

..

UNREALITY

SANDY HOOK MESSES MINDS

MARY W MAXWELL, LLB

ISBN: 978-1-68489-700-1

Copyright Mary Maxwell

Keywords:

Sandy Hook School shooting, Adam Lanza, false flag, psy-op, extrinsic fraud, Bushmaster gun, James Fetzer, Erik Enby, Wolfgang Halbig, legalized lying, Florida Atlantic University, Robert David Steele, Court of Equity, *Soto v Remington*

To the lawyers, and/or law lovers
who will eventually do
justice with regard to Sandy Hook

and to the still-living children,
with empathy

PREFACE

This is an emergency book. I have two homes: the US and Australia. In Australia the situation is dire. One of its states, Victoria, is already a tyranny, with thugs in uniform. I wish to warn Americas of what will happen to them, too.

In September 2021, I published a book entitled “Keep the Republic, Kill the Takeover.” By “takeover,” I meant the globalist buy-out of nearly every nation-state. By “Keep the Republic,” I show that it is easy -- yes, easy -- for us to restore the Rule of Law in America.

Here, in this book, I'm interested only in confirming that some fraudsters have become adept at persuading the public that “unreal” things are happening. I use the Sandy Hook case as an example of how difficult it is to undo a false picture once it has been presented by the media.

My goal is to persuade you that there are simple ways to discern when you are being fooled. These events are psychological operations -- psy-ops. General Dwight Eisenhower, seventy years ago, said “Without a doubt, psychological warfare has proven its right to a place of dignity in our military arsenal.”

Well, OK, maybe it's morally acceptable to try to fool your enemy, but these psyops are used by Americans against Americans. Much is involved -- including a large portion of public education -- to trick the young and to deliberately alter their brain processes!

So please walk with me through this easy-to-read dissertation on the Sandy Hook hoax. I don't insist that you accept my version of events. In fact, I lack the means to prove most of the points I make. But there is an unmistakable logic to the

whole program. “Scaring everybody” is an essential part. And shutting up any critics is, itself, quite an energy-intensive job.

Acknowledgements

The chapters were written as articles beginning in August 2021, mostly at GumshoeNews.com and at RumorMillNews.com. The founders of those two online news outlets, Dee McLachlan and Rayelan Allen, have worked for us truth-seekers, at great personal expense. Some are just born for leadership!

When the Lockdowns began, in March 2020, hundreds, thousands, and then millions of people came out to protest in in big cities and small towns. This was the success story of alternative media. The mainstream media utterly exposed its lack of responsibility by not covering these dramatic scenes!

Let us realize that the Internet has changed our position from that of the complainers of yesteryear. We can find out “in real time” that we have brethren everywhere. This is our strength.

I thank the many whistle blowers. Typically, they not only have to fear the authorities but suffer resistance from family and isolation from friends. I salute them.

Cheers to William Scott for splainin' the Soto case to me, and for introducing me to the concept of “extrinsic fraud,” which has renewed my appreciation for the Court of Equity. As you will see, I envision it as a *deus ex machina* for Sandy Hook.

Massive thanks to Erik Enby for the Interview. *Gracias* to the personages whose writings are in the other appendices. Kudos to Susan Serpa of Bostonfor911Truth, and Kathy for KathyDopp.info, a clearinghouse re the vaccine tragedy. Love to Deb Hendry, Anita, Cherri Bonney, Kev, and brainy Peter for various hot leads. I am so blessed!

Mary W Maxwell Concord, New Hampshire 11-15-2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	6
Foreword	11
Table of Laws and Cases	14
1. Ten Ways To Evaluate Fact versus Fiction	16
2. Lawsuits by Remington and Pozner	23
3. What's the Legal Position on the Use of Crisis Actors?	31
4. Professor James Tracy's Firing -- The Fix Was In	39
5. The Paucity of Evidence	48
6. Who Can Be Punished for the Deaths?	56
7. Have Whistleblowers Suffered?	63
8. Housekeeping	71
9. Sandy Hook in the Light of Dunblane	79
10. Sandy Hook and the Boston Marathon Bombing	87
11. Robert Steele's Revelation Can Save Tsarnaev	93
12. Has Connecticut Left the Union?	103
CENTERFOLD	112
13. The Sedensky Report: Contents of Lanza's House	114
14. Some Additional Problems and Photographs	124
15. My Hypothesis Regarding That Famous Day	129
16. The Corrupt DoJ, and the Sherman Anti-Trust Act	135
17. What Does the Guarantee Clause Guarantee?	139
18. Did the Iconic Photo Lead to Suborning of Perjury?	146
19. The Law Always Provides a Remedy	150
20. A Mind Is a Terrible Thing To Waste	157

ADDENDUM

What Can the Courts Do about Sandy Hook?	163
--	-----

APPENDICES

1. President Obama at Vigil, December 18, 2012	178
2. Rachael Van Ness's Sworn Statement	179
3. James Tracy's Observations of Dr Wayne Carver	180
4. Cardinal Dolan Compares Sandy Hook Victim to Jesus	183
5. Organizational Chart of the Department of Justice	184
6. Halbig's FOI Demands to the FBI and Others	185
7. Connecticut's Grand Jury Law	186
8. Perloff “Got” the Charleston Shootout in a Week	187
9. Dr Erik Enby Astonished by Particles in Pfizer Vax	188
10. Dee McLachlan on the Lack of Trials for 5g Danger	192
11. Please, President Woodrow Wilson, Stop Army Vax	193
12. US Soldiers and Veterans Declare an In-house War	196
13. Appeal Brief in Vax Case, <i>Maxwell v Secretary of Defense</i>	198
Quiz on the Twenty Chapters	216
About the Author	217
Index	220

FOREWORD BY DEE MCLACHLAN

Attention! Be ready to find out that something you took to be reality -- the massacre of 20 children and 6 adults at the Sandy Hook school in 2012 -- was not reality after all. Did not happen. And that's pleasant news when you think of it.

My colleague Mary W Maxwell, PhD, had been busy fighting off some other colleagues who said Sandy Hook was a hoax -- she assumed it was a real event. However, while writing articles about this at my website GumshoeNews, Mary found some key clues and now realizes that that we have been snookered. How many times have we been snookered?

The book's title “Unreality” can cover more than just the Sandy Hook affair. Once you are attuned to the patterns and clues, it becomes easier to identify reality. Much of mainstream media news is the flipside of reality – with their narrative being the lie... or fiction. I am familiar with fiction, as I write screenplays for a living -- scripts for television and movies. My film *The Jammed*, about sex trafficking, won Best Movie in 2007. Can't we do better than sell our children?

When the MSM feed us a convoluted story of a massacre that never took place, society naturally undergoes some changes. We become fearful -- is any place safe anymore? Not even a first-grader's classroom? Is human nature such that a young man (“Adam Lanza”) can shoot his mother dead in her bed?

Maxwell thinks it's meant to turn our eyes away and distract us from “the real plans.” I live here in Melbourne where the plans are evident. They have been unfolding before us over the last

eighteen months. We cannot travel, and shopping and jobs are now limited to the vaccinated. Many doctors have been instructed to tell lies by their governing body APHRA. My Dad was a doctor and he had a bent for truth; have all those old stalwarts gone to pasture? No, young doctors plead for a chance to get the truth out.

I myself swanned over to the local police precinct (St Kilda's) and filed a criminal complaint against politicians and the Health Chief -- leaders who have murderously banned use of Ivermectin, a good cure for Covid symptoms. Now they are coming for the 5-year-olds.

Mary is a law graduate with an eye on how the powerful are completely protected from prosecution! She recommends an overhaul of the law school curriculum -- why not teach a course on this crucial undermining of criminal law? In chapters 17-19 she is all agog with how the law can bring an end to our ludicrous obeisance to the purveyors of Sandy Hook massacre.

If you are reading this, looking for hope, you have come to the right place. And if you have been a closet conspiracy theorist you can come out now. The facts and insights displayed in this *Unreality* book will make you confident enough to show others that the official Sandy Hook narrative is absurd; *mortifying* might be a better word. You will NOT be able to support the official story any longer; it is a nonsense tale.

A few chapters dwell on the fact that using one's own gray matter is the virtuous thing to do. Please virtue-signal with your good brain. Thank you!

-- Dee is the author of six children's book in the *Awaken* series. She can be contacted at McLachlanDee@gmail.com

“The Soviets clearly demonstrated that the most blatant lies can be successfully put across through massive repetition of disinformation and propaganda. In fact, repetition was the secret of their success. Some Soviet propaganda lines were constantly repeated for 50 years.”

-- *US Air Force Col Frank L Goldstein, in “Psychological Operations: Principles and Case Studies” (1996)*

“Today we are faced, I think, with the approach of what may be called the ultimate revolution, the final revolution, where man can act directly on the mind-body of his fellows...we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably will always exist to get people to love their servitude.”

-- *Aldous Huxley, in “The Ultimate Revolution” lecture at University of California, Berkeley Language Center (1996)*

TABLE OF LAWS AND COURT CASES CITED IN THIS BOOK

Articles of US Constitution

Article I, sec 8, Clause 18: Executive Orders aren't law	90
Article I, sec 5: Congress must keep a journal	90
Article IV guarantees states a republican form of gov't	139
Amendment I freedom of expression	42
Amendment II right to bear arms	17

United States Laws

Freedom of Information Act 1967	79
National Defense Authorization Act 2012	95
Smith-Mundt Act 1948 -- Domestic Propaganda	95
The Calling Forth Act	142
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 60B	101
Federal Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act	170

Crimes Codified in United States Law

Crime of Interference with Civil Rights, 18 USC 1983	43
Crime of Sex Enslavement of Minors, 18 USC 1591	53
Crime of providing Material Support to Terrorists, 18 USC 2339B	65
Crime of Obstruction of Justice, 18 USC 1503	148
Crime of Misprision, 18 USC 4	152
Crime of Slaveholding, 18 USC 1589	153
Crime of Obstructing Interstate Commerce, 18 USC 1033	155
Crime of Terrorism intended to coerce a civilian population, 18 USC 2332	156


Connecticut State Laws

statute of limitations CGS (Connecticut General Statutes) 54-193	58
Connecticut grand jury law	187
crime of perjury CGS 53a-156	147
crime of larceny CT penal code 53A-119	151
crime of racketeering sec 393	152
crime of murder CT penal code sec 53a-53b	153
crime of impairing child's morals, CGS 53-21	149
whistleblower protection CGS 31-379	155
crime of tampering with a witness, CT 253a-151	155

Court Cases

<i>Pozner v Fetzer</i> (current) defamation	25
<i>Soto v Bushmaster</i> 2014 assault weapon caused death	26
<i>US v Reynolds</i> 1953 national security excuse for secrecy	34
<i>Maxwell v FBI et al</i> 2019 RICO case	37
<i>Texas v Johnson</i> 1989 free expression	42
<i>Snyder v Phelps</i> 2011 freedom of speech	42
<i>King v Jowers</i> 1999 Ray did not kill MLK	60
<i>Shanley v O'Prey</i> 2016 fraud and terrorism by media	65
<i>Shanley v Atkinson</i> 2016 eviction by landlord	72
<i>Sullivan v NYT</i> 1964 right to publish criticism	64
<i>US v Throckmorton</i> 1878 extrinsic fraud	173
<i>US v Tsarnaev</i> 2015 Tsarnaev convicted of bombing	100
<i>McCoy v Louisiana</i> 2018 right to choose defense strategy	101
<i>Citizens United v Fed Election Comm</i> 2010 campaign funds	140
<i>Giannamore v Shevchuk</i> CT 2008 malicious prosecution	154
<i>Maxwell v Secretary of Defense</i> , 2021 mandatory vaccination	198

Chapter 1. Ten Ways To Evaluate Fact versus Fiction
(published September 14, 2021)



*(Top) a real pic of Adam Lanza, and a New York Times rendition
(Bottom) a real pic of Martin Bryant, and the eyepopping version*

Allow me to pretend that I'm teaching a high school class on "How to think." The problem before us is the allegation by government and media in 2012 that a school shooting took place in Connecticut, at which 20 children and 6 staff members died. Is there any chance it is a "psy-op" story, meant to scare people? (Or even just meant to check up on people's gullibility?)

I myself have written at book-length about three false stories — the 1996 Port Arthur massacre, the 2014 Sydney siege, and the 2013 Boston Marathon bombing. I have some suspicion

that the Sandy Hook event is a psy-op, but I haven't researched it. Let's see if there is a way to arm-chair evaluate its veracity. I want students to know that they do not have to wait till they have proof in hand, to form an intelligent opinion.

Point # 1. There's a **barrier to investigating** Sandy Hook, since it involves tragedy. Granted, it's horribly impolite to show disrespect to bereaved parents. But we can counteract that barrier as follows: (a) We could inquire only about the 6 staff members who died. (b) As regards all 26 who died, if there was a life insurance policy it is normal business for proof of the death to be presented. (c) Sandy Hook had a major impact on society, so it's proper to take a devil's advocate pose in researching it. Anyone can muse hypothetically "What *if* there were no deaths?"

Point #2. There is **fear of forcible reprisal**. Dear Students, pretend you are a journalist, or have a designated role in protecting society, such as that of a clergyperson. Someone comes to you with information that contradicts the official story of Sandy Hook. What could you do? Many journalists and clergy will not even undertake the simple mission of raising the matter.

I'll bet they think it's the sensitive issue of the parents' tragedy that keeps them silent. But more likely it is fear of force. Two inquiring men have already felt force: Jim Fetzer, PhD, of Wisconsin was sued for \$450,000 (for claiming a child's death certificate was fake) and the Florida home of Wolfgang Halbig was raided in the middle of the night because he emailed the victims. (Yes, First Amendment allows emailing, but his email was deemed harassment, a misdemeanor.)

Students, it's wise to 'red flag' any attacks made on critics of news stories. Those attacks can be seen as circumstantial evidence of protection of crime, aka, coverup of a crime. Coverup — along with the destroying of evidence — is a standard Blackstonian crime. And by the way, it is a principle

of law that everything can be presumed against the despoiler of evidence! “*Omnia praesumuntur, contra spoliatores.*” Ah, the law is gorgeous.

Point #3. Apply common sense. What else can we look at, to judge the story’s veracity? Just use your life experience to measure the *likelihood* that Adam Lanza, age 20, shot all those kids. And try to work out the logic of why he would kill his mother, Nancy Lanza, before the killing spree, and shoot himself dead, afterward.

Dwell upon oddities. If Adam knew he was going to end up dead, what was the point of killing Mom (Nancy Lanza)? In Australia’s 1996 Port Arthur massacre, Martin Bryant was said to have shot dead two hoteliers before he went on the rampage. Why? “because of an old grudge.” Logic says you don’t suddenly kill folks who, many years ago, gave you a minor hurt. *It doesn’t make sense.*

I am guessing that the killing of the hoteliers – by someone other than Martin – was done to render them unavailable as witnesses to his innocence. Similarly, the death of Nancy Lanza guaranteed that she could not speak in defense of her son.

Point #4. Try the Cock Robin methodology. I use the nursery rhyme *Who killed Cock Robin?* to see who was officially present at the event. “I, said the spy with my little eye, I saw him die; I, said the fish with my little dish, I caught his blood,” — and so forth. The idea came to me from Chris Bollyn’s investigation of 9-11. He asks such questions as: “Who created the narrative? Who had custody of the evidence? Who was in charge of Security? Did insurance companies make a fuss? Did judges perform in a normal manner? If it turns out that answers to these questions are guarded secretively, one can (tentatively) smell malfeasance in the air. To repeat: I am clearly ineligible for the title “expert on Sandy Hook.” But I — and you — can do some work from an armchair.

Point #5. Dear Students, one can **start with undisputed facts**. The following are two undisputed facts of the December 14, 2012 “shooting” that, in and of themselves, raise eyebrows:

Fact One — There was a FEMA drill scheduled, and carried out in Newton CT on the previous day, December 13, and the day itself, December 14, 2012.

Fact Two — Later, the school was razed to the ground. So, too, was Nancy Lanza’s nice suburban house — for no known reason.

Fact 3 — The killed-to-injured ratio was extremely high. Adam Lanza, who was no marksman, is said to have, within minutes, caused 26 people to die from his gun, while only two were hit and not killed. Even in the military, such a ratio of dead-to-wounded is unheard of. Let your eyebrows rise high.

Point #6. You can **be a court watcher**. The basis for my book, *Inquest*, about the December 2014 “Sydney siege,” was my attendance at the coroner’s hearings. The basis for my book, *Boston’s Marathon Bombing*, was the transcripts of the Tsarnaev trial (a shockingly unfair trial). Sandy Hook has so far had two judicial cases — *Pozner v Fetzer*, in the Wisconsin court, and *Soto v Remington*, in several courts, principally Connecticut. In these two cases, the court’s decisions so far have been vividly unusual. Lenny Pozner sued Prof Jim Fetzer for publishing an accusation that Lenny provided a fake death certificate for his son Noah Pozner. In a defamation case, you get to argue that your allegation is true. Fetzer was not allowed to do so! (He has at least a ghost of a chance of getting that overturned by the Wisconsin Supreme Court.)

The judge in the District Court in Wisconsin ruled against Fetzer by issuing a summary judgement in Pozner’s favor. (One can picture a metaphorical knife being held to the judge’s throat, can one not? Or maybe a real one.) The judge than

called in a jury, but only to decide on the amount of damages. They awarded \$450,000.

The second case was filed by parents led by Donna Soto, against Remington Arms, the manufacturer of Lanza's alleged gun, the Bushmaster. Normally a gun maker is not liable for what eventuates, but the court ruled, that the Federal statute forbidding suit against gun manufacturers doesn't hold for a military-grade weapon. So, Remington lost and declared bankruptcy. Its insurance carriers have offered the plaintiffs just shy of \$33 million, to be divided among the nine.

Point #7. You can **sniff around for a false flag**. It is normal to interpret a false flag event as being done for the purpose of highlighting "the wrong enemy." In Australia, it's well accepted that the "Port Arthur" was done to scare people and bring about a gun-control law. The new prime minister in 1996, John Howard, had anti-gun legislation in his pocket, ready to spring "when needed."

You won't be surprised to hear that the "conspiracy theorists" who started to doubt Martin Bryant's guilt were the gun owners of Australia, especially farmers, who saw through the hoax. (By *hoax* I mean the falseness of attributing the gunwork to Bryant.)

In regard to Sandy Hook, it's a bit strange that gun clubs have not raised the issue of a hoax. Indeed, in the *Soto v Remington* case, in 2017, when the National Shooting Sports Foundation submitted an amicus curiae brief about the legal immunity of gun makers, they stated: "The shooting claimed the lives of twenty children and six adults." It would have been better to add the word "allegedly" before the verb "claimed." Judges rarely open up, *sua sponte*, a matter that neither side has raised. Ask: Didn't NSSF notice that if nobody died at Sandy Hook, there's no case against the Bushmaster gun?

Point #8. You can **calculate the overall direction in which the powerful is moving**. I wonder: Are today's gun lobbies

dinki di? Infiltrating them would have been a high priority for One World authoritarians, no? My late friend Trish Fotheringham, a survivor of MK-Ultra mind control, told me that when her co-survivors were sent in to infiltrate Environmental groups, they did not even realize they were being used; it's quite a system! And George Soros is heavily into putting paid to the Second Amendment....

Back in 2006, when I ran for Congress in New Hampshire, Second Amendment voters hugged me (I mean they smiled at me) when I stated that the right to bear arms includes shoulder-held missiles. (Not to be confused with candidate David Thistle's claim that he can have an aircraft carrier moored at his pier!) But now that I think of it, in my more recent talks on the hustings, I don't get bowled over by hugs or smiles upon mention of the right to bear arms. It's being white-anted.

Dear Students, look around at what various gun lobbies are doing these days. And peruse the last 100 headlines of a major newspaper to see how many are about shootings. Please try to imagine that any reported shooting may not have happened at all. I mean it may be newspaper fluff "for a purpose." Or it may have been actually carried out — for a purpose!

In the now-declassified Northwoods Memo of 1962, Joint Chiefs of Staff leader Jay Lemnitzer unabashedly discussed with his Pentagon colleagues a plan to create a make-believe air crash. The stated purpose was to blame Cubans for it and thus start warring against Cuba. Lemnitzer was even planning to organize "fake funerals" for the "fake passengers" on the downed plane. (Oops, I mean the downed "plane.")

It's reasonable to entertain the possibility that the 2012 headline-grabbing story of tiny tots being gunned down was a scheme to "take away our guns" and leave the citizens without protection against a tyrant. There is undeniably a direction in which the powerful are moving today, viz., total control. Such

a thing was always on the minds of the Founding Fathers and they never hesitated to discuss it openly. So don't be shy!

Point #9. Look on the bright side. If you were to demonstrate that the Sandy Hook deaths did not take place, this would be great news. Probably half the nation was traumatized or saddened by the announcement, just before Christmas 2012, that beautiful six-year-olds were struck down by a nutter. It would be pleasant news for the whole world that those kids, who would now be age 15 or older, are still enjoying life.

By the way, if this is so, they must be coming under some personal pressure about their possible fake identities. It was never their fault that a false story was circulated. They should feel free to step forward and ask for our help. We would welcome them.

Point #10. **Look at sleuths who are pursuing hard data.** In the Sandy Hook case, Wolfgang Halbig, a citizen whose former occupation was as a School Safety Expert, has been badgering the Freedom of Information Act people "mercilessly." They in turn have been ignoring him mercilessly. My personal rule (ask me about General Boykin's case) is: If FOIA is not forthcoming, tell them "*Omnia praesumuntur, contra spoliatores.*"

Think: how can it be OK for FOIA people to turn down requests by such a respectable citizen as Halbig? You'd be well within your rights to assign "IRPs" -- Information Refused Points -- as weights *against* the validity of the official story, when weighing up your judgment as to the validity of the event. Please note that any citizen can **call for official inquiries** by a legislature, or **petition the court** for a Writ of Coram Nobis.

Neither the Federal Bankruptcy Court nor the Connecticut trial judge presiding over the settlement between Remington Arms and the nine Soto plaintiffs is obliged to rubber-stamp the \$33 million payout. As for the court in Alabama, I have particular faith in them, from my experience in that state. Rip tide!

Chapter 2. Lawsuits by Soto and Pozner against James Fetzer and Alex Jones (*published September 12, 2021*)



The Sandy Hook massacre occurred on December 14, 2012. I could express that sentence a bit differently by saying “The Sandy Hook massacre allegedly occurred on December 14, 2012.” Not everyone thinks it really happened. I have stated, several times, that I think the massacre really happened. But I am no longer so sure and will look into it.

In the past, I have written about two other massacres — one at Dunblane, Scotland on March 13, 1996 and the other six weeks later on April 28, 1996 at Port Arthur, Australia I have not the slightest doubt that they really occurred and involved many deaths. However, the naming of a gunman in each case — Thomas Hamilton at Dunblane, and Martin Bryant at Port Arthur — appears to me to be erroneous. Someone else did the shooting — and has never faced punishment. Think about it!

The purpose of both those massacres was to obtain legislation for gun control. Am I saying that people were killed for that reason? Yes. Definitely. Do I think the same of the massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary School (SHES)? No, I don’t have enough information. [This chapter was written by me as an article on September 11, 2021. I subsequently obtained more information, as you will see.]

This chapter is about court cases concerning Sandy Hook. The aforementioned Dunblane and Port Arthur cases had no trials, so no court ever produced jurisprudence on the question of what really happened. Here the situation is better — only a smidgeon better, but every smidgeon counts.

I will emphasize some peculiarities of the cases, on the part of the judges, in order to shed light on possible abuse of process by the litigants, and also to remind everyone that even the slightest slip of ethical perfection by a judge can prove enormously costly to society.

We need our courts to do what the law tells them to do, both on points of justice and on points of procedure. If that ethic has been abandoned, we are all dead in the water. Or, to express that more positively, I say “Dear Judges, we need your stalwart attention to both the letter and spirit of the law. Please help us — at whatever cost to yourselves that may entail.” (Note: enforcement of judicial ethics is almost nil these days.)

Pozner and Soto

Of the 20 children who died at Sandy Hook, the parent who has been most litigious is Leonard Pozner, father of Noah Pozner, age 6. Leonard sued several people, including Alex Jones and James Fetzer, claiming defamation, and he is also one of nine plaintiffs in the Soto case.

The Soto case has been organized by Donna L. Soto, the mother of a teacher, Ms. Victoria Soto, who died at SHES. The other plaintiffs include eight other families of deceased kids. They went to court in 2014 to sue the gun manufacturer Remington Arms, for \$215 million in damages. The case is called *Soto v Remington/Bushmaster* (the name of the gun.)

You may be wondering if any criminal charges are pending. At one point, Wolfgang Halbig was arrested in Florida for allegedly harassing the victims, but the prosecutor subsequently

dropped that charge. Halbig also was sued in Florida – that case was dropped by Pozner. Halbig was sued again by Pozner in Connecticut along with his videographer Cory Sklanka — that case is pending.

(Two additional suits against Alex Jones were filed by aggrieved parents Neil Heslin in Texas and Erica Lafferty in Connecticut. Also, Alex Jones’ colleague Owen Shoyer was included as a defendant in the Texas lawsuit. Update November 14, 2021: Judge Bellis in Connecticut Judge has issued a summary judgement against Alex Jones.

Pozner v Fetzer

I am mainly concerned with the case filed by Pozner against Professor James Fetzer, editor of the book “Nobody Died at Sandy Hook. You may wonder what happened to free speech, if Pozner was able to sue Fetzer for book-writing. The accusation was that Fetzer defamed Pozner by calling him a liar, in effect, by claiming that the child’s death certificate was bogus.

(In the initial filing, two associates of Fetzer were included as defendants: his publisher Moon Rock Books, and his “Nobody Died” co-editor, Michael Palecek. Both settled with Pozner for undisclosed amounts.)

Fetzer is now facing the music alone. A judge in Dane County Circuit Court in Wisconsin, ruled that Mr. Fetzer had defamed Mr. Pozner, and on October 15, 2019 a jury, selected to determine damages, awarded Pozner \$450,000.

Seeking Justice

All individuals in the US can seek justice through the courts if they feel they have been wronged. The cases must be brought where one or more of the defendants reside. For example, Alex Jones was sued in Texas, where he lives, and James Fetzer was sued in Wisconsin, where he lives. (Note: The Sandy Hook

cases are all at the state level; those that were removed to US courts have been remanded because Federal law is not involved.)

So here is the gist of the above cases:

1. The plaintiffs want compensation for the loss of a loved one. There is normally a freedom from liability for the maker of weapons. However, there is a Connecticut Supreme Court decision, in the Soto case against Remington, that interprets the Federal exemption from litigation statute to exclude military-grade assault weapons. In that same decision that court also ruled that one of the Sandy Hook guns, a Bushmaster AR-15, is an assault weapon.
2. As the father of one of the 20 deceased children, Leonard Pozner, sued several persons who had said he had presented a fake death certificate of his son Noah. According to Pozner's lawyer, Jake Zimmerman, Mr. Pozner supplied Noah's birth and death records, and a DNA sample that matched Noah's, "stored as a little drop of blood on a special piece of paper," at the Connecticut medical examiner's office.

Status of the Cases as of September 11, 2021

During litigation in *Soto v Bushmaster*, Remington Arms declared voluntary bankruptcy. They have closed their Bushmaster gun-making business and sold their ammunition-making and other gun-making businesses. They have offered a settlement of \$33 million to Soto et al. So far, the nine plaintiffs have not accepted their offers.

Remington is in receivership, with \$33 million or more having been set aside by the insurance companies and from the proceeds of sales. The insurance companies haven't even asked for proof of death of the children. Note: there are many unsecured creditors of Remington, who are lower in priority

for payment than Soto. Remington could withdraw the settlement offers and demand information about the massacre but it has not done so (in spite of repeated requests to do so.)

It would be normal for a defendant, Remington, to question every aspect of the claim made against it by the plaintiff, Soto. But it has appeared to be cooperative with the plaintiffs.

Reeves Wiederman, writing an article entitled “The Sandy Hook Hoax,” in the *New York Magazine*, says:

“By January [one month after the December 2012 event] a 30-minute YouTube video, titled ‘The Sandy Hook Shooting — Fully Exposed,’ which asked questions like “Wouldn’t frantic kids be a difficult target to hit?” had been viewed more than 10 million times.”

Ten million is a huge number, yet the question of the truth of the massacre has not really entered into any of the judicial decisions. On September 10, 2021, Fetzer filed a Motion to Intervene in the *Soto v Bushmaster* (Remington) case to attempt to raise the hoax question.

The basis on which he can do so is that, when Fetzer appealed his \$450,000 Wisconsin judgment (*Pozner v Fetzer*), the Wisconsin appellate court said that the massacre was not a hoax. The Wisconsin court hadn’t arrived at that conclusion by seeking any evidence of the massacre, but merely by citing the following passage from the *Soto* Connecticut Supreme Court opinion (that ruled the Bushmaster an assault weapon):

“On December 14, 2012, twenty year old Adam Lanza forced his way into Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown and, during the course of 264 seconds [4.4 minutes], fatally shot twenty first grade children and six staff members, and wounded two other staff members. Lanza carried out this massacre using a Bushmaster XM15-E2S semiautomatic rifle that was allegedly manufactured, distributed, and ultimately sold to Lanza’s

mother by the various defendants in this case. There is no doubt that Lanza was directly and primarily responsible for this appalling series of crimes.”

But those words from the Remington case had never been based on any adjudication of the matter either. You might say the reality of the massacre has not been put to any legal test, so far — even though big sums of money have been offered or awarded. In any case, Professor Fetzer now wants the words from the Soto case removed from the judgment against him in the Wisconsin case (i.e., Pozner’s suit against him, i.e., the \$450,000).

Halbig’s Freedom-of-Information Searches

Another issue needs to be raised. Namely, the stubborn refusal by authorities to reply to Freedom of Information requests by a citizen, Wolfgang Halbig. For the aforementioned article in the *New York Magazine*, Reeves Wiederman interviewed Halbig in his Florida home. He reports:

“Halbig says that, initially, Sandy Hook had horrified him, and he donated \$200 to the town of Newtown and the local United Way. ‘The first ten days, they had me hooked,’ Halbig told me.... He had worked in school security for a number of years, and he said that it was only after he was asked to give a presentation to the Florida School Boards Association about preventing such an attack that he began seriously investigating the shooting. ‘I didn’t have the answers,’ Halbig said. ‘So, I said, ‘I’ll find out.’”

But he has not “found out.” Is there something to hide?

My Worries and Doubts

Thus far, although I do not claim in any way to have researched the facts on the ground, I see that there are peculiarities happening in court, which to me is a very worrying sign. I am

wondering if the Soto people and the Remington people are in cahoots with one another. They could both be pursuing the goal of gun control. (Yes, you heard me, a gun manufacturer rootin' for legislation against gun ownership!)

A rather strange goal for an arms manufacturer, no? Why hasn't Remington ever seemed to try to avoid paying Soto? Granted, they tried to claim immunity, but the result of that effort was to have the Connecticut Supreme Court tell them they were not immune. They, their insurers, and the unsecured creditors would normally put up a fight, but haven't.

It also has to be noted, this time as a fault of the Dane County court in Wisconsin, that Professor Fetzer was not allowed to have discovery on the question of "did anyone die?" He should have been able to introduce evidence on his allegation that Nobody Died which would axiomatically prove the Noah death certificate was false. He did appeal, to get his right to discovery, but was defeated at the appellate court in Wisconsin.

Currently, Fetzer hopes his case will be accepted for a further appeal at the Wisconsin Supreme Court. This would do a service to the 10 million people who supposedly were suspecting a hoax, while watching the aforementioned video in January 2013! (Personally, I would halve that number to 5 million, given that view counts are often exaggerated and that many people watch a video twice.)

Also, Fetzer had no trouble finding readers for his book Nobody Died at Sandy Hook — but Amazon has banned it and he is under court order not to share it so long as it contains the offending statement about Pozner's honesty.

Doesn't it also seem odd that civil rights groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union aren't jumping up and down about the Freedom of Speech aspects of the cases against Alex Jones? And isn't Academia distressed that a philosophy

professor, James Fetzer, is persecuted for asking questions? What ever happened to the Socratic method?

The Disciplining of Angels

One more oddment. Last week, out of the blue, there was an article in *The New Yorker* by Melissa Chan, reporting that the Remington defendants had sought “the children’s school records and disciplinary records” and that the Soto plaintiffs are asking the court to seal those records.

I smell a fish market. In some lawsuits, there is an effort to determine the damages to be paid by calculating how many years the injured or deceased person would have worked and pocketed a salary. Surely the kids’ records were not needed for this. I reckon the gesture was intended to arouse public agreement that any “disciplinary records” of little angels now in heaven, ought to be sealed for privacy and dignity. Hence it will now be impossible for Fetzer’s lawyers to see the said proof of the children’s existence.

I consider this whole thing an emergency. Let Fetzer have his Discovery. Surely the whole nation is entitled to see the death records of persons killed in a massacre. The way things are going today, everyone is in fear of the government going off the rails. In my new book, *Keep the Republic*, I say: “Act now while we still have a legal system in place. Once we lose it, there won’t be any way to get it back, will there?”

Update: I have now heard that Internet broadcaster Alex Jones lost the defamation lawsuit by way of a *default* ruling from the judge. This was because Jones had committed “contempt of court” by not fronting up with all the Discovery materials requested, such as emails and contracts with distributors. Of course this prevented the case from going to the merits, as they say. Possibly another fish market here?

Chapter 3. What's the Legal Position on the Use of Crisis Actors? *(published September 18, 2021)*



For a 2016 drill about a potential plane crash at Sydney, mannequins (left) and cardboard cutouts (right), as well as live actors, were used Photos: Cameron Richardson at DailyTelegraph.com.au

It's a sad world we live in today, with all the lying, hoaxing, and surrealism visible everywhere. But we mustn't give in to it. The antidote is to talk about reality, and also to call out the instances of fakery.

In this article, I will try to pin down any criminality that exists in the use of so-called crisis actors. But first I'll inventory the circumstances in which it is OK to play-act.

1. It's OK to play act a scene in a drama on stage. The audience knows that when they bought a ticket, they were going to see play-acting. Romeo struts onto the stage with Juliet in the balcony doing her monologue. How can anyone complain of being fooled?
2. It's also OK when an actor poses in a TV ad as a satisfied customer. "I love using this furniture polish on my dining room table." Quite possibly she has never polished furniture in her life; maybe she does not even have a dining room table, but it's OK because we have long accepted the custom of a business hiring an actor to show off its product.

3. Now for “puffery.” Someone says, in an ad (or writes it on the packaging), “The sharpest razor in the world.” It is by no means the sharpest in the world but “we all understand” that the promoter could not have measured the sharpness of all the world’s razors. Thus, since we can guess that it’s a meaningless claim, we won’t fuss about it. I was surprised to learn in law school that the promoter won’t be sue-able for telling lies, as it is considered “mere puffery.”
4. But it’s not so OK if an actor proclaims, in an ad, that he is a doctor (or dresses like one). When he says “This pill is excellent for migraines” the audience absorbs his doctor-like image and the claim about the medication into one message: Doctors have checked the science or have had experience with real patients that made him evaluate the migraine pill positively.

Note: As far as I know, society has not complained that this is wrong. But it *is* wrong. The pill manufacturer should get a real doctor to make the statement, giving his real name, too. This isn’t the same as the lady actor who promotes furniture polish.

Crisis Acting

5. Now let’s talk about actors who play a part in a scene that is meant to look authentic and be shown as News. Here, there won’t be a chance for folks watching it to discount it, in the way we’d discount an advertisement as self-serving; it is being presented to us as reality, as history in the making. I say that it’s not OK. So let’s pause to grade different types of crisis-acting scenes:
6. Type A — a publicly announced drill. In the photo shown above, public announcements were made that, on a certain date there would be an exercise to help prepare for a putative plane crash onto the streets of Sydney. Locals were told that 700 persons would be

playing the role of injured, bereaved, and spectators. While it was true that fake blood would be dropped on the ground and some “canned” wailing would be heard, no one would go away thinking they had just seen the victims of a real crash. I judge this to be OK.

7. Type B — the practice of making warlike scenes for soldiers, before they have left their base to go to battle, to give them an idea of what they may encounter. For example, they may encounter a soldier whose leg has just been blown off. I judge this to be OK, not because the men were advised of the exercise — maybe they weren’t advised — but because it is beneficial for them to see horrible injuries and then be taught how to cope with it. (The guys playing the role of the legless would be an actor who was a real amputee, or for whom there is a way to hide the leg.)
8. Type C — crisis actors are hired to make it look like some awful thing has occurred, for purposes of scaring people in general. This is not OK and is the crime of assault — the onlookers are assaulted mentally, or could even suffer a heart attack.
9. Type D — crisis actors are hired to play the part of, say, “far-right wingers” or “Muslim jihadists,” creating chaos or murder, for the purpose of having this group suffer damage to its reputation. This is a form of libel and is not OK. It may be charged as a crime of fraud.
10. Type E — which is sometimes intertwined with type D — has the group doing wrong so that new laws can be passed to criminalize certain behavior. The common examples are laws against gun-toting and laws against terrorism. Of course, this is not OK. I have recently heard it referred to as SCAD — state crimes against democracy. That idea needs to be developed — after

all, if the result is a lessening of democracy, this crisis acting of a fake event must somehow be criminal.

Is There a License To Lie?

It appears that persons who are hired to do Type D and E crisis-acting are told that they won't be — or can't be — sued or charged with crime. They are protected by “a new law that aids national security.”

Where is that new law? I don't believe it exists. On a case-by-case basis, an individual who has been sued or prosecuted may be able to hide behind the national security mantra. This was seen in the 1953 case, *US v Reynolds*. Some widows of ~~Air Force men~~ civilians who were in a military plane crash asked for damages. The defendant, the United States military, wormed its way out of providing Discovery by saying the cause of the (domestic) crash was classified.

As a result, the plaintiffs lost the case. The military, on pretext of doing something for the nation (I say pretext because it turned out later that the national security issue was bogus), was protected. I agree it is proper for national security to make lying OK, in specific circumstances, but not across the board.

Anyway, the word has passed around that the “new law” that okays crisis acting is contained in the 2012 NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act. Every two years Congress authorizes all upcoming expenses for the army, navy, air force, and now the space force. Most Congresspersons are eager to vote for the passage of the bill as it contains some pork for their constituents. Often something gets snuck into the NDAA at the last minute (as an “amendment”).

In 2012, the bill called for a repeal of the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948. That law had funded US overseas broadcasts such as by the Voice of America and Liberty Radio. This was just after World War II ended, and the plan was to downtool a

bit. Smith-Mundt forbade the stuff we send overseas from doubling back onto the US audience as propaganda.

The 2012 NDA Act, officially called the Thornberry Act, does not — as some have reported — suddenly allow the government to try to influence public opinion. It only lifts some of the restrictions formerly imposed on the State Department. Propaganda is still a no-no in America.

My answer to the question “Is there a license to lie?” is: Of course not! My answer to the question “Is it legal for the US government to propagandize the citizenry in any way, shape, or form?” is: “Surely you jest.”

The Northwoods Memo “Authorizes” a False Flag against Cuba

We turn now to the declassified Northwoods Memo of 1962. It describes a false flag operation that the Pentagon would create for the purpose of justifying a US war against Cuba. We would PRETEND that Cubans had hurt us by downing a plane carrying some American passengers. We would go through the motions of attending those passengers’ “funerals.” (You can imagine the lugubrious language to be used, concerning the tragedy of those “deaths.”)

Here is the Northwoods Memo: As sent to The Secretary of Defense ...

From: Gen. Jay Lemnitzer, March 23, 1962. For: Secretary of Defense

Joint Chiefs of Staff are to indicate brief but precise description of pretexts, which they consider, **would provide justification** for US military intervention in Cuba....

World opinion, and the United States forum should be favorably affected by developing the international image

of the Cuban government as rash and irresponsible, and as an alarming and unpredictable threat to peace. a. Sabotage ship in harbor; large fires naphthalene

Conduct funerals for mock victims... c. Commence large-scale ... military operations.... We could develop a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area, or other Florida cities and even in Washington.... We could sink a boatload of Cubans en route to Florida (real or simulated).

We could foster attempts on lives of Cuban refugees in the United States even to the extent of wounding in instances to be widely publicized... C-46 type aircraft could make cane-burning raids at night. Soviet Bloc incendiaries could be found...

Hijacking attempts against civil air and surface craft should **appear to continue** as harassing measures condoned by the government of Cuba.... It is possible to create an incident, which will demonstrate convincingly that **a Cuban aircraft has attacked and shot down** a chartered civil airliner en route from the United States to Jamaica. An aircraft at Eglin AFB would be **painted and numbered as an exact duplicate** for a civil registered aircraft belonging to a CIA proprietary organization.

[It] would be loaded with the selected passengers, all boarded under carefully prepared aliases. The actual registered aircraft would be converted to a drone. At precisely the same time that the aircraft was presumably shot down, a submarine or small surface would disburse F-101 parts....

The first thing that has to be said is “All’s fair in love and war.” For Thomas Hobbes writing in 1651 “Force and Fraud are in warre the two Cardinall vertues.” That is, it is just fine and dandy to kill and to deceive the enemy.

All people have a big double standard in regard to moral responsibility to other societies. It's not surprising that Gen Lemnitzer said: "We could develop a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area, or other Florida cities and even in Washington.... We could sink a boatload of Cubans en route to Florida (real or simulated). We could foster attempts on lives of Cuban refugees in the United States even to the extent of wounding in instances to be widely publicized."

Wait a minute! A terror campaign in Florida and Washington is going to hurt Americans. Sinking a boatload of civilians is a war crime. And the wounding of refugees means persons already here in the US. And on top of all that, consider the SCAD involved. Lemnitzer's plan is a State Crime Against Democracy, isn't it? Per the Constitution, it is for Congress, not the Executive, to decide that we will go to war.

Non-Disclosure Agreements

Finally, what is the legal position on contracting with someone to commit a crime? Let's say X hires you to participate as an actor in a false flag event. No one is meant to be harmed, and in fact no one suffers physical harm. But the audience — the nation — will be deceived into thinking a tragedy occurred (a bombing, a shooting spree, etc.).

Assume that X pays you, perhaps handsomely, for your work as an actor. The contract includes an obligation on your part that you will not tattle. It might even explain to you that this secrecy is a requirement for national security. Maybe X goes so far as to instruct you that if you do break the secrecy ("non-disclosure") agreement, the government might prosecute you for violating national security.

Possibly this sort of thing does go on when crisis actors are being hired. Let this chapter stand as a warning to crisis actors that there is no such protection for them. They may get hung out to dry.

Homeland Security Department Form 68

FEMA Homeland Security Emergency **Exercise**, April 30, 2013

1. The day will be long and tiring. You need to be at the site by [time], and you will probably not finish until after [time]. If you have any health concerns or medical conditions, please tell POC.
2. If you are not age 18 and are not in the military, parental permission is required to participate.
5. Be on time! Please do not arrive late. It is difficult to begin the exercise if actors are not in place. Volunteers transported to hospitals will be given a snack before being returned to the exercise site.
6. Wear layers of old clothes, clothes that can be removed.
...Wear clothes that you do not mind getting wet, dirty, or torn.
7. There will be no place to keep personal belongings. Bring your driver's license, keys, and a sense of humor. Do not bring cameras, jewelry, items you don't want to get wet, large sums of money, or uninvited friends or volunteers.
8. Don't overact. When you arrive at the exercise site, you will be assigned an injury or role and will be briefed about your roles and what will happen during the exercise.

If you are assigned the role of a psychologically distressed person, please act upset, not out of control.
9. If you get hurt or have a real problem, say "This is a real emergency" to tell exercise staff you are not just acting.

On behalf of [Agency/Jurisdiction] and all of the participants in the exercise, thank you for volunteering. Our community will be better prepared to face challenges in future.

Chapter 4. Professor James Tracy's Firing; the Fix Was In
(published September 22, 2021)



(L) Professor James Tracy, Photo: Palm Beach Post/Richard Granlich
(R) Motto in the seal: "Equal justice through law"

This is the opening of the Appeal Court's ruling, as written by Judge Julie Carnes:

"Following the December 14, 2012 Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting in Newtown, Connecticut, where twenty children and six adults lost their lives, Plaintiff James Tracy attracted national news media attention for publicly questioning whether the massacre had in fact occurred. At the time, Plaintiff held a tenured position in the School of Communication and Multimedia Studies at Florida Atlantic University and maintained a personal online blog, called the "Memory Hole Blog," where he criticized the media and explored conspiracy theories."

James Tracy, born 1965, father of four, was fired from his teaching job in January 2016 and fought it at the District Court, in April 2016. That court ruled in favor of the employer, in December 2017. Tracy appealed to the Eleventh Circuit Court which is based in Atlanta, Georgia in 2018. He lost that appeal in 2020.

Let me begin with a quote that appeared in his original pleadings. It is from Justice Brennan in *Texas v Johnson* in 1989:

“If there is a bedrock principle underlying the First Amendment, it is that the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable.”

That’s still current, of course. In a 2011 case, *Snyder v Phelps*, Chief Justice Roberts, used Brennan’s words. Roberts said that the First Amendment right prevails even when deeply hurtful hate speech is used, such as walking past a soldier’s funeral with picket signs that say “Thank God for Dead Soldiers,” or “God Hates Fags.”

Perhaps you read about Professor Tracy losing his position — a tenured one — at a public university in Florida. Two thoughts may have passed through your mind: Firstly, that tenured jobs are tenured — as in, you can’t get fired, per the principle of academic freedom.

Secondly, that it is firmly established in law that you can criticize government in print — as noted by Brennan and Roberts above. Americans are dedicated to their First Amendment, and rightly so, since so much hangs from it.

You definitely are free to say “Sandy Hook was a government operation aimed at gun control” — or aimed at getting people to travel to Outer Space, or whatever. A few exceptions are well-known: you are not free to yell “Fire” in a crowded theatre; and if you insult a private person rather than Uncle Sam, she may sue you for slander. But you *can* say “God hates fags.” (Probably another First Amendment right would be invoked there — your freedom of religion to assume you know what’s on God’s mind.)

I myself have “tried it out” — I’ve said that I think the Boston Marathon bombing was done by the FBI, and I do not expect

to be punished. In fact, I marched into federal district court and filed a RICO case against several entities including the FBI. I lost on a technicality, wouldn't you know.

(Like I was going to win?)

Some of the Legal Concepts in Tracy's Case

I have spent hours perusing the James Tracy court transcripts. It is tedious beyond belief, and I won't put you through it. (Go read it at tracylegaldefense.org if you are a masochist, or if you want to do a PhD on it — actually that would be helpful, please. Just be sure to check your brakes often if you decide to get involved.)

It will help to survey a few of the relevant principles in this case. Note that it is not a case against Tracy for speaking out. (He would win.) It is a case *by* Tracy against the employer for sacking him. I'll just list some of the issues related to the pleadings and the rulings:

Jurisdiction. This plaintiff has the right to go to US District Court as he wants to use a federal law, one known as “1983.” It is an astonishing law that promises every citizen that they can ask for federal help if a private party, or a state government entity, steps on their constitutional toes. Example: someone installs a surveillance system in your bedroom (contra Fourth Amendment). Or someone fires you for doing conspiracy theory, as in Tracy's case. See 18 USC 1983.

Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If you sign an agreement with your employer, both parties must carry it out. And if one complains against the other, they should look to the fine print to see how the grievance process will work. Based on it, a court may turn away a litigant, such as James Tracy, if he failed to exhaust his internal appeals. That's referred to in the legal trade as “exhaustion.” (Lawyers have to have a legalese name for everything, right?)

Preponderance of Evidence. In civil actions (i.e., lawsuits) the requirement is not to prove the case beyond reasonable doubt, but to show that you are right on the preponderance of evidence.

Vagueness of a Law. It is considered unconstitutional to try to enforce a vague law. Everyone has the right to know what he must do to stay lawful.

Opening the Door to Admissibility: If a certain type of evidence would normally be inadmissible but one side has introduced it, the other side may be able to get his or her two cents worth in, on that topic.

“403 grounds.” Per federal law, the court may exclude relevant evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by a danger of one or more of the following: unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.

Policy on Outside Activities. The school, FAU, has a Policy that faculty must report outside activities. The reason for this policy is to avoid conflicts of interest. (You don’t want the professor of holistic medicine to moonlight as a registered lobbyist for GlaxoKlineSmith type thing.) Another good reason is to see that the teacher is not devoting too much time to tasks other than the ones for which he is responsible to the university.

Retaliation. In the instant case, Tracy needed to show that his firing was not for the convoluted reasons that the Defendant — Florida Atlantic University (FAU) — presented, but was a simple case of retaliation for his blogging about Sandy Hook.

Chronology

In 2012, Tracy started a blog titled “Memory Hole: Reflections on Media and Politics.” (Recall: the academic department he

worked in is Media.) He blogged on his personal time and got donations of \$850.

The Sandy Hook massacre took place on December 14, 2012. Soon, Tracy blogged about it and in January 2013, FAU officials, including the former president of FAU and staff from the press office met to discuss the complaints and to explore terminating him. I quote from Tracy's appeal brief:

“The group kept handwritten notes and agreed not to exchange emails so their discussions would not enter the public record. The notes recognized that FAU was bound by “freedom of speech” and “acad[emic] freedom,” but stated Tracy’s activities were “reckless + irresponsible,” and that he was a “black eye on all faculty” and a “1-man argument against tenure.”

The notes also state “JT [is] not going to stop publishing,” and the group was encouraged to “read his stuff” and “find winning metaphors” to circumvent the “1st Amendment.”

Dean Heather Coltman spoke to Tracy advising that he failed to issue a disclaimer. Actually, his blog did say that the views expressed were his alone, but he used his work title Associate Professor. (Twenty other faculty members had blogs on which they gave their job title, but weren't admonished for it.)

FAU and Tracy settled the matter, with FAU agreeing to drop the discipline and remove the disciplinary notice from his file in exchange for Tracy's agreement to stop using his FAU title in blog postings and to use a disclaimer drafted by FAU that stated the content of the blog were the views of Tracy and not FAU.

The Policy

The next matter to be raised by the university (seeking means of firing him) concerns the Policy by which all faculty are asked

to report on a specific form if they have any conflict of interest. The form offers check boxes for four types of activities: “Employment”; “Professional Activity”; “Compensated Activity”; and “Continuing Business Interest.”

Again, it would be hard to say that James Tracy’s blog was against the Policy. But in any case, the Policy was vague. It said nothing about blogging. Faculty members who believed they did not have any conflict of interest did not have to fill out the form.

All Florida public universities must have a conflict-of-interest policy pursuant to Chapter 112, Part III, Florida Statutes (2018). FAU’s “Report of Outside Employment Guidelines” instructs that employees must report their conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment, and outside activities “prior to” engaging in said activity.

One person who got fired was a Spanish teacher who failed to state (and later lied about) the fact that she had 8 other jobs.

To apply the Policy to a blog, Diane Alperin, vice-provost, testified that administrators would have to examine the contents of the blog. The same goes for social media posts: “I think it would depend on the content of the Twitter.”

No check box is offered for any type of uncompensated activity. Employees are not required to report “incidental use” of FAU equipment for outside activities. (Tracy sometimes typed his stuff on his work computer.) The rule in 2015 was that financial interests under \$10,000 did not have to be reported.

The Trouble Begins

Between October and November 2015, Tracy asked for clarification about the Policy, including requesting a statement from FAU that his blogging did not qualify as a reportable

outside activity. Williams forwarded Tracy's emails to Alperin for further clarification. Some went to FAU's legal department. FAU never answered Tracy's questions nor met with him to instruct him on the scope or applicability of its vague Policy.

Instead, on November 10, 2015, Coltman sent Tracy a Notice of Discipline, which he did not receive until November 20, 2015, as he had been on paternity leave [Aw]. The Notice required Tracy to comply within 48 hours or face "additional disciplinary action."

On November 22, 2015, Tracy responded by letter. He raised concerns about the Policy's breadth and that it violated his First Amendment rights. He informed Coltman that he had affirmed receipt of his annual assignment.

On December 16, 2015, Alperin sent Tracy a Notice of Termination, stating that he had failed to submit "properly completed forms" by the deadline. Tracy remained "recalcitrant" in refusing to report other activities that "may be in conflict with [his] employer," namely his "personal blog."

I don't think you want to endure pages and pages of details so I will come right to the court case. By this time, a Freedom of Speech group was assisting Tracy. They submitted the case with plenty of proof that he did not merit a firing. They showed that his firing was retaliation for the Sandy Hook criticism.

The judge properly instructed the jury. The verdict form contained two questions:

(1) whether Tracy's speech was a motivating factor in his termination; and

(2) if so, whether FAU would have fired him absent the controversial speech. As to the first question, the jury was instructed as follows:

“[F]or Professor Tracy to prove that his speech was a motivating factor in FAU’s decision, Professor Tracy does not have to prove that his speech was the only reason for FAU’s actions. It is enough if Professor Tracy proves that his speech influenced FAU’s decision. If Professor Tracy’s speech made a difference in FAU’s decision, you may find that it was a motivating factor in the decision.”

So How Did Tracy Manage To Lose?

To win, Tracy would have had to provide a preponderance of the evidence — meaning it was more likely true than not -- that retaliation was involved. The simple answer to how he lost the case at the District level was that the jury, amazingly, voted NO — Tracy’s blog speech was NOT a motivating factor in FAU’s decision to dump him.

In a December 15, 2017 article at the *Sun Sentinel*, we learn that:

“By the time James Tracy was fired from his job as a professor in January 2016, Florida Atlantic University officials said they had made it clear they were not stifling his free speech about Sandy Hook conspiracy theories.”

Well, feel free to believe that if you wish.

An appeal to the Eleventh Circuit followed. The excellent lawyers for Tracy wrote that there are four questions to be answered:

1. Whether FAU’s policy regarding conflicts of interest created by faculty blogging on matters of public concern is unconstitutionally vague under the First Amendment.
2. Whether the conflict-of-interest blogging policy inherently constitutes a content-based viewpoint discriminatory violation of the First Amendment.

3. Whether the district court erred in resolving the First Amendment claims on exhaustion, standing, and waiver.
4. Whether any reasonable jury could have concluded that controversial blogging was not a motivating factor in FAU's decision to fire Tracy.

(Raise hands all who think the firing was retaliation for blogging about Sandy Hook.)

The final word of the Eleventh Circuit ruling, concerning the District Court's decision to deny James Tracy's claim is: "Affirmed."

A quick bang of the gavel and that's the end of that.

Chapter 5. The Paucity of Evidence (*published 5 Oct 2021*)



(L) *Wolfgang Halbig*, Photo: *Jeff Reidel, New York Magazine* (C) *the late Robert David Steele*, Photo: *fak.dk* (R) *James Fetzer*, Photo: *Rollingstone.com*

I am a conspiracy theorist. I have sufficiently looked into the 1996 massacre in Port Arthur, Australia and the 1996 massacre in Dunblane, Scotland to be able to say confidently that the victims really did die, and that the nominated gunman was not the gunman — someone else did it.

Australian and British police and Parliament provided whatever was needed to prevent people from seeing the respective massacres as inside jobs. They *were* inside jobs.

I've also done my best to show that the 2014 Sydney siege was staged, and that the 2013 Boston Marathon's "Laurel Street shootout" was staged. Regarding the 2012 Sandy Hook massacre of 20 children and 6 adults, I have been opposed to the conspiracy theory, as I assumed the children did die. I have published my beliefs that the conspiracy theorists of Sandy Hook were *planted*, to lead us down the garden path.

I no longer think so. The three men pictured above now seem to me to have worked hard at getting the truth but were defeated at every turn. But I still have not found enough to

“close the case,” either for or against, to my personal satisfaction. In Chapter 4, I described the firing of conspiracy theorist James Tracy, a tenured professor, which itself makes the officials look dicey.

Here in Chapter 5, I will attempt the simple job of describing the quite empty barrel of evidence, especially photographic evidence, of the Sandy Hook massacre. I have collected this material from several sources, but the principal investigator, for almost nine years, has been Wolfgang Halbig. He leaves no FOIA stone unturned. I have to say that each time he is rebuffed, the conspiracy theory gains strength — as it certainly looks like they are hiding something. (Recall from Chapter 2 that “IRP’s” can be issued as points against the refusing party.)

The MSM Narrative

All three networks, plus PBS and CNN, came on strong within days of the massacre (December 14, 2012), and later the *Encyclopedia Britannica* joined them. They all give the official narrative straight; there is no criticizing or questioning of officialdom, no sniffing around for foul play. For those of us who can remember the old TV show “77 Sunset Strip,” those days of crime-solving are gone.

In sum: a 20-year-old mentally ill boy, of diminutive build, wrecked his hard drive at home and then shot dead his Mom. He — Adam Lanza — then drove to the Sandy Hook Elementary School (SHES), which is rather hidden from view of any main road. He crashed his way through a glass door, went into a classroom of first-graders and killed 14 of them, then went to another classroom and shot 6 more.

Lanza also shot 7 adults, but I have not got any data on how he did that. Per the media, he then killed himself. The Newtown Police Department was 2 minutes away, but it took them 20 minutes to get there, and they waited 6 minutes before entering the building.

One odd feature of the story was similar to the Dunblane event, where the parents of the deceased children were not allowed to go see their child for five hours. At Sandy Hook they were not allowed to see them at all. Late at night on Saturday, reportedly, the bodies were removed.

Physical Evidence

The theme of this article is that one doesn't have much to work with in trying to decide if the massacre really took place. So here is my inventory of what you might *expect* to have at hand to work with but, sorry, ain't got:

- *Interviews with eyewitnesses to the actual shooting,

- *Videos of the parents entering the school,

- *Videos of the full student population, almost 500, as they departed school that day,

- *Names of the 20 kids, appearing in the Social Security Death Index (I don't mean you get rebuffed, as Halbig does when he asks impertinent questions; the SSDI is public. The names of the 20 children are, however, not on it, nor on the Federal Master list.),

- *Photos of blood stains on the floor

- *Interview with the janitor who reportedly helped lock classroom doors

- *Interviews with Peter Lanza who lost both his son Adam, the gunman and his ex-wife, Nancy Lanza. (It is rumored that such an interview did appear on YouTube but is now gone),

- *Interviews with Ryan Lanza, Adam's brother, whose ID was found in Adam's pocket.

- *Photos of the deceased children or adults
- *Cell phone records of Adam Lanza
- *Email history of Adam Lanza (maybe *Wikileaks* has it!),
- *Videos of the kids running up the street (such as the 6 who ended up in the nearby yard of Gene Rosen),
- *Hospital records of emergency care,
- *Autopsy reports (these are under seal),
- *Photos of bullets on school floor, or bullet holes in the wall,
- *Photos of the dead body of the gunman,

(TO REPEAT: THIS LIST IS WHAT WE *DON'T* HAVE)

- *DNA tests to prove anyone's identity,
- *Fingerprints on the gun or Lanza's steering wheel,
- *Interview with the school nurse
- *Interview with the school principal or deputy
- *Video from school surveillance camera
- *Audio from anyone's cell phone
- *Evidence of bullets at Nancy Lanza's house (since razed)
- *Photos of the three wounded persons
- *Trial transcripts (no trial)

Now see the list of what we did not get from the FBI!

FBI Report on Sandy Hook, List of redacted pages:

Total Deleted Page(s) = 102
Page 8 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 9 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 10 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 11 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 12 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 13 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 14 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 15 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 16 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 17 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 18 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 20 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 21 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 22 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 23 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 24 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 25 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 26 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 27 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 28 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 29 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 30 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 31 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 32 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 34 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 35 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 36 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 37 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 38 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 39 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 40 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 41 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 6;
Page 45 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4, 5; b7C - 4, 5;
Page 46 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 49 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 1, 4, 5; b7C - 1, 4, 5;
Page 51 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 52 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 55 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 1, 4; b7C - 1, 4;
Page 57 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 58 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 61 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 1, 4; b7C - 1, 4;
Page 63 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 64 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 68 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 1, 4; b7C - 1, 4;
Page 70 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 71 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 73 ~ Duplicate;

Page 77 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 80 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 81 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 82 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 3;
Page 83 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2; b7E - 3;
Page 84 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 85 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 86 ~ b6 - 1, 2; b7C - 1, 2;
Page 87 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 88 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 89 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 91 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 92 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 95 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 1; b7C - 1;
Page 97 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 98 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 101 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 1, 4; b7C - 1, 4;
Page 103 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 104 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 107 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 1; b7C - 1;
Page 127 ~ b6 - 5, 6; b7C - 5, 6; b7D - 1;
Page 128 ~ b6 - 5, 6; b7C - 5, 6; b7D - 1;
Page 129 ~ b6 - 5, 6; b7C - 5, 6; b7D - 1;
Page 130 ~ b6 - 5, 6; b7C - 5, 6; b7D - 1;
Page 131 ~ b6 - 3, 5, 6; b7C - 3, 5, 6; b7D - 1;
Page 186 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 187 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 191 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 192 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 195 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 1; b7C - 1;
Page 197 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 198 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 4; b7C - 4;
Page 201 ~ b3 - 1; b6 - 1; b7C - 1;
Page 205 ~ b6 - 2, 4; b7C - 2, 4;
Page 250 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 251 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 252 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 253 ~ b6 - 1, 2; b7C - 1, 2;
Page 254 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 255 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 256 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 257 ~ b6 - 1, 2; b7C - 1, 2;
Page 258 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 259 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 260 ~ b6 - 1, 2; b7C - 1, 2;
Page 279 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 280 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 281 ~ b6 - 2; b7C - 2;
Page 282 ~ b6 - 2, 5; b7C - 2, 5;
Page 283 ~ b6 - 2, 5; b7C - 2, 5;
Page 284 ~ b6 - 2, 5; b7C - 2, 5;
Page 285 ~ b6 - 2, 5; b7C - 2, 5;
Page 286 ~ b6 - 2, 5; b7C - 2, 5;
Page 287 ~ b6 - 2, 5; b7C - 2, 5;

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
X Deleted Page(s) X
X No Duplication Fee X
X For this Page X
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

(seems to be surrounded by kisses!)

The Iconic Photo

Although we haven't seen the 27 things in the above list, or the FBI redacts, many people think they did see a lot. They did in fact see videos of funeral processions, interviews with bereaved parents, commentators on the need for gun control, psychologists analyzing Adam Lanza (by proxy, as it were), and anything a TV show could think of to mark the event.

Most of all, people seem to remember that they saw the children running out of the school, crying. Here is the “iconic” photo, which was carried on the front page of newspapers around the world. The photographer was Shannon Hicks, for the *Newtown Bee*:



But it has since been learned that this was *not* taken on the day. Note: It is not known what caused the girl in the blue sweater to cry. It is understood that kids in a drill may be told to shut their eyes so as to be spared from seeing dead bodies.

I believe it is now certain that the iconic photo was snapped on some other occasion, as there is a simultaneous shot of these

kids and the policewoman, Rachael Van Ness, taken from a few feet behind this cameraman. It shows parents standing, casually watching this photographing. [See Appendix 2 below.]



Of course, I cannot conclude anything from the “negative list” in this chapter, other than the fact that the paucity of evidence is itself remarkable. When there is a major car crash, news photographers are there fast to get a picture of the mangled cars. Here they may well have not wanted to show deceased children, but they could have grabbed the joyful scene of a parent reunited with a survivor child.

For now, the Sandy Hook case is unsolved. The FBI provided a report in 2013, but it is heavily redacted. It is up to American citizens to check out the story. This need not take the form of insulting the families, or “harassing” state officials.

It would help if some wealthy soul would offer a Reward for any significant whistleblowing. Or if some of the kids who were in the school that day would tell the public what they saw. Kids who were 10 years old then are 18 now.

We would be grateful for their pluck.

Chapter 6. Who Can Be Punished for the Deaths?
(published October 8, 2021)



*Cemetery scene on first anniversary of the Sandy Hook massacre, 2013,
Photo: Real Stories at YouTube.com*

My theory of the decline of America in the period 1980-2020 is that all the government criminals who have harmed the nation enjoy protection from prosecution by the corrupt DoJ, Department of Justice. Therefore, I try to take every opportunity to point out who is eligible for punishment, and under what law or constitutional provision.

(Equally, I like to zoom in on the many wrongful punishments that have been meted out to whistleblowers, including the ultimate punishment of being “bumped off,” but I will save that for Chapter 7.)

Federal Crimes

The US Constitution did not foresee much in the way of punishments for criminals (which is a state matter). The Framers in 1787 did not grant any police power to the federal government except in cases of a few crimes: treason, counterfeiting, piracy, and violations of the law of nations. The Thirteenth Amendment, in 1865, added slavery to the list of crimes.

The fact that there is now a huge prosecutorial function of the “US Attorney” has to do with Congress cooking up “federal crimes” such as related to drugs and terrorism. Naughty behaviors have also been defined by statutes related to IRS, the EPA, or even Fish and Wildlife.

One never sees the DOJ prosecuting the sex slavery of minors, even though at 18 USC 1591 it is punishable for 15 years up to life in prison. Note the Constitution's Article I, sec 8, Clause 3, known as the Commerce Clause: “Congress shall have power to ... regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.” Recall that the Mann Act, against transporting a woman across state borders for prostitution, was federalized because of that provision.

Impeachment. The Constitution, however, is big on punishing office holders by means of removing them. Any president, vice president, federal judge, military officer, and other appointed bureaucrats can be impeached by the House of Representatives and then tried by the Senate. Eight judges have lost their bench this way. No president has been removed from office (though 50 senators found Clinton guilty of obstruction of justice in 1999 and 57 found Trump guilty of inciting insurrection in 2021. Conviction requires 67 votes).



(L) Eric Holder (with President Obama) was US Atty General from 2009 to 2015, Photo: Boston Globe (R) Robert Mueller was FBI Director from 2001 to 2013

A Cabinet member need not be impeached, as his boss can pink-slip him at any time. I believe the Attorney General is not a Cabinet member and is impeachable. Certainly his underling, the FBI Director, is. (A quick way to know who is impeachable is whether their nomination for the job was Senate-confirmed.) A state can do impeachments, too, if its constitution says so.

The Attorney General and FBI Director when the Sandy Hook massacre occurred cannot be impeached as they are no longer in office:

Note: the FBI made a report of the Sandy Hook massacre, but it is “heavily redacted. One must ask Why?”

Blackstonian Law and Statutes of Limitations

At both the state and federal level, members of government — as well as citizens — can be criminally punished for Obstruction of Justice in various forms. I call this Blackstonian Law. Sir William Blackstone’s 1769 book *Commentaries on the Laws of England* was well read by the American colonists, and no doubt will soon again be read by up-in-arms citizens, given the reckless criminality of government during the pandemic.

Examples of Blackstonian crimes are: tampering with evidence, influencing jurors, suborning perjury, and threatening a witness. Abuse of process is also a crime — don’t try to use court procedure to accomplish a goal other than justice. (Oh, *my*.)

Now to the matter of Statute of Limitations. One cannot prosecute a miscreant after a certain time — in Connecticut it is five years; in some places it is seven years. But there is no statute of limitations on murder and treason. As far as lawsuits (civil actions) are concerned, the “stat of lim” is usually 2 years.

Note that a statute is a statute — thus a legislature can change it at any time. I propose that all 50 states and Congress modify

their current statutes of limitations to say that in cases where the government is the accused, the tolling of time begins when information that was hidden by government (e.g., is “classified”) becomes available. Otherwise, we are letting the government impudently hide its criminality.

Sandy Hook — Persons Connected to the Event

We're up to Chapter 6. I have been fence-sitting as to the issue of “Did the 20 Children Really Die?” I think there's much to suggest that they did *not* die, but for purposes of discussing punishment I haven't enough data to accuse So-and-So of staging a false massacre. Perforce, I will take as the baseline the official story that 20 kids and 6 adults were shot dead in the school.

(Pardon me, let's make that 5 adults, as one of the six, Dawn Hochsprung, the 47-year-old school principal, was subsequently sighted in New York, I believe. Not sure, but I'd rather go for the minimum.)



Sandy Hook Elementary School principal, Dawn Hochsprung, Photo: Reuters

Two other people are sometimes included to make a total of 28, namely Adam Lanza, killed by police, and Nancy Lanza killed by her son. I will not include Nancy here; I have some doubt that she died, even if all the children did die.

So what crimes, if any, were committed at Sandy Hook school? Mainly, the homicide of the 25 people. It's unlikely that Adam Lanza was the murderer and therefore the murderer is still at

large. (There are no photos or video of Adam's presence on campus that day, and no forensic stuff either.).

Note: to weed out the real killer, or exonerate the falsely accused, does not mean that the official record will change! James Earl Ray is still written in textbooks as the killer of Martin Luther King in 1968, even though a court case (*King v Jowers*) proved otherwise. Lee Harvey Oswald is still, ridiculously, credited with the 1963 assassination of JFK.

My reason for thinking Adam did not do it, has to do with my background as a student of the Port Arthur massacre and the Dunblane massacre. Interestingly, those two cases took place within six weeks of each other in 1996.

We know that the shooter at Dunblane, Scotland was someone other than the alleged killer Thomas Hamilton (“who then turned the gun on himself” — how implausible!). Lord Burton later spilled the beans on his colleagues in the Freemasons and the Speculative Society as the planners of this murder of 16 children and their teacher. Lord Robertson, a local, seem to have had some involvement — in 1999 he became Secretary General of NATO!

Now back to my other “study” — the Port Arthur massacre in Tasmania, Australia. As discussed in Chapter 1, media was given the public a photo of Adam Lanza that was photoshopped to make his eyes look wild. The same was done to Martin Bryant at Port Arthur.

Who needs it? A regular mugshot would do, *if* the man (Martin or Adam) was really the killer. I mean, if media have to fool you to think Adam Lanza is a crazy man, he probably is not a crazy man. If media have to fool you that he is killer material, media probably knows it is someone else. Eh? In any case **we need to charge someone with the murders at Sandy Hook, and there is no statute of limitations on murder.**

I would also charge media with the crime of fraud, for that misrepresentation of Adam Lanza. As noted, there is a 5-year statute of limitations, so it is too late to prosecute for what media said up until 2016, but what they have continued to say provides Open Season for prosecutors.

What about Civil Actions?

As for bringing civil actions against the Connecticut government, it is also too late. Besides, Connecticut is a sovereign state and can legally prevent suits against it. (A plaintiff files for “leave to sue” and this is often granted.) I have in mind a family suing the government for wrongful death of the loved one, be it a child or adult.

One attorney, Irving Pinsky, attempted to bring a case of negligence against the State Board of Education, for not providing a safe setting for students at Sandy Hook. His client, “Jill Doe,” had heard the gunfire and screaming. He sued for a million dollars, but — according to CNN: “a flurry of online comments – many of which surfaced on Pinsky’s Facebook page – blasted the potential lawsuit and accused Pinsky and his client of trying to profit from last month’s tragedy.” So he withdrew the case.

Speaking of money, one person was criminally charged with using a Donations page to harvest some dough. Apparently she had nothing to do with the tragedy. Or the case may have been staged to create the idea that all other donor sites are OK.

If money is still coming in, or is still being improperly spent, the statute of limitations for that may perhaps still be running. It is also the case that if any charity is breaking IRS’s rules there is room for prosecutorial action, both statewise and federally.

Much money came in, to Sandy Hook, through the United Way. It was given to organizations that could promote gun

control and mental health. I don't know if it also got distributed to the families of deceased children and any injured survivors.

By contrast, a Congressional payout to victims of 911, payable on the signing of a promise not to sue, was handed to each family, averaging \$2 million per deceased victim. The One Fund — donated by corporations — handed above \$1 million to each of the amputees after the Boston Marathon bombing. Both of those funds were administered by Kenneth Feinberg, who also helped distribute some of the Sandy Hook funds.

Conclusion

I think justice has not been done in regard to the 2012 massacre. Even apart from the controversy over the “reality” of the event, normal police procedure was not carried out.

There could not be a court trial for Adam Lanza since he was killed at the Sandy Hook site, but this leaves the public with no proof that he was the gunman. Had Lanza been prosecuted for homicide, the state would need to show that he had the means, the motive, and the weapon. As for a motive, it is not enough to say that a crazy boy decides to kill a lot of children.

There is also no forensic proof of Lanza's presence there that day, although his brother Ryan was seen there by police. It is crucial that we have no evidence of Adam's prior skill with guns. The kill-to-wounded ratio at the Sandy Hook massacre was that of a top-class marksman. This is like the Martin Bryant case in Australia. A military expert has said Bryant could not possibly have shot dead so many people.

I call for a search for the real murderer.

Note: Sorry for the confusion. On the date that I penned the above chapter as an article in Australia, I hadn't fully got the picture about the hoax. You will see in Chapter 9 that by now I've “come around” more or less completely.

Chapter 7. Have Whistleblowers Suffered? (*published October 9, 2021*)



(L) *William Brandon Shanley, litigant* (C) *Dr Wayne Carver, Newtown Medical Examiner, Photo: Michael McAndrews, Harford Courant* (R) *Mary W Maxwell, stickybeak at large*

I am a freedom-of-speech maniac. That is to say, I'm American, ever clothed in the Constitution, of which the First Amendment is a part. I am interested in bringing to book anyone who punished any citizen for investigating the Sandy Hook massacre. Can you imagine!

Or, for that matter, anyone who investigated the Brinks robbery (I think the FBI did it, as I presume all unsolved bank robberies are inside jobs.) Or anyone — such as Alyssa Peterson, US Air Force translator, who attempted to whistleblow the CIA's torture at Abu Ghraib.

James Fetzer Has Suffered

In regard to Sandy Hook, consider the case of Emeritus Professor of Philosophy James Fetzer of Wisconsin, who attempted, by publishing a book (*Nobody Died at Sandy Hook; It Was a FEMA Drill To Support Gun Control*) to air his theory that the whole event was a hoax.

I am interested in punishing, legally, any person who has unfairly attacked Fetzer for exercising his laryngeal muscles to speak, or his finger muscles to write. He is entitled to do so all

he likes, even unto causing hurt feelings among the grieving parents. How else can the public ever find out about hoaxes? You have to hear all sides of a story.

As described in Chapter 2, Fetzer, and a few other writers, were sued by Leonard Pozner for defamation. That is OK, too. Pozner has his legal rights. (He said Fetzer called him a liar by saying that the death certificate he provided, for his son Noah, was fake.)

Once Pozner submitted his accusatory brief, Fetzer was entitled to make a reply and get the privilege — oops, the right — of Discovery. This means Fetzer could have employed the authority of the court to subpoena documents from the State of Connecticut, such as the death certificate or anything else he needed to defend himself against Pozner. Roughly, truth is a defense against a civil action for defamation.

If the death certificate was “doctored” (whether or not the child died), Fetzer would have been spared from a judgement against him. Nevertheless, the district judge made a summary judgement (without Discovery) as to Fetzer’s liability and a jury decided the amount: \$450,000. Not exactly chicken feed. He is currently appealing that decision to the Wisconsin Supreme Court, and it could, theoretically, go to SCOTUS.

William Brandon Shanley, RIP, Suffered

It is alleged by conspiracy theorists that several people died because they were critics of, or potential witnesses of, malfeasance related to Sandy Hook. One was a police dispatcher (reportedly “beaten to death”), one was a 27-year-old mainstream journalist, one was — etc.

As I have not researched any of those allegations of death, I will skip over them. But there is reason to believe that William Brandon Shanley, a major conspiracy theorist, was “taken out.” That is, I name him here as a person who got punished for

investigating Sandy Hook. I claim that the ones who punished him should be brought to book. Note: if he was murdered, there is no statute of limitations.

Shanley, a resident of Connecticut, sued in the US District Court, almost all the heads of media in the English-speaking world. The named defendants are: CBS, Viacom, Disney, CNN, the BBC, and so forth. Shanley also included as defendants some specific persons such as Rupert Murdoch of NewsCorp, Anderson Cooper of CNN, and Richard Graziano, publisher of the Hartford Courant.

His case mentions federal law 18 USC 1028, on “Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents” and 18 USC 2339 on “providing material support to terrorists.” But this is not a prosecution case, it is a demand for damages.

The opening words of William Shanley’s December 22, 2014 pleading in *Shanley v O’Prey* are:

“Defendants entered in a multi-year conspiracy, separately and together, to commit fraud and terrorism, i.e., to brainwash the public into thinking a lone gunman drill known as the Sandy Hook Massacre was real, when in fact, it was a staged FEMA National Level Exercise Event...” and later “The *sine qua non* of journalism is the search for truth.”

Many people ridiculed him, including, I’m sorry to say, Mary W Maxwell. I only read the headlines of the case and figured he was planted to file and lose, thus discouraging others from trying. I also thought he had no standing, the bugaboo of my own efforts to “get” the government in court.

Shanley's case was dismissed with prejudice (which means he cannot file it again). He also asked for a recusal of Judge Jeffrey Myers, to which that judge replied:

“[No] because plaintiff has not established bias or an appearance of impropriety or other grounds for my disqualification under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a). Although my father used to serve as a legislator in Connecticut and supported gun control legislation, there is no basis to attribute my father’s views to me or to support plaintiff’s contention that the dismissal of plaintiff’s cases would somehow have the effect of “shielding [my] father from future prosecution.” Signed, June 15, 2017.

I note that Shanley had attached to his complaint a copy of “the FEMA Sandy Hook Call-Down Drill Exercise Plan (Mass Casualty Drill)”.

Mr Shanley died on November 5, 2017. His followers say he was in good health, and they consider it a murder. I think any person who has obviously done some whistleblowing and then dies should be an automatic candidate for a Special Coroner to look at. I will gladly admit that no matter how suspicious the case looks, the death could have been by natural causes. Or, if he/she were in a car crash, it could have been a genuinely accidental accident. Nevertheless, the matter should be aired.

James Tracy Suffered

Chapter 4 discussed the firing of tenured professor James Tracy at Florida Atlantic University. Other academics should have come to his aid, but they didn’t. In the old days, there would have been an immediate uproar on distant campuses.

The problem here was both the university staff and the court. The dean had sent an email to fellow staff with a picture of a champagne glass, implying celebration of Tracy’s fate. There is no question that he was kicked out because of his blogging about Sandy Hook. The court let him down by *not* allowing him to submit the minutes of a university senate meeting which would have made clear the cause of his firing.

Instead, the prosecutor was able to paint the case as one of Tracy's insubordination. He had failed to fill out a form about outside interests. There was no requirement for professors to hand in the form if they had no outside interests to report. In any case, Professor James Tracy lost his livelihood.

Dr Wayne Carver Possibly Suffered

Wayne Carver, MD, was Connecticut's medical examiner (like a coroner). He gave a press conference at which he made the strange remark "'I hope they [medical staff] and the people of Newtown don't have it crash on their heads later." He died in 2017. Per thecount.com, "Carver's death was natural, officials said, but the exact cause was not immediately clear."

Per obit at Brown University: "Wayne discovered a passion for science and music at an early age. He received both his undergraduate and medical degrees from Brown, where he was the drum major of the marching band and played in three orchestras. It was at Brown that he met the love of his life and wife of 44 years, Deborah DeHertogh, MD'77...."

One wonders if Carver was made to do things he did not want to do, when conducting autopsies on those children.

Wolfgang Halbig Is Suffering

In Chapters 2 and 4, I mentioned Wolfgang Halbig. His day job had been as a School Safety expert. At first, he offered his services in a non-dissident way, as he did not initially think the massacre was fake. Later when he did think so, he settled into fulltime research on the subject.

He found that Sandy Hook school had not been in use at least *in the three months prior to the massacre* (some say it's been empty since 2008). Halbig looked at such things as no Internet service to that address, no compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act protocols for wheelchair ramps. By checking

on safety aspects, he did what he had done in his profession. He should be thanked for this diligence, whether you think the massacre took place or not.

Halbig got harassed by police and by officials when he visited Connecticut. His home in Florida was raided during the night. As far as I am aware, he hadn't treated anyone rudely. Halbig's legal bills have unfairly impoverished him.

Mary Maxwell Has Not Suffered

I have not suffered despite being in perfect opposition to the Boston Marathon conviction of Jahar Tsarnaev, the Port Arthur conviction of Martin Bryant, and the Sydney siege coroner's report.

As for Sandy Hook, I have yet to delve into it. But I see that the FBI's report is classified — what is the point of having a report if we can't see it? Also, Connecticut passed a law to prevent inspection of the kids' death certificates. Hmm.

I had heard on the grapevine that the legislature has criminalized all investigation of Sandy Hook! I figured I could go there, do the naughty, and get jailed -- and thereby force judicial review of that law, or jury nullification of that law.

Turns out it was a false rumor, though. The legislature did not criminalize snooping (Australian Parliament did that!). And by the way, most jurors do not realize it is legal to nullify bad law.

Ridiculously, police chief Vance announced that "misinformation" would be prosecuted. Good-o. That means he can be prosecuted if he misinforms. No, not really -- his pronouncement is baseless since he is not the lawmaker, and anyway the First Amendment prevails.

Now see what happened to a local dissident, William Brandon Shanley for writing angry letters:

Evidence: Letter sent by William Shanley to US House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and US Senate Committee of Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Greetings from New Haven

October 23, 2016

This story is the **biggest story of treason** in Connecticut since the 1815 Hartford Convention when Tories in New England states sought to succeed from the USA. It is a story bigger than Watergate because it involves crimes of fraud, terrorism and obstruction of justice by the government and mainstream news media against the People of the United States.

The terrorism?: producing the Sandy Hook Massacre psy-op, a DHS-FEMA drill, at Sandy Hook Elementary School December 13-14, 2012, a school that was closed in 2008 for biohazards and failure to meet ADA requirements. Despite the official narrative, this was an exercise in which there is no evidence anyone died. It is clear that the psy-op was undertaken by the Obama and Malloy governments to stampede legislators and the public into shackling the Second Amendment -- which they have done.

My name is Will Shanley. I'm a documentary filmmaker, editor of popular books on Quantum science, a media analyst with 40 years' experience ever since I worked for Jimmy Carter as his broadcast technician on the campaign trail **in 1976 and first noticed a difference between campaign reality and pseudo-reality in TV news.**

This prompted me in 1979 to begin production at the White House for a film about media coverage of the 1980 Carter-Reagan-Anderson race that would become my critically-acclaimed documentary feature, The Made-for-TV Election starring Martin Sheen (1986). My most recent popular science book, Alice and the Quantum Cat (2011), introduces the most advanced physics to non-scientists without math.

News icon, the late, great Helen Thomas, ... entrusted me to tell her life story in more than 5 hours of interviews. It is becoming increasingly apparent **these recordings** and my docudrama in production for seven years, America's Divine Comedy, which follows Dante's journey through the soul of America, **have been destroyed** because I filed lawsuits to expose the corruption at Sandy Hook.

For filing lawsuits, I was beaten, drugged, imprisoned three times, evicted from my apartment when my rent was paid, rendering me homeless for seven months, **49 years of creative works apparently destroyed.**

Take a look at the attached two cases against big MSM for co-producing the Sandy Hook Massacre psy-op with the government, a “single shooter, mass casualty” DHS-FEMA drill ...and for censoring proof of official crimes. **The FEMA site activation document is included,** with other Exhibits ...

Damages of more than one trillion dollars are being sought to establish and fund a News Trust to free journalism from this “tyranny over the mind of man.”

Given the controversial nature of my Complaints, I have not been able to get a lawyer here in Connecticut, so I have been doing the best I can proceeding pro se. I also am suing my former landlord in Connecticut Superior Court in New London for evicting me when my rent was paid: See *Shanley v Atkinson*, et al

This story is unprecedented in nature and scope and significance. I know that you recognize that it is critical to the future of our Republic that this story be investigated now. I'll be looking forward to hearing from you.

Cordially, Will Shanley 56 Avon Street, New Haven

Chapter 8. Housekeeping *(published October 11, 2021)*



(L) An animated reenactment by MSM so you'll be sure to know that Lanza wore two guns and carried a rifle (R) something about bullet holes on cars in the parking lot, which is rarely mentioned in the narrative

In this book about the 2012 Sandy Hook massacre, I am trying to think of new ways to approach any issue in which citizen researchers aver that the government and media are lying. Where can one position herself to analyze it all? Are there any toe-holds?

I have called this chapter “housekeeping.” Let me claim upfront that the plan here, is a simple one — to collect and display bits and pieces of research that have been floating around. Apparently, many investigators have concluded that the Sandy Hook massacre was a hoax — it did not happen. You often see this in comments under a YouTube video.

Below, I'll proceed to convey, to those who have hardly read about the Sandy Hook tragedy, the typical content of blogs and video that dispute the official facts. I will not be evaluating any of them. Indeed, I shy away from them, preferring to use my own method, which has more to do with “Who is following the law and who is breaking it?” Please don't think I reject out of hand the diligent work of other writers — I welcome them.

But I have trouble knowing which ones can be confidently relied on.

As an example, I have just read, in a book entitled *Monumental Myths*, by Ty Bollinger, that four days before the massacre (12-14-2012), someone created a Facebook page for Virginia Soto that said “R.I.P. Victoria Soto.” Bollinger writes: “An alert citizen manages to capture the page before it was removed.” He does not give us a photo of it, but even if he did, who am I to be able to judge that it is dinki di, as we say in Australia. I can’t distinguish a “doctored” item from an original. Can you?

Another example: it was said that the car that Adam Lanza drove to the scene of the crime belongs to Chris Rodia, and has the license number 872-YEO. Well, that sounds more “official” than something about an erased Facebook page, but it would be of use only to a registered investigator. If Little Old Me walked into the Motor Vehicle Office and asked in whose name was the number 872-YEO held, the secretary would most likely show me to the door.

One more. Say that a major network broadcasts an interview of a 19-year-old girl giving her recollections of dating Adam Lanza two years prior to the event, and claims he was a nutjob. Are we to take that in as evidence about Adam and his mental problems, or are we to see it is media propaganda, in which an actress, posing as Adam’s date, has never in fact met him?

Enough said. But many researchers have worked hard on some specialized piece of the puzzle. Here’s a quick round-up:

Categorizing Thirteen Concerns about Sandy Hook

1. The Real Estate Issue

Several of the parents of the 20 deceased children were given a free house in 2009. That is according to public records in the land title office, where the sale price is shown as \$.00.

Furthermore, the date of “purchase” for most of these homes was December 25. Who transacts that kind of business on Christmas Day?

2. The SSDI Missing Names

The Social Security Death Index does not list the children’s deaths. For Adam Lanza, it shows his death as December 13, one day too early, but it was later changed to December 14. Moreover, there is a Federal Master List and the kids’ births and deaths do not appear on it.

3. The Visit to Gene Rosen’s House

Gene Rosen, an older man whose house is close to the school, said that 6 children showed up in his front yard at 10:30am. He fed them juice and gave them teddy bears to play with. The police footage however shows Gene at the Fire Station at 10.30am. Also, he changed his story, having earlier said that a female bus driver brought the 6 kids to his home.

4. The Replacement of the School

The government provided \$50 million to rebuild the school, at least three times the standard amount. Also, when the old building was being razed, the demolition men were required to sign a gag order as to what they saw. The debris was not simply carted away; it was first pulverized.

5. The Types of Guns Used

During the crisis, media and police reported that the deaths were caused by two handguns, a Sig Sauer and a Glock. A helicopter shot shows someone putting a rifle in the boot of the car. By the end of the day, it was being claimed that the gunfire all came from a Bushmaster rifle. The noise of that weapon would have been extremely loud and at close range the victims would have been blown up.

REMINDER: Dear Reader, this parade of issues reflects what's out there in the literature. I do not endorse the accuracy any of it. Nor do I criticize it. I am but a scribe today.

6. The Choir at the Superbowl

Sandy Hook Elementary School had a choir. The choristers were invited to sing at the February 2013 Superbowl game. This was only two months after a tragic event. Several of the singers look like the kids who died. (The explanation proffered is that they were 11 years old in 2013, nobody died, and their old first-grade pictures were used as fakes, or something.)

7. The Real Adam Lanza

It is hard to know who the real Adam Lanza was. He has zero footprint on social media! A brother named Ryan does not have Internet presence either. Adam lived with his mother Nancy Lanza, although one neighbor said Adam was never seen, and Nicole Hochley referred to Nancy's house as a "dark spot" on her street. The only statement of Adam's hobby as a gunman came from his father, Peter Lanza. Guns galore, and swords, were found in the house.

8. Drills Here and at Other Schools

An exercise for a mass attack was happening nearby in Newton on the same day, December 14th, at St Rose of Lima School. Also a Newtown drill had been conducted in November. FEMA printed a manual to cover a dry-run drill on December 13, at Sandy Hook Elementary School, and it was to be completed "live" on the 14th (not live as in real killings, just a live drill.)

9. Porta Potties and the Sign

As might occur in a drill, there were 4 porta potties outside the Sandy Hook School. There was also a large electronic sign

“Everyone must check in.” The Connecticut Homeland Security office, in response to a Freedom of Information request, said that it had placed the sign there.

10. The School Having Been Abandoned

There is evidence that the campus had not been in use either for months or years. It was grimy and moldy and contained massive amounts of boxes as though it had become a storage unit. It did not meet the requirements of cleanliness or safety for a school. No milk had been delivered to the school for months.

Reminder again. Please do not go away saying Mary Maxwell claims the school had been abandoned. (Wolfgang Halbig claims it, bigtime.)

11. Gun Control as a Motive for a Staged Massacre

President Obama used the event to emphasize the need for gun control. Harry Reid proposed legislation in the Senate. The mothers of the victims became activist quite early, both for school safety in general and for gun control. This is seen in their group “Sandy Hook Promise.”

12. The Parking Lot

Various photos and videos were broadcast by the Mainstream media. They do not all accord as to the parking lot — where the white line was, which way the parked cars were facing, whether there was frost on the ground, or leaves on the trees. In sum, the photos can’t all have been taken on the same day.

13. The Glass Door

Reportedly, school policy calls for external doors to be locked. Entrance is achieved by ringing a bell and identifying oneself. Adam Lanza is said to have shot his way in, by using

the gun to breach the front door. But the glass in the door was reinforced with wire and would have resisted shattering. Also, the police, who arrived once Adam was already in the building, claim to have also needed to break down the door.

The Book Edited by James Fetzer and Michael Palecek

Sorry for repeating (ad nauseum?) that the above is a housekeeping exercise. I do not want to claim that it proves anything. The several interviews with bereaved parents, that were shown on mainstream television, argue for the genuineness of the tragedy.

If you wish to look deeper into the particulars of what I sketched above, there is one-stop shopping in a book edited by James Fetzer and Michael Palecek. The title is: “Nobody Died at Sandy Hook: It Was a FEMA Drill in Support of Gun Control.” Various authors contributed specialized chapters, to preach their particular views about Sandy Hook. Cumulatively, it adds up to a strong case that the state of Connecticut distributed misinformation. Here are some of the authors and their topics:

Vivian Lee, PhD argues that Adam Lanza could not have done the shooting.

Dennis Cimino compares the event to the one in a theatre in Aurora Colorado.

James Tracy, PhD, pulls apart some things that were said at a press conference by Medical Examiner Wayne Carver, MD.

Dr Eowyn (a pseudonym) offers “6 signs the school was closed” (number 10 above).

Allan Powell, with Kelly Watt, offers many photos of the (scrumptious) home of Nancy Lanza, arguing that its room furnishings were created to match the story.

Professor Fetzner and Dr Eowyn delve into the FBI's statistics of "no murders took place in Newton Connecticut in 2012."

Sterling Harwood holds forth on "I never promised you a Rosen garden" (number 3 above).

Nick Kollerstrom looks into the real estate question (1 above).

There is an unexpected interview with a man, Paul Preston, whose legitimate job consisted of organizing mass casualty drills. The interviewer is Sofia Smallstorm (number 8 above).

The book ends with James Tracy's lengthy Timeline of Sandy Hook, which can be seen at his www.memoryholeblog.org. (He wrote a similar one about the Boston Marathon bombing.)

The Appendix of *Nobody Died at Sandy Hook* contains an October surprise — a copy of the FEMA manual for a drill to be held on December 13 and 14, 2012 at Sandy Hook school. Quite the definitive proof, if it be dinki di. I will write to FEMA and ask them, but let's not be holding our breath, OK?

Update — Steele's Book

Gosh. I have just discovered a 128-page book by Robert David Steele, who recently died. We already knew Steele at Gumshoe, thanks to his taking testimony from Rachel Vaughan and Fiona Barnett at the International Tribunal for Natural Justice. I also encountered him recently as the source for much material in Joachim Hagopian's *Satan and Pedophilia* — a stunning book.

Steele's book (only a PDF) is called *Sandy Hook Truth: Memo to POTUS*. It includes some of the above and additional pieces that argue strongly for there not having been any operative school at the site in December 2012. This means a huge number of locals are being forced to stay silent about something you would hardly believe folks could be kept silent about.

Chapter 9. Sandy Hook in the Light of Dunblane (*published October 11, 2021*)



Parents running to Dunblane School in 1996 when they heard a gunman had shot their children, Photo: Andrew Milligan at Scotsman.com

I don't suppose the world is waiting for me to come to a verdict about Sandy Hook. However, *I* am waiting for me to come to a verdict about Sandy Hook — I don't enjoy staying on the fence about anything. As of today, I am practically falling off the fence into the yard of the “Sandy Hook denialists.”

Why? Mainly because I have now learned that there have been many attempts by the Connecticut government to suppress relevant information. This is Dunblane-esque. As you may know, the “court” even agreed to have the Dunblane Report sealed for a hundred years.

Hang on! What's this about sealing the records of an ordinary murder? By “ordinary,” I mean that the official story is that a bad man entered the Dunblane school premises and shot dead 16 children and their teacher Gwen Mayor.

The kids were in the gym waiting for PE class to begin. It's just ordinary murder (albeit extensive) insofar as it reportedly had no other complications, for example no “terrorist” stuff, no

sexual-abuse stuff. Who could gain from the suppression of facts? Who could lose by the publication of facts?

The suppression is itself a clue. In regard to Sandy Hook, there is an apparent excuse for suppression — writers of the Denialist school have accused people of making up the story, and if you are a mom or dad whose child has died it is pretty painful to countenance that talk. Still, I am an “investigator” of sorts and I would *never* insult a bereaved Mom or Dad.

By the way, I try to stick to paper sources, from courts and government files. I’m not much of a hands-on investigator. I don’t go out and measure the gun casings, or compare the color of blood. Physician Cesar Baruja has compared photos of blood in the Boston case — both the color of the blood on the ground at Boylston St and in Sean Collier’s cruiser car — and cried foul. Would anyone suggest he is being insulting by doing so? Should he stop? Oh, please.

Sandy Hook Holdback

Here are three examples of the unwillingness of officials to let us see relevant, or potentially relevant, information in regard to the 2012 massacre at Sandy Hook:

1. Requests by Wolfgang Halbig, made under Connecticut’s Freedom of Information Act, often go unanswered. He finally got to have a hearing about their foot-dragging. (Under the *federal* FOIA scheme, you are entitled to sue, free of charge, to obtain answers or a good reason for no answers, by a judge.) Yet the state’s lawyer at Halbig’s FOIA hearing kept stalling or obfuscating. Halbig’s queries had nothing to do with insulting a bereaved person — he was looking at such mundane things as “Did the school have to close for asbestos problems?”

2. Genealogy sites such as Ancestry.com had for years taken data freely from the SSDI, Social Security Death Index and the Federal Master Death Register. But as of March 2014 (15 months after Sandy Hook massacre), the SSDI no longer allows general public access! I can't say for sure that this decision has anything to do with Sandy Hook, but journalists had complained that the names of the Sandy Hook deceased were absent from that register. So, why *are* the names absent? It's reasonable to deduce that if "Mary Smith" is not on the death list for "June 15, 1999" then Mary Smith did not die on June 15, 1999. Right?
3. The FBI did a comprehensive report, on the 2012 massacre. But it is heavily redacted. Again, let's ask WHY? If Adam Lanza (like Thomas Hamilton in Dunblane) entered the school on his own steam, well armed, and carried out a senseless mass murder, what on earth could there be in the FBI's file that we are not allowed to see? Come on, make a suggestion as to what type of information should be suppressed by the FBI. I am so skeptical of the FBI's honesty that I actually *presume* the redacted stuff has to do with covering up corruption. Cover-up is felonious. See what a bind we are in?

Furthermore, on the holdback front, Amazon has banned James Fetzer's book *Nobody Died at Sandy Hook* — though Amazon is not, *stricto sensu*, an official. And a judge this week (on October 6, 2021) ruled against Alex Jones in a defamation suit brought by Neil Heslin, father of a child who died at Sandy Hook. I have not read the offending article by Jones, but it has traditionally been considered legally very acceptable for a newspaper to engage in the most bitter questioning of facts presented by police, the president, or anyone.

The precedent for this is *Sullivan v New York Times* (1964). Heslin has his rights of course, to not be defamed. But can the judge in the case even know if the defamatory remarks were true, in a situation where the very seeking of facts is forbidden? Truth — as to the facts — is a standard defense in a defamation suit. You sue me because I claimed that you, a famous fashion model, have had three facelifts. I defamed you, you had hurt feelings, your status fell, and you lost money. In court I get the right to Discovery (even unto subpoenaing your medical records or divorce records) and prove that you did have the face lifts. Case closed.

If the Sandy Hook event was only a drill, not a real murder scene, then Mr Heslin is “by definition” lying about his son’s death. Yet the judge is no more able than I am, at the moment, to know if Sandy Hook *was* real. Why? Because investigators are being prevented from investigating. I plainly do not know if, say, the school had really been closed since 2008.

It sounds crazy — hundreds of families would have been able to raise a stink if they read in the paper that the scene of a massacre was a school that they knew to be closed. Over the last few years when I have occasionally read about the claim that the school was inoperative, I dismissed it as foolish. OK, then, if it is foolish, let’s see the records that prove the school was open and running. Is it asking too much?

The Real Dunblane Event

The Dunblane School in Scotland is not far from where my late husband went to school, in Stirlingshire. Maybe that’s why I bothered to read about it, I don’t remember. But somewhere along the line I found out that Sandra Uttley, an ordinary citizen of Dunblane, had written a book in 2006, *Dunblane Unburied*, in which she raised questions about the alleged killer, Thomas Hamilton. I got in touch with her and we discussed it. She was under fire from police and locals for her effort. I guess that is standard.

Later, I had reason to look at the case again because of my commitment to unraveling some of the child-sex-trafficking that goes on in Australia (my other home). I learned that Thomas Hamilton had been a sort of cruel director of a boy's camp at Loch Lomond. Uttley pointed out that Hamilton's renewal of a gun license should not have been granted, based on the complaints about his bullying behavior at the camp. One camper's Mom, Doreen Hagger, became Sandra Uttley's co-conspiracy theorist, as it were.

They wanted to report to the Lord Cullen Inquiry into the 1996 massacre. They were not trying to make a case about pedophilia, just about Hamilton being unfit to run a camp or own a gun. I saw, however, that there were signs of Hamilton running a pedophile racket — maybe. It was reported that the walls of his home were covered with photos of under-dressed boys, and, most tellingly, that the chief of police paid regular visits to Hamilton's home, on a social basis.

Uttley's book also mentioned, quietly, that traffic cameras showed that Hamilton's car, on the morning of the massacre (March 13, 1996), drove off the highway on a ramp that did not lead in the direction of Dunblane school. This gave me the idea that he was not the murderer. Reportedly his body was found in the school gym, along with the kids' bodies, and a gun was on the floor next to him. OK, but we did not stop to do a DNA test, did we, to see if it really was Hamilton? And would a man bent on killing kids also want to take his own life? Why?

It is my guess — wild speculation if you prefer — that Hamilton went elsewhere, maybe at the behest of police, was killed and was brought to the school gym, and dumped there, the perfect patsy. An off-duty cop who was first on the scene was not allowed to testify to the Cullen Inquiry.

Rule One of Conspiracy Theory, always raise a red flag if an eyewitness is *prevented* from coming to court! The main witness at Port Arthur, Wendy Scurr, was told to stay home.

Satan and Silence

But even I did not see anything “satanic” about the Dunblane massacre. I do *now* think a bunch of satan worshippers was involved in it. Ah, should I shut up because it will be horrific for the parents to hear such a thing? Let’s talk about that. Protecting a parent from pain is important. Not that you can ever protect them from the primordial pain of having lost their little one. But one wants to show them extra respect.

Fine, but there are other values here. There is surely the value of revealing what actually happened. Say, for the moment, that 5 satanic psychopaths arranged to have the kids killed, and that their identity is known to someone. Isn’t it imperative that we catch them and put them out of business, so that more victims do not come their way? Mustn’t the protection of the feelings of the parents (and siblings) give way to the higher value of crime prevention?

Now for the second part of this story:



Pipers’ Parade at Queen Victoria School in 2011, Photo from a YouTube video by SonofMeldrew

A few years ago, there was new interest in what really happened at Dunblane. It seems that there is another school in the vicinity, a private one called Queen Victoria School, QVS. One

of the housemasters, Glenn Harris, had worked there from 1989-1991, when Thomas Hamilton was still alive. Harris noticed that Hamilton had visited the school. As housemaster he also noticed well-to-do people arriving on Friday night to take boys home for a weekend visit.

Suspecting some sexual activity, he complained to the school administrators and then wrote to parents whose kids were in his dorm. Eventually when Harris was not at home, police broke down his door at QVS with a sledgehammer (couldn't they have obtained a key?) and seized his papers.

Tom Minogue. Scottish journalist Tim Minogue found out about the abuse of boys at QVS and made a police complaint. He also approached, unsuccessfully, parliament, the judiciary and the monarch. Minogue went about his inquiries politely and "by the book." But he found that the police had started an investigation on him.

When Minogue asked why this was happening, he was told that it was because Lord Robertson, one of the persons he wrote to, was a public figure and therefore deserving of police protection. (Too right, mate!) Robertson, a Labor MP, later became Secretary General of NATO (and following that, worked for a defense contractor).

Minogue searched the Dunblane Inquiry on the Internet and found that three persons had said under oath that they knew of a Hamilton connection to the QVS school: Grace Jones Ogilvie, a neighbour of Hamilton, said she knew of him taking his boys' clubs camping at Loch Lomond and at the QVS. Ian Steven Boal said that his friend Hamilton had got him a job at a QVS summer camp. Robert Mark Ure, who lived across the street from Hamilton, said his estranged wife had been at the firing range at QVS with her friend Hamilton.

Tim Minogue was contacted by Lord Burton, who had told *The Scotsman* that the Freemasons were involved. Minogue says:

“I found him to be a pleasant, and I believe a decent man, but he was over keen to protect his organisation (The Freemasons) and blamed the Speculative Society clique in the judiciary and the police for a cover up ‘at the highest level’ of the Dunblane tragedy. He told me that a Scots Tory Law Lord and member of the Speculative Society had pounded his fist on his desk in the House of Lords to emphasise that he [Burton] should let the matter drop.”


Why did Lord Cullen and his mates cover up the massacre? In order to keep the pedophilia hush-hush? Well yes, but it’s much worse than that. I speculate that the massacre was group planned. Some people somehow thought it good to send sixteen darling children to their graves. If you don’t think it possible, please see Joachim Hagopian’s book *Satan and Pedophilia*, Volume 2 about the British side of things. It may change your view of the world!

Note: Cullen “made his name” by running the Lockerbie case. As for Robertson, I see that he sued *The Sunday Herald* for indicating that he was responsible for the Dunblane massacre. The paper paid an out-of-court settlement of 25,000 pounds. The fact that it was out of court makes me think the paper was in on it, and the point was *to chill free speech*. Why didn’t the *Sunday Herald* just ask for Discovery?

The title of this chapter is “Sandy Hook in the Light of Dunblane.” Deep down, I’m really talking about Sandy Hook, not Dunblane. To be clear, I make ZERO claim that there was any pedophilia involved at Sandy Hook. The similarity of the two massacres has to do with the government’s hiding of facts.

The law maxim *Omnia praesumuntur, contra spoliatorem*, means it can be presumed that whoever is hiding or destroying the evidence is the guilty party. Per that maxim, I hereby presume the Connecticut government guilty of the Sandy Hook massacre. If they shut the door on investigators like Wolfgang Halbig, it’s praesumuntur time.

Chapter 10. Sandy Hook and the Boston Marathon Bombing *(published October 12, 2021)*



Tamerlan Tsarnaev being arrested after he supposedly was run over by an SUV driven by his brother Jahar, Photo: Gabe Ramirez, CNN.com

I wish to bring this analysis of Sandy Hook to a satisfactory close, soon. I can't stand an unsolved mystery. In fact, why don't I come to it right now — I believe Sandy Hook did not involve actual deaths of actual children. There, that's it!

As you know, I believed for the last 9 years that it was a true story. That's mainly because I didn't look into it. If you look into it, it's hard to accept as real. Meanwhile, whilst I was ignoring Newtown Connecticut (the site of Sandy Hook school), I was studying Boston. That taught me a thing or two.

So now in Chapter 10, I will explicitly try to persuade my audience that 2012 Sandy Hook is fake, just as the 2013 Laurel St shootout connected to the Boston bombing was fake. As to whether a bomb really went off on Boylston St, I imagine it did, but that is not part of my investigation. I came in through the door of the court in the 2015 Tsarnaev trial and have worked on Jahar's innocence.

Oops, now that I think of it, I came in at least by July 2014, when I attended the Jury Instructions in the case of two friends of Jahar Tsarnaev at Boston federal courthouse. At that point

I did not even realize how surreal it was for these college kids to be sentenced to prison for — wait for it — “lying to the FBI.”

(Seriously, can you even lie to the FBI?)

Sandy Hook Similarities

Before expounding about Boston, let me lay out some of its relevant connections to Newtown.

1. The “Sandy Hook massacre” (December 14, 2012) took place four months before the Marathon (April 15, 2013) and may have been a try-out to see how much a hoaxer can get away with. The networks and CNN went ahead with assertions about Adam Lanza as though no one could doubt it. All details were provided — how he shot through the front door, what kind of weapons and ammo he carried, how the parents were made to wait a long time for details, and so forth.

Remember, as of this article today, I am taking the position that there were no actual parents of deceased children. The whole thing is fictional, it exists in words but not in the flesh. However, the perps would have measured the public’s resistance as being rather weak, so they could proceed to do the Boston thing uninhibited. Even now, eight years after the Marathon, resistance is so weak that the perps have been able to commit the Covid Vaccine scam with impunity.

2. Both Sandy Hook and Boston were false flags. This means that an evil deed is carried out and the blame is placed on someone whom we want to set up for punishment. In 1990, another false flag involved the report that Saddam Hussein’s troops had thrown babies out of their incubators “onto the cold floor of the hospital” and thus the US was justified in attacking Iraq over its supposed invasion of Kuwait. The conveyor of

that story was play-acting. She spoke to Congress, claiming to be an Iraqi nurse, but she was really the daughter of the Kuwaiti ambassador to the US.

Adam Lanza stood for gun-owners, who were to be demonized. Jahar Tsarnaev stood for Muslim terrorists who have been getting demonized since the 1970s. Once the public “understands” that gun owners and Muslims “throw babies out of their incubators”, anyone who pleads for merciful treatment of them will find herself castigated. She is a disloyal American, a radical, or a tinfoil hatter.

3. Both at Boston and at Sandy Hook, there had to have been large numbers of people who were “in on it.” This in itself makes it difficult for any ordinary citizen to accept that there is fakery in the air. You naturally reckon “It must have happened, as there are so many who watched it and would yell if the media was lying.”

At both sites, there had to have been police, doctors, and media all of whom had prior knowledge of what would occur, in order to perform their specific task, or at least play dumb. Non-participants had to be kept out of the action area, as they may have upset the whole activity. Not to worry, though, if someone really threatens to blow the story, he can be killed by heart attack, car accident, etc.

The Smoking Guns at Boston

Let me just name two smoking guns of the Marathon story. These are widely known and should cause any good Bostonian to put his foot down and say “This story is false. I refuse to go along with it.”

The first is the **plainly visible arrest of Tamerlan Tsarnaev**, age 26, in Watertown, Massachusetts in the wee hours of Friday, April 19, 2013. There are two perfect videos. In one, taken on Mt Auburn St at roughly 1:05 am, Tamerlan is not

easily viewed but his voice is clear. As the cop is asking for his ID, Tamerlan realizes he is a patsy. He yells “Podstava”. – Russian for “It’s a set-up.” (That video was shot by a local, named “Big Headphones.”) A better visual can be had from CNN (as shown above) which shows him being escorted to a police car, naked and unwounded.

The reason Tamerlan’s arrest is a smoking gun is that it ruins the whole thrust of the “Muslim terrorist bomber” story. That story depended on the brothers having been in a shootout with police at approximately 12:35 am on Laurel St. I believe a sub-patsy was used. This is, I think an innocent young man was substituted for Tamerlan on Laurel St and died there. (Sgt John McLellan stated, at my 2018 Watertown Library lecture, that he saw a guy bleed to death on Laurel St.)

The second smoking gun of the Marathon is the so-called **confession written by Jahar Tsarnaev on the wall of a dry-docked boat**. It is absurd. For one thing, he had no instrument with which to write it, and for another thing, it speaks of Tamerlan as having gone to heaven when, according to the official story, Jahar could not have known Tamerlan was dead. It is also written in a formal religious style that Jahar never used. Had an honest defense lawyer knocked down that piece of false evidence at Jahar’s trial, the audience would have seen that the boy was being framed. Instead, he was sent to Death Row.

There are other smoking guns at Boston, such as the claim by the hugely injured Jeff Bauman (in his book, *Stronger*) that he had told the ambulance driver that he had locked eyes with Tamerlan and suspected him of the bombing. (What hooley!) And there’s the deceptive film *White Hat*, produced by National Geographic, that used Alex Karavay to play the part of Jahar placing a bomb. It has a voice-over with FBI saying the film came from a surveillance camera at one of the Boylston St shops.

The Smoking Guns at Newtown

Needless to say, it is up to any person to pick his own faves among the available smoking guns in relation to the Sandy Hook affair. Mine are rather abstract. Thus, I don't rely on "moldy walls in the school building which proves it was not an operative school." Nor do I care for the pitch that "children who closely resemble the deceased children were seen in a choir at the 2013 Superbowl."

And I find it worthless evidence that the FBI national report of murders in 2012 did not list any occurring in the relevant area of Connecticut. Also, I hope to be forgiven for not denying the massacre on the grounds that Lanza was too small-built to carry all the guns and ammo he is supposed to have been found with. Perhaps it all matters but most of those bits don't grab me.

By the way, I not only am *not worried* about the giggling by a parent (Robbie Parker) after the tragedy, or the histrionics by Gene Rosen. I think those were thrown in to cause doubt and thus be a barometer of how serious was the vaccine hesitancy of the day — so to speak. Same for the loose tourniquet on Jeff Bauman's leg at the Marathon. Many people talked about it, but none did anything about it, so it must have been deemed safe for the "authorities" (that is, the *Boston Globe*) to continue to prattle on.

My best smoking gun at Sandy Hook is **the iconic photo**. The journalist from the *Newtown Bee*, Shannon Hicks, does claim to have taken it on the day — December 14, 2012. But it was not taken on that day, and it's not a scene of children escaping. It is a posed shot. Furthermore, there are other shots taken by her minutes later in which the director (the alleged policewoman in the photo) is re-arranging the order of kids to **get a better "conga line."**

Had there been an error by which the wrong item from Ms Hick's collection of photos got sent out to the whole world, there could have been a humble retraction by the big media. But no, to this day they speak of it as the escape photo

To please those who want me to cite a more nitty-gritty forensic issue, I hereby offer the **lack of any blood stains in the school** as proof that no shooting occurred.

A comprehensive fave of mine is the **attacks on James Tracy** who lost his job for calling the massacre a hoax and the **physical attack on Wolf Halbig** in his Florida home. Both episodes were completely uncalled for. Tracy's university could have just published a statement that it does not agree with his "nincompoop" ideas about a Sandy Hook hoax. And Halbig could have received a letter in the mail telling him there is a prosecution pending against him for harassing a parent (or whatever it was they were charging him with).

Using aggression, instead, tells me that the real perps wanted to sew up the problem of critics by scaring everyone off. They don't scare me because, at 74, I'm Nearer My God to Thee anyway, and because I am so vainglorious as to believe I can get the law to prevail. S'truth!

Finally, there is the **out-and-out censorship** issue. James Fetzer has lost his ability to make an income by selling books, per the edict of Amazon, and the Connecticut legislature has discussed the possibility of criminalizing any criticism of Sandy Hook. I am very suspicious of the fact that the SSDI closed down all public access to data about deaths. Now we won't be able to find out if George Washington and Abe Lincoln really died. Oh, well.

I have said that a cause of these false flags may have been to set up enemies — be they gun owners or Muslims. But another purpose is to reduce us to uncritical idiots. And I think a further purpose, now that we have YouTube and other fora for

conspiracy-theorizing, is to make us throw up our hands in frustration. We can state the truth — Jahar’s boat-wall confession is a crock — and yet face serious magazines such as *The New Yorker* telling us that the boat-wall confession reveals Jahar’s inner love for Allah and jihadism type thing.

Eventually you say “There's no standard to measure truth; it’s all relative.” In fact, you may eventually resign yourself to the notion that it is morally OK to promote fake stories if it be for a good cause. Setting up a straw man named Adam Lanza helps us face the fact that guns are dangerous (blood or no). Creating Middle-East-complected men as the enemy helps us steal oil from their part of the world, and we all need our oil don’t we?

The Tragedy and Treachery of the Judiciary

Here in Chapter 10, I have cast my vote for the hoax theory of Sandy Hook. Personally, what gets me down the most is the sellout by the judiciary. In Boston I have been squawking for years about the wrongful trial of Jahar. Sure, the prosecutor and the Public Defender did everything wrong. And witnesses lied like there was no tomorrow. But whatever they did could have been thwarted by an honest judge

I think they are all in it. This is tragic beyond belief. If we have lost our courts, we have also lost the ability to rely on the law. Powerful people can exploit us to their heart’s content — nuttin’ to stop ’em. No matter how egregious an injustice you have suffered, there will be no place to go to get retribution. It will be a free for all, a veritable Hobbesian state of nature.

I call upon the folks of Massachusetts and Connecticut to stop what they are doing via their passive acceptance of false stories, which then invite outrageous court judgements. Come on, is it so hard to say “I have seen Tamerlan naked and looking mighty buff and I don’t believe for a minute that he had just been run over by an SUV”? You can do it. I know you can do it. Just do it. Say: Jahar is innocent, and Nobody died at Sandy Hook.

Chapter 11. Robert Steele's Revelation Can Save Tsarnaev
(published October 13, 2021)



*International Tribunal for Natural Justice, Robert Steele (1952-2021)
at far right*

Something wonderful has happened that has given me great hope and I hope you will share that hope. This week I read the following statement by the late Robert David Steele, known to us as a counsel at the International Tribunal for Natural Justice. He was formerly a CIA agent. He said:

“I managed a false flag event for the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in my capacity as a Clandestine Operations Officer stationed overseas. I have personal experience with ‘legalized lying’ whereby ostensible orders ‘from the highest authorities’ mandate lying to the Court and lying to the media and the public, in support of national security objectives. **Individuals ordered to lie are offered both full immunity and severe penalties if they fail to lie as ordered.**”
[Emphasis added]

Legalized Lying

Trust me, there is no such thing as legalized lying. The word “legalized” refers to a law passed by a legislature, doesn’t it? That means by Congress or by a state legislature. Since Steele

refers to “national security objectives” (whatever the hell those are), it would have to be Congress that passed such a law. There is no other way for something to be federally legalized. It can’t be done by the president, and it can’t be done by the courts.

Article I of the Constitution is all about the powers of Congress. In its section 8, Clause 18, we see that if the courts or the president need something legalized, they have to ask Congress to do that for them. No amount of Executive Order writing, or rulings handed down by the US Supreme Court, will suffice to make something a law.

The wording of Clause 18 of Article I, section 8 is as follows:

“[Congress shall have the power to] ... make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

Trust me, Clause 18 is not in dispute. Executive Orders by the president have no force of law if they deviate from laws enacted by Congress. As for the judiciary, it has the inherent power to set court policy, but of course it does not have a power to legalize lying by, say, allowing a “special” witness to lie under oath.

Bottom line: only Congress, not the White House or the CIA or the judiciary, makes law. So if there is a law that legalizes lying we must be able to find it in the Congressional Record. THERE ARE NO SECRET LAWS in the United States.

Article I, section 5 says “Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy.”

Oh, so a law can be secret? Are you kidding? Of course not. All laws have to be publicly known.

The Smith-Mundt Thing

In 1948, after World War II ended, Congressmen Smith and Mundt thought it would be wise to clarify that although the US had broadcast untruths to the enemy abroad, that material should not come flying back into the domestic public's radios. Hence, they drafted an Act which forbids the propagandizing of Americans.

In 2012, when the bi-annual budgeting of money for the Pentagon was being approved by the legislature (the National Defense Authorization Act), someone added a few words that removed the strong proscriptions of the Smith-Mundt Act. But does that mean lying is legalized? Oh please.

The Boston Marathon Bombing Case

Steele claimed that he had managed a false flag event, and that “ostensible orders ‘from the highest authorities’ mandate lying to the Court and lying to the media and the public, in support of national security objectives.” That’s rubbish, unless you interpret his word “ostensible” to mean that such orders do not actually exist. Steele goes on to say that “Individuals ordered to lie are offered both full immunity and severe penalties if they fail to lie as ordered.”

Aha! Eureka! That must be what happened in the Boston case. “Ostensibility” ran rampant. People (such as witnesses against Jahar) must have been told that they should do such-and-such, even though ordinary folks would recognize such-and-such as illegal (not to mention immoral and outrageous). To me this explains their blatant breaches of law and of common sense.

The new knowledge, from Mr Steele, about false-flag management is very important. As I have recorded in my 2021 book, *Boston's Marathon Bombing*, and as Maret Tsarnaeva, aunt of the convicted patsy Jahar (Dzhokhar) Tsarnaev, wrote in an affidavit for the US District Court in April 2015, her relatives

were explicitly told to lie. They may have been given rewards for doing so. It is plausible that they — and even the convicted Jahar himself — were “threatened with severe penalties” if they did not cooperate.

The Boston Marathon bombing was definitely a false flag. The planting and detonating of the two bombs were done by someone other than the Tsarnaev brothers (likely by the FBI). I am now of the mind that the prosecutor, US Attorney Carmen Ortiz, was one of the many people offered rewards for lying in court. She was probably told that it was an offer she couldn't refuse.

It's likely that the cops and the FBI, and even the doctors at the Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital, participated on the same basis. Judge George A O'Toole, Jr must have been aware of the details of this false flag, in order to handle the trial of Jahar with an eye to conviction. The mind boggles, does it not? Of course, both he and Ms Ortiz are deeply trained in the Constitution and would know that “legalized lying” is a mirage.

The 2012 Massacre at “Sandy Hook Elementary School”

Although Yours Truly is happy to be labeled a conspiracy theorist, the Sandy Hook conspiracy theory (that the kids did not die, as advertised) went right past me. I felt sure it was a genuine shooting, as opposed to some which are fictional. I figured James Fetzer got what he deserved (a judgment of \$450,000 for defaming the father of a Sandy Hook victim, Noah Pozner).

In recent weeks, while studying the case, I began to think it was a false flag, and as of today I can say I am certain of it. A main thing that changed my mind was the evidence, laid out in a 128-page book by Robert Steele, arguing that there was no Sandy Hook School in operation at the time. Fancy that. I was also influenced by the aggressive punishing of persons who criticize

the official narrative. Good old freedom of speech was dishonored hither and thither.

Steele's book, *Sandy Hook Truth: Memo to POTUS*, is online as a pdf. You can also find James Tracy's exhaustive Timeline of the event, at memoryholeblog.org. Fetzer has a book called "Nobody Died at Sandy Hook: It Was a FEMA Drill in Support of Gun Control," but Amazon has banned it.

The really astonishing thing is that a whole town, Newtown CT, may have been persuaded to uphold the false story of the massacre of 20 children and 6 adults, and the alleged suicide of the alleged gunman Adam Lanza. If Steele is correct (God bless you, Mr Steele), the folks would have been told that their participation is mandatory under some sort of — garbagy — National Security Law. I wonder if any of them phoned up the nearby Yale Law School to query this amazing dispensation!

Extrinsic Fraud and Equitable Relief

In a court case where there was "extrinsic fraud," a person may be eligible for equitable relief. This does not cover fraud by which the parties were deceitful (that is expected!) but where the officers of the court cheated. A Writ of Error Coram Nobis may be the basis for reopening the latter type of case.

The US Supreme Court has agreed, since the 1878 case *United States v Throckmorton*, that a ruling doesn't have to stand final if there was extrinsic fraud. This could mean that a person was prevented from knowing that he could sue, or where evidence was destroyed after a subpoena was issued or where a lawyer, purporting to act for the defendant, connived for his defeat.

The extrinsic-ness means that the fraud occurred before the facts in the case were presented for adjudication. Such a case therefore never really got contested, did it? Therefore, the rule of res judicata (preventing re-litigation) is not applicable. See *A Treatise on the Law of Judgements*, by Abraham Freeman (1925).

SCOTUS To Hear the Tsarnaev Appeal

Extrinsic fraud doctrine allows a court of equity to grant relief. This should be happening right now for Jahar in *United States v Tsarnaev*. On October 13, 2021, the US Supreme Court will hear oral argument concerning his death penalty. I think the merits of the case, ought to be discussed, not just the penalty.

Myself and two other persons were accepted as amici curiae in November 2017. We informed the court that, as a point of law, the lower court failed to note that the evidence of Jahar's guilt tendered by the FBI in the form of an exploded black backpack did not accord with the other evidence tendered by the FBI, namely the photo of Jahar wearing a whitish color backpack, shortly before the explosion.

Our information was ignored by the First Circuit Court of Appeals. We submitted a further brief on this subject for the upcoming SCOTUS appeal. Also in the file is the stunning affidavit by Aunt Maret, which did not make sense until Robert Steele came out with his statement about legalized lying being "mandated." I'll now quote the aunt, and one of Jahar's elderly cousins, Dzhamaly Tsarnaev.

Maret Tsarnaeva says in her April 2015 affidavit that the Public Defenders Judy Clarke and William Fick had made 13 trips to talk to Jahar's parents in part of the Russian Federation. They wanted to persuade the parents to write to Jahar encouraging him to cooperate. Maret (who has a Canadian law degree) could see that they were not acting in the best interests of their client.

"Dzhokhar's parents expressed willingness to engage independent counsel.... Mr Fick replied that government agents would obstruct independent counsel." [Hello???] And shockingly warned 'that, if their advice were not followed, Dzhokhar's life in custody near Boston would be more difficult.'" [That's a line right out of *The Godfather*, isn't it?]

Note: Jahar has been imprisoned for eight years, under Special Administrative Measures that thwart his communicating to us.

Cousin Dzhamaly

Separately, cousin Dzhamaly Maazovich Tsarnaev told of chats he had in Dagestan, with junior personnel from Boston's Public Defender Office, financed by the court. He was refused a visa to US to attend the trial, but he wrote an affidavit. It never got presented but here are five of its paragraphs:

“Representatives of the defense team were confident in the innocence of the brothers, Tamerlan and Dzhokhar; in particular the lead defense lawyer Judy Clarke agreed, adding in the conversation, ‘we know it — they are innocent.’ From the words of my brother, Said-Khusein Tsarnaev, I learned that on August 7, 2014 the meeting with representatives of the defense team, which took place at the hotel “Grozny City.”

“Charlene, who presented herself as an independent investigator involved in the case by Dzhokhar’s lawyers; Jane, presented as a social worker and psychologist; and Olga (a translator from New Jersey, who arrived with the team), translating the conversation, openly admitted to my brother that they knew that Dzhokhar and Tamerlan were not guilty of the bombings, and with this they were apologizing that the Tsarnaevs have had to endure the tragedy involving criminal allegations.

“My last personal conversation with the representative of Dzhokhar’s lawyers team, Alicia, introduced to me as assistant to the state-appointed defense attorney, during which I had to speak through an interpreter named Elena. I had met with Alicia and Elena on April 14, 2015 at noon in the hall of the ‘Ararat – Hyatt’ hotel. Later we moved to a cafe on the second floor. Our conversation lasted around 40 minutes. And suddenly Alicia said to me, ‘Dzhokhar’s guilt has been proven by the prosecution in court, please convince Dzhokhar to take

the blame for the bombings in the marathon so that he is not given the death penalty.’

“I was shocked by her revelation and request and said, ‘what are you talking about, we and you both know that the boys are innocent and there is a lot of conclusive evidence of it, and representatives of the defense, who visited earlier in Dagestan and Chechnya, admitted to us that they had known themselves that Tamerlan and Dzhokhar were not involved in the Boston bombings’.”

“To this Alicia had stated, ‘If Dzhokhar does not accept the guilt and does not express remorse, then the court will issue him a death sentence, however Dzhokhar is insisting upon his own, that he is ready to die rather than allow for Tamerlan to be blamed for the bombings and to plead guilty for himself and his brother’.” — end of excerpts from Dzhamaly's affidavit.

Will SCOTUS Give Equitable Relief?

In the United States we have common law, code law, and equity. In England, until 1873, there were separate courts for law and for equity, the latter being called the Court of Chancery. In 1873 they merged. I graduated from Law School in Australia where, by 1973, all state courts had completed the merger.

In a nutshell, the point of having equity is to give judges broader discretion to bring about fairness — they can “construct” a remedy. This happens when, say, a court overrules a contract in which one of the parties had undue influence over the other. It happens when a court prevents a person from travelling abroad while someone is suing him.

In the US, fewer than half the states still have a separate court of equity; in the federal system they are merged (except that the bankruptcy court, which is equitable, stands alone). The US appellate courts and the Supreme Court can render rulings

based on the principles of equity. Specifically, Rule 60b of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides:

“Grounds for Relief from a Final Judgment, Order, or Proceeding. On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: (3) fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party;... (6) any other reason that justifies relief.”

As SCOTUS will be listening to the Tsarnaev case 48 hours from now, I hasten to declare that **Jahar was unable to present his case in 2015 due to massive extrinsic fraud.** To wit, the case was a false flag in which Jahar was a patsy.

I have been arguing since 2018 that Jahar is entitled to a new trial based on the 2018 case of *McCoy v Louisiana*, in which SCOTUS ruled that it was unconstitutional for McCoy’s lawyer to tell the jury he was guilty. This is what happened to Jahar also -- Public Defender Judy Clarke said in her opening speech “It was him.” But now, thanks to what Robert Steele revealed about “legalized lying,” the concept of extrinsic fraud can cause FRCP Rule 60b to come into play. **On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment.** Hooray!

Technically, a motion for that must be filed by Jahar’s Public Defender, but surely the Justices have authority to rule *sua sponte* that Jahar was wrongly convicted. Granted, equity is usually not used in criminal cases — as the jury’s fact-finding isn’t supposed to be challenged. Still, because of extrinsic fraud, Jahar did not get to present his case — in effect, his trial never happened!

In his *Memo to Potus*, Robert Steele attributes the following to John Remington Graham, who has been a member of the Minnesota Bar for fifty years and helped Maret Tsarnaeva, pro bono:

Historic Memory

The litigation against Alex Jones in state courts of Connecticut is plainly an abuse of process, impossible to institute and press in an uncorrupt and honest manner, and designed to intimidate any and all journalists who dare to contend that the alleged shooting at the Sandy Hook Elementary School in December 2012 was a staged event, meant to shape public opinion in favor of gun control legislation

The idea that damages for defamation could be lawfully granted against Jones is patently absurd in light of seminal authority long ago established in *New York Times v. Sullivan* (1964), and *Garrison v. Louisiana* (1974).

The episode at Sandy Hook can be and has been studied in various degrees of depth, but we can know that Sandy Hook was a hoax, as surely we can know that the intelligence of the American people was insulted by the news media reports and the Warren Commission concerning the murder of John F. Kennedy which led to the tragedy of the Vietnam War.

As was once observed by Lord Acton, “Historic responsibility has to make up for want of legal responsibility.” And there is our consolation. Death has intervened to prevent temporal justice against those who plotted the death of Kennedy, but we know who they were, and we are beginning to learn lessons from their crimes for the good of our country. ...

If we are going to talk about conspiracy theories, as if such thinking were a sign of mental imbalance, let us remember that Abraham Lincoln believed in conspiracy theories. His “House Divided” speech is an outstanding exposition of why and how we should infer concert from circumstantial evidence in history and politics.... Those in the press who denounce conspiratorial thinking, are wittingly or unwittingly domestic enemies of the US.

... All upright lawyers should protest.

Chapter 12. Has Connecticut Left the Union? *(published October 19, 2021)*



Connecticut is to the east of New York, to the west of Rhode Island, and south of Massachusetts, Photo: Google Maps (Sandy Hook is eleven miles east of Danbury.)

Connecticut has, in my opinion, left the Union. I don't mean to pick on Connecticut — we have probably all left the Union, but it suits my purpose to emphasize that one state. I wish to make the point that the amount of lying necessary to keep up the false story of the 2012 massacre of 20 children is an almost lethal burden. As is true of all major deceptions, I suppose.

In his remarkable 100-page Timeline of the Event, “the late professor” James Tracy — not late as in R.I.P., just late as in no longer a professor — presents themes that MSM developed contemporaneously concerning the tragic event.. He quotes from the Newtown Bee, the New York Times, CNN, and so forth.

I notice that the early reports, starting on December 14, 2012, when the alleged massacre occurred, employ terms like “the police said” or “the governor said.” Officials are not named, other than that of the police chief, Lt. J Paul Vance. But, by January 2013, names came tripping out.

Note: perhaps they were waiting to see if there were major problems, credibility problems. As none developed (or, if necessary, a person or two were silenced), it would be safe to continue. They did then continue, and I've picked out 28 persons who made it into the newspaper or TV and will list them below. Each of them did something or said something to "solidify" the official narrative.

By the way, the Boston Marathon bombing occurred on April 15, 2013, just 4 months after Sandy Hook. Probably the Sandy Hook massacre (happily a victimless massacre — as best I can see) was a tryout, to see how far into fiction a bunch of officials could stray. Today, with the Covid narrative, we see that one can stray all the way to La-La Land.

Surrounded

Here are the 28 names, alphabetically, of CT state personnel. I shan't include feds who also spoke out, whether it be the president of the day, Obama, the FBI director, Mueller, or even the US Secretary of Education who had something to say. I don't care about them right now. The point here is that if you lived in Connecticut, you'd be surrounded by your state officials all engaging in false talk. Thus, how could those persons perform their jobs? How could any position they take on any subject look credible? This is what I'm lamenting.

Each of these persons appears, in James Tracy's Timeline, making a specific contribution to the false story.

For example, they described in detail the way windows were blown out during the shooting, or they made formal statements at memorial services, or they lobbied for a change in policy, such as to ban the release of death certificates.

Leo Aresimowicz, CT House majority leader

Debbie Aurelio, Newtown Town Clerk

Reuben Bradford, CT Emergency Services

George Bensen, Newtown Land Use Director

Richard Blumenthal, CT Atty Gen (later US Senator)

Mitch Bolinsky, State Rep

Dan Carden, State Rep

Dr Wayne Carver, State Medical Examiner

Sally Cox, School nurse at Sandy Hook

Donna Curbell, District Health Director

Douglas Fuchs, Redding CT Police Chief

Bill Halstead, Fire Chief [rumored by conspiracy theorists on the Internet to have been a main coordinator of the drill]

George Jepsen, State Attorney

Ed Jutila, State Rep

Kevin Kane, Chief State Attorney

Patrick Kwanashie, Assistant Atty Gen

Debbie Leidlein, School board chairman

Patricia Llodra, First Selectman

Kyle Lyddy, Committee Chair, Permanent Memorial

Daniel P Malloy, Governor of CT

Chris Murphy, Senator-elect

William Rodgers, Second Selectman

Dr John Reed, Interim school superintendent

Janet Robinson, School superintendent

Stephen Sedensky, State Attorney for Danbury district

Timothy Sugrue, Assistant to state attorney Kane

Paul Vance, State Police Chief of CT

Paul Vance, Jr, CT Claims Commissioner

I omitted any names of teachers, cops, doctors, or journalists, in order to focus on persons to whom Connecticut citizens have entrusted themselves in a formal, accountable way. No doubt the 28 officials I named are but a small sample — Connecticut has hundreds of bureaucrats and politicians. I wonder if all of them are equally resigned to the prospect of going along with the lies indefinitely, no matter how embarrassing it may be.

An Across-the-Board Pardon Would Help

The only solution I can think of — and the matter is urgent, you know — would be for someone to announce, with humble apology, that the Sandy Hook hoax was a hoax, and that the hoaxers are to be forgiven, just this time.

This is easier than, say, offering forgiveness to the 9-11 conspirators, as there were many deaths on 9-11 (and many more later, from Manhattan's polluted air). I am pretty certain there were no deaths at the Sandy Hook Elementary School. Thus, it can't "horrible and cruel" to state the truth; rather, it is joyful: No little darlings were gunned down by Adam Lanza.

I'm serious about formal pardons for each and every one of the 28 Connecticut officials listed above. They would only have to do one thing to qualify: give a sincere confession. Ah, their overlords will be displeased about that, as the blame will quickly filter up, up, up.

But wait, the overlords may also be given a chance to come clean and rejoin the human race. Why not?

Robert Steele's Questions

In his 128-page book, *Sandy Hook Truth: Memo to POTUS [President of the United States]*, the late Robert David Steele asks dozens of questions. As a CIA insider, he asks ones that most of us would never think of. For example: "Who, exactly, got at the staff of the *Chronicle of Higher Education Chronicle*, telling them to smear Professor James Tracy?" And "Who, exactly, was in the chain of custody of each incoming FOIA request from Wolfgang Halbig [king of the FOIA approach]?"

Here are 36 more of Steele's questions. His recent death may be relevant to his having dug up such a range of ideas:

Did the CIA provide seed funding for Facebook, Google, Twitter, and YouTube?

Does the CIA have official embedded personnel within each of the social media platforms as NSA does with cell companies?

Can we demand all relevant documentation of instructions received by the media from FEMA with respect to Newtown?

Can we depose Alex Jones on all contacts with him seeking to shut down both PizzaGate and Sandy Hook coverage by him?

Why have multiple lawsuits emerged against Alex Jones when the perpetrators know that discovery will blow them up?

Can we follow the money and create a clear visualization of how all this is being orchestrated?

Has anyone demanded of the *New York Times* all documentation associated with its stories about harassment of alleged parents by conspiracy theorists?

Who, exactly, made the decision at Amazon to ban Jim Fetzer's book? Were they directed to do so by the US Government?

What role has Media Matters played in seeking to defame and censor skeptics of Sandy Hook, the Boston Bombing, and more?

Why does Lenny Pozner have 23 web sites attacking Sandy Hook skeptics? Who pays for them?

Can we bring Kevin Riley, the mortician who allegedly cremated Adam Lanza, for an in-depth discussion? Any photos?

Who hired Shannon Hicks to stage her photographs of Sandy Hook kids being escorted from the school?

Can we depose, under oath, Susan Bro, also known as the mother of Victoria Soto? [This be a huge item. A girl named Heather Heyer was the sole fatality in a 2015 car rampage in Charleston Virginia, blamed on white supremacists. Her mom, Susan Bro, has spoken out about racism. But she -- Susan Bro -- looks very like Donna Soto, mom of teacher Victoria Soo killed at Sandy Hook. It's as though someone is teasing us.]

Is there an official policy that requires FBI to pretend to investigate false flag events, and then validate them to the public?

Did the media who were allowed access to the event have to sign a complicity agreement in advance of the event?

Has FEMA been forced to testify under oath about Sandy Hook being an exercise, similar to the Boston Bombing?

How many people had foreknowledge of the event at the local, state, and national levels?

Where is the work order for the “Everyone Must Check In” sign? Where are the sign-in sheets?

Why does the “Final Report” on Sandy Hook not link the shooter, his victims and his weapons?

Can we get an accounting for the millions of dollars raised for the “victims” of Sandy Hook, with great precision?

Has anyone interrogated, under oath, all staff from the Chalk Hill Middle School that took over the Sandy Hill students? [Note: it has been speculated by some that the Chalk Hill Middle School had also been abandoned like Sandy Hook Elementary, due to asbestos. Just think how many locals could quickly remove this as an open question by giving a pleasant press conference, with all questions allowable.]

Where are all the documents related to the nullification of the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948 on propaganda against citizens?

Where are all the internal documents on instructions from FEMA to state and local authorities about legalized lies?

Can we demand legal disclosure of all Democratic National Committee emails and calls related to Sandy Hook?

Can broadcasting and publishing licenses be revoked if it's proven that they are being used to lie to the American public?

Can we demand a list of all US law enforcement personnel funded by AIPAC for anything, such as training in Israel, and compare that to events in the US?

Can we interrogate Sheriff David Mahoney (Madison) and Captain Kevin McMahill (Las Vegas), on training they received?

Should the Department of Justice have a RICO investigation going against both Mainstream Media and Social Media? [Yes]

Is the US Social Security Death Master file wrong when it says no one died at Sandy Hook on 14 December 2012?

Where were the 469 “other” students and the 70 staff and teachers allegedly employed at Sandy Hook, on the day of the event?

Who organized the Sandy Hook Chorus for the Superbowl in February 2013? Where are the documents?

It Will Be Easy To Get This One Over With

Honestly, I really am proposing that the people of Connecticut get the whole problem over with in one hit, by admitting that the massacre never happened. It was most likely a FEMA drill. Amazingly, there was an announced drill at the Putnam County School on the very same day, December 14, 2012, at 9am. It really happened, less than an hour’s drive from Newtown!

There was never the slightest image of Adam Lanza at the scene, never a blood stain on the floor, or anything else you would expect — but plenty of talk about his mental state.

I’d call the presentation of the Sandy Hook event “verbal only.” (In Australia we used to call it “a police verbal” if cops typed up a story and handed it, for signature, to some poor bloke who was to be charged with the crime.) Granted, the verblivity of the Sandy Hook narrative was accompanied by a few visuals. Recall the “official” picture of children “escaping from the gunman,” taken by Newtown Bee photographer Shannon Hicks. But this got outed — the photo was taken on

an earlier day (or month or year), as we now know from “a picture being shot of the picture being shot.”

How about Giving Awards To Ease the Transition?

Our society doesn't give enough awards. When did you last see a student get an award for honesty, bravery, loyalty, etc? I think part of the cleansing operation that will occur, as soon as the town of Newtown overthrows its burdensome lies, should involve celebration. I mean a celebration of honesty itself. A celebration of the relief from such darkness.

One way to create light would be to thank those persons in Newtown who did come forward, at any point, with correct information. Patricia Llorda revealed the origin of the “Check-in” sign which was blatantly placed on the street by the school as part of a drill. She reportedly said “I believe Homeland Security put it there.” Thank you, Ma'am!

I'd give an award to any parent or teacher at Sandy Hook school, or the nearby Catholic school, St Rose of Lima, who ever piped up that teaching kids to lie is not a good idea.

I'd even give an award to any kid who did lie but expressed a revulsion at doing so. It has been rumored (sorry, I have no evidence) that in the ensuing eight years, almost nine years, quite a few complainers spilled their soul on Facebook. The older students are now grown up — surely they worry that some future child of theirs will confront them.

Surely some Connecticut citizens, both young and old, feel very angry that videos of them, play-acting, are still shown on YouTube. Surely they feel guilty when they see truth-tellers get mocked or punished. Surely they'd like to revive the good old days when “authority” meant something, and when what you saw in the newspaper accorded with reality. Surely it would be nice to equate one's schooling with something beautiful.

EXCUSE THE INTERRUPTION

THIS PAGE IS THE BOOK'S "CENTREFOLD."

I'll quote a few conspiracy-theorist comments from YouTube for your amusement (mixed in with believer comments and, no doubt, chatter from the paid). These appeared under the ABC's video about the 911 calls allegedly made to police from Sandy Hook that day. I retrieved them on October 29, 2021:

Ryan Witter -- 1 year ago

I've just been shot in the head, Dispatcher: ok what makes u think that?

justliketolook -- 5 years ago

We will see how fast they delete there post once Remington ask to see the photo's of the dead body's to prove there gun didn't kill anyone , and they won't be able to produce them because no one died . Its going to blow this sandy Hook drill wide open

Michigan Accountability Network -- 3 years ago

Gabby Schneider yeah and I was in the building doing renovations the day before that school was closed.... Just kidding I don't lie, but you shouldn't either

Theo Fulk -- 2 years ago

We know this conspiracy, crap IS DISGUSTING, and doubly so that you and thousands upon thousands have FALLEN FOR IT, Hook, Line, Sinker, Rod&Reel, Tackle Box, and BOAT AND MOTOR.

1vengeful Heart -- 3 years ago

Tony Smith 👍 Don't ever let people discourage you from speaking up!! You really nailed it. I understand why it's so hard for people to accept these things... but it seems that, slowly but surely, it's finally getting out. More people are talking than ever And the people that were involved in these things from the start

are really up there in age now.. and there's beginning to be a lot of death bed declarations.

Dani Dakota -- 3 years ago

Gabby Schneider can you tell us that lady's name, please?? If you know her, I guess you know her name

Gabriel The Magolor Main 🗨️ -- 2 years ago

Dragoon GT You have a really sad existence. Where do you think they're hiding the kids?

Tracey Air -- 3 years ago

Not one body was recorded in picture. So weird

Dragoon GT -- 2 years ago

They paid every one of the victims families with free mortgage on their houses. They are not hiding the kids. They are just using fake names. A UK woman also reported that her 6th grade daughters kindergarten photo was being used as one of the victims even though her daughter was alive and well.

Gabriel The Magolor Main 🗨️ -- 2 years ago

@Dragoon GT Instead of adding to this harmful conspiracy theory, and believing things because it's fun to be into conspiracy theories, do your research backwards. Every claim that has been made to "prove" it's fake has been debunked. I can't believe what you people have put these families through. <https://www.metabunk.org/debunked-sandy-hook-residents-got-their-houses-for-free.t3198/>


Theo Fulk -- 2 years ago

The PROPAGANDA AUDACITY IS 100-fold the outrage and insolence to the RIGHT OF AMERICANS TO KNOW, to QUESTION, and to find out the Truth that is underneath FEMA L366--- there is no denial that it at least STARTED OUT AS A DRILL----- start there.

Lanza's House Disposed Of



Nancy Lanza's big house, in background, Photo: CBS News




In 2014, bank donates the house to Newtown, Photo: WTNH 8



The house is razed to the ground, allegedly because it makes people feel bad. The demolition firm did the work pro bono, hence no need for open bidding, Photo: CBS News

Chapter 13. The Sedensky Report -- The Section on the Contents of the Lanza House *(published October 22, 2021)*



Alleged writing by Adam Lanza, shown in a YouTube video, from NBC News, on January 23, 2019, entitled “Documents Reveal Sandy Hook Killer’s Descent into Darkness.”

This chapter is not written by me, but by the State’s Attorney in Connecticut. Yet it does have my “opinion” in it, to the extent that I bolded many items that looked a bit odd to me. I suggest you just peruse it to see if you can find something that strongly suggests Adam Lanza was the killer.

The Sedensky Report occupies thousands of pages; I will use only the summary. The state website portal.ct.gov says:

“Based on a painstaking investigation it is determined that there will be no arrests or prosecutions. The Connecticut State Police are to be commended for their tireless work on this investigation and their consideration of the families and victims involved,” State’s Attorney Sedensky said.

Now here is the Sedensky Report text, from pages 27-30.

Note: I chose only the bit involving the post-crime inspection of Nancy Lanza’s house. I did not modify anything, but made a few elisions.

Summary of Final Report on Sandy Hook Investigation,
by Stephen J Sedensky III, Connecticut State's Attorney for the
Judicial District of Danbury, issued on November 25, 2013.

[The] 36 YOGANANDA STREET, NEWTOWN, CT –
SCENE INVESTIGATION

After the body of the shooter's mother was found and the scene declared safe, the process of obtaining search warrants for the house began, with the first warrant being reviewed and signed **by a judge** of the Superior Court at 5:29 p.m. on December 14, 2012, at the Emergency Operations Center. Additional search warrants were approved and issued as the search disclosed additional evidence. ...

The **weapon used to kill Nancy Lanza**, the .22 cal. Savage Mark II rifle, was found near her bed and seized. In the chamber of the rifle was a spent .22 cal. shell casing and three live rounds were in the magazine. Three other spent .22 cal. shell casings were found in the room and seized.

The shooter's second floor bedroom windows were taped over with black trash bags. The second-floor computer room also had its windows covered. There, **investigators found a computer hard drive that appeared to have been intentionally damaged.** To date, because of the extensive damage, forensic **experts have not yet been able** to recover any information from that hard drive.

In a typical criminal case, the investigation would remain open when potentially important evidence was still being examined. **Given the improbability of any information being recovered from the damaged hard drive**, this outstanding piece of evidence is not preventing the closure of this case now. Should any relevant information related to the existence of any accessory or co- conspirator be obtained from the hard drive, the case will be reopened.

Investigators found a large number of firearms and related items in the home. **All firearms involved in these incidents were legally purchased by the shooter's mother over the years.** The home also contained many **edged weapons, knives, swords, spears, etc.** A prescription **bottle in the shooter's name** for acetaminophen with codeine was found in the mother's bathroom, which was part of the master bedroom.

During the search of 36 Yogananda Street, a **global positioning system (GPS) device was located in the shooter's room** with various routes in the memory from April 25, 2012, **through December 13, 2012.** Investigation revealed that the GPS was purchased for the shooter.

The routes taken indicate a number of trips from 36 Yogananda Street to the area of a local theater where a commercial version of the game **"Dance Dance Revolution" is located.** Over that time period, trips were made that took the driver in the vicinity of some schools in Newtown, including SHES. **On December 13, 2012, a trip was recorded from 2:09 p.m. to 2:32 p.m. starting and ending on Yogananda Street and driving in Sandy Hook, which is in the area of SHES,** though the route does not indicate the shooter drove up to the school.

Numerous video games were located in the basement computer/gaming area. The list of video games includes, but is not limited to:

-“Left for Dead” -“Metal Gear Solid” -“Dead Rising” -“Half Life” -“Battlefield” -“Call of Duty”

-“Grand Theft Auto” -“Shin Megami Tensei” -“Dynasty Warriors” -“Vice City”

-“Team Fortress” -“Doom”

Other items found and noted for this report are:

- A **Christmas check from the mother** to the shooter to purchase a CZ 83 firearm;
- The return for the December 16, 2012, search warrant indicates that Exhibit #612 was a check for a “C183.” (A closer inspection of the check makes it clear that “CZ83” is written. A CZ 83 is a type of pistol. The check reads “Christmas Day” in the check’s date section)
- A **New York Times article from February 18, 2008**, regarding the school shooting at Northern Illinois University;
- Three **photographs of what appear to be a dead human, covered in blood and wrapped in plastic**;
- The book *Amish Grace: How Forgiveness Transcended Tragedy*, Jossey-Bass, 2007, by Donald B. Kraybill, Steven Nolt and David Weaver-Zercher; and
- Photocopied **newspaper articles from 1891 pertaining to the shooting of school children**
- While the **vast majority of persons interviewed** had no explanation for the shooter’s actions, a review of electronic evidence or digital media that appeared to belong to the shooter, revealed that the shooter had a preoccupation with mass shootings, in particular the Columbine shootings⁴¹ and a strong interest in firearms. **For example, there was a spreadsheet with mass murders over the years** listing information about each shooting.
- The review of the electronic evidence also found many things that are on a typical hard drive or memory card that would probably have no relevance to the investigation either because of creation date or subject matter. That being said, the following selected topics or items **were found within the digital evidence seized**:

Bookmarks pertaining to firearms, military, politics, mass murder, video games, music, books, Army Ranger, computers and programs, ammunition, **candy**, **economic books**

- Web page design folders
- **Two videos showing suicide by gunshot**
commercial movies depicting mass shootings
- **The computer game titled “School Shooting”**
where the player controls a character who enters a school and shoots at students
-
- Screen shots (172) of the online game “Combat Arms”
- “Dance Dance Revolution” (DDR) game screen shots
Videos of shooter playing DDR
-
- Images of the shooter holding a handgun to his head
- **Images of the shooter holding a rifle to his head**
- Five-second video (**dramatization**) depicting children being shot
- Images of shooter with a rifle, shotgun and **numerous magazines** in his pockets
- **Documents** on weapons and magazine capacity
- A document written showing the prerequisites for a mass murder spreadsheet
- A spreadsheet listing mass murders by name and information about the incident
- Materials regarding the topic of pedophilia and **advocating for rights for pedophiles** (not child pornography)
- Large amount of materials relating to Columbine shootings and documents on mass murders
- Large amount of materials on firearms
- Comedy videos
- Music
- **Images of hamsters**
- **Images of Lego creations.**

36 YOGANANDA STREET, NEWTOWN, CT – AUTOPSY INFORMATION

“The OCME performed an autopsy on the body of Nancy Lanza, age 52, on December 16, 2012, at the OCME. The cause of death was determined to be multiple gunshots to the head. The manner of death was homicide.

SHOOTER – AUTOPSY INFORMATION

The autopsy of the shooter was conducted on December 16, 2012, at the OCME. The shooter, age 20, was 72 inches tall and weighed 112 pounds. No drugs were found in the shooter’s system. The cause of death was determined to be a gunshot wound to the head. The manner of death was suicide.

INVESTIGATION TO DETERMINE ACCESSORIES AND/OR CO-CONSPIRATORS

The **investigation sought to determine** if the shooter was aided by or had conspired with anyone to commit these crimes. As detailed above, none of the persons found in the vicinity of SHES on December 14, 2012, played any role in the shootings. **Most were attempting to escape the area; others were responding to the school** after learning of the shootings. None had any association with the shooter.

Investigators then sought to determine **if anyone had conspired with or aided the shooter before the shootings. To that end, investigators examined social contacts, writings, e-mails, internet blogs, telephone records and his general internet presence.** One of the internet blogs on which the shooter posted focused on mass shootings and in particular the Columbine shootings

What follows are some observations that investigators developed in attempting to determine the shooter’s motive.

Parents

The shooter's mother and father Peter Lanza had been married to each other. They moved from New Hampshire to the Sandy Hook section of Newtown in 1998. In addition to the shooter, they had another son Ryan Lanza, who was four years older than the shooter.⁴³ (43 Both the shooter's father and brother cooperated fully with the investigation.)

In 2001 the shooter's parents separated. The children continued to reside with the mother. The parents subsequently divorced. The father remarried in 2011; the mother never remarried.

After college, the brother moved out of state. **He reached out to the shooter a few times but the shooter did not respond.** As of December 14, 2012, the older brother had not had contact with the shooter since 2010. The brother believed that the shooter and his mother had a close relationship. After his older brother left for college, **the shooter reportedly became interested in firearms** and at one point considered joining the military.”

[Interjection: This is entirely taken from the Sedensky Report; I have added nothing but the bolding -- MM]

Both the shooter's mother and father indicated that the shooter was bullied growing up. The father indicated that it was not excessive and concerned his social awkwardness and physical gait. As expanded upon in the Education and Mental Health section below, other witnesses did not recall the shooter being overtly bullied. **Nonetheless, the shooter appears to have had few friends growing up.**

The shooter's father saw him regularly until he turned 18. They would go hiking, play video games and other activities. They went shooting twice. The shooter had a cell phone but never

used it. Calls all went to voice mail. His father would just e-mail him when he wanted to reach him.

The shooter's relationship with his father deteriorated in the last quarter of 2010 and the father last saw the shooter in that year. After that the father would reach out to the shooter by mail or through e-mails regularly, **asking him to join him at various places for different activities.** The shooter stopped responding at some point prior to December 2012.

One witness who knew the shooter in 2011 and 2012 said that he rarely mentioned his father or his brother; though he would mention briefly something he did with his father or brother in the past.

While it appears that the shooter's mother did volunteer at SHES, it was when the shooter was a student. There is no indication that she volunteered there in recent years.

The mother took care of all of the shooter's needs. The mother indicated that she did not work **because of her son's condition.** She worried about what would happen to the shooter if anything happened to her.

One witness indicated that the shooter did not have an emotional connection to his mother. Recently **when his mother asked him if he would feel bad if anything happened to her, he replied,** "No." Others, however, have indicated that they thought the shooter was close to his mother and she was the only person to whom the shooter would talk.

A person who knew the shooter in 2011 and 2012 said the shooter described his relationship with his mother as strained because the shooter said her behavior was not rational.

The shooter was particular **about the food that he ate and its arrangement on a plate in relation to other foods on the plate.** Certain types of dishware could not be used for

particular foods. The mother would shop for him and cook to the shooter's specifications, though sometimes he would cook for himself. Reportedly the shooter did not drink alcohol, take drugs, prescription or otherwise, and **hated the thought** of doing any of those things.

The **mother did the shooter's laundry on a daily basis** as the shooter often changed clothing during the day. She was not allowed in the shooter's room, however, even to clean. No one was allowed in his room.

The **shooter disliked birthdays**, Christmas and holidays. He would not allow his mother to put up a Christmas tree. The **mother explained it** by saying that shooter had no emotions or feelings. The mother also got rid of a cat because the shooter did not want it in the house.

People Outside the Family

When the shooter **had his hair cut**, he did not like to be touched and did not like the sound of clippers, so they were not used much. He would sit with his hands in his lap and always look down, **giving one word answers if the cutter** tried to engage him in conversation.

Those who worked on the property at 36 Yogananda Street never entered the home. They spoke with the mother outside in the yard or at the bottom of driveway. ...

Over the years his hobbies included building computers, **writing poetry** and hiking. The shooter worked briefly at a computer repair shop. When he was younger he played the saxophone. The **shooter had a cell phone but never used it**.

-- To repeat, none of the above was written by me, MM. It is from the Sedensky Report, dated November 2013

Chapter 14. Additional Issues and Some Photographs

(published October 23, 2021)



Cardboard angels roadside memorial for the victims, Photo: Reuters/ Mike Segar

It is not my duty to record all the complaints about Sandy Hook that have been published. Now that it's patent to me that the whole thing is deceitful, I don't want to pour time into it.

Still, it is worth a lot to show people how they get fooled. Many private researchers already worked hard at digging for the real facts, and we must be grateful to them. I will now mention 3 whom I did not include earlier. Each is listed in Robert David Steele's book "Sandy Hook Truth: Memo to POTUS."

The License Plate

Citizen-Investigator **Ms Sylvia Sledge** undertook to trace the history of the licence plate on the car, a black Honda Civic that Adam Lanza drove to Sandy Hook school on December 14, 2012. The Department of Motor Vehicles does not show this plate (Connecticut 872-YEO) as registered to Nancy Lanza. Rather the *plate* is owned by the Dane County Sheriff's office in Wisconsin, even though Nancy owns the *car*. Sledge writes:

"The **CT license plate** also returns search results for a 2010 Ford Silver Crown Vic Police Interceptor, issued, 03/29/2012, [eight months prior to] the Sandy Hook shooting.... Its listed Registration Type is for "GOV" use. Separate databases yield conflicting results; **the license plate is listed as a police**

interceptor [that's a sedan made by Ford]. What more direct and obvious proof could we have that law enforcement was in on the scam? Does anyone think they were unable to track the license plate on the car of an alleged mass murderer?"

Furthermore, Ms Sledge found that the Dane County Sheriff's Department plays an important role in Active Shooter Training and has their own training academy. According to their 2012 Annual Report (Sledge's website is TheGovernmentRag.com):

"The Dane County Sheriff's Office Special Events Team (SET) has been successfully deployed to large gatherings, protests, and disturbances since the 1960's. SET is comprised of sixty-four members and utilizes a mini-team model. This model facilitates communication and addresses issues of consistency [??] and accountability. Given the target rich environment of large crowds, this structure provides for an easy transition to an active shooter scenario or other rapidly evolving threats."

The Cremation of Adam Lanza

Ms Cinderella Broom writes a blog on Sandy Hook, or should I say *wrote* a blog "until it was suspended by WordPress on August 15, 2018 for no stated reason." She says:

"The story we've been told about Sandy Hook is so laden with anomalies, contradictions and absurdities that, were it proposed as a screenplay, producers would likely reject it as ridiculous. One aspect deserving more discussion concerns how the faked deaths involved the fake disposal of bodies. *What do you do to cover the disposition of bodies in works of fiction?*"

Ms Broom inquired as to which mortician was assigned to deal with the body (assuming there was a body) of Adam Lanza. She found (with the help of Dr Eowyn, I think) that it was a man who had recently got convicted after pleading guilty to larceny. I don't think that tells us enough to dispose of the case — there are so many liars that even the most respectable

mortician in Connecticut may have been willing to say he had cremated the body of Lanza when he hadn't.

Still there us an interesting aside. The convicted criminal had “landed a lucrative contract worth \$500K with the state of Connecticut to provide decent burials for people who died with no immediate families to care for them.” A subpoena may lead us to find out if that mortician dipped into the fund by claiming that Adam had no relatives.

Still, Adam had a brother Ryan Lanza and a millionaire father, Peter Lanza, who, even if estranged, could have been expected to pay his son's funeral expenses.

The Ages of the Mothers. Carl Herman, a schoolteacher, says he has found, from open sources, that the average age of the 20 moms who lost a child in the massacre was 36 when that child was born. Adding on six years, as most of the kids were 6 (four of the 20 were 7, he says), this means the mom was 42 at the time her first-grader was killed in 2012. Indeed, many of the interviews conducted in subsequent weeks by CNN and other MSM with the parents are not as young as you'd expect.

Photos. YouTube is still heavy with videos of Sandy Hook. Many are the originals and is it astonishing how many details the networks knew of how the killings were allegedly carried out, from the very day of the event. Some are from the Official Report a year later, at the channel of Rick Pluto. These include crime scene photos such as of Adam's closet at home, and casings of bullets found at the school. I can tell you from the Tsarnaev trial that it is easy for police to plant evidence in the .person's home and “at the scene.” As we would do in fiction

There is a surfeit of “happy love” photos meant to be positive about the lives of the deceased. Every major network ran lengthy interviews with friends, and neighbors. Another theme, as was used in the Marathon case, is sports events at which tribute is paid. This allows inexpensive advertising to crowds.



(L) A cross for each child (R) the Firehouse near the school, from “CT Shooting in Newtown, 1 gunman confirmed dead.” Dec 14, 2012, CBS News



(L) bullet found (R) Daily News knows more than we do



Moments of silence at sporting events.



Tarps are used for triage in FEMA drills. These are empty.



Catholic bishop!



The first of the funerals took place today
victims of the massacre at an elementary
PBS anchor!



Fifty officers
on guard at Sandy Hook funeral (perhaps Fire Dep't uniform?).
Very difficult to believe the event is other than genuine reality

Chapter 15. My Hypothesis Regarding That Famous Day (published October 27, 2021)



Jillian Soto speaks at the August 2015 ribbon-cutting of a new school in Stratford CT, The Victoria Soto School, named after her sister Victoria who was a teacher at Sandy Hook Elementary School, Photo: WTNH News, on YouTube.com

While writing articles at GumshoeNews.com, I came around from a position that Sandy Hook was NOT a fake, to one in which Sandy Hook WAS a fake. I don't demand that anyone agree with me -- possibly I'm on a frolic of my own. But if it's true that it was a false flag, no doubt a government-designed one (how else would participants get away with it?), we should ask: Of what did the big chore actually consist?

To picture it, you'd have to try to erase from your mind the whole story about the deaths of children and of school staff, the cops and FBI running to and fro, doctors doing autopsies, parents going mad with grief, and neighbors giving interviews. All of that would only clog up your imaginative space.

Here in Chapter 15, I hypothesize that a false flag operation took place at Sandy Hook Elementary School (SHES) on December 14, 2012, and had been set up far in advance. I speculate that its purpose was threefold: One, to demonize gun ownership. Two, to test the waters to see if anyone would pose

a serious challenge (maybe with an eye to seeing if martial law could be safely installed later). And Three, in the long run, to teach people that truth and falsehood have pretty much equal status -- “So don't worry about it.”

By the way, James Perloff of Boston, a very responsible analyst of the many 20th-century false flags, offers a good explanation. He suggests that a drill is run on the same day that the bad guys are planning a false flag, so that **if things go awry**, it can be collapsed down to just the drill. Not all Londoners know that Peter Powers was running a drill in the *exact* three Tube stations on the day of the July 2007 bombing. Not all Americans know that a drill, for planes to run into the World Trade Center, was officially held on the morning of September 11, 2001!

(Think of it! The mainstream media has never whispered a word about these officially documented drills. Think how it would change citizens' perspective if they knew. I have been reading a book by a bereaved mother of the London Tube bombing and wager that she is unaware of the Peter Powers.)

A Postulated Scenario of Preparation

I ask you to picture a scenario. The feds (or someone higher up than the feds -- the globalists) travel to Connecticut, months in advance, and arrange with various state and town officers to hold a standard drill. There's already a well-known type of Homeland Security drill called an “active shooter drill” and another one called “danger to children.” This one (in my scenario) will be held over two days, December 13th and 14th, 2012, with the 13th being a rehearsal.

The empty site of SHES is chosen for the drill. There had not been any kids or classes there for a while. Several weeks before the drill, nine kids will be asked to pose in a “conga line” at the actual SHES campus, but there won't be any involvement of youngsters on the *day* of the drill. Just a few persons “in the know” will be there.

Locals will have to be warned that the TV News is going to scream Murder! So all persons of Newtown will have to be ready to take that with a grain of salt. Some may see it as their patriotic duty to pretend it is all real “for national security's sake.” Many may have received a payment to go along with the officials. Some will have been threatened. Possibly some are hypnotized or otherwise mind-controlled.

Note: I realize my scenario is a stretch. Still, drills do take place with public acceptance. When I lived in Australia, there was a public announcement that a plane would make-believe crash into Sydney and 700 people on the ground would be “injured.” The government openly asked for volunteers to play the role of shocked bystanders. That was August 28, 2106.

In order to make it seem like a genuine drill at Sandy Hook, on the first day, the Thursday, people will go through some of the motions of a drill. Porta-potties will be set up outside the school. A sign will say “Everyone must check in.” Supervisors will wear lanyards. Actors will be assigned their “itinerary.”

A Postulated Scenario of the Actual Event

On December 14, 2012, to repeat, there are no children at SHES campus. Everyone on that street knows what's going to happen, so there is no emotional frenzy. I don't know if there was any real noise of gunshot (none are heard during the hilariously fake-sounding 911 calls to police). Probably someone did have to break the glass at the front door, to make it possible for photographers to convey an authentic break-in.

There is no Adam Lanza in this scenario, and he certainly did not kill his mom in her bed. Not only are there no 20 kids to be massacred, there are no six adults about to be killed or another two adults to be injured. That exists only “on paper.” (In the Sydney scene mentioned above in 2016, there was no real airplane, and the dead bodies on the street were mannequins.)

In my scenario, the main people on the Sandy Hook scene are cops, media, actors, neighbors. I don't know if any elected officials, school board members, or actual Emergency Medical Technicians were there. In fact I don't know *anything*. I am making this up, as one must do when one lacks access to authorities such as courts, and when no investigative journalist of the MSM has even stuck his nose into the matter since 2012, despite many websites yelling that Sandy Hook was a hoax.

Judging by the size of the Connecticut population, it must be that some people did not get taken into the confidence of the planners. In fact, amazingly, a *real* “live-shooter drill” was going on in Carmel School in Putnam County starting at 9am. It's a 45-minute ride to Newtown. Some cops in Putnam heard about a problem at SHES (after 9:45am) and phoned to offer help but was told it was taken care of.

Later in the day, it would have been enough for any naive Connecticut citizenry to see Lt J Paul Vance of the State Troopers standing there at a mic, reporting the tragedy. From that moment, the deal was sealed: deaths of beautiful first-graders “had definitely happened.”

President Obama

The same night, President Obama went on TV to offer condolences, and on December 15 he attended a vigil at Sandy hook, giving a 20-minute speech. It contained these words:

... I can only hope it helps for you to know that you're not alone in your grief; ... whatever measure of comfort we can provide, we will provide; whatever portion of sadness that we can share with you to ease this heavy load, we will gladly bear it....

We know that when danger arrived in the halls of Sandy Hook Elementary, the school's staff did not flinch, they did not hesitate. Dawn Hochsprung and Mary Sherlach, Vicki Soto,

Lauren Rousseau, Rachel Davino and Anne Marie Murphy -- they responded as we all hope we might respond in such terrifying circumstances -- with courage and with love, giving their lives to protect the children in their care.

We know that there were other teachers who barricaded themselves inside classrooms, and kept steady through it all, and reassured their students

Disappearances

Hmm. My scenario must account in some way for the disappearance of the six women mentioned by President Obama: Hochsprung, Sherlach, Soto, Rousseau, Davino, and Murphy. I can only conjecture that they were sent away and given a new identity. It is also possible that they were killed by the planners of the false-flag operation. Wouldn't be the first time!

Another possibility is that there was no such staff member. The website "Team Rachel Marie D'Avino" says Rachel had only worked at Sandy Hook for a week prior to the tragedy. Her two sisters, Hannah and Sarah, speak lovingly of her in a 2004 article by Brian Koonz at *The Stamford Advocate*, entitled "Sandy Hook Siblings Struggle Two Years Later."

In that same article, Jillian Soto, a sibling of teacher Virginia Soto, says she has had to grow up in a hurry because her family needs her:

"My brother, it's his senior year of high school this year [2014]. You're supposed to be looking forward to your prom and graduation and your homecoming, everything like that. But that's been taken away from him.... My sister is married to a Marine and five months pregnant in North Carolina. Vicki will never get to see her new niece or nephew," Soto said, pausing to let the injustice of that image sink in...."

“Jillian Soto says the hurt has been compounded by conspiracy theorists who insist the shooting was a hoax to promote a national gun control agenda. 'I've been called a hoaxster to my face,' she said. 'I've seen terrible things written on the Internet. But I know my sister is real.'”

I am sorry for causing anyone to feel hurt by my own skepticism. I will change my tune if I ever get some strong evidence to support the official story.

By the way, the Connecticut police and Dr Wayne Carver said that the parents of slain children were never shown the bodies. Talk about unusual! I don't know if the same was true of the six adult victims. I would insist on seeing my spouse.

In Chapter 3, I quoted the declassified Northwoods memo from General Lemnitzer who wanted to do a false flag that would harm the reputation of Cuba. He'd make up a story that Cuba had downed a small plane:

“An aircraft at Eglin AFB would be painted and numbered as an exact duplicate for a civil registered aircraft belonging to a CIA proprietary organization. [It] would be loaded with the selected passengers, all boarded under carefully prepared aliases. [We would] conduct mock funerals.”

I will shout my apologies from the rooftop if I am incorrect in my belief that the Sandy Hook funerals were of this fake type. I realize it is “beyond the beyonds” to tell a genuinely bereaved mother, father, sister, or brother that they are lying about the death of a child.

It is also beyond the beyonds for a judge to refuse to hear a dispute about the matter. People need to reach the truth and a court is a famous venue in which to attempt this.

That will be aired in the Addendum of this book.

Chapter 16. The DoJ, Anti-Trust, and Media-To-Go
(published November 8, 2021)



(L) Zephyr Teachout, Photo: Politico.com (C) Senator John Sherman (1823-1900) (R) Sidney Powell, Photo: The Guardian

We are cursed with a corrupt DoJ, the US Department of Justice. For all of the 20th century, and now more than a fifth of the 21st (where does the time go?), this entity harmed the nation. It did so by sins of omission as surely as commission.

So what is the DoJ? It is headed by the US Attorney General. President George Washington appointed the first AG in 1789, Edmund Randolph whose Virginia Plan had been used in the design of the US Constitution. Randolph was a thinker, trying to keep the government balanced. It is hard to think of any recent AGs giving a hoot about that.

So what do they give a hoot about? My guess is that they, along with the president, are obeying someone who is not an elected leader but a behind-the-scenes operator. What a pity. They should be helping the president fulfill the Article II obligation “He shall take care that the laws are faithfully executed.”

Not until 1870 did we have a DoJ. See DoJ's organizational chart in Appendix 5. That department grew to have within it an Office of Legal Counsel, to advise the president, a Solicitor General, to argue the government's side in court cases, the FBI, and regional US Attorneys. The DoJ's website says “Its attorneys represent the rights and interests of the people.”

Could have fooled me! A main activity of the US Attorney is to prosecute, *and to prevent prosecution*. I think the following is a reasonably accurate description of what the DoJ does: It goes after the little guy both for crime and for regulatory violations; but makes sure, 100% sure, that anyone who is “favored” by The Powers That Be won't receive punishment for anything.

Former US Attorney Sidney Powell opines that the problem became crucial under federal judges appointed in the 1980s. Ronald Reagan was president but he was, I think, fronting for his vice president, George HW Bush. The following quote is from page 401 of Sidney Powell's 2014 book, *Licensed To Lie*:

“Our system of justice is crying for a cultural change. We must return to a system in which prosecutors seek justice more than headlines and in which judges are willing to judge. Our Founding Fathers created three separate but equal branches of government. They intended the federal courts to serve as a check and balance on the executive branch, which runs the prosecutions. Judges are the immediate and most meaningful check on wrongful prosecutions and the misconduct of prosecutors.”

What about the foolish fear a judge may have if he or she does the “wrong” thing? In regard to Sandy Hook, if my hypothesis is correct (no deaths), judges would be afraid to do justice. Now, corruption is taken for granted. I quote Tom Jefferson:

“We are to guard against ourselves; not against ourselves as we are, but as we may be; for who can imagine what we may become under circumstances not now imaginable?” -- from a letter to Jedidiah Morse, in 1822.

“[When] corruption ... [has] so familiarized itself as that men otherwise honest could look on it without horror... [then we must] be alive to the suppression of this odious practice and... bring to punishment and brand with eternal disgrace every man guilty of it, whatever be his station.”
-- from a letter to WCC Claiborne, 1804

The Chickenization of America and the Media

The main culprit in the Sandy Hook hoax, if hoax it be, was the mainstream media. You can go to YouTube even now and see clips from all the major networks recorded on the very day, 14 December 2012 and following weeks. How is it that the media is able to get away with wholesale lies, and fake news?

In her TED talk about “the chickenization of America,” law professor Zephyr Teachout shows how major industries -- food production, pharmaceuticals, finance, media and others, have become monopolies. All parts merge horizontally and vertically. So, if you are a chicken farmer, you have to agree to use the one and only distribution system and buy the one and only brand of equipment or of chickenfeed.

Worse, when you sign the contract to deliver your chickens to Perdue, you may not see in the fine print that you are agreeing to settle any dispute not in a court but in arbitration, where the arbitrators too have been chickenized.

The media, Teachout says, have destroyed journalism. They are able to reach so many people, and are wealthy enough to drub out any challengers, that they can publish anything at all.

Can “Sherman” Limit the Scope of Media Corporations?

Let's not forget that state legislatures are the grantors of the charters of corporations and can pass laws to restrict them! In fact, centuries ago when the first corporations arose, they did so by getting a charter for showing what they would contribute to society in exchange for the special privilege of limited liability. I don't see any reason why that could not be reinstated.

In any case, even once a corporation has become huge, the federal government can act to reduce its size under the

Sherman Anti-trust Act. It is a short act, still in force, since 1890. This is the full text of it:

“Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any contract or engage in any combination or conspiracy hereby declared to be illegal shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$100,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$1,000,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.”

One corporation can sue another under this Act, and the DoJ can bring prosecutions. It is said that the Anti-trust Division of the DoJ just twiddles its prosecutory thumbs. This could be turned around instantly if we had a non-corrupt DoJ.

A point that Zephyr Teachout makes in her book *Break 'em Up* (2020) is that the power of the corporation directly curtails free politics via a horrendous Supreme Court decision, made 5-4, in *Citizens United v Federal Election Commission* (2010). That case was about the amount of money corporations can give to political candidates. It's unlimited.

Still, it has been found that private persons, using “dark money” are the biggest contributors to campaigns. Activists at the website OpenSecrets.org traced the first decade of the new law, 2010 to 2020: The 10 most generous donors and their spouses **injected \$1.2 billion into federal elections** over the last decade.... Election-related spending from non-party independent groups **ballooned to \$4.5 billion** over the decade. It totaled just \$750 million over the two decades prior.

I have twice run for Congress and can say that unless a candidate starts with millions of dollars in her coffers, she does not stand any chance of even getting “name recognition.”

Chapter 17. What Can the Guarantee Clause Guarantee?

(published November 8, 2021)



George

Washington addresses his colleagues in Convention Hall in 1787

What could the Framers of the US Constitution have been thinking in that hot summer of 1787 when they offered to protect each state as a republic? They wrote in Article IV:

The United States shall **guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government**, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence. [Emphasis added]

Maybe they were thinking of Connecticut in the 21st Century!

What if any state gets taken over by thugs, or by extremists fostering some sort of a cult, or by a subtle band of thieves who are able to nestle inconspicuously into government positions?

We can concentrate on the first part of “the guarantee clause,” as it is called -- the bit before the semicolon. The nation will protect a state against invasion. If the invaders are heavily armed, *and boy are today's invaders heavily armed*, what options are there for concerted action? This chapter looks at both violent and non-violent responses that are eminently legal.

Oops, I just hopped over to Google Scholar (source of links to journals), and typed “Guarantee Clause, Article IV.” I am dismayed to read, in a 1993 article by Edward Stelzer, that the US Supreme Court considers cases about this clause to be non-justiciable under its doctrine of “the political question.” But I like Stelzer's heading: “Bearing the Judicial Mantle: State Enforcement of the Guarantee Clause.” Yipee!

Instead of analyzing the jurisprudence, or lack thereof, regarding Article IV, let's look more generally at the means available for someone, anyone, to crack down on the depriving of a state of a republican form of government.

Consider Sandy Hook. Imagine that the people, most of whom would like to be freed from the burden of maintaining a great lie, are held in a sort of psychological trap based on fear. Question: Can other states run in and save CT? Can you personally, right now, march in and do something? If armed forces of Connecticut yell “Stay out,” could you invoke Article IV? The answer must be Yes because there it is in black and white. The Framers of the Constitution didn't put it there for no reason. (I realize the case at hand is a bit crazy, but...)

Legality and Constitutionality of Defying Authority

I believe we are biologically geared up to obey. As Thomas Jefferson wrote in a letter to Edward Carrington in 1788, “The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground.” Who has the guts to face a man wearing a badge and carrying not only a gun but the respect of most of the people? It's difficult -- but it has been done.

Anyway, *you* are “wearing a badge” when you act in defense of the Constitution. And the Constitution has higher authority than bad (nullifiable) laws. At the time of the founding of the United States, people took a position on the subject of blind obedience to authority. The proper authority in 1775 was King George III of Britain.

It was decided that he was doing a bad job. Here is an abridged version of “where we told him he could go”:

IN CONGRESS, July 4, 1776.

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America,

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. —That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,

—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

...[W]hen a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.... The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world....

Please stick with me through this chapter's material. If you think it is hard to follow, that's because it is inherently stacked: we have a subconscious loyalty to our tribe. As Americans the tribe means America. We can join up emotionally whenever someone tells us that X or Y is the enemy, but when we hear compatriots criticize our nation or its leaders, we get defensive.

So, today, when it is a fact that Americans are harming us, we are not well prepared to try to rouse our countrymen against our countrymen! (Note how cleverly Jefferson, penning the Declaration of Independence, construed the king as enemy.) Let me give two historic examples of internal conflict -- the Whiskey Rebellion of 1792 and Hurricane Katrina of 2005.

In western Pennsylvania some producers of whiskey disagreed with being taxed. They fought against tax collectors even to the point of tarring and feathering one. I quote from history.com: "On September 11, 1791, excise officer Robert Johnson was riding through his collection route in western Pennsylvania. [They] stripped him naked and then tarred and feathered him before stealing his horse and abandoning him in the forest."

George Washington called out the militia, with Congress's say-so per Article I, section 8, Clause 15, and rode out with 12,000 troops to put down the rebellion. He justified this with the following section of a now-repealed law:

"Whenever the laws of the United States shall be opposed or the execution thereof obstructed in any **state by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings** ... it shall be lawful for the President to call forth the militia of such state to suppress such combinations and to **cause the laws to be duly executed**. And if the militia of a state shall refuse or be insufficient... it shall be lawful for the President, if the legislature of the United States shall not be in session, to call forth and employ such numbers of the militia of any other state... or states most convenient thereto as may be necessary."

I have bolded the phrases most relevant to us today. There is a large *combination* governing us, sub rosa. You could call it “the Establishment.” It seems to include corporations, part of the military, finance, medicine, and astonishingly, Academia. These must be the organizers of the Sandy Hook hoax and many other such hoaxes. They are doing us in. It's up to any citizen to think of ways to get around their terrific combined power.

My other example is Hurricane Katrina. Very likely this event was geo-engineered. Part of the plan was for a precedent-setting federal takeover, but Louisiana Gov Kathleen Blanco held firm against President Bush's efforts to nationalize the LA Guard. I mention it because the president *did* bow to the law!

Getting the Baddies. Trust me when I say it's all about getting the baddies. I'll repeat that sentence: [The solution] is all about getting the baddies. How do I know that the solution is not about spreading love, or electing a different Party's leader, or undergoing some transhumanist alteration? I know because I can see how clearly it is the baddies who “do in” our otherwise good system.

THE problem is that we don't get the baddies. We don't charge them with crime. We “forgive” them. It is natural to forgive elite types. We subconsciously prefer to do that. After all, it's natural to be embarrassed about their wrongdoing. We automatically rationalize it. “It's not there. All is well.”

Wouldn't you agree that today's policemen are completely unmotivated to chase after the people who do hoaxes? It is part of their training to keep on chasing after small-time criminals. Where there is a huge crime going on, such as the CIA's importing of crack cocaine in the 1980s, or Big Pharma's giving injections of poison, cops are told to send the matter upstairs to specialists in the force. That specialist specializes in coverup. No worries if the coverup includes killing a whistleblower or two. That's show biz.

Back to the Guarantee Clause in Article IV. The US Constitution can be interpreted not only as black-letter-law but as incorporating -- and thereby solidifying -- society's values. Indeed, the US Supreme Court has often made its ruling based on the spirit of the dear parchment. Article IV's guarantee clause promises that if any State stops being a republic, society will come to the rescue of the people of that state.

The clause can readily be interpreted to mean: "Hey, we, your Founding Fathers were not born yesterday. We've seen human nature for what it is. We know it would not take much for a secret group to use its wits to cancel the people's right. They'd install their own little tyranny -- and scare everyone by shows of ruthlessness -- just like ol' Machiavelli said in 1532."

Therefore, your response to today's takeover of the US by the globalists can deploy the heartfelt message of Article IV in new ways. In my 2021 book *Keep the Republic, Kill the Takeover*, I listed methods that are already on the books as to legal ways of reacting. Here are some that most people aren't aware of:

- **citizen's arrest** for felonies that have been or are about to be committed
 - **law of outlawry** for persons who are beyond the law (it is open season to kill them)
 - the ability to hold, without criminal charge, **a person who has information** we need, per the federal Material Witness Act
 - the ability of citizens to **form a grand jury** to investigate and, if appropriate, indict any criminal
 - the **duty** of cops and soldiers to **disobey illegal orders**
 - the ordinary **law of self-defense**: If someone is about to kill you or seriously injure you or a person close to you, you may use force, including lethal force, against them.
 - your right to start a **truth commission** or committee
 - your state's right to **nullify** an unconstitutional law
 - your right to file a lawsuit, including a civil **RICO** suit.
- Swearda God, all of these are enshrined in black-letter-law.

Enactments. My *Keep* book also suggested *new* legislation:

1. I suggest a law to demand that any whistleblower death be treated as top priority crime even when proof is unavailable:

3. I would repeal the 1986 National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act that exempts vaccine-makers from liability.

4. I would cancel the odd provision that makes the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, accountable to no one.

5. I would add to the UCMJ a provision that allows a soldier not to take a vaccination. They get very over-vaccinated.

6. I'd reinstate the Smith-Mundt Act which got repealed in the 2012 NDAA. We need it as it declares that US government mustn't propagandize us (as in the Sandy Hook hoax).

7. I would enact a law that all judge and legislators, must swear as to their status as a member of a secret society.

8. I would enact a law to criminalize menticide.

10. I would establish a time limit in which the DoJ must act to enforce the Sherman Anti-trust Act -- or else.

12. I would abolish the tax-haven routine.

13. I would deal with the dismantling of the National Guard Bureau and its outrageous Partners for Peace program that causes foreign troops to be here on US soil to "get" us.

14. I would remove us from the World Health Organization (what a joke!), and from the elite's private military, "NATO."

15. I'd impeach many federal judges and SCOTUS justices.

16. I would refer all living attorneys general to the ... AG!

Chapter 18. The Iconic Photo and Suborning of Perjury



Photo by Shannon Hicks of the Newtown Bee, said to have been taken on the day, sent around the world as illustrating the evacuation

I think there is sufficient evidence, in the form of photographs, that the so-called iconic photo is not an evacuation photo. For example, there is a photo below in which the policewoman, Rachael Van Ness, touches the arm of a girl in a pale jersey, who is *not in the iconic photo*. In this photo, we can see other kids who aren't crying and don't look like they are in a conga line.



'pale jersey'

I hate working from pictures, as I can't know who may have fiddled with them. But in this case the *Newtown Bee* photographer Shannon Hicks does say that the iconic picture is her work.

In Jim Fetzer's book *Nobody Died*, p 307, James Tracy prints an email from photographer Ms Hicks dated March 25, 2013. Tracy had queried if she had any other photos. She replied:

“The photos I took on 12/14 have not been shared with anyone ... We have no plans to do so, either. I would appreciate it if you consider this our final contact. I have enough work to do without getting involved in the kind of ‘research’ that continues to hurt those who live in Newtown.”

Was There Perjury?

Thanks to a commenter named Bob at GumshoeNews.com, I have seen the statement that the policewoman made, under oath. I believe she is Rachael Van Ness, a sergeant detective, Number 1431. The form she signed was countersigned by her supervising sergeant, Number 130, dated 3/16/2013. She specifically swore that she attended some children in the parking lot and that they were frightened and crying. Oddly she said she walked *at the back* of the line of kids. See Appendix 2 in this book. Please consider also that on the famous day there would not just have been a few first-graders coming out of the building; there were 469 older kids. Officer Van Ness mentions that she saw two girls; one may have had a “cardiac issue.”

If the evacuation really happened, then no perjury is involved. If she did *not* see children really crying, then her statement looks to me like perjury. Under Connecticut law, section 53a-156:

Perjury: Class D felony. (a) A person is guilty of perjury if, in any official proceeding, he intentionally, under oath, makes a false statement, swears, affirms or testifies falsely, to a material statement which he does not believe to be true.

Can You Perjure If It Was a Drill?

Now let's talk about the possibility that the December 14th event was a drill in which all participants -- teachers, parents,

cops, media photographers -- were told that they should simply do as one does, quite legally, in a drill. Moms should run around screaming “My child is missing”-- in a proper drill this would not be a lie. If a 20-year-old boy went racing through the classrooms with a gun (unloaded), that too would be OK.

The US Department of Homeland Security arranges drills, and some states, including Connecticut, have a homeland security agency. One citizen, Wolfgang Halbig, and probably others, sent requests to the government under the Freedom of Information Act, asking about various things. The government did not reply that a drill was occurring at Sandy Hook that day.

Now let us consider one further possibility, the one that the late Robert David Steele presents in his book *Sandy Hook Truth*. He says that he himself, as a CIA agent, had managed a false-flag operation for the agency. The deal was that all participants were promised immunity from prosecution as some sort of law had been passed, which “legalized lying” for national security.

The question for Connecticut personnel today is: **who (allegedly) issued such an immunity?**

I have already claimed, in Chapter 11, that there is no such federal law. There was an easing up on the prohibiting of propaganda coming from such overseas broadcasters as the Voice of America. It appeared as part of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012. That law says nothing about legalized lying. No one is allowed to create a false story about a murder of children. Give me a break.

If members of the Connecticut police have knowingly signed under oath that they did such-and-such, or saw such-and-such on December 14, 2012, describing drill-type activity as reality when they knew it was a drill, that is perjury. I presume they **knew** they were committing perjury, even if they had been given the crazy excuse that lying has been legalized.

The Suborning of Perjury

It's not only humans that the law protects. The law also protects the law. It protects justice. The obstruction of justice is a crime which carries a prison sentence. Most states rely on the common law in this area (I call it Blackstonian law). Federally, it is codified at 18 USC 1503. Obstructing justice means messing up judicial proceedings by an act that

“corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice.”

It includes such things as planting evidence, bribing jurors, or threatening a whistleblower, or tampering with a witness. It includes not only perjury but the suborning of perjury.

If members of the police in Newtown Connecticut, in a rather organized way, committed perjury by conjuring up a false story of a Sandy Hook massacre, it is very likely that a higher-up member of government suborned -- i.e., recruited -- their perjury. This could have been done by bribery, intimidation, or any other means. Suborning is punishable by imprisonment.

Needless to say, it will be very helpful to all of us if we sort this out. Everyone always says “You won't be able to penetrate the mystery of who ordered it, as that person's name is never to be known. He is too high up.”

Nonsense. You go with the army you have, as Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld once said. You start with persons whose job description makes them answerable for things like the Sandy Hook affair. Eric Holder was US Attorney General in December 2012. Start with Eric Holder. Daniel Malloy was governor of Connecticut. Start with Daniel Malloy. You could ask Rachael Van Ness to put the squeeze on those two persons.

Chapter 19. Law Always Provides a Remedy (*published November 11, 2021*)



Code of Hammurabi, King of Babylon, 1770 BCE, Photo: ancient pages.com Example: “If someone is too lazy to keep their dam in proper condition, and then the dam ruptures and all fields are flooded, the land whose dam the rupture occurred in will be sold for money, and the money must replace the corn it caused to be ruined.”

The maxims of law are high principles from centuries ago that are available as guidance for judges. Some are definitions of law itself: *Lex est dictamen rationis* -- “Law is the dictate of reason,” and *Lex respicit aequitatem* -- “Law pays regard to equity.”

Another maxim is *Lex semper dabit remedium* -- “Law always provides a remedy.” I believe that's the purpose of the legal system -- to sort out our conflicts and bring justice. In this chapter I will consult the law of the land to see what's available. Chapter 6 already provided some facts about statutes of limitations. Chapter 10 held forth on extrinsic fraud and equity. Chapter 18 dealt with perjury and the suborning thereof, under the heading of obstruction of justice. The game here is to pretend that it has already been determined by a court that the Sandy Hook massacre *was* a hoax.

Punishing Fraud. We will look at financial fraud first, as it is comparatively simple. Anyone who collected a donation on the basis of being a victim of the massacre (or a bereaved person),

but who was not actually a victim or bereaved, can be punished. Some money came in via the United Way, and some from Facebook pages or other personal advertisements. There were also trips made by the bereaved to attend functions sponsored by government or by charitable organization. Expenses paid to the traveler were perhaps frauds against the payer.

The largest potential donation to be made to the families is the \$33 million that has so far been offered by the maker of the gun in *Soto et al v Remington/Bushmaster*. If it gets paid out, and if Sandy Hook was a hoax, the plaintiffs could be charged with the crime of fraud and perhaps extortion.

Larceny. Under Connecticut General Statutes 53a-119

(6) Defrauding of public community. A person is guilty of defrauding a public community who (A) authorizes, certifies, attests or files a claim for benefits or reimbursement from a local, state or federal agency which he knows is false; or (B) knowingly accepts the benefits from a claim he knows is false.

(5) Extortion. A person obtains property by extortion when he compels or induces another person to deliver ... by means of instilling in him a fear that, if the property is not so delivered, the actor or another will: (A) Cause physical injury to some person in the future; ... (D) accuse some person of a crime or **cause criminal charges to be instituted** against him; or (E) expose a secret or publicize an asserted fact, whether true or false, tending to subject some person to hatred, contempt or ridicule; ... or (H) use or abuse his position as a public servant by performing some act within or related to his official duties, or by failing or refusing to perform an official duty, in such manner as to affect some person adversely... [Emphasis added]

Other ‘Sandy Hook crimes’ will now be considered briefly: conspiring to commit crime, destruction of property, misprision, homicide, child abuse, slavery, moral neglect, abuse

of process, threatening a whistleblower, obstruction of interstate commerce, tampering with a witness, terrorism, imposture, and menticide.

Conspiring to commit crime. This may sound like a weak crime, but it could cover a lot. If I'm right that the whole event was planned years in advance, a huge number of people were in conspiracy. It also makes one think of the RICO law which could be used to prosecute the fraudsters in one giant hit. Section 393 of Connecticut law replaces RICO with CORA: Corrupt Organization and Racketeering Activities Act. The persons who conspire can be punished even if the plan fails.

Destruction of Property. I have in mind the razing of the house at 36 Yogananda St, Newtown. As such it is not a crime -- you can order your home razed if you wish. But this seems to have been ordered by government as part of the buildup of the case (the media trial) of Adam Lanza. Or to hide evidence. Ahem. *Contra spoliatorem, omnia praesumuntur.*

Neighbors supposedly indicated a wish to have the house removed. A bank is said to have handed the mortgage to the city. Next thing you know, a demolition team -- who would normally charge at least \$15,000 for such a job -- offered to do it for free. Nothing has been published as to how much equity Nancy Lanza had in the house or whether she left a will!

Misprision. This is an old-fashioned crime, meaning you did not do your duty of keeping your society on the up and up. Federally it is codified at 18 USC 4:

“Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and **does not as soon as possible make known** the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.” [Emphasis added]

I recommend that when you want to report a crime to the police, and they try to dismiss you, just read them 18 USC 4.

Homicide. This is an easy one, and it has no statute of limitations. One person kills another. So who killed Adam Lanza? or Nancy Lanza? Is either of them really dead? Under Connecticut penal code, murder is the intentional killing of another person, punishable by up to 60 years in prison and up to \$20,000 in fines. The minimum sentence served is 25 years.

Child abuse. No doubt in my mind it was child abuse to make all those kids lie. (That is, assuming my hypothesis is correct.) But I didn't expect I could nail it down as a Connecticut crime. Aha, yes, I can! In Chapter 939, Offenses against the Person, we find: sec 53-21 (a) Any person who willfully or unlawfully:

permits any child under the age of sixteen years to be placed in such a situation that the life or limb of such child is endangered, the health of such child is likely to be injured or the morals of such child are likely to be impaired, **or does any act likely to impair the health or morals of any such child ...** such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of which five years of the sentence imposed may not be suspended

Slavery. Any child made to do immoral things for an adult by coercion is acting as a slave. Thanks to the Thirteenth Amendment to the US Constitution, slavery is a crime. See 18 USC 1589: “(a)Whoever knowingly provides or obtains the labor or services of a person ... (4) by means of any ... pattern intended to cause the person to believe that, if that person did not perform such labor or services, that person or another person would suffer serious harm or physical restraint, shall be (d) imprisoned not more than 20 years. (This applies to adult as well as child slavery, of course.)

Moral Neglect. The following is not part of the penal code but of the Child Protection Service, re issues of child custody.

Moral neglect is: Exposing, allowing, or encouraging the child to engage in illegal or reprehensible activities by the person responsible for the child's health, welfare or care or person given access or person entrusted with the child's care. Evidence of Moral Neglect includes but is not limited to: stealing, using drugs..., and involving a child in the commission of a crime...

(Note: per Keith Harmon Snow's book *In the Worst Interests of the Child*, Connecticut courts do terrible things to children.)

Abuse of process comes to mind in regard to the aforementioned slavery. Who gave the orders? Did a police chief order his men to speak of the event as if it really happened? I suppose that is abuse of power. Perhaps it is also abuse of process but that crime is generally connected to the judicial process -- to bring a false prosecution is abuse of process.

Punishing malicious prosecution is done by civil action. I have not so far learned of anyone being prosecuted at all in connections with Sandy Hook. If, however, there is a malicious prosecution, one can look to the 2008 Connecticut case of *Giannamore v. Shevchuk*, where: the CT Supreme Court ruled:

“In a malicious prosecution action, the defendant is said to have acted with malice if he acted primarily for an improper purpose; that is, **for a purpose other than that of securing the proper adjudication of the claim** on which [the proceedings] are based...” [Emphasis added]

Moreover, “if the evidence supports a finding of a lack of probable cause, the fact finder reasonably may conclude that the defendant acted with malice.”

Tampering with a Witness. Under Connecticut General Statutes, sec 53a-151, this is a Class C felony:

“a) A person is guilty of tampering with a witness if, believing that an official proceeding is pending or about to be instituted, he induces or attempts to induce a witness to testify falsely, withhold testimony, elude legal process summoning him ...”

That law should have the effect of encouraging Connecticut state employees to yield up the needed information.

Obstruction of Interstate Commerce. There are many federal laws against a free flow of commerce over state borders, for example, the one that covers insurance: 18 USC 1033

(a) (1)Whoever is engaged in the business of insurance ... and with the intent to deceive, makes any false material statement or report or willfully and materially overvalues any land, property or security— **(2)** The punishment for an offense under paragraph (1) is a fine or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both,

Whoever is engaged in the business of insurance and whose activities affect interstate commerce or is involved (other than as an insured or beneficiary under a policy of insurance) in a transaction relating to the conduct of affairs of such a business, knowingly makes any false entry of material fact in any book, report, or statement of such person engaged in the business of insurance with intent to deceive any person,
... shall be punished as provided in paragraph (2).

Terrorism. I think the entire nation was assaulted by the Sandy Hook story of a massacre. All parents would have added a new worry to their list of worries, even if only subconsciously. Their kid is away all day at school -- maybe something terrible is happening. Just look up 18 USC 2332 on terrorism.

(1) activities that **(A)** involve violent acts or acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the US

or of any State.... **(B)**appear to be intended—to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; **(ii)** to influence the policy ...

Providing financial support to terrorists is also a crime. Ahem.

Threatening a whistleblower. From the website cga.ct.gov:

Connecticut's whistleblower law, like other state laws and the federal law, provides a process for public employees to disclose information about a statutory or code violation, mismanagement, abuse of authority, or waste of public funds, among other things. The law protects these whistleblowers by making it illegal for other employees, officers, or appointing authorities to take any personnel action against them in retaliation for their disclosure of improper activities.


Menticide and Imposture. These last two crimes to be discussed are, *pro tem*, mere figments of my imagination.

By *menticide* I mean the killing of a mind. I am pretty sure that this is a major goal of the persons who do false flags. They put out a crazy media story, and drum it into everyone's brain. They also leak some material to paid conspiracy theorists to publicize in a way that will bring disrespect to the notion of investigating. Minds get killed when the whole procedure is too complicated, and you just give up on searching for truth.

By *imposture* I am referring to an overarching situation that exists today. I think the globalists, the monopoly corporations and the zillionaires have bought out all governments, federal and state, and all courts. Because of this, it is fair to look at any public servant and see not the job they claim to hold, but instead to see them as impostors holding that job.

Applying the concepts of criminal menticide and imposture to Sandy Hook, it looks as though almost everyone is a criminal. We need to put a stop to this.

Chapter 20. A Mind Is a Terrible Thing To Waste



University of Rochester Medical Center: "Through the transplantation of human glial cells we can effectively achieve re-myelination in the adult brain"

When I was commuting to high school in Boston, I would see, every day on the wall of the subway train, two more or less permanent ads. One had a picture of Smokey Bear saying "Only you can prevent forest fires." The other, an ad for the Negro College Fund, said "A mind is a terrible thing to waste."

I found out only much later that those two ads, inappropriately located, were "public service ads." A law required that space be given to such charities. Apparently the Ad Council made sure the space was not taken up (in the 1960s) by what would today appear on the Internet -- spontaneous community stuff. Everything had to be controlled. And we were not to have a clue that this was being done. We assumed Smokey the Bear was really giving good advice about forest fires -- in Boston?

This book is about the mind being "a terrible thing to waste." Human society needs the brains of its members in order to function properly. Yet some are devoted to making our brains work poorly, *en masse*. I never looked into the Sandy Hook 2012 massacre until 2021; I assumed it was, like Dunblane, a real event. How many other things that I think are true are really nonsense? Lying has been so blatant in regard to Covid that millions of people now feel hopeless about "truth."

America is supposed to be a republic where the people decide what is good policy. I am sure this is technically possible -- I argue for it in my book *Keep the Republic, Kill the Takeover*. But it's thwarted by psy-ops and by the big program of miseducation conducted in schools, as elucidated by Charlotte Iserbyt in her book *Deliberate Dumbing Down*. (Free online.)

Please join me in decrying Sandy Hook as a disgrace to the very purpose of America. *Even if I'm wrong* that it was a hoax, even if the tragedy *did* occur, the CT government has outrageously kept information under lock and key. Persons have gone to court to force the matter, but *judges back the government every time*. Note: I think that the judiciary is killing all of law.

A mind is a terrible thing to waste. We need to get cracking today on restoring good methods of science, courtroom justice, and legislative inquiry. If persons holding office don't or won't or can't do it, we'll have to set up ad hoc means, such as citizen-led grand juries.

The current grand-jury system is in breach of the Seventh Amendment "No person shall be held to answer... unless on presentment or indictment of a grand jury." In Appendix 7 below, you can see Connecticut's undermining of this.

Message to Young Readers:

Did you notice the number of times this book referenced the wisdom of past thinkers? Do you imagine that they had something that you don't have? No way. All humans have the same brain. The early Americans weren't shy to use theirs! They also were pleased to show off their virtue -- no kidding; moral character was highly prized, and it brought fame. Being outed as a cheat was something to be avoided at all costs.

That was society's way of saying we need norms of personal restraint. The ability to reside in a good setting will always depend on there being a comfortable structure in which to be

helpful to others and get help. (You don't think you get help? Oh, who put the water in the taps? Who services your bus?)

Today we're not supposed to know that society is a real entity. Margaret Thatcher famously said "There are only individuals." Wrong; that point of view that does not accord with biology - *H sapiens* is a social species. However, a viewpoint can alter everyone's behavior. I quote Lionel Tiger's *The Manufacture of Evil*, (1987; 137) about the popularity of self-help books:

"The mechanism of individualism remains, the mechanism of a questing creature seeking more and better experience, not content with the great chain of being.... This is colorful and surely often fun [but] it results in a quite striking, perhaps novel form of society in which there is hardly a full-throated society at all but rather what I call a "psychiety'."

What kind of society do you wish for? Please vote for one that has the major values that have made for happiness and a decent life. Those major values must have come from the brains of many thinkers and doers. We were taught that the ancient Greeks more or less invented "reasoning." Just by talking about it, Aristotle et al donated it to the subsequent generations. How foolish to let it go out of style on a whim.

Truth. Besides the effort that is being made to rid us of social feeling, and reasoning, a huge effort is underway to get us to devalue truth. Today, in regard to the Covid vaccination, the government is lying to a ludicrous extent. But that's a "value." See? They not only get you to take a dangerous shot, they show how far they'll disregard the sober facts and make wild claims.

Dishonesty will be praised. The goal, I believe, is to up-end society. Our day-to-day survival, especially in a modern city, depends on honesty. People need to follow rules and to know what the other guy is getting up to. Truth is essential.

End of the Line for Humans? Teach Kids To Lie, a review of Gail Heyman's item at Theconversation.com Nov 8, 2021

Was I ever amazed to see someone say without criticism that there is now a way to find out how 3-year-olds learn to lie, and that lying is “a developmental milestone.” I do understand that lying is part of intelligence-- we always try to appear our best, we shrink from admitting guilt, and we may want to steal furtively.

Gail Heyman admits that lying has costs, such as the strain of remembering what you lied about! “Lies undermine relationships, organizations and institutions.” Yep, they do and that is a problem for all of us today. “However,” she writes, “the ability to lie and engage in other forms of deception is also a source of great social power, as it allows people to shape interactions in ways that serve their interests.” She reports a experiment in deception where a kid was told to hides a treat under one of two cups:

“We found that, as expected, when children first started playing the game most of them made no effort to deceive, and lost to the experimenter every time. However, within the next few sessions most children discovered how to deceive in order to win the game – and **after their initial discovery they used deception consistently**. The experimenter noted that a theory of mind is needed “because when children lie, they intentionally communicate information that differs from what they themselves believe.” And they **must learn to “stop themselves from blurting out the truth** when they try to lie.” In this study, at U Cal San Diego, we learn “**By mastering these skills**, they gain the power **to help shape social narratives** in ways that can have far-reaching consequences for themselves and for others.”

-- I say humans are instinctively selfish and have the ability to hit, steal, etc. But they get trained out of it by parents and teachers. The two facts are compatible: human nature and social inventions to control actions that harm others. Is it now OK to chuck all that out and say “Go ahead, lie when it is beneficial to you?” This is a Sandy Hook issue: Truth is a huge value; don't throw it out

The Sandy Hook affair not only includes the false story of a massacre; it has other bits which, by design, look crazy. Nancy Lanza's house was senselessly demolished -- that is meant to leave you scratching your head. Nothing makes sense.

Did you read the previous page, about the ability to deceive others being a *milestone* in a child's life? Betcha five dollars that's the opening salvo of a new scheme. Kids will be seen as malfunctioning if they don't master a technique for deceiving. They'll have to get therapy if they're inclined towards honesty.

In fact the many kids who were told to play the false narrative of Sandy Hook look to me, on YouTube, as if they are proud of doing so. I have already said that it will be necessary to offer pardons for what has happened in this drama. But pardoning those children isn't enough -- they deserve an apology! They could even ask for compensation.

To wrap up the twenty chapters of this book: the Sandy Hook massacre thankfully did not happen. But a lot of bad came from the story. Citizens began to believe that no place is safe, not even a classroom in elementary school. The much-prized right of Americans to bear arms is now in tatters. The practice of journalistic investigation of a crime also got squelched. Have we -- as Aldous Huxley so presciently "foresaw" -- come to love our servitude?

Recall Robert Steele's revelation that when he was in the CIA, he managed a false-flag operation in which he assured people that lying had been legalized. He also told them there would be severe penalties if they did not do the requisite fakery.

We don't need to put up with this, do we?

ADDENDUM

Commentary on the courts' and litigants' handling of matters related to Sandy Hook, as of November 10, 2021.

So far, the courts in three states -- Connecticut, Alabama, and Wisconsin -- have had opportunities to deal with genuine facts about the alleged December 14, 2012 massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary School (hereinafter, 'SHES'). Sadly, they have instead been silent in this regard, choosing to “play the game.”

I am aware of three types of cases that have come up. **The first was for wrongful dismissal from employment:** Professor James Tracy sued Florida Atlantic University for firing him.




As I showed in Chapter 4 of this book, Tracy claimed that the University fired him because he had written on his blog that the massacre was most likely a hoax. The firing could have been overcome on First Amendment grounds -- that Americans have the right to publish their ideas. However, the Defendant, the University, asserted it had the right to fire Tracy because he failed to fill out a form to disclose his outside blogging activities.

Tracy refused to complete the forms because his Union representative told him he should insist on the same treatment as all other faculty members (none were required to report about their blogs).

The second type were lawsuits for damages based on defamation. Various relatives of alleged decedents, including Leonard Pozner and Neil Heslin and one injured person (not sure of the name) sued broadcasters and writers, including Alex Jones and James Fetzer, PhD for saying that the SHES deaths did not occur. In particular, Leonard Pozner said that he had been called a liar by virtue of the

fact that Fetzer said the death certificate Pozner submitted to him and another author, for his son Noah, is fake. Fetzer is the editor of many books.



The Wisconsin Appellate Court affirmed the trial court finding of defamation in favor of Pozner against Dr. Fetzer. He has now filed a Petition for Review in Wisconsin Supreme Court on (August 6, 2021), asserting that Pozner was obligated to prove the SHES massacre occurred as a condition precedent to a determination of “Was the death certificate Leonard Pozner submitted for his child genuine”?

During preliminary hearings, Judge Frank D. Remington, of the Wisconsin Circuit Court, ruled that it was not necessary to determine the truth of “did the massacre occur” to find that Dr. Fetzer had defamed Leonard Pozner by calling the child’s death certificate a fake. I disagree with that decision even though in the face of it, it makes sense. The authenticity of a document, the D/C, can be inquired into on its own merits. Still if the SHES massacre never occurred, the D/C axiomatically is fake.

When Dr. Fetzer submitted two expert opinions that the death certificate was a fake, the Judge simply said those were merely two other opinions that would be considered as just someone’s opinion rather than determinative of had Pozner sufficiently proven the death certificate was genuine (!)

Unfortunately, Dr. Fetzer was a pro se litigant, as he could not find a lawyer to represent him at the outset, and was not aware that he should make a demand for a jury trial. (He has since gained the services of Richard Bolton and William Sumner Scott.) Judge Remington entered a summary judgment that Fetzer had defamed Pozner. The amount of damages was left to a jury. The jury awarded Pozner \$450,000, but Fetzer is appealing this.

The third type of case blamed a gun manufacturer. This was filed in the Connecticut State Superior Court by SHES families in 2014 against Remington Arms, for marketing the military grade Bushmaster AR-15 gun to civilians with no useful civilian purpose. The case is *Soto et al v Bushmaster, et al*.



The Soto et al plaintiffs are the personal representatives of the estates of Victoria L Soto, Dylan Hockley, Mary Joy Sherlach, Noah S Pozner, Lauren E Rousseau, Benjamin A Wheeler, Jesse McCord Lewis, Daniel G Barden and Rachel M D'Avino, along with the husband of Mary Joy Sherlach and an injured survivor.

They sued Bushmaster Firearms International, LLC, for the wrongful death and injuries caused Adam Lanza's use of that weapon by Adam Lanza. Remington Outdoor Company, Inc., a parent company of Bushmaster was also named as Defendant.

The Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss, but only based on the Federal law that excepts liability upon manufacturers for unlawful use of the firearms they lawfully sell. The trial court granted the Motion to Dismiss, but the families appealed this.

The Connecticut Supreme Court, in an interlocutory appeal of the dismissal of the entire case based on the Federal exemption statute, ruled that the issue of the military grade advertising could continue. It remanded the case back to the trial court for further proceedings. If the Remington/Bushmaster advertising was improper, they could be held liable to the Plaintiffs under the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act.

There has also been some interaction between Leonard Pozner's defamation suit against James Fetzer, and the Remington gun case. This is because the Connecticut Supreme Court said, in the Remington appeal, that SHES occurred, and that Adam Lanza was obviously the culprit. The Wisconsin Appellate Court mined

that statement to use against Fetzer when he appealed against having to pay \$450k over the birth certificate matter.

Dr. Fetzer asserted in his Motion for Reconsideration to the Wisconsin Appellate Court, and also in his Petition to the Wisconsin Supreme Court, that the finding by the Connecticut Supreme Court, about Lanza's guilt was *dicta* (i.e., not part of the reasoning of that case, just “musings”), and so should not be used by the Wisconsin courts. The Wisconsin Supreme Court has not yet to decide whether or not it will review the affirmation of the Pozner Judgment against Dr. Fetzer.

Remington filed for the protection of the US bankruptcy code, under Chapter 11, as soon as it heard of the Connecticut Supreme Court ruling that the Federal exemption to litigation did not apply to the marketing of military grade weapons to civilians. Without having filed an answer or taking discovery, against the families, Remington made separate offers of settlement to nine of the Plaintiffs that totaled nearly \$33 million.

Dr Fetzer has been unable to get a Connecticut lawyer to represent him. You would be surprised at how hard it is to land a lawyer to go against the powerful! Upon learning of the settlement offers, Fetzer, pro se, filed a Motion, pro se, to Intervene in the Soto case before the Connecticut Superior Court. He claimed to that the size of the settlement offers make it appear as though the murders occurred. He contended that Remington should put forth a vigorous defense against Soto -- why ever not?

The trial court gave the Soto Plaintiffs ten days to respond to Fetzer's Motion and Remington ten days to reply. Now please reach for your smelling salts: Remington joined in with the Soto Plaintiffs to object to the Fetzer Motion to Intervene. Yes.

Clearly it goes against Remington's self-interest to do that. (I think this counts, straightforwardly, as evidence that not only is the massacre fake, but so is the whole fandangle of *Soto et al.*) If the court granted the intervention by Fetzer, letting him show his wares that prove SHES was a FEMA drill to support gun control,

Remington would save \$33 million that would be made available to pay to its creditors and/or shareholders.

Connecticut Superior Court Judge Barbara N. Bellis denied Dr. Fetzer's Motion. Fetzer then had 30 days to appeal this denial, but he missed the 30-day time requirement. (Give him a break he is 80 years old.) He filed for an extension of time to the Connecticut Superior Court that was denied, although the law provides that *pro se* peeps -- like myself -- should be given a bit of mercy. There is also the dear old maxim *Apices juris non sunt jura* -- the niceties of the law are not the law. Ah, them's were the days.

Now (November 10, 2021) Fetzer has a Motion before the Connecticut Appellate Court, for permission to file his appeal late.

Now for **the bankruptcy case**, in which Fetzer is also trying to make his presence known. He says the Bankrupt Estate was obliged to obtain Bankruptcy Court approval prior to making the settlement offers and that the estate (as the half-dead Remington firm is now called) had to make a strong defense.



The Bankruptcy Court lost no time denying Fetzer's Motion to Intervene in its environs. Now, *pro se*, he timely filed an Appeal of that denial to the US District Court for the Northern District of Alabama (Remington's Corporate Domicile). His designation of the record on appeal was filed on November 2, 2021 and that appeal is pending. (Taking bets -- will he win?)

Note: Out of the blue, Remington asked SHES to provide the children's birth certificates and school records. It did so. Then the families asked the court to seal those records Judge Bellis granted that request. Thus the birth, death and other records maintained by the school district will not be in the public record of the case. Faith rules: Jim is now seeking to retain a Connecticut lawyer to represent him if he be granted an appeal of the Soto case and an Alabama lawyer for his appeal in the Bankruptcy matter.

The Wisconsin Court situation has not breathed its last. James Fetzer has used his best efforts to present his defense, initially at trial, pro se, and subsequently on appeal, with aid of legal counsel Richard Bolton from Wisconsin and New Jersey lawyer William Sumner Scott, who appeared pro hac vice, in the defamation suit.

Fetzer asks the following questions in regard to the currently pending Petition for Review to the Wisconsin Supreme Court:

1. Did the circuit court deny Fetzer due process by foreclosing a relevant defense, and an entire theory of the case?
2. Did the circuit court err by summarily holding Fetzer liable for defamation without proof of fault?
3. Does speaker liability, for threats and harassment perpetrated by third parties [as claimed in the media], require proof of incitement? --- etc.

COMMENTS about judicial response in *POZNER v FETZER*, and *SOTO v REMINGTON*



If the US judicial system were functional, there would be ways to discipline judges who stray from the impartial, honest, determination of cases before them. I still dream of this.

Judge Barbara N. Bellis of the state Superior Court, Judicial District of Waterbury, has been the source of the initial decisions concerning Remington Outdoor Company, Inc., the largest firearms manufacturer in America. Remington thought it had won the case when Judge Bellis ruled that the Federal Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, 15 USC 7901, et seq., prevented the Soto claims. The case was dismissed, but as mentioned, the Soto Plaintiffs filed an appeal and Connecticut Supreme Court took jurisdiction.

On March 19, 2019 that state Supreme Court was comprised of Chief Justice Richard A. Robinson, Justice Andrew J. McDonald, Justice Gregory T. D'Auria, Justice Steven D. Eckler, Justice Raheem L. Mullins, Justice Maria Araujo Kahn, Acting Chief Justice Richard N. Palmer.

Justice Palmer retired May 27, 2020, upon reaching the mandatory retirement age. He wrote the Opinion in which Justices McDonald, Mullins and Kahn concurred, that held:

“On December 14, 2012, twenty-year-old Adam Lanza forced his way into Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown and, during the course of 264 seconds [4.4 minutes], fatally shot twenty first grade children and six staff members, and wounded two other staff members. Lanza carried out this massacre using a Bushmaster XM15-E2S semiautomatic rifle that was allegedly manufactured, distributed, and ultimately sold to Lanza's mother by the various defendants in this case. There is no doubt that Lanza was directly and primarily responsible for this appalling series of crimes.”

Judge Frank Remington totally ignored the question Did anyone die at Sandy Hook. He also ignored the two expert opinions that the death certificate was fake. These are serious breaches of applicable rules of law. A finding that no one died at SHES renders the Pozner death certificate that states his son died at SHES a fake. The expert opinions created a sufficient question of fact to require a trial -- it is a proper Controversy.

Thankfully, Justices Robinson did write a dissent, which Justices Vertefeuille and Elgo joined, to distinguish the theory upon which a gun manufacturer can be held liable without disagreement, from the above quoted introductory statement that the Sandy Hook murders occurred, that Lanza did it, using a Bushmaster.

Note: there is no explanation, in the opinion, of why Justices Eckler and D'Auria did not participate, and why non-members Vertefeuille and Elgo were involved in the decision.

The *Soto* opinion stands a good chance to reach the US Supreme Court should Bushmaster preserve its objection to the Connecticut Court pre-emption of the “Federal Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act” at the Connecticut appellate level.

Bushmaster is now controlled by bankruptcy proceedings. As I said, settlement offers, reaching almost \$33 million, were made before Remington filed an answer or sought Discovery. If the Plaintiffs accept these offers, the question of did anyone die at SHES, and the Connecticut State Court preemption of the application of Federal law issue, will die on the vine.

The Fetzer Motion to Intervene, filed in September 2021, put Judge Bellis on notice that both parties in *Soto* were engaged in a sham proceeding before the Court. She has taken no action to make a record of why Remington objected to the Fetzer intervention. Fetzer's argument would have inured to the benefit of Remington, a point that no media outlet can be expected to say.

JUSTICE



Dear Reader, in this book you heard me waffle at first as to whether the 2012 massacre took place, and then you heard me say I have voted for the conspiracy theory. But now for a moment I retreat -- for argument's sake -- to the idea that it all did happen as the Connecticut authorities say it did.

I believe that the defamation case against James Fetzer was handled unjustly and unethically EVEN IF the Sandy Hook massacre is real. He deserves “his day in court.” There is simply no excuse for the judges to act as if there were no controversy regarding the Pozner issue. It was indeed all about the authenticity of the death certificate, or, really, the authenticity of the death.

In the James Tracy firing case, I do not know who prevented James from submitting the faculty senate notes of a key meeting. But again, even a child can see that you can't achieve justice if the person can't access the machinery of justice. Tracy was fired for having exercised his free-speech rights. Sure, an employer has a right to fire, but tenure is granted to professors simply to provide an exception to that. We need our academics to think and speak and not be a bunch of milquetoasts.

Now I revert to my conspiracy stance: the cahoots in which Remington and Soto are engaged is telling of the fact that they can't let Discovery happen. And you know why. The judges are in on that, too, sadly, as are Remington's attorneys and insurers.

So let's look at how this could be dealt with by, say, Sir William Blackstone, author of *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (which made good beach reading around 1769). He would say "It is a crime to assault justice." Definitely it is a black-letter-law crime at 18 USC 1503, but rarely prosecuted.

Sidney Powell roars about it, in her 2014 book *License to Lie* :

"No court ever required the politically powerful former prosecutors to answer for their conduct. No court cared that they capitalized on their misconduct repeatedly. The charges against Weissmann in the New York Bar were 'referred' to the OPR (Office of Professional Responsibility) in the DOJ. That's like giving the fox the key to the chicken house."

Powell says the DOJ opposes Congress's plan to codify the Brady rule of exculpatory evidence so it can keep "the sole discretion to withhold whatever evidence it wants to withhold. It wants an unlimited and unchecked License to Lie." How do you like that?

If the massacre did *not* happen, some court-related personnel have committed the crime of fraud. Let's walk through the possible way for James Fetzer to approach the Court of Equity and be compensated for what he has been through. If that happens, the criminality of court persons would be laid bare.

Court of Equity and Extrinsic Fraud

Here's the skinny on the Court of Equity. Having graduated from Adelaide Law School, where Janie Greene was the professor who taught Equity, I have a British sense of it.

At the queen's coronation, the Archbishop of Canterbury, says “Receive the Royal Sceptre, the ensign of kingly power and justice” and puts the sceptre into her right hand. Then he puts the rod into her left hand and says: “Receive the Rod of equity and mercy. **Be so merciful that you be not too remiss, so execute justice that you forget not mercy.**”



The principles of equity are higher than law. In the American colonies we received equity along with the common law in the 1600s. Unless a court in the US repeals it we've still got it. I can tell we have not repealed it by looking at Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60b. As noted in my chapter on Boston, it says:

“On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: (3) fraud

“On motion” means you have to ask for it to happen. I hope Fetzner moves to do this. (Jargon: he becomes “the movant.”) He can show that he was not allowed to access the court. Granted, was physically in the courtroom but tricks were played, mainly by wordings, to block him out.

He did not get to tell his story (as so often happens today in all sorts of courts, for which I blame the machinations of the law profession. *Quel* disgrace!) Let's turn this around, nationwide. Lookie: we've had form for it since 1878:

Fraud Vitiates Everything -- *US v Throckmorton* (1878):

It is true that the United States is not bound by the Statute of Limitations, as an individual would be. There is no question of the general doctrine that **fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents, and even judgments.**

There is also no question that many rights originally founded in fraud become—by lapse of time, by the difficulty of proving the fraud, and by the protection which the law throws around rights once established by formal judicial proceedings ...according to the methods of the law—no longer open to inquiry in the usual and ordinary methods....

If the court has been mistaken in the law, **there is a remedy by writ of error.** If the jury has been mistaken in the facts, the remedy is by motion for new trial. If there has been evidence discovered since the trial, a motion for a new trial will give appropriate relief.

[See], **there was in fact no adversary trial or decision of the issue in the case.** ... Where the unsuccessful party has been prevented from exhibiting fully his case, by fraud or deception practised on him by his opponent, as by keeping him away from court, a false promise of a compromise; or where the defendant never had knowledge of the suit, being kept in ignorance by the acts of the plaintiff; or **where an attorney fraudulently or without authority assumes to represent a party and connives at his defeat;** or where the attorney regularly employed corruptly sells out his client's interest to the other side,—**these, and similar cases which show that there has never been a real contest in the trial or hearing of the case, are reasons for which a new suit may be sustained to set aside and annul the former judgment or decree, and open the case for a new and a fair hearing.**

In all these cases, and many others..., relief has been granted, on the ground that, by some fraud practised directly upon the party seeking relief against the judgment or decree, that party has been prevented from presenting all of his case to the court.

Mr. Wells, in his very useful work on Res Adjudicata, says, sect. 499: **Fraud vitiates every thing,** and a judgment equally with a contract.... [Emphasis added]

Nolo's Plain-English Law Dictionary defines “extrinsic fraud” as: “Fraudulent acts which keep a person from obtaining information about his or her rights to enforce a contract or getting evidence to defend against a lawsuit”

Consider the difficulty of getting info about Sandy Hook. Folks say “You're a bastard if you ask any questions! People are bereaved!” I am sure that Equity calls for a fresh reading of the *Pozner v Fetzner* defamation suit. No damages should have been charged to Fetzner until he was able to present his case.

As to whether Equity can come in, on the apparent cheating by Remington, I don't see how it could happen other than by the Intervention of Fetzner into *Soto*, which he has already tried.

Let's turn now to another branch of government, the legislature. The Connecticut legislature can start an investigation into any aspect of the Sandy Hook event. And it can pass new laws.

We can look, too at the executive branch of government, especially the prosecutorial office. I have read that a Connecticut prosecutor already handled one case where a non SHES person collected money by soliciting donations as a victim. A similar prosecution could apply to all the families that collected donations if there was no massacre. It's theft, isn't it?

Another measure that can be taken is to act against the tax-exemption of such charities. If they lose the tax exemption, then the funds are no longer tax free. Some folks are going to owe IRS a handsome sum in back income tax.

Organizations of gun owners have so far not filed suit to assert that SHES is a fraud on them, but presumably they can still do so. Note: they'd be happily supported by Australians who lost their gun rights in 1996 immediately after the false-flag event known as the Port Arthur massacre took place. (See my book, *Port Arthur: Enough Is Enough*). By the way, is the National Sport Shooting Association, whose HQ is reportedly in Newtown, part of the action *against* the Second Amendment? Is Remington

somehow a partner in this too? Then it is a racket that could be handled by CORA -- Connecticut's anti-racketeering law.

People who know my 2011 book, *Prosecution for Treason*, may think I am champing at the bit for criminals to be prosecuted. No, I have no bloodlust whatsoever (I'm bloodlust deficient.) What I want is for the nation to be able to spot treason and yell about it. Think of this: it's been over four centuries since Sir John Harington (1561-1612) wrote the following:

“Treason doth not prosper, what's the reason? For if it prosper, none dare call it treason.”

He meant that we have a great shyness about saying that the persons “way up there” are misbehaving. They are definitely misbehaving -- treacherously -- even to the point of planning to genocide their own countrymen.

If you do want to engender some prosecutions for the Sandy Hook hoax (if you've got bloodlust), see Chapter 19 above. I listed possible crimes, and this could hardly be the grand total:

fraud, destruction of property, misprision, homicide, child abuse, slavery, moral neglect, abuse of process, threatening a whistleblower, obstruction of interstate commerce, tampering with a witness, terrorism, plus the rather comprehensive crime of “conspiring to commit crime” (no joke, it's on the books). And homicide? Where is Adam Lanza? Where is his mother?

I repeat here the general common sense behind punishment and reparations, as stated by the ancient king Hammurabi:

“If someone is too lazy to keep their dam in proper condition, and then the dam ruptures and all fields are flooded, the land whose dam the rupture occurred in will be sold for money, and the money must replace the corn it caused to be ruined.”
--

Anyone who can beat that logic, please get in touch!

WELCOME to the APPENDICES

1. President Obama at Vigil, December 18, 2012	178
2. Rachael Van Ness's Sworn Statement	179
3. James Tracy's Observations of Dr Wayne Carter	180
4. Cardinal Dolan Compares Sandy Hook Victim to Jesus	183
5. Organizational Chart of the Department of Justice	184
6. Halbig's FOI Demands to the FBI and Others	185
7. Connecticut's Grand Jury Law	186
8. Perloff "Got" the Charleston Shootout in a Week	187
9. Dr Erik Enby Astonished by Particles in Pfizer Vax	188
10. Dee McLachlan on the Lack of Trials for 5g Danger	192
11. Plea to President Woodrow Wilson To Stop the Vax	193
12. US Soldiers and Veterans Declare an In-house War	196
13. Appeal Brief in Vax Case, <i>Maxwell v Secretary of Defense</i>	198

Appendices 1 through 8 are about Sandy Hook.

Appendix 12, from angry soldiers, speaks for itself.

Appendices 9, 10, 11, and 13 are about the greatest issue of our generation -- the genocidal vaccines. Please feel free to re-deploy my court case in your own name. It opposes vax on grounds of the Fourth Amendment, which should hardly need to be argued!

Appendix 1. President Obama's Speech at the Sandy Hook Vigil, 4 days after the massacre, December 18, 2012



Obama at vigil

Thank you, Governor. To all the families, first responders, to the community of Newtown, clergy, guests --

... We know that when danger arrived in the halls of Sandy Hook Elementary, the school's staff did not flinch, they did not hesitate. Dawn Hochsprung and Mary Sherlach, Vicki Soto, Lauren Rousseau, Rachel Davino and Anne Marie Murphy -- they responded as we all hope we might respond in such terrifying circumstances -- with courage and with love, giving their lives to protect the children in their care.

We know that there were other teachers who barricaded themselves inside classrooms, and kept steady through it all, and reassured their students by saying "wait for the good guys, they're coming"; "show me your smile..."

"Let the little children come to me," Jesus said, "and do not hinder them -- for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven."

Charlotte. Daniel. Olivia. Josephine. Ana. Dylan. Madeleine. Catherine. Chase. Jesse. James. Grace. Emilie. Jack. Noah. Caroline. Jessica. Benjamin. Avielle. Allison.

God has called them all home. For those of us who remain, let us find the strength to carry on, and make our country worthy of their memory.... And may He bless and watch over this community, and the United States of America.

Appendix 2. Sworn Statement by Rachael Van Ness

The undersigned, investigator, having been duly sworn, deposes:

[abridged] While on the scene this detective [me, Van Ness] observed there to be a small black vehicle parked in the fire lane to the right of the front doors was unaware of how it was involved in this scene. This detective recalls the officer exiting the building carrying a small girl, possibly a kindergartener on his hip, and holding the hand of another child as well. This detective was not advised as to where the children have been found or why it was no adult faculty or staff member.... This detective was advised if they appeared to be the last, and brought the children down the hill to the firehouse. At one point while in parking lot this detective observed TSC Macisco number 906 to begin recording the registration plates of the vehicles in the parking lot.

This detective documented several children's as well as their parents names via ID The children were holding onto each others shoulders from behind walking in the single file line as directed. This detective observed many of the children were crying in front, in addition to being cold, and attempted to be encouraging while leading them to the back of the parking lot.

... to keep any of the parents present from pulling their children from the line [I] ran back across the lot and received the next group of children most of whom exited in the same manner and appeared to exhibit the same mix of emotions.... This detective remained with children from those grades who were not physically able to run, always walking behind the last child in the group in the effort to ensure that if additional shots were aimed at the children (as the theory that there could be another shooter in the wood line or in the building was still circulating) this detective would have the opportunity to gather and shield the stragglers. This detective observed two white females to come running out of the building both wearing purple shirts. This detective observed that they were both crying and visibly shaken ... one appearing to be having an anxiety attack or suffering from a cardiac issue.... she was turned over to an EMS worker....

Appendix 3. Odd Remarks by Medical Examiner Wayne Carver, MD at a Press Conference, December 15, 2012. As annotated by James Tracy at memoryholeblog.com

Note: James Tracy notes that Dr Carver (who has since died) spoke oddly at an outdoor press conference the day after the event. Carver said: “[My staff] and I hope the people of Newtown don’t have it crash on their head later.”



Dr Wayne Carver

James Tracy writes: “On December 19 the Connecticut State Police assigned [a cop to stay at the home of] each of the 26 families who lost a loved one at Sandy Hook Elementary. ‘The families have requested no press interviews,’ State Police assert on their behalf, ‘and we are asking that this request be honored.’

“With the exception of an unusual and apparently contrived appearance by Emilie Parker’s alleged father, victims’ family members have been almost wholly absent from public scrutiny. While it sounds like an outrageous claim, one is left to inquire whether the Sandy Hook shooting ever took place—at least in the way law enforcement authorities and the nation’s news media have described.

“[At the press conference] the multiple gaffes, discrepancies, and hedges in response to reporters’ astute questions suggest that Dr Carver is either under coercion or an imposter. While the latter sounds untenable it would go a long way in explaining his sub-pedestrian grasp of medical procedures and terminology.

“Carver is accompanied by Connecticut State Police Lieutenant H. Paul Vance and additional Connecticut State Police personnel.

The reporters are off-screen and thus unidentified so I [James Tracy] have assigned them simple numerical identification based on what can be discerned of their voices. “

[Mary Maxwell will now cherry-pick from the text of the press conference]:

Reporter #1: So the rifle was the primary weapon?
H. Wayne Carver: Yes.

Reporter #2: Doctor, can you tell us about the nature of the wounds. Were they at very close range? Were the children shot at from across the room? Carver: Uhm, I only did seven of the autopsies. The victims I had ranged from three to eleven wounds apiece and I only saw two with close range shooting.

Reporter #3: But you said that the long rifle was used?
Carver: Yes.

Reporter #3: But the long rifle was discovered in the car.

State Police Lieutenant Vance: That's not correct, sir.
Unidentified reporter #4: How many bullets or bullet fragments did you find in the autopsy. Can you tell us that?

Carver: There were lots of them, OK? This type of weapon is not, uh ... the bullets are designed in such a fashion that the energy—this is very clinical. I shouldn't be saying this. But the energy is deposited in the tissue so the bullet stays in [the tissue].

[In fact, the Bushmaster .223 Connecticut police finally claimed was used in the shooting is designed for long range field use and utilizes high velocity bullets averaging 3,000 feet-per-second, the energy of which even at considerable distance would penetrate several bodies before finally coming to rest in tissue.]

Reporter #6: In what shape were the bodies when the families were brought to check [inaudible].

Carver: Uh, we did not bring the bodies and the families into contact. We took pictures of them, uhm, of their facial features. We have, uh, uh—it's easier on the families when you do that. Un, there is, uh, a time and place for the up close and personal in the grieving process, but to accomplish this we thought it would be best to do it this way and, uh, you can sort of, uh ...

You can control a situation depending on the photographer, and I have very good photographers. Uh, but uh—

Reporter #7: Do you know the difference of the time of death between the mother in the house and the bodies recovered [in the school].

Carver: Uh, no, I don't. Sorry.

Reporter #8: Did the gunman kill himself with the rifle?

Carver: No. I—I don't know yet. I'll-I'll examine him tomorrow morning. But, but I don't think so. [Why has Carver left arguably the most important specimen for last? And why doesn't he think Lanza didn't commit suicide with the rifle? -- JT]

Reporter #9: In terms of the children, were they all found in one classroom or—

Carver: Uhm ... [inaudible] [Turns to Lieutenant Vance] Paul and company will deal with that.

Reporter #12: Doctor, can you discuss the fatal injuries to the adults? Carver: Ah, they were similar to those of the children.

Reporter #13: Doctor, the children you had autopsied, where in the bodies were they hit? Carver: Uhm. All over. All over.

Reporter #14: Were [the students] sitting at their desks or were they running away when this happened? Carver: I'll let the guys who—the scene guys talk—address that issue. I, uh, obviously I was at the scene. Obviously I'm very experienced in that. But there are people who are, uh, the number one professionals in that. I'll let them—let that [voice trails off].

Appendix 4. Cardinal Dolan Compares Victim to Jesus, by Ron Dicker at HuffPost December 21, 2012

For trying to shield her student as both died in the gunfire, Sandy Hook School teacher Anne Marie Murphy earned perhaps the highest praise from New York Cardinal Timothy Dolan on Thursday. The Catholic leader, presiding over the 52-year-old Murphy's funeral, compared her to Jesus, NBC News reported.

“Like Jesus, Annie laid down her life for her friends,” Dolan told mourners at St. Mary Church in Katonah, N.Y. “Like Jesus, Annie's life and death brings light, truth, goodness and love to a world often shrouded in darkness, evil, selfishness and death.”

Murphy, a mother of four who was a special education teacher, was reportedly found with her arms wrapped around 6-year-old Dylan Hockley. She worked with Dylan one-on-one.... The Associated Press wrote that other children were discovered under Murphy's protective embrace as well.

“Like Jesus, Annie was an excellent teacher; like him, she had a favored place in her big, tender heart for children, especially those with struggles,” Dolan said (per the *Poughkeepsie Journal*).

“I never had the honor of meeting Annie, so I'm at a disadvantage,” Dolan said, according to the NYT. “Then again, I never had the honor of physically meeting Jesus, yet my union with him is the most important thing in my life. And because I know Jesus, I feel as if I know Anne Marie McGowan Murphy quite well.” Her heroism bonded the grieving everywhere, he said. “Like [Jesus], she has brought together a community, a nation, a world, now awed by her own life and death.”



portrait of Anne Marie Murphy, Fallen Heroes Project.org

Appendix 6. Halbig's FOI Demands to FCC and FBI.

To Ms Jocelyn Frye, Federal Communications Commission, September 15, 2021 with copies to FBI offices in New Haven CT, Tampa FL, Jacksonville FL, Washington Field Office, and Criminal Division of the US Department of Justice

Why are you refusing to comply with the United States Freedom of Information Public Record requests? You are breaking the law. Again please comply with the law and provide me with my Public records.

Thanks. Wolfgang W. Halbig

I am attaching a copy's of the Newtown CT School Board USAC 471 E-Rate application to the FCC for Taxpayer funding for the school years 2012 (Attachment enclosed). I have received these documents through the CT Freedom of Information Public Record requests from the School Board.

What they are refusing to provide me is: the funding Year letter approving the USAC 471 grant application for 2012: 07/01/2012- 06-30-2013) Therefore I am now requesting US Public Records to verify that these documents are actual true and accurate documents filed by the Newtown, CT School Board for Federal FCC E-Rate taxpayer funding for the school years 2012-2013.

1. Provide a copy of the Award letter that was send by the FCC to the Newtown, CT School approving that USAC 471 grant application for funding for the school years 2012-2013.

I have attached a copy of what that letter should look like.

This is Taxpayer dollars funding these grants, and I need a copy of that award letter that was send to Newtown CT School Board approving the USAC 471 grants.

Appendix 7. Connecticut's Grand Jury System, at cga.ct.gov,
by Jason K Matthews, January 18, 2002

Under Connecticut law, crimes charged by the state on after May 26, 1983 are prosecuted by complaint or information, rather than grand jury indictment. By law, an investigatory grand jury can be empaneled to conduct investigations of (1) government corruption; (2) Medicaid vendor fraud; (3) racketeering; (4) election law violations; and (5) felonies... **for which the chief state's attorney can show** that there is no other means of [discerning] whether a crime has been committed ...or the perpetrator's identity.

The **investigatory grand jury is a judge**, judge referee, or three-judge panel. The applicant must have a reasonable belief that the administration of justice requires an investigation If the applicant is the chief state's attorney or a state's attorney, he also must demonstrate that normal investigatory methods have failed.... The grand jury ... may subpoena people to testify before it and produce documents. Witnesses must be informed ... of their right to remain silent. At the conclusion of the investigation, the grand jury must file its finding of whether there is probable cause to believe a crime was committed with the court and the prosecutor, if any, who applied for the grand jury.

The legislature created the investigatory grand jury in 1941 giving it authority to investigate any crime. In 1985, the legislature **restricted the scope of the investigation** to crimes that concerned (1) state and local government corruption; (2) Medicaid vendor fraud; (3) organized crime; and (4) class A, B, or C felonies when the chief state's attorney can show he has no other means of obtaining information concerning whether a crime has been committed.

In 1987, the legislature expanded this list to include (1) election law violations and (2) unclassified felonies punishable by more than five years imprisonment. ...After 1985, the applicant had to show that normal investigatory methods had failed, were likely to fail, or were too dangerous.

Comment: The bolded provisions look unconstitutional to me. -- M Maxwell

Appendix 8. James Perloff “Got” the Charleston shooting in a Week. Posted June 23, 2015, at JamesPerloff.com.

[Perloff thanks YouTuber Redsilverj for several insights.]

- (1) Why do the family members interviewed show little sorrow and emotion just one day after the June 17, 2015 incident?
- (3) Why is the U.S. government giving \$29 million [!!!!] to the families? Some ask if this could be actor reimbursement.
- (4) Why was the church already re-opened for services on Sunday? Isn't cleanup from a bloody massacre a time-consuming process?
- (5) Why was only one person reported wounded? How was Dylann Roof able to get nearly a 100% kill ratio (similar to Adam Lanza's).
- (6) As with Charlie Hebdo, there are no pictures of bodies or carnage. Is this from respect for the victims or something else?
- (7) Why did media already have a detailed profile of Dylann Roof, including sound bites from a relative, just hours after his arrest?
- (8) Is it only a coincidence that the Department of Homeland Security had an **“Active Shooter Threat Training Program” scheduled for Charleston at the very time of the shooting?**
- (9) Why does the Wayback Machine show that Roof's webpage was created only days before the shooting?
- (11) Is it a coincidence that the incident occurred as the Jade Helm exercise is getting under way, an event that many believe is intended to transition America into martial law?
- (13) Is it only coincidence that South Carolina was the first state to secede from the Union before the Civil War, and thus Charleston symbolizes the Confederate flag now being targeted for banning?

Note: Susan Bro, mother of Heather Heyer killed at Charleston, looks remarkably like Donna Soto, mother of teacher Vicki Soto. I would guess they are the same person -- and that this situation is not her fault. -- MM

Appendix 9. Erik Enby Astonished by Particles in Pfizer



(L) *Enby particles in Pfizer's Covid vaccine?* Dr Erik Enby, Gotheburg

Mary: Erik, if you don't mind me calling you Erik... **Enby:** It's fine. **Mary:** Aussies use first name only. When I moved to Oz, in 1980, Malcolm Fraser was the PM and was surprised when an interviewer called him Malcolm to his face. **Enby:** I'm not a Prime Minister. **Mary:** I understand you are not even a medico, having had your license taken away. **Enby:** Yes, it was for prescribing natural medicine. **Mary:** Well, we can't have that. Especially if it would work a cure. **Enby:** One mustn't even talk about it.

Mary: I want to tell the world what you found in a vial of Pfizer's Covid vaccine. **Enby:** I found the same "growth particles" that I find in the blood of chronically ill people. **Mary:** I think this is very exciting, and not just for the reason that you wish to publicize it. **Enby:** The reason is to warn as many folks as possible not to be injected with these unknown particles.

Mary: Yes that's essential but the other reason that little vial excites me is that it shows that someone, somewhere has made the same discovery that took you fifty years to work out. **Enby:** I haven't worked it out yet. **Mary:** Actually they may be a step ahead of you, but frankly, I suspect they hijacked your work. **Enby:** I want it to be hijacked. **Mary:** I do, too. It is astonishing as you say, that the medical literature has no mention of such a thing. **Enby:** I saw in your *Consider the Lilies* book, which I bought in Sweden, that 18 cures for cancer have been suppressed. **Mary:** Thirty, and counting. It is sheer wickedness. **Enby:** I was shocked to read the article by Ed Rosenow that you sent me --

shocked that he turned out such great medicine in the 1920s. He knew microbiology and electromagnetism. **Mary:** He put microbes in a Faraday cage and deduced that waves could cause disease; he also cured polio in 1917. **Enby:** “But we can't have that.” **Mary:** Let's go back to your early self-education. **Enby:** It was not all of the self type, I studied under Gunther Enderlein in Germany. **Mary:** I equate Enderlein (1872-1968) with the biggies -- Antoine Béchamp (1816-1908) and Jules Tissot (1870-1950). **Enby:** Enderlein taught me that blood is like the soil; it is what makes growth possible. **Mary:** Pray tell what Tissot's work teaches. **Enby:** His book published in 1926, definitely put me on the track: “*Constitution des organismes animaux et végétaux. Causes des maladies qui les atteignent*”. (Constitution of animals and plants organisms. Causes of diseases attacking them.)


Mary: Let's go back further. You were interested to see if the way plants grow could explain how “vegetation” in the blood can be harmful. **Enby:** Yes, but it is not always harmful, although I've always been able to achieve a good correlation between growth of particles in the blood, and illness. **Mary:** Here is a statement by you that I got from your interview at Newsvoice:

Enby: “What was it that kept an individual sick and slowly destroyed his body? This took rather a long time, and not until I studied the diseases of the vegetable kingdom, I started to have a feeling of how the chronic complaints of man begin. I had noticed that the plant diseases had always had a connection with a fungus attack, destroying different tissue parts of the plant and that this could happen at a varying speed. Tissot thought that it can be in the same way with tissues from animals and human beings and had even written a whole chapter about the development of the fatal disease cancer having a connection with a fungus attack. It was then that I began to suspect that the tissues are broken down in a fundamentally similar way in all nature, it may be a question of plants, small and big animals or humans.”

Mary: Do you recall my telling you in in 2014 that I asked my physician husband “What is death?” and he said “It is when the

cells collapse and putrefaction sets in.” I knew immediately that the little creatures doing the putrefying had to have already been in the body. Is that the same as your particles? **Enby:** I considered what is happening: In nature, the overripeness comes after the ripeness, and then always the putrefaction. This process of destruction seems to be something completely normal and is always part of the life process. **Mary:** We Catholics say “Unto dust thou shalt return.” **Enby:** When I looked upon this in the microscope I noticed different kinds of vegetation in tissues, which were on the way to decay. In my investigations of fruit and vegetables in the breaking down phase *it was never a question of an inexplicable decay of tissues*. Different kinds of growth were going on in these and caused the decay. One just had to put a lemon or an apple showing the first signs of destruction, under a glass cover and study the continued course of destruction. **Mary:** There's a YouTube video of a McDonald's hamburger under a cover, and it never breaks down. Maybe it needs some of that Pfizer stuff.

Enby: Let's look at the flakes in the vial from Pfizer. Again I say, I don't really know what the particles are. **Mary:** I call them “Enby particles” in the tradition of naming as “Russell bodies” the large microbes Wm Russell discovered in the '90s. Of course I mean the 1890s. If he discovered it in the 1990s he'd be in Gitmo. Are your particles living? **Enby:** Maybe. They move around randomly.



Here is a flake. I found it in Pfizer, but I have always seen such flakes when I put the blood of sick people under the microscope. It's like a red bubble and soon it gives rise to a myriad of particles. There is no word about this in the literature. (It's to the left of that black line.) **Mary:** What's your best guess? **Enby:** Putting it crudely, if a flake gives rise to a splurge of particles and is lodged in a blood vessel the patient may experience bleeding. If they attack the nervous system, nervous symptoms will appear. **Mary:** I noticed in the excellent video

made by Borge Peratt, that you take exception to a recent prediction by Luc Montaigner that all who have been injected for Covid will die in a few years. **Enby:** They will die only if the circumstances in their body call for it. In many healthy people there are “Enby particles” that get eliminated after a while. A helpful treatment is large doses of Vitamins C and D. **Mary:** I want to mention that infrared may be involved. Philip Callahan says in his 1995 book *Paramagnetism*, that Dr Painter, a crop scientist, collected all the wheat strains that best resist disease and insects. Philip tested them and found that if he planted them in poor soil they were sick plants, and if in good soil they were healthy. **Enby:** Enderlein would certainly agree with that.

Mary: Callahan found that the way insects get attracted to plants (I mean the way scavengers know when there is work to be done on soon-to-die creatures) is the presence of ethanol and ammonia. Moreover, he says the reason those two substances are attractive is the infrared signals they give off. I see in the book by Lakhovsky, 1925, *Secret of Life*, that he proved the migration of some bird species to be by radio wave. I recall also Crile [1864-1943] saying that vultures appear to fall from the air when a carcass is available. The sense involved is not necessarily olfactory or vision. Could be electronic.

Enby: Please see what you can do to spread the word today about particles that showed up in a vial, to my great surprise. **Mary:** I will do my best but the media hype is for many people decisive. They think they are helping society by taking the vaccine.

Mary: Dr Erik Enby, you deserve first of all, a Nobel Prize for your vital discoveries. And the awarders better get a wiggle on, as you are not young. **Enby:** I'm 84. **Mary:** And you are entitled to a national apology for the terrible way you have been treated. It's a good thing you were able to hold your own. At the very least, students must be grateful to you for salvaging the work of the older greats. Finally, thank you for this pleasant interview.

Enby: Thank you, also. It is good to hear from the wider world.

Appendix 10. “We’re Safe with 5G”? by Dee McLachlan, at GumshoeNews.com, July 15, 2020



5G tower

Photo: marylandmatters.org

The introduction of 5G is one of the most startling examples of technology by stealth — with a global plan to immerse the population in more electromagnetic frequencies. At a Congressional hearing, it was admitted that no health studies on 5G had been done. *Give us a break!* Surely studies have been done. We have been warned by many scientists that EMF pollution could render the planet inhospitable to human life.

Scientific Study Confirms it’s “Predominately Benign” (Really?) I read an article (dailymail.co.uk) entitled: “Scientific study confirms again that 5G is ‘harmless and benign’ in response to crackpot conspiracy theorists” Whew, we’re saved. A scientific study has saved the day. And we are crackpots to think 5G may have some negative health consequences. To quote the article: ‘Based on our study, **we don’t think 5G radiation is that harmful,**’ said Dr Subham Dasgupta at the Department of Environmental and Molecular Toxicology at Oregon State University. **‘It’s predominantly benign.’**”

Dr Dasgupta and his colleagues exposed embryonic zebrafish for **two days** to 3.5 GHz radio-frequency radiation – the frequency typically used by 5G-enabled phones.”... And **“Scientists, top doctors, and other experts have already debunked the theory that 5G radiation causes harm to humans in response to wacky claims regarding its safety.”** TWO DAYS? But we are subjected 24/7/365. And what about trying other frequencies as 5G ranges from 3 kilohertz (kHz) up to 80GHz?

**Appendix 11. Charles Higgins' Letter to Pres Woodrow Wilson,
"Please Abolish Compulsory Army/Navy Vaccination," 1920**



Woodrow Wilson was president of United States from 1913 to 1921. Pictured with Edith, First Lady

Dear Mr President,

The President is Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy and is thus invested with supreme commanding and pardoning power, through which he can bring about an immediate reform in the evil practice of compulsory vaccination by pardoning, at his discretion, all men in the Army or Navy now unjustly condemned by Court Martial for refusing vaccination.

This enlarged work has required nearly twelve months to complete and make ready for the consideration of the President after his return from the Peace Conference,. It can leave no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man or woman that Compulsory Vaccination should be abolished.

In this medical malpractice of to-day doctors inject [into the blood] various more or less virulent diseases, blood poisons, or disease germs, cultures or products, either living or dead. In some fatal cases, death finally occurs from lockjaw, paralysis, meningitis, or pneumonia....

These fatal results of vaccination are commonly denied and concealed in death certificates.... See the "Manual of Causes of Death," by U. S. Census Bureau, page 56, No. 20, in which vaccination is recorded as a form of septicemia.

I have now in hand a memorial pamphlet written by an aggrieved father, Mr. James A. Loyster, which shows the death of his own son and about thirty other children from vaccination in New York State in 1914. This child slaughter was the result of a general vaccination raid made upon the school proof that about thirty were killed by vaccine infection.

Elmer N. Olson, a soldier in training here, refused to submit to vaccination. He was tried by general court-martial and sentenced to fifteen years in the disciplinary barracks at Fort Leavenworth.

Now I respectfully submit, Mr. President Article IV. "The right of the people to be secure in their persons... against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated." To thus degrade a loyal and honorable soldier and condemn him like a felonious criminal to the long term of fifteen or twenty-five years' imprisonment, merely for the act of refusing to have a dangerous ... inflicted disease forced upon his body against his will and consent, is clearly an "unreasonable seizure" of the person.

Mr. President, I want to remind you of the rich American thought you expressed in your address to the American soldiers on the battlefield in France, at Chaumont, on Christmas Day, 1918. You were reported to have there said: . . . "this is not a war in which the soldiers of the free nations have obeyed masters. You have commanders, but you have no masters."

From the rapidity, severity, and mortality of this disease, it would seem not to be a true influenza, as heretofore known, and as its worst cases are characterized by a rapid and fatal ending, with a few days' sickness, in malignant or septic pneumonia, with abscesses in the lungs, it seems more related to the very fatal '*Pneumonic Plague*' which raged in Manchuria after the Japanese war.

General Shiro of Japan is credited with half a million Chinese deaths by cholera for which he used an insect vector, in 1934. ...

Let us here ask, what is the use of having soldiers forced to submit to a whole series of disease infections, if these infections, at best, give immunity only for a little while from such diseases as smallpox and typhoid and make the system more susceptible to the far worse diseases ... possible effects of vaccination from the recurring epidemics of these dangerous diseases in our heavily vaccinated camps?

On page 18 in the Report of the Secretary of War for 1918 the death rate of the Army in the United States from disease for the year ending August 30, 1918, is given as 6.4. The age-groups composing the Army are, between twenty and forty. In the same Report it is admitted that the male civilian death rate for the same ages as in the Army (twenty to forty) was about 4.7, which is a difference of 1.7 or nearly 2 per 1000 in favor of the civilian.

The army population is made up of “hand-picked” men selected for their nearly perfect health and physique and the absence of all serious constitutional diseases such as tuberculosis and others, which are all excluded from the army group. On the other hand, the civil population of the same age-group of twenty to forty includes the healthy and diseased; those afflicted with tuberculosis constitute a big fraction.

Note: The author of this letter, Charles Higgins, sunk his fortune into trying to get relief, but to no avail. Thank you for trying, Sir.



In Brazil in 1904, mandatory vaccination led to rebellion and a mutiny of army cadets.



US Veterans Preparing for War

The Biden administration is denying VA healthcare to all non-vaxxed veterans. The tactical fascist vaxx purge of the U.S. military has now happening.

Make no mistake, it is the most devastating blow to military readiness in the history of the United States, and it is a blatant act of war against the American people.

Hundreds of thousands of newly discharged U.S. military service members, police, doctors and nurses are now joining forces with veterans to defend our country against this global fascist takeover attempt.

They are presently forming a decentralized asymmetric defense of our homeland. Here’s a brief statement to give you a little taste of what is featured in this courageous and awe-inspiring video:

“This is the land of the free.

We will not allow forced injections, segregation, or an authoritarian surveillance and control grid passport system.

We have sworn an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies.

We will do everything in our power to keep the peace. We, the combat veterans and Special Forces veterans of America, know the horrors of war all too well.

We will be strategic, disciplined and surgical.

We know who the leading perpetrators are, and if they do not stand down, cease and desist, if they keep trying to oppress our people and enslave our nation, if they keep stripping away our freedom and rights, those fascist enemy combatants will be held personally accountable.

Do you think we do not know what is going on?

You released a bio-weapon.

Then you systemically shutdown life-saving treatments leading to millions of unnecessary deaths.

You strategically censored doctors, nurses, medical experts, scientists, journalists, Intel Community members and soldiers.

Now you are injecting millions of people with a weaponized spike protein in an immune-system-degrading, gene-altering nanotech vax.

You have committed Crimes Against Humanity on a global scale. Your power-addicted pathological shortsighted greed has destroyed our economy and severally inhibited people's abilities to provide for their families.

You have rigged our political and economic system, burying people in inescapable debt.

You have captured and corrupted both of our political parties and the government agencies that are supposed to protect the civilian population from predatory global interests.

You have captured and corrupted our information and communication systems.

You are trying to cut off our ability to get healthcare and move freely throughout our communities.

You are contaminating our water supply and now you are systematically destroying our food supply, which you have been systemically poisoning for years as standard operating procedure. Your long list of systemic abuses and usurpations amount to absolute Despotism.

Your wickedly evil corruption is now infecting all aspects of our lives.

We Have Had Enough! The Line Has Been Drawn.

We represent every race, creed, and ethnicity.

Your divide and conquer. PSYOPS don't fly here.

We know how you tactically deploy PSYOPS and stoke identity politics to silo off regional civilian populations into the smallest possible demographics to incite tribalism and make us fight amongst each other, while distracting us from being laser-focused on you, the head of the snake...".

APPENDIX 13. Appeal Brief, *Maxwell v Secretary of Defense*

United States Court of Appeal, First Circuit
No. 21 cv 1256

Mary Maxwell, Plaintiff and Appellant

v

Lloyd J Austin, US Secretary of Defense,
Robert J Fulton, Acting Administrator of FEMA,
Xavier Becerra, US Secretary of Health and Human Services,
Defendants and Appellees

On appeal from the US District Court, District of New
Hampshire,
Filed Pro Se by Mary Maxwell, 175 Loudon Rd, Apt 1, Concord
NH 03301. Email: MaxwellMaryLLB @gmail.com

Dated June 20, 2021

Table of Contents

Table of Authorities
Statement of Issues
Statement of Facts
Summary of the Argument
Conclusion to the Argument
Particulars about Covid and the Vaccine
Appendix

Table of Authorities

Baker v Carr (1963)
Katz v Pershing (2012)
Home Building v Blaisdell (1931)
Jacobson v Massachusetts (1905)
Laird v Tatum (1972)
Lujan v Defenders of Wildlife (1992)
McCullough v Maryland (1819)
Marbury v Madison (1803)
Republican Party of Pennsylvania v Degraffenteid (2021)

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

Appellant sought, on December 5, 2020, an injunction against mandatory vaccination for Covid. She gave as her reasons a desire to have her Fourth Amendment rights protected (i.e., against invasion of her body), and a desire to have the Third Branch weigh in generally by stating that mandatory vaccination is unconstitutional. This, she thinks, would help restore the Constitution at a time when many Americans are saying “Government is now controlled by private individuals and entities – for example Bill Gates, Pfizer Pharmaceutical, or the International Monetary Fund -- for their own purposes.”

The District Court, on February 1, 2021 dismissed the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, saying that the Plaintiff did not state an injury that is imminent and irreversible, and not hypothetical, and that none of the three Defendants have to date ordered anyone to be vaccinated. Plaintiff’s choice of defendants was based on the US President’s stating on May 15, 2020 that his Operation Warp Speed would involve the military in the supply and distribution of the vaccine when it got FDA approval (which it did, on an Emergency Use Authorization basis, in December 12, 2020) and the President’s putting FEMA in charge of the overall response to Covid. DHHS is the department that oversees the CDC which delivers the recommendations for vaccination.

Plaintiff also pleaded that a “vaccine tattoo” may open up new types of surveillance that violate her Fourth Amendment rights to privacy.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Now that more time has passed since her December 5, 2020 pleadings, we see that the vaccination was voluntarily accepted by a reported two-thirds of the US adult population. There has not been any federal order mandating a vaccination. The 50 states have taken various positions. For example, Governor Charlie Baker of Massachusetts had mandated the Covid vaccination for all students age 12 -30, but he withdrew that in the face of public protest. Overseas, some countries mandated the vaccination. In Israel, that mandating led persons to file a complaint with the International Criminal Court on the grounds that it is a war crime under the 1949 Geneva Convention to perform medical experiments without informed consent, and the Covid vaccines are

experimental, having skipped the usual trials. By contrast, several state legislatures, such as Florida and Alabama, enacted laws to forbid businesses to limit their services to “only the vaccinated.”

In regard to surveillance, Rep Rush’s bill in the House (HR 6666) for “contact tracing” did not get reported out of committee, but many schools, buses, and other providers of service did ask citizens to register their name and phone number for purposes of tracing their contacts. Also, many businesses now ask people to indicate their vaccination status. Currently in appellant’s city, Concord New Hampshire, the mask-wearing order has been lifted but only for the fully vaccinated. A Texas court has ruled against employees of Methodist Hospital who claimed that the threatened loss of their jobs, if they did not get vaccinated is coercive. Judge Lynn ruled that is not coercive as they can get employment elsewhere. By contrast, schools in Miami have decided that vaccinated people cannot come to school based on the newly discovered fact that a vaccinated person can “shed” spike proteins on the unvaccinated, causing harm.

Summary of the Argument

Appellant argues that the District Court erred in saying that “Maxwell . . . has failed to allege an actual or imminent injury in fact that confers her with Article III standing to sue.” The District Court has pitched its jurisdiction on the basis of a 2012 First Circuit case, *Katz v Pershing*, that in turn is based on *Baker v Carr* (1963) and *Lujan v Defenders of Wildlife* (1992). These hold that it is not enough for an injury to be hypothetical. Appellant rejects those 1963-2012 precedents, saying that they do not control her case. Although in some sense her injury is hypothetical, given that no member of government is coming at her forcefully with a vaccine, it would not be reasonable for her to have to wait until that scene eventuates, as she would then have no practicable way to seek a judicial ruling. The *Katz v Pershing* requirement is a Catch-22.

Also, Appellant claims that, in part, her injury is already happening. She is fast losing her Fourth Amendment rights, along with all 330 million Americans who are losing many of their constitutional rights. Appellant has lived in four countries besides the US and is sharply aware that her security is a consequence of the existence of the US Constitution, which she takes to be a covenant among all Americans

to stand up for one another, regarding the allocation of powers, and the Bill of Rights. The typical speaker on behalf of endangered rights is the Judiciary. Its voice is needed now, as the public conversation is more and more dominated by a media whose loyalties lie with various interests, not specifically the interest of the people.

In 1803, Chief Justice John Marshall wrote, in *Marbury v Madison*, “The very essence of liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws whenever he receives an injury.”

The ruling in *Jacobson v Massachusetts* (1905) is often cited as the precedent on vaccination mandates. Now 116 years old, that ruling is out of date and needs to be overturned. Much has happened in science to cast doubt on both the efficacy of vaccines and the notion that the unvaccinated person can harm the vaccinated.

While it is true that *Jacobson* was about states’ rights, it is widely misinterpreted to mean that the Fourth Amendment must bend to a public health emergency. The more appropriate ruling is that of *Home Builders v Blaisdell* (1931) in which the Court said: “Emergency does not create power. Emergency does not increase granted power.... The Constitution was adopted in a period of grave emergency. Its grants of power ... were not altered by emergency.”

Certainly it was the very invoking of an “Emergency” due to Covid (in the wake of the World Health Organization’s declaring of a health emergency) that has flavored all actions by state, local, and federal government, in the period since March 2020. The vast majority of US citizens are under the mistaken impression that (1) the federal government is within its rights to judge health matters, and (2) that it is constitutional for a president to hold the Bill of Rights in abeyance while an emergency is occurring.

Still, the *Jacobson* ruling (which affirmed Massachusetts right to use its police power for health reasons) says: “Before closing this opinion we deem it appropriate ... to observe ... that the police power of a state, whether exercised directly by the legislature, or by a local body acting under its authority, may be exerted in such circumstances, or by regulations so arbitrary and oppressive in

particular cases, as to justify the interference of the courts to prevent wrong and oppression.”

Mr Jacobson had been fined \$5 for not accepting a vaccination. The US Supreme Court said that he did have to pay the fine. He had not been threatened with forcible vaccination by the state. Perhaps if he had been, the ruling would have said “this is too oppressive.” Today there is no precedent available for instances in which a government holds a person down to force a vaccination on him. *Maxwell v Secretary of Defense* could become that precedent.

There is also the harm of losing Fourth Amendment rights regarding privacy by way of a new kind of surveillance that the Framers could not have imagined. The potential for use of a vaccine passport, inserted under the skin, is very real. As Plaintiff stated in her pleadings, Bill Gates is working with MIT to develop a Microneedle Delivery System, a luminescent hand tattoo. The quantum dots could store data and be updated by transmission of new information -- such as one’s bank balance. It is a step in the direction of total surveillance. Cameras are everywhere now, and conversations get automatically recorded. In a dissenting opinion in *Laird v Tatum* (1972), Justice William Douglas, joined by Justice Thurgood Marshall said:

“This case involves a cancer in our body politic. It is a measure of the disease which afflicts us. Army surveillance, ... is at war with the principles of the First Amendment. Those who already walk submissively will say there is no cause for alarm. But submissiveness is not our heritage. The First Amendment was designed to allow rebellion to remain as our heritage. The Constitution was designed to keep government off the backs of the people. ... The aim was to allow men to be free and independent and to assert their rights against government.”

It is essential for the court to state what the law is. In fact, in a culture that is today drowning in lies, judicial statements have the power of assertion of truth, a huge gift to society. Chief Justice John Marshall of the US Supreme Court wrote in *Marbury v Madison*, in 1803:

“That the people have an original right to establish, for their future government, such principles as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness, is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been erected. The exercise of this original right is a very great exertion; nor can it, nor ought it, to be frequently repeated. The principles, therefore, so established, are deemed fundamental. And as the authority from which they proceed is supreme, ... they are designed to be permanent..... To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained ...?”

“Certainly all those who have framed written constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law of the nation, and consequently, the theory of every such government must be, that an act of the legislature, repugnant to the constitution, is void.... This theory is ... one of the fundamental principles of our society....

“... It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is.... We must never forget that it is a constitution we are expounding ... intended to endure for ages to come, and consequently, to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs.... [I]t is apparent, that the framers of the constitution contemplated that instrument as a rule for the government of courts.... Why otherwise does it direct the judges to take an oath to support it?... How immoral to impose it on them, if they were to be used as the instruments, and the knowing instruments, for violating what they swear to support!”

Conclusion of the Argument

The District Court erred in dismissing this case on grounds of *Baker v Carr* and *Lujan v Defenders of Wildlife*. Appellant argues that such are the times today that silence by the courts contributes positively to harm. As Justice Clarence Thomas recently wrote, in a dissent joined by Samuel Alito and Neil Gorsuch, about a 2020 presidential election case, *Republican Party of Pennsylvania v. Degraffenreid* (2021): “One wonders what the Court waits for. We failed to settle this dispute before the election, and thus provide clear rules. Now we again fail to provide clear rules for future elections....

By doing nothing, we invite further confusion Our fellow citizens deserve better and expect more of us.”

The Appellate court can overturn the dismissal. The District Court can easily rule, despite the precedents of Baker and Lujan, that the defendants must not mandate a Covid vaccination for Appellant. This would not entail judicial activism or writing new law. It would not even entail any nuanced interpretation of the Constitution.

The Fourth Amendment says it plainly: “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated....”

The above also covers the requirement of redressability. The District Court judge of the US District of New Hampshire said that Appellant must plead for a solution that would redress the problem. An injunction, which also acts as declaratory relief, would give the redress sought.

Particulars about Covid and the Vaccine.

In her 2020 pleadings, Plaintiff Maxwell offered eight grounds on which a citizen may question the push for a Covid vaccination. Some sound felonious; this strengthens her resolve to avoid taking the vaccination:

- (1) that the testing for Covid is unreliable,
- (2) that Covid cases aren't being accurately reported,
- (3) that the purpose of the Lockdown is apparently not for health but to terminate national economies,
- (4) that the emergency vaccines have evaded standard safety testing,
- (5) that there is a little-understood connection between vaccination and DNA,
- (6) that successful cures for Covid, such as Ivermectin, are withheld, casting doubt on the sincerity of the race for a Covid vaccine,
- (7) that a vaccine tattoo may be used as a 'passport,' and
- (8) that scientific debate is being forbidden by censors.

Numbers 1-3 are now history. Numbers 4-8 are described here and via the Exhibits:

#4. FDA's "approval" was not approval, only "emergency use authorization" with no testing.

#5. Manufacturers now acknowledge that the "vaccines" are gene-therapy, not vaccines.

#6. Prosecution is being sought in India for the government actions that prevented doctors from using the cures that had been successful even I 2020 for Covid.

#7. More and more businesses, including airlines and restaurants, have started to demand presentation of a vaccine passport.

#8. the forbidding of scientific debate is a historic break from the norms of Western society in which the whole way of finding truth in Nature depends on hypotheses and critiques.

Respectfully submitted, Mary Maxwell, Pro Se

Exhibits -- Appendix [to this appeal brief, as filed]

Publications critical of the Covid vaccine, exhibited here to demonstrate the broad context in which Maxwell v Department of Defense is placed.

Exhibit A. "Inventor of Covid MRNA Vaccine Platform [Dr Robert Malone] Says FDA was aware of Dangers, Blames Lack of Long-Term Animal Trials." Published at coronanews123.wordpress.com

Exhibit B. Physicians in Canada object to Ontario licensing board forbidding them to question or debate the official measures recommended for Covid. Published at CanadianPhysicians.org

Exhibit C. "Dr Michael Leadon, former Chief Science Officer and VP for Pfizer, Dr. Mike Yeadon [says] 'Your government is lying to you in a way that could lead to your death.'" Published at LifesiteNews.com April 7, 2021

Exhibit D. “The Indian Bar Association Sued WHO Scientist over Ivermectin” by Justus R Hope, MD. Published at The Desert Review .com, June 7, 2021, updated June 10, 2021

Exhibit E. Questions in the Australian Federal Parliament about Covid and Vaccines. At Hansard, 1 June 2021 and 5 February 2021, at aph.gov.au

Exhibit F. Maxims Pertinent to This Case. General Principles of Law (Selected from the Law Dictionary, 1888 -- Wesley Gilmer’s 1986 revision of Wm. Cochran Cox’s 1976 edition)

EXHIBIT A. "INVENTOR OF COVID MRNA VACCINE PLATFORM [DR ROBERT MALONE] SAYS FDA WAS AWARE OF DANGERS, BLAMES LACK OF LONG-TERM ANIMAL TRIALS"

Directly contradicting Dr. Fauci’s, the FDA’s, and the media and medical establishment’s relentless campaign to inject as many Americans as possible with what are, at least until the end of 2022, officially experimental drugs, the inventor of the mRNA core technology has sounded the alarm Dr. Malone addressed a recent Japanese study which shows that the mRNA shot does not work in the manner intended. All new drugs have typically undergone three to six years of animal trials. Introducing the topic, Dr. Bret Weinstein said

“So I must say that this is a difficult topic for us to address. We all, I believe, are agreed that something very serious is afoot and the public is largely unaware that they have been placed into a kind of danger. And we also know that there’s a great deal of stigma directed at those who would explore these dangers. ... They did not believe the spike was biologically active.... Now know the spike protein is very dangerous there. It is violent. ...But if it did what the brochure on these vaccines says it should do, which is large in the membrane of the cells that are doing the transcribing, it would be a lot less destructive, right?”

Dr. Malone: “I think that’s fair. And you’re right. It’s not just the literature that the documentation about the vaccine. It’s the prior literature that was put out by the people that developed it that

developed these clones. So they were they were aware that there was a risk of Spike being biologically active in having adverse events if it did not stay stuck to the cells that were transected, that got the RNA and made it OK. And they used a genetic engineering method of putting a trans membrane domain on it to ensure that it stayed anchored and stayed put. And there they did limited, non-clinical studies to say looks like it stays stuck. We engineered it to stay stuck. They did. And they published it. Here's the thing...Is that that's generally not good enough in a non-clinical data package..."

EXHIBIT B. "Declaration of Canadian Physicians for Science and Truth," -- Objection to Ontario Licensing Board Advice of April 30, 2021. From Canadian Physicians.org

We are a broad and diverse group of Canadian physicians from across Canada who are sending out this urgent declaration to the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons. On April 30, 2021, Ontario's physician licensing body, ...issued a statement forbidding physicians from questioning or debating any or all of the official measures imposed in response to COVID-19. As physicians, our primary duty of care is not to the CPSO ... but to our patients.

1. Denial of the Scientific Method itself: The CPSO is ordering physicians to put aside the scientific method and to not debate the processes and conclusions of science. We physicians know and continue to believe that throughout history, opposing views, vigorous debate and openness to new ideas have been the bedrock of scientific progress. Any major advance in science has been arrived at by practitioners vigorously questioning "official" narratives and following a different path in the pursuit of truth....

We also give notice to other Canadian and international licensing authorities for physicians and allied professions that the stifling of scientific inquiry and any order to violate our conscience and professional pledge to our patients, itself may constitute a crime against humanity.

College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario Statement on Public Health Misinformation (4/30/21): "The College is aware and concerned about the increase of misinformation circulating on social

media and other platforms regarding physicians who are publicly contradicting public health orders and recommendations.

Physicians hold a unique position of trust with the public and have a professional responsibility to not communicate anti-vaccine, anti-masking, anti-distancing and anti-lockdown statements and/or promoting unsupported, unproven treatments for COVID-19.

Physicians must not make comments or provide advice that encourages the public to act contrary to public health orders and recommendations. Physicians who put the public at risk may face an investigation by the CPSO and disciplinary action, when warranted.”

Exhibit C. – Former Pfizer VP: “Your government is lying to you in a way that could lead to your death.” Exclusive Interview at LifesiteNews.com April 7, 2021

Dr. Michael Yeadon, Pfizer's former Vice President and Chief Scientist for Allergy & Respiratory who spent 32 years in the industry leading new medicines research and retired from the pharmaceutical giant with “the most senior research position” in his field, spoke with LifeSiteNews in a telephone interview. He said:

“But in the last year I have realized that my government and its advisers are lying in the faces of the British people about everything to do with this coronavirus. Absolutely every-thing. It’s a fallacy this idea of asymptomatic transmission and that you don’t have symptoms, but you are a source of a virus. That lockdowns work, that masks have a protective value obviously for you or someone else, and that variants are scary things and we even need to close international borders in case some of these nasty foreign variants get in.

“Or, by the way, on top of the current list of gene-based vaccines that we have miraculously made, there will be some ‘top-up’ vaccines to cope with the immune escape variants.

“But what I would like to do is talk about immune escape.... Last year I thought it was what I called ‘convergent opportunism,’ that is a bunch of different stakeholder groups have managed to pounce

on a world in chaos to push us in a particular direction. So it looked like it was kind of linked, but I was prepared to say it was just convergence. I [now] think that's naïve. There is no question in my mind that very significant powerbrokers around the world have either planned to take advantage of the next pandemic or created the pandemic. One of those two things is true because the reason it must be true is that dozens and dozens of governments are all saying the same lies and doing the same inefficacious things that demonstrably cost lives.

“And they are talking the same sort of future script which is, ‘We don’t want you to move around because of these pesky varmints, these “variants”’— which I call ‘samiant’s’ by the way, because they are pretty much the same — but they’re all saying this and they are all saying ‘don’t worry, there will be “top-up” vaccines that will cope with the potential escapees.’ They’re all saying this when it is obviously nonsense.”

“I think the end game is going to be, ‘everyone receives a vaccine’... Everyone on the planet is going to find themselves persuaded, cajoled, not quite mandated, hemmed-in to take a jab. When they do that every single individual on the planet will have a name, or unique digital ID and a health status flag which will be ‘vaccinated,’ or not ... and whoever possesses that, sort of single database, operable centrally, applicable everywhere to control, to provide as it were, a privilege, you can either cross this particular threshold or conduct this particular transaction or not depending on [what] the controllers of that one human population database decide. And I think that’s what this is all about because once you’ve got that, we become playthings and the world can be as the controllers of that database want it.

“For example, you might find that after a banking reset that you can only spend through using an app that actually feeds off this [database], your ID, your name, [and] your health status flag.”

“And, yes, certainly crossing an international border is the most obvious use for these vaccine passports, as they are called, but I’ve heard talk of them already that they could be necessary for you to get into public spaces, enclosed public spaces. I expect that if they wanted to, you would not be able to leave your house in the future without the appropriate privilege on your app.

“And since I can’t think of a benign explanation for any of the steps: variants, top-up vaccines, no regulatory studies... it’s not only that I cannot think of a benign explanation, the steps described, and the scenario described, and the necessary sort of resolution to this false problem is going to allow what I just described: unknown, and unnecessary gene sequences injected into the arms of potentially billions of people for no reason....”

Exhibit D. “The Indian Bar Association Sued WHO Scientist over Ivermectin” by Justus R Hope, MD. Published at The Desert Review .com, June 7, 2021, updated June 10, 2021

The Indian Bar Association (IBA) sued WHO Chief Scientist Dr. Soumya Swaminathan on May 25, accusing her in a 71-point brief of causing the deaths of Indian citizens by misleading them about Ivermectin. Point 56 states, “That your misleading tweet on May 10, 2021, against the use of Ivermectin had the effect of the State of Tamil Nadu withdrawing Ivermectin from the protocol on May 11, 2021, just a day after the Tamil Nadu government had indicated the same for the treatment of COVID-19 patients.”

Advocate Dipali Ojha, lead attorney for the Indian Bar Association, threatened criminal prosecution against Dr. Swaminathan “for each death” caused by her acts of commission and omission. The brief accused Swaminathan of misconduct by using her position as a health authority to further the agenda of special interests to maintain an EUA for the lucrative vaccine industry.

Specific charges included the running of a disinformation campaign against Ivermectin and issuing statements in social and mainstream media to wrongfully influence the public against the use of Ivermectin despite the existence of large amounts of clinical data showing its profound effectiveness in both prevention and treatment of COVID-19....

The brief cited US Attorney Ralph C. Lorigo’s hospital cases in New York where court orders were required for dying COVID patients to receive the Ivermectin. In multiple instances of such comatose patients, following the court-ordered Ivermectin, the patients recovered

Advocate Ojha accused the WHO and Dr. Swaminathan in Points 60 and 61....:

“The world is gradually waking up to your absurd, arbitrary and fallacious approach in presenting concocted facts as ‘scientific approach.’ While the WHO flaunts itself like a ‘know it all,’ it is akin to the vain Emperor in new clothes while the entire world has realized by now, the Emperor has no clothes at all.”

The brief accused the WHO of being complicit in a vast disinformation campaign. Point 61 states, “The FLCCC and the BIRD have shown exemplary courage in building a formidable force to tackle the challenge of disinformation, resistance, and rebuke from pharma lobbies and powerful health interests like WHO, NIH, CDC, and regulators like the US FDA.”

Dr. Swaminathan was called out for her malfeasance in discrediting Ivermectin to preserve the EUA for the vaccine and pharmaceutical industry. Point 52 reads, “It seems you have deliberately opted for deaths of people to achieve your ulterior goals, and this is sufficient grounds for criminal prosecution against you.”

"The Indian Bar Association has warned action under section 302 etc. of the Indian Penal Code against Dr. Soumya Swaminathan and others, for murder of each person dying due to obstruction in treatment of COVID-19 patient effectively by Ivermectin. Punishment under section 302 of the Indian Penal Code is death penalty or life imprisonment."

He further wrote, "After receiving the said notice, Dr. Soumya Swaminathan went on the back foot and deleted her tweet. ... By deleting the tweet, Dr. Soumya Swaminathan has proved her mala fide intentions." The Indian Bar Association dared to initiate a landmark court case against a Public Health Authority (PHA) to call out corruption and to save lives.

As the courts in the United States proved to be the life-saving force to ensure a patient’s right to receive Ivermectin, a court in India is now doing the same. . Perhaps this pathway will ultimately break the disinformation and censorship stranglehold around repurposed drug use to save lives. Maybe we will witness other countries following India’s example, both in medicine and in law.

Exhibit E. Questions in the Australian Federal Parliament about Covid and Vaccines. Published in Hansard, 1 June 2021 and 5 February 2021, at aph.gov.au

[At a parliamentary hearing on 5 February 2021 the following question was put by Tony Zappia, MP, Labor Party, of Makin South Australia. The person answering is Adjunct Professor John Skerritt, Deputy Secretary, Health Products Regulation.]:

Q. Once you get vaccinated, will you have to be vaccinated in, say, 12 months time?

Dr Skerritt: If you know the answer to that, could you tell us! That's the \$64 billion question. And that, of course, is one of the primary questions that people following this epidemic are asking. We hope not. There are two possibilities: either the current vaccines don't provide long-term protection per se, or there is antigenic or virus strain drift. It'll possibly be a combination of both. So it may well be you'll have to have Pfizer mark II in 12 months time because the virus, whether it's the South Africa, Brazil or UK strain, will have changed enough that you'll need a more efficacious boost in 12 months time. Or it could just be the inherent characteristics of a vaccine for a disease that you need to be boosted in 12 months time...."

[The following questions were put by Senator Malcolm Roberts and answered by Mr Edwards]:

Q. The vaccine only has provisional approval. Is it true that provisional approval is only possible where there are no approved pharmaceutical treatments available?

A. The provisional approval is possible where there is not a similar treatment available in that, for that group of patients. And so, if there'd been an approved vaccine, but say it had been on the market for several years, fully approved, then it wouldn't have been possible to provisionally approve a vaccine, but at the time of the submissions of those vaccines, and indeed we have provisionally designated the Novavax vaccine as well and the Johnson & Johnson or Janssen vaccine, it is possible to provisionally designate and potentially provisionally approve those vaccines.

Q. How long before we know the intergenerational effects?

A. There's no evidence at all from animal or human studies that the RNA vaccines, if you're talking about them, incorporate into the genetic material of human beings. They wouldn't have been approved for regulatory approval and that includes by much bigger regulators such as the FDA, if these bits of mRNA incorporated into the human genetic material. In fact, medicines that incorporate into human genetic material and are inherited are currently not permitted in most major countries, including Australia.

Thank you. How many times and how often would each of us need to be injected for the vaccine to be effective and for each time, for how long does the effect last?

A. ... I think it's very important that Australia knows that this is the start of our vaccine programme. It will almost certainly not be the end. There will be a need for boosters into the future particularly in relation to the variants of concern of which there are four now that have been designated by the World Health Organisation. ... How long the two dose effect works is still, we don't know. We know it's at least six months because that's the studies of, been looking at it for six months. It's almost certainly longer than that for the original strain, but the variance of concern adds another complexity to it.

[The following question was put by Fiona Matin, PhD, MP, and answered by Dr Murphy]:

Q. The immunisation schedule for children up to four years is not necessarily consistent between states.... I'm wondering about the psychology ... that having such transparency and information about associated risks will actually increase uptake of the vaccine....

A. We love psychology. We are spending well over \$23 million, I think, on a comms campaign, which is in three phases. The first phase is to get people confident about the registration process. They feature gentlemen in white coats and other people to assure people that our registration processes are as rigorous as anywhere in the world.

[The following question was put by Mr Tony Zappia, MP and answered by Dr Skerritt]:

Q. Have there been any concerns raised, in respect to pregnancy and the vaccine?

A. Dr Skerritt: Again, it's more a lack of data rather than any evidence of miscarriages and the like. ... Some clinical groups are recommending that, if you're not in a high-risk or high-exposure group and if you're pregnant, you hold off until you have the kid. However, there are the examples of the US and the UK, where you've got a number of pregnant healthcare workers and both systems are under such strain. If you took every pregnant doctor and nurse out of the UK at the moment and told them to stay at home for nine months, you'd put the system even under more stress. ... There hasn't been any evidence—and I'll check with Dr Cook that my statement is correct—of ill effects in pregnancy. It was more that, in clinical trials, it's normal to exclude pregnant people.

[The following question was put by Mike Freeland, MD, MP and answered by Dr Murphy and Dr Skerritt]:

Q. ... We've committed to helping our Pacific neighbours. When are we going to start rolling out vaccines to them, and will it predominantly be the AstraZeneca?

A. Dr Murphy: Obviously, AstraZeneca and then, later, Novavax, are the likely ones. DFAT have invested over half a billion dollars in a vaccine for the Pacific and they're doing some advance planning with the Pacific countries at the moment....

Dr Skerritt ... If you have two women in a village who miscarry two days after having the vaccine, you could lose whole villages and potentially half a country out of a vaccination system. We saw that in Samoa with the measles vaccine recently. In South-East Asia, the nature of our assistance will be different. They don't need us to build a vaccine safety system for them, but, for example, the Indonesians have never seen a messenger RNA vaccine before, and they want high-level technical, scientific help with those vaccines. ...

the government, through DFAT, is also funding procurement that will essentially cover the full population of East Timor, Papua New Guinea and all the Pacific islands, and will cover a percentage of the population—and that percentage is a lower percentage targeted at

vulnerable groups—in countries like Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, we hope, and the Philippines.

Exhibit F. Maxims Pertinent to This Case [Maxwell v Secretary of Defense]. General Principles of Law (Selected from the Law Dictionary, 1888 -- Wesley Gilmer's 1986 revision of Wm. Cochran Cox's 1976 edition)

The niceties of the law are not the law: *Apices juris non sunt jura.*

It is the duty of a good judge to enlarge his jurisdiction, i.e., to amplify the remedies of the law: *Boni judicis est ampliare jurisdictionem.*

He who has authority to do the more important ought not to be prohibited from doing that which is less important: *Cui licet quod majus non debet quod minus est non licere.*

Let justice be done, though the heavens should fall: *Fiat justitia, ruat coelum.*

We should judge by the laws, not precedents: *Judicandum est legibus, non exemplis.*

Law is the dictate of reason: *Lex est dictamen rationis.*

Law is a rule of right: *Lex est norma recti.*

The law will always furnish a remedy: *Lex semper dabit remedium.*

An evil custom should be abolished: *Malus usus est abolendus.*

Wretched is the slavery where the law is changeable or uncertain: *Misera est servitus ubi jus est vagum aut incertum.*

Odious and dishonest things are not to be presumed in law: *Odiosa et in honesta non sunt in lege praesumenda.*

The reason of the law is the life of the law: *Ratio legis est anima legis.*

Where there are many counselors there is safety: *Salus ubi multi consilarii.*

-- End of Exhibits in *Maxwell v Sec'y of Defense* Appeal brief.

QUIZ. TWENTY QUESTIONS FROM TWENTY CHAPTERS

1. What do you look for in an article to judge its truthfulness?
2. Can you be sued for libel if what you said was true?
3. When is crisis-acting ethical, and when not?
4. Is a professor free to publish his opinions about current events?
5. What does it mean when there's no physical evidence of crime, for instance, blood?
6. Which suspects were rounded up at Sandy Hook killing?
7. Do you think William Brandon Shanley was snuffed out?
8. If the massacre did not happen, what was Gene Rosen's role?
9. Who killed the 16 first-graders in Dunblane in 1996?
10. What should SCOTUS do with Tsarnaev's conviction now?
11. Should the CIA tell people that lying has become legalized?
12. Which members of Connecticut government deserve trust?
13. Did the contents of Nancy Lanza's house yield a motive?
14. If the story is fake, how could so many officers line up for the funerals?
15. For a drill, how many townspeople get prepared in advance?
16. What is the relationship between the corruption of the US Department of Justice and the corruption of local police?
17. How might one State rescue another from a dire situation?
18. The iconic photo -- do you think it reflects a day of murders?
19. What laws do you invoke if you find an event to be a hoax?
20. If minds have been messed up by false news, what is the best corrective?

ABOUT THE AUTHOR. Mary was born under a lucky star. Good things have come her way in droves. This started at Baptism, just before the blizzard of 'Forty Seven. It is still going on, unabated.

Education began with the nuns. Their Order was founded by a French-speaker, and they rang a bell every hour to make the students say "*Ah qu'il est bon le bon Dieu.*" Basically, God is A.O.K.

Maxwell's Dad graduated from Harvard College in 1922 and she is hoping to be the Commencement speaker when the Class of Twenty-Two graduates next year.

Well, not really. It's hard being a dissident. Even her own law school will not shelve her books such as *Fraud Upon the Court*. Why can't May-ree just fall into line and think the Tsarnaev brothers bombed the Marathon, or that the pandemic is all it's cracked up to be? Dunno. Might be something wrong in the head.

Prone to violence, vicariously that is, and ever law-based, she wants to see some action along the lines of her book *Prosecution for Treason*. "Even if it prosper, all should call it treason."

For the record, Mary does not believe every conspiracy story: she will go with the Moon Landing narrative until better info pops up. She thinks the Rodney King beating never happened! She thinks Monica and Bill did not do what they admit to doing and that it was a psy-op to get sympathy for the wife, pre-Senate win.

Maxwell knows that the situation is going to improve. Knowledge is the key. Solidarity is the key. Laughing at fear is the key. Calling a spade a spade would help a lot.

Want to chat? Give the old girl a buzz at MaxwellMaryLLB @ gmail. Or see Events at website ConstitutionAndTruth.com. Ta!

BOOKS BY MARY W MAXWELL

Published by University Presses:

Human Evolution 1984

Morality among Nations 1990

The Sociobiological Imagination (as editor) 1990

Moral Inertia 1991

Published by Trine Day Press:

Prosecution for Treason 2011

Fraud Upon the Court 2015

Consider the Lilies: A Review of 18 Cures for Cancer and
Their Legal Status 2015

Self-published while resident in Australia:

Port Arthur (co-authored with Dee McLachlan) 2015

Truth in Journalism (co-authored with Dee McLachlan) 2015

Etiquette with Feelings (for teens and tweens) 2012

Inquest: Siege in Sydney 2017

A Balm in Gilead (about Autism) 2014

Self-published while resident in the US:

Deliverance (about Pizzagate) 2019

Boston's Marathon Bombing 2021

Keep the Republic, Kill the Takeover 2021

ReUnion: Judging the Family Court 2020

Unreality: Sandy Hook Messes Minds 2021

New Book: Boston's Marathon Bombing: What Can Law Do? by Mary W Maxwell, LLB. Here's the Table of Contents:

Part One — Ten Embarrassing Facts

1. Fact: The Death of Sean Collier Is an Open Case
2. Fact: CNN Transcript Shows Tamerlan Survived
3. Fact: Boat Confession and Apology Are Bogus
4. Fact: Defense Team in Russia Acted Like the Mafia
5. Fact: Tsarnaev's Trial Is Reminiscent of Scottsboro
6. Fact: Favorable Witnesses Were Suppressed
7. Fact: A Backpack Cannot Change Its Stripes
8. Fact: There Was No Carjacking with Dun Meng
9. Fact: Laurel St Shootout Involved 3-6 Other Men
10. Fact: Chasing 'White Hat' Took Place in Arizona
11. *Conclusion to Part One:* There's No Case Here. Period.

Part Two – Bringing the Law To Bear

12. Law Requires Inquests for Collier, Todashev, Tamerlan
13. Ruling in *McCoy* Means Jahar Walks, but SAMs Block It
14. Blackstone Emphasized Crimes against Justice, in 1769
15. *Brady* Rule Guarantees Exculpatory Evidence Will Out
16. Civil Rights Law USC 1983 Protects Muslim Americans
17. *Prinze v US:* Federal Government Can't Dictate to States
18. Marathon Crime Scenes: Massachusetts Laws Apply
19. If the FBI Did the Marathon, They Will Pay, Of Course
20. Judges Can Be Impeached, Lawyers Can Be Disbarred
21. Officers of Media Companies Can Be Indicted for Fraud
22. The 1970 RICO Act Can Be Used in Civil Actions
23. Government Can De-gag, Discover, Offer Immunity
24. *Conclusion to Part Two:* Turn Back the Clock in Boston

Nota bene: The United States Supreme Court is currently considering the fate of the falsely accused Jahar Tsarnaev.

