



©2010 The Phillips DNA Project

Phillips DNA News

www.phillipsdnaproject.com

July 2011

Volume 3 Issue 7

Editor: [Nancy Kiser](#)

Please submit news articles or ideas for articles to the editor. Questions about Genetic Genealogy can always be sent to the editor.

Project News

Happy Canada Day to all our Canadian readers and Happy Independence Day to all our American readers!

First, I would like to thank everyone who made a donation to our General Fund for the Father's Day Drive. We collected \$220 which is enough to supply two free 12 marker tests to any willing British participants.

Our Phillips DNA project continues to grow like a weed and we now have over 550 participants when you include all participants tested at all labs. At the end of each quarter throughout the year, a man named Bill Davenport visits Family Tree DNA's Projects page and copies into a spreadsheet all the names of the surname projects along with the number of participants. He then sorts them in order from the largest to the smallest. The other testing companies don't supply participant numbers, but a few administrators supply him with their figures, and they are included in this listing.

Bill maintains a website at World Families called Surname Projects - Top 50. Here is a link to his website: <http://www.worldfamilies.net/surnames/top50/list>. There is a chart on the summary page that shows the totals from FTDNA projects and how they have grown since the previous quarter. Since individuals are allowed to participate in more than one project, there may be some duplication. There are also several projects in this total that are not technically surname projects, such as Southern California. However, they are listed at FTDNA as surname projects, so Bill doesn't try to make any distinction between them.

As of 31 March 2011, our Phillips DNA Project was ranked by Bill as the 12th largest surname project with 526 members. As of 30 June 2011, we have 547 FTDNA participants and an additional 30 or 40 participants who have tested elsewhere. We continue to add approximately 7 or 8 new members per month. Here is Bill's list of the 25 largest surname projects at FTDNA as of 31 March 2011: (see the chart on the next page)

Rank	# in Project	Surname
1	1349	Smith Worldwide
2	1310	Clan Fraser
3	1087	Donald USA (MacDonald)
4	862	Johnson
5	842	Williams
6	760	Brown-Browne-Braun
7	727	Southern California
8	695	Donnachaidh
9	692	Walker
10	604	Rose
11	547	MacLaren
12	526	Phillips
13	499	Wells
14	495	Wilson
15	490	Baker
16	476	Davis/Davies/David
17	469	Smith Connections
17	454	Harris
19	454	Hill
20	450	Stewart
21	436	Lewis-2
22	435	Miller
23	422	Graves
23	420	Taylor
25	415	Anderson/Andersen

WAYNE SCOTT PHILLIPS

Phillips Family DNA Group 16

I am sorry to report that we have lost a valued member of our Phillips DNA Project. Wayne Scott Phillips passed away at age 52 on June 1, 2011 in Santa Barbara, California. He is survived by his loving wife, Susan, two sons and daughter-in-love, Daniel and Christen Phillips of Escondido and David Phillips of Lompoc, and his father and late mother, Charles and (Margaret) Evelyn Phillips. Wayne was born in San Diego in 1959 and grew up there, before moving to Sunnyvale, Riverside and Fullerton where he became an Eagle Scout and graduated from Fullerton High School. He earned a Bachelor's degree in Computer Science from UC Santa Barbara and made his career in software engineering in the infrared technology field for Amber Engineering, and finally for Raytheon. He married Susan in 1987 and they made their home in

Lompoc from 1989 to present. Wayne continued to support his family and fully participated in raising their sons in spite of his long battle with Lou Gehrig's disease, which required a move to Goleta Valley Hospital in 1998. Wayne's greatest legacy was his deep love for God and his reliance on Jesus Christ as the source of his strength and perseverance. In spite of his many, many challenges and physical suffering, Wayne continued steadfast in his belief that God is good, and we know that he was received in heaven with great rejoicing: "Well done, good and faithful servant...enter into the joy of your master!"

Featured Family Story

Mark Anthony Peter Phillips

Compiled by Nancy Kiser



Mark Anthony Peter Phillips, born 22 September 1948 in Middlesex, UK, is the ex-husband of Princess Anne and a British Olympic gold-medal-winning horseman. Mark was educated at Stouts Hill Preparatory School and Marlborough College, after which he joined the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst. Marlborough College is a British boarding school in the county of Wiltshire, founded in 1843 for the education of the sons of Church of England clergy, although it now accepts both boys and girls of all beliefs. The Royal Military Academy Sandhurst (commonly known as Sandhurst) is the British Army officer training center.

Upon graduating from Sandhurst, Mark was commissioned as a second lieutenant into the 1st Queen's Royal Dragoon Guards in July 1969. The Queen's Dragoon Guards (the Welsh Cavalry) is an armored dragoon regiment of the British Army, comprising troops from Wales, Herefordshire, and Shropshire. Mark was promoted to lieutenant in January 1971. By the start of 1974, Phillips was an acting captain when he was appointed a Personal Aide-de-Camp to Queen Elizabeth II. As Personal Aide-de-Camp, Mark's duties were to represent the Queen (or reigning monarch) or their viceroys. He shared that honor with Prince Charles, Andrew and Edward and Tim Laurence, Princess Anne's second husband. It is typical for this military position to be held by members of the British Royal Family, but it is not essential.

Mark was promoted to captain in July 1975 and retired from the Army on 30 March 1978. After retiring from the Army, he continued to style himself Captain Mark Phillips. Ordinarily, only Army officers of or above the rank of major may use their rank when retired. However, retired junior cavalry officers whose civilian work involves equestrianism may continue to use their rank. Mark is a regular columnist in *Horse & Hound* magazine, and remains a leading figure in British and American equestrian circles.

Phillips had a very successful equestrian career, with his greatest success coming at the Munich Olympics in 1972, when he won the gold medal as a member of the British three-day event team. He won the Badminton Horse Trials in 1971 and 1972 riding *Great Ovation*, in 1974 riding *Colombus*, and in 1981 riding *Lincoln*. It was through his equestrian activities that he met Princess Anne, only daughter of Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh.

Mark married Princess Anne on 14 November 1973, at Westminster Abbey and they subsequently had two children:

- Peter Mark Andrew Phillips born in 1977
- Zara Anne Elizabeth Phillips born in 1981

Contrary to precedent, Mark Phillips did not receive a peerage upon his marriage to Anne. As female-line grandchildren of the Sovereign, Princess Anne's children are not eligible for the style "Royal Highness" or the title "Prince/Princess". If Phillips held a peerage, however, his children with Princess Anne would have been entitled to be addressed as "Lord" or "Lady" and not merely "Mr." or "Miss." Peter and Zara are Queen Elizabeth's only untitled grandchildren.

The following passage is from the book *Elizabeth* by Sarah Bradford:

Captain Mark Phillips, a professional soldier with decent, reasonably well-off parents and a respectable middle-class background, was an acceptable husband; whether he was a long-term prospect or merely a passing phase in the Princess's life was another matter. A remark Elizabeth is said to have made at the time indicates that she had diagnosed the true cause of his attraction: 'I shouldn't wonder if their children are four-legged.' The Queen Mother, displaying a similar flippancy, delivered the verdict that 'They could almost have been computer-dated.'

Privately it seems that Anne's parents were not overly impressed by her choice ('they were frightfully against it', a relation said), but relieved to see her safely married. Charles received the news of his sister's engagement in a letter from his father while serving in the Navy in the Caribbean. He experienced, he told a friend, 'a spasm of shock and amazement' at the prospect of 'such a ghastly mismatch'; later, according to reports, he dubbed his brother-in-law 'Fog', because he was 'thick and wet'. The general opinion at court was that once the physical attraction had passed, Anne might find her husband dull, but, since childhood, what Anne wanted she got.

Rumors of a stormy relationship between Mark and Anne were rife throughout their marriage, and their home life at Gatcombe Park was the subject of much unwanted media attention. Several sources, including Nicholas Davies' book *Queen Elizabeth II: A Woman Who Is Not Amused*, have attempted to cast doubt on whether Phillips fathered his daughter Zara. The theory is Anne fell in love with her personal bodyguard, Sergeant Peter Cross, and became involved in a passionate two year affair with him in the early 1980s. The following passage is from the book *Queen Elizabeth II: A Woman Who Is Not Amused*:

Mark Phillips sensed that his wife was becoming emotionally and sexually involved with her bodyguard and decided to have Sergeant Cross removed from duties at Gatcombe Park. Anne had changed toward him during those few months, becoming more hypercritical of whatever he said or did. And he had noticed how Anne and Cross talked to each other and acted toward each other whenever they were together. Mark may have been nicknamed Fog, but he was nobody's fool.



Gatcombe Park in Gloucestershire, England

In August 1985, while still married to Princess Anne, Phillips himself strayed and fathered a daughter, Felicity (nicknamed Bunny), as a result of an extramarital affair with New Zealand art teacher Heather Tonkin. Phillips was confirmed as the father through DNA testing during a paternity suit in 1991. Finally in 1992, Mark Phillips and the Princess Royal were divorced. Following the breakdown of his marriage to Princess Anne, Mark moved to America. On 1 February 1997, Phillips married Sandy Pflueger, an American dressage rider. The couple has a daughter named Stephanie, born 2 October 1997.

Although Mark can claim descent from King Edward I through his mother's side of the family, his Phillips ancestors all appear to have been commoners who originally worked in the coal mines of the English Midlands. Mark's great great grandparents were John Phillips born about 1820 in Oswestry, Shropshire, England and Eliza Wilde, a hatter's daughter. John married Eliza in about 1844. John was a collier (coal miner) and he appears on the 1851, 1871, 1881 and 1891 census in Hyde, Cheshire, England. In 1861, he is on the census in Denton, Lancashire, England.

Mark's great grandparents were William Garside Phillips born about 1850 in Hyde, Cheshire, England and Emma Grundy, daughter of William Grundy, wheelwright, of John Street, Hyde, Cheshire, England. William was a bookkeeper and later colliery (coal) manager and mining engineer. William and Emma married after 1871 and they appear on the 1901 census in Ansley, Warwickshire, England.

Mark's grandparents were Joseph Herbert Phillips born about 1882 in Ansley, Warwickshire, England and Dorothea Mary Land, the daughter of a quarry owner. Joseph was a coal mining engineer like his father and he married Dorothea in 1912. It appears that Joseph married "up", much like his grandson Mark.

Mark's father, Major Peter William Garside Phillips, was born 26 July 1920 and died 12 September 1998. Peter married Anne Patricia Tiarks 17 December 1946. During World War II, Peter served with the 1st King's Dragoon Guards with whom he won the Military Cross during the Italian Campaign. The Phillips family home was at Great Somerford, which is a village located within Dauntsey Vale, Wiltshire, England, situated next to the river Avon.



The Mount House, boyhood home of Mark Phillips

Mark Phillips' mother, Anne Patricia Tiarks, was born 28 February 1926 and died 25 July 1988. She was the only child of Brigadier John Gerhard Edward Tiarks (born 28 December 1896; died 27 November 1962 hunting with the Berkeley) who married Evelyn Florence 1 June 1922, youngest daughter of Percy Roland Cripps of Winford. Brigadier Tiarks was Aide-de-Camp to King George VI from 1947-50, Colonel, 1st King's Dragoon Guards, and Master of Foxhounds.

Sources:

Elizabeth by Sarah Bradford

Queen Elizabeth: A Woman Who Is Not Amused by Nicholas Davies

ThePeerage.com

<http://www.britroyals.com/family.asp?id=mark>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark_Phillips

<http://www.geni.com/people/Captain-Mark-Phillips/6000000001324098449>

Guest Column

I Have A Complaint Concerning Many Genealogists

The following article is from Eastman's Online Genealogy Newsletter and is copyright by Richard W. Eastman. It is re-published here with the permission of the author. Information about the newsletter is available at <http://www.eogn.com>

I have a complaint that may upset some people, including some who read this newsletter. I will probably lose some readers because of this article, but I don't care. Like many of my readers, I feel so strongly about this issue that I just have to speak out - hold the sugar coating.

Some people are so shortsighted that they manage to ignore certain facts that are blatantly obvious to others.

In short, every time I post an article or republish some company's press release about some new genealogy data becoming available online on a fee-based web site, a great hue and cry arises from a very few nay-sayers. The comments they post on this newsletter's web site and elsewhere vary in wording but have a common theme: "The information is public and should remain free to all of us and not be the private property of some company. The company should provide the information free of charge."

I am amazed at the folks who actually believe this bit of misinformation. In fact, information that was free in the past remains free today and probably will always be free. In the United States, this is dictated by Federal law. That is true now, it has always been true, and will always be true unless Congress changes the laws. Until then, the information will remain free to all of us in the same manner that it always has been available. Information that was free to all of us last year or ten years ago or thirty years ago is still free today and most likely will remain free for many more years.

By Federal law, public domain information has always been available to all of us free of charge. All we ever had to do was to travel to the location where the information is available, be it in Washington, D.C. or Salt Lake City or at a nearby library or at some other archive. The information is free although we might have to pay a modest fee for photocopying. If we don't want to pay a photocopying fee, we always have the option of transcribing the information by hand. That free access is not changing by the simple act of some web site placing the information online. By Federal law, that information will continue to be available free of charge to anyone and everyone who wishes to travel to the location where the information resides. There is absolutely no change to this free access.

What ***IS*** changing is that we now have more methods of obtaining that information. While we can continue to access it at no charge in the old-fashioned way, we now also have new avenues that didn't exist a few years ago - specifically, online. Companies that seek out this free information and then invest thousands of dollars in scanners, servers, data centers, high speed (and expensive) connections to the Internet backbones, programmers, support personnel, and all the other expenses are allowed to charge a fee for that access. However, the old-fashioned, in-person free access remains exactly the same as before: free.

Let me draw an analogy: water is free. If I want water, I can go to the local river or lake with a bucket and get all the water I want at no charge. But if I elect to use a more convenient method, the local water company spends money laying pipes under the street and across my lawn to my house. I then have to pay a fee for that higher level of service. I pay for those pipes and the pumps that push the water through the pipes. I also pay for the maintenance to keep those pipes and pumps in good working order so that the water is available to me at my convenience, whenever I want it. Nobody forces me to pay for the water and the associated equipment needed to provide convenient access to water; I am still free (literally!) to obtain water the old-fashioned way without paying for it. The choice is mine to make. In effect, I am paying for the convenience.

The same is true for public information: the information remains free, but genealogists expect to pay a fee for the expensive "pipes" that deliver that information to our homes at our convenience.

For me and for most other Americans, it is cheaper to pay for online access (Ancestry.com, Footnote.com, WorldVitalRecords.com, etc.) than it is to take a trip to Washington, D.C. like I used to do. Using one of these online services actually **REDUCES** my expenses significantly. In "the old days," I used to pay a lot more money to travel to distant repositories than what I pay today to access those same records.

I am very thankful that commercial services make the information available for a modest fee so that I no longer have to pay exorbitant travel expenses. (Have you priced automobile gasoline or airline tickets lately?)

I am appalled that some people apparently expect a company to spend millions of dollars gathering free records, spend money scanning it, spend money building data centers, spend money buying servers and disk farms, spend money on high-speed Internet connectivity, spend money for programmers, spend money on customer support personnel, and spend money on advertising to let you know that the information is available, and then expect that same company to make the information available free of charge!

Where did these people learn economics? At the Tooth Fairy University?

Ancestry.com is the most-often mentioned commercial company in the business of delivering public records online for a fee, although it certainly is not the only company in that business. Let's use that company as an example but the issues I will describe apply to almost all the

other companies in the business of delivering online information of interest to genealogists.

Ancestry.com is now a publicly-traded company and therefore its financial statements are available to anyone with an interest. I invite you, your accountant, and anyone else with an interest to download Ancestry.com's latest financial statements and examine them closely to see if the company is gouging its customers. I don't think you will find any evidence of that.

Thank goodness, Ancestry.com ***IS*** profitable and does provide a reasonable financial return to its investors. That means the company will probably remain in the business of providing public information to you and to me for a long time yet. All this will be provided at prices far lower than what I used to spend traveling to distant repositories to view the same records. I love the convenience and I am delighted to pay these lower prices instead of paying for gasoline, parking, and the occasional airline ticket! I hope that Ancestry.com and all the other companies in the same business continue to do the same forever.

I do get upset when I read comments of "They should provide the information free of charge." To quote William Safire, speechwriter to one of my least favorite vice-presidents, these people are "nattering nabobs of negativity."

C'mon, folks. It is time to grow up and recognize the simple fact that those who spend money making information available to all of us are allowed to recover their expenses plus a reasonable profit. Those who don't like this are free to obtain their information the same way that we have been obtaining it for decades: take a trip. If you don't care for the new option, simply use the old method that has been in place for decades. If you don't want to pay the online fees, please obtain your information the way we all did it before online access became available. That option is still available to you and probably will continue to be available for many more years.

You are free to choose whatever you want, but please don't complain about the new, more convenient options that many of us appreciate.

If any vendors decide to drop out of this business because of the chronic complainers, we all will lose.

Are you a "nattering nabob of negativity?"