrospective-on-dunblane-18-years-on/>

Is quite interesting in that it talks about Sandra Uttley, who is a paramedic who wasn't on shift at the time of the incident but lived in the area and was interested in the event, also the partner (for a time) of Dr. North (he of the creepy lighting and gun control push). **Miles: so we know she is a plant of some sort.** The article raises about a dozen points to look at, to do with Hamilton's alleged background as a shady molester/photographer of boys, the anecdote that an off-duty policeman called Grant McCutcheon walked in on the event at the time the headmaster was running into the gym, etc. I was originally going to buy her book, *Dunblane Unburied*, after listening to this YouTube interview with her:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W6i2dkLauUo>

I didn't buy the book, but this made me spend several days reading about Freemasonry and secret paedophile sex rings and so on. The QVS subplot. The Port Arthur Massacre. On and on. Finally I could see that she's another Siren that beacons you through Door Number 2 and off into the marsh of conspiracies.

Here's more of the same:

<https://newspellcom.org/2018/01/15/scotland-goes-hollywood-dirty-dancing-in-dunblane/#more-27646>

Where this guy goes off on tangents about the Freemasons and the 1975 Australian Constitutional Crisis and so on. He does some "numerology":

"Mainstream news sources allege the massacre of 16 primary school children and their teacher were ruthlessly executed in less than three minutes at Dunblane, near Stirling, Stirlingshire, Scotland by lone gunman Thomas Hamilton reportedly carrying 4 (Kabbalah door of perception) handguns on the 13th of March 1996 (March the 3rd month)=313(7)/1996=25, or 2+5=7+16(#of victims)=1+6=7(777)=intelligence joker code)."

He talks about the Jesuits being behind it all. About how they had actress Jennifer Grey (of *Dirty Dancing*) play one of the parents, etc. **Miles: I have seen that. One problem: that woman doesn't look like Jennifer Grey. Oh, and another problem: it isn't the Jesuits, it is the Jews. This guy looks**

like Mossad, and he is obviously running an “eyes-off” project here, pushing you away from Jews and towards Jesuits. It is textbook misdirection, psyop 101.

I’m supposed to go off talking about Freemasonry and all the little ins-and-outs of Thomas Hamilton’s secret life and past and whatnot. I’m not going to do that, that’s part of the trick. Get sucked into all of that. Were there two gunshot holes in the wall of the gym where Hamilton lay dead? Did he shoot himself in the head twice... or was there a second gunman? What did the student teacher David Scott see and how did HE survive the event uninjured, shortly before vanishing from the radar? Why did the CCTV showing Hamilton leaving his house early enough that it indicated he went somewhere **before** going to the school, but with no investigation into **where** he went. Who were the rich people in flashy cars who would turn up at Hamilton’s house on the regular? How was that £6 million Dunblane charity money allocated?

Like I said, it’s a quagmire without end.

An Attempt at a Summation

The three ways we can look at this event:

1) It happened exactly as the government tell us it did, which doesn’t account for the various cracks in the narrative as listed previously (cracks is being charitable).

2) Those kids (and the teacher) did die, but Hamilton was the patsy, executed by persons unknown, to fulfil secret objectives. To create an atrocity that would justify the banning of firearms? To instill fear in the population? To protect a secret Freemason child sex ring that went to the very heights of the British Monarchy!?

3) Nobody died. The whole thing was a sham. If Hamilton was a nonce who procured children for the elite then he wouldn’t be killed off, he’d be rewarded by faking his death and relocating him to Australia or wherever. No-one saw him enter the building. No-one saw him move through the school. We have some people say they saw him dead in the gym but they’re unreliable. We have no autopsy, no photographs of the event. There were **33** people injured or killed in the incident so we have 33 people pretending to be disabled or dead, if they even existed at all. The main photo of the kids has been doctored. The witness accounts are contradictory, illogical or in the case of the Mary Blake (assistant teacher in the gym) just obvious lies.

I originally thought it would be Door number 2, then spent hours reading about the bloody Freemasons, but when I tried to find something substantial in the witness statements, the photo evidence etc. it all dissolves into slurry, just like with Hungerford. That’s the thing about lies, they don’t really hold up to scrutiny. You have to get over the horrible **idea** of what happened and then it starts to fall apart.

Key points to remember:

- The class photo is unconvincing.
- The kids were unknown to everyone, including a lack of registers of names.
- The parents of the kids (all 13 of them) get herded into a separate building on the day and are never seen or spoken to again because of privacy laws.
- The timeline is all messed up, whether it’s 4 minutes of gunplay or a thousand other anomalies.
- The embellishments of what happened in the nearby hut is absurd and is never mentioned again.

- That fat Scottish kid was lying. Fair enough, he got bought off in Snickers bars, he's a good lad really, but he was making it up in that interview.
- The evidence is all covered up or destroyed.
- The press and the parents were alerted way too quickly without massive effort causing huge panic and confusion.
- Nobody seems to actually know anyone who was directly affected. They're all hidden anyway due to the **100 year censorship** of it.
- They showed a woman with no head trauma saying she was a teacher who'd been shot in the head.
- Various witnesses/survivors are caught talking bollocks, as I've pointed out.
- The Cullen Report is an obvious whitewash.
- The media had all of the background and narrative on Hamilton packed up for deployment the same evening the event happened.

Comparisons with Hungerford are fairly obvious – Wednesday, number 13, remote town, unemployed loner, suicide, guns are evil. We're left with multiple examples of media lies, crisis actors and forced narrative. The police just clamp down a physical area, the media turns up making everyone panic, the news at ten gives them THE STORY and everyone goes 'Oh, another man went mental and shot people'. Then everything gets bulldozed, deleted, people move away into obscurity, medical injuries miraculously heal within minutes, etc. After that its just softball TV interviews with actors and propaganda masquerading as news.

I think I've made my point.

One day this global empire will fall apart from its own rot. The plants will grow over the top of the ruins and we'll sit around and sing and feast and look at the stars properly for the first time.


For now, bugger these sons of bitches.

Fade to black, playing M83 by Midnight City.



Miles: Well, we got some good research there and the correct conclusion. The sealing of court documents for 100 years is enough to tag this one as a fake. They try to explain it as protecting the victims, but that doesn't fly. It is obviously to protect the event fakers. But I think more could be done, especially in regard to uncloaking the people involved. Someone who isn't pushing the

pedophile angle needs to really nail down Hamilton, who I am sure is MI5/6, related to the Dukes of Hamilton/Abercorn. That link to Dunblane police is tantalizing, and my guess is some tasty bits are waiting to be found by somebody. Probably won't be me, since I am sick of these school shootings. But I predict the court order hasn't successfully buried all available information. Anyone with a good skimmer should be able to scoop up some more red flags. For instance, in the pic above, Hamilton is wearing a green v-neck with a ramping lion on it, pointing us directly at the peerage. The other characters should also be researched, like Blake, Gordon, Mayor, Frazer, and North, for more military, peerage, Intel links.




I checked the coat of arms for the Dukes of Hamilton, but didn't find the ramping lion. I did however find that strange old ship. What does that remind us of? Maybe Phoenicians? I still think the ramping lion is a clue left on purpose, since it is not only the sign of royalty in Scotland, it takes us back to the Lion of Judah (Jerusalem). The event coordinators are signalling one another with that.

Thomas Hamilton's middle name is **Watt**, which tends to confirm my guesses. Watt/Watts is another name from the peerage, related to the Hamiltons, and we have seen them involved in these hoaxes. See especially the Watts-Russells, who are not only related to the **Russell** dukes but are also related to the **Egerton** dukes, the Lindsay dukes, the Molyneux, the Mertons, the **Oswalds**^a, the Grenfells, the Mills, the Gordons, and the Nevilles. This would also explain the involvement of Andy Murray in this hoax, since the Murrays are top peers in Scotland, also related closely to the Hamiltons. I did find a [Thomas Hamilton](#) in the peerage born in 1952, but wasn't immediately able to connect him to this Thomas Hamilton. However, it is strange how well scrubbed our Thomas Hamilton is. On the Dunblane page at Wikipedia, they don't even link to a page on Hamilton, which is pretty strange. Wiki doesn't even have a page on Hamilton, and other bios are ludicrously short, failing to tell us parents. I could not find the maiden name of his mother Agnes, who we saw interviewed above. We do get the usual misdirection about Agnes being adopted and Thomas being raised by her parents, who he thought were his parents. He thought his mother was his sister. We have heard that over and over in these fakes, including with Ted Bundy and Jack Nicholson. The spooks reuse that stupid story over and over, since it allows them to hide ancestries. You seem to hit a quick wall trying to figure out who Hamilton is. The father is immediately jettisoned in the story, and since the mother is adopted, her name is buried as well. This indicates the name is very prominent, and would be a dead giveaway. My first guesses would be Stewart/Stuart, Douglas, Graham, or. . . Murray.

[With more research](#), we find Hamilton was the name of his maternal great uncle and aunt. Notice in that article they say these people were Thomas' aunt and uncle, but they were his *great* aunt and uncle, so even the writers at the *Scottish Sun* can't keep the story straight. This means it is his

father's name being hidden. Also his maternal grandfather's name is hidden, as well as all his great-grandparents except the Hamilton.

Which reminds me that in the peerage the Hamilton line failed a few generations ago, and was taken up by the Grahams, Dukes of Montrose. The Montagu and Douglas lines also intercepted in this takeover. And guess what:



The coats of arms of the Dukes of Montrose and the Douglasses, Earls of Angus, with rampant lions.

I also learned something interesting about the recent Mayors of the peerage. Gwen **Mayor** was the fake teacher killed in Dunblane. See [Theresa Mayor](#), who married Nathaniel **Rothschild** in 1946. Rothschild's previous wife was Barbara **Hutchinson**, which reminds us of Amy Hutchison above. Also see [Andreas Mayor](#), who married the Countess Apponyi, daughter of the Princess of Montenuovo, in 1955. The Princess' great-grandfather was Franz II Joseph Karl von Osterreich, Holy Roman Emperor (whose daughter married Napoleon). The Countess Apponyi had previously been married to John **Russell**, which links us to the Watts-Russells, which links us to Thomas Watt Hamilton. So, as usual, it begins to appear that all the actors in Dunblane are from the peerage and are closely related—just as we would expect. We have seen it in all previous hoaxed events.

For more indication of that, let us look at more closely at one of the injured at Dunblane, 5-year-old Ryan Liddell, pictured in the class photo. [He allegedly assaulted](#) a 76-year-old retired nurse in 2011 in Dumbarton, and was convicted of attempted rape. He was only 20 at the time, but we aren't told why he was attempting to rape a 76-year-old. . . or why he failed. If you read the fake story at that link, you will see that his presense at Dunblane never came up at trial. Do you believe that? If this had been a real trial, his attorney would have wanted to make that known to the jury first thing, to elicit sympathy. But we can figure out what is going here by noticing one thing: his name **Liddell**. Remember Alice Liddell, of *Alice in Wonderland*? The Liddells are also in the peerage, being the Barons and Earls Ravensworth. And guess what, they are closely related to the **Hamiltons**. See the [2nd Earl Ravensworth](#), whose mother was Isabella **Seymour**, daughter of Isabella Hamilton, of the Earls of Abercorn. So we can already tell this 2011 story is also a fake, and that Ryan Liddell is another spook from the families pushing ahead Operation Chaos in Scotland.

The name **Blake** fits in here in a similar way. Remember Mary Blake, fake teacher in the gym. The Blakes are Barons and Baronets, and [the 1st Baronet's](#) mother was a **Douglas**, linking us to the Hamiltons. This 1st Baronet Blake married a **Burns** of the Barons Inverclyde. One of them, the Hon. Emily Dunbar Burns, married Gerard Morell McKenna in 1921, linking us to Terence Kemp McKenna, famous US spook. Terence's father's middle name was Morell.

Also remember teacher Catherine **Gordon**, who we saw above? Well, the Gordons are Dukes of Gordon, related to the Hamiltons, Douglasses, Grahams, Campbells, Stuarts, and everyone else we have looked at. We can include headmaster Ronald **Taylor** here, since the Taylors are Baronets closely related to the Stuarts. The Taylors are also the Marquesses of Headfort, living on Isle of Man. Also the Barons Grantchester, who later became the Kirwan-Taylors. The Taylors are related to the **Douglasses**, Moncktons, **Grahams**, Livinstones, **Millers**, Scotts, de Courcys, **Hutchinsons**, Fausitts, **Murrays**, Pitts, Grosvenors, Beresfords, **Montagues**, and Windsors. See Lady Helen Windsor, who married Timothy Verner Taylor in 1992 in Windsor Castle. Taylor's mother is a **Percy** and his father is Commander Michael Taylor.

What about the spooky Dr. Mick **North** above, holding the picture of his fake daughter? Well, the Norths are the Earls of Guilford, among other things. They are related to the Baronets Burrell, which links us to the Thatchers, Pearces, Trees, and Cavendishes. Also see [John Montague North](#), son of the 8th Earl, who shows us that the Norths were related to the Montagus, and thereby to the Hamiltons. These Earls North are from Kent, but if we go back a few generations we see they were related to the Earls of Halifax and the Earls of Manchester (both Montagues). As we have seen, these Montagues were high in the peerages of both England and Scotland, marrying with the Douglasses and Grahams as well as the Hamiltons. I didn't find a Mick or Michael North in the peerage, but it does make us wonder what his mother's maiden name is. My guess is he won't ever tell us. If you see him, it is the first thing I would ask him.

Searching on this, I came across [something very interesting](#). It is from the 1997 *Scottish Daily Record*, reporting that Mick North left Dunblane soon after the hoax to live with paramedic Sandra Uttley. You remember her, right? Another actor in the fake tragedy? So it is sort of strange to see these two shacking up. In the same article, we find something equally strange, or moreso: the husband of faux-dead teacher Gwen Mayor was then shacking up with. . . **her sister**. Hmmm. That's not suspicious at all, is it? And let me guess, the two sisters looked exactly alike? Or were they twins? Reminds us of previous hoaxes, including the sister switch in the [Tate/Manson hoax](#), the sister switch in the [Nicole Simpson hoax](#), and the sister switch in the Dorothy Stratten hoax.

And could there be Uttleys in the peerage, related to all these same people? You know it. See [Lieut. George Uttley](#), d. 1986, who married Barbara St. John, of the Barons St. John of Bletso. Her mother was Eveline **Russell**. The Uttleys are also related to the Barons Vestey. The 1st Baron was head of the Blue Star Line, which [links us](#) to my recent *Titanic* paper. [His great-grandson](#) married Rose Clifton, whose mother was Patricia Gibson-**Watt**. They descend directly from scientist James Watt, who was also a **Miller**. The Millers are the Baronets of Dunblane. And who was the director of the Central Scotland Police during the Dunblane hoax? Procurator John Miller, mentioned many times in the Cullen Report.

And who is the Hon. Lord Cullen? Oh yes, that would be William **Douglas** Cullen, Baron of Whitekirk, [who appears in the peerage](#) with no parents listed. Wikipedia also lists no parents for him. I guess he was hatched from an egg that fell from Mars. Geni has no page for him; nor does Geneanet. But his middle name is our clue. He is a Douglas, which links us directly to. . . the Hamiltons. This is why his genealogy has to be hidden: the name Hamilton would come up almost immediately, dooming the Dunblane hoax.

I said I wouldn't get into this one, didn't I, but I have already given some lucky researcher a big headstart on the rest of the world.

Addendum January 26, 2019. Miles: I am supposed to be working on portraits this week, but caught a cold. So I don't have the energy for anything but sitting at the computer. Which led me to ask what my writer asks above: why Dunblane? I first looked for military bases nearby, but that

failing I was led immediately to Stirling University—where I hit paydirt. It is a very spooky campus. The first thing I noticed was the heavy promotion of modern “art” at the Pathfoot building (see Crush Hall) and other venues, which I have learned to read as a sign of a broader infiltration by the usual spooks. Wherever they go they carry their fake art with them. Likewise for their fake and hideous architecture. Stirling campus is known for its beauty, but that is mostly false promotion. The natural scenery is nice, but other than a few old buildings like Airthrey Castle, the place is the usual eyesore. This is because the university wasn't built until 1967, our next red flag. Stirling was the first new college in Scotland in 400 years, and it was opened by Lord **Robbins**. . . our next and largest red flag. Baron Lionel Robbins was an economist out of the **London School of Economics**, and he was a major spook. His mother Harris came from a line of wealthy merchants, and his father **Rowland** is given no history in the peerage. I suspect the name Rowland connects him to the Rowlands/Rowlings, and thereby to J. K. Rowling (who is a Rowlands). This suspicion is given double weight when we remember who J. K. Rowling married: a . . . **Murray**.

Lord Robbins married Iris **Gardiner**, which name we just saw in my Titanic paper. Robin Gardiner wrote *Titanic: the Ship that Never Sank*, remember? Iris' father was the writer Alfred Gardiner, and his mother was Susanna **Taylor**, also of wealthy merchants. All of these people are scrubbed at the peerage, and we have no idea why any of them are listed. None link to actual peers, except the created Baron Robbins. Iris' mother is conspicuously not given where she should be, telling me this connection is probably why Robbins was later raised to the peerage. Iris' brother Clive married a **Lancaster**, but she is also scrubbed.

Alfred Gardiner is sold as a liberal, but of course he was a plant. He was early on (1902) editor of the “liberal” *Daily News* in Manchester, but that was just a continuation of the Marx project to infiltrate the left. Gardiner pretended to be a friend of the worker, but he was actually a close friend of the paper's owner, George **Cadbury**. I'll give you a hint: no Manchester newspaper owned by a rich guy was ever progressive or pro-worker. Period. And that goes for all other cities worldwide. Cadbury, a Quaker (red flag), married twice, once to a **Tylor** and once to a **Taylor**. Just a coincidence, right? Couldn't be that Alfred Gardiner was actually related to Cadbury through his mother Susanna **Taylor**, could it? Cadbury is also sold as a progressive, but you don't get to be a chocolate billionaire—or any other kind of billionaire—by being a nice guy. Cadbury is also in the peerage, but again it is not clear why he is listed. He links to no peers. His youngest son Sir Egbert married Mary **Forbes Phillips**, who obviously has links to the peerage, but she is also scrubbed.

But back to Lionel Robbins. Wiki tells us

Robbins is famous for his definition of economics:

"Economics is the science which studies human behaviour as a relationship between ends and scarce means which have alternative uses."

So he was famous for being a bad writer, apparently, and for saying nothing. For this and other non-talents, he was appointed Chair of the LSE in 1929. Although he added nothing to the empty fake discipline of Economics, he was raised to the peerage in 1959. Eight years later he founded University of Stirling, where he was its first chancellor (until 1978).

The campus includes a bank. Does your college have a bank on site? Not a few ATMs. A bank. That is probably the LSE's doing, but it leads us to ask why the campus is on the Airthrey estate, formerly occupied by the Grahams (Dukes of Montrose, etc) back to at least 1488. Well, it helps to know that Stirling is named for the Grahams, who are also Stirlings. Their ancestors have been there since the beginning, and were only later outranked by the Stewarts of Stirling Castle.

Airthrey Castle owner Donald Graham's brother Sir John Hatt Noble Graham was the 1st Baronet, but their mother is scrubbed at the peerage. Their father restored Skelmorlie Castle. Their grandfather is given only as William Graham of Burntshiels. Sir John was of the **East India Company**, which tells us who we are dealing with: the Phoenicians again. The 4th Baronet was ambassador to Iraq and Iran in the 1970s. These baronets are descended from the Grahams of Dundaff, and thereby the Dukes of Montrose. The 5th Baronet will be Lt. Gen. Andrew Graham (b. 1956), head of the **Defence Academy of the UK**. *Which gives us our military link here.* I prove below that the Grahams are still involved in Stirling and Stirling University, which may link General Graham to the fake at Dunblane. This had to be coordinated by someone, you know. Andrew Graham was a local boy and had been appointed Commanding Officer of the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders in 1995. And where was their garrison/HQ in 1996? Stirling Castle.

More suspicious things about University of Stirling:



That's the law school at University of Stirling. See the golf course in the backyard? Was your law school a castle with a golf course in the backyard? Makes even Harvard look like a bowling alley. How many unconnected Gentiles do you think were accepted there over the years? Zero? And how many Jews and crypto-Jews from aristo families? Can you say, "All of them"? Which sort of unburies the joke about Jews being kept out of country clubs. We can be sure that never happened. The truth was almost the opposite: Jews were given a bye *in*. But to keep up the charade, once a decade or so they all drew from a hat, to choose who would *appear* to be kicked out for being a Jew. Or maybe some Jews *were* restricted from membership: *nouveau riche* Jews not from the top old families weren't wanted by the aristo-Jews. I am not really sure. What I am now sure of is that country clubs could not have restricted the top Jewish bloodlines: that would have emptied them of all their richest members and founders. They couldn't have afforded to water the greens or sweep the tennis courts.

One of the other shockingly beautiful things near Stirling campus is the William Wallace monument, built in the 19th century but made to look like a tower from centuries earlier. Its foundation stone was laid in 1861 by the Duke of Atholl, who was a . . . **Murray**. Do you still wonder why Andy Murray was involved in the Dunblane hoax? The Duke of Atholl was also the Grand Master Mason of the Grand Lodge of Scotland. In 1953 the Grand Lodge of Scotland chartered the Grand Lodge of the State of Israel as a sovereign Grand Lodge.

So, Andy Murray again. With a name like Sir Andrew **Barron Murray**, from Glasgow and Dunblane, there is no possibility he isn't from the peerage. He was knighted before he was 30. . . for playing tennis. Which makes us wonder how and why he is hidden. He isn't listed in the peerage under that name. However, we do find a [William Murray](#) of the right age to be his father.

This would make his paternal grandmother a Godfrey, daughter of the 7th Baronet Godfrey and **Caroline Iris Robins**.

Hold it. We just saw an **Iris (Gardiner) Robbins** above, wife of Lord Robbins of Stirling University. Can't be the same woman, since one is a maiden name and one a married name, but it is unlikely to be a coincidence, either. And we know it isn't, because the Robins and Gardiners are related. Remember the author of *Titanic: the Ship that Never Sank*? **Robin Gardiner**. His first name is a transported last name, as usual. Which would link Andy Murray not only to Dunblane, but to University of Stirling Chancellor Lionel Robbins. Unfortunately, we can't prove that William Murray of the peerage is Andy's father, so all that is just a theory.

[Addendum January 28, 2019: That's a maybe, but we can *definitely* link our William Murray to **Cadbury**—which brings the strangeness full circle here. Just this month [*The Sun* admitted](#) he is manager of RS McColl, the largest newsagent in Great Britain. And Wikipedia tells us that RS McColl was until recently owned by Cadburys. That makes sense, because RS McColl doubles as a confectioner. Which gives us only a couple of degrees of separation between William Murray and Baron Robbins of University of Stirling. The Murrays have close ties not only to Dunblane, but to Stirling, since Andy's mother Judy Erskine Murray was born in Bridge of Allan—just across the road from the University. They are literally adjacent, listed as being 1000ft apart at Google maps. In my mind, this is just more indication the Murrays are closely related to the Grahams of Airthrey, and my guess would be that Andy Murray is a Graham in some line or lines on his mother's side.

To check that theory, we go back to thepeerage.com, seeking marriages between the Erskines and Grahams in the period before Judy Erskine's birth (say, 1850-1950). And guess what? We get a hit. The Erskines are the Earls of Buchan, the Barons of Restormel Castle, etc. In 1937, [*Swanzie Erskine*](#) of the Erskines of Restormel Castle married the 10th Baronet Agnew of Lochnaw, whose mother was Lillian Murray. And we can *prove* Lillian Murray wasn't just any Murray. She was of the Murrays of Blackbarony, who were related to Stuarts, Douglasses, Hamiltons, and **Grahams**. So when we see the Murrays and Erskines marrying 40 years later (Andy's parents), our first assumption would be that they are also peers. But this earlier Erskine/Murray marriage leads to paydirt, since Swanzie's son the 11th Baronet Agnew married Susan Strang Steel in 1980. Her mother is Lesley **Graham**. This links the Grahams, Erskines, and Murrays just a few years before Andy's birth. The only thing it doesn't do is explain why Andy's mother was born on the edge of the Graham estate in Stirling. We need an earlier link to Graham for that, don't we?

We hit one possibility in 1847, when Edward Erskine, son of the 2nd Baron, marries Caroline Vaughan. Her father was Robert Hamilton Vaughan, linking us to both the Hamiltons and Vaughans, which both link us in short lines to the Grahams. They also link us to the **Robins**, since Edward Erskine's daughter married a Crewe-Read, whose grandson married Diana Robins. She was the daughter of the Baron Robins (d. 1962). I remind you that the William Murray we found in the peerage—possibly the father of Andy—is the grandson of a Caroline Robins. So this may be a clue.

We find another clue with Jane Plumer Erskine, another daughter of the 2nd Baron, who married James Callander in 1837. Their only child Janey married extremely well, snagging a Campbell, son of the 8th Duke of Argyll. His mother was equally noble, being a Sutherland-Leveson-Gower, of the Dukes of Sutherland. So the Erskines linked themselves to two Dukes in one marriage. In fact, Janey's son became the 10th Duke of Argyll. This connected them to the very top, since the 9th Duke had married the Princess Louise, daughter of Queen Victoria.

But we have to go back one more step for the proof. We have been looking at the children of the 2nd Baron, but it is their mother that finishes this. Yes, the 2nd Baron Erskine married Anna

Cunninghame **Graham**, daughter of the 7th of Gartmore and 16th of Ardoch. So, that proves that these Erskines ARE Grahams. It is all one big family, since the Barons of Restormel Castle and their descendants all come from this Anna Graham. Which probably tells us why Judy Erskine was born on the periphery of the Graham estate at Airthrey.

We have even more links, since the 2nd Baron's mother was a. . . **Taylor, sister of the 1st Baronet Taylor**. The Taylors again, as you see, linking us back to the Cadburys and Gardiners, as well as Dunblane Headmaster Ronald Taylor.

{Added **February 2, 2019**: I was rereading [my paper on Harry Potter](#), when I was reminded of something. After tying J. K. Rowling to both the Stanleys and Murrays (she is married to a Murray), I told you this:

The Isle of Man passed from the Stanleys, Earls of Derby, to the Murrays, Dukes of Atholl, in 1736, when the Earl of Derby died without issue. His cousin James Murray (whose grandmother was a Stanley) inherited the Lordship of the Isle. Since this Murray's mother was a Hamilton, this also brings the Dukes of Hamilton into it. Anyway, this indicates that Rowling's husband Neil Murray is probably a cousin, and that her ties to Killiechassie Castle may be as strong as his.

That tells us something very important about the Murrays, since everything I have said about the Stanleys in previous papers we can now attach to the Murrays. But also notice the name Hamilton there, linking us to the fake Dunblane shooter. It gives us yet another link between the Hamiltons and Murrays, showing they—with the Stanleys—are one big family.}

Despite all that, Andy's mother is not to be found on a quick search in the peerage. Strange, since she has also been tapped by the Queen with her shiny sword. She became OBE in 2017, for “services to tennis, women in sport, and charity”. Hmmm. Doesn't seem to take much to be “knighted” if you are a Murray or Erskine, which tends to prove my points here. She also has honorary doctorates from five universities, including University of Stirling. Really? For coaching tennis? An honorary doctorate of tennis coaching? You have to be kidding me.]

As a nod to thoroughness, let's search on Andy's middle name **Barron**. The Barrons are Irish, descended from the Fitzgeralds, Barons Burnchurch. They later married the **Russells**. We find the name **Aloysius** in their ranks, always a red flag. The 1st Baronet Barron was created in 1841 for Sir Henry Winston Barron, who married the daughter of the Page-**Turner** Baronet. The Barrons also married into the Dukes of **Fitzjames** in 1885 and the **Barings** of Barings Bank in 1901. At the same time, Agnes Barron married the Russian ambassador Baron **de Stoeckl**, which connected her to Russian royalty. In her marriage announcement we find that “her father's vast wealth was derived from Mexico”. This takes us to Islapedia, which tells us this was the company **Barron Forbes**, the largest trading house in the country. The founder Eustace Barron, grandfather of Agnes, was also a top banker. He bought the entire island of Santa Cruz just to raise sheep. The Barrons also married the Forbes.

Which leads us to ask Geni who Andy Murray is. . . and they won't tell us. His father is hidden, and his mother is given no parents.² Just what we expected. But we have seen that Andy must not only be in the peerage, he must be high up. He may have a title beyond “Sir”. Why else would they knight an effing tennis player? As with Mick Jagger, it can't be explained until you realize these guys were from the peerage to start with. They weren't knighted for music or sport, they were knighted for being famous crypto-aristos, and because they asked for it. They wanted to be tapped by the queen, so they were. But given my research on Tiger Woods, it leads us to another question: did someone take a dive so that Andy Murray could win Wimbledon, etc.? Otherwise, I never

could understand it. He beat Djokovic in straight sets in 2013? What? Curiously, Murray also won in straight sets at the 2012 Olympics in . . . London. Couldn't have been scripted better, could it? I have no proof these matches were thrown, of course. I just point out the possibility. [It is known matches have been thrown at the highest levels](#)³, so who knows? If Andy would lie about Dunblane, he is down for anything.



If you find that shocking, your eyes simply aren't open. The first time I saw Andy Murray, I thought he was a creep. He just has that look. That smug, entitled, no-smile, dead-eyed persona that no one will miss when he retires. He may have thought he was entitled to win Wimbledon as well. We have seen stranger things. Regardless, never will a “champion” be sooner and more justly forgotten. You just have to wonder how and why such people are ever forced down our throats as important. Tennis? Really? Hitting a little fuzzy ball over a net over and over and over and over? That's important? That's worth millions of dollars and front-page coverage?

*Yeah, like posh Tories Neil and Christine Hamilton of Louis Theroux documentary fame, now part of UKIP. Also the other Hamiltons that Miles has flagged up in previous papers.

**My wife, who I obviously love to bits, is a very good Scully to my Mulder. I'm interested in evidence-based dissection of elite lies, she'll take every bit of data fresh and get me to prove it. I think that's actually quite useful in a lot of ways.

^a The name Oswald jumps out at us, because—for some reason—Thomas Hamilton [has been compared in the media to Lee Harvey Oswald](#).

² [Here](#) we learn his 2g-grandmother was a **Golding**.

³ This BBC story from 2016 admits **Grand Slam winners** are involved, but won't name them. It also admits the ATP is looking the other way. It also admits TIU, Tennis Integrity Unit, is a sham. All I can say is, watch Murray's 2013 Wimbledon match against Djokovic and come to your own conclusion. I have. Look especially at Murray's awful high-bouncing second serve, moving about 75mph—by far the slowest and worst at that level of tennis. Djokovic should be blasting that thing for an immediate winner every single time. But he almost never does. He only does so once or twice, when he is fed up with Murray's game and demands that Murray at least make a show of it. For instance, in the last game of the match, Djokovic throws the first three points, letting Murray get to 40-0. But then he tightens up, asking Murray to win at least one point honestly. Djokovic blasts one of Murray's second serves off the court with disgust to win one of the points. So why wasn't he doing that before?

Does that mean Raonic's 2016 Wimbledon loss was also a throw? I would say so. Raonic should have beaten Murray in his sleep that year, but he does seem like the perfect choice to take a dive. Clearly Djokovic didn't want to be picked for that role again, which would explain why he bowed out earlier to Sam Querrey. Federer and Nadal also didn't want that role, which may explain why both guys fortuitously missed

most of the year with injuries. I would say they got the Murray memo early that year, and decided the injury story would be preferable to throwing matches to Murray. This would explain the strange events of later that year (and early 2017) as well, as everyone was instructed to lay down so that Murray could advance to a number one ranking. How else to explain Djokovic's strange loss to Istomin in Australia? It looks to me like Djokovic was refusing to throw any more matches to Murray in person in those months, but pressure was applied to him to lay down one way or another. And remember, Raonic is the one that withdrew from the Paris Masters in a convenient fashion, allowing Murray a walkover in the semi-finals, just in time to take the number one ranking from Djokovic. In fact, this theory explains a lot of the strangeness of the past few years on tour, which is only now dissipating. Once Murray got his two Wimbledons, two Olympic golds, and a number one ranking, he pulled back, allowing things to get somewhat back to normal.

Or almost normal. Remember how Murray pledged his 2017 Queens prize money to the victims of the manufactured Grenfell Towers fire, only to lose in the first round? You have to laugh.

So why do I say Raonic was the perfect pick to lay down for Murray? Because Raonic is a Serb whose uncle was Deputy Prime Minister of Montenegro. His surname is Gvozdenovic, which links Raonic to General [Anto Gvozdenovic](#), d. 1935, of the Russian Imperial Privy Council. The Gvozdenovics were Princes of Montenegro, and we may assume they still are. They are very wealthy, and Raonic was living in Monte Carlo even before he starting making money on tour. His ancestor General Prince Anto Gvozdenovic was [General of the Cavalry] von Rennenkampf's righthand man and General-Leader during the Russian-Japanese War (1904), but somehow survived the Russian Revolution. So, like the Murrays, the Gvozdenovics/Raonics are nobility, closely linked to the Kings of Russia and England—who are likewise closely linked. The Murrays are near relatives of the Queen, and the Gvozdenovics were near relatives of Nicholas II—which is why they were Princes. All the royalty of Europe is related, and always has been. So Raonic was simply instructed to step aside temporarily for his cousin, I assume.

But could the same be said of Djokovic and others on the tour? Possibly, since Djokovic has a page at Geni but it is completely scrubbed. Famechain tells us his grandfather Zdenka Zagar was a “high-ranking officer” in the Yugoslav Army, but we aren't told if that was colonel or general or what. Plus, even that looks like a fudge, since Zdenka is a woman's name. Djokovic's grandparents couldn't have been Zdenka and Elisabeta. However, Djokovic may be related to Zoran Zagar, a top banker in Belgrade who became Deputy Executive Director of the World Bank in the late 1960s and Executive VP of the International Finance Corporation in London in the early 1970s. Also see Joze Zagar, head of the Slovenian Railway and later General Manager of Smelt. Also see Ivan Zagar, CEO of Prebold Textile Factory.

You may also consult [this 2016 article](#), which admits the ITF allows gambling agencies to sponsor major tournaments. The article calls it “intriguing”, but surely that isn't the correct adjective. This should be a sign of how utterly compromised professional sport is.

2024: that link is now broken, with the article memoryholed, deleted even from the Wayback Machine. However, it appears it was updated and strengthened before being deleted, since the stub still leads with this:

Gangsters a threat to Players

Retired American great Andy Roddick has raised the suggestion that players may have been forced into fixing matches by threats of violence. Among the queries he considered is a ramification that goes hand in glove with corruption in sport and life, namely the potential for harm.

Why would *The Australian* and the Wayback Machine delete that article? Could it be because the whole world is under the thumb of gangsters?