

TARTARIA



by Miles Mathis

First published July 23, 2020

For the past couple of years I have been getting emails on Tartaria or Khazaria, asking what I thought of these theories. Although they are separate theories (mostly), I lump them in here for a reason. I will show that they can be dismissed as variants of the same misdirection.

The Khazars theory came first, and it goes all the way back to around 1800, when Rabbi Levinsohn and Johann Ewers pushed it for a few years. That is your first clue: it is and always has been promulgated by Jews. The idea is that the Ashkenazi came from Khazars in southern Russia in the 8th c. AD. Although it is true the Khazarian leaders were “converted” to Judaism at that time, it doesn't mean the Ashkenazi came from them. As I have shown you, the more likely answer is that area was taken over by Phoenicians/Jews in that period, through trade and intermarriage. So it wasn't a conversion, it was an infiltration and subversion. But large parts of the world could say the same. The Phoenicians had been taking over the world for 3,000 years by that time, and were covertly conquering large parts of Europe and Asia in those millennia. So to claim that a major sect of Jews came from a particular location like Khazaria is misdirection. It is misdirection, because the Jews pushing this theory want to point you to everywhere *except* the right spot. They need to divert you away from the right answer, which is that the Jews came from the same place the Phoenicians came from: Canaan, Phoenicia, or Jerusalem. The Jews don't want you to realize they are equivalent to the Phoenicians, because that would destroy all their stories of victimhood.

[**Added April 18, 2021:** This also ties into the claim that modern Jews are not Israelites. Every time I run a paper touching on the subject, I get emails from people telling me these people I am calling Jews aren't the Jews of the Bible. For years I have been ignoring these people, intuiting it was a scam by the Jews themselves, but I finally looked into it. The claim is that modern Jews come from the Khazars, who weren't Israelites because they didn't come from the line of Jacob. Jacob was also called Israel, and that is where the name Israelites comes from. But if we look closer, this theory admits the Khazars were Edomites, which means they came from the line of Esau, brother of Jacob. But since they are

twin brothers and grandsons of Abraham, the theory completely falls apart. I will be told Edom became an enemy nation against Israel, but that doesn't change any bloodlines. The question is one of bloodlines, not disagreements or nations. The only merit the theory has is that it explains where the red-haired line of the modern Jews comes from. Esau means "red", and he was supposed to have flaming red hair. It confirms the Biblical story as true history, at least in this particular, since the Edomites and Khazars did and do have many red-haired members. We may assume the red hair in the British Isles came from the same place, as the Edomites became the Vikings became the Scots/Irish lines. Well, it has merit in one other way: it explains the dishonesty inherent in Jacob's line, since Jacob is famous for stealing by trickery Esau's birthright as first born. This dishonesty comes through the female line, since the idea of the trick comes from their mother Rebecca. Jacob is then cheated by his uncle, so we are not sure why the Israelis are so proud of their past. Also never explained is why Isaac or God allowed this deception by Rebecca and Jacob to stand. God himself seems unjust. The entire nation of Israel is therefore built upon deception and trickery, and the disinclination of God to set it right. Knowing of the deception, God nonetheless confirms his renaming of Jacob as Israel.]

Historians and archaeologists admit the Jews and Phoenicians come from the same place and have the same language, so they really have to jump through hoops to prevent you from making the obvious connection. They have to make you think the Phoenicians crashed and burned completely at the time the Jews (Twelve Tribes) were arising, and that after that the Jews were the constant punching bags of the Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians, etc. When the truth is, *Phoenicia never crashed*. Phoenicia was an extension of Egypt, and was behind both Persia and Babylon. It was also behind Mycenae, Crete, Greece, and Macedonia.

The Phoenicians were also behind the Khazars and Tartars, so that is the only way those theories are true. But the promoters of those theories don't admit that, of course. They want your eyes off that as much as possible, because the purpose of the new theories is to make you think the Phoenicians/Jews are still marginalized. They want you to think the Phoenicians are extinct and that the Jews are small, struggling populations descended from lost races like the Tartars or minor historical people like the Khazars. When the truth is, the Phoenicians/Jews now own/run the entire world. They are the merchants and bankers behind every government in the world. I have shown you the genealogies that prove this beyond a doubt, and you should have known it just by studying these people's names and faces. It is that obvious. But they have taught you not to trust your eyes and not to ask any questions.

You see how Tartaria is just a variant of Khazaria. Although promoted heavily by Arthur Koestler and his people back in the 1970s, the Khazaria theory never really took hold. So when my numbers started going viral in the past five years, the governors could see they needed another project of misdirection and they needed it fast. Tartaria came out of nowhere in about 2018 and has been promoted heavily at all the usual places, including Youtube. See Max Igan promoting it there right now. He is Jewish of course.

At the same time, several other similar projects have also gone into overdrive, including the theory that the British Isles were founded by Sephardic Jews, but that Sephardic Jews are converts and therefore not really Jews by blood. See *When Scotland was Jewish* for the spearhead of that theory. On the flipside, we have the theory that Ashkenazi are not really Jews by blood. The Khazar theory plays into that one as well, since if the Ashkenazi came from Khazars, they are again converts, and therefore not really Jews. Someone badly wants you to believe that all modern Jewish people are not really Jews.

I have been told, "Well, you are misdirecting in the same way, telling us Jews are really Phoenicians. Isn't that the same project with a different spin?" Nope, since in my theory Jews and Phoenicians are

just two names for the same people, but they have the same bloodlines regardless. There was no conversion or takeover, just a name change. No misdirection is going on, since I am not pointing *away* from the Jews in any way. My theory doesn't diminish their blame in any way, it *increases* it, because you can see exactly who they are and what they have done. And how and why as well. The Jewish lie has gotten much much bigger by tying it to the Phoenician lie, you see. Which is precisely why all these people promoting Khazaria and Tartaria stay as far away from me as possible. If I were really promoting a variant of their theories, they would quote me all the time. As it is, they pretend I don't exist.


You will say, "If that is true, then why do we see these people and countries fighting each other throughout history? If the Phoenicians now own the world and always have, why all the conflict?" Two answers: one, a lot of that conflict was manufactured, as I have shown. It was either made up from nothing on paper, to cover the real events of the time; or the wars were manufactured (and were partly real) to generate profit. Wars allowed for the efficient movement of wealth and populations, and provided excuses for many events that would otherwise be difficult to manage. Just like now. People can be made to do things in wartime they wouldn't consider doing in times of peace. Two, in the past, the Phoenicians were not completely cohesive or coherent. The world was large enough to allow for many splits, and some families took over one area while others took over other areas. At first these areas were separated, but as populations grew, the areas met one another. So you had Family versus Family. We saw that most recently in my paper on Jefferson, where we saw the Dutch East India Company fighting the British East India Company for control of the Americas. That was Phoenicians versus Phoenicians. It actually had little or nothing to do with colonists or Kings.



Another small point on which the new theorists are accidentally right is the Tartaria theory claim that the Mongols or Golden Horde people have changed in their historical portraits. The Khans are now drawn as looking like Orientals, with slanted eyes, so we connect them in our minds to China. But in the past, they were drawn looking European, or even Jewish, with light hair or long noses. The first portrait above is the one most people know as Genghis, but it came from centuries later, and is obviously just a Chinese portrait mistagged as Genghis. The second is from even later, and there he

has been made to look Indian or Arabic. However, most of the oldest paintings and drawings of the Khans (including Batu Khan and Tamerlane** or Timur Khan) don't look anything like that.





So there is definitely misdirection going on here, but not the misdirection they want you to think. The Jews pushing this theory should never have gone there, because it points directly at *my* theories. I have shown you the Cohens have been the big winners in the Phoenician Navy battles for supremacy. They were formerly Comyns, Komnenes (from Armenia), and they are also. . . Kahns and Khans. Genghis Khan was really Genghis Komnene or Genghis Cohen. The last thing the new theorists want you to realize.

We are supposed to believe that Genghis Khan is a title, not a name. We are told his real name was Temujin, meaning “iron”, and that his title Genghis Khan meant “universal ruler”. But that looks like the usual fudge to me. Clearly, Temujin was his nickname—kind of like “Stalin”, which means “steel”. Stalin wasn't Stalin's real name, you know. So we still have the name Genghis Khan to

explain. No doubt Khan *did* come to mean ruler, but only later. It was originally Komnene or Cohen. A similar thing happened in Israel, of course, where Kohen came to mean “of the highest priestly class”. But that was because Komnenes/Kohens had always filled those positions.

So where does Genghis come from? My guess is it is just a localization of “George”. Both probably come from Ge, meaning Earth. Which means Genghis Khan is just George Cohen. Bet you never thought of that.

Once you realize this, you will find a lot of other obvious Jewish/Phoenician names in the “Mongolian” lists. Such as? Such as Naiman. We are told it is Mongolian for **eight**, and that the Naiman were a tribe of the Kazakh nation, being either Nestorian Christians or Buddhists. Right. Anyway, we know they were in the early bloodlines of the Khans, since the mainstream admits it. Here are some more clues: the Naiman came *from the west*, and they actually outnumbered Mongols in the Mongol Empire in the 1200s. But they couldn't have been Phoenicians/Jews coming from the direction of Armenia, right? Naiman couldn't link us forward to Neiman, as in Neiman-Marcus, could it? That's right, the “Mongols” still run Dallas, TX, 800 years later. Which could be why a guy hiding behind the handle [KorbenDallas](#)* is the one that is most prominently pushing this Tartaria theory online.


We are taught that the current Jewish surname Neiman/Naiman comes from the German Neumann, but that is just another fudge. The Jews are no doubt happy to maintain the conflation and confusion. But the name Naiman was around long before. We are taught that the Mongols conquered the Naiman, but that is a reversal. The Naiman conquered the local peoples of that region via trade and intermarriage, as usual, and created a story to cover it later.

And where does the name Naiman really come from? This is so easy. It is one of the Twelve Tribes, of course. Naaman (meaning “pleasant” or “graceful”) was one of the sons of Benjamin. Hundreds of years later there was another famous Naaman, commander of the armies of Ben-Hadad II. The name Naaman is the same in Urdu and Arabic, where it means the same thing. So that is where the Naiman in Mongolia came from, as well as the Naiman/Neiman now. Not from Neumann, but from Naaman, the son of Benjamin.

Genghis' son was named Jochi. Hmmm. That couldn't be the same as Jacob, could it? They were of the house of Borjigin. Hmmm. That couldn't be the same as Borgia, could it? No link to the Bourbons, surely? They admit these Borjigins ruled Mongolia (north of China) until the 20th century. They also ruled Crimea until 1783. The last Khan of Crimea was Sahin Giray. Hmmm. Sahin is a Jewish name, so that couldn't be the same as Sahin Gray, could it? No relation to the Grays/Greys of the British peerage, right? Giray studied in Greece and **Venice**. He spoke Italian and Greek. Catherine the Great took the time to point out in a famous letter that Giray was circumcised. What could it mean? He was preceded by his cousin Selim III Giray. But Selim can't be the same as Solomon, could it? No, that would be too easy.

As you are seeing, we are finding our Jews in turbans going back to the 12th century. We have recently caught them pretending to be Christians or Muslims, and we now see they have doing it for almost a thousand years.

Another thing that points at my theory, not theirs, is the flags we find:



They tell us that is supposed to be proof Tartaria was an independent nation, not just a general term for western Asia. Which is true in a way. We are being given clues here, but not the clues they think. We have a Griffon/Phoenix and an Owl here. . . Oh, what could it mean? The owl appears on many Phoenician coins, since it was their symbol before it was borrowed by Athena and the Greeks.



Those implements behind the owl are the crook and flail of Egypt, confirming the link between Egypt and Phoenicia. By the way, you can get one of those coins on Ebay if you want one. A real one.

If you want to know what the owl meant to the Phoenicians, it isn't hidden. Both the Greeks and the Vikings *were* Phoenicians, and we know they both held the owl to be a symbol of wisdom. But the owl is of course also the most **covert** hunter, gliding silently through the darkness. So while the dolphin is a symbol of their shipping, the owl is a symbol of their stealth. He is the ultimate symbol of covert operations, which is why the CIA and NRO love to use him.



The second image there is from the [CIA's recent Instagram page](#), which they loaded with symbols. They only forgot the Phoenix. But he is displayed prominently in their lobby:



Where O where is the Phoenix? Can you find him? He's peeking over the top of the shield. You will tell me that is an eagle. That is what they want you to think, but that isn't an eagle, it is a phoenix. You will say, "Cmon, that's just the American bald eagle! Everyone knows that." No, the "eagle", symbol of the US, was actually based on the the two-headed "eagle" of Prussia and Russia, and that design [goes back to Byzantium and Rome](#). But the confusion is understandable, since Herodotus himself told us of the phoenix, "The plumage is partly red, partly golden, while the general make and size are almost exactly that of the eagle."



Historically, the “double-eagle” was usually black, and that is because it was really the phoenix, charred by the flames. At that last link to Wikipedia, you will learn the symbol goes back even further, to Mycenae and the Hittites, and that it has always been a symbol of **Empire**. Since the Phoenicians were behind both the Hittites and the Mycenae, they are just proving my point for me. Eagles don't have two heads, do they? What does? The Phoenix.



Here is the coat of arms of Byzantine Emperor John VIII Palaiologos:



No longer looks like an eagle, does it? Wrong tail, wrong beak. With those phoenix feathers on top of his heads. And who was John? Well, all the Palaiologos Emperors were descended from. . . Komnenes. John was also descended from Savoys, Counts of Flanders. They of course link us forward to King of Italy Victor Emmanuel III, Mussolini's little buddy.

The Indians also have their two-headed phoenix, though they call him the [Gandaberunda](#):



It was used as an avatar of both Shiva and Vishnu. It has long been used by the state of Mysore, telling us what to think of that. Mysore was ruled from 1399 to 1950 by the Wodeyer dynasty. Does that name look familiar? It should. Think of Woden. The dynasty started with Adi Yaduraya, who comes out of nowhere. Yaduraya=Yoda=Woden. It is just an Indianizing of Woden. He was allegedly

appointed by Harihara II and ruled Mysore under six emperors. These emperors all have ancestries, but Adi has none. No parents. Since he brought the phoenix with him, we now know where he came from. We can glean the same thing from the fact that while the Vijayanagara Empire was struggling at that time, Mysore was expanding. It was a great center of trade.

From this fact alone, we can also theorize about the so-called Dravidian languages of India, of which Kannada, the language of Mysore, is one. All you have to do is drop the “r” to get Davidian. Do you really think that is a coincidence? If you do, you may wish to study all the similarities between Tamil, Kannada, and Hebrew. It is admitted that ancient Tamil and Kannada are pretty much the same. But the “experts” tell us there is no link between Hebrew and Tamil/Kannada. They pretend not to know where the outside influence came from, even stating at Wikipedia that the influence probably came from within India. You have to laugh. Anyone who studies the question for more than 15 minutes can see they are misdirecting. It soon becomes obvious that the Dravidian languages are showing a Davidian/Hebrew outside influence. They even admit the influence may have come from Tamil **merchants**. And who do you think those merchants were? Phoenicians/Hebrews/Jews.

So why the misdirection? Because, again, they don't want you to realize that the Phoenicians have been in India almost since the beginning. They didn't start ruling the place only after the British arrived. They had been ruling it long before that. And still are. Above, we have already taken it back to 1400, and with more digging we could take it back much further.

The same can be said for China, though I won't hit that here.

Addendum July 25: While we are looking at the Phoenix again, let's take it back even further:



That's the symbol of the Achaemenids, who ruled Persia from 700-300BC. We studied them in my [paper on the Phoenicians](#), where I showed you they were infiltrated in the time of Darius. We are told that is a falcon, but it is obviously our phoenix again. The three balls are curious, and they remind us of the Medici balls, as well as other balls on other later coats of arms. Those balls have never really been explained, though they may be coins. Money as a symbol of the Phoenicians makes sense, but we should keep our minds open. The Medici balls weren't usually circular, but spherical, and red. Coins were not red or spherical. And why five with the Medicis and three here?† It also reminds us of the solar disks we saw in Egyptian drawings and carvings.

At any rate, we can kill two phoenices with one stone here, since the Achaemenids also seeded the Orontid dynasty of Armenia, starting in about 570BC. That indicates they had been infiltrated by the Phoenicians long before the time of Darius. Supporting evidence for the Phoenician foundation of Armenia is that Aramaic was the language used by the Imperial Court. Aramaic is of course closely related to Hebrew and Phoenician, and the language of early Armenia wasn't Aramaic at all. It was late Phoenician. Scholars simply choose to call late Phoenician Aramaic, so it is just a matter of naming. You are supposed to think the Phoenicians disappeared in 539BC, so there can't be any such thing as late Phoenician. But since the Phoenicians did *not* disappear, we could simplify the language divisions, and simply tag both Aramaic and Hebrew as late Phoenician. Just as they admit old Hebrew is equivalent to old Phoenician, we can push them both forward together, with later Hebrew the same as later Phoenician. Since the Phoenicians continued to run the Mediterranean after 500BC, all divisions between the Hebrews/Israelites/Canaanites/Phoenicians are manufactured, including most of the language divisions.

Also interesting is that Armenia was originally known as Hayk. That reminds us of the name Hayek, which we can now see as a pointer to Armenia. The mainstream completely misses this, of course, giving the source of the name as Czech or Arabian. Since the Komnenes came from Armenia, this also helps us peg the Hayeks.

And if you still don't think the Phoenicians are the same as the Jews, I will remind you of something I haven't pointed you toward before. Do you remember who is famous for building Solomon's Temple? The Freemasons know, since they still feature him. Hiram I, King of Tyre, built Solomon's Temple. He was Phoenician. The Freemasons will tell you their Hiram was not the King, but just a craftsman in the same event. They do this so that they don't have to mention the Phoenicians, of course. If you mention Hiram the King, people will ask, "King of what?" But if Hiram is introduced in the story as just a craftsman, that question is dodged. See the [Wiki page for Hiram Abiff](#) of the Freemason ritual. Although the page does mention Hiram of Tyre, Phoenicia/Phoenician does not appear on the page.

Hiram also built David's Palace in Jerusalem, so Solomon's Temple was not a one-off. Hiram and Solomon were not just trading partners or allies, they were co-heads of the largest trading empire in the world, with Hiram the first name on the heading. The company was Hiram Solomon, not Solomon Hiram. Hiram was building palaces and temples for the Jews, as if he was setting up his in-laws. Why? Because he was. David and Solomon were Phoenicians.

Don't believe me? Let's look at the women. David's mother was Nitzevet, which is a Phoenician name. The Bible is careful not to name her, and her name may have been erased to prevent us recognizing that Nitzevet is not a Twelve Tribes name. Historians also don't want to tell us anything about her, like where she came from. Her husband Jesse is also scrubbed. Although we know his paternal grandparents, we don't know his mother. Solomon's mother was Bathsheba, of course. Her father is given as Eliam of Gilon. Since Gilon is now in Israel, you are supposed to think Eliam and Bathsheba were Israelites. But Gilon is only about six miles east of Acre, and both were north of the southern border of Phoenicia at the time. Acre and Gilon were in Phoenicia. So Bathsheba was Phoenician. Which means Solomon was also Phoenician, by their own rules. To cover this, most maps of this time give the entire region to the Tribe of Asher. Sidon and Tyre are drawn within Asher after 1200BC, based on the Book of Joshua. But this is of course absurd. They admit in other places that Hiram I was King of Tyre, and that Phoenicia was at a zenith in those years. This was during the "Phoenician Renaissance". So how could Phoenicia be part of Asher? As usual, Phoenicia is just wiped off the map to suit the selective memory of the Jewish historians.

Solomon was succeeded by Rehoboam, and his mother is given as Naamah, admitted to be “a foreigner”. Of course that takes us back to the name Naaman, confirming my analysis there. It looks to me like Naamah/Naaman was a Phoenician name from the beginning, a big clue in all of this. It is also very revealing that they admit Naamah was “a foreigner”. They tell us she was the only foreigner among the top queens of Israel, but as you are seeing that isn't true. I suspect she was a daughter of Hiram. Why? Because it would explain why Hiram was building palaces and temples for Solomon and his family, wouldn't it? They tell us Naamah was from Ammon, but that wouldn't make her a foreigner. Ammon had originally been anything east of the Jordan River, but the western part of it had already been taken over by Israel. It was the subkingdom of Gad, remember. Besides, Ammon itself was not really separate from either Israel or Phoenicia, and they admit that at the time we are speaking of, Shobi, King of Ammon, was simply a vassal of David. Which of course means all of Gad and Ammon were subkingdoms of Israel. So an Ammonite would not have been a foreigner. This looks like more misdirection, to cover the fact that Naamah was a Phoenician.

You will say, “If the Israelites and Phoenicians were really the same people, then Phoenicians weren't foreigners, either. So your argument doesn't follow”. But it does, for two reasons. One, my point is that Naamah isn't admitted to be Phoenician because the historians have to keep the name Phoenicia out of the stories as much as possible. Even when they mention Hiram, they call him King of Tyre, not King of Phoenicia. Which should look strange to you. If he was King of Tyre, he was also King of Phoenicia. But they hope most people won't key on that. Two, I am showing you that although Phoenicians and Israelites had always been closely linked, both being family extensions of the royal house of Egypt, in the time of David they became completely indistinguishable, precisely due to these royal intermarriages between the house of Hiram and the house of David. In fact, this is one way they later hid the Phoenicians. The historians phased the Phoenicians out over the next several centuries, and one of the places they hid them is in the royal lines of Israel. You aren't supposed to realize that after the time of David, the Israelites and the Phoenicians were the same company/country/kingdom.

Remember, this is precisely what the phoenix represents: being born again on the ashes of your parent or predecessor. This is why the descendants of the hidden Phoenicians have used the bird as their primary representation and symbol. You would think it would be a little too obvious—since the name itself gives them away—but as we know these people love to hide in plain sight. They don't think too much of our intelligence, and they have rarely been wrong about that. The Phoenicians went into a cocoon of their own making—manufactured by their own historians like Herodotus, Thucydides, Plutarch, and Pliny—pretending to be dead. They then rose up on those ashes, having become the Israelites, the Persians, the Greeks, the Mycenaeans, the Minoans, the Armenians, the Macedonians, the Romans, the Carthaginians, and the Byzantines. Later they became the Mongols, the Vikings, the Goths, the Ottomans, the Franks, the Normans, the Scots, the Stuarts, the Medicis, the Bourbons, the Habsburgs, the Stanleys, the Romanovs, the Sachs, the Kohens, the Goldmans, the Rothschilds, the Rockefellers, the Kennedys, and the Vanderbilts. This is why they love name changes so much: every name change is like another cocoon and another phoenix—another rising from the pretend ashes, and another hiding of the past.

*Korben Dallas was Bruce Willis' character in *The Fifth Element*. Dallas was a Major in Special Forces, telling me the guy behind the moniker may be from a similar background. Not many people know Willis was born in Idar-Oberstein, Germany. Wikipedia scrubs his mother, giving us no last name. Geni, Geneanet, and even

Ethnic celebs also scrub her, meaning they really don't want us to know her maiden name. Given that they admit Willis is a Jacobs, I would guess her name isn't something like Cohen. It would have to be something like Goebbels or Thyssen. She was not just a port in a storm for Willis' father, since he married her and brought her back to the US. She worked in a bank, so she must have known English. On his father's side, Willis is a Parsons, **Jacobs**, Mumford, Graves, Morris, Sterling and a **Webb**. The current Queen is a Webb. He also has an ancestor named Pau Pauwiske. Along with Capt. Raleigh Croshaw, she helped found Virginia. His ancestor Capt. Richard Norman also helped found Salem with the Baldwins and Lockwoods. Through them he is related to the Burrs and Ferrises. The Ferrises link us immediately to the **Howards**, including the Earl of Norfolk. This links us immediately to the Talbots, Stuarts, and FitzAlans of the 16th century. If we keep going back, we hit Henry VII and John of Gaunt. Willis worked at **Salem** Nuclear Power Plant before becoming an actor. What are the odds, eh? He also worked at Dupont. He was in the first episode of the new *Twilight Zone* in 1985. Despite having almost no acting experience and no resume, he beat out 3,000 other actors for his part in *Moonlighting*.

Dallas is also a Jewish name, related to Dulles, Dalz, Dalzer, Dalzell. See my paper [on Mussolini](#) for more on that. Korben is also a Jewish name, see Jeremy Corbyn, who pretends not to be Jewish so he can pretend to be anti-Jewish, playing the opposition. So the handle KorbenDallas is another clue in the same direction.

Tamerlane wasn't Tamerlane, he was Timur-lame, or Timur the Lame. The mainstream now admits this "fiercest warrior" was lame, with a withered hand. He couldn't mount a horse or stay on it without pain, and couldn't hold a weapon. He could barely walk. Since he was otherwise deformed, with one shoulder far lower than the other, these infirmities may not have been due to injury. He had red hair, but supposedly had Mongoloid (East Asian features). Yeah, right. Compare his story to that of Alexander the Great, which I have [already unwound](#). Alexander is also sold to us as a great warrior, tall and hale, when in fact he was short, ugly, and deformed. Timur's story is currently under the care of historian Beatrice **Forbes Manz, which should tell you it is the usual fake. Another top historian in that field is Adam Knobler, ditto. That's another Jewish name, a variant of Nobel.

† I think I figured it out. The number is the clue, along with the color. The Medicis had five red balls, plus the blue one on top, which always indicated their "home base". Well, if we study the Gandaberunda phoenix, we find the same number: six. The phoenix is holding two large elephants in his claws, plus four smaller animals in his mouths. So the balls and animals are representing. . . planets. Only the planets up to Saturn were known until recently, and there are six of them. The Earth is the blue planet, of course, and the others look reddish in the night sky, compared to the stars. There are two large planets and four small ones. So the big elephants represent Jupiter and Saturn.