


The Human Mind



and

Sandy Hook's Unreality

Mary W Maxwell, LLB

**The Human Mind
and Sandy Hook's Unreality**

Mary W Maxwell, PhD, LLB

ISBN 978-1-68489-700-1

Copyright Mary Maxwell, 2022, 2023

Keywords:

Sandy Hook School shooting, Adam Lanza, false flag, psy-op, legalized lying, Robert David Steele, Zephyr Teachout, Court of Equity, extrinsic fraud, *Soto v Remington*, Joseph Giovannoli, The Oath Keepers, Robin Allot, Philip Allott, Maui fire, crisis actors, citizen-led grand jury

Author's Email address: MaxwellMaryLLB@ gmail.com

Snail Mail: 175 Loudon Rd, Apt 6, Concord NH 03301, USA

Website: Constitution And Truth. com

Other books by this author:

Prosecution for Treason, 2011

Fraud Upon the Court, 2015

Inquest: Siege in Sydney, 2017

Reunion: Judging the Family Court, 2019

Boston's Marathon Bombing, 2022

Keep the Republic, Kill the Takeover, 2022

Society Is the Authority, 2023

Get up, Australia, Get Up, 2023

The author is a member of the Federalist Society, the Republican Party of New Hampshire and of Alabama, and the Irish Social Club of Boston. Her law degree and PhD are from the University of Adelaide, Australia.

To hard-working conspiracy theorists,
some of whom have been shunned
for seeking the truth

“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 (1962)*

**President Obama's Speech at the Sandy Hook Vigil,
four days after the alleged massacre, December 18, 2012**



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.

Preface to the Revised Edition

I am an odd Sandy Hook conspiracy theorist insofar as I was a believer until June 2021, 8 years after the event. But in that year, I caught onto the case of *Soto et al v Remington*, maker of the Bushmaster AR-15 rifle. This led me to revive my interest in fraud-upon-the-court, so I hastened to publish a book, entitled *Unreality: Sandy Hook Messes Minds* (2022). Recently that *Soto* case has settled.

Also, I've been recently influenced by a wonderful book by Joseph Giovannoli entitled *Seeing Reality As It Is: How Our Beliefs and Genetic Chaperones Shape Our Perceptions*. It's not about politics or conspiracies; it's about our amazing brain. The good news is that many highly credentialed persons are now analyzing the fact that so many people fell for the false claim of "health emergency" during Covid and started to obey "authority" unthinkingly.

This book argues that some fraudsters have become adept at persuading the public that "unreal" things are happening. I aim to show how damned difficult it is to *undo* a false picture once it has been presented by the media. But it's not impossible!

I thank William Sumner Scott, JD, of the New Jersey Bar for providing me with many pieces of information about Sandy Hook. I thank James Perloff, persistent exposé of false flags, and author of *Truth Is a Lonely Warrior (1985!)* for giving the following blurb to this book's earlier version: *Unreality: Sandy Hook Messes Minds*:

"Mary Maxwell has done an excellent job of reviewing many aspects of the Sandy Hook controversy. Her legal background makes this book unique, as she sheds light on many laws pertinent to the case."

I happily thank Robin Allott for his groundbreaking work on motor patterns of the brain. I am grateful to all photographers whose work I have used, and Dee McLachlan for the Foreword.

Mary W Maxwell Concord, New Hampshire October 5, 2023

Table of Contents

President Obama at the 18 December 2012 Vigil	7
Preface to Revised Edition	9
Table of Authorities	12
Foreword by Dee McLachlan	15
Part One – Let’s Examine the 2012 Event	17
1. The Iconic Photo Is All You Need	18
2. The Official Narrative of the Massacre	20
3. Solid Criticisms of the Official Story	27
4. Who Is Eligible for Punishment?	33
5. What Is the Catholic Church Doing Here?	37
6. The Gun Manufacturer Shows His True Colors	41
Part Two – The Human Mind	46
7. Four Stages in the History of Critical Thought	47
8. Orwell Knew! -- Your Mind Is the Target	50
9. The Ethics and Legality of Crisis Acting	55
10. Shanley Insisted that the Media Are To Blame	61
11. Motor Patterns May Dictate Your Thinking	67
12. Help Minors Who Were Trained To Lie	72

Part Three – How To Restore Solidarity	76
13. Proclaim an (Almost) Universal Amnesty	77
14. Do You Know What’s in the Guarantee Clause?	79
15. Regain the Court of Equity, against Extrinsic Fraud	83
16. Role of the Militias and the Jan 6 Non-Insurrection	88
17. A 9/11 Ruling Validates Citizen-Led Grand Juries	96
18. Please Stop Conversing in Unreality Terms!	100
Appendices	104
A. Maui Testifier: “We Must Fight Government”	105
B. Veterans Hopping Mad at Trickery by Officialdom	106
C. James Tracy Looks at Dr Wayne Carver’s Answers	108
D. SHES Skeptics’ Sarcastic Comments at YouTube	110
E. William Sumner Scott on How To Oppose the ABA	112
F. Sen. Rand Paul Refers Fauci for Criminal Investigation	114
G. Vaccines, “Dissident” Doctors, Lies	115
H. Joel Sussman Enlightens His City Council in Canada	116
J. Redacted Items from the FBI’s Sandy Hook Report?	118
Bibliography	120
Student Quiz	121
Addendum, <i>Maxwell v Secretary of Defense et al</i>	122
Index	139

Table of Laws and Court Cases Referred to in This Book

The US Constitution

Article III – all of the judiciary’s powers	96
Article III, sec 3 – treason	62
Article IV, sec 4 guarantees states a republican form of gov’t	79
Amendment I -- freedom of expression	128
Amendment II -- right to bear arms	95
Amendment IV – right to privacy	127

United States Laws

National Defense Authorization Act 2012	55
Smith-Mundt Act 1948 -- on domestic propaganda	55
The All Writs Act 1911	86
Sherman Anti-Trust Act 1890, codified at 15 USC 1	65
Enslavement of minors, 18 USC 1591	73
Providing material support to terrorists, 18 USC 2339	61
Obstruction of justice, 18 USC 1503	82
Misprision, failure to report a felony, 18 USC 4	82
Sending a threatening email 18 USC 875	35
Congress can challenge Electoral College votes, 3 USC	94
Lying, oe covering-up, to Congress 18 USC 1001	114

Connecticut State Laws

statute of limitations CGS (Conn. General Statutes) 54-193	75
Connecticut law changing the structure of grand jury law	98
crime of perjury CGS 53a-156 147	77
crime of larceny CT penal code 53A-119	81

crime of impairing child's morals CGS 53-21	73
whistleblower protection CGS31-379	28
crime of tampering with a witness CT 253a-151	154
freedom of information (state)	43
law of privacy of autopsies if child killed	36
donations must be used for the purpose stated	32

Rulings by the US Supreme Court	
Marbury v Madison 1803, US Supreme Court's Task	96
US v Reynolds 1953, national security excuse for secrecy	60
Sullivan v NYT 1964, right to publish criticism	36
US v Throckmorton 1878, fraud vitiates everything	83
Citizens United v FEC 2010 campaign funds	65
Hazel-Atlas v Hartford-Empire 1944 error coram nobis	84
US v Korematsu 1944 internment of Japanese Americans	87

Other Court Cases

Pozner v Fetzer 2014 defamation re fake death certificate	36
Soto v Remington/Bushmaster 2014 assault weapon	41
Maxwell v Secretary of Defense, re mandatory vax	122
Shanley v O'Prey 2016 fraud and terrorism by media	61
Bullock v US 1985 where the court itself is corrupted	87
Remington bankruptcy case in Alabama	43

A Federal Rule (which is not a law)

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60B, regarding fraud	84
--	----

Foreword by Dee McLachlan

(revised in 2023)

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 book will make you confident enough to show others that the official Sandy Hook narrative is silly; *mortifying* might be a better word.

You will NOT be able to support the official story any longer. A few chapters in this book dwell on the fact that using one's own gray matter is the virtuous thing to do. Please virtue-signal with your good brain. We need all the virtue we can get.

I am the editor of the Melbourne Australia news site Gumshoe-News.com. Mary Maxwell has been writing articles for me for ten years and we are co-authors of two books, "Truth in Journalism," and "Port Arthur: Enough Is Enough." We have lately worked together on issues of Covid vaccination, and the fact that the Children's Courts participate in child trafficking.

While living in Australia, Mary also investigated the 2014 hostage-taking in Sydney and concluded that it was a false flag. Her education on this came from attending the coroner's court during the 2016 Inquest. She is prone to evaluate the honesty of "famous cases" (including the Boston Marathon bombing and 9/11) by researching the legal niceties found in trial transcripts.

That is true for the Sandy Hook case. The current edition of her book was prompted by the \$73 million settlement that the gun manufacture made to nine of the bereaved families. You will see her insights into that litigation – it is jaw-dropping.

Once you are attuned to the patterns and clues, it becomes easier to identify reality – real 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

This book is entitled “The Human Mind and Sandy Hook’s Unreality.” Many people argue that gun-control was the motive for this false flag, but Maxwell thinks the bigger plan was to make us doubt everything. Thousands of people doubt the “reality” of the Sandy Hook massacre, but the majority of Americans believe it happened as reported by the media. Such a state of confusion and contention is pretty unhealthy.

I think our health will improve when we place the blame on the right parties. Mary, being a law graduate, has an eye for the methods that keep the powerful protected from prosecution!

In the appendices, William Scott recommends an overhaul of the law school curriculum -- why not teach a course on this crucial undermining of criminal law? This book is full of ways in which law can bring an end to our ludicrous obeisance to the real perpetrators.

It is also about the way the courts let us down.

See? *Unreality* is a very real thing! Thank you for your help in getting us back on a track of reality.

Dee McLachlan, Melbourne, Australia September 29, 2023

Dee is the author of six children’s book in the Awaken series. She has been working at the coalface for the last five years on the unbelievable treachery of government in regard to the stealing of children. Dee can be contacted at McLachlanDee@gmail.com

WELCOME TO PART ONE

**LET'S EXAMINE
THE OFFICIAL STORY**

WHAT EVIDENCE PROVES THAT THE SANDY HOOK
MASSACRE TOOK PLACE? WHAT EVIDENCE SAYS
NO?

Chapter 1. The Iconic Photo Is All You Need

It isn't easy to fight the power of the media. For every inch of news column that you might be able to secure for your side of a story, "they" can secure millions of inches. But when an event is fairly complicated, media will screw up, perhaps fatally.

They screwed up in regard to Sandy Hook. The published, on that very morning (December 14, 2012), a photo of the crying children being led out of the school by a policewoman, and it went world-wide. It even appears in the Encyclopedia Britannica. It's the iconic photo of the tragic Sandy Hook massacre. It was snapped by photographer Shannon Hicks of the *Newtown Bee*:



“Near”

The justification for the way the kids are walking, sort of in a conga line, is that this is the way schools train kids to exit from an “active shooter” scene, or a bombing, or whatever. As for them having their eyes closed (do you think kids would comply with that instruction?), it is supposedly to spare them the trauma of seeing wounded or dead schoolmates.

One girl is clearly crying. Since it is my baseline that the massacre story is false, I speculate that she was told to cry. As for the general looks of the weather, a December day in Connecticut should normally be cold enough to make them look shivery.

Skeptics, deniers, dissidents, tin foil hatters, whatever you want to call conspiracy theorists, such as myself, figure that the photo may have been taken weeks earlier as part of a drill. This is supported by the photo below. I call it “far” since the person who snapped it is standing farther away than the photograph of the “near” shot, the iconic shot, as he caught more of the scene.

We don’t need any more than this to call the massacre a hoax. The policewoman in the far shot has now placed a little girl at the front, perhaps to try a different look. It’s obviously not a panic scene, judging by the body language of the adults.



“Far”

Personally, I hate to sleuth a false flag by using pictures, as the source of them is often unverified. But in this case, Wolfgang Halbig emailed Shannon Hicks to ask if she had taken the iconic photo and she, in a return email, said Yes. (I bet Shannon was used by the Biggies and that she is unhappy about it all.)

I offer this as the Introductory chapter so, if you’re reading along, and start to get chicken about calling Sandy Hook a hoax, you can come back to the Near-and-the-Far and rest assured.

Simply: if the Near got published worldwide, with official approval, claiming that it WAS shot on 12/14 of kids exiting from the shooting spree -- and we can see (from the Far) that such an explanation of the scene does not hold up, then the iconic shot is a lie. Those are NOT kids exiting school on 12/14.

Chapter 2. Official Story of Sandy Hook Massacre: Adam Lanza Killed 27 Persons on December 14, 2012



On the left, Adam Lanza. On the right another photo of him, perhaps doctored to exaggerate his weirdness.

What happened at Sandy Hook Elementary School (SHES)? The following statements are made, even today, by officials and media:

A 20-year-old unemployed man, Adam Lanza, owned some guns, one of which was given to him by his mother, on a previous Christmas (she wrote him a check, according to the FBI).

On the morning of December 14, 2012, which was a Friday, with no known provocation, he shot his mom dead in her bed. She, Nancy Lanza, was divorced from her husband Peter Lanza, and had one other son, Ryan. She lived in a large house at 36 Yoganda St, in Newtown, Connecticut, with son Adam.

There hasn't been any interrogation of ex-spouse Peter as regards the death of Nancy. There has been no mention of an autopsy of her. The mortician for Adam was Kevin Riley.

At the scene of the massacre, brother Ryan's ID was found in Adam's pocket. At first it was said that Adam was a graduate of SHES school, but this may have been a mistake. On the day, at 9:30am, while school was in session, Adam drove up and parked his car, licence plate #872-YEO. The school is not viewable from the road, so Adam Lanza must have had a plan to go there.

On arrival, he was faced with a locked door. He broke a glass door and climbed through it into the building. A 'reenactment,' by way of an animated cartoon shows him carrying two hand guns -- a Glock and a Sig Sauer -- and a rifle:



Adam Lanza, a 3-gun-man!



The broken window

He soon entered a classroom and started shooting. He killed all 16 kids there, and the teacher. Then he went into another room and killed 4 more, and their teacher. (So says the narrative.) But Kaitlin Roig, was able to hide her 15 pupils in the built-in lavatory at the back of her classroom. It is only 3 feet by four feet but she was able to fit them in and keep them quiet, thus saving their lives.

Lanza encountered four other staff members, including the principal, in the hallway and shot them dead. He then “turned the gun on himself” committing suicide. None of this is captured by any kind of surveillance camera within the school, or outside..

Soon, law enforcement was on duty. They, too met a locked door and so they climbed through the broken-glass door. Even though the first cop to enter could have then opened the regular door from inside by its handle, subsequent cops have said, in affidavits, that they used the glass entry.

Detective Van Ness (see Chapter 1 above) swore, in an affidavit, how she helped the kids that day:

“The undersigned, investigator, having been duly sworn, deposes: [abridged] While on the scene this detective [me, Rachael 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.... [I] 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....”



That statement is found in the Sedensky Report, the state’s inquiry. A summary is public at: portal.ct.gov. That report, “Final Report on Sandy Hook Investigation, was done by the State’s Attorney for the Judicial District of Danbury. It was issued on November 25, 2013. One would expect it to be a forensic-type investigation, covering all the steps police carried out that day.

The bulk of the Report (I have seen only the Summary) seems to be about the psychological state of Adam Lanza. There was a 7,000 page police report, too, in 2013. And four years later, an FBI report. Bob Ryser, writing for NewsTimes.com, says:

“The FBI’s 1,500-plus page report on the case was released in response to a Freedom of Information request. It is highly redacted, but its grim details are still haunting. The transcript from a telephone answering machine seized by police at the Lanza home in Newtown shows everyday life dissolving in cascade of urgent messages after the worst crime in Connecticut history.”

I haven’t found parts that could be considered grim or haunting.

It starts with a message from the dentist’s office that Adam is due in for a cleaning. Then there is a message reminding Nancy about a lunch date. Then the Connecticut State Police: “Please answer the phone.” Other voices said: “Saw headlines ... checking in,” “I’m really sorry for what you are going through,” and “Is this the (expletive) that killed those kids?” Here is more from Ryser:

“The release of the FBI documents, which a top prosecutor said Tuesday contain little new information for law enforcement, comes two months before the fifth remembrance of the Sandy Hook massacre and Newtown’s irreplaceable loss. Nicole Hockley, who lost a son in the massacre, said she was reading the FBI documents with a sense of hope. “We are looking through all of this information to see if there is anything that could have pointed to an opportunity for intervention,” said Hockley. I hope this gives us some additional knowledge to point to signs and signals that were missed.’

“In 2014, the state Office of the Child Advocate released a 140-page report about the mental health history of Lanza, who had Asperger’s syndrome, anorexia and obsessive-compulsive disorder. The report found multiple missed opportunities to help Lanza by the school district and by Lanza’s family, but it concluded that no single factor was to blame for Lanza’s act.

Dear Reader, if you are waiting for the revelatory part to start, you may be waiting indefinitely. I guess it could be that I have not looked hard enough, but in the Sedensky Summary -- which I assume gives proportionate weight to all aspects of the work -- there is near-exclusive concern for “what made Adam tick.”

I have to be non-enthusiastic when they quote what Adam was reading online, as the same was done for Jahar Tsarnaev in the Boston Marathon case, informing us of Jahar’s great interest in Islam, but Jahar – “a pothead” -- had no interest in Islam. Per the Sedensky Report on Lanza, investigators found: “Photocopied **newspaper articles from 1891 pertaining to the shooting of school children.**” The summary observes [with my bolding]:

“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 shootings and a strong interest in firearms.

“For example, there was a spreadsheet with mass murders over the years listing information about each shooting.

In line with this, the police supposedly searched Nancy’s home:



Newstimes.com:

“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. 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.

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. [Emphasis added]

Among other found items that Sedensky lists are: images of the shooter holding a rifle to his head, a five-second video (dramatization) of children being shot, a computer game "School shooting "where the player controls a character who enters a school and shoots at students," documents on weapons and magazine capacity, materials advocating for the rights of pedophiles (not pornography), large amount of paper relating to Columbine.

Note: Both the school and Nancy Lanza's have been razed to the ground, so the physical evidence can no longer be challenged. As to why the expensive-looking house was destroyed, we are told that neighbors did not want to look at the scene of that murder. A demolition company gave its services for free, and the city became the owner of the now-bare land.

Or so it is said.

At the end of the Sedensky report, we find this bold statement:

"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...."

Chapter 3: Solid Criticisms of the Official Story



Robert Steele (1952-2021)

There are many ways to fault the official story. I don't want this book to be a compendium of them. I am eager to get to the legal activities regarding Sandy Hook. But I must offer a few items that I hope any reader would accept as compelling evidence of dishonesty in the Sandy Hook story.

Let's begin with Robert Steele. I only lately discovered that he had written a short book called "Sandy Hook Truth: Memo to Potus," which is on the Internet. Before that, I had known of his work at the International Tribunal for Natural Justice, and trusted him. Steele died of Covid, in a hospital but I'm guessing he was killed.

Here is a statement from him that makes a lot of sense to me, as I have investigated five false-flag incidents at book length:

"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."
-- Robert Steele [Emphasis added]

We will come back to Steele below. Now moving to a **second criticism of mine**, regarding the affidavit of Detective Rachael Van Ness, quoted in the previous chapter. She is the police-woman in the iconic photo. Her statements are **absurd**. They seem to have been made up to suit the photo, although that photo must have been snapped on a date before December 2014.

“This detective,” as Officer Rachael Van Ness formally refers to herself, said she was helping the children leave the school. The rule was for them to walk single file and close their eyes. She also said she was at the back of the line, rather than at the front. How would the front ‘blind’ student know what to do?

“This detective” said her duty was to keep any parents from pulling their kid out of line. What! The best possible thing for those kids would be to run to Mom or Dad. And why would any parent put up with being held back? The story is so crazy that I wonder of it was put in to test how far our gullibility for official narratives goes. (Not that many people would have seen the affidavit in Sedensky’s report; I came by it by luck in 2021.)

A third criticism of mine has to do with the way Sandy Hook **whistleblowers** have been treated – always a good clue. Professor James Tracy lost his academic job for blogging some doubts. Wolfgang Halbig, an ex-state trooper of Florida was manhandled by cops in a midnight raid of his home. Professor James Fetzer was billed \$450,000 in an unfair defamation suit. The worst was William Shanley who filed suit against the media – quoted below. He ended up dead, poor thing.

A fourth criticism is the **paucity of evidence** provided by law enforcement to show Adam’s guilt. If Connecticut is so sure the children died, and that Lanza did it, why isn’t there a heap of ordinary evidence from the crime scene? Close your eyes for a minute and think what you would expect to be readily available.

Photos of Adam, recorded sounds of the shots, blood on the floor, comments by witnesses, right? Nada.

As is typical of fake cases, the normal surveillance cameras had been turned off. (No explanation given). The janitor supposedly helped lock the doors to classrooms once he saw what was happening, but no one has interviewed him. Why? No finger-prints taken, such as from the steering wheel of Lanza's car. Why?

In the iconic photo, only a few kids are shown. The population of the school was around 500. Where are the older students? Where are the teachers? How about some hospital records of the two persons who reported got wounded but survived?

Why did the children's names not show up on the SSDI (Social Security Death Index)? If it's because they were too young to have social security numbers, what of the six deceased staff members? Note: Cell phones were not as ubiquitous in 2012 as they are today, but some of the arriving parents, or the firefighters, or someone would have taken picture of the chaos. Wouldn't they?

A **fifth criticism** is the **suppression of data and material**. For example, autopsies were put under seal. Questions from the public were treated as near-criminal. It was easy to smack down anyone who expressed a doubt that the children died on the ground that this was cruel to the very sad families.

Some people were accused of stalking, when they legitimately sought answers. A mentally disturbed woman, Lucy Richards, was accused of harassing Leonard Pozner, a dad. Wolfgang Halbig says he was physically prevented, by security guards, from entering a public building in Hartford CT. A man named Matthew Mills was arrest by Stratford Police during a memorial race for Vicki Soto as he had asked Vicki's sister Jillian a question about a family picture. Mills was charged with interfering with police!

My **sixth criticism** of the official story has to do with malfeasance by government, involving much of the state of Connecticut and the feds. Assuming, for the moment, that "Sandy Hook" was all a lie, why was it done? One leading theory is that it was part of President Obama's plan to undo the Second

Amendment's promise of the citizen's right to bear arms. This would explain Sandy Hook parents' emphasis on gun control.

Another possibility is that all such false stories of violence are intended to put the public in a general state of fear and apprehension. A recent headline was "Gunfire in two crowded buses in Harlem" (September 26, 2023). It is sheer Machiavellianism to get people to worry about their safety. "You'll be able to rule them easily – they'll even help you enforce your despotism."

Still another possibility is the one suggested in the title: The Human Mind and Sandy Hook's Unreality. There have been millions of views of Internet videos and articles that outrightly mock the Lanza story. So it can be assumed that many people have doubts.

In the olden days, you could seek truth from such institutions as the courts, the church, the academy, or "pillars of the community" to get the truth. If, today, there aren't any such reliable sources, you will start to feel that honesty has gone out the window. In which case, what would motivate you to be honest in your own dealings? You don't want to be a chump, do you?

Various other criticisms have been printed, in refutation of the government narrative. I don't think we need them, as the case for a hoax is watertight. But I will mention a few:

1. The late Dr Wayne Carver, coroner, said, publicly, "I hope the people of Newtown don't have it crash on their head later." That seems like something a doctor would say if he had been asked to make crazy claims about autopsies of non-existent children.
2. There was very little media coverage of any grandparents.
3. It's odd that parents were forbidden to view their child's corpses. As to whether the survivors of the six deceased staff members gained entry to the school to see their loved one, I have not heard.
4. And I did not see any news of the two allegedly wounded teachers, Natalie Hammond and Debra Pisini, being taken to hospital. They have never been interviewed on TV.

Chapter 4: Who May Be Eligible for Punishment?



(L) Eric Holder (with President Obama) was US Atty General in 2012. Photo: Boston Globe (R) Robert Mueller was FBI Director in 2012

Assume for now that the entire Sandy Hook incident was a psy-op. We lack the benefit of trial transcripts as there was no trial. This is typical in psy-ops: you have to depend on media and on government personnel for any information.

If I am *wrong*, and 27 people really got murdered, and Adam Lanza did the whole thing, there is no need to punish anyone, other than to punish the officials who harassed critics, for violating their First Amendment rights. But if I am *right*, that Sandy Hook was a psy-op, many people could be up for punishment. There is no reason to say it's OK to do a psy-op and that the lies of the official narrative should be forgiven.

As noted, ex-CIA agent Robert Steele says that he carried out a false-flag operation overseas, and that his instructions were to warn participants that they must never tell what they did. He told them there were “severe penalties” (who knows -- maybe death?) if they spoke out. Because of this, I'd recommend that lenience be shown to participants who felt they were trapped.

This chapter will assume that SHES been established to be a hoax, and will look to see the range of crimes involved. “Blackstonian” crimes, such as obstruction of justice --- in the courtroom – will make an appearance later in the book.

Money Crimes. “Connecticut law requires that gifts invited from the public must be used solely for the purpose represented ... in the solicitation.” False collections constitute fraud.

Many citizens gave freely to the cause of bereaved parents in 2012, and since then many gave to the gun-control cause. I do not criticize any of them. Likewise I do not accuse any of the *collectors* of funds if the Sandy Hook massacre was indeed real, or if the collectors genuinely believed it was real.

But if it did not happen, the collecting of funds for the gun-control cause, “based on what happened at SHES in 2012” is not OK. I would think the donors can ask for their money back.

It is reported that The Newtown Police Union spent \$30,000 on “events” and expenses intended to “repair the morale of the department,” such as co-pays for psychiatric treatment, medical bills, and lost wages for officers. What if they lost no pay?

The main misuse of money is not what came from \$28 million in gifts, but on taxpayer money used to set up the whole thing. Were media outlets paid to tell false stories? Were actors paid to play the part of First Responders? Were politicians paid to stay quiet?

Was someone paid to murder William Shanley? Or, if not to murder him, to destroy all his pre-2012 recordings of interviews?

It is said that \$50 million was provided, to build a new Sandy Hook Elementary School, for which the price should be only \$8 million. What was that all about and who kept the change?

What if the \$73 million paid to nine plaintiffs in the *Soto v Remington* case did not really get handed to them? Or if it did get paid out by Remington for a false lawsuit, what is owed to the shareholders of Remington who footed that bill?

What if judges were paid to do the wrong thing? Where did that money come from?

Some Charities Listed in Connecticut Attorney General's and Commissioner of Consumer Protection's Survey That Solicited Donations Related to the Sandy Hook Tragedy. A total of \$28 million was collected by charities such as:

Adopt A Sandy Hook/Newtown Cop Program
America Responds With Love, Inc.
American Red Cross
Angel of Hope for Newtown
Angels of Sandy Hook Elementary
Children's Memorial Walkway
Connecticut Bar Association - Young Lawyers Section Connecticut Community Foundation
Connecticut State Grange Foundation, Inc.
Boy Scouts of America, Pack 170 Memorial Fund
CTPTSA Sandy Hook School PTA
Cultural Alliance of Western Connecticut
Fairfield County Community Foundation
Funeral Consumer Alliance of CT
Gray Foundation, Inc.
Greater Hartford Police Federal Credit Union
Healing Sandy Hook Through the Arts, Inc.
Kevin's Community Center Free Clinic
Kris Schwartz (Angels of Sandy Hook Bracelets)
My Sandy Hook Family Fund
National Philanthropic Trust
Newtown Cultural Arts Commission (NCAC)
Newtown Family Recovery Fund aka National Service Charity
Newtown Forest Association, Inc.
Sandy Hook School Memorial Tree Fund
Newtown Kindness
Newtown Lions Club Foundation, Inc.
Newtown Memorial Fund
Newtown Parent Connection, Inc.
Newtown Pride
Newtown Rotary Club Foundation, Inc.
Newtown-Sandy Hook Community Foundation, Inc.
Newtown Strong/Newtown Proud
Seven of these organizations reported raising over \$1 million.

Perjury. The crime of perjury often goes unpunished. In a courtroom if a party loses, his loss of the case is perhaps seen to be sufficient punishment. The judge and the prosecutor are unlikely to chase after him with charges of perjury. And in this age of “lying is not really bad,” perjury doesn’t arouse ire as it used to.

So far in this book we have encountered one instance of perjury outside of a court case, that of police detective who (I think) signed an affidavit with crazy claims of leading blindfolded kids from behind and not letting parents take over. There are many such affidavits in file and it is quite a worry to think that someone as professional as a detective can do it with impunity.

There is also possible perjury made by Leonard Pozner, father of six-year-old Noah. I mentioned earlier that Lucy Richards was arrested, and served time, for harassing the Pozner family based on her conspiracy theories. I personally know a lot of conspiracy theorists, and none of them have any desire to physically attack persons such as Pozner.



Lucy Richards took a plea, admitting guilt in exchange for a lighter sentence. Photo: Sentinel Sun, cbc.ca

Since this was a government prosecution of Lucy, rather than a lawsuit by Pozner, there perhaps weren’t any signed statements under penalty of perjury. Also, Lucy took a plea, so she herself probably did not give sworn testimony.

Assistant Federal Public Defender Robert Berube wrote in his sentencing memorandum that Lucy Richards -- a former waitress, now on Social Security disability benefits -- “is the product of an extremely unusual upbringing,” was “emotionally abused by her parents” and was “reared in a hell hole.” Wow. So vulnerable.

The US Court website stated, on June 17, 2017, that Lucy Richards pled guilty to crime under 18 USC 875(c). That law says:

“Whoever transmits in interstate commerce [e.g., sends an email] any communication containing a threat to kidnap or injure another shall be fined or imprisoned not more than 5 years....”

US District Judge James Cohn sentenced her to five months in prison and three years of supervised release (now completed). Laura McMahon, writing in the *Sentinel Sun*, wrote:

“The judge ordered Richards to continue to receive mental health treatment and banned her from visiting several websites that promote conspiracy theories that falsely claim the Sandy Hook and other mass shootings never happened.... Though Richards has a history of mental health problems, Senior U.S. District Judge James Cohn told her he did not believe they were a major factor in her decision to commit the crime. [She] was part of a group of people who insist that some mass shootings are part of a government hoax or conspiracy to take away gun rights, the judge said. [He said]: ‘Your words were cruel and insensitive.... This is reality. There is no fiction [here] and there are no alternative facts.’”

I was not aware that a judge could add a punishment that is not on the books, such as “Don’t visit conspiracy-theory websites.” I also don’t know how Judge Cohn can profess to know that there are no alternative facts.

The Death Certificate Perjury? James Fetzer, a professor emeritus of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin, now age 80, co-edited a book entitled “Nobody Died at Sandy Hook; It Was a FEMA Drill To Promote Gun Control.” In it he showed a photo of the alleged death certificate of first-grader Noah Pozner. Fetzer said it was doctored. Noah’s dad, Leonard sued Fetzer.

Pozner has been the most litigious of the 40 bereaved parents. He cannot sue the people, including me, who express disbelief of the SHES event, per the protections of the First Amendment, backed up by the 1974 US Supreme Court case *Sullivan v New York Times*.

Still, Leonard ‘Len’ Pozner was able to claim defamation against himself, saying that Fetzter in effect called him a liar by saying that the death certificate of son Noah was fake. Len filed his pleadings in Wisconsin; Fetzter replied. He had affidavits by two expert forensic witnesses supporting the claim of fakery.

Judge Frank Remington ruled by summary judgment in favor of Pozner, saying that the two experts (who are properly credentialed and experienced) were just giving their ‘opinion.’ So Fetzter lost, without there ever having been a trial on the subject. A jury was then called in, solely to fix the amount of damages. In 2019 they decided on \$450,000. Fetzter took it higher on appeal but all judge panel judges simply said “Affirmed.” A trifecta.

The question here is: Did Pozner commit perjury? If his son *had* died and if Len then promulgated a fake death certificate on the Internet (for whatever silly reason), I suppose that does not merit punishment. But if there was never such a person as Noah and the dad promulgated a wholly fake certificate and then sued the man who insulted him by calling it “fake,” then perjury occurred.

The real issue underlying the *Pozner v Fetzter* case is whether a child named Noah Pozner ever lived. The public is now unable to see any of the death certificates. And there had, incidentally, been a law passed months before the SHES massacre to prevent any autopsy of a child from being inspected, for privacy reasons!

I believe the wrong that was omitted in the courtroom was by the judge. If the whole thing is a racket, as I suspect it is, Pozner is merely the front man for FEMA, or similar. His crime should count the same as that of any of the many persons who retailed a false story (and/or took payment for it, as alluded to above).

The judge, however, works for us. He may have committed Blackstonian crimes (such as obstructing justice), but I don’t rule out that he committed treason -- “levying war” on us all.

Chapter 5: What Is the Catholic Church Doing Here?



Monsignor Robert Weiss celebrates Golden Jubilee of his ordination, Photo: Newtown Bee

Let's pause for a minute. I know the reader must be thinking "How can Ms Maxwell accept the idea that no children got killed at Sandy Hook? Surely it would be impossible for a whole town to go along with a hoax if hoax it was. Locals would have come out of the woodwork, wouldn't they?"

You would think so. I am Catholic and would have taken it as given that the clergy would object to any false story. No one could ever have pressured priests or nuns to support a hoax. No way!

But now I will show you how three priests acted wrongly. The first is Bishop Tobin in Providence, RI. A Connecticut woman, Maureen Crowley, allegedly tried to become a whistleblower, or truth supporter in 2015 and so she delivered an essay on the subject, to the office of the bishop. She later stated "He called the Rhode Island State Police, who then called to interrogate me."

I would not have heard about that but for seeing an article on the Internet by a physics professor from Georgia, Winfield Abbe (1939-2021) whom I will quote below.

The second is Monsignor Weiss, pastor at St Rose of Lima, near SHES. He should speak in a fatherly way to conspiracy nutters like me, but he doesn't. We have reason to be curious about that school's connections. But he is silent. The third is Cardinal Timothy Dolan, who compared one of the killed teachers to Jesus. I assure you, clergy do not speak way over the top like that. It must be that he was ordered to lay it on thick. See if you agree:

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 NY Times. "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, FallenHeroesProject.org

As for St Rose of Lima, if nothing else there have got to be kids in that school who are whispering “hoax.” But they see teachers refusing to discuss it. I mean they see their teachers lying. I never, ever saw any teacher of mine lying. These boys and girls might also figure that their teachers are scared.

In October 1962, in Boston, my classmates and I saw our nuns a bit scared during the Cuban Missile Crisis. (N-war was on the cards). Still, they wouldn’t have obeyed a rule to keep hush-hush about wrongdoing. Fortunately, America being America, we did not have to expect a gestapo visit if we criticized government.

Maureen Crowley. Now I remind you of a physics professor, Winfield Abbe, at the University of Georgia. He said the Sandy Hook hoax was “the most shameful episode of any during my lifetime of 81 years in America.” (Maybe he has not heard of 9/11.) It was he who republished the essay by Maureen Crowley. Here it is, allegedly in her words; I do not know where she is now:

“An Essay on Sandy Hook,” AUGUST 29, 2016 [by CROWLEY]

“Who on earth originally would have reason to not trust the heads of a state police department. or in their wildest dreams believe these law enforcement officers would be integral in taking a TOPOFF (stands for top official) Capstone Drill, and passing it off as a mass casualty event?

It seemed inconceivable they were utilizing the federal agencies of DHS, FBI, FEMA, etc. for a massive fraud that also made use of, in my opinion, organized crime in Connecticut, to implement a massive agenda, of which gun control was but one component?...

Sandy Hook researcher and retired Florida Safe School Commissioner Wolfgang Halbig’s wife has been threatened where she works. NY resident **Jonathan Reich** was arrested and hit with a \$50,000 bond for legitimately asking questions of Connecticut medical examiner Wayne Carver, as to how bill 1054 got passed in Ct. in 2011, that prohibited autopsies of juvenile murder victims from being made public. A schoolteacher in NY, **Adam Heller**, who legally purchased a firearm, was met at his home by seven policemen, then

tossed into a mental institution. He lost his job for questioning Sandy Hook. Connecticut State Police Major William **Podgorski** -- a lead investigator into Sandy Hook -- who was privy to extensive FBI redaction of documents, received minor surgery, then was transferred from Bristol Hospital to Yale's New Haven facility.

49 years old and the father of three children, Podgorski shockingly **died**, and there was NO mention whatsoever in Connecticut mass media, of his connection to the investigation of Sandy Hook, or his cause of death. My discus [Disquis?] account has been blocked from commenting on the *New Haven Register* page about his death.

Many participants in the scam have retired, as well. The school is sawdust, with construction workers employed in its demolition forced to sign non-disclosure agreements. **[There's] no footage whatsoever of "Adam" on the newly acquired school security system.** Columbine is still intact, and there's plenty of video footage of shooters Klebold and Harris [in Colorado].

I will also point out that there are tweeted pictures of Danbury Fire fighters, police cars, and fire engines filling up the parking lot of the firehouse (several feet away from Sandy Hook Elementary School) tweeted at 9:13 A.M. -- yet "Adam Lanza" according to the official report, did not arrive at the school until 9:30, with calls for ambulances going right up until 10:05. **There are even reports of the media filling up the very large local ball park, Treadwell Memorial, as early as 7 A.M.!**" Citizens had the fear of God instilled in them to utter a peep if the school was closed **lest they might not wake up in the morning.**" [Emphasis added]

Prof Winfield Abbe appended this remark: "And just think of this: There are roughly 1.3 million very silent lawyers in the U.S. today. Why the deafening silence from them on this massive crime against all citizens by government at every level -- federal, state and local in the cesspool of the country."

I think I know the answer: each person alone is too overwhelmed by the size of it. Plus, one can always hang on for another week or month, waiting for someone high up to take charge. It's now 10 years since the Adam Lanza myth was spun. Hurry, People!

Chapter 6. Gun Manufacturer Shows His True Colors



Economist.com

Although I've been vocal about some psy-ops and false flags, I didn't believe, in 2012, that Sandy Hook "didn't happen." I was sure it did happen! I argued, in print, *against* a 'conspiracy theory.'

Then in 2021, New Jersey attorney William Sumner Scott (who had heard that I was an amicus curiae in the Marathon bombing case) wrote to me about *Soto v Remington*. It took me a few months to hammer it into my brain. Finally I got it. It now is the item that most convinces me that we all should be yelling 'Hoax.'

Soto is a complicated case. Bottom line: I reckon the gun company, Remington Arms, makers of Bushmaster AR-15 rifle, were aware Sandy Hook was a hoax. I speculate that they're cozy with FEMA. Remington, which belonged to JP Morgan in 1913, is presumably dependent on the biggest munitions customer, the US military. Th US and Big Business find ways to coordinate.

Donna Soto is the mother of the allegedly deceased Vicki Soto, a 28-year-old teacher at SHES on that day in 2012 – after whom a school in Connecticut was recently named. Two of Vicki's siblings, Jillian and Peter, have been regular anti-gun preachers. Last year they went to Uvalde, TX, to speak. To me they look like a sincere family. I am sad to be criticizing them.

Donna Soto is the 'name plaintiff' in *Soto v Remington* (later *Soto v Bushmaster*). Only nine out of a possible 28 victims sued: 26 killed plus Natalie Hammond and Debra Pisini who were wounded.

This being a private lawsuit, it could be settled out of court. In 2022, the plaintiffs accepted \$73 million (\$8 mil each). Four were family of staff members: Lauren Rousseau, Mary Sherlach, Vicki Soto, Rachel D’Avino. Five were parents of: Benjamin Wheeler Dylan Hockley, Noah Pozner, Jesse Lewis, and Daniel Barden. Originally Natalie Hammond was suing but she dropped out.

Why Didn’t Remington/Bushmaster Fight the Case?

In 2014, they all lost the case, as gunmakers have immunity thanks to a 2005 federal law: Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (PLCAA). Soto et al appealed and won at Connecticut Supreme Court, on grounds that the gun was wrongly advertised, per Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA).

Above, I said the case is suspicious. Here is my justification: As soon as plaintiffs got past the gunmaker-immunity block, the defendant, Remington, could have tried to show that it was the Glock, not the rifle, that did the damage. Or it could have subpoena’d every witness in town, or challenged the Christmas cheque that Nancy Lanza gave Adam. Or presented footage from the Internet that purports to show the rifle being stored in a trunk.

But all Remington did was rush to declare bankruptcy. So far, you may be thinking “Well, they just knew they could not win.” OK, but here are two more things they did against their own interest:

1. Jim Fetzer, wishing to protect himself from that \$450K fine in Wisconsin, asked to intervene in the *Soto* case, on the side of “Lanza didn’t do it. Nobody did it.” Remington said: Get lost.
2. Remington asked to see the kids’ school records, include their conduct records – how embarrassing! The parents asked the court to seal them up. The court obliged. In fact it went further and sealed the children’s birth and death certificates. I think Remington made that bad-sounding request for the kids’ conduct reports, *in order* to get the court to seal it! Thus we, the public, can’t even see a record of kids’ attendance at school or their exact names. Note: Connecticut’s legislature could still modify this.

Given that Remington manufactures a consumer good, you would expect them protect their customers, rather than protect the government. But look around you – is there any large business that sides with folks rather than with government? To put the question more severely, does Big Business object to any US government plan? No, because those US government plans came from Big Business in the first place. I don't think it's within the realm of 'doable' for Bushmaster to yell "Our gun was innocent."

In short, I speculate that Remington went along with the hoax, to fulfill government's wish that we have gun control (and, per the theme of this book, that we mess up minds about "reality.").

President Obama's Gun-Control Agenda

Now for a word about "2A." The Second Amendment guarantees every citizen the right (or even the duty) to bear arms for "the security of a free state." Nevertheless, a major plan of government today is to 'attrit' the Second Amendment. Most citizens have been hearing constantly about shootings and don't know that such reports may be false. People now want gun restrictions.

Today it's actually hard to tell folks, "The Framers of the Constitution – or at least the ratifiers of the Bill of Rights – want everyone to bear arms." The shoot-outs at Las Vegas or Orlando or Columbine, or Sandy Hook have truly made a dent. Frankly, I don't think guns can match the hi-tech weapons anyway, but it's still an affront to Americanism to say "Hand over your gun."

What about the Fraud Aspect: Any Legal Implications?

Soto case was a private settlement, voluntarily made. What if the decision be in the hands of a court? Ah. Then the judge has to do the dirty. And so he/she has done, in every case brought *against* the hoax -- cases such as James Tracy's job termination or Lucy Richard's "threats." Fetzer did not succeed against the defamation suit by Pozner, and Halbig can't even win the satisfaction he is clearly entitled to regarding his extensive Freedom of Information requests to the states of CT and FL.

I have known for a while, from other cases that I work on, in the US and Australia, that our courts have been captured. We simply do not, any longer, have a place **where we can go to get justice**. That story will be taken up in Parts Two and Three of this book.

For now, let's go back to the specific matter of Remington siding with the psy-op. In doing so (if I am correct that it did so), did it commit any crimes? It claims to have paid \$73 million to nine families. That was a spending decision made on the basis of fraud.

Or maybe it didn't. If the whole thing is a hoax, Remington never paid money out, but pretending it did must constitute fraud. A bankruptcy case is supposed to list all the final payouts, so one could search to see any such payment being made to the plaintiffs.

Anyway, let me read you the closing sentence of the 1878 US Supreme Court ruling in *US v Throckmorton*, which has not been obsoleted, as far as I know, and will be discussed in Chapter 15:

“In all these cases, and many others... relief has been granted... Mr Wells, in his very useful work on Res Adjudicata sect 499, says **Fraud vitiates everything**, and a judgment as well as a contract...” [Emphasis added]

There are many ways, in the common law, to counteract fraud. When I say “common law” I mean the jurisprudence built up over the years by rulings on cases. In the common law we find “crimes against justice,” mostly committed in a courtroom, such as perjury, tampering with a witness, and hiding evidence. Old-fashioned ones such as champerty and maintenance, still extant.

A 2003 Ohio case *Rancman v. Interim* decided “A contract making the repayment of funds advanced to a party to a pending case contingent upon the outcome of that case is void as champerty and maintenance.” Did the CIA have such a contract on SHES?

Can the CIA be prosecuted if it ran the Sandy Hook hoax? You don't have to ask; it goes without saying. Anyway, the answer is Yes. All we'd need is some sort of grand jury to indict the CIA.

Quick Recap of Part One's Argument for Hoax

1. The school crime scene yielded none of the standard physical evidence such as **blood stains, or bullet holes** in the wall and both that crime scene and Lanza's house have since been **razed**.
2. A retired CIA guy, Steele, told us that he had once run a false flag where he was instructed to **assure the actors of protection**, and threaten severe consequences if they ever revealed the truth.
3. When Pozner sued Fetzer, a jury demand was in the complaint, so a Wisconsin judge was obligated to **give Fetzer a jury trial** to resolve whether the death certificate fake, but didn't. Rather, he made a summary judgment. An Appeals Court OK'd this.
4. The iconic photo does not look like kids are exiting a school after a shootout. SHES had hundreds of children, why would only a few 7-year-olds be shown? When the "Far" photo is added, **we see adults calmly watching the children**. There was no drama.
5. Detective Van Ness's affidavit describes an **absurdity**: keeping the surviving kids away from their parents. See this old photo:



Dunblane parents rushing to find their kids after a real shootout in 1996:

6. *Soto-Remington/Bushmaster* case is suspicious. Connecticut's law, CUTPA, provided a way around the federal law that makes gun-makers immune. When Soto sued, Bushmaster made an offer of \$33 mil and declared bankruptcy -- without asking for discovery.

WELCOME TO PART TWO
THE HUMAN MIND

HOW IS IT POSSIBLE, POST-ENLIGHTENMENT,
THAT WE NO LONGER LOVE REASONING?

Chapter 7. A Four-Stage History of Critical Thought



Walter Ong's Orality and Literacy (1982), Joseph Giovannoli's Seeing Reality As It Is (2019), Robin Allott's The Child and the World (2012)

In Part Two we think about thinking. Historians of technology sometimes identify four stages of human progress: the discovery of agriculture, the mining of metals, mechanization of labor, and science's conquest of matter. Four stages of critical thought can also be identified. By "critical thought" I mean the intellectual questioning of what we are doing. This has become urgent today.

The **first stage** was the **biological evolution of language** in our species maybe 100,000 years ago. With language we could tell our neighbors what we were thinking and thus develop a basis for accumulating knowledge, as well as for gossiping and making up imaginative stories. Leaders used the spoken word to give instructions. There was probably not much critical thought in early days, although curiosity and the search for explanations must have always been innate in humans.

The **second stage** was the **invention of writing** about five thousand years ago. This made possible the keeping of records, which aided commerce and education. It also paved the way for the writing of law, biography, poetry, and holy scripture. As for critical thought in this stage, Greek philosophers from the 6th century BC openly engaged in questioning our common ideas. "Know thyself," said Socrates. Aristotle is credited with having discovered rationality and logic.

The **third stage** was the **development of mass communication** through printing and then through electronics. Johannes Gutenberg introduced movable type in 1450. By 1900, a majority of people in the world were literate. Electronic broadcasting of information and entertainment began with radio in the 1920s and TV in the 1950s. By 2000, the personal computer started to replace paper print. In the 1600s, Rene Descartes had opened a field of critical thought -- epistemology -- that asks how do we know what we know? Generally, that inquiry was prestigious in academia but now has taken a fall. It's politically incorrect to question things, as though people should just accept propaganda patriotically (!). Humans also get seduced into cults, wherein independent thinking is a sin.

The **fourth stage** is **mind control that seeks physical control** of everyone's brain. This includes indirect mind control such as by causing social panic or despair such that the population's rationality is turned off and folks take refuge in a leader's care. Or it can be direct mind control through hypnotic techniques or drug-induced states. Currently, the effort is to implant chips in the brain or alter the human DNA. "Artificial intelligence" is already carrying out many tasks. That could mean a complete end to critical thought. Luckily, however, many watchful people are rushing to get their criticisms in as fast as possible.

Why the Rush to Artificial Intelligence & Transhumanism?

Along with each of the 8 billion humans alive today, I'm entitled to have a say in the proposed changes to human nature. I think if we exercise some critical thought, we will all be inclined to say "Stop this train!" Here are some reasons for stopping this train:

* We are not ready to evaluate the suggested changes, as we don't know enough about what the new look would entail. The sales pitch is that a few brilliant people do know what it looks like, and if they say it will be good, we should trust them.

* Naturally, we shouldn't trust individuals who don't even feel a responsibility to explain what is going on. The ones who do speak

openly appear to be mentally unwell. Clearly, two of the sponsors of AI -- Bill Gates and Klaus Schwab -- are clinical cases.

* The history of scientific efforts to control minds is loaded with murder and torture, for which no perpetrator has yet been held to account. By 1920, Tavistock doctors studied shell-shocked soldiers from WWI, perhaps with an eye to finding out how to create shell shock. By 1940, Allen Dulles (later the first head of the CIA) was practicing mind control techniques on babies, including by breaking the mother-child bond. (Think about it.)

*As of 1950, Sidney Gottlieb was in charge of the MK-Ultra program that wanted to find out how to wipe out an individual's memory and ego, using "clever tools" such as terror and humiliation. (Gee, how clever can you get?) 'Mind control 'experiments' are going on in prisons right this minute. It may yet happen to you. You won't like it.

* Some of the victims in the US, UK, and Australia report that the mind control they underwent was done in the context of satanism. That is a religion in which the leaders actually support evil as a good. (On a separate note, such persons have started wars, using the combatants as their playthings.) A show of conscience would be considered a breach of etiquette in that social set. A recent Scotus judge was a child torturer – they don't wear horns, you know. I take Henry Kissinger, Hillary Clinton, and Tony Blair to be satanists. Have we forgotten that in 2009 the Brits paid a settlement to the Mau Mau of Kenya, whom they castrated? (They used pliers.)

* A perfectly good reason not to tamper with Mother Nature is that Mother Nature knows best. Every living creature, both plant and animal, is a miracle, and their interactions are fantastic. We can deduce, from the AI guys' failure to talk about Nature, that they do not even appreciate the wonders of the human body. Furthermore, they don't even attempt to map out how their proposed changes to the human species could affect the general ecology of the planet. By God, they are thick. Please demote them in any way you can. Create a barrier to their work.

Chapter 8: Orwell Knew! The Human Mind Is the Target



Cops ambush protestors, Melbourne, 2021, Photo: Dee McLachlan

Eric Blair, aka George Orwell, attended Eton from 1917 to 1921. I am quite sure he knew more than his biographers admit. Surely he was up there with the ruling class, and what he lays out in the novel *1984* must have been genuine plans for our future. I think he knew the worst of the worst. Maybe he went beyond his allowed revelations, to really warn us -- he died in 1950, age 47.

At the end of Part One, I claimed that we have lost our courts. But we have not lost the laws that a good court could still use. The problem is that courts no longer adhere to the value of honesty. They seem to be marching to a different drummer.

In 2022, for an article at granitegrok.com I conjured up an open letter "to the Great Nine," on Sandy Hook as an Orwellian thing:

To the Nine American Justices,

O Justices, you have before you a very modest case in which the Petitioner/Defendant, Prof James Fetzer, who was denied a demanded jury trial, now asks for your help. All that is required is that you send it back to the lower court for a trial. The case involves a conspiracy theory, but that need not play any part in your judgment. Not at all. It's about a simple matter of procedural justice, to which each of us Americans is entitled at all times.

What this man is asking is that he be given a chance to fight for recognition of reality. The alternative is that he be forced to cave in to the 21st Century trend of treating reality as unimportant. I believe we are all under great pressure to cave in to that trend these days. Therefore, your decision on this case could be wonderfully historic. Or, it could be devastating.

This afternoon (September 30, 2022), I pulled out my old copy of the “novel” *1984*, written by George Orwell in 1949. I was reminded that a main plot of that book is Winston Smith's desire to re-discover a hidden past, the real past. In Winston's society in London, set in the fictional 1980s, a totalitarian government, led by “the Inner Party,” has **deleted the past** from the record. In the real 2020's we have a government doing just that!

The book *1984* starts with Winston Smith, age 39, working for the Ministry of Truth. His job is to receive old publications, such as from *The Times*, in order **to make a correction if the content no longer accords with officialdom's current truth**. When he writes the new version, it gets printed and made to pass for the original. He dutifully sends the original down the memory hole (which goes to a furnace).

Until Winston acquires a girlfriend (Julia), which acquiring is criminal itself, he is alone. There's no one he dares speak to. So we, the readers, get to listen to his private battling with questions that can be roughly paraphrased as “What was the real past like?”, “If the current reality (the Party's lies) are not true, must I make my emotions conform to them?”, and “Is life worth living if we're all forced to be fakers?” Allow me to quote *1984* verbatim, to give the flavor. Page numbers are from the Penguin Signet Classics edition. The headings and bolding were inserted by me.

Making “Truth” (The Party announces that we are at war against Eurasia.) pp 34-35:

“The Party said that Oceania had never been in alliance with Eurasia. He, Winston Smith, knew that Oceania had been in alliance with Eurasia as short a time as four years ago. But where did that knowledge exist? **Only in his own consciousness, which in any case must soon be annihilated.** And if all others accepted

the lie which the Party imposed -- if all records told the same tale -- **then the lie passed into history and became truth.... All that was needed was an unending series of victories over your own memory. 'Reality control', they called it....**

“[Winston's] mind slid away into the labyrinthine world of doublethink. To know and not to know,... **to repudiate morality while laying claim to it ... [ultimately] to become unconscious of the act of hypnosis you had just performed.**”

The Defamation Lawsuit

I interrupt Orwell here to describe the case that is before you, Great Nine. I mean it's in a pile waiting to see if just four of you will agree to rule on it. It was initiated as a lawsuit by Leonard Pozner, saying Prof Fetzer had defamed him by claiming that Pozner faked his child's death certificate. Wisconsin Judge Frank Remington could have subpoena'd the original from the state.

But instead, the district judge made a summary judgment in Pozner's favor, and then called in a jury to set the amount of damages. They set it at \$450,000. The Wisconsin Appeals Court went along with this, despite Prof Fetzer having been deprived of the basic due-process right to Discovery. (Does that tell you something?)

The ruling fits into Orwell's theme about reality. I think a finding of a faked death certificate would have laid open the truth about Sandy Hook's famous massacre, namely, that it never occurred.

Fetzer hired two top forensic examiners of documents to look at the death certificate, A P Robertson and Larry Wickstrom (independently). He submitted their affidavits but to no avail.

I think all Americans will feel betrayed when they finally see just the following item that Fetzer was not allowed to show the court. It's simply a detail from the death certificate in controversy that any layperson can understand:

Forensic expert A P Robertson found the letter N to be two pixels lower, and the letter R two pixels higher, than the other letters. This wouldn't happen in a computer-generated document:



Also, the other forensic expert, Larry Wickstrom, swore: "From my examination of the documents which were presented to me electronically and by US Mail, I make these determinations:

1. That the 132KB, JPEG imaged Certificate of Death, for Noah Samuel Pozner age 6, (CoD1) as examined is an altered and unreliable document image. No determination of originality, or intentional act of forgery, can be supported due to the multi generational copy degradation of printed image and the low resolution of the captured image.

2. That the obviously altered in shape and content, 1.7MB, JPEG imaged Certificate of Death, for Noah Samuel Pozner age 6, (CoD 2) is a forgery.

3. That the State of Connecticut, Registrar of Vital Statistics, has issued two different and certified as true versions (CoD 3 & 8) of state file number 2012-07- 078033, a Certificate of Death, for Noah Samuel Pozner age 6.

4. That for reasons disclosed and undisclosed, the content of state file number 2012-07- Case 2018CV003122 Document 178 Filed 06-07-2019 Page 7 of 22 Page 8 078033 has been digitally and physically altered.

5. That until such time as the State of Connecticut addresses and rectifies the conditions that allow this kind of record manipulation, any 'true copy of a record filed', certified by the Seal of State of Connecticut, Department of Public Health, should be considered suspect and treated as unreliable."

Orwell on the Limiting of Language. Now back to Orwell, Here is Syme, Winston's co-worker, lecturing to him. Pp 52-5:

“You haven't a real appreciation of Newspeak, Winston... In your heart you'd prefer to stick to Oldspeak, with all its vagueness and its useless shades of meaning. You don't grasp the beauty of the destruction of words. ... Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought?”

“In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it.”

“Even now, of course, there's no excuse for committing thought crime. It's merely a question of self-discipline, **reality-control**. But in the end there won't be any need even for that. The Revolution will be complete when the language is perfect.

Dear Justices, Orwell also tied-in the Party's mind control policy with emotional control. Winston kept puzzling over the way that the government wanted to take away everyone's humanness. P 30:

“Today there were fear, hatred, and pain, but no dignity of emotion, or deep or complex sorrows.... Tragedy belonged to the ancient time when there were still, privacy, friendship and love.”

Many people are sensing this loss of love today but they have no clue that it is a directed program. I hope that you, who can recognize the real picture, will open this defamation case. That will send a message to the evil doers that the US Supreme Court is “allowing” citizens to sort through the lies, and will challenge the long-existing the governmental protection of high-level criminals.

Thank you for considering this.

Yours very respectfully,

Mary Maxwell, 175 Loudon Rd, Apt 6, New Hampshire 03301
Email address: MaxwellMaryLLB@gmail.com

[Alas, Scotus did not take the case.]

Chapter 9. The Ethics and Legality of Crisis-Acting



A Sydney drill in 2015 for a plane crash, Photo: DailyTelegraph.com.au

Word has passed around that a “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 Reps 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 modification 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 downsize a bit. Smith-Mundt forbade the stuff we send overseas from doubling back onto the US audience as propaganda.

The 2012 NDA Act, incorporating 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. Hence, 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.” Yet 50 years ago the Joint Chiefs took it in stride. They arranged for us to mimic a plane crash and blame it on Cuba, to justify us warring on Cuba. We’d arrange some mock funerals for the (non)deceased. They wrote:

The Declassified Northwoods Memo of 1962 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.... [Emphasis added]

[Note President Kennedy put the kibosh on this plan, so it never took place.]

For this chapter, 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."

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 good 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. This isn't the same as the lady actor who promotes furniture polish.

Crisis Acting. 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. I say that it's not OK. So let's pause to grade different types of crisis-acting scenes:

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.

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.)

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. (Note I think the scenes we saw in Melbourne of police beating elderly protectors (over the lockdown) were meant to condition us all.)

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.

FEMA Homeland Security Emergency Exercise Handout

April 30, 2013. Note: This is Form-68, given to all volunteer crisis actors. It's not particularly related to Sandy Hook

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 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. 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. [Oh, really?]

Note This form is dated 2013, after SHES, but was in use before 2012.

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. We should developed that idea; after all, if the result is a lessening of democracy, this crisis acting of a fake event must somehow be criminal. Repeat: SCAD, SCAD, SCAD.

There Is Definitely No License To Lie

Sidney Powell's 2014 book, *Licensed To Lie*, is about the DoJ's lies. She laments about a case that's not related to Sandy Hook:

“Lying to a court is diametrically opposed to achieving justice. Truth is a very great value and we need Connecticut's Court to act now to protect it. In England, a writ for the correction of error could be granted only after the king has signed *Fiat justitia, ruat caelum* — ‘Let justice be done even if the heavens fall’. [Yay!]

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 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.

Thus, 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.

Chapter 10. Let's Deal with the Media: They're Killing Us



(L) William Shanley, Photo: Blogger.com (C) Professor Zephyr Teachout, Photo: New York Times

William Brandon Shanley, a resident of Connecticut, sued, in the US District Court, almost all the heads of media in the English-speaking world: CBS, Viacom, Disney, CNN, the BBC, and so forth. Shanley also included as defendants some specific persons such as 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.

These are Shanley’s opening words December 2014, in *Shanley v O’Prey*, USDC for Connecticut – case number 3:14-cv-01929:

“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, on June 15, 2017:

“[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.”

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.

Although I like to say “No one died at Sandy Hook,” Shanley in some sense died there, and we all killed him. He was arrested and imprisoned for year (2014-2015) for having bothered people about the hoax – and why not, it was his duty. A sorrow he suffered was that his landlord evicted him and since he was not there to clean out his apartment, “they” threw everything away including his lifetime’s work of interviewing people.

On 23 October 2016, Shanley wrote to Congress’s Committee on Oversight and US Senate Committee of Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. He said:

“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.... Despite the official narrative, this was an exercise in which **there is no evidence anyone died....**

“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.**

“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.**

“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.

“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. [Bolding added]

“Cordially, Will Shanley 56 Avon Street, New Haven”

The Sherman Anti-Trust Act

The main culprit in the Sandy Hook hoax, if hoax it be, was the mainstream media. At YouTube even now we see clips from the major networks recorded on the very day, 14 December 2012 and interviewing many of the parents, weeks later. 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,” Dr Zephyr Teachout, professor of law at Fordham, 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 feed.

Worse, when you sign the contract to deliver your chickens to, say, 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, Zephyr 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 from the king 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.” [Emphasis added] -- See 15 USC 1-38

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 2010, in *Citizens United v Federal Election Commission*. 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.

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.”

Now here is the amateurish lawsuit by the late William Shanley. He dreamed of it “bringing down the MSM.” Goodonya, Citizen. It mentions the iconic photo. I have abridged it greatly:

William Brandon Shanley v

R. Scudder Smith, Publisher Curtiss Clark, Editor Shannon Hicks/AKA JANE DOE, Asst. Assoc. Editor The Bee, Inc., The Associated Press, Inc. Gary Pruitt, Pres/CEO AP, Inc., The New York Times Company, Aurthur Sulzberger, Jr. Publisher, The Hartford Courant/Tribune Media, Andrew Julien, Publisher

[A. PARTIES, B. Jurisdiction...]


C. NATURE OF THE CASE. Request for Declaratory Relief. Defendants have published the photograph, and stated that it was taken at 10:09 a.m. on December 14, 2012, and that it shows an evacuation of the Sandy Hook Elementary. Plaintiff has discovered a wider view of children being staged for photos during a drill, proving that Shannon Hicks is lying about Exhibit ...and we see that it is exposed as not being a news actuality at all.

Exhibit C: A folder containing a sampling of AP-affiliated newspaper front pages from around the world that published this staged photo. Exhibit D: Sandy Hook Mass Evacuation video.

Dash Cam from 3 State Police cars at Sandy Hook School further evidence of no emergency and the lunacy of this criminal conspiracy to terrorize humankind. Plaintiff contends that Defendants published the photograph with captions knowing that it misrepresented the facts. This is a ripe, justiciable controversy.

D. CAUSE OF ACTION ... Claim I: That the criminal conspiracy that published the fake photograph were among the perpetrators of an act of terrorism against *me*, the People of the United States and the World. Claim II: That said Defendants have been actively involved in a cover-up of such crimes against me, the People of the United States and the World the criminal conspiracy that continues to this date. Punitive damages \$5 billion dollars. ...Signed under penalty of perjury, WS. Dec 17, 2014.

Chapter 11. Motor Patterns May Dictate Your Thinking



AI robots taking over ping pong, Photo: Highlight Reel's YouTube channel

The robot shown above never gets it wrong. He has been programmed to hit the incoming ball, which he can “see.” He must twist his hand, arm, back, knee, ankle, etc, to position his body the same way you or I would, in order to send the ball back. He can’t be using his cerebrum, since he ain’t got one. He is using only motor programs. What about the human on the opposite side of the table? He has a cerebrum -- just this morning he was trying to decide whether to re-mortgage his house! But during most ping-pong moves, his motor cortex does the work.

By chance I came across a 1989 book, *The Motor Theory of Language Origin*, by Robin Allott. I will greatly simplify the motor theory:

Some of the actions we take, such as breathing, swallowing, or blinking, are controlled by the autonomic nervous system. No thinking is needed. All of those behaviors are instinctual. Much of our **thought-out behavior is also based on instinct**, as in that guy above deciding to re-mortgage his house.

There were no houses in evolutionary times, much less mortgages, but *Homo sapiens* was evolving various ways to calculate his best advantage. Robin Allott was mainly interested in figuring out how language evolved. It has to do with a connection between perception and action. A simple creature, the paramecium,

perceives a bacterial item he can eat. He propels his body toward it with his cilia. Or when a baby get hungry, the pang in his stomach may sends a message to his motor cortex to make him cry. Mom will appear. The language thing is similar. If my senses perceive high heat, I might yell “Turn that thermostat down.”

Here in Part Two, “The Human Mind,” language is not the focus. I want to tie Allott’s ideas in with those of Joseph Giovannoli. We must ask “How do so many Americans seem blind to the truth about Sandy Hook?” Giovannoli was the author in 2000 of *The Biology of Belief*. In his 2019 work, *Seeing Reality As It Is*, he supplies a new term for the way we “inherit” the culture, and the beliefs, of our forebears. His term is psycho-genes. Sure we have a biological way of carrying our ancestors genes, but we can also “carry” their ideas. They get handed down if they help survival.

I suspect that just as we have a program for physical actions -- like that robot ping-pong champ, we may have a program for thinking. It’s not all DNA. What we learn in childhood – hey, I can still recite the Credo straight through – seeps down. The practices of one’s culture are “second nature.” New things, psycho genes, get into you, and you become their servant. Recall this song by Frederick Lowe:

“It’s second nature to me now, like breathing out and breathing in, I was serenely independent and content before we met. Surely I could always be that way again and yet, I’ve grown accustomed to her face, it almost makes the day begin....” Etc.

Media and Mind Manipulation. But wait – now there is a whole industry of mind manipulation by the media. Their experts are trained to give us psycho-genes **that work in the favor of our masters**. I assume that what our masters want is our obeisance, and now they know how to get it. Quoting Giovannoli:

“Today, through the media...using propaganda...power elites corrupt what the public believes, and thereby what businesses, governments and other entities do. If we permit this to continue by interpreting the constitutional protection of free speech to

extend to corporations... whose purpose is to thwart free speech, we are probably jeopardizing the right of future generations to open debate intended by the US Constitution.”

To repeat: we have instincts, which often use motor programs. We also have second-nature learned “instincts.” And now we have whole arrays of mind-manipulators. They work through schools as well as by newscasters, opinion columns, etc. So “the Human Mind” today is not as independent as it once was.

Most Americans, unfortunately, think “Sandy Hook” is real. They are sitting ducks waiting for the next false story to be added to their collection of “historical events.” (Ah, just four months after Sandy Hook we had the Boston Marathon ‘bomb.’ And in 2021 we had the full-on Hollywood psy-op known as ‘Jan 6.’)

Does the rebellious spirit of the college crowd counteract this? No, as we can see from the strong defense students give to the ‘woke’ ideology. As Bev Eakman has said, teachers have, for many years been advising students NOT to argue an idea through, not to their deploy reasoning, not to disrupt the “consensus.” They have been given the rule “Don’t hurt anyone’s feelings” as prime.

Can the humane instinct step in to modify our war policies? Here again a deft media trick can change all that. I quote Giovannoli:

“In the Gulf War ... press coverage put heavy emphasis on the opinions of US military figures and their explanations of the technical genius of American-made military technology. ... War was presented to Americans as a sort of exciting video game characterized by flashes of light in the night and precision attacks devoid of any bloodshed and death. This process of desensitizing of the media, and from there, the American people to the horrendous human effects of war-making culminated in the revolting spectacle, on January 30th, 1991 of reporters chuckling along with General Norman Schwartzkopf as he joked while showing them videos of supposed ‘smart bombs’ killing people like ants from the safety of 30,000 feet’.”

Our domestic enemy knows all the tricks of mind control and knows simple truths of how we operate unconsciously. Let's imagine some globalist deciding that the US needs gun control. She asks President Obama to create a scene that Americans can understand. He then tells Attorney General Holder to tell FBI Director Mueller to get with it. (By the way, Mueller came on board just weeks before 9/11 and quit right after the Marathon.)

Mueller calls in his false-flag specialists, and asks Which states have a good corrupt government and a lot of mind-controlled citizens? Four states are found in the database for that, and Connecticut gets picked, as Richard Blumenthal is its attorney-general. (He was named in the Wikileaks emails as a Pizzagate person.) They choose a city in CT that has good relations with the Church, and a police department with many "Intel" officers.

It is decided that a drill will be advertised. As James Perloff has pointed out, the point of having a drill occur may be to have a story ready to explain police behavior if the event falls apart. I notice that in the first month after "the massacre," major media quoted only unnamed "officials" for its news, and later gave names. Possibly they were waiting to see if any smart citizens made an appreciable stink.

Note: they also plant immediate YouTube conspiracy theorists to be able to control the CTN ('conspiracy theorist narrative')! Right away there were claims in the CTN that the real SHES was an abandoned school, that Lanza was seen locking his rifle in the trunk, that Gene Rosen, a neighbor, had acted as his career. Later there was talk that the actual non-deceased kids sang in a choir at the 2013 Superbowl, and that the fake parents had got paid off by receiving a fully-paid house 3 years earlier. Sincere sleuths may have originated some of those, or fraudsters, who knows?

Control of insurance companies was needed. I have heard that some families sued Nancy Lanza's Home Owners' Insurance policy and were paid \$96K each. Control of the CT legislature was needed for passage of a law making some gun manufacturers liable despite a federal exemption. And for the privacy law.

Control of courts was, sad to say, not much of a problem. I am forced to think that the corruption starts at the very top. I assume the case against Alex Jones was staged. As of today, most Americans think he got what was coming to him, for insulting the families. He played along with that, acting as if he were hit with a billion-dollar judgment for ‘inflicting emotional distress.’ No. His case never got to the merits. The judge in Texas knew better than to let it get to the merits. She made a default judgement on the grounds that he had failed to produce requested documents. And in Connecticut, Judge Barbara Bellis, citing contempt, wrote:

“The Court's authority here is rooted not only in Practice Book Section 13-14, but the Court also has **inherent sanctioning power**. With respect to the issue of contempt, the Court finds by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant, Alex Jones, willfully and in bad faith **violated without justification several clear Court orders** requiring his attendance at his depositions on March 23 and March 24 [2-22].” [Emphasis added]

Meanwhile all citizens absorbed the idea that it’s illegal to say that Sandy Hook is a hoax. (I am hereby legally saying it *was* a hoax. If I’m wrong the punishment will be criticism, not jail.) The sacking of Prof Tracy, at Florida Atlantic U, also helped send a message to college students not to push their teachers about conspiracies.

Another problem for Mueller to sort in advance was the hiding of the 6 not-dead teachers. I find it hard to believe that married people could separate, but only one of the 6 had a husband.

FBI creative writers also had to produce tons of drivel:

“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. ...”

Consider how the Sandy Hook story insults your intelligence!

Chapter 12: Help Minors Who Were Trained To Lie



“Dad, about that cherry tree....” Photo: nordskogpublishing.com

It is essential for kids to be trained in truth-telling. This is because lying is normal. We all lie, a lot. Anything listed in the Ten Commandments is something humans want to do -- hence the commands to stop doing it. Plus, there are secular punishments.

But in recent decades there has been a training *to* lie. Children’s entertainment shows implicit admiration for one who can succeed at a task by being cleverly deceptive. In 2021 at TheConversation.com, Gail Heyman described an experiment at UCal San Diego where a kid was told to hide 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.”

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.” [Wow]

Just imagine what the world we be like when the value of truth has dropped off the radar. You won't be able to expect your partner in a contract to carry out his part of the deal. You will never know if the TV weather forecaster is lying.

All this is part of a much bigger plan to demoralize people and destabilize society. Have you seen the YouTube interview of Yuri Bezemov by Ed Griffin, made in 1985? Soviet defector Bezemov, of the KGB, explains how he was ordered to change American society. He says "It's easy. It takes only 15 years; you start with the 3-year-olds."

For purposes of this chapter, I wish only to point out that there is still law on the books to criminalize deception. And surprisingly there is law on the Connecticut books: 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 16 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"

And don't forget the Thirteenth Amendment to the US Constitution, which makes slavery a crime. Any child made to do immoral things for an adult, by coercion, is acting as a slave:

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.

Was I ever surprised to find that Connecticut's Child Protection Service says: "Moral neglect is: Exposing, allowing, or encour-

aging the child to engage in illegal or reprehensible activities by the person responsible for the child's health, or care.”

To repeat, it is my belief that the official story of Sandy Hook is untrue. Possibly some persons could be charged with crime for forcing some pupils to lie. Also, some children of that school, once they reach age 18, could file a civil action for damages. *Without a lawyer, they can file pro se for \$402, but only singly, not together.* I've scripted a fictional court case here, as a very rough template:

United States District Court for the District of Connecticut

Jim Anxiety, Dina Depression, and Bruce Humiliation, plaintiffs
v

Linda Loopish, Director of FEMA for New England States, Bobby Bluebird, Attorney General of Connecticut, Gary Bull, Official in Charge at the Mandy Brook Fire Station, all in both their official capacity and their private capacity, and Rupert Murderly, head of Newsamillion, Inc, and Newsamillion, Inc, defendants

Jury trial demanded

I. Introduction. An “active shooter drill” was scheduled to take place at the campus of the abandoned Mandy Brook School and its local firehouse on December 13th and 14th, 2012. It was run by a combination of local, state, and federal government personnel. The government planned to create a drama in which a 20-year-old boy, loaded with guns, would be said to have entered the school by breaking a glass door and shot 20 first-graders and 6 staff members. The actual students, families, and teachers were subsequently told to uphold this false story. They were threatened with harm if they spoke out.

II. Jurisdiction and Venue. This is a federal case because the direction of the activity was likely led by Federal Agency, FEMA. If a trial is held, the venue should be at some distance from Mandy Brook district, owing to complicated involvement of local officials, civilians, and churches.

III. The Parties. The Plaintiffs are three children who, on December 14, 2012, were in fourth grade at Mandy Brook School. The Defendants are three persons who held government positions on the day, plus one that is a media corporation and one, Rupert Murderly, who heads that corporation.

IV. Statute of Limitations. Connecticut statute of limitations for civil actions is two or three years. It should begin to toll when the injured party reaches the legal age for suing. Under state law, a cause of action may begin when the injury “is discovered or in the exercise of reasonable care should have been discovered.” The Plaintiffs not only were too young to file a claim, but the pressure on everyone deterred lawyers from representing citizens in any Mandy Brook-related matters.

V. Injury. These children were age 10 in December 2012. Their teachers, parents, and neighbors assured them that story of the killings, as reported in the newspaper and on TV, had a good purpose and they must play along with it. Over the years, Jim, Dina, and Bruce, now age 21, have been reading in social media that many folks ridicule the Mandy Brook story.

And some college friends blame them for participating in the lie. The whole experience has been embarrassing, and caused them depression, nervousness, and suicidal thoughts. Their future careers and marriages will no doubt be marred by it all.

VI. Prayer for Relief. The plaintiffs ask for declaratory relief, by the court’s declaring that the Mandy Brook massacre was not genuine, and for \$300,000 each, trebled as punitive damages.

Sworn and signed on _____ at _____.

Note to Students: I am trying to arouse your interest by using names like Jim Anxiety. The above fake lawsuit could act as a launchpad. Folks in CT may be dying to hear what you have to say about that day in 2012. You could put on a play in the park called “Moot court” and ask the mainstream media to review it. (Ah, fat chance!)

**WELCOME TO
PART THREE**

HOW TO RESTORE SOLIDARITY

“A HOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF
CANNOT STAND.” – ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Chapter 13. Proclaim an (Almost) Universal Amnesty



Visiting the Cemetery

Sandy Hook is a rare false-flag case. No one was killed at the scene, and the event was not used to start a foreign war. Rejoice!

It may be wise to end it all – remember I claim it is messing people’s minds. A full amnesty could be granted. As stated in Chapter 3, money crimes were committed and perjury was committed. And once it is acknowledged that the whole Sandy Hook shooting was a hoax, numerous officials would be indictable for wrongdoing. “You’re not allowed to hoax the public, Guys.”

That is to say, many, many people stand to be relieved if they hear that an amnesty is in the works.

For many years, South Africans were at an impasse. Many whites had treated blacks cruelly and criminally. By the 1980s, the whites wanted to stop apartheid – not least because other countries had made a pariah of South Africa. But it was hard to see how to accomplish the transition.

An amnesty system was cooked up and was largely accepted by the population. The police had been the worst offenders. They would now be allowed to appear before a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. They absolutely had to describe their crimes to get amnesty (or pardon) and show true remorse.

The Connecticut situation is not “black and white” like that. But as an outsider to Connecticut, I can see that something needs to give. Here we are approaching the 11th anniversary of Sandy Hook with the government and media still humming the same old tune about Adam Lanza, and “those awful conspiracy nuts.”

Not one iota of compromise has been reached in regard to, say, the sacking of Prof James Tracy, the failure of the Wisconsin judges to credit Fetzer's issue over Noah Pozner's death certificate, or the ridiculous inadequacy of the Sedensky Report. Must we go for another ten years? I won't still be alive then.

I feel sorry for the crisis actors. Something tells me they did not ken, at the beginning, how long the burden would last. And very likely there have been marital breakups over it. And don't forget, some of those parents have other kids. What if at least a few of them wised up to the facts?

So let's say the word goes out today that all the crisis actors are forgiven. That means they can... um... sing. I take seriously Robert Steele's revelation about his CIA work. He threatened the crisis actors with severe penalties, and at the same time gave them 100% assurance they would not be prosecuted.

Note: This TRC – Truth and Reconciliation Commission could not contain government workers. It could be old grandpa's, young dancers, whatever. Maybe Canadians would come down to help. I declare it can be done with no authority figures.

Twice in US history there have been mass amnesties. In 1865, after the War between the States, President Andrew Johnson offered a pardon to thousands of soldiers who had joined the Confederacy.

In 1978, President Carter granted a blanket pardon to the men who had "deserted" to Canada, or elsewhere to escape the draft.

But the Powers That Be ordered those two amnesties in order to preempt any jurisprudence on the subject of secession and the illegality of the Vietnam War. That's OK. Such is the unacceptability, to the PTB, of such jurisprudence that the status quo may have festered forever. It was wiser to call it a day.

Nobody is gaining anything from the Sandy Hook psy-op now. If folks need to argue over gun rights, they can do so on the merits. We are big boys and girls. We can handle it.

Chapter 14. Do You Know What's in the Guarantee Cause?



We should help the people of Connecticut. I'm pretty sure they need relief from the burden of this whole thing. Do we in the other 49 states have an obligation to help them? Actually, yes, we do. It is in the US Constitution at Article IV, section 4:

“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]

According to that first sentence, we don't need to be invited in, and help them re-establish their republic, if they have been invaded. I say they *have* been invaded. I've recently written about the invasion of Hawaii by unknown parties who used Directed Energy Weapons (perchance from a satellite), which caused much loss of life, and destruction of property.

In the case of Connecticut, I speculate that they were invaded by globalists, whose goal is to harm every country to the max, and also invaded by what I call “Tavi.” That is, an outgrowth of Tavistock's program that we associate with Aldous Huxley. The goal is to “make you love your servitude.” It looks to me that most of the CT people are happy with the hoax. How and why did the Guarantee Clause come about? Remember, the Declaration of Independence is dated 1776, and the

Constitution was not written until 1787, and came into force on 1789. Meanwhile, from 1781 to 1789, we had a 'bridging' government under the Articles of Confederation. The leaders at that time wanted to carefully to recruit all the eligible ex-colonies. Canada was invited to join but declined.

Here is the jurisprudence of the Clause, per Cornell Law's website. Superscript numbers take you to the cases online:

“An early version of the Guarantee Clause was among the resolutions of the Virginia Plan introduced at the Constitutional Convention by Edmund Randolph and attributed to James Madison.³ The resolution went through several formulations during the debates at the Convention.⁴ During a key debate, Gouverneur Morris objected to the resolution because ‘[h]e should be very unwilling that such laws as exist in R[hode] Island ought to be guarantied.’⁵ Randolph explained that, rather than cementing the existing laws of the states, the resolution had two objects: ‘1. to secure Republican Government[;] 2. to suppress domestic commotions.’⁶ Along with concerns about rebellions, delegates expressed fears that a monarchy might arise in a particular state and ‘establish a tyranny over the whole [United States].’⁷ ...⁸ with Ranfolph Randolph then moving to add language that ‘no State shall be at liberty to form any other than a Republican [Government].’⁹ James Wilson then introduced, as a ‘better expression of the idea,’ ... similar to the final form of the Guarantee Clause, which the Convention approved unanimously.¹⁰”

In reality, the only time the Clause has been used was during the Reconstruction period of the South in states that had seceded. The US Supreme Court has deemed the Guarantee Clause a “non-justiciable political question.” In the civil rights era. it assisted the people of Jefferson County, Alabama, to get a long-overdue redistricting of voters for the House of Reps.

29 Persons. Each of these persons appears, in James Tracy's Timeline of Sandy Hook, as making a specific contribution to the

false story. For example, they described in detail (falsely) that 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 (later, senator)
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

Some Crimes. Chapter 3 above listed money crimes and perjury, Chapter 14 listed crimes of harming a child's morals.

Obstruction of Justice. Here's the federal law; states have similar: 18 USC 1503: using threats or force against a juror, 18 USC 1512: against a witness or destroying of evidence. An amazing crime, called **misprision**, is codified at 18 USC 4:

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

Media can be found guilty of **fraud** against the United States. Also, the FCC can punish broadcasters by removal of license.

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 a person to hatred, contempt or ridicule.

We might also look at the crime of destruction of **property**, the undeserved payouts by insurance companies, the collecting of donations under false pretenses, **mis-auditing** of bankruptcy, and cheating IRS. All persons promised by the CIA to be kept out of jail forever need to think again. If a hitman killed Shanley, the person who hired him is up for **homicide**; so is the hitman.

Chapter 15. Regain the Court of Equity, vs Extrinsic Fraud



Coronation of QEII in 1953, Photo: RadioTimes.com

Equity! Oh, those were the days! In England, for centuries prior to the Judicature Act of 1873, there were the regular courts of law and, separately, a Court of Equity. In that court, the king could bend the law a bit to fit unusual circumstances of a case. He could make “constructive remedies.” He could also order persons to “disgorge their ill-gotten gains.” Just imagine Bill Gates disgorging now.

The idea was to follow the dictates of justice, and also of mercy. At her Coronation, Queen Elizabeth sat there while the Archbishop of Canterbury – in the role of God, so to speak -- handed her two symbols of her reign. (I don’t know if the May 2023 coronation of Charles III followed this tradition.) The archbishop 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.”

After 1873, the two courts, law and equity, were combined. Any judge could make use of either tradition in his decisions. Equity is seldom used, but it should be. Consider this maxim: *Bonus judex secundem quequum et bonum judicat, et aequitatem stricto juri praefert* -- A good judge decides according to equity and right, and prefers equity to strict law.

Court of Equity and Extrinsic Fraud

Breathing new life into the Court of Equity is also a way of reviving the concept of ‘extrinsic fraud.’ The definition of ‘extrinsic fraud’, in *Nolo’s Plain-English Law Dictionary* is: “Fraudulent acts which keep a person from ... getting evidence to defend against a lawsuit”

US federal law says, in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60b: “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”

Consider the difficulty of getting facts about December 14, 2012 at Sandy Hook. I am sure that Equity calls for a fresh reading of the *Pozner v Fetzer* defamation suit. No damages should have been charged to Fetzer until he was able to present his case, regarding the authenticity of Noah Pozner’s death certificate.

The words “On motion” in Rule 60b mean you have to ask for it to happen. I hope Fetzer moves to do this. (Jargon: he becomes “the movant.”) He can show that he was not allowed to access the court. Granted, he was physically in the courtroom but tricks were played to block his using the work of the forensic experts.

I quote the current US Supreme Court precedent, from the 1944 case *Hazel-Atlas Glass v Hartford Empire*. Justice Jackson wrote:

“Tampering with the administration of justice involves far more than an injury to a single litigant. It is a wrong against the institutions set up to protect and safeguard the public, **instances in which fraud cannot complacently be tolerated** consistently with the good order of society.” [Emphasis added]

My argument is that the fact ‘extrinsic to the record’ *is the false story* that 20 children were killed at SHES. Now please have a look at the Opinion in a very old case, *US v Throckmorton*. It states that fraud renders a judgment invalid. Info about Sandy Hook being a hoax wasn’t available to the Wisconsin court but it is now.

Supreme Court Opinion in *US v Throckmorton* (1878):

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** -- 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.

...**There was in fact no adversary trial or decision of the issue in** [Throckmorton's 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 [Soto v Remington?] -- 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]

The Writ of Error Coram Nobis. Most writs of English law were grandfathered in to US law by Congress in 1789, updated in the All Writs Act of 1911. It is codified at 28 USC 1651, as:

“(a) The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law. (b) An alternative writ or rule nisi may be issued by a justice or judge of a court which has jurisdiction.”

One of the writs seems appropriate to use where an already-decided case that may have contained extrinsic fraud. It is called the Writ of Error Coram Nobis. The Latin phrase “Error coram nobis” means “the errors before us” – the royal we. It indicates the king has suddenly seen an error in a paper on his desk. You can petition for this writ to be looked at.

In a 1945 Pennsylvania case, *Commonwealth v Harris*, we find: “Coram nobis lies only where facts exist extrinsic of the record, unknown and unknowable by the exercise of diligence at the time of its rendition, and which would, if known, have prevented the judgment in its entirety or in the form in which it was rendered.”

Whom to petition? I have been told the petition has to go to the original judge, not an appeals court. It’s as though you are doing her a favor, similar to being an *amicus curiae*, a friend of the court. “Hi there, Judge, I know you’d want to be informed about this.”

Over the years, I have sent urgent petitions to judges who were about to be responsible for wrongful executions, such as of Troy Davis in Georgia in 2011 and Nathan Wood in Alabama in 2020, and in favor of releasing (or giving a trial to) Martin Bryant in the Australian state of Tasmania, and releasing Jahar Tsarnaev, or retrying him, in the Boston Marathon case. (I got nowhere.)

I will compose one now regarding the Pozner-Fetzer case, to provide the reader with a template for other cases. Fetzer has exhausted his appeals, so this is a way to reopen the case, based on extrinsic fraud as described above:

To Judge Frank Remington, District Court of Wisconsin
From Mary W Maxwell, October 3, 2023 [This is make believe.]

Greetings from Concord, New Hampshire! I write to petition for a Writ of Error Coram Nobis in the case of Pozner v Fetzer. I believe there was extrinsic fraud. The fraud is that the story of Adam Lanza killing children, including Noah Pozner, is a false story. It was a psy-op to which all Americans were subjected.

The writ of error coram nobis is available per 28 USC 1651. The relevant precedent of the US Supreme Court is the case of Fred Korematsu. In 1942 he was arrested for disobeying the curfew imposed on him and all Japanese Americans. Decades after Korematsu finished serving his sentence, it was discovered by Law Professor Peter Irons that FDR knew that West Coast persons had been loyal to America. On the basis that this exculpatory information should have been supplied by the prosecutor, Korematsu's conviction was set aside by Judge Marilyn Patel of the Federal District Court of Northern California in 1984.

I also cite the 1985 ruling of the Tenth Circuit in *Bulloch v US*: "Fraud upon the court is where the court or a member is corrupted ... or where the judge has not performed his judicial function, thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted."

In *Kenner C.I.R.*, the Seventh Circuit Court had said in 1968: "A decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final." That accords with *US v Throckmorton* where the judge in 1878 said "Fraud vitiates everything and a judgement equally with a contract."

The Sandy Hook massacre was a hoax and this extrinsic fraud has corrupted many judicial rulings. Fetzer was not given a trial as Your Honor made a summary judgment, based on the hoax. I humbly request that you now reopen that case, based on the Writ of Error Coram Nobis.

Respectfully yours, Mary Maxwell, PhD, LLB (Adel)

16. Role of the Militias and the Jan 6 Non-Insurrection



Entering the Capitol on Jan 6, 2021, Photo: firstamendment.mtsu.edu

Soon we will mark 60 years since JFK met his fate in Dallas on November 22, 1963. Although many of the guilty parties are known, none have suffered. We have also seen 27 years go by since the OKC bombing, surely an inside job, and 22 years have passed since 9/11 with no man even being called on the carpet.

You have to credit the Protectors who not only keep all of those criminals happy but who cause many deaths, such as of the patsy Lee Oswald, the patsy Tim McVeigh, and the patsies in Gitmo plus the population of Afghanistan, plus whistle blowers. Thus, it is impractical to expect Sandy Hook to be “tried.”

We thus ask what else is available? Here is one answer. Article 10 of the New Hampshire state Constitution, adopted in 1784:

“Government being instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security, of the whole community, and not for the private interest or emolument of any one man, family, or class of men; therefore, whenever the ends of government are perverted, and public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the people may, and of right ought to reform the old, or establish a new government. The doctrine of nonresistance against arbitrary power, and oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind.”

I believe a citizen-led grand jury is a way for suspects to be indicted. If government would refuse to try an indicted person, the people would have to do it. If the government then refused to imprison the convicted, the people would have to do it. That will be discussed in Chapter 17, but first let's look at January 6 and then at "militias."

The January 6th Violence at the Capitol

The Capitol Building houses the US legislature. It is not like the Greek forum, a place where citizens could have their say. It is open to visitors who wish to see their Congressperson, and to registered lobbyists, and to tourists, at times. The proper place for people to gather in protest is anywhere outdoors or inside buildings which they have booked for that, not the Capitol.

If a mob attacked that building, got inside, and harmed people, they would be liable for such charges as disturbing the peace, trespassing, destruction of property, and grievous bodily harm. I don't think they would be chargeable with sedition which is quite a different thing. In 18 USC 2384 we find:

"If two or more persons in [the U.S.], conspire to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States, or by force to seize, take, or possess any property of the United States contrary to the authority thereof, they shall each be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both."

I do not know the true facts of January 6, as it is impossible to get an unbiased readout. But even accepting, *pro tem*, the idea that a bunch of citizens went to the Capitol to fight against the government, in particular the government's declaring Biden the winner of the 2020 election, this is not sedition. No one was trying to overthrow the government as such. The protestors definitely did not want the US to stop having the kind of government that it has had ever since the Constitution was ratified in 1788.

To the naked eye, the January 6 event *does* merit the labels “riot” and “attack on the Capitol.” Even if only one window got broken, that’s **an attack on the Capitol**. And the rough milling about of numerous bodies is what we usually mean when we say **riot**. Putting both labels together, though, you don’t get sedition.

We need to reserve the **crime of sedition** for terrible actions like the current fires in food processing plants, the dispensing of disease, train wrecks with hazardous chemicals. That’s all overthrowing the once-happy governance of US society, isn’t it? Since we don’t have a handy word for it, it’s hard to conceptualize it.

I want to emphasize the importance of definitions. Our mental furniture is getting more limited all the time. In contemporary politics, tribalism has helped reduce the available options. Let’s say a US politician wants to object to the use of landmines. If he is a Dem and the Repubs happen to be taking that position, he’ll refrain from expressing it – to avoid being ‘disloyal’ to his tribe.

Orwell’s “Double-Plus-Good.” George Orwell understood, in 1949, when he wrote *1984*, that “They” want to limit our brain. He put it sarcastically:

“What justification is there for a word which is simply the opposite of some other words? A word contains its opposite in itself. Take 'good,' for instance. If you have a word like 'good,' what need is there for a word like 'bad'? 'Ungood' will do just as well. ... Or again, if you want a stronger version of 'good,' what sense is there in having a whole string of vague useless words like 'excellent' and 'splendid' and all the rest of them? 'Plusgood' covers the meaning, or 'doubleplusgood' if you want something stronger still. .. In the end the whole notion of goodness and badness will be covered by only six words -- in reality, only one word. Don't you see the beauty of that, Winston?”

I confess at this moment that I know of no way to cogitate on a Second American Revolution. The first was but a declaration of splitting off from England. Stirring words were used to justify it:

IN CONGRESS, July 4, 1776

[with bolding added]

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....

Well that's simple enough, but American schoolchildren stopped being taught those concepts decades ago.?



A Man's a Man for a' That

[Photo: Scottish-at-heart .com]

... For a' that, and a' that,
Their tinsel show, an' a' that;
The honest man, tho' e'er sae poor,
Is king o' men for a' that.

Ye see yon birkie ca'd a lord,
Wha struts, an' stares, an' a' that,
Tho' hundreds worship at his word,
He's but a coof for a' that.
For a' that, an' a' that,
His ribband, star, an' a' that,
The man o' independent mind,
He looks an' laughs at a' that.
A Prince can mak a belted knight,
A marquis, duke, an' a' that!
But an honest man's aboon his might –
Guid faith, he mauna fa' that!

... For a' that, an' a' that,
Their dignities, an' a' that,
The pith o' Sense an' pride o' Worth
Are higher rank than a' that.

Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will for a' that,
That Sense and Worth, o'er a' the earth
Shall bear the gree an' a' that.
For a' that, an' a' that,
It's comin yet for a' that,
That Man to Man the warld o'er
Shall brithers be for a' that.

-- Robert Burns (1759-1796)

Oath Keepers' Leader Sentenced to 18 Years for Jan 6

The Oath Keepers are a few thousand Americans -- veterans or currently serving, including reservists and National Guard, plus some sheriffs and peace officers. The 'oath' that they want to keep is the one they took: "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic..."

Orders We Will Not Obey (Says the Oath Keeper's promise):

1. We will NOT obey orders to disarm the American people.
2. We will NOT obey orders to conduct warrantless searches of the American people
3. We will NOT obey orders to detain citizens as "unlawful enemy combatants" or to subject them to military tribunal.
4. We will NOT obey orders to impose martial law or a "state of emergency" on a state.
5. We will NOT obey orders to invade and subjugate any state that asserts its sovereignty.
6. We will NOT obey any order to blockade American cities, thus turning them into giant concentration camps.
7. We will NOT obey any order to force American citizens into any form of detention camps under any pretext.
8. We will NOT obey orders to assist or support the use of any foreign troops on U.S. soil against the American people to "keep the peace" or to "maintain control."
9. We will NOT obey any orders to confiscate the property of the American people, including food and other essential supplies.
10. We will NOT obey any orders which infringe on the right of the people to free speech, to peaceably assemble, and to petition their government for a redress of grievances.

Elmer Rhodes, age 57, head of the Oath Keepers, had been emailing his men ever since the 2020 election looked like being stolen.

Roger Parloff, at lawfaremedia. com, tells us that Elmer Rhodes' emails became evidence used by the prosecution at trial:

“When the vote count came in showing a Biden win, a member asked ‘What’s the gameplan?’ Rhodes replied: ‘Don’t give legitimacy to an illegitimate, fraudulent ... system. ... I won’t ever recognize [Biden] as a legitimate President because of that fraud ... and ... his being a ChiCom [i.e., Chinese Communist] puppet.’

[Rhodes continued:] “The Dem party has taken off the mask and revealed their totalitarian, Marxist, America-hating, and hate-filled agenda. They seek our destruction. They seek the destruction of all we swore to defend. We must defeat them. George Washington said: ‘Our cruel enemy leaves us only the choice of brave resistance... We have to resolve to conquer or to die.’

‘We must do what the people of Serbia did when Milosevic stole their election,’ Rhodes wrote. ‘Refuse to accept it and march en-mass [sic] on the nation’s Capitol.’ [Quoting Serbians]: ‘Millions gathered in our capital. There were no barricades strong enough to stop them ... Police and Military aligned with the people after a few hours of fist-fight. We [Serbians] stormed the Parliament.’” [based on an email sent by Rhodes on 11/7/2020]

Further info from the transcript shows that the Oath Keepers really did not have a plan. And they did not enter the building until 2:30pm, well after others. What could they have done?

The situation is more complicated than one dishonest election. Jim Collier’s 1992 book *VoteScam* shows how the electronic rigging of elections had been child’s play since 1970. Anyway, there was a procedure in place for Congress, per 3 USC 15, to challenge the vote. 138 members did so, in the wee hours of Jan 7 when members got back to their desks. That was not a majority, vote, so all the electoral ballots did get accepted. President Trump incorrectly thought there was a way for Pence to stop it.

Citizens don’t know these things because MSM keeps it all under wraps, while at the same time saying extremist, terrorists, and of course white supremacists had killed some people in the Capitol. Not true, only Ashley Babbitt, a protestor died. MSM also reported many guilty pleas of the thousand arrestees. This was the result of plea bargaining. If a person wishes to plead Not Guilty, but has

been in solitary (yes, they were put in solitary, illegally) he may say 'Guilty' to get away from such conditions.

Militias Are Legal

You're allowed to form an armed militia (albeit you mustn't wear what looks like a US military uniform). The Second Amendment says "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed." But even that Amendment will not save us today. The tyranny today is not like that of old. It involves citizens' lack of the "mental furniture" with which to confront our actual situation.

Plus, the media can construct a story to guide us, as they did with Jan 6, Sandy Hook, and many other full-of-lies broadcasts. And that doesn't even touch the genuine problem of mind control. In the following photo of a Sandy Hook Funeral procession, what if every person is delusional? What if they can no longer recognize *unreality*:



I ask the reader to contemplate these real issues, not distractions. A top priority is to support, and gather up, the many eager but isolated people who wish to put down the mighty from their seat.

Chapter 17. 9/11 Ruling Validates Citizen-Led Grand Jury



(L) William Marbury (C) Poster, Photo: rollcall.com (R) James Madison

Did the Framers of the US Constitution in 1787 genuinely wrack their brains to come up every possible power-constraining mechanism for citizens to use against an evil government? One huge omission at the Philadelphia Convention was the Founders' failure to raise the question: What if a few Americans become so wealthy that they can control government by bribes? Admittedly, they mentioned 'bribery' as a cause for impeaching presidents and other officers, but what all impeachers (members of Congress' lower house) got bribed out of their minds?

Another omission: What if one of the three branches of government grabbed for itself the right to be THE interpreter of parchmentese? In 1903, *Marbury v Madison*, the Supreme Court declared parts of an Act of Congress unconstitutional, and this has bequeathed to these Justices, rightly or wrongly, the honor of being the interpreter. Such a role for the judiciary is not granted to them in Article III, which specifies all their powers.

After some of the US Supreme Court's recent behavior, I am no longer willing to let them have the last word on anything. They killed the Fourth Amendment by allowing a man to be strip-searched when arrested for a traffic violation (the Albert Florence case), they scrunched up the Fifth Amendment's right to keep your castle (in *Kelo v London*), and they basically killed democracy with *Citizens United v FEC*, in 2010, by allowing SuperPACs to contribute limitless funds to candidates.

Scotus (Supreme Court of the United States) and 9/11

In January 2023, Scotus outdid its previous treachery. (Yes, I said treachery). It told some plaintiffs in a 9/11 case that they did not have the right to submit to a Grand Jury some important information about that crime. How did this not make headlines?

All 9/11-related cases have been “required” to go to one US District Court, namely the famously corrupt SDNY, Southern District of New York. The plaintiffs filed their pleadings about (alleged) government chicanery and were dismissed, as follows:

“Lawyers’ Committee for 9/11 Inquiry, et al. v. William P. Barr, Attorney General of the United States, et al., Case No. 1:19-cv-8312-PGG, issued its Order dismissing Petitioners-Plaintiffs-Appellants’ claims on March 24, 2021, for lack of standing.”

On appeal, on August 5, 2022, the Second Circuit, Case No. 21-1338-cv. dismissed it also. The next attempt was to ask Scotus to adjudicate it. Scotus gets thousands of “petitions for certiorari” every year, but it agrees to hear only hundreds. You may think that a 9/11 case coming before the Justices, twenty years after the event, was one of the hundreds they should take.

It challenged the NIST theory that fires had caused the Towers to fall. (NIST stands for National Institute of Standards and Technology.) The Lawyers Committee for 9/11 brought in the research done by scientists at University of Fairbanks, Alaska.

But the Justices declined – they didn’t take the case. I’ll have to say this is really a shock. They dared to prevent citizens from approaching the Foreman of the sitting New York grand jury! That is a completely corrupt move on their part. Note: I am not saying that Scotus “ruled” against the plaintiffs. They chose NOT to rule. Four out of the Big Nine have to say Yes to accept a case. (But in my heart of hearts I know they “ruled.”)

As we saw, Scotus has recently shredded the parchment in, say, Florence, Kelo, and Citizens United. It misinterpreted clauses

that no one had ever dreamed of misinterpreting. Those were *positive* decisions, while the refusal to “grant Cert” in this 9/11 case is technically a non-ruling. But for Scotus to fail to stand up for the citizens’ right to direct a grand jury is far out, man. It’s far, far out. This must stop. Indeed, **if we don’t stop it, we are ‘conditioning’ ourselves for more of same.**

So where to look for other mechanisms? I note that there is certainly no constitutional requirement that every 9/11 case go to just one US District Court. Theoretically, even at this late stage, plaintiffs could bring their complaint to another US District Court. But an even better idea is to forget the feds. The 50 states all have their own courts and their own supreme court.

In New York state, a plaintiff could re-open everything about 9/11 merely by claiming that she suffered respiratory illness as an after-effect of the fall of the towers.. Such a claim would lead to the question: What was in the air? Was it exploded cement? Or stuff that suggests nukes or Directed Energy Weapons? Note: Legislatures can relieve any problem of the statute of limitations.

Oddly, in 1983, Connecticut’s legislature eliminated the grand jury. It does allow for something called an Investigative grand jury in cases of corruption, but the members of the Grand Jury are: “a judge, judge referee or a three-judge panel.” Ridiculous!

This chapter has called for both a retrenchment of the “fallout” of 1803’s *Marbury v Madison*, whereby everyone bows to Scotus as the Sole Interpreter, and a states-rights rethink of the federal court system (which Congress constitutionally controls.)

Moreover, by affirming the Appeals Court decision, which prevents citizens from handing crucial 9/11 material to a Grand Jury foreman, the Supreme Court has – in my opinion – surrendered its right to make any such decision. The courts never really had power over the grand jury under the Constitution, and now we have clear argument to rescind their *de facto* power.

Spend a moment now to heed some rare philosophical advice:

Ideas from Philip Allott's 2016 book "Eutopia: New Philosophy and New Law for a Troubled World" [all bolding added by MM]

5.17 "We now have plenty of evidence to suggest that the pursuit of total control of the minds of human beings ends in failure. **People are remarkably resistant in the depth and integrity and energy of their minds**, their self-defense against such an invading social force, seeking to make them think what they do not want to think, and feel what they do not want to feel."

12.15: "We know immeasurably more about everything than all those who have gone before us ... and can access it at the touch of a button. Yet we do not feel correspondingly cleverer or wiser. Acquiring knowledge is no longer a crucial, and exciting, form of human experience. Knowledge has taken on the character of an inert thing... as an effect of its immensity and its availability."

"Law courts are an integral part of the ... self-creating of society and hence socially accountable for their decisions...."

10:24 "The central problem of law in human society is its relation to power. **All law is an exercise of power by human beings**, in its making, application and enforcement. As a consequence, there can be good law and bad law, good courts and bad courts.... Law can be a means of oppression and exploitation."

10.29 "Two particular aspects have predominated in the installing of law in the deep-structure of society -- the problem of law in relation to the totality of society; the problem of the role of law in the control of public power." Both are crucial.

10:33 "Rule of Law asserts the authority of law over all public power." 10.44 "**Law is an expression of a society's collective will to become what it chooses to be.**" 10.65 "It took centuries of evolutionary constitutionalism **to find the basis for the authority of a society's law within the authority of that society as a whole....** [Often] the struggle led to civil war."

Allott urges: **MAKERS OF THE NEW WORLD, UNITE!**

Chapter 18: Please Stop Conversing in Unreality Terms



Cinderella glass slippers are for sale at Amazon, \$24

Everyone knows that there was never a Cinderella whose coach may turn into a pumpkin. No prince ever gave her a glass slipper.

This book revises my 2022 book, *Unreality*, in which I spent too much ink figuring out whether Sandy Hook was real. Part One of this book has settled the matter. The SHES story is fiction.

Part Two, “The Human Brain,” is the essence of this book. I began Part Two with a chapter on the four stages of the history of thought, and ended with a chapter on a brains’ motor programs.

I am asking the public now to **join me in stating** just this one major point: that we are suddenly in a moment of history like no other. A few people at the top control the 8 billion at the bottom, largely by getting those 8 billion to support unreal stuff.

Even to make such a statement will be very hard for people, no matter how educated they are, as nobody wants to be called a nutter. I say Go on, be called a nutter, it won’t kill you to be called a nutter. You can tolerate a bit of ridicule and ostracism, can’t you? For the sake of humanity? It’s a small sacrifice.

I’m pretty sure that the top-dogs are counting on our being too shy to declare “We are in a moment of historic social change.” They know how strong is the urge to conform and not stick out. I bet the fear of embarrassment is on a par with fear of death.

In bygone days we had to evolve the traits that make us able to cooperate unthinkingly, like wolves in a pack. It really was essential that we not step out of line. But those traits are still with us and they are now having a lethal effect. We’ve got to develop

ways to cast off the fear of sticking out. Maybe you can hold an event where all scream “We are in a time of extreme change.”

Part Two also included a chapter “Orwell Knew” – about the erasing of memory (at the Ministry of Truth), and a chapter on Shanley’s cry “Halt the Media – They Are To Blame.” Another chapter in Part Two looked at the ethics of crisis-acting and a final chapter pleaded “Help Minors Who Were Trained To Lie.”

All of that said, the job comes down to Part Three’s mission, to identify whatever tricks we can use at this stage to restore solidarity. Here in the US, there are at least 200 million adults. If each tries to operate alone to overcome these big problems, he has no chance of winning. With solidarity of citizens there is a chance.

Specifically in regard to the Sandy Hook hoax, Part Three named the following ways to try to regain solidarity.

*Offer a generous amnesty to all the liars so we can get back to normal. I think they are carrying a burden and wish it to end.

*Use the old criterion of extrinsic fraud to catch the foul things that are going on in courts. And more generally revive Equity, which aims for just remedies for unique situations like this one.

*Think about the Clause in which the US “guarantees” to each state a republican form of government. In the *res publica*, any citizen has a say. If Connecticut is being run by the makers of the hoax, who arrest those who challenge it, it’s not republican.

*There is a proper, constitutional role for militias. The Oath Keepers had a vague idea of showing their strength on Jan 6, but were undercut by those who fear such citizen resolve.

*Sandy Hook miscreants (including Obama) could be indicted by a Citizen-led Grand Jury. Scotus inadvertently gave blessing to such a thing by leaving the SDNY 9/11 case out in the rain.

Should we go further and pull a revolutionary war out of a hat? I am pretty sure we can't beat a domestic enemy that has access to satellite-based weapons, as was clearly the case in Maui's fire. Those desperados could set fires or drop drones everywhere.

Still, we need to beef up our sense of the rightness of our cause. Recall Article 10 of New Hampshire's constitution on revolting:

“[W]henever the ends of government are perverted, and public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the people may, and of right ought to reform the old, or establish a new government. The doctrine of non-resistance against arbitrary power, and oppression, is absurd....”

Public liberty was manifestly endangered during Covid, with most folks feeling they had to obey emergency orders, for the common good. Meanwhile, thousands died from the vaccine.

I have kept the Covid story and the Maui fire story out of this book in order to identify ways to deal with one case, SHES. The lack of mass murder at Sandy Hook should make that case easier for us to discuss. Mass murder did occur in Covid and at Maui.

(Please see, separately, the who-dunnit and the what-to-do-about-it, for Massachusetts, in my book *Boston's Marathon Bombing*.)

Three Principles of Law

1. **Self-defense.** Our forebears recognized the imbalance of power between good people and bad people. They did not say “Just lie there and take it.” But many politicians today, and media people, and even academics (shame, shame on them), are enunciating a new religion of “taking it.” They claim that those who don't take it – say, parents at a school board meeting who protest the teaching of sex to 8-year-olds – are terrorists.

Our forebears gave the All Clear to self-defense. If someone is harming you, or people close to you, and you've got a baseball bat handy, use it. Why ever not?

2. **Citizen's arrest.** This is legal in all 50 states. It would have to be, as that is how the FBI makes arrests (unless a city has deputized them as cops). For you to do it, google for your state's rules. You have to know that a felony has just been committed or is about to be committed, and you must announce to the person why he is being arrested. Then you call cops to collect him.

3. **The law of outlawry.** We did not always have cops. Think of the wild west -- bandits would station themselves on a highway and attack travelers. They were hard to punish, like pirates at sea. Society wisely made up the concept of Outlawry: a man whom the law could not reach was declared an outlaw. You have a right to kill him -- and it's a crime to protect him or feed him. Check if your state has statutorily repealed the law of outlawry. If not, it is still there. We inherited British common law wholesale.

Be Spencer St. There is an Australian play called *The Removalists*. In a riveting scene, cops are beating up a man in his home. (I forget the cause, maybe to take his money.) He yells to his girlfriend "Call the police." She says "Those *are* the police." He says "I mean call Spencer St." He hoped the bosses at Police Headquarters, on Melbourne's Spencer St, would save him.

Today you can't call "Spencer St." No officials are there to help. Law Enforcement has sided with the baddies, worldwide. Most likely a cop is afraid of losing his/her job or is just afraid, period.

We are on our own. It's up to you. This has happened before. People got together and came up with a new plan.

Don't give up the ghost if some individuals vehemently disagree with you -- that's par for the course. Don't be distressed that some of the good guys are actually spies. Spying is big, big business. You just have to put up with that occupational hazard.

Your willingness to act with solidarity is what will give us all a chance to live. Remember: "For want of a nail, the shoe was lost."

You are that nail.

WELCOME TO THE APPENDICES

EXPANDING THE THEME of FALSENESS
TO OTHER MATTERS:

- A. TESTIMONY TO MAUI COUNCIL ON THE FIRE
- B. VETERANS TAKING MATTERS INTO OWN HANDS
- C. HOW DID CORONER CARVER ANSWER QUERIES?
- D. MANY PEOPLE SCORN THOSE MSM INTERVIEWS
- E. ABA CONTROLS LEGAL PROFESSION SNEAKILY
- F. RAND PAUL YELLS “FAUCI LIED TO CONGRESS”
- G. AUTISM CAUSED BY SHOTS? MALICE ABOUND.
- H. DEAL LOCALLY WITH THE “SMART CITIES” SCAM
- J. FBI REDACTS ‘SECRETS’ IN SANDY HOOK REPORTS

Appendix A. Maui Testifier: “We Must Fight Government”



banyan tree in Lahaina

The Hawaiian Island of Maui was subjected to a fire on August 8, 2023 that caused many deaths. I believe this was done by a Directed Energy Weapon, as can be seen by the fact that cars were fully burnt, while trees near the cars remained unharmed. I [MM] want to shout that this is an act of war and of treason, but as usual the mainstream media are utterly avoiding the question of cause, and mentioning downed power lines in the windstorm. No one is being held to explain the road blocks in which cops clearly prevented many folks from escaping. Because hundreds of people are in shock, I think it would be unfair to ask them to take up the matter of prosecution. The Maui Council has held hearings at which anyone could speak for 5 minutes. Here is one woman:

“Aloha, I am Miss Lizzie. People are literally dying of heartbreak. To the families of Lahaina and the students I taught, whom I know and love, to your lineage, your Ohana, your island culture, to your home unto Hawaii. Stand proud. I am sorry you have had to witness bombs, smoke, desolation, poverty and horror, I am sorry there was no warning. I am sorry there was no communication when you were trapped in gridlock. When you were burnt, tired and hungry and shell-shocked Lahaina, we the people must work united against the government who has failed you, and work toward the self-sustaining goal of the Hawaiian Islands. Fight against the government who barricaded you, who took your voice, and silenced you. ... The mayor no listen to you. The DoE no listen to you. I spoke out at the DoE meeting on August 20th. My testimony has disappeared. All of our testimonies have disappeared. [We demand] the return of our water; water is life.... Then after [changes], we can start to breathe with the sacred aloha of our island, not the tourist industry. God hear our prayers. Please send us angels.”

US Veterans Preparing for War



The Biden administration is denying VA healthcare to all non-vaxxed veterans. 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 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 C. Odd Remarks by Medical Examiner Wayne Carver, MD at a Press Conference, December 15, 2012.

(As annotated by James Tracy at memoryholeblog.com)



Dr Wayne Carver, at press conference, surrounded by CT state troopers

PROFESSOR James Tracy notes:

"On December 19 the Connecticut State Police assigned [a cop to stay -- for a month -- 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.'

"[At Carver's 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.

[I, MM, will cherry-pick the text of the press conference used by Tracy]:

Reporter #1: So the rifle was the primary weapon?
Dr 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 depos-ited 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 [redacted] 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?

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 #12: Doctor, can you discuss the fatal injuries to the adults? **Carver:** Ah, they were similar to those of the children.

Appendix D. Sarcastic Comments under CBS Video

[This video had 11,958 views when I found it in December 2021. I did not cherry-pick: these comments were at the top.]



Scott Pelley spoke to Catherine Hubbard's parents. (He is now at *Sixty Minutes*). He mentioned that each family had a state trooper in residence for a month after the tragedy:

hockeyguydude25, 5 years ago, **These stories are so contrived** it's truly unbelievable, and kind of remarkable that most people fall for this trash!!!

Debbie Sharon, 2 years ago, Well that's amazing, I had never heard Trippers being assigned so quickly to a family.

Shapemaster E906, 5 months ago *trooper
@Shapemaster E906 , yeah... troopers. Stupid smartphones

TMarie PI, 1 year ago (edited) An interview 3 months after their murdered child was buried? They obviously have amazing robotic-like strength.

Gg Homemaker, Omgosh I'm in tears. This is so awesome!!

Ericka Grant, 4 months ago (edited), Wow. So strong. How did they survive this? I would be worse. I would never let my other child go back to public school ever again. I would feel so overwhelmed with that risk. So brave.

frankenstrat78, 5 years ago, No parent in or out of their right mind would accept someone else's word that their child was dead! It's that simple.

Sporty Kid, 4 years ago, i feel really bad for them

Debbie Sharon, 2 years ago, **but then again, probably most everyone does realize this by now.**

Firstname Lastname, 5 years ago, You know, a dead child couldn't have happened to more Equipped people. These parents took the news of a dead child with such joy, acceptance and pride! Most "normal" parents would be near nervous breakdown, not smiling.

Debbie Sharon, 2 years ago, Yeah, Joy is the most reasonable response when you find out your child is dead. LOLLLL.
such a f** fake hoax**

Clarence Vickrot, 5 years ago, No complaints about this waste of taxes. At first I thought it was just a cover to keep the TV people from asking uncomfortable questions. **Now I'm thinking it was also a way to keep mom and dad in line.** Pelley loves posing with his eyewear. He's like a slightly more intelligent Ted Baxter.

hockeyguydude25, 5 years ago, quite fascinating and very intriguing none the less though. lol

Agent Orange, 2 years ago, I just knew my daughter was dead. Laughs and smiles.

Karlann Herndon, 2 years ago, Wow! "I just knew my daughter was dead"(\$miles & laughs) Wow! Same emotion as. "I just knew I'd hit the lottery!" Geeesh!

scott miller, 1 month ago, This why conecticut troopers are the best

freeman bill, 5 years ago, **stop with the lies already we all know it was a staged event**

Lee Allen, 5 years ago, Laughing away, talking about how she knew her child was dead!???

[Bolding added by MM]

Appendix E. The ABA's Control of Legal Education, Copyright William Sumner Scott, 2022

Those immersed in the U. S. justice system know it is run from the top down, via Congress and the US President. Judges and the attorney general are appointed by the President from a pre-determined list, based on who sponsors them politically. Some are sufficiently under the control of the sponsor to do as bidden.

The admission to practice law is under the control of each state, with the American Bar Association (“ABA”) being the central authority. Its business is conducted by committees whose leaders are elected through a nomination process that is also determined, I presume, by the person or organization that has sponsored him/her for that position.

Among those rules are procedures to prevent lawyers from criticizing judicial behavior publicly. Complaints must be sent to the Clerk of the applicable court in a sealed envelope to be withheld from public view. Consequently, judges are able to commit various transgressions with little risk of sanction by citizens. The false handling of the cases of 9-11, OKC, Ruby Ridge, Waco, and the murders of JFK, RFK, and MLK, have made it obvious that the U. S. Justice system fails to protect us from harm.

Remove the ABA from the accreditation of law schools? New curricula are called for, but the ABA thwarts any such change. How do law schools get accredited? Congress handed out this power (unconstitutionally) in 1965 via the Higher Education Act. The Secretary of the US Dept of Education has delegated supervisory power to a committee, for the granting of accreditation. This group has the awkward name: National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (“NACIQI”).

After a 2003 court case about discrimination, *Grutter v Bollinger*, a group of law school deans urged NACIQI to recommend to the Secretary that the ABA right to accredit law schools be revoked. My contention and theirs was that ABA control interfered with the ability of law schools to admit the students and teach the

subjects they wished. Hence, in 2006, NACIQI, voiced its intent to recommend to the Secretary that the ABA be removed from the law school accreditation process. In response, the ABA got Congress to freeze the 1965 authority granted to the Secretary of Education to determine which agencies may be authorized to grant accreditation. In 2008, Congress passed the Higher Education Opportunity Act which changed the NACIQI composition.

It went from “15 members appointed by the Secretary of Education,” to 18 members, with 6 appointed by the Secretary of Education for three-year terms, 6 by the Speaker of the House for four-year terms, and 6 by the President pro tempore of the Senate for six-year terms. By this stagger of the terms, the political appointees to NACIQI will always have the majority.

In the future we can seek legislation to turn that over. Just think how much intellectual excitement would be generated if law schools had free reign over their subject matter. They could look into any aspect of criminality within courts and the legal system.

George Soros and his affiliated entities contribute heavily to elect attorneys general at the state level who are likely to establish a lax administration of justice. Prosecutorial discretion to refrain from prosecuting certain criminals, combined with a defund-the-police move, has weakened the safety of everyone. What better energizer for malfeasance could there be than awareness that forces at the top are dedicated to maintaining weaponized prosecutions against those lawyers who dare challenge a Government narrative?

As public awareness of these things increases. There is hope!



William Summer Scott

Appendix E. “Rand Paul Sends Criminal Referral on Fauci to DOJ.” by Christian Spencer, *The Hill*, July 26, 2021



Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) made good on his threat to refer Anthony Fauci, chief medical adviser to President Biden... to the Justice Department for allegedly lying to Congress about funding gain-of-function research at Wuhan Institute.

As *Changing America* previously reported, Fauci said that the National Institutes of Health “has not ever and does not now fund gain-of-function research in the Wuhan Institute of Virology” in response to Paul’s unsubstantiated claims to the contrary during a May hearing.

Last Tuesday, Paul asked Fauci if he would like to retract a previous statement, saying “as you are aware it is a crime to lie to Congress.” Fauci said he would not retract the statement and was adamant that he has never lied before Congress. “You do not know what you’re talking about, quite frankly, and I want to say that officially. You do not know what you’re talking about. If anybody is lying here, senator, it is you,” Fauci said.

The following Wednesday, reported The Washington Examiner, the Kentucky senator officially sent a request to Attorney General Merrick Garland to open a criminal investigation of Fauci’s statement. “to open an investigation into testimony made to the United States Senate Committee on Health... by Dr. Anthony Fauci, Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, on May 11, 2021,” Paul wrote in the referral obtained by The Examiner.

...Molecular biologist Richard Ebright, [had said] in May that research conducted by the Wuhan lab “matches, indeed, epitomizes the definition of ‘gain-of-function research of concern’ for which federal funding was ‘paused’ in 2014-2017.”

Appendix F. Vaccines, Dissident Doctors, Lies, *by Mary Maxwell*

In 2020 Trump gave billions to Big Pharma to help them compete for the right to a Covid vax that they already had! Michael Yeadon former CEO of Pfizer says that certain batches are lethal. Congress never repeals bad laws that spare Pharma from liability, and shuts its eyes to incredible conflicts of interest at CDC and NIH.

Ivermectin and Hydroxychloroquine has been used successfully for decades on human as well as animal diseases, but were banned in the US in 2020 so it could be said that vaccines were urgently needed. This warranted big measures such as use of ventilators, which killed almost every elderly person who was put on them.

Luckily, doctors are speaking out: Peter McCullough in the US, Thomas Borody in Australia, Sucharit Bahkdi in Germany, Mark Trozzi in Canada, Vernon Coleman in UK, etc. Former US Army surgeon Rashid Buttar spoke out and got killed for doing so.

I immediately knew the Covid pandemic was a scam, owing to my 2013 book “Consider the Lilies: A Review of 18 Cures for Cancer and their Legal Status.” I say polio vaccines were cooked up, in advance of the 1955 polio epidemic, as a means of causing cancer

I say autism was *deliberately* caused by the mercury in children’s measles vax. RFK, Jr caught onto that, thanks to the Simpsonwood conference, *qv.* Harris Coulter and Barbara Loe Fisher knew the dangers of DPT shot. I have argued that thalidomide injuries were planned. (It’s in my book *Society Is the Authority.*)

Also, the cure for many illnesses has been known but is held back. See Steve Ross’s book *And then Nothing Happened.* John Rockefeller took over the medical profession by 1920, and Big Pharma now trains all doctors to do its bidding. Veterinarians obey, too.

Genocide has been known about since biblical times, but people refuse to talk about it now. Many lawsuits have been filed including my *Maxwell v Secretary of Defense* (2020, Fifth Circuit) but all get dismissed. Our courts don’t work. Period.

Appendix H. Citizen of Aurora Reduces WEF's Plans to a Matter for City Council To Decide. *by Joel Sussman*



Good evening. Restructuring of Canadian mayors and municipalities under the auspices of United Nations began in 1992. PM Mulrooney signed Canada onto UN agenda 21. 178 countries signed on, lured by the promise of big money to go green.

By 2000, countries including Canada were being governed by directions of the UN, the G7, the G20, World Economic Forum and World Health Organisation to name some. Every organisation name is a foreign based NGO non-governmental organisation and every member of all these organisations is unelected.

Parliamentary procedures for law changes weren't followed. In 1994, a municipal primer was issued to all local towns outlining how they were to restructure their governments. Though the municipal primer was a non-binding agreement, all towns adopted it.

Our public officials -- the mayor and councillors of that day -- were partnered with a private corporation, the corp. of the town of Aurora, who appointed a chief administrative officer who helps implement the global agenda, instead of a local one. The international council on local and environmental issues, became the main source of consultation to push and fund a global agenda.

This is the same World Economic Forum whose chairman Klaus Schwab famously declared **you will owe nothing and be happy**. This is the same Klaus Schwab who, referring to Canadian prime minister Justine Trudeau, boasted "We have penetrated more than half of his cabinet." We would ask Mayor Marakas and the

councillors, why should the citizens of Aurora [Ontario] bow down to the intrusive dictates of an unelected foreign entity? The fact is we should not and **we will not.**

What, you ask, does this have to do with 15-minute smart cities? Absolutely everything. “Smart” S for surveillance, M for monitoring, A for analysis, R for reporting and T for technology. Technology news editor **Patrick Wood** [with] 50 years of experience and expertise on technocracy wrote:

“The fifteen-minute city is a cover for data collection bonanza for technocrats to design and operate them. Cities designed for maximum efficiency always reveal technocrat thinking that efficiency itself is the goal. **Maximum surveillance allows for maximum control to achieve even more efficiency. At its very root this mechanistic thinking is anti-human.**”

Anyone remember the truckers’ convoy in Ottawa February 22 when the government of Canada invoked the Emergencies Act, and froze the private bank accounts of law-abiding citizens? 15-minute cities are **wolves in sheep’s clothing.** Don’t believe the stories spewing forth from the elitist-captured mainstream media.

24/7 surveillance thru the Internet of Things inside your home, 5G, and LED streetlights outside monitoring tracking and recording everything. **Ability to control behaviours thru military directed energy technologies.** Property ownership could be outlawed, evictions from rural areas to gather people into cities.

Digital passports being **promulgated** by the UN world economic forum and the world health organisation, are in the final stages of planning and implementation. They are tied to social credit score which is determined by compliance to government directives. ...

Most importantly, we the citizens of Aurora need to **have the conversation with council about exiting their non-binding agreement with the private, for-profit entity** known as “The Corporation of the Town of Aurora.”

Appendix J. FBI Sandy Hook Report, “Redacted Pages”

[Note: Even this presentation of redaction is probably a psy-op. The FBI’s Report is so mild there would be nothing to redact!]

```
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;
```



Production of this non-item was taxpayer funded, of course.

Student Quiz

Students, thank you very much for reading this book. Now see if you can hold forth for 3 minutes on these topics. Of course you are free to take a position unlike the one expressed by the author!

What laws do you invoke if you find an event to be a hoax?

Should the CIA tell people that lying has become legalized?

Could a search of Nancy Lanza's house yield Adam's motive?

What is the Court of Equity, and has it disappeared?

Can you lose a defamation lawsuit if what you said was true?

Do you think William Brandon Shanley "asked for it"?

Why do people readily agree to obey a leader?

What is the Oath Keepers organization all about?

Can you name four stages in the history of thought?

Do parts of the Sandy Hook official story look implausible to you?

What is the 'chickenization' of America?

What does Philip Allott urge as a corrective for fatalism?

What do you look for in "the news" to judge its truthfulness?

How might one State rescue another from a dire situation?

When a drill is scheduled, which people get advance warning?

When can a fraud be called "extrinsic"? How is it dealt with?

How does the brain's motor programming make instincts work?

Is it possible for a whole nation to believe a false story?

In what ways can the media be held accountable for lying?

Should American Bar Association control law school curricula?

How could a corrupt Department of Justice corrupt local cops?

What does Joseph Giovannoli mean by "psycho genes"?

Legally, what is an insurrection?

Bibliography and Suggested Readings

Biology:



Politics (serious “conspiracy theory”):



ADDENDUM – Court Case against Mandatory Vax

At the last minute, when this book was going to press, we decided to pull it, to include, as an addendum, my appeal brief in *Maxwell v Secretary of Defense* (2021). No law journal has picked up on it. Its significance is that it challenges the reigning precedent on mandatory vaccination, namely a 1905 case *Jacobson v Massachusetts*. My grounds are mainly the Fourth Amendment. Each time we fail to fight an incursion on our rights, we contribute to the Parchment's death.

I filed the original in NH at US District Court, in 2020, after President Trump announced his Operation WarpSpeed. I had pitched it as a request for a restraining order against potential vax harm to myself. It was dismissed for jurisdiction and ripeness. Then I submitted my Appeal Brief, as printed below. Readers focusing on Sandy Hook needn't spend time on it, so I offer "Cliff Notes" as follows:

Jacobson was a man who rejected being vaccinated for smallpox. In 1898, the UK published its report on that vax which, I can say for sure, did not reflect the disapproving analysis by many doctors who contributed to that report. (A la what Sylvia Meagher found when she indexed all the submissions made to the Warren Report, 1965.) The rule had been made by the Board of Health of a municipality, Cambridge MA. In 1902, it issued the following regulation:

"Whereas, smallpox has been prevalent to some extent in [this city] and still continues to increase; and whereas it is necessary for the speedy extermination of the disease that all persons not protected by vaccination should be vaccinated, and whereas, in the opinion of the board, the public health and safety require the vaccination or revaccination of all the inhabitants of Cambridge; be it ordered, that all the inhabitants of the city who have not been successfully vaccinated since March 1, 1897, be vaccinated or revaccinated."

My case, re Covid vaccine, is not about the particulars of the vax. It is mainly about the unconstitutionality of a federal push, or any push. "My body's my body," etc. Let me here mention the issue of state authority. We keep hearing that it was long ago agreed to that the US Supreme Court, aka SCOTUS, ruled that mandatory jabs are acceptable if ordered by a state -- the precedent being *Jacobson v Massachusetts*. NO, NO, NO -- there was no issue of "mandatory jabs" in that case. The accused, Henning Jacobson (in 1905, mind you),

fought against having to pay the \$5 fine for not taking the job. He paid it, and then went jobless into the night.

The rule had been made by the Board of Health of a municipality. The Scotus judges said: “We now decide only that the statute **covers the present case**, and that nothing clearly appears that would justify this court in holding it to be unconstitutional. . . .” [Emphasis added] Note: Mr Jacobson had only been forced to pay a fine, not held down by cops to take a job – as did happen in the army. Scotus ruled correctly, since it was innocent of the harms of the smallpox vax.

It ruled that health matters are a state dominion, not federal. This does not mean that the US Supreme Court can’t rubbish a state’s ruling in any case brought before it. It can and does. This ability was set in stone in 1868 by the Fourteenth Amendment. In 1905, if the justices had considered the job to be oppressive to the extent of violating the Bill of Rights, they could have told Massachusetts to naff off. Indeed they cautiously closed their text with a promise so to do, if a future case demonstrated unconstitutionality:

“Before closing this opinion we deem it appropriate, in order to prevent misapprehension as to our views, to observe . . . that the police power of a state [which includes the health power], 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. . . .”

By the way, it’s nice that SCOTUS also referred to “facts of common knowledge, which the court will always regard in passing upon the constitutionality of a statute.” It was *common knowledge* that smallpox vax was OK. But, see, it wasn’t. As we saw in the Sandy Hook case, not to mention the 9/11 case, people believe what they are told to believe. You are a “bad person” if you deviate.

Now, Beloved Reader, see my Appeal, if you wish. At least take a peek at Exhibit F, which is about the maxims -- high principles of law that underlie this book’s plea to revive the Court of Equity. The whole thing is 5,800 words. I’ll UNDERLINE some hot parts. It represents the status at June, 2021. I have not added anything new.

United States Court of Appeal, First Circuit

No. 20 cv 01193 PB

Dated: June 20, 2021

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, Concord NH 03301.

Email: MaxwellMaryLLB @gmail.com.

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 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 submissive-ness 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 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

175 Loudon Rd, Concord NH 03301

Email address: MaxwellMaryLLB@gmail.com

Appendix – These 8 Publications critical of the Covid vaccine, are 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” 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 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 everything. 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, 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. His answers show ignorance of science and contempt for the people.]:

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 combination of both.

[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.

Q -- 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. ... In clinical trials, it's normal to exclude pregnant people.

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)

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 ampliari 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 semper dabit remedium.*

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 appeal brief in Maxwell v Secretary of Defense et al

[The underlining is not in the original. I omitted 2 exhibits]

Index

ABA, the, 11, 104, 112, 113
 Abbe, Winfield, 37, 39, 40
 active shooter drill, 74
 Allott, Philip, 4, 9, 47, 67, 68, 99, 100
 Australia, 4, 15, 16, 43, 49, 115
 autopsy, 20, 36, 109
 Bankruptcy Court, 44
 Bellis, Judge Barbara, 71
 Boston Marathon, 15, 24, 69, 86
 Bryant, Martin, 86
 Carver, Dr Wayne, 104
 Catholic Church, 10, 37
 charities, 33
 child's morals, 13, 82
 CIA, 27, 31, 45, 49, 56, 78, 82
 citizen's arrest, 103
 civil action, 74
 civil rights, 80
 Clinton, Pres Bill, 49
 community, 7, 38, 59, 82, 88
 Cooper, Anderson, 61
 coram nobis, 86, 87
 corruption, 63, 71, 98, 107
 cover-up, 66
 Covid, 9, 15, 27, 102, 115
 crisis actors, 4, 57, 58, 59, 78
 Crowley, Maureen, 37, 39
 D'Avino, Rachel, 42
 Declaration of Independence, 80
 discovery, 47, 72
 DoJ, 60, 65
 Dolan, Cardinal Timothy, 37, 38
 donations, 13, 82
 drill, 19, 55, 58, 61, 66, 70, 81
 Dunblane, 45
 equity, 4, 11, 83, 84, 101
 extrinsic fraud, 11, 83, 84
 false flag, 4, 15, 16, 19, 27, 45, 77
 FBI, 11, 20, 23, 24, 31, 39, 40, 70, 71, 103, 105, 118
 FEMA, 35, 36, 39, 41, 59, 61, 74
 Fetzer, Prof James, 13, 28, 35, 36, 42, 43, 45, 50, 52, 78, 84, 86, 87
 Framers, the, 43, 96
 Fraud Upon the Court, 4
 free speech, 68, 93
 Freeman, Abraham, 112
 glass door, 21, 74
 grand jury, 4, 12, 89, 97, 98, 99
 Halbig, Wolfgang, 19, 28, 29, 39, 43

Hammond, Natalie, 30, 41
Hicks, Shannon, 18, 19, 66
Hochsprung, Dawn, 7
Hockley, Nicole, 24
Holder, Eric, 31
Homeland Security, 59, 62
iconic photo, 18, 19, 28, 29, 45, 65
janitor, 29
Jones, Alex, 71
Keep the Republic, 4
Lanza, Adam, 4, 20, 21, 23, 31, 40, 77, 87
Lanza, Nancy, 20, 25, 26, 42, 70
Lanza, Peter, 20
larceny, 82
legalized lying, 4, 27
Lemnitzer, Gen J, 56
love, 6, 7, 38, 54, 57, 79, 105
Macisco, Officer, 22
Malloy, Gov Daniel, 81
Maxwell, Mary W, 3, 4, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 37, 54, 61, 87, 115, 116
McLachlan, Dee, 9, 10, 15, 16, 50
Memo to Potus, 27
mind control, 48, 49, 54, 70, 95
misprision, 82
MK-Ultra, 49
mock funeral, 55
Mueller, Robert, 31, 70, 71
Murphy, Anne M, 7, 38
Myers, Judge Jeffrey, 62
national security, 13, 27, 60
NDAA, 55
Newtown Bee, 18, 37
non-disclosure agreement, 40
Northwoods Memo, 56
Obama, President Barack, 7, 10, 29, 31, 70, 102
obstructing justice, 36
Orwell, George, 10, 50, 51, 52, 54, 90, 101
outlawry, law of, 103
Pelley, Scott, 110, 111
Perloff, James, 9, 70
Pisini, Debra, 30, 41
Podgorski, Major W, 40
Port Arthur, 15
Powell, Sidney, 60
Pozner, Leonard, 29, 34, 52
Practice Book, 71
psy-op, 4, 31, 63, 69, 78, 87, 118
Queen Elizabeth, 83
Randolph, Edmund, 80
reasoning, 46
recusal of Judge, 62

Reich, Jonathan, 39
 Remington Arms, 41
 Remington, Judge Frank, 36, 52, 87
 Riley, Keven, 20
 Robertson, A P, 52, 53
 Rousseau, Lauren, 7, 42
 Rule 60b, 84
 satan, 49
 satanism, 49
 Scott, William Sumner, 9, 11, 112, 114
 SCOTUS, see US Supreme Court
 Sedensky Report, 23, 24, 78
 self-defense, law of, 102, 103
 settlement, 15, 43, 49
 "severe penalties if they fail to lie", 27
 Shanley, William Brandon, 10, 13, 28, 32, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 82, 101
 Sherlach, M, 7, 42
 Sherman Anti-Trust, 12, 64
 slavery, 73
 Soros, George, 113
 Soto v Remington/Bushmaster, 4, 32, 41, 85
 Soto, Donna, 41
 Soto, Jillian, 29, 41
 Special Coroner, 62
 SSDI, 29
 St Rose of Lima, 37, 39
 Statute of Limitations, 75
 Steele, Robert, 27, 31, 78
 Sussman, Joel, 11, 116
 Sydney drill, 55
 Teachout, Zephyr, 4, 61, 64, 65
 terrorism, 13, 60, 61, 62, 66
 Throckmorton, 13, 44, 84, 85, 87
 Tracy, Prof James, 11, 28, 43, 71, 78, 81, 108
 US Supreme Court, 13, 36, 44, 54, 80, 84, 87, 96, 97, 98, 102
 Van Ness, Rachael, 21, 22, 28, 45
 Vance, Lt J Paul, 81, 109
 Weiss, Monsignor R, 37
 Wheeler, Benjamin, 42
 Wickstrom, Larry, 52, 53