To Graham, from Dee

To Elissa, from Mary

and to our adoptive country, Australia
From George Orwell’s *1984*:

It’s a beautiful thing, the destruction of words. …

After all, what justification is there for a word which is simply the opposite of some other word? 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”? “Plusgood” covers the meaning…Of course we use those forms already, but in the final version of Newspeak there’ll be nothing else.

Don’t you see the beauty of that, Winston?
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FOREWORD
BY DEAN HARTWELL

The truth about anything is never in dispute. We need only consider who is purporting to tell it.

The facts are present and capable of our discovery on just about anything one could imagine. But those who carry the “official” stamp of reporting information to us, who have access to the same facts, frequently tell us stories that contradict those facts.

We have been conditioned by society that the truth prevails, or makes us free, but if you are reading this book, you know that isn’t the case. The fact is that facts rarely matter.

Then what does matter?

All of us know the answer but we may not know how we know. But all we need do is to apply reason to discern the truth of a matter.

People lie. That includes those who speak on behalf of the government, those who write for the media and those who own it.

It also includes every one of us. The point, though, is not that people lie, but rather why they do it.

I love pizza and that’s no lie. If I had a large pepperoni pizza and I felt like devouring it, I wouldn’t be so keen to let others know of its existence. I would be happy to tell a tall tale of how I had nothing to eat at my place to make anyone a threat to the pizza go away. Even though they may suspect I am lying, they would lack the power to do anything about it.
My ability to shield my pizza represents power to me (the right to eat what I want and as much of it as I please) the way that the government and media’s ability to shield the truth about events represents power to them.

The truth is rather simple: all over the world, the wealthy and powerful continue to accrue more wealth and power at the expense of the rest of us.

Every single official story will distort facts of events in such a manner as to convince us that the truth is anything but that simple. Never forget that those wealthy and powerful people are among the very people reporting to us and governing us!

The powers that be have no reason to tell us the truth. And there is little we can do to change that.

Some say we need more power. But pleas for more power for the powerless succeed as often as someone getting my pizza.

Some say we need more transparency. But cries for transparency in government forget that the hands that hold open the window to allow us to see activity are the same hands that close it.

Some say we need real investigations. But urges that the mainstream media conduct real investigations make the powerful laugh at the idea of pointing fingers at themselves.

Better we think for ourselves and remain a minority than to join a majority who use power for power’s sake. The powerful may secretly admire a principled stance, but none dare call it reason.

Dean Hartwell is the author of several books on 9-11 and on the questioning of authority.
SCHOOLS OF JOURNALISM
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Bond, Deakin, Monash, Queensland University of Technology, Curtin, Griffith, Murdoch, and the Universities of Melbourne, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and University of Technology, Sydney.

These offer an undergraduate degree only: Latrobe, Woolongong, Canberra, Macleay, Cook, Sturt, RMIT, Newcastle, the University of the Sunshine Coast, and Swinburne.
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Last year, 2014, I thumbed through the Adelaide Fringe catalogue and did not see any shows that looked like “political criticism.” Didn’t that used to be the main emphasis of the Fringe, perhaps its *raison d’être*?

This year, when the deadline was approaching to register as a Fringe artist, I asked Dee if she would care to cook up a show, and I would present a separate one. After we found out that renting the venue is pretty expensive, we decided to do just one show, jointly.

That’s what led to this book. We hoped the audience at our March 13 Fringe show would be so sad when the curtain came down that they would want to buy some souvenir. So we went to our recent articles at Gumshoe, chose the faves, and created this book.

Lemme tell you, Gumshoe News.com, based in Melbourne Town, is no ordinary “media outlet.” It is an extraordinary media outlet. It surprises me more every day. In fact what surprises me most every day is that they “let us get away with it.”

By the time August 2015 arrived we had visions of going on a lecture tour to schools of journalism. Thus Dee added, to this book, a Part IV “Reflections for Students.” It contains some helpful hints, such as for persisting with police reports.

We are keen to get the students’ reaction to the title “Truth in Journalism.” Presumably many will chuckle, but if you were to see what is stated in the published “Code of Ethics for the Press” you would really roll in the aisles. Relatively speaking, “truth in journalism” is a humble goal!
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Invitation

We want you. Oh boy, do we want you. Wait till you read the opening chapter about our old Adelaide man, Rupe. There’s lots of room for us to change the road we’re presently on. We can break some new paths, and what’s to prevent us, also, from going back to tried and true ways of doing business?

Please get in touch with us. At the very least, please tune into Gumshoenews dot com, and don’t be shy about saying what’s on your mind. Dee and Mary have big ears, even huge ears, even gargantuan ears. Your ideas will be welcome. There’s kind of sort of a crisis going on, know what I’m sayin’?

Mary W Maxwell                      Adelaide             September 1, 2015
Welcome to Section 1

Dee’s articles on
The Media
Mr Murdoch, sir, you have the opportunity of a lifetime.

For more than half a century you have amassed a media empire across the globe, with News Corp being the world’s second-largest media group (2011 revenue), and the world’s third largest in entertainment (2009), now split and called 21st Century Fox. You have been listed #2 by Forbes (as most powerful business person) and some time ago at #32 in the world’s Most Powerful People. You have met constantly with Prime Ministers in the UK and Australia, influenced voters and governments – even Presidential outcomes. It is generally accepted that you control the heads of states, as reflected in The Age today (4/2/15) on your ‘bromance’ with Australian PM, Tony Abbott (below).

You have a clear understanding of the power of the media and ‘groupthink’. An editorial in The Age (January 1987) wrote this about your rise then, “The effective control of the media is
the first step on the road to controlling the values and future direction of our society.” And we understand this ‘influential power’ is what drives you.

When journalist Ken Auletta spent time with you in 2007, he asked: “of all the things in your business empire, what gives you the most pleasure?” you instantly replied: “being involved with the editor of a paper in a day-to-day campaign… trying to influence people.”. That is the core of the Rupert Murdoch brand: Influencing people – from politicians to plebs.

That has also created a long list of ‘enemies’ – e.g. Ted Turner has called you a war-monger – but you did promote the war on Iraq, and say “I think Bush is acting very morally, very correctly” (New York Times, 4/9/03; Guardian, 2/12/03). The war was a murderous adventure that has become an “embarrassment” for Former Australian PM John Howard, and lethal to over a million Iraqis.

In a Center of American Progress article ‘Who is Rupert Murdoch?’ you are labelled a neocon, a defender of repressive regimes, propagandist for dictators, union buster, tax evader – and worse. (Well, in Australia, Fox did only pay 1% tax and you managed to get $880 million back from the Australian tax payers). Other commentators, like Alex Constantine, have brought up other questions too; whether your partnership with Sir Peter Abeles resulted in drug running into the US, and did an association with CIA jackal Ted Shackley result in support from the CIA to build your empire? But that is all history now.

Media’s Lies and Deception

It is the future that is upon us – and humanity in 2015 needs your help. Mr Murdoch we are DROWNING in political lies and deception – and YOU have the power, the influence, and the reach to change this world forever. Over the last several decades, your carefully chosen editors have been withholding vital evidence from your readers and viewers. Unfortunately it has become the ‘norm’ to push unquestioningly the ‘government line’ (and lie).
So much so, that the dumbed-down folks are completely unaware of what is REALLY happening around them. I believe you and other media moguls know exactly what is really happening. And thus, it seems, the corporate media have been involved in the suppression of crucial evidence – even deliberately covering up the egregious crimes of the all powerful.

Take 9-11, for example, an event that has started a global war of terror and world-wide legislation to limit freedoms. The facts and the scientific evidence have been ‘buried’ by the corporate media. Scientists with facts have been openly mocked and scorned. And the official government lie – which has been proved as an impossibility – has been blindly propagated. Approximately 46%, nearly one in two, are NOT AWARE that a third skyscraper collapsed on 9/11, or that it came down in a seemingly perfect demolition ‘event’.

My friend, Patricia, referring to you, says “No other living person has squandered such influence and power”.

It is not too late to change that.

**Just One Email**

You are probably one of only a few people in this world, that could change the world with one single email. You could forward a brief to all your editors, CEOs and managers that you are in so much contact with. One paragraph is all that is required, and it could go something like this:

“I instruct you all herewith to encourage your staff and journalists to provide articles and programs that investigate all of the evidence and facts surrounding past and future terror events, wars, banking and politics. Disclose the real news, without fear or favour. You could cover some history – e.g. the facts surrounding September 11 and other so-called terror ‘events’ (false flags). Thereafter, you could offer open debate and reportage of GMO’s, vaccines, pharmaceuticals, trade agreements and the like….”

I know this would unleash an overload of information to a misinformed public. **There would be some acclimatisation and societal adjustment required.**
You personally might very well lose some friends – but you will earn the respect of billions. This email will be greater than anything Nelson Mandela could ever achieve in his lifetime of service and three decades of prison.

With honest and open reporting, you would unleash the truth and the reality we live in. The world will instantaneously become different! There would be inner reflection from governments all across the globe. It might assist the failing financial banking system. It might very well deflate the threat of terrorism, and could save Homo sapiens from self annihilation.

And Mr Murdoch, strangely enough, I think you are powerful enough to survive assassination. Once your email is sent, the cat will be let out the bag. It will be too late to ‘deal’ with you – and the exposé of criminal elements in governments and shadow governments could begin. Real news across 175 newspapers and over 35 TV stations would be a tipping point – an avalanche in the psyche of humanity. Other media organisations would be forced to follow – or become totally irrelevant. It would even force public broadcasters like the Australian Broadcasting (‘Bulldust’) Corporation to start reporting honestly.

Maybe you are part of the cabal that wants to keep the populace oblivious of reality, but you alone, Mr Murdoch, with one email – could save humanity from the tyranny

*With son James at a Parliamentary hearing in 2011*
and totalitarianism that awaits the 99.9% of us.

If you instructed your minions to disclose the real news, without fear or favour, in the millennia to come, this would be recorded as one of mankind’s greatest turning points. Imagine a world where honesty prevails.

If not, history will surely remember ONLY your shameful moment.

**Greater Wealth and Power Awaits You**

And if you are after more power and wealth – well this could be just the ticket. **This could be the best decision you ever made.** As the ‘dinosaur’ corporate media slowly declines, you could turn that around and attract huge NEW audiences. According to the New York Times/CBS News poll (2004), only 21% believed the government was “telling the truth” about 9/11. More don’t believe the bullsh*t in your countless papers, than do believe.

You are said to be **worth around $14 billion.** Imagine when your papers and channels start allowing the reportage of actual facts and evidence. **What a marvelous and innovative concept that would be!** It would surpass your ‘killer bees’ story each and every day. Your popularity will rise a thousandfold and you will amass even greater fortunes and power. Forbes will have to rethink your place – as you would surely rise to the top – and be the most influential person among the 7 billion of us.

I read countless comments from people that look upon you as an appalling, reprehensible plunderer of humanity’s mind and soul.

You are now 83 – the clock is ticking. It would take a mere 30 minutes of deep reflection to write such an instructive email – and change the world for the better. Heaven, both on earth now and in the afterlife, awaits you.

**Mr Murdoch, you are only one click away from greatness.**

*Sir, reach out and click that key.*
I heard Dr Karl Kruszelnicki on Sunday morning on ABC’s Weekend Breakfast show being interviewed by Andrew Geoghegan – and in typical ABC style denigrating those who challenge the official 9/11 theory.

They were covering various topics with a neuroscientist and skeptic and were talking about analytical thinking, when they moved to a discussion of 9/11 conspiracy theorists. To paraphrase: They as scientists have critical and skeptical thinking on their side, but the 9/11 conspiracy theorists are wrong – finding a theory to fit their belief system (that government was somehow involved). Celebrity scientist Karl agreed. What a joke! They are themselves guilty of fitting the facts and science into their belief system – and have thrown critical thinking out the window.

And Dr Karl, it’s wrong to claim that so-called ‘conspiracy theorists’ start from a belief system and then find the facts to fit. In the early 2000’s I was against the war on Iraq, but firm in the belief that 19 Arabs were responsible – UNTIL I happened across the anomaly of Building 7. It took three months of intensive soul searching (and research) as I reluctantly forced a change to my belief system to match the science and the facts before me.

Thus, I do not consider myself to be believing in a ‘conspiracy’, but rather a theory (the most plausible) that fits the laws of science and the facts. I have come to understand that the official theory is fraudulent fanciful nonsense. (And by the way, I have no idea who orchestrated it – but an honest investigation would root out some of the players).
So Dr Karl, this is a challenge to you (and if you are not prepared to take it up – stop talking down to people who challenge the official version):

‘Please Explain’ Building 7

Oh, do you know about WTC 7? Well, I’ll link you to the video below. This skyscraper was not hit by a plane and had only a few office fires. It was the THIRD skyscraper to ‘collapse’ – and did so at 5.20 that afternoon of the 11th. And if it was ‘brought down’ then this creates a terrible dilemma.

The official (FEMA and NIST) theory says:

The official report claimed the fires expanded floor beams, which pushed a girder off its seat, precipitating multiple floor failures, which left column 79 unsupported and it buckled, which then dragged floors 14 to the roof downward. Then a north to south floor failure commenced, which propagated to the west. When most of the floors had fallen, the exterior was essentially an empty shell and it collapsed straight down, at free-fall acceleration.

The principal ‘conspiracy’ – or other theory:

Over 2300 engineers, architects and scientists (like yourself) believe the only possible explanation for this steel frame building to free fall in this perfect collapse is by demolition, and the use of some form of explosives. (Remember, no other skyscraper has ever just collapsed as a result of fire, even though some fires raged for 24 hours.) See Architects and Engineers at ae911truth.org.

So – I want you, Dr Karl, to ‘Please Explain’ how did the 47 floor skyscraper (note: the Rialto in Melbourne is 52) just ‘come down’ in a mostly free fall collapse into its own foot print (so to speak)? And you can just comment below, if you want, or contact me.

But these are the simple rules:

1. You must only take into account the ‘science’ relating to the collapse.

2. You MUST ignore your personal belief system when you investigate the evidence.
3. You must ignore all media reports, witness statements, hearsay evidence, all reportage from conspiracy theorists and from government that are not strictly factual.

4. You must ignore ‘possible’ theories – and make you conclusions ONLY based on ‘hard’ science.

5. You must be honest about your findings – and provide the most logical scientific option to the collapse of WTC 7.

For your interest – this is NIST’s computer model that purports to explain the collapse. However, it does not match reality. We can provide links to relevant scientific data on request.

And I would suggest you inform the ABC of your findings (and radio personalities like Jon Faine). As you hold great sway at the ‘people’s organisation’, it might stop the ABC from propagating the fraudulent story of how those Australians were murdered on September 11, 2001.

Postscript: There is a Youtube video of Larry Silverstein, saying that “we” “pulled” the building. But as this is just a ‘statement’, you will NOT be allowed to use it to sway your scientific investigation either way.

Who is Dr Karl?

Dr Karl Kruszelnicki’s media career began in 1981 presenting ‘Great Moments In Science’ and since then his celebrity status has exploded, and he has even been called the ‘President of Science’ in Australia. He has authored 26 books, with his Please Explain released in November 2007. According to New Scientist magazine Karl’s last five books have all gained the position of best-selling Popular Science book in Australia. Dr Karl Kruszelnicki received the Member of the Order of Australia Award in 2006. In 2007 the Australian Skeptics awarded Dr Karl the Australia Skeptic of The Year Prize.

Karl has degrees in Physics and Mathematics, Biomedical Engineering, Medicine and Surgery and has worked as a physicist, tutor, film-maker, car mechanic, labourer, and as a medical doctor at the Kids’ Hospital in Sydney.
On the 23rd March, Matt will go to court against the BBC and claim that the organisation is in violation of UK anti-terrorist legislation. Matt will claim that he has reasonable cause to believe that the BBC has been willfully complicit in the deliberate cover-up of vital and incontrovertible evidence relating to how his brother Geoff was killed in the North Tower, and that as such the BBC is guilty of complicity with terrorism – under Section 38B of the Terrorism Act 2000 (UK) as amended by Section 117.

Therefore, according to Matt, to pay his TV Licence Fee to the BBC would in fact be a criminal act according to Section 15, Article 3 of the Terrorism Act. He believes that he has a situation of conflict of law whereby he is prepared to continue paying his TV Licence Fee, but not if it goes to the BBC, because to provide funds to the BBC would be to provide funds to an organisation that is supporting an act of terrorism. He will put forward evidence (and expert witnesses) that allege the use of controlled demolition on September 11, 2001.

**Comment from John O’Donnell of Brisbane:**
This is brilliant. We should be using the rule of law to expose the perpetrators of 9/11. Not all judges are corrupt and most cops and even journalists intend to do the right thing. The problem is their bosses. Section 15 of the anti terrorism law says that it is illegal to give any funds to any organisation if you SUSPECT that the organisation has any links to terrorist organisations.

For anyone with any knowledge of the events of 9/11, it is blatantly obvious that the BBC programmes, ‘conspiracy road trip’ and ‘conspiracy files’ are full of lies, untruths, strawman arguments and innuendo and are therefore covering up for the real perpetrators of the events of 9/11 which makes them complicit and they are therefore a terrorist organisation.
Gold Walkley Awards – Excellent Journalism Avoiding the Real Crimes
by Dee McLachlan, December 8, 2014

Just over a week ago journalists and the media celebrated the 2014 Gold Walkley Awards in – the primo journalistic awards for Australia. The Walkley Foundation’s core mission is to foster excellence in journalism and support a robust and independent media, which deepens and enriches democracy and lies at the heart of a free society.

And each year they slap themselves on the back and toast with champagne on the great stories they have disclosed to the Australian public. But unfortunately, the ‘controlled’ media refuses to report and investigate with honesty the most heinous crimes against humanity – like 9/11.

The Gold Wankleys (per suggestion of our reader, Ned)
Well, what won the Walkley this year? The Four Corners team took the award with their ‘Banking Bad’ program that captured the human side of poor financial advice from the Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA) – focusing on some of the bad apples in the organisation. It is a pity that none of these media organisations focus on the banking scam or broadcast program’s like Michael Rivero’s “All Wars are Bankers Wars”

Sir Josiah Stamp, who was president of the Bank of England and the second richest man in the UK in the 1920’s, said:
“Banking was conceived in iniquity and was born in sin. The
Bankers own the Earth. Take it away from them, but leave them the power to create deposits, and with the flick of a pen they will create enough deposits to buy it back again. However, take it away from them, and all the fortunes like mine will disappear, and they ought to disappear, for this world would be a happier and better world to live in. But if you wish to remain slaves of the Bankers and pay for the cost of your own slavery, let them continue to create deposits.”

Rivero’s program doesn’t expose a few bad apples – it reveals how the bankers have enslaved countries and brought on wars, resulting in the deaths of tens millions of people. That is a story!

And the Guardian took the ‘Scoop of the Year’ – for the Yudhoyono spy story revealing that Australia’s spy networks were targeting Indonesian president Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono’s personal mobile phone. All a little bit of a distraction from what is really happening with regard to crushing surveillance planned for the Australian population. At least some of that is being reported on.

But, as I have said before, the media organisations and their paid journalists avoid the ‘real crimes’. They win awards for reporting stories of ‘distraction’, while avoiding the big questions that challenge the globally controlled status quo.

So let us look at some past winners:

1999  Disguised paid advertising in radio;
2000  Timor Intelligence;
2001  Allegations of sexual abuse by ATSIC chairman, Geoff Clarke;
2002  Bulldogs (sports) salary cap scandal;
2003  Canberra Bushfires;
2004  Rene Rivkin;
2005  Aceh Tsunami and Jakarta Embassy Bomb (killed 9 people);
2006  Civilian militia in East Timor (2006);
2007  Dr Haneef;
2008  A doctor’s alleged malpractice in Bega;
2009  The Black Saturday bushfires;
2010  Labor leaks;
2011  Indonesian abattoirs;
2012  Gina Rinehart’s feud with her children, an asylum seeker
      boat tragedy;
2013  Sex abuse in the Catholic Church.

A perfect list of “ankle biting” stories ‘allowed’ by the mainstream
propaganda machine involving 1) Environmental events, 2) Internal Labor turmoil or Unions, 3) Attacks (or focus) on individuals, 4) Powerless countries, 5) Sex abuse, and of course 6) Cruelty to animals. I am not saying that these stories are unimportant. They were well produced and deserve recognition.
But—

**Where are these stories?**

MH17 secret agreement and investigating Ukraine as a possible suspect; an analysis of Building 7 and why it is being kept out of mainstream media; the fraudulent war on terror created by the 9/11 event that resulted in over a million deaths. What about reporting Benghazi and the details behind the murder of the US Ambassador; the alleged use of chemical weapons by Syrian rebels. And why haven’t we heard or read about General Wesley Clark’s revelations about destroying 7 countries in five years? Or the real story behind the attacks on USS Liberty or the Port Arthur massacre? I could go on and on, but so little ‘big stuff’ gets reported with honesty or with some unbiased detail that discloses the criminal actions of governments in their geopolitical destruction of countries and societies.

The conclusion: The mainstream media has bought and sold real democracy down the river. And the Walkley’s have as a result become a sham.
Canada’s Most Important Court Case, on Banking

by Dee McLachlan, March 9, 2015

“This is probably the most important case... that I’ve done as a constitutional lawyer,” says Canadian lawyer, Rocco Galati. And… “No I don’t believe we are living in a democracy (in Canada).”

A class action suit, COMER versus Bank of Canada, is set to expose the one of the greatest frauds of all time – the central banking hoax. It claims that Canadian Central Bank was essentially stolen in 1974, and that in joining the Bank of International Settlements in the 1940s, Canada surrendered its sovereign control of money to private financiers.

As can be expected, the mainstream media is not reporting this case.

The nature of the lawsuit has been explained at pressfortruth.ca in the following terms:

“Two Canadians and a Canadian economic think tank confront the global financial powers in the Canadian federal court. The Canadians plead for declarations that would restore the use of the Bank of Canada for the benefit of Canadians and remove it from the control of international private entities.”

The plaintiff is the Committee on Monetary and Economic Reform (COMER).

(See Christopher Brooks’ Gumshoe article of February 12, 2015: “Australia Need Money CREATION Reform”.)
The government’s first tranche of tougher anti-terrorism bills was being debated in the Senate. The death of an 18-year-old radical had already added fuel to George Brandis’s ‘big brother’ legislation. On Thursday at 6.30am a member of the Australian Defence Force was attacked. The 41-year-old man told police he was threatened and assaulted by two men of Middle Eastern appearance while wearing his full uniform at Bella Vista, Sydney.

Suffering minor bruising, he reported the matter to police and then attended Kings Cross police station in person. All military personnel are warned! The fight is now on Australian shores! The media did their usual blitz.

Later that Thursday night, legislation to beef up the powers of the domestic spy agency ASIO, passes in the Senate by 44 votes to 12 – with bipartisan support from Labor.

On Friday morning (11:52), the NSW Police issued a statement announcing the “allegation of assault has now been withdrawn”. “NSW Police will continue to examine the circumstances that led to the allegation being brought to their attention”. (!!!)

We need to know: was the Bella Vista attack fake?

The police media department did not want to provide me any more detail other than their 2-line media release.

What was passed in the Senate:

Australian spies will soon have the power to monitor the entire Australian internet with just one warrant, and journalists, whistleblowers and bloggers will face up to 10 years’ jail for ‘recklessly’ disclosing classified information. Are the crimes of 9-11 deemed classified? What happens if the intelligence operation being exposed is detrimental to the wellbeing of the Australian community? That doesn’t matter. The rights to disclose secret criminality in government are gone.

At some point Brandis will be voted out out or he will retire.

But, the ‘powers’ that control the secrets for the Australian people can’t be voted out. We don’t even know who they are. It is secret.
Laurie Oakes writing in his latest article, “Now Prime Minister Abbott must act over Vladimir Putin”, has proved he is just a patsy of the mainstream propaganda media. He has long been in the top list of journo’s in this country, but this article reveals his true colours. He should have done his homework and just a little bit of investigating before trying to inflame tensions. And maybe take into account that there is a presumption of innocence in a sane world. The Power Index writes: “No journalist in Canberra carries as much gravitas as Laurie Oakes” Laurie advocates in his article: “But giving Putin the cold shoulder will not be enough. Having promised confrontation, Abbott needs to deliver it. He needs to be seen to be conveying to Putin in no uncertain terms the fury Australians feel about what happened to the plane”.

It is embarrassing that one of our top journalists is blatantly accusing Putin of murdering 38 Australians before the outcome of an investigation. The facts are easily researched. But Mr Oakes is just parroting the NATO/Washington/Canberra script. It is actually shameful. I was writing to Julie Bishop’s office from the first week – but after several weeks and more of my emails they referred my query to the Federal Police (to scare me off???). They never once referred to the facts I gave. And it is not actually me putting these facts forward. I was merely informing DFAT of what the (OSCE) International Monitor, Michael Bociurkiw, was reporting. (OSCE is the Organisation for Security and Cooperation In Europe.)
Bociurkiw was one of two monitors on the ground and had became intimate with the wreckage over a number of days. He reported that several pieces of fuselage had ‘machine-gun fire’ type bullet holes. His observation, along with eye witnesses and Russian radar does NOT point to Russia.

The Dutch preliminary report in early September said: MH17 was brought down by “a large number of high energy objects that penetrated the aircraft from the outside”. And then there’s the report of the “oxygen mask” that accidentally slipped out on television: Dutch Foreign Minister Frans Timmermans accidentally revealed that someone had “donned an oxygen mask before the fatal crash, suggesting some on board might have been aware of their impending deaths”. Thus, surely it would be prudent to wait for the outcome of a detailed investigation. Let’s pray the evidence is not infected by secret deals and that the investigation is produced without fear or favour.

I am no fan of much of Russia’s policies – but the mainstream media have accused Russia of trying to obstruct the investigation, when Russia was the only country to quickly disclose its Intel and radar data. Russian radar had spotted a second aircraft in the ill-fated airliner’s vicinity just before the crash and that it was likely a Ukrainian fighter jet. Yet Laurie, you say: “The charge is based on hard intelligence information“.

Maybe you have information we don’t – or is this just more of your gravitas BS. Your “hard intelligence” I think refers to “orders” from the Global Corporate Kleptocrats trying to muscle in on Ukraine’s resources.

This is a murder investigation of 38 Australians so I hope the investigation will be done without fear or favour. But I am skeptical.

As I predicted in an earlier post – blame will probably quietly switch from Russia to a Ukrainian jet fighter flown by rogue pilot from another EU country who was on medication. He got mixed up and thought he was shooting down a Russian (or Putin’s) plane. End of story.
Cabal ‘frontman’ Wesley is back with his inside ‘tips.’
Retired General Wesley Clark spent 34 years in the Army, became Supreme Allied Commander Europe of NATO from 1997 to 2000, received many military decorations, several honorary knighthoods, and a Presidential Medal of Freedom.
He told us in 2007 that the US was planning to destroy the Middle East – 7 countries in 5 years (Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Lebanon, Syria, Iran).
That was a great tip, and he got much praise for it in alternative circles. But WHY did he just sit on that intel for six years (from 2001 to 2007), while the US et al destroyed several of those countries?
Now he is telling us that ISIS got started by funding from our (the US) “friends and allies”. That was obvious to many critics, but now it’s from the horse’s mouth. The US and allies have been funding al Qaeda, and Obama has requested funding from Congress to back the moderate rebels in Syria to fight ISIS – but really to destroy al-Assad. This is insane.

al-Assad or ISIS
So if you are wondering about the Syrian conflict, the retired General has tipped us off that ‘we’ (indirectly or directly) are funding ISIS (or groups that will affiliate with ISIS) to destroy Assad – in a similar manner as Saddam and Gaddafi were dealt with. Yes, ‘they’ have gone out of their way to recruit zealots.
This is what Clark said in February 2015:
“But we need the authorisation to follow the leads, put the troops in and play this… . Look, ISIS got started through funding from
our friends and allies. Because people will tell you in the region – if you want somebody to fight to the death against Hezbollah…. you go after zealots.”

The CNN host replies: “…the question would be, if they wipe out ISIS in Syria – which is the goal, then what about Bashar al-Assad?”

Clark: “Some things you can’t exactly plan…” (Like the destruction of Syria – because Russia will not cooperate)

Back in 2007, this is how he phrased his leak (He was talking to Amy Goodman of the leftwing Democracy Now show):

“About ten days after 9/11, I went through the Pentagon and I saw Secretary Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz. I went downstairs just to say hello to some of the people on the Joint Staff who used to work for me, and one of the generals called me in. He said, “Sir, you’ve got to come in and talk to me a second.”…”

“And he (a General) said, “I just got this down from upstairs” — meaning the Secretary of Defense’s office — “today.” And he said, “This is a memo that describes how we’re going to take out seven countries in five years, starting with Iraq, and then Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and, finishing off, Iran.” I said, “Is it classified?” He said, “Yes, sir.” I said, “Well, don’t show it to me.””

So Clark seems to be the official “informer”? Other whistleblowers have to hide in Russia. Clark, though, allegedly formed the website stopiranwar.com. The site is “devoted to promoting peace at a world level, but specially in the Middle East. We strongly believe that the solutions will come from using diplomacy instead of military force to resolve conflicts”. But on CNN he is pushing for troops on the ground – and more war against the zealots funded by friends.

I was amazed when I first heard Clark and his 7 countries in 5 years revelation. The Supreme Commander of NATO forces revealing an astonishing ‘classified’ memo? But I personally don’t trust him. See the attempted interview with him, by a reporter who wanted to know if Clark would support a new investigation of 9-11.
I read over the weekend the most disgraceful distorted reporting in the Herald Sun by Patrick Carlyon. You would have thought that the pro-Russian separatists were responsible for the decomposition of the bodies (I’m sure those same poor souls wouldn’t decompose on Australian soil – as we’re ‘nice’ people).

The article, entitled **Bullies, goons and body-snatchers** at the MH17 disaster site – goes on about the body snatching – this printed alongside a photograph of two officials dressed in blue uniforms collecting bodies and taking them to a train station to be sent off to another country. Body-snatchers? He goes on about the “cover-up” – and all the time pointing blame at Putin.

Well the separatists have given up the black boxes, and the Russians have published their radar data. It is the West that is busy in a cover-up. It is the West (the US and the Ukraine government) that has not been forthcoming with their data. And the mainstream media keeps citing old fraudulent social media as fact – as did Andrew Bolt during his Bolt Report on Sunday.

Then splashed across a double page – **BARBARIANS AT THE GATE.** This reflected the ‘war-mongering’ mentality of the
article. I think it would be more reflective to recall that Australia jumped to conclusions and went into Iraq on false evidence and bombed Iraq back into the stone age – killing (murdering) tens of thousands of innocent civilians. That is barbaric.

However, let’s review the evidence. Carlyon fails to mention any of the potential evidence that points elsewhere. He does not mention Carlos in the control tower tweeting that Ukrainian fighter jets shot MH17 down. He does not question why Ukraine hasn’t released the control tower transcripts.

However I will point to one sentence in his article: “If it is evidence of a missile blast, the separatists fail, at least insofar that media photos clearly show shrapnel blast patterns to sections of the fuselage. Closer observations show they resemble machinegun fire. If it is the fragments of the missile itself they hope to hide, their success or otherwise is more difficult to measure…. ” Very interesting. Machine gun fire.

Well there is now a report from InvestmentWatch indicating German experts point a finger at Ukrainian air-force jets.

“Surface to air missile attack ruled out as calibre of cockpit bullet holes puts Ukraine pilots in the frame for MH17 murders…. .if you look at the image of Cockpit-Fragments, this picture is certainly shocking”. 
Further quotes from InvestmentWatch:

“Entry and exit holes from bullets in the area of the cockpit. This is not speculation, but analysis of clear facts: the cockpit shows clear evidence of bullet holes. You can see the entry holes and some exit points. The edges of the bullet holes are bent inwards, these are much smaller and round in shape. A 30mm calibre. The exit holes are less well formed and the edges are torn outwards.”

“Armour-piercing ammunition. Russia has published radar data that a Ukranian SU 25 was close to MH 17. This corresponds with Spanish air traffic control that two Ukranian fighter aircraft were in direct contact with MH 17. Examine the weaponry of the SU 25: it is fitted out with a 30mm cannon Type GSch-302 /AO-17A, with 250 rounds of splintering exploding bullets on a belt – shrapnel rounds. The cockpit of MH 17 was hit from TWO sides, as there are entry and exit holes on the same side…”

Well, Carlyon was right about that one sentence: “Closer observations show they resemble machinegun fire”. But the rest of the article is disgraceful and uninformed journalism.

The Australian government has led the charge against Russia. Let’s hope they will be able to stomach the latest facts – that MH17 appears to have been downed by a Ukranian jet.
Welcome to Section 2

Dee’s articles on
Australia’s Sovereignty
Question: I know you have met Nelson Mandela. What would he say of the news on Anti-terror laws that have been brought in?
Malcolm: He would probably say that they were anti-democratic, they’re contrary to the basic human rights that we have forgotten in the fight against terrorism. We must preserve our own values and not betray our own values. He would call those laws a betrayal of the basic values of a civilised nation.

Question: But how do you think it happened here?
Malcolm: I often ask that, I have had discussions with people who were involved in the Labour Party, and they believe the Labour Party is beyond reform. I believe the liberal party is beyond reform and I don’t really think it’s a Conservative party, I mean it used to be a liberal party in Menzies’ day… I think it is now something more to the right of conservative. But it has forgotten the essentials of Australia’s own independence, of Australia as a nation. Perhaps people believe the good times will roll on forever.

When I entered the parliament there were a lot of people who had been prisoners of war by the Japanese or Germans. The trade unionist people that were there were people who had probably left school at 13 or 14, come up the hard way, worked in the union and got their hands dirty. And then they got positions because they had initiative…. Today a trade unionist representative in parliament has been to university, goes and works with the trade union, goes and works with the Labour Party, goes and works for a
member of Parliament, earns Brownie points and gets preselected. In their own way, the liberals do the same thing so they are all professionals. And that’s a big difference. In terms of experience, a lot of liberals would have had a legal profession, medical practices, they ran small businesses and got a bit older and were able to leave the business in the hands of somebody else, so they came into parliament. But now it’s a professional class of people in both parties. The pre-selection process has become more selective. We don’t want the independent free thinkers like Ian McPhee or Alan Misson from Victoria, Senator Misson, we want people who will accept the party line and serve the party purpose.

Question: Do you think the corporate world has muscled in, and is now in control of politics?
Malcolm: they certainly have an influence that they did not have in my time or Menzies’ time, but in Victoria, for example, in my time, members of parliament were not allowed to raise money…. none of them would tell me who was giving money. The idea then was to have those who collected money for the party to be quite divorced from members of parliament. Once members of parliament are directly involved, as they are, in raising funds, an element of independence disappears, you have to be affected. If somebody is in your office sitting at the other side of your desk and asks you for something, you know he has been a very substantial supporter of your campaign funds you’re not going to want to offend him. You’ll try and give him what he wants. Well, I was never in that position and I never wanted to be. That was a different parliament, a different way, a different party and they still use the word liberal but it’s not a liberal party with the liberal values which Menzies first, you know, sweated on to the party.

Question: On False Flags, when did you first discover that the Gulf of Tonkin was a fraudulent thing?
Malcolm: Well there were allegations at the time, but doing my research for my book really brought this out into the open.
Senator Fulbright, who guided the War Powers Resolution as a result of the Gulf of Tolkin through the senate for Johnson, later accused the president of having misled him. Now if he was going to mislead one of his own senators, he certainly wasn’t going to hesitate about misleading Prime Minister Harold Holt.

Question: I was really interested in your interview with Jon Faine:

Malcolm -- Israel, years ago, during one of the wars killed 30-40 Americans on a spy ship on the Western Mediterranean.  
Jon -- That was a mistaken missile if I remember correctly?  
Malcolm -- Well, the Americans tried to cover it up, it wasn’t a mistake; it was deliberate.  
Jon -- You believe so?  
Malcolm -- Yes  
Jon -- That’s a massive claim to make.  
Malcolm -- It is.  
Jon -- It borders on the beliefs that some people have that I think are completely insane about conspiracy theories such as 9/11.

Deceased American sailors being removed from USS Liberty
Malcolm: I had used the word deliberate and Jon thought this was really going overboard, that it couldn’t possibly have been deliberate. But I have no doubt that the United States had decided that if it were proven that quite deliberately Israeli ships and aircrafts had attacked USS Liberty, that it would not be possible to sustain the unquestioning support of Israel that America had provided. And Dean Rusk, I think Jessie Helms, and a number of others, Admiral Moore who was a significant person in the American Navy, I think in charge of the Mediterranean fleet at the time. But 34 Americans were killed and 70 wounded. Those senior people I mentioned said “No, it was no accident.”

Question: I got an email forwarded to me by Joe Meadors, who was actually on the boat and he describes exactly what happened.…. Malcolm: Well, Israeli surveillance aircrafts were flying around the Liberty for some hours before an attack was launched. …. I think the Israelis had good reason for wanting to stop the Americans listening in to what the high command was doing during that 1967 war. …what was a pending disaster for Israeli American relations was getting worse and worse. MacNamara must have been aware he would have been alerted to the difficulty Liberty was in because they had been under attack …. But as soon as he heard the aircrafts had been dispatched he ordered they be returned, not to defend Liberty. …It demonstrates that a major power when it believes its vital interests are involved will sacrifice any number of its own people to preserve that vital interest.

Question: Can I ask you one or two questions on 9/11? In your book you said that America was taken by surprise and on the morning of 9/11; they had war games simulating exactly that…. Malcolm: It was a total failure of Americans intelligence services. I think the information was in the hands of the Americans that would have enabled them to work out what was going to unfold. But it was never all in the one place, it wasn’t all brought together. And it was only afterwards that they recognised the significant bits of it.
Trans-Pacific Partnership — Trading Away Oz’s Sovereignty. Never Trust a Secret Process

by Dee McLachlan, March 5, 2015

When you buy a car, you are allowed to look under the hood and start the engine. But with regard to the Trans Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP), we must just trust what government says – because a Minister says so. If signed – 23 million people and the future of their children will be impacted by what has been negotiated in secret.

The Age reported that the text in 20 chapters of the TPP will not be made public until after the trade ministers shake hands (next month)! Based on the (leaked) proposals in the TPP, investor-state dispute settlement procedures would make it difficult for governments to legislate in ways that harmed tobacco, alcohol, medicines.

Yet Andrew Robb, our Minister for Trade and Investment, rejects ‘scaremongering.’ He claims The Age reports and others – are “another beat up”. Since 2011, he says, DFAT has conducted more than 1,000 briefings with interested stakeholders: groups representing health, pharmaceuticals, consumers and unions. But as Choice reports – the media has been locked out. I believe the TPP might be a little like signing one of these online app agreements. We won’t understand or have the time to absorb the document’s ramifications fully.

Below are concerns why we must be suspicious of TPP:

#1 The process is being conducted in secret.

#2 It has been said that only 5 of the 29 chapters have something to do with trade. What are the other chapters about. Covert control?

#3 The corporate elites are allegedly writing the text. If so, this provides an advantage for these corporations.
#4 Will the TPP give multinational corporations the power to sue the Australian Government? There are examples around the world of companies using Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) provisions to sue governments:

- A foreign-owned energy company filed a $250 million lawsuit against the Canadian government, when Quebec placed a ban on dangerous fracking processes in a local river.
- In El Salvador, a Canadian company is suing the government for $315 million in “loss of future profits” because local citizens won a hard-fought campaign against a gold mine that threatened to contaminate their water supplies!
- And in Canada, U.S. pharmaceutical company Eli Lilly is suing the government for $500 million in compensation, because the courts revoked two of the company’s patents citing lack of evidence around the drugs’ supposed benefits.

#5 Be suspicious when the media is locked out.

#6 You can’t trust government; they aren’t “culpable” for their poor decisions. Take for example the East West Link Tunnel Project. A month before the election, the previous Victorian government signed a contract that had huge penalties for cancellation. A month later the project was cancelled. Construction of the actual project had not begun. Yet taxpayers will be paying a $1.1 billion in compensation. East West Link consortium is refusing to tell the State Government how much it has spent so far (a guess is maybe $250 million? But it wants $1.2 billion). The people will be paying for corporate bonuses. Plus they always pay for previous Ministers (who signed the poor contract) to walk away with fat pensions and benefits.

#7 The time proposed for public scrutiny seems limited and late in the game.

#8 It sounds like the Ministers are doing all the negotiating. But is this true? Trans-Pacific Partnership Leaders’ Statement November 10, 2014 states “Our fundamental direction to our Ministers
throughout this process…. And the TPP Trade Ministers’ Report to Leaders says “Ministers have been actively engaging…."

I have written to Minister Robb’s office many times asking: “Has Minister Robb read the text?” They cannot answer the question, except to say that he “is engaged in the process”!!!

**Comment from Christopher Brooks:**

The Banking matrix governs the world. The media is their PR department. The TPP will very certainly include agreements that bind us deeper into the matrix and prohibit national policies to challenge the dictatorship of global debt money “solutions” to counter the artificial economic pressures. These approach total collapse if you live in Ukraine or Greece. Who is negotiating the TPP? Banking and corporate vested interests in international monopoly progress towards their utopian centralized global system that in any real sense removes any National power or identity.

Will the TPP have a clause to make National Public Banking illegal? The TPP is another gradual surrender of freedom and self determination to the self-anointed chosen high priests who trade in lies and deception – the Rothschild Gang.

The deeper issue is the attack on our individual human potential and purpose that is progressively subjugated to the materialistic money directives beyond our conscious choosing.

I just spoke with Zoe at the minister’s office and forcefully made the case that I reject the dictatorial process.

Australian economic, social and geo-political direction does not favor the Australian people’s genuine desired purpose. Money monopoly effects have mangled understanding of our real abundant freedom potential options, along with knowledge of the correct political methods and action to release that reality. Real power always rests with the individual in all association when honesty, truth and accountability govern the individual spirit, heart and mind.
UPDATE (May 2, 2015):
The hundredth anniversary of Gallipoli may have been branded as a ‘historical moment’, but something much more historical is happening. We are about to be TPP’d.

I’ve written several times to Minister Robb, to ask if he has even read the Agreement. I have not heard a ‘Yes’. Thus, I feel it’s time to conclude that he is acting under personal pressure from foreign elements. If so, we should call in the Australian Federal Police.

The AFP can assist by confiscating his computers for inspection -- such that an independent Australian authority can assess whether the Trans Pacific Partnership is in fact designed to remove power from the Australian government. Expert financial, business and legal minds can then access the documents and ascertain whether the TPP is a valid treaty for the good of the people of Australia. Opposition Party can put key questions about the sinister TPP.

I note that in the past, legislation has often been brought in by deception, stealth, and surprise. In America, a secret meeting was held on Jekyll Island in November of 1910. Its outcome was that the US Congress passed The Federal Reserve Act. Control over global money and debt creation was thereby succinctly delivered over to a handful of men.

This is what US President Woodrow Wilson said, AFTER signing the Federal Reserve into existence:

“I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country. A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men. We are no longer a Government by free opinion, [or] a Government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but [are under] duress of a small group of dominant men.”

What a tragic admission: “I have unwittingly ruined my country.” If Minister Andrew Robb gets the TPP through Canberra, might he have similar regrets when he retires?
“The easiest way to gain control of a population is to carry out acts of terror. [The public] will clamor for such laws if their personal security is threatened”. This has been attributed to Josef Stalin. It however matters not who originally said it, governments are well aware of the ‘terror-effect’ on the populace. Yesterday, Mary Maxwell wrote a piece ‘Terrorism Defined…’ on how foolish we are to keep on letting governments use a “strategy of tension” to keep people in fear, to justify wars, and to enable the police state. The corporate media, it seems, wants to keep us ignorant of the term “False Flag”.

False flag operations are covert operations conducted by governments, corporations, or other organizations, which are designed to appear as if they are being carried out by other entities. The name is derived from the military concept of flying false colors; that is, flying the flag of a country other than one’s own. False flag operations are not limited to war and counter-insurgency operations, and have been used in peace-time.

The most outrageous and ingenious false flag in recent times is the 9-11 event. It had the effect of a ‘New Pearl Harbor’ and created the environment for wars, resource grabs, anti-liberty legislation, etc. When this event will be admitted is another question.
But an article in Infowars.com lists 42 instances in which a false flag was used and was subsequently admitted to.

Being from South Africa, this caught my attention:

#22 The South African Truth and Reconciliation Council found that, in 1989, the Civil Cooperation Bureau (a covert branch of the South African Defense Force) approached an explosives expert and asked him “to participate in an operation aimed at discrediting the ANC [the African National Congress] by bombing the police vehicle of the investigating officer into the murder incident”, thus framing the ANC for the bombing.

And these also merited my attention:

#34 Undercover Israeli soldiers admitted in 2005 to throwing stones at other Israeli soldiers so they could blame it on Palestinians, as an excuse to crack down on peaceful protests.

#41 The former Ukrainian security chief admits that the sniper attacks which started the Ukrainian coup were carried out in order to frame others.

#42 Britain’s spy agency has admitted that it carries out “digital false flag” attacks on targets, framing people by writing offensive or unlawful material … and blaming it on the target.

Bus explodes in Tavistock Square, London, on 7 July, 2005

#14 As admitted by the U.S. government, recently declassified documents show that in 1962, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had an
elaborate plan involving the switching of airplanes, and also to commit terrorist acts on American soil, and then to blame it on the Cubans in order to justify an invasion of Cuba.

Events like 9-11, the London Tube Bombings of 7/7/05, Oklahoma City Bombing, Sandy Hook Elementary School, Aurora Colorado Batman Shooting, Port Arthur Massacre and the Boston Marathon all have the ‘signs’ of a classic false flag.

But the Australian corporate media don’t even acknowledge the word – false flag – including the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. I doubt you would find that is has been used or referred to by News Corp (the Murdoch Press) or Fairfax Media journalists. Sharpen your pencils and complain to the editors.

Below is a remarkable picture, from January, 2015. The Paris office of the magazine “Charlie” was attacked, nine died. World leaders walked arm-in-arm, apparently as a show of solidarity in support of freedom of the press.

Charlie had published cartoons offensive to Islam.

*Left to right: Israeli prime minister Netanyahu, Malian president Keita, French president Hollande, German chancellor Merkel, EU president Tusk, Palestinian president Abbas*
The utopian Australian experience under an expanding Corporatocracy! When will Coles expand to hospitals, schools and funeral homes? Then we’ll only need to have one rewards card – and maybe if you build up enough rewards points, you will be rewarded with a free burial voucher:

*Coles will be with you all the way.*

Wesfarmers, which started as a farmers’ cooperative, has bought Coles. That amounts to **756 supermarkets**, 810 liquor outlets, 92 hotels, and 636 petrol and convenience stores, as of 2013.

Now Wesfarmers is diversifying its interests by acquiring other companies: **150 Officeworks**, **Kmart (190 stores)**, **183 Target stores** and **125 Target Country stores**.

Don’t forget 263 Kmart Tyre and 37 Auto Service centres. There’s Wesfarmers Insurance – 89 WFI offices, 26 Lumley offices, plus 32 OAMPS offices and 23 Crombie Lockwood offices.

What about Resources, like Wesfarmers Resources open-cut coal producers in Queensland, or Wesfarmers Chemicals, Energy & Fertilisers (WesCEF) producer and marketer of chemicals, fertilisers and gas products.
Wesfarmers Industrial and Safety businesses include Blackwoods, Protector Alsafe, NZ Safety,

Bullivants, Coregas, Blackwoods Protector, Safety Source, Total Fasteners, Packaging House and GotStock.

Also, Wesfarmers holds 50% interest in investment house Gresham Partners plus interests in Gresham Private Equity Funds, 50% interest in Wespine, a plantation softwood sawmill at Dardanup, Western Australia and a 24% interest in BWP Trust.

Never heard of BWP? They own Bunnings Warehouses, tenanted by Bunnings Group Limited. It’s part of Coles.

Wesfarmers has 100% interest in many other subsidiaries: BBC Hardware, Coles Ansett Travel, Coles Group Superannuation Fund, Coles Property Management,

and Comnet, Fosseys, GJ Coles & Coy, Grocery Holdings Pty Ltd, HarrisTechnology, Howard Smith.


Note: Bunnings Warehouse (over 200 stores) could supply coffins to Coles Funeral Service.
**WILL THE MH17 INVESTIGATION BE COMPROMISED?**

*by Dee McLachlan, September 4, 2014*

“Australia and Ukraine are geographically distant but we have grown close in responding to the MH17 atrocity in which 37 Australians were murdered, were murdered by Russian-backed rebels,” Mr Abbott said.

I look at the factors that are potentially going to compromise this investigation: The Mainstream Media (MSM) journalists have failed to report the facts; no government department wants to discuss the alleged secret non-disclosure agreement; and now closer ties with Ukraine.

The Australian reported yesterday: **Australia is stepping up action against Russia, banning uranium sales and supporting Ukrainian sovereignty by opening an embassy in Kiev, a city that takes a position against the Moscow-backed separatists.** The interim embassy will assist nine AFP officers who remain in Ukraine to assist with the investigation of MH17, *allegedly* shot down by Russian-supported rebels. *(Good to see “allegedly” in there).*

Obviously, the investigation outcome over MH17 is important? For one it is a murder investigation of 37 Australians, and secondly — the incident resulted in inflaming conflict with a world power.

So what’s the problem with closer ties with the Ukrainian government? Well there is **evidence that points to 30mm bullet holes on the fuselage** – most likely from a Ukrainian jet fighter (as seen on Russian radar). Well – whether it was a false flag or an accidental shoot down is now beside the point, as the public
relation swords are drawn and clashing.

I had read and reported earlier about a possible secret non-disclosure agreement signed on the 8th August. The agreement apparently requires consensus between Ukraine, Australia, Netherlands and Belgium for the disclosure of the investigations. This could present a major problem for the transparency of the outcome if – IF – it is found that the Ukrainians played a part in the downing (accidental or otherwise)!

DFAT (Dept. of Foreign Affairs and Trade) did not want to answer questions regarding this possible agreement – and then eventually passed my query onto the AFP (Australian Federal Police).

The AFP informed me that a robust investigation was underway, but did not want answer my questions directly (re: Was there a secret non-disclosure agreement signed on the 8th August between the four countries, that required consensus before releasing the investigations outcomes?).

I called the Ukrainian Embassy on the 2nd September and spoke briefly to Mr Mykola Dzhydzhora — Chargé d’Affaires. I asked: Can you confirm that Ukraine, Australia, Netherlands and Belgium signed a non-disclosure agreement over MH17? He answered: Yes. On requesting more detail, he said I should be able to find more information on their website. I could find none, so I called back on the 4th. He again confirmed that a ‘memorandum’ had been signed – but best to speak to the Australians. He could very well be confusing this with the memorandum signed (at the end of July) regarding ‘allowing investigators into Ukraine and cooperation towards an investigation’ – a very different proposition.

And why does it matter? It seems now, that whether there is a “secret deal” on the table or not – the immediate rush to blame the Russians (by Tony Abbott) and the subsequent steps leading to much closer ties with Ukraine will probably compromise the investigation anyway. I describe, further down, the events that put pressure on the Abbott government. I’m all for closer
ties – but it will be a very brave politician to go against the tide now and demand justice and resolution if – IF – Ukraine had a hand in MH17.

I don’t envy Foreign Minister Julie Bishop’s position. Through the downing of MH17, she was thrust into a Petrodollar war and a convoluted Kleptocracy grab by some wily operators. So–

First some BACKGROUND:

George Soros et al. Is the corporate push on the Ukraine just another master stroke of KLEPTOCRACY at work?

Well, the man who “broke the Bank of England” and pocketed $1 billion on the deal in one day (in 1992), has had a long history in Ukraine and Eastern Europe. Once a frontman for the Rothschild’s, he helped fund, for example, the revolutions of 1989 in Poland. So what happened in Poland? Soros apparently organized a secret meeting between the Communist regime and (then illegal) opposition union organization Solidarnosc. His alleged proposed plan (simplistically): The Communists should let Solidarnosc win government and thus the confidence of the people. Then the state should deliberately drive its own state industries to ruin (by hiking interest rates, withholding state loans and get companies in debt). Then he would facilitate the privatization of state companies.

Asked by CNN’s Fareed Zakaria (May 14) “Are you doing similar things in Ukraine?”, Soros replies “Well, I set up a foundation in Ukraine before Ukraine became independent of Russia. And the foundation has been functioning ever since and played an important part in events now”. But, Soros’s www.opensocietyfoundations.org says (with violins playing) “…a group of unarmed citizens rose up. We are witnessing the birth of a new nation, a new Ukraine – with a limitless future made possible by people willing to sacrifice their lives for their country.”

Soros assisted ‘them’ in transforming their country into a more “open” and “democratic” society. But as William Engdahl
explains: What Soros means by “open,” is a society that allows him and his financial predator friends to loot the resources and buy precious assets at dirt-cheap prices. *Monster Reawakens, the American Ukrainian Coup and Soros’s footprint.* But Soros wins every which way: He recently invested hundreds of millions of dollars in a major coal and natural gas producer, CONSOL Energy Inc (NYSE:CNX). CNX is a stock which has potential to take advantage of Russian Political Crisis. And don’t forget Joe Biden’s son, Hunter Biden, has now been added to the board of Ukraine’s largest private gas producer, Burisma. Ukraine is a great prize for any **Kleptocrat.**

![Ukraine uprising, 2014](image)

**But this is a complex situation for AUSTRALIA:**
What makes it difficult for Canberra – regardless of any legal restraint from a ‘deal’ – is that the Abbott government has become strongly aligned to the Ukrainian government since MH17 (and this pushed along by John Kerry). **So is this close UKR-OZ friendship going to compromise the murder investigation?**

To recap (all dates are 2014):

- **19 March** Australian Government announces that it would impose the sanctions. Anti-Russian sentiment has been building for some time.

- **17 July** MH17 goes down. **Russia is quickly blamed.**
• 19 July  Australia is hosting a **Trade Ministers meeting in Sydney** for the **Group of Twenty** (G20). Russia must have been a discussion point, but the focus is growth strategies that aim to lift collective GDP. *The pressure is on to conform.*

• 21 July  Security Council at its 7221st meeting, on Resolution 2166 (2014) re: MH17 *The pressure increases for Bishop.*

• 24 July  Media release: Bishop travels with the Dutch Foreign Minister Frans Timmermans to meet with the Ukraine leadership in Kiev, to discuss the means of implementing the UN Security Council Resolution to secure the crash site of Malaysia Airlines flight MH17. Australia’s Special Envoy Air Chief Marshal Angus Houston will provide briefings on Australia’s support operations and *Operation Bring Them Home.* News reports of separatists trying to hamper investigation. *Probably distorted. No one requests control tower tapes.*

• 31 July  Verkhovna Rada ratifies agreements with Australia and the Netherlands on international mission to Ukraine – also an Agreement between Ukraine and Australia on sending personnel to Ukraine in connection with the Malaysian Airlines’ MH17 – which was signed on July 24, 2014 in Kiev.

• 1 August  For the first time, the international task force comprising 101 **experts gets to the MH17 crash site.** (It is reported by Ukraine that) 38 experts from Australia are part of the group that investigate the crash site.

• 8 August  **Non-disclosure agreement signed between Ukraine, Oz, Netherlands and Belgium.** This leaks out later (NOT CONFIRMED).

• 11 August  Julie Bishop flying in the same plane with John Kerry

• 12 August  **AUSMIN 2014 Joint Communiqué**  Minister Bishop, Minister for Defence Senator David Johnston, Secretary of State John Kerry and Secretary of Defense Chuck
Hagel met for the annual Australia-United States Ministerial Consultations (AUSMIN). Talks reaffirmed the Alliance’s important contribution to peace, security, and prosperity – and reaffirmed bilateral defence and security cooperation under the Alliance. *Could Julie Bishop be under any more pressure on the geopolitical stage?*

- **14 August** The **Australian Government is ready to provide comprehensive assistance to Ukraine** in this difficult time for the country - delegation headed by Allan Grant “Angus” Houston (Special Envoy of the PM of Australia on the investigation into circumstances of MH17 crash). And,

- **13 – 15th August ASEAN** Foreign Minister’s meeting and East Asia Summit in Nay Pyi Taw, Burma. Bishop down the corridor from John Kerry. Two days high-level talks and Bishop clashes with the Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Morgulov over Moscow’s backing of the rebels and MH17.

- **3 September** Australia to open **Embassy in Kiev.**

- **3 September** Australia steps up action against Russia – **banning uranium sales.**

- **3 September** Australia is also considering short-term support to Ukraine through aid and **“nonlethal military assistance”,** the Prime Minister told parliament. It would consider a civil and military capacity build-up in Ukraine in the medium term, he said.

**Conclusion:**

I have to conclude that as DFAT and the AFP were so mum on the ‘secret agreement’, that – yes – some cooperative deal was signed. And that it might compromise the release of information. But I think the deal has almost become irrelevant. The facts have been buried by the MSM. And the Abbott government keeps saying definitely – that Russia is to blame (before the outcome of the investigation).
John Kerry has probably also provided his ‘guidance’. But it is the closer ties with the Ukraine – the creation of an embassy, the pledged support and the bans on Russia – that have also created a potential problem for an open outcome to the investigation. I am all for closer ties – but it must be without fear or favour. So I doubt the Abbott government could do a 180.

**The Investigation Outcome:**

The AFP tell me ‘the process will take as long as it needs to ensure thorough and robust investigations’ and ‘aiming to deliver preliminary findings in October’. I’m sure the Australian investigators are doing their very best to get to the bottom of this – and would like to get the truth out there. The investigation will have to address the bullet holes, but will the pressure of politics burden the outcome?

**UPDATE:** I’ve been complaining about MH17 for over 8 months. Now there is another crash: Germanwings in the French Alps. The New York Times so flagrantly published a fake story, immediately after the crash, that I believe the public will consider this a tipping point.

The Age followed suit, blaring the headline “There was a deliberate desire to crash this plane”, attributing the crash to the pilot’s mental problems before any investigation took place! Since no Aussies died on this flight it will be easier to discuss it. The Age must be called to account for false reporting.

I predicted in an earlier post – that blame will quietly switch from Russia to a Ukrainian jet fighter flown by rogue pilot from another EU country who was on medication. He he got mixed up and thought he was shooting down a Russian (or Putin’s) plane. End of story.
A committee of the US Senate, headed by Dianne Feinstein, has finally released its report on torture as committed by Americans. The reporting of this, I believe, is a tipping point for western governments (and specifically the US) and for what is called our ‘democratic society’. One arm of the US government has called the other to account. It is astounding. But if – if we did live in a democracy, those accountable would have already been arrested. Leaders have lied; crimes have been committed and the true nature of those in control and in positions of power have now been exposed. But not only that – you have Dick Cheney defending his actions and even the Ex-CIA Director defending rectal rehydration.

These people are defending pure evil. And this should reveal to us all that none of these people should be in power – and you would think that Australian government would now be judicious in its dealings with those running the (fraudulent) war on terror.

All this torture was done to find out who attacked America on 9/11 – and to prevent another such deed. Well, the deceit in all of this, is that those ‘in the loop’ must have known that Building 7 was not brought down by Arab terrorists – and that WTC 1 and 2 defied all laws of gravity to ‘explode’ as they did.

These same people tricked the world (and maybe our Australian leaders) – and then orchestrated the most horrendous torture regime to root out somebody to blame.

The Torture

As Paul Craig Roberts (once Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy, and associate editor of the Wall Street Journal) writes:

“One purpose of the torture program was to produce self-incriminated ‘terrorists’ to justify and feed the hoax “war on terror.” The “war on
“terror” was public cover for secret agendas that the American people would have rejected. This is disturbing enough. Even more disturbing, the torture program shows that no one in the US and European governments who knew of the program and participated in torture has an ounce of humanity, integrity, compassion, and morality. They are evil people, and the ones who inflicted the torture enjoyed the pain and suffering that they inflicted on others.

The only exceptional thing about the US is the extent of the evil that resides in Washington, D.C.”

Roberts reflects:
• The CIA even tortured its own informers.
• Two American psychologists who designed the torture program were paid $81 million.
• CIA torturers received cash awards for “consistently superior work” when their innocent victims died.
• The US government involved 54 countries in its torture program.
• And Obama tortures also. And more…

Australia Needs To Respond
Australia has been a partner in these wars and ‘supportive’ of what the US has done. George Bush was given a standing ovation in the Australian parliament and after saying “We call evil by its name, and stand for the freedom that leads to peace.” The Coalition machine stood as one and clapped continuously for several minutes. The only opposition to Bush’s presence and actions were the two Greens, Bob Brown and Kerry Nettle.

So-called interrogations at Abu Ghraib prison, Iraq, 2006
It is shameful that we were accomplices to all this evil. And if – if we live in a democracy – these ‘wrongs’ and poor associations would be acknowledged. Discussions would be initiated as to how to prevent this in the future – so that a sane society can prevail. Therefore, regarding the torture revelations, our Australian politicians need to have an inquiry as to whether ASIO was aware of the extent of the torture regime, and whether ASIO was briefing our politicians with due diligence.

They must send a stern message to Washington that:
1) Australia will have no part in this kind of conduct,
2) all Australians condemn torture, and
3) Australia’s commitment in the war on terror needs to have new rules of engagement.

Also, they should openly condemn Dick Cheney, George Bush and other leaders that are still defending the crime of torture.

Sadly, **Australia has been a pawn in this game.** John Howard was manipulated in 2001 to rush off to fraudulent wars, and now Abbott has been duped by the ISIS crisis and MH17. And all the while the mainstream media colluded in covering up the reports of witnesses and the factual evidence over 9/11. As Christopher Brooks said in a past comment on this site: “We must not forget that the real political climate is one where ALL Governments and powerful entities are corrupt and employ lies and propaganda.”

If our politicians stay silent on this torture report, it confirms that they should not be governing us.

---

**SMH in 2009:** “In the character of John Winston Howard we see that fine Australian spirit of standing by your mates,” Mr Bush said.
We Need Aussie ‘Bantustans’ (satire)

by Dee McLachlan, October 14, 2014

Gerard, I have the perfect solution for you: The creation of Aussie ‘bantustans’. You can glumly present it on your next politically predictable television appearance in the presstitute media.

Mr Glum – Gerard Henderson (Executive Director of The Sydney Institute and often seen on television) – says the minimum wage of $17 ($16.87) is way too high. And this in Australia where CEO pay is 93 times more than the average Australian worker (at $45K) (says a study in the Business Spectator).

So what is a bantustan? It is a term used by the apartheid-era South African government to describe enclaves for the second-class black population. But it was a dictatorial government’s goodwill spin so that the low wage earners could have some dignity by owning their own home in their own ‘stan’.

So with Melbourne house prices rising to a new record median of $658,000, we could create new Aussie Bantustans outside each major city. This designated area would have limited utilities and few permit restrictions, thus allowing people to erect homes from tin roofing and scraps from Bunnings. Perfect for the new low wager on $9/h or the student paying off his or her HECS debt.
A class system would provide an ideal future Australia. While we maintain the high standards of living for society’s crust and keep the asset bubble bubbling – the bottom feeders and bludgers could retain their dignity by owning their own home too. In fact I’ve done a quick scrap check – the average tin shanty would only cost about about $7,000.

Maybe we can expect some politicians billing us for a South African safari (to see the above) or a trip to Rio Carnival (below) to investigate the idea of Bantustans down under in Oz.
Welcome to Section 3

Dee’s articles on
Lies and Freedom of Speech
More than two thousand Australians commit suicide every year. In 2012 the figure was 2535. About 300 people drown – and around 10 people succumb to stings from the European honey bee each year in Australia. Three people died at Martin Place.

Even though Prime Minister Tony Abbott is on a mission to keep us safe, living is not risk free.

**Metadata Man**

Let us hope that the government does not use Monis as their ‘Metadata’ man. Even before the dust settled in Sydney, the new Police Commissioner was on mainstream television pushing for our data. I doubt any amount of metadata could have changed Monday’s events. They even got an anonymous tip-off shortly before the event to view his increasingly disturbing website. We definitely do NOT need our metadata scooped up at such a huge cost to our liberties and pockets as a protection from people like Monis. We need the government and the media to put the Monis ‘event’ back into its box, and get back some perspective.

Fortunately, at least one Senator is proving to us that capturing our metadata is “appalling, it’s absolutely appalling.” Senator David Leyonhjelm agreed to have his company’s metadata captured –
with shocking results. Any law passed today for the yielding of personal data will be usable by future governments, and governments whose size and shape we cannot today predict.

“The government’s basically saying we’re going to spy on everybody in the country,” said Leyonhjelm. And–

“If you’re going to invade people’s privacy and treat them all like criminals-in-waiting, then to what extent do you do that? Malcolm Turnbull has said it’s nothing more than phone data, to and from and time and location, but it’s a lot more than that. I don’t see how it can be limited to that and I don’t believe it will be, either.”

And all this to keep us safe? No, it is about control. But look on the bright side: We might put tens of thousands of Australian to work sifting through the megatons of metadata garbage.

But talking about saving lives: Maybe issuing some drought relief money to farmers (and not from the Federal Reserve debt machine) could save hundreds of farmers from committing suicide.

With the case of ‘Metadata’ Monis, it is difficult to gauge whether he was being ‘managed’ in any way. He has the perfect profile for such a role – as is clearly described in a 21st Century Wire Special Report, but there are some oddities to Monis that point to a socially rejected and mentally-unstable-media-junkie at the end of a long road of a political, religious, criminal and legal misadventure. Does someone, after two decades of being a camera addict, then acquire a gun (shotgun at that) and go off on a ‘mission’ that has really only one conclusion – death or life in prison? Maybe?

He was allegedly pacing outside Channel 7 – but as they had recently beefed up security – he supposedly lands up at the Lindt Café opposite buying a coffee. But – oops – he forgot his ISIS flag. (My guess is that if he was being “managed,” he would have been given the gun and the ISIS flag).

But as reported in Globalresearch he was a ‘Shape-Shifting Sheik’ with various aliases, from Sunni to Shite, from pens-for-peace to pledging allegiance to ISIS – and with his last words allegedly being, “Look what you’ve made me do”. All very odd. And
now we can only speculate what his plan of action was going to be?

But as my friend Mary said to me, “I just want to know when and how he managed to urinate during the 17 hours.”

In any event, I believe these questions should be asked: Was Monis at one time an informant? Had a psychological assessment ever been done? Any traces of (anti-psychotic) medication?

**Police Action**

As I said previously, it was curious as to why we – the public – were kept in the dark about his identity until late into the night. We could also easily have been assured early in the afternoon that the person holding the hostages was acting alone. The perspective on prime time news and on the day would have taken on an entirely different hue had the public known who the police were dealing with. To me this could be a ‘sign’ of a staged event: The media and authorities creating a drawn-out false reality.

I believe the authorities should not take the public for dummies. They should provide more open information post the event. (I have seen many letters and comments “Why didn’t they just shoot him?”). Now we are told that the kind of glass in this building is “bank glass”, impossible to shoot through.) Also, we need to know how they tried to negotiate with the hostage taker?
Transparency
Again – the entire investigation must be transparent and nonrestrictive – so we can confirm that this was in fact the actions of a mentality unstable loner. For example, one has to be immediately suspicious of the the MH17 investigation, as it has been signed into secrecy until a consensus has been reached.

We are justified in questioning every (odd) ‘event’ as a possible false flag (or staged event). That is what police do when a husband calls 000 and says he has just arrived home and found his wife murdered. It is routine to investigate the husband to make sure he has not ‘staged’ the murder (event). Thus, it should be routine to investigate for a false-flag event (and possible foreign intervention). We too, as Australians, need to be on guard for what might be staged, most likely by some controlling entity outside Australia, to manipulate us (and to manipulate our police and our politicians in Canberra) – for some (global) agenda that might not be in the interests of Australian citizens.

In analyzing Sydney, one has to peruse numerous factors with logic and without bias. There are a few factors, that individually mean little:

a) There had been a “mock terror drill” at Martin Place only 12 months earlier,
b) Man Haron Monis fits the ‘unhinged’ lone wolf profile,
c) Identity of Monis is withheld,
d) He had written to soldiers’ families,
e) Legislation is waiting in the wings,
f) Inquiry had narrow terms of reference,
g) There were Intelligence failures,
h) The event occurred opposite a media studio,
i) The Government is presently unpopular.

It seems these days there is always draconian legislation waiting in the wings and as Monis was a media junkie, it is logical to be near Channel 7. In reflection, maybe the police, on confirming Monis’s identity, were less proactive than they might have been – deciding the best option was to wait the ‘nutter’ out. And the
police *fortunately* don’t get much practice dealing with hostage takers – but will probably be analyzing their tactics.

Monis’s seemingly haphazard modus operandi maybe more an indication of an unhinged loser than a managed one. But we will need to be more informed of the facts.

In any event, **we do NOT need the metadata legislation to save us from the Monises of this world. And if the government uses Monis for this end, then we need to be more questioning and suspicious.**

**Clues on Staged Events**

Over the years there have been countless ‘staged events’ – all done for all sorts of nefarious reasons. For example *Operation Himmler* in 1939 was a project planned by Nazi Germany to create the appearance of Polish aggression.

On staged events and false flags, there are some signs and patterns that need to evaluated and analysed. I am an amateur at this, but these come to mind:

1. The event is usually a high profile attack.
2. The government of the day is having a ‘bad day’ and needs ‘help’ to regain power/popularity.
3. **There is a drill matching the ‘attack’** (9/11, 7/7 bombings, Sandy Hook).
4. **There is often legislation (to remove liberties) waiting in the wings** (9/11, underpants bomber, Sandy Hook).
5. There is some kind of **stand down** by police or military ‘allowing’ the attack to ‘happen’ (Cheney, NORAD on 9/11).
6. Crucial timelines and evidence are withheld from the public (cameras at the Pentagon, 28 redacted pages).
7. Politicians and their spokespersons seem prepared with a ‘narrative’ (e.g. Paul Bremer and Jerome Hauer on live television identified Bin Laden within hours).
8. The immediate reaction by newscasters morphs or changes later to fit the political narrative.
9. The ‘lone-wolf’ scenario is pushed when evidence points to multiple sources/shooters (e.g., JFK, Aurora).
10. A scapegoat – a person that is a loose cannon / or mentally unstable – is said to be behind the ‘attack’, e.g., Sirhan Sirhan, Sandy Hook, Port Arthur. (This person is a patsy.)
11. The scapegoat often has covert connections with intelligence agencies.
12. A mainstream media ‘beat up’ is used to create an illusion of the reality, often stirring up public emotion (to fit an agenda).
13. Eyewitness accounts are often quelled (e.g., Aurora witnesses reported multiple shooters).
14. There may be crisis actors (e.g., Sandy Hook, Boston bombing?).
15. An official investigation where the narrative can be controlled (and tainted) provides superficial comfort to the public.
16. There is an outcome that benefits those in power or aligned with power (e.g., profits of war by invading Iraq). The outcome of the event benefits the (global) power structure.
17. Secrecy and non-transparency around detail.
18. Denial and obtuseness by people in power regarding the facts (e.g., WTC 7).
19. Newly appointed officials are in critical controlling positions.
20. Advance predictive clues, or advance tips are seen.
21. The mainstream media refuses to report the event honestly – often suppressing the obvious.

I’m sure there are other factors. It is also logical to believe that false flags are also becoming more sophisticated to counter the internet sleuths and alternative media analysts.

The police, the politicians, the media, and the public – we need to all be on the same side. If there is complete transparency, and questions are answered without fear or favour, then we – as Australians – will be comforted that we are living in a democracy. But if certain aspects remain shrouded in secrecy, then, by default, the event should be considered a ‘managed’ one.
UPDATE: On March 20, the famous scene of the crime was again accessible to the public. On Saturday morning I ventured to Martin Place to buy a cup of coffee. Of course it was jam-packed with well-wishers, and the curious like myself.

The Lindt Café is a huge square room with doors on three sides. It struck me as the last place anyone would attempt the holding of hostages. Indeed I felt as though I were in a glassed-in birdcage. The only furniture, other than tables and chairs (none of them in booth style), is a row of glass cabinets in which the individual chocolates are displayed. To get to toilets, one must walk upstairs.

Right across the street is the studio of News 7. They would have been able to see all the action after dark.

There’s a lovely plaque for Tori Johnston, who was shot by Monis, and Katrina Dawson. ABC reporter Brendan Trembath said that, after the 29 January inquest, counsel assistant Jeremy Gormley stated:

“Ms Dawson was struck by six fragments of a police bullet or bullets, which ricocheted from hard surfaces into her body… I’ll not detail the damage done to Ms Dawson other than to say that one fragment struck a major blood vessel. She lost consciousness quickly and died shortly afterwards.”

I wondered what surfaces the bullets had ricocheted off.

On right, 3 steps up to Lindt Café
The dispute began when a journalist, Søren K. Villemoes, published a scathing article (2012) entitled, “Madness in the Library”. In the article he referred to Niels Harrit and his 9/11 Truth colleagues as “crackpots”. This sounds familiar. ABC’s Jon Faine and Minister Josh Frydneberg did the same to Kevin Braken in Australia. As a scientist who had taught for 40 years at the University of Copenhagen, Dr. Harrit was appalled at being labeled a “crackpot”, so he filed a libel suit. In 2013, the parties appeared in City Court in Copenhagen.

Under Danish libel law, Villemoes had the burden of demonstrating a factual basis for his claim. As a journalist, he must also demonstrate that his reporting meets the standards of good journalism. At the first trial, he did neither. Still, the judge ruled in the defendant’s favour.

They will be back in the High Court in two weeks and Villemoes will have a much harder time, because Dr. Harrit is being allowed to submit more evidence – namely, the video of Building 7’s destruction, as well as an actual sample of the WTC dust.

It all started in 2009 when an international team of scientists published an article in the Bentham Open Chemical and Physics Journal detailing the findings of their 18-month study on dust samples recovered from the World Trade Center after September 11, 2001.

Based on their discovery of red-gray chips found in the WTC dust, the group concluded that a high-tech nano-thermitic material was present. This supports the conclusion that wide-scale thermitic reactions were a primary cause of the World Trade Center’s destruction on 9/11. Full Report at ae911thtruth.org.

Let the games begin. Hopefully this will be one of many court cases that unravels the lie that is 9-11.
Monsanto versus the Scientists
by Dee McLachlan, February 16, 2015

As a trained botanist, I am very interested in this matter. Monsanto et al want to have their cake – BUT they DON’T want to eat it. It is alleged that in the Monsanto canteens they do not serve their GMO inventions – but only offer organic food.

Systematic Attacks on Scientists
As reported at minds.com (December 29, 2014), ‘Árpád Pusztai and Ignacio Chapela have two things in common. They are distinguished scientists, and their careers lie in ruins. Both chose to investigate the phenomenon of genetic engineering. Both made important discoveries. Both are now suffering the fate of those who criticise the powerful vested interests that dominate big business and scientific research. Statements made by scientists themselves suggest that 95% of those researching in the area of genetic engineering are funded to do so by industry. Only 5% are independent. This situation presents a major threat to the freedom of science – and to our democracy. Can we, the public, still trust our scientists?’ There is a film about the potential destruction of the planet’s bio-diversity, produced by German director Bertram Verhaag.

Please see 3-minute Youtube trailer for: “Scientists Under Attack; Genetic Engineering in the Magnetic Field of Money”.
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Freedom is the right to tell people what they do not want to hear. -- George Orwell

Australian spies will soon have the power to monitor the entire Australian internet with just one warrant. Journalists, whistleblowers and even bloggers who “recklessly” disclose “information … [that] relates to a special intelligence operation” will face up to 10 years’ jail. Any operation can be declared “special”. ASIO will have criminal and civil immunity (this will green-light forms of torture) Those who identify ASIO agents could face a decade in prison – a tenfold increase in the existing maximum penalty. It might be a criminal offence to travel to a terrorist hot-spot without a reasonable cause.

I doubt many of the sitting politicians have lived under a police state or a tyrannical regime. Well I have, and I can now smell and taste it from a long way off. I was born in South Africa under the repressive and brutal apartheid regime. (But being white, I really didn’t understand how brutal). The government and the laws of the day censored speech and thought. And journalists were fearful of crossing the line in criticizing the government. The laws were profoundly
manipulative and the general populace (like me) were spooked into a ‘brain-inveigled’ state to automatically censor their thinking and accept repression as ‘normal’. It took me more than a decade after leaving South Africa to ‘unlearn’ self-censorship, and to begin questioning openly again. But fortunately since then, I feel compelled to speak my mind.

I was brought to this beautiful lucky country by a spouse – and I have became a proud Australian. But for me these laws are déjà vu. Politicians like George Brandis have this passionate “manipulation-fear-speak” that I remember well from the South Africa’s Prime Ministers Hendrik Verwoerd and B J Vorster. Like this extract of Vorster’s speech…

“It is vital that you have the knowledge that that political party will ensure your safety and will bring about peace and order in your fatherland” AND in 1967 “We listen to the radio and we read the newspaper, and let me say at once that I know of very few places that are safer and more peaceful at this moment than this very Southern Africa”.

But now – in Australia – as a news provider, I am being warned: Beware – if you recklessly disclose (even the truth) – the authorities will lock you away for a very long time. It might seem, for now, that we are on the right side of these laws – but they feel more draconian than South African law ever was. They must surely be the worst in the developed world.

But why do they represent a tyrannical approach to society? We are required to take it on good faith that ASIO is representing the people of Australia. We do not have the ability to check. Politicians come and go – but ASIO is not an elected body – so by default is an organisation with continuum and in control.
of its agenda (without scrutiny or disclosure). They know more secrets than our politicians do. They brief our politicians – and so they can operate with seeming impunity – without already fragile checks and balances. Now I am not saying they are corrupt or intend to abuse these powers – it is that there are no longer brakes on a system. Thus it has the opportunity to function like a tyranny. 

_A hypothetical:_ It is 2027 and a journalist discovers that elected politicians have been blackmailed and manipulated into selling Australia and putting us in virtual slave camps. This ‘secret operation’ cannot be revealed.

These laws have sold us down the river.

**Let us look at a few comparisons.**

_Award-winning Australian journalist Peter Greste:_ Arrested for trying to tarnish Egypt’s image by broadcasting false information; and accused of holding meetings with members of the Muslim Brotherhood (recently declared a terrorist organisation). He was sentenced seven years – in an open court, that, to us, seemed a sham. **Australia was outraged.** PM Tony Abbott even raised the case of jailed Australian journalist Peter Greste with the Egyptian president in person.

Describing the Egyptian president as a “reluctant jailer”, Mr Abbott said he was hopeful of a positive outcome as President el-Sisi was allowing the Egyptian legal process to run its course.
What would this case look like under the new Australian laws – and spying on the Muslim Brotherhood had been deemed a secret operation? Would Peter Greste’s situation be more grim?

Our Australian laws now a far cry from freedom.

You might have seen Richard Attenborough’s film – CRY FREEDOM - about journalist Donald James Woods (CBE) and Steve Biko, leader of the anti-apartheid Black Consciousness Movement. Woods was a white South African anti-apartheid activist and editor of the Daily Dispatch from 1965 to 1977. He had several scrapes with the South African Security Police regarding editorial matters and on numerous occasions ruffled the feathers of Prime Minister B. J. Vorster, but he found himself tiptoeing around the increasingly oppressive policies to control the press.

Woods befriended Biko in the era of police brutality and shootings. Biko had been involved in clandestine contacts with two (outlawed) anti-apartheid movements, the African National Congress (ANC) and the PAC. He was eventually arrested – then battered to death (Woods’ photographs were the evidence of these beatings). Soon after Biko’s death, Woods was placed under a five-year ban, was stripped of his editorship, and not allowed to speak publicly, write, travel or even work for the duration of his ban. Because of increasing harassment to his family, and now without a passport, he decided to flee across into Lesotho and sought exile in London. In 1978, he became the first private citizen to address the United Nations Security Council.

If this situation were to happen under the new Australian laws, would Woods have been subjected to ‘house arrest’ or an Australian prison?
In Gambia, two plainclothes officers of the National Intelligence Agency arrested Manneh at the office of his newspaper, the pro-government Daily Observer. The reason for the arrest was unclear, although some colleagues believe it was linked to his attempt to republish a BBC article critical of President Yahya Jammeh. Despite dozens of inquiries from international organizations, the government has not provided a credible account of what happened to Manneh after he was taken into custody in 2006.

In 2008, the Court of Justice of the Economic Community of West African States ruled that Gambia had unlawfully seized Manneh. It ordered his immediate release. Sketchy and conflicting details have emerged about Manneh’s whereabouts, health, and legal status – and speculation is that he is no longer alive. He was never charged with a crime.

It is all perspective – as the life of Nelson Mandela demonstrated. As Tony Abbott has said on many occasions – these laws are about combatting crime – and the crime of terrorism. That maybe the open intention – but in the end it will be more about concealing crime.
It started in March with a frenzied throwing of faeces at the statue of Cecil John Rhodes at the University of Cape Town (UCT). This turned into a well-supported and structured movement at the university.

Australia’s prime minister, Rhodes Scholar Tony Abbott, would probably decry the removal of the statue, but I think feminist Olive Schreiner would be applauding this decision. She was a Rhodes critic over a Century ago. Schreiner, initially awed by Rhodes, had come to abhor him. In April of 1897 she wrote:

“Rhodes means so much of oppression, injustice, & moral degradation to South Africa. But if he passed away tomorrow there still remains the terrible fact that something in our society has formed the matrix which has fed, nourished, built up such a man!”

“Matrix” – Schreiner used the word back in 1897 – a word that has once again become popular to describe the modus operandi of the power structures.

When I was at the University of Cape Town in the 1970’s, I was ignorant of Rhodes’ true vision and the egregious means by which he pursued power. Rhodes formed the British South African Company (BSAC) that colonized Zimbabwe, and in April 1888, in search of an oligopoly over diamond production, he (with Rudd and the financial support of Nathaniel Mayer Rothschild) launched the De Beers Consolidated Mines mining company.

In 1890 Rhodes became the Prime Minister of the Cape colony – with one of his most notorious undertakings being the Glen Grey Act – a document often seen as the blueprint for apartheid. At Oxford many years before (1877), Rhodes had articulated his imperial vision:

“I contend that we are the first race in the world, and that the more of the world we inhabit the better it is for the human race.
Just fancy those parts that are at present inhabited by the most despicable specimen of human being, what an alteration there would be in them if they were brought under Anglo-Saxon influence…”

Cecil Rhodes was motivated by his ‘great idea’ which came to him at the age of 24 – in the hours immediately following his initiation into the Masonic Order while at Oxford University.

He proceeded to pen his ‘Confession of Faith’ in which he outlined his ambition: to establish a secret society whose objective would be the furtherance of the British Empire and the uniting of the entire Anglo-Saxon race, including America, into one single empire.

Rhodes joined together with Rothschild agent Lord Alfred Milner to form a secret group on February 5, 1891. Their group had an Inner Circle, known as the ‘Circle of Initiates’, led by Rhodes, and later they formed The Outer Circle – the Round Table.

Rhodes’ fortune, through initiatives like the Rhodes Scholarship Fund, has been used to promote their goal: To eventually establish a one-world government, which would be controlled by the international banking community. Rhodes supported the idea (from Plato’s Republic) of “…a ruling class with a powerful army to keep it in power and a society completely subordinate to the monolithic authority of the rulers.” Sound familiar?
UPDATE, April 29, 2015:
The Rhodes statue affair is only the tip of an iceberg. Back in 1891, three British Imperialists met in London: Cecil Rhodes, William Stead and Lord Esher. They were soon joined by Lords Rothschild, Salisbury, Rosebery and Milner. From the outset they operated in secret, determined that history would not reveal their influence.

The man who later exposed them (and their American child the CFR) was Carroll Quigley, a professor of history at Georgetown University. I quote an article in Globalresearch.ca, by Gerry Docherty and Jim Macgregor, authors of Hidden History, The Secret Origins of the First World War:

“These Founding Fathers, the Secret Elite, began with Rhodes’ secret society and expanded across the Atlantic. They were men who always pursued their own malevolent agenda. What they achieved in causing the First World War was but the first step in their long-term drive to a new world order…. At the inner core, Lord Alfred Milner offers cause for greater scrutiny because he has been virtually airbrushed from the history of the period....”

Lord Alfred Milner (1854-1925) Knight of the Garter

Milner deliberately caused the Boer War in order to grab the Transvaal’s gold and perpetuate Secret Elite control. He confessed in a letter to Lord Roberts, “I precipitated the crisis, which was inevitable, before it was too late. It is not very agreeable, and in many eyes, not very creditable piece of business to have been largely instrumental in bringing about a big war.”

With the signing of a treaty in 1902, the Boer Republics were annexed to the British Empire. The Transvaal’s gold was finally in the hands of the Secret Elite. 70,000 had died on the battlefields; 32,000, mainly children, died of half-rations in concentration camps created by the British.
African Assassinations Compared to JFK’s
by Dee McLachlan, April 15, 2015

After the 1960s and a spate of assassinations, leaders (with a few exceptions) have never really been able to lead again. And it seems it all started with Patrice Lumumba – the first legally elected prime minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

He was assassinated on 17 January, 1961, and, said the Guardian, “This heinous crime was a culmination of two interrelated assassination plots by American and Belgian governments, which used Congolese accomplices and a Belgian execution squad to carry out the deed”.

The West is in the belief that it holds the lantern of democracy – but they blew out the flame a long time ago.

A short extract from Lumumba’s Independence speech:

“…Together we shall establish social justice and ensure for every man a fair remuneration for his labour… We shall see to it that the lands of our native country truly benefit its children. We shall revise all the old laws and make them into new ones that will be just and noble. We shall stop the persecution of free thought. We shall see to it that all citizens enjoy to the fullest extent the basic freedoms provided for by the Declaration of Human Rights…”

He spoke of the struggle against the colonizers – and today we could just replace colonizers with global multinationals. He was not good for business, and thus his arrest was “orchestrated”. He was assassinated in 1961.
Just as Americans remember what they were doing the day JFK was shot in 1963, I can recall the day at school (in Pretoria) when we were informed that Prime Minister Dr Hendrik Verwoerd had been assassinated.

Verwoerd – known as the “Architect of Apartheid” – was assassinated after entering the House of Assembly on 6 September 1966. A uniformed parliamentary messenger, Dimitri Tsafendas, stabbed Verwoerd in the neck and chest four times before being subdued by other members of the Assembly. He had no plan for escape.

**The ‘Loner’ Narrative**

Even though a medical doctor in the House who attended to Verwoerd said “The assassin must have received training in the art of wielding a knife”, the “lone wolf” scenario (like Lee Harvey Oswald and Sirhan Sirhan) was quickly rolled out. On the 7th of September, one day after the assassination, “The Star” (Johannesburg) had a headline: “No sign of assassination plot. This was the work of a lone killer, says Vorster”.

John Vorster was appointed as successor to Verwoerd. He quickly appointed his own commission of enquiry – consisting of ONE MAN – who found that there was “no ground for the rumour that the wounds had been inflicted by an expert”. At the time I was a kid, and my parents (who were very anti-apartheid) never questioned the story.
The Assassin. Dimitri Tsafendas was of Greek descent and joined the Communist Party in the 1930s. He then became a seaman and spent 20 years travelling. He began to experience psychotic episodes that resulted in short periods of institutionalisation in various countries, including 6-month detention on Ellis Island (!) where he was diagnosed as schizophrenic.

Although classified ‘white,’ Tsafendas was shunned in white circles because of his dark skin. He had applied to have his classification changed to ‘coloured’ but was turned down.

In 1966, the press reported that the Security Police had a file on Tsafendas – but political reporter Michael Smith claims the Security Police had no fewer than FOUR files. It’s improbable that a coloured-skin person with several secret files would have been “allowed” near the prime minister – in a government paranoid about the swart gevaar (“the black threat”).

The Hoek Report. Like JFK who spoke out against secret societies and signed Executive Order 11110, to issue interest free loans, Dr Verwoerd was putting the screws on big business and big banking. He had launched an inquiry into “Die Georganiseerde Geldmag” (The Organized Money Power)! He asked Professor Piet Hoek to investigate the stranglehold that economic monopolies such as Anglo American (the Oppenheimer’s, mining), Rembrandt (liquor and cigarettes), Trust Bank (Jan Marais), Sanlam (Wasenaar, insurance), were holding. This Hoek Report was finished after Verwoerd’s death; Vorster refused to publish it. In the 1987 book, South Africa Inc., by Pallister, Stewart, and Lepper, it is alleged that Oppenheimer lobbied the Rothschilds to overthrow Verwoerd.
COMMENT FROM MARY W MAXWELL:
Consider how vulnerable a good leader is. I can’t say if Lumumba was good or not, as I haven’t inspected his work. But there are always outside forces willing to kill off a leader in any country who looks like he might set up a brilliant system for his people. To me this recommends that nations should protect their leaders. How about a Committee of Five Clones, so that if a leader is killed, another like-minded is able to replace him.

I hear you saying “Et tu, Brute.” OK, it may not work but the mere airing of the problem would help. Dee did this brilliantly in her video of the Brisbane G20 meeting. I found it not only hilarious but heart-rending. Watch it again. Turn the volume off and just read the subtitles. It is called “Tony Abbott’s Address to the G20 Leaders – TRANSLATED.”

Note: I think Prince Albert was assassinated, via disease. He died in 1861 at age 42, leaving his widow Queen Victoria with 9 children. She stayed on the throne for 40 more years in a famed state of mourning.

I have zero evidence for this hypothesis, but, as Dee says, when somebody is “uncooperative” they get bumped off. After his success with Expo, Albert was feeling his oats. Even royals are not allowed to feel their oats. If I am right, maybe Victoria knew the score, and the mourning thing was a combination of shock, anger, and grief.

Ahem. I have been waiting over 24 hours for someone to clobber me for my Prince Albert claim. No takers. OK, then here’s another one. I suspect David Lloyd George’s beloved daughter Mary, age 28, died of foul play rather than of appendicitis. Lloyd George, a Welshman, was UK prime minister from 1916 to 1922. Had many a far-out idea. To kill him would be too obvious, but to demoralize him with a death in the family would have not aroused anyone’s suspicions. Let the clobbering begin.
THE PARIS “CHARLIE” HEBDO KILLINGS
by Dee McLachlan, January 8, 2015

“France finally got its ‘9/11 moment’ today, when at least two gunman dressed in black and armed with Kalashnikov rifles, stormed the offices of a magazine, killing two police/security personnel and 10 journalists, and injuring 11 others during the raid.” -- said 21stCenturyWire.

The attack happened to take place in the middle of an editorial meeting of the political magazine Charlie Hebdo with masked gunman calling out by name and killing first its editor Stephane Charbonnier, 47, and 9 other editors and staff, including French economist Bernard Maris.

As of 11:30pm local time, French police are claiming to have arrested 3 suspects, two brothers and one other, who reside in a suburb of Paris, and who police believe “may have been the shooters” (but this does not necessarily mean they were the gunmen who carried out today’s attack).

This is from 21st centurywire:
“Beyond all of the media’s ‘ISIS’ hyperbole, unquestionably, today’s attack has all the characteristic of a professional contract hit. Witnesses remarked on how the gunman spoke perfect native French, and commented on their ‘expert marksmanship’, hitting all targets with single shots, and not spraying bullets indiscriminately. Witnesses also described the gunman as ‘bulked-up’ from what appears to be body armor, and kevlar ‘bullet-proof’ protection underneath their over garments.

Another witness commented on the adroit, European-style and professional demeanor of the gunman, stating, “At first I thought it was special forces.”

The Charlie magazine, published weekly, is no stranger to controversy, and was the center of national debate around what Muslims claimed was its antagonistic Islamic cartoons which they began printing nearly a decade ago.
Comment from Mary Maxwell:
The French still take pride in their 1789 “Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen.” Those rights include:

2. The aim of all political association is the preservation of the natural … rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression. [Great! One has a right to resist oppressive metadata laws.]

3. The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation. No body nor individual may exercise any authority which does not proceed directly from the nation.
[What about orders from World Government?]

4. Liberty consists in the freedom to do everything which injures no one else… [such as wearing a headscarf?]

6. Law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate personally, or through his representative, in its foundation…
[Go, Gumshoe.]

8. The law shall provide for such punishments only as are strictly and obviously necessary…

10. No one shall be disquieted on account of his opinions, including his religious views…

11. The free communication of ideas and opinions is one of the most precious of the rights of man. Every citizen may, accordingly, speak, write, and print with freedom, but shall be responsible for such abuses of this freedom as shall be defined by law.
[But France has a law criminalising Holocaust Denial]

15. Society has the right to require of every public agent an account of his administration.

[Boy! I’d never heard of that one. If the Monis capture had been in France, we could get the police bullet-fragment story down pat. Wait! The Charlie killings were in Paris. Did “society” get a full accounting?]

Allons enfants de la patrie, do it today! Help the world! S.V.P.!
Wednesday January 7, 2015. At 11.30am two men, disguised by balaclavas, entered Charlie magazine office in the outskirts of Paris, killing 11 people. They were “cool and professional.” How did they get away? They even managed to pass a police car. Then, a short distance away they reportedly got out and casually killed a cop (an incident miraculously caught on camera).

Then they crashed their own car for no reason, abandoned it, and proceeded to do what Mary Maxwell calls “the traditional carjacking.” They disappear for 22 hours – maybe in order for tension to build in Paris?

But oops, they “slipped up” by leaving ID card in the stolen car. (Recall the 9-11 passport at the WTC?). If not for that, we’d be left to guess who shouted Allahu Akbar.

Police release photos of the suspects, now said to be Cherif and Said Kouachi, brothers with a terrorist past (sort of). Said had gone to Yemen for training. He had once lived across the hall from the Underwear Bomber, Umar Faruk Abdulmutallab. Small world!
Thursday January 8 at 10.30am. The brothers – now sans balaclavas – walk into a petrol station, being sure to put their face under the CCTV camera. And what’s one of them casually slinging there – is it a rocket launcher? A prop?

These professional killers must have had a brain freeze, appearing in a petrol station and stealing some water. Are we STUPID? Or are the brothers STUPID?

Now the chase is on. The boys find their way to a warehouse where they’re eventually captured. No, not captured, but shot dead. “Problem solved.” It is then speculated that the Kouachi brothers may have acted in synch with Amedy Couliby, a Malian, who was busy doing the killings at a kosher supermarket the next day, in Paris.

My question is: were there two sets of “brothers”? Did the Kouachi’s really do the sleek hits at Charlie? Have they got body doubles? Who carried out the killings? What is the standard of journalism here? Mon Dieu.

Now we hear that the man investigating the attack, Police Commissioner Helric Fredou, committed suicide in his office. “Burnout and depression”, you know, but his mother says No.

Media do not pursue the matter!!!
Mr Brandis, your laws are a fraud on the people

by Dee McLachlan, November 6, 2014

These new anti-terror laws (section 35P) are founded on global criminality – and that is why your laws are a fraud on the people of Australia, Mr George Brandis.

Australia’s 36th Attorney-General George Brandis was born in the safety of picturesque Sydney, Australia, went to a private Catholic school and then to the University of Queensland for a couple of degrees. I doubt Mr Brandis has any idea of what tyranny smells and looks like from his privileged journey to the comfort of Canberra. And I’m sure he remains in denial that the west’s (illegal) destruction of Iraq caused much of this ‘terror’ mess in the first place.

I grew up in South Africa and remember well the outlook of (Apartheid) Prime Ministers Hendrik Verwoerd, B. J. Vorster and P.W. Botha and their rhetoric on restricting press freedoms for the good of the people. Well, Mr Brandis, I can say you would have been most welcome in Pretoria during the Apartheid regime. You are cut from the same cloth.

George Brandis (2014) and PW Botha (Prime Minister 1978 – 1984)

P W Botha would have jumped at the chance to bring in such egregious laws that Mr Brandis has so enthusiastically defended. Section 35P (unauthorised disclosure of information) of the new National Security Legislation – makes it an offence, punishable
by up to 10 years imprisonment, to “disclose information” about a so-called special intelligence operation.

This is worse than the Apartheid regime (See my article on Teetering Towards Totalitarianism). But sadly, this trend to crush whistle-blower journalism is worldwide (and has an orchestrated ‘New World Order’ stench to it). You would have thought that South Africans would have learned from history. But no. Disregarding protests, the South African Parliament overwhelmingly passed a bill that will severely restrict the ability of journalists to report any information deemed to be a government secret.

Archbishop Desmond Tutu (Nobel peace laureate and leading figure in the fight to end apartheid and discrimination) said it was “insulting to all South Africans to be asked to stomach legislation that could be used to outlaw whistle-blowing and investigative journalism.”

And, Mr Brandis, the same applies here: It is insulting to all Australians.

It seems that these laws are designed specifically to suppress the ever growing realization that governments are fraudulent institutions doing the bidding of global powers above them. Why else would a so called patriotic Australian want to enshrine laws that intend to restrict enlightenment to the people who pay his salary and entitlements?

Mr Brandis and all the other politicians have acted against the interests of all Australians. We are told this is for our own good. We are indoctrinated into believing that government secrecy is good and necessary for the people. That is absolute NONSENSE. You are using these laws to keep us dumbed down and hopefully ignorant.

Corrupt Advantage

Secrecy breeds only one thing: Corrupt advantage of power for those holding the secrets.

Now you threaten Australian writers and journalists (like myself) with 10 years jail if information is disclosed – that relates
to a special intelligence operation; and…. (may) prejudice the effective conduct of a special intelligence operation.

What do we do? Mr Brandis – FOR EXAMPLE, if we discover the special operation is a planned false flag attack that is going to kill innocent Australians? Like a 9/11 scenario, or a Port Arthur type incident – and that this (hypothetical) special operation is not in the interests of Australians. What do we do then? Keep quite and be traitors to the Australians – or be servants to a ‘law’?

And we know what happens to journalists: Donald Woods had to escape South Africa, Ebrima Manneh just disappeared, Michael Hastings was murdered in a car ‘explosion’ accident, and Peter Greste is in jail. And we know what Mr Brandis thinks of Edward Snowden enlightening the American public: “Those who doubted that Edward Snowden was a traitor were either of the ‘self-loathing left’ or the ‘anarcho-libertarian right,’” (to a Washington think tank). But this is why am I suspicious of your laws:

All of you in Canberra refuse to confront the murderous deceptions of 9/11. You have failed to take note of the scientific evidence which points away from the 19 hijackers. The evidence points to sophisticated explosives being used on 3 buildings.

Have you even heard of Building 7, Mr Brandis?

How distorted is the logic when the taxi driver taking me to the airport is more aware of the evidence and detail of 9/11 than our Attorney-General?
MSM a Disgrace
And how appalling is it when our mainstream media (MSM) fails to report these events honestly. The Australian MSM are involved in a cover-up – and have betrayed our democracy. ‘They went down the rabbit hole, slept with ferrets, got fleas and are now scratching’.

Without our politicians (and the MSM) interrogating this “special operation” known as 9/11 (whoever’s operation it was), they are in denial and have been deceived by a murderous fraud on humanity – unknowingly (or has Canberra just been forced to go along with it?). It doesn’t really matter which it is. But as a result of this “special 9/11 operation,” the west created a fraudulent war on terror, bombed Iraq back into the stone age and killed hundreds of thousands of people. We all have blood on our hands.

How can we trust ANY special operation when it is enshrouded with secrecy (for our own good)?

Canberra Bamboozled?
One can only conclude that Canberra is buried and confused by its own deceptions and secrets. It is so enmeshed and stymied by global corruption that our politicians have bought the LIE. It appears that those politicians in Canberra who voted for these laws on Monday have been bamboozled into perpetuating secrecy and ignorance – by passing laws carefully constructed to prevent transparency. It is clear – whistle-blowers and investigate journalists are now deemed a danger to the status quo of (secret) governance.

Mr Brandis, these laws are founded on global criminality – and that is why your laws are a fraud on the people of Australia.
MAXWELL RECAPS MCLACHLAN’S ARTICLES

The categories “Media, Australia’s Sovereignty, and Lies and Freedom of Speech” were added ex post facto to an existing body of work, namely, Dee’s Gumshoe articles. It does show, however, that these are the biggies that mean a lot to her. Or maybe it’s just that these are the biggies that conspicuously stick out, in our lives today.

Gumshoe’s raison d’être is to provide a better job than the MSM is currently offering. (Not a hard task to achieve, really.) Think of the simple things Dee asks for. She asks Dr Karl, decorated scientist of Oz’s publicly-funded radio, to take a whack at the science of Building 7’s “collapse.” She asks that Gold Wankleys be awarded for exposés of governmental crime. Sure, why not? She can even imagine Rupe sending “just one email” to set everything right.

On sovereignty, Dee has a bee in her bonnet re MH17. Not primarily because 38 Aussies were killed and families need information. Rather, she is appalled at Tony Abbott and Julie Bishop agreeing to a secret inquiry that may be a NATO-sponsored anti-Russian (hence pro-war) move.

As for metadata collecting, and the Sydney siege in general, Dee’s theme is: I have seen this happen in South Africa and it leads to totalitarianism and self-censorship. She is also obsessed, as we all should be, with Wesley Clark’s calm prediction that the US will destroy 7 nations.

Now for Part II, arguably the most important document today (46 years old)! Dr Day spills the beans on the cabal’s intricate plans for control of the people. Gumshoe re-published the report, unabridged, on December 27, 2014, per a suggestion by reader Ned. Did you not wish to read it all, I recommend you at least gaze at these shocking items: 30. diseases, 40. churches, 58. planned collapse of buildings and bridges, 66. irritants, 77. new roles for females, 80. more violence in entertainment, 84. music to carry messages to young, 88. control of food supply, 89. weather control, 91. politics, 97. terrorism, 101. debt, 104. implants, 109, people to just disappear!
“**EVERYTHING IS IN PLACE AND NOBODY CAN STOP US NOW**”

These are the recollections of Lawrence Dunegan, MD, of a lecture he attended in 1969. The speaker was Dr Richard Day, MD (Harvard Med School ’31).

1. Everything is in place and nobody can stop us now.

2. He [Dr Day] indicated that there is much more co-operation between East and West than most people realise.

3. Most people don’t understand how governments operate and even **people in high positions in governments don’t really understand how and where decisions are made.**

4. People who **really influence decisions are names that for the most part would be familiar to most of us, but he would not use individuals’ names -- people of prominence who were primarily known in their private occupations.**

5. His purpose in telling our group about these changes that were to be brought about was to make it easier for us to adapt to these changes.

6. One of the statements had to do with change. “People will have to get used to the idea of change, so used to change, that they’ll be expecting change. Nothing will be permanent.” This in the context of a society where **people seemed to have no roots or moorings, but would be passively willing to accept change simply because it was all they had ever known.**

7. “People are too trusting, they don’t ask the right questions.”

8. “Everything has two purposes. One is the ostensible purpose which will make it acceptable to people and second is the real purpose which would further the goals of establishing the new system.

9. Numbers of people living at any one time on the planet must be limited or we will run out of space to live. We will outgrow our food supply and pollute the world with our waste.
10. People won’t be allowed to have babies just because they want to. Some people would be allowed only one, however outstanding people might be selected and allowed to have three.

11. Contraceptives would be displayed more prominently in drug stores, right up with the cigarettes and chewing gum. Contraceptives would be advertised and also dispensed in the schools in association with sex education!

12. Sex Education is a tool of world government. Many cities in the United States have already set up school-based clinics, which are primarily contraception, birth control, population control clinics.

13. Now back in 1969, four years before Roe vs. Wade, he said, “Abortion will no longer be a crime.” 14. “People will be given permission to be homosexual.” 15. Clothing would be more stimulating and provocative. Bras would be thinner and softer allowing more natural movement.

16. Divorce would be made easier and more prevalent. More people will not marry. Unmarried people would stay in hotels and even live together. That would be very common.

17. More women will work outside the home. More men will be transferred to other cities and in their jobs, more men would travel. Therefore, it would be harder for families to stay together. This would tend to make the marriage relationship less stable. Travel would be easier, less expensive, for a while, so that people who did have to travel would feel they could get back to their families…. Rather a diabolical approach to this whole thing!

18. Everybody has a right to live only so long. The old are no longer useful. They become a burden. Some things that would help people realize that they had lived long enough, e.g., the use of very pale printing ink on forms that are necessary to fill out. Older people wouldn’t be able to read the pale ink as easily and would need to go to younger people for help.

19. Automobile -- there would be more high-speed traffic lanes that older people with their slower reflexes would have trouble dealing with and thus, loses some of their independence.

20. The cost of medical care would be made burdensomely high. Medical care would be connected very closely with one’s work but also would be made very, very high in cost so that it would simply be unavailable to people beyond a certain time.
21. The young would become agreeable to helping Mom and Dad along the way, provided this was done humanely and with dignity. Then the example was – there could be a nice, farewell party, a real celebration. Mom and Dad had done a good job. Then after the party’s over they take the ‘demise pill.’

22. There would be profound changes in the practice of medicine. Overall, it would be much more tightly controlled. “Congress is not going to go along with national health insurance, it is now abundantly evident. But it’s not necessary, we have other ways to control health care.” Costs would be forced up so that people won’t be able to afford to go without insurance. People pay for it, you’re entitled to it. **Your role being responsible for your own care would be diminished.**

23. The insurance company, paying for your care, does not pay that same amount. If you are charged, say, $600 for the use of an operating room, the insurance company does not pay $600; they only pay $300 or $400. You would feel grateful for insurance.

24. Identification would be needed to get into the building. The security in and around hospitals would be established and gradually increased so that nobody without identification could get in or move around inside the building. **Theft of hospital equipment, things like typewriters and microscopes and so forth would be ‘allowed’ and exaggerated; reports of it would be exaggerated so that this would be the excuse needed to establish the need for strict security until people got used to it.**

25. This need for ID would start in small ways: hospitals, some businesses, gradually expand to include everybody in all places!

26. **It was observed that hospitals can be used to confine people and for the treatment of criminals.**

27. The image of the doctor would change. No longer would he be seen as an individual professional in service to individual patients. The job is to include things like executions by lethal injection. **The image of the doctor being a powerful, independent person would have to be changed.** He went on to say, “Doctors are making entirely too much money. They should advertise like any other product.”

28. Lawyers would be advertising, too.

29. **The solo practitioner would become a thing of the past.** Most
doctors would be employed by an institution of one kind or another. Along with that, of course, unstated but necessary, is the employee serves his employer, not his patient.

30. He said there would be new diseases to appear which had not ever been seen before. Would be very difficult to diagnose and be untreatable – at least for a long time. No elaboration was made on this. I now think that AIDS probably was a manufactured disease.

31. Cancer. He said, “We can cure almost every cancer right now. Information is on file in the Rockefeller Institute, if it’s ever decided that it should be released.” Ultimately the cancer cures which were being hidden in the Rockefeller Institute would come to light because independent researchers might bring them out, despite these efforts to suppress them. But at least for the time being, letting people die of cancer was a good thing to do because of the problem of overpopulation.

32. He said, “There is now a way to simulate a real heart attack. It can be used as a means of assassination.” Only a very skilled pathologist who knew exactly what to look for at an autopsy, could distinguish this from the real thing.

33. People would have to eat right and exercise right to live as long as before. And that if people who were too dumb or too lazy to exercise as they should, then their circulating fats go up and predispose to disease. Most people would ignore the advice and just go on and eat what was convenient and tasted good.

34. With regard to exercise, “people will be running all over the place.” He pointed out how supply produces demand. As athletic clothing and equipment would be made more widely available and glamorized, particularly running shoes, this would stimulate people to develop an interest in running exercise.

35. In connection with nutrition he also mentioned that public eating places would rapidly increase. This had a connection with the family too. As more and more people eat out, eating at home would become less important. Convenience foods being made widely available – things like you could pop into the microwave.

36. This was all presented as sort of a moral judgment about people and what they should do with their energies. People who are smart, who would learn about nutrition, and who are disciplined
enough to eat right and exercise right are better people – and the kind you want to live longer.

37. Education as a tool for accelerating onset of puberty and evolution. There was a statement that “we think that we can push evolution faster and in the direction we want it to go.” I remember this only as a general statement.

38. Another area of discussion was Religion. This is an avowed atheist speaking. He said, “Religion is not necessarily bad. A lot of people seem to need religion, with its mysteries and rituals – so they will have religion. But the major religions of today have to be changed because they are not compatible with the changes to come. The old religions will have to go especially Christianity. Once the Roman Catholic Church is brought down, the rest of Christianity will follow easily. Then a new religion can be accepted for use all over the world.

39. In order to do this, the Bible will be changed. It will be rewritten to fit the new religion. Gradually, key words will be replaced with new words having various shades of meaning. Everything in Scripture need not be rewritten, just key words will be replaced by other words.

40. Then followed one of the most surprising statements of the whole presentation: He said, “Some of you probably think the Churches won’t stand for this,” and he went on to say, “the churches will help us!” There was no elaboration on this.

41. The classics in Literature would be changed. I seem to recall Mark Twain’s writings was given as one example. But he said that the casual reader reading a revised version of a classic would never even suspect that there was any change. But the changes would promote the acceptability of the new system.

42. Kids will spend more time in schools, but they wouldn’t learn anything. In the better schools learning would be accelerated. This is another time where he said, “We think we can push evolution.” As if this pushing would alter their physiology. Overall, schooling would be prolonged. I’m not sure what he said about a long school day, I do remember he said that school was planned to go all summer. Students would have to decide at a younger age what they would want to study and get onto their track early.

43. It would be harder to change to another field of study once you get started. You wouldn’t have access to material in other fields,
outside your own area of study, without approval. Anybody who wanted computer access, or access to books that were not directly related to their field of study would have to have a very good reason for so doing, or would be denied access.

44. Another angle was that the schools would become more important in people’s overall life. Kids wanting any activities outside of school would be almost forced to get them through the school. There would be few opportunities outside.

45. “There will be some help available to students in handling stress, but the unfit won’t be able to make it. They will then move on to other things.” In this connection and later on with drug abuse and alcohol abuse he indicated that psychiatric services to help would be increased dramatically. Some would fall by the wayside and therefore were sort of dispensable, ‘expendable.’

46. Education would be lifelong. There’ll be new information that adults must have, to keep up. When you can’t keep up, you’re too old. This was another way of letting older people know that the time had come for them to take the demise pill.

47. “Some books would just disappear from the libraries.” This was in the vein that some books contain information or contain ideas that should not be kept around. But I seem to recall carrying away this idea that this would include thefts. [A designated person will steal the books.] Further down the line, not everybody will be allowed to own books. And some books nobody will be allowed to own.

48. Laws would be changed. At that time a lot of States had blue laws about Sunday sales, certain Sunday activities. He said the blue laws [Sunday laws] would all be repealed.

49. Gambling laws would be relaxed, so that gambling would increase. Governments would get into gambling.

50. Bankruptcy laws would be changed.

51. Antitrust laws will be changed, or be interpreted differently. I recall of having the impression that it was like competition but within members of a club. There would be nobody outside the club who would be able to compete. Like teams competing within a professional sports league; if you’re the NFL.

52. Law enforcement efforts against drugs would be increased.
53. [The increased availability of drugs would provide a sort of law of the jungle] whereby the weak and the unfit would be selected out. “But now we’ve become so civilized – we’re over civilized – and the unfit are enabled to survive only at the expense of those who are more fit.” The abuse of drugs would restore, in a certain sense, the law of the jungle and selection of the fittest for survival. News about drug abuse would also tend to reduce this unwarranted American complacency that the world is a safe place, and a nice place.

54. The same thing would happen with alcohol. Alcohol abuse would be both promoted and demoted at the same time. The vulnerable and the weak would respond to the promotions and therefore use and abuse more alcohol. Drunk driving would become more of a problem; and stricter rules about driving under the influence would be established. Again, much more in the way of psychological services would be made available to help those who got hooked on drugs and alcohol.

55. Not everybody should be free to travel the way they do now in the United States. People don’t have a need to travel.

56. More jails would be needed. Hospitals could serve as jails. Some new hospital construction would be designed so as to make them adaptable to jail-like use. [End of tape 1]

57. Nothing is permanent. Streets would be re-routed and renamed. Areas you had not seen in a while would become unfamiliar. This would contribute to older people feeling that it was time to move on, couldn't even keep up with the changes in areas that were once familiar. Buildings would be allowed to stand empty and deteriorate, and streets would be allowed to deteriorate in certain localities. The purpose of this was to provide the jungle, the depressed atmosphere for the unfit.

58. Buildings and bridges would be made so that they would collapse after a while, there would be more accidents involving aeroplanes and railroads and automobiles. All of this to contribute to the feeling of insecurity, that nothing was safe. 59. Other areas would be well maintained. Not every part of the city would be slums.

60. Crime used to manage society. There would be the created slums and other areas well maintained. Those people able to leave the slums for better areas then would learn to better appreciate the importance of human accomplishment. This meant that if they left the jungle and
came to civilization, so to speak, they could be proud of their own accomplishments that they made it. There was no related sympathy for those who were left behind in the jungle of drugs and deterioration.

61. “We think we can effectively limit crime to the slum areas, so it won’t be spread heavily into better areas.” I remember wondering, how can he be so confident that the criminal element is going to stay where he wants it to stay? In the better areas, [we’d have] better coordinated police efforts. He did not say so, but I wondered at that time about the moves that were afoot to consolidate all the police departments of suburbs around the major cities. John Birch Society was saying “Support your local police, don’t let them be consolidated.”

62. There would be a whole new industry of residential security systems to develop with alarms and locks and alarms going into the police department so that people could protect their wealth and their wellbeing.

63. American industry came under discussion – it was the first that I’d heard the term global interdependence. The stated plan was that different parts of the world would be assigned different roles of industry and commerce in a unified global system. The continued pre-eminence of the United States [must] be changed. This was one of the several times that he said in order to create a new structure, you first have to tear down the old, and American industry was one example of that.

64. Our heavy industries would be cut back while the same industries were being developed in other countries, notably Japan. I remember he said that automobiles would be imported from Japan on an equal footing with our own domestically produced automobiles, but the Japanese product would be better.

65. Things would be made so they would break and fall apart, that is in the United States so that people would tend to prefer the imported variety. One example was the Japanese. In 1969 Japanese automobiles, if they were sold here at all I don’t remember, but they certainly weren’t very popular. But the idea was you could get a little bit disgusted with your Ford, GM or Chrysler product or whatever because little things like window handles would fall off more. If you bought Japanese, German, that it would last longer. Patriotism would go down the drain.
66. It was mentioned elsewhere things being made to fall apart, too, being made deliberately defective and unreliable. Not only was this [intended] to tear down patriotism but to be just a little source of irritation to people who would use such things.

67. We had had enough environmental damage from smoke stacks and industrial waste. Other people could put up with that for a while. And along this line there were talks about people losing their jobs as a result of industry, and opportunities for retraining.

68. Population shifts were to be brought about so that people would be tending to move into the Sun Belt. They would be the sort of people without roots in their new locations, and traditions are easier to change in a place where there are a lot of transplanted people. Things like new medical care systems, if you pick up from a Northeast industrial city and you transplant yourself to the South Sunbelt or Southwest, you’ll be more accepting of whatever kind of, for example, controlled medical care you find there.

69. (He used the plural personal pronoun we) we take control first of the port cities – New York, San Francisco, Seattle – the idea being that this is a piece of strategy, that if you control the port cities with your philosophy and your way of life, the heartland in between has to yield. The heartland, the Midwest, does seem to have maintained its conservatism.

70. But as you take away industry and jobs and relocate people then this is a strategy to break down conservatism. When you take away industry and people are unemployed and poor they will accept whatever change seems, to offer them survival.

71. With this ‘global interdependence’ the national identities would tend to be de-emphasized. Each area depended on every other area for one or another elements of its life. We would all become citizens of the world rather than of any one country.

72. Sport in the United States was to be changed, in part as a way of de-emphasizing nationalism. Soccer, a world-wide sport, was to be emphasized and pushed in the United States. This was of interest because in this area the game of soccer was virtually unknown at that time. And the traditional sport of American baseball would be de-emphasized and possibly eliminated because it might be seen as too American.
73. Actually, the way to break down baseball would be to make the salaries go very high. The idea behind this was that as the salaries got ridiculously high, **there would be a certain amount of discontent and antagonism as people resented the athletes being paid so much.** And then the fans would support soccer and the baseball fields could be used as soccer fields. It wasn’t said definitely this would have to happen, but **if the international flavor didn’t come around rapidly enough this could be done.**

74. He said football would be harder to dismantle because it was so widely played in colleges as well as in the professional leagues and would be harder to tear down. There was something else also about the violence in football that met a psychological need that was perceived, and people have a need for this vicarious violence. The same thing is true of hockey.

75. Soccer was to be the keystone of athletics because it is already a worldwide sport in South America, Europe, and parts of Asia and the United States should get on the bandwagon. All this would foster international competition.

76. Hunting requires guns and gun control is a big element in these plans. I don’t remember the details much, but the idea is that gun ownership is a privilege. The **few privileged people who should be allowed to hunt could maybe rent or borrow a gun from official quarters rather than own their own.**

77. Very important in sports was sports for girls. Athletics would be pushed for girls. This was intended to replace dolls. **Baby dolls would still be around, a few of them, but you would not see the number and variety of dolls.** Dolls would not be pushed because girls should not be thinking about babies and reproduction. Girls and boys really don’t need to be all that different. Tea sets were to go the way of dolls.

78. Just one other thing I recall was that **the sports pages would be full of the scores of girls’ teams.** And that’s recently begun to appear after 20 years in our local papers. The girls’ sports scores are right along with the boys’ sports scores. So all of this is to change the role model of what young girls should look to be. While she’s growing up, she should look to be an athlete rather than to look forward to being a mother.

79. Movies would gradually be made more explicit as regards sex and
language. **There would be pornographic movies in the theatres and on television.** VCR’s were not around at that time, but he had indicated that these cassettes would be available. He said something like: “You’ll see people in the movies doing everything you can think of.” He said all of this is intended to bring sex out in the open. That was another comment that was made several times -- the term “sex out in the open.”

80. Violence would be made more graphic. **This was intended to desensitize people to violence.** There might need to be a time when people would witness real violence and be a part of it. So there would be more realistic violence in entertainment, which would make it easier for people to adjust.

81. People’s attitudes toward death would change. People would not be so fearful of it but more accepting of it, and they would not be so aghast at the sight of dead people or injured people. We don’t need to have a genteel population paralyzed by what they might see. This was the first statement suggesting that **the plan includes numerous human casualties that the survivors would see.**

82. As regards music, he made a rather straightforward statement like: **Music will get worse.** In 1969 Rock music was getting more and more unpleasant. It was interesting the way he expressed it, “it would get worse” acknowledging that it was already bad. **Lyrics would become more openly sexual.** No new sugary romantic music would be publicized like that which had been written before. All of the old music would be brought back on certain radio stations and records for older people to hear.

83. **He seemed to indicate that one group would not hear the other group’s music.** Older folks would just refuse to hear the junk that was offered to young people, and **the young people would accept the junk because it identified them.**

84. He went on to say that the music would carry a message to the young and nobody would even know the message was there they would just think it was loud music.

85. Entertainment would be a tool to influence young people. It won’t change the older people, they are already set in their ways, but **the changes would all be aimed at the young who are in their formative years.** The younger generation being formed are the ones
that would be important for the future, in the 21st century.

86. All the old movies would be brought back again. There were other privileges that would also be accorded older folks: free transportation, breaks on purchases, discounts, tax discounts, — a number of privileges just because they were old. The bringing back of the good old music and the good old movies was going to help ease them through their final years in comfort. Once that generation passed, then gradually things would tighten up and the tightening up would be accelerated. The old movies and old songs would be withdrawn, gentler entertainment would be withdrawn.

87. People would need permission to travel and they would need a good reason to travel, and everyone would need ID. This would at first be an ID card you would carry on your person and you must show when you are asked for it. It was already planned that later on some sort of device would be developed to be implanted under the skin that would be coded specifically to identify the individual. This would have to be material on which information could be recorded and retrieved by some sort of scanner while it was not rejected by the body. Silicon at that time was thought to be well tolerated.

88. Food supplies would come under tight control. If population growth didn’t slow down, food shortages could be created in a hurry and people would realise the dangers of overpopulation. Food supply is to be brought under centralised control so that people would not have enough to support any fugitives from the new system. In other words, if you had a friend or relative who didn’t sign on, and growing one’s own food would be outlawed. And if you persist in illegal activities like growing your own food, then you’re a criminal.

89. There was a mention then of weather. This was another really striking statement. He said, “We can or soon will be able to control the weather.” He said, “I’m not merely referring to dropping iodide crystals into the clouds to precipitate rain that’s already there, but REAL control.” It could make rain.

90. “On the one hand you can make drought during the growing season so that nothing will grow, and on the other hand you can make for very heavy rains during harvest season so the fields are too muddy to bring in the harvest, and indeed one might be able to do both.” It was stated that either it was already possible or very, very
close to being possible.

91. Politics. He said that very few people really know how government works. **Elected officials are influenced in ways that they don’t even realize and they carry out plans that have been made for them and they think they are authors of the plans.**

92. Somewhere in the presentation he made two statements. One is, “**People can carry in their minds and act upon two contradictory ideas at one time, provided that these two contradictory ideas are kept far enough apart.**” The other statement is, “You can know pretty well how rational people are going to respond to certain circumstances or to certain information that they encounter. So, to determine the response you want you need only control the kind of data or information that they’re presented or the kinds of circumstance that they’re in; and being rational people they’ll do what you want them to do. They may not fully understand what they’re doing or why.”

93. Some scientific research data could be, and indeed has been, falsified in order to bring about desired results. Out of all of this was to come the New International Governing Body, probably to come through the U.N. and with a World Court, but not necessarily through those structures. It could be brought about in other ways. Acceptance of the U.N. at that time was seen as not being as wide as was hoped. **People would be more and more used to the idea of relinquishing some national sovereignty.**

94. Formerly wars could be controlled, but if nuclear weapons would fall into the wrong hands there could be an unintended nuclear disaster. It was not stated who the “wrong hands” are. We were free to infer that maybe this meant terrorists, but in more recent years I’m wondering whether the wrong hands might also include people that we’ve assumed they’ve had nuclear weapons all along, maybe they don’t have them. When he said they might fall into the wrong hands, **there was some statement that the possession of nuclear weapons had been tightly controlled, sort of implying that anybody who had nuclear weapons was intended to have them.** That would have included the Soviet Union, if indeed they have them. But I recall wondering, “Are you telling us, or are you implying that this country willingly gave weapons to the Soviets?” At that time that seemed like a terribly unthinkable thing to do.”
95. We would bring in the ‘New International Political System.’ “If there were too many people in the right places who resisted this, there might be a need to use one or two or possibly more nuclear weapons.” As it was put this would be possibly needed to convince people that, “We mean business.” That was followed by the statement that, “By the time one or two of those went off then everybody, even the most reluctant, would yield.” He said something about, “This negotiated peace would be very convincing,” as in a framework or in a context that the whole thing was rehearsed but nobody would know it.

96. There were some good things about war. One was you’re going to die anyway and people sometimes in war get a chance to display great courage and heroism. If they die they’ve died well and if they survive they get recognition. Another justification expressed for war was, if you think of the many millions of casualties in WWI and WWII had not died but had continued to live and continued to have babies then there would be millions upon millions and we would already be overpopulated. So those two great wars served a benign purpose in delaying over-population. But now there are technological means for the individual and governments to control over-population so in this regard war is obsolete.

97. There was a discussion of terrorism. Terrorism would be used widely in Europe and in other parts of the world. At that time it was thought terrorism would not be necessary in the United States. It could become necessary in the United States if the United States did not move rapidly enough into accepting the system. Along with this came a bit of a scolding that Americans had had it too good anyway and just a little bit of terrorism would help convince Americans that the world is indeed a dangerous place, or can be if we don’t relinquish control to the proper authorities.

98. Money. One statement was, “Inflation is infinite. You can put an infinite number of zeros after any number and put the decimals points wherever you want,” as an indication that inflation is a tool of the controllers. Money would become predominately credit. It was already. People would carry money only in very small amounts. Earnings would be electronically entered into your account. It would be a single banking system. It may have the appearance of being more than one but ultimately and basically it would be one single
banking system.

99. Also computer records can be kept on whatever it was you purchased so that if you were purchasing too much of any particular item and some official wanted to know what you were doing with your money they could go back and review your purchases and determine what you were buying.

100. The ability to save would be greatly curtailed.

101. People would be encouraged to use credit to borrow and then also be encouraged to renege on their debt so they would destroy their own credit. People would have credit cards with the electronic strip on it and once they got used to that then it would be pointed out the advantage of having all of that combined into a single credit card, serving a single monetary system and then they won’t have to carry around all that plastic.

102. So, the next step would be the single card and then the next step would be to replace the single card with a skin implant in a place that would be convenient to the skin; for example your right hand or your forehead. At that time when I heard this I was unfamiliar with the statements in the Book of Revelation. The speaker went on to say, “Now some of you people who read the Bible will attach significance to this to the Bible,” but he went on to disclaim any Biblical significance.

103. There was some mention, also, of implants that would lend themselves to surveillance by providing radio signals. This could be under the skin or a dental implant, put in like a filling so that either fugitives or possibly other citizens could be identified by a certain frequency from his personal transmitter and could be located at any time or any place by any authority.

104. “You’ll be watching television and somebody will be watching you at the same time at a central monitoring station.” The TV set wouldn’t have to be on for this to be operative. How would we get people to accept these things into their homes? This was described by being what we now know as Cable TV to replace the antenna TV. And then the cable would be the means of carrying the surveillance message to the monitor. By the time people found out that this monitoring was going on, they would also be very dependent upon television for a number of things. Television would be used for would be purchases. You wouldn’t have to leave your home.
105. There was some discussion of audio monitors too, just in case the authorities wanted to hear what was going on in rooms other than where the television monitor was. In regard to this the statement was made, “Any wire that went into your house, for example your telephone wire, could be used this way.” It was mentioned that there would be service trucks all over the place, working on the wires and putting in new cables. This is how insiders would know how things were progressing.

106. Privately owned housing would become a thing of the past. The cost of housing and financing housing would gradually be made so high that most people couldn’t afford it. More and more unsold houses would stand vacant. People just couldn’t buy them. You’d think, well the vacant house, the price would come down, the people would buy it. But the price would be held high even though there were many available so that free market places would not operate. People would not be able to buy these and gradually more and more of the population would be forced into small apartments that would not accommodate very many children. Ultimately, people would be assigned where they would live and it would be common to have non-family members living with you. This by way of your not knowing just how far you could trust anybody.

107. This would all be under the control of a central housing authority. Have this in mind in 1990 when they ask, “How many bedrooms in your house? How many bathrooms in your house? Do you have a finished game room?” This information is personal and is of no national interest to government.

108. When the new system takes over, people will be expected to sign allegiance to it, indicating that they don’t have any reservations or holding back to the old system. “There just won’t be any room,” he said, “for people who won’t go along. We can’t have such people cluttering up the place so such people would be taken to special places,” and here I don’t remember the exact words, but the inference I drew was that at these special places where they were taken, then they would not live very long. He may have said something like, “disposed of humanely.”

109. Somewhere in this vein he said there would not be any martyrs. When I first heard this I thought it meant the people would not be
killed, but as the presentation developed what he meant was they would not be killed in such a way or disposed of in such a way that they could serve as inspiration to other people the way martyrs do. Rather, he said something like this. “People will just disappear.”

110. The bringing in of the new system he said probably would occur on a weekend in the winter. **Everything would shut down on Friday evening and Monday morning when everybody wakened there would be an announcement that the New System was in place.**

111. During the process in getting the United States ready for these changes **everybody would be busier with less leisure time and less opportunity to really look about and see what was going on around them.**

112. Also, there would be more changes and more difficulty in keeping up regarding one’s investments. Investment instruments would be changing. **Interest rates would be changing so that it would be difficult keeping up with what you already earned.**

113. Interesting about automobiles; it would look as though there were many varieties of automobiles, but when you look very closely there would be great duplication. They would be made to look different with chrome and wheel covers and this sort of thing, but looking closely one would see that the same automobile was made by more than one manufacturer.

114. I’m hurrying here because I’m just about to the end of the tape. Let me just summarize by saying, all of these things said by one individual at one time in one place relating to so many different human endeavors and then to look and see how many of these actually came about. Meaning the changes accomplished between then and now [1969 – 1988] and the things that are planned for the future. **I think there is no denying that this is controlled and there is indeed a conspiracy.**

115. The question then becomes what to do. I think first off, we must put our faith in God and pray and ask for His guidance. And secondly do what we can to inform other individuals as much as possible. Some people just don’t care, because they’re preoccupied with getting along in their personal endeavors. **Let’s insist on liberty and justice for all.**

[Bolding and numbering added]
Welcome to Section 4

Mary’s articles on
Law and the Human Brain
Humans tend to see persons in authority as having a right to boss them around. Indeed we do need to be led; that’s how our species carries on. In later articles I argue that officials can be acting on a secret agenda and can do harm; I say let them be caught and stopped.

Here the point is that we do have ways of establishing a leader (in the instant case, a monarch) for protection of the society. Remarkably you can see on Youtube the ceremony in which the queen was crowned in 1953. She does not march in all boss-like. The archbishop takes her to east, south, west, and north of the church to see if it is all right with the people to proceed. He asks each section if they recognize (as in approve of) Queen Elizabeth. When each group shouts affirmation, she BOWS to them.

Please read the Order of Service for the Coronation (abridged) on next two pages, for more surprises:
Her Majesty having already on Tuesday, the fourth day of November, 1952, in the presence of the two Houses of Parliament, made and signed the Declaration prescribed by Act of Parliament), the Archbishop asks: Madam, is your Majesty willing to take the Oath?
And the Queen answering, I am willing, The Queen, having a book in her hands, shall answer each question ….
Archbishop: Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the Peoples of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, **Australia**, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Ceylon, and Pakistan... according to their respective laws and customs? Queen: I solemnly promise so to do.
Archbishop: Will you to your power cause Law and Justice, in Mercy, to be executed in all your judgements? Queen: I will…

Then the Queen… laying her right hand upon… the great Bible (tendered to her as she kneels upon the steps), [says]:
The things which I have here before promised,
I will perform, and keep. So help me God….  

**The Epistle... Peter 2, 13.** Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God….
The Archbishop shall say:... Bless and sanctify thy chosen servant ELIZABETH, … Confirm and stablish her with thy free and princely Spirit, the Spirit of wisdom and government,… the Spirit of knowledge and true godliness, and fill her, O Lord, with the Spirit of thy holy fear, now and for ever; through Jesus Christ our Lord. **Amen.** This prayer being ended, and the people standing, the choir shall sing (I Kings 1, 39, 40):
Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet anointed Solomon king; and all the people rejoiced and said God save the king, Long live
the king, May the king live for ever. Amen. Hallelujah. The Spurs shall be brought from the Altar …Hear our prayers, O Lord, we beseech thee, and so direct and support thy servant Queen ELIZABETH, that she may not bear the Sword in vain;

but may use it as the minister of God for the terror and punishment of evildoers, and for the protection and encouragement of those that do well. . . . .

The …Archbishop shall deliver the Sceptre with the Cross into the Queen’s right hand, saying: Receive the Royal Sceptre, the ensign of kingly power and justice. And then he shall deliver the Rod with the Dove into the Queen’s left hand, and say: Receive the Rod of equity and mercy. Be so merciful that you be not too remiss, so execute justice that you forget not mercy. Punish the wicked, protect and cherish the just, and lead your people in the way wherein they should go.

The Dean of Westminster shall bring the Crown, and the Archbishop shall reverently put it upon the Queen’s head. At the sight whereof the people, with loud and repeated shouts, shall cry,

\textit{GOD SAVE THE QUEEN}

The Archbishop shall solemnly bless her: . . . The Lord bless you and keep you. The Lord protect you in all your ways and prosper all your handywork. Amen. The Lord give you faithful Parliaments and quiet Realms; sure defence against all enemies; fruitful lands and a prosperous industry; wise counsellors and upright magistrates; leaders of integrity in learning and labour; a devout, learned and useful clergy; honest peaceable and dutiful citizens. Amen.
It was startling to learn that Laurent Louis, a 32-year-old member of Belgium’s parliament, got arrested for slander. I was also surprised to see that it happened back in March, 2014, and yet there has been almost no coverage of it!

Louis’ sin was not his famous “Fuck you” to everybody in the House of Reps. This time he said “Thank you, Mr Pedophile, oops I mean Mr Prime Minister.” The Belgian constitution protects him from being punished for any statement made on the floor, but perhaps he repeated it later. Youtube shows his brutal arrest. There is no excuse for any cop, anywhere, using force on someone who is not resisting arrest. The really bad news is that his colleagues around the world, including Oz parliamentarians, did not kick up a fuss. Wimps, no?

I’d Vote for Passionate Outbursts Any Day
I am 100% in favor of strong statements in the House of Reps, the Senate, the local council meeting, or any place in which persons we have entrusted with our lives are attempting to justify their decisions. Polite talk is nice but there are greater values at stake. Even slander has to be allowed during parliamentary debate.

What is the legal position? In 1689, when William and Mary were recuperating from the Glorious Revolution, the English
Bill of Rights proclaimed: “Freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of parliament.”

That idea was incorporated into the Constitution of the US in 1787. In Australia, the Constitution of 1901 allowed parliament to enact legislation about this, which it finally got around to doing in 1987 with the Parliamentary Privilege Act. Belgium also has, on its books, parliamentary privilege. Louis was fined 50,000 euros and given a suspended prison sentence.

Anyway, it was obvious that there would be action against him as he had been speaking the truth about invasive wars, and strongly condemning the fakery and political crime that virtually characterize our era. No doubt he will be harassed in such a way that he will lose the next election, and that will “solve the Louis Laurent problem.”

This was done to Cynthia McKinney in the US Congress. She did not know how to be polite: she called a member of the Executive to task! (Donald Rumsfeld). Then, out she went. Darn, I just checked Wikipedia: Louis has indeed departed parliament.

**Mr Fujita in Parliament, and Japan’s ‘Peace’ Value**

Do you recall the case of a parliamentarian in Japan, Yukihisa Fujita? In 2008 he said — without invective, expletive, or any other breach of etiquette, though massive breach of ingovernment loyalty perhaps:

“I would like to ask about the suspicious information being uncovered and the doubts people worldwide are having about the events of 9-11. [Please] look at this panel. This is concrete evidence in the form of photographs…. The first photograph [shows the size of the plane] that hit the Pentagon. It had a width of 38 meters. So as you can see even though such a large plane hit the Pentagon there is only a hole that is too small for the airplane.”

His speech was broadcast nationally in Japan on NHK-TV. Japan has had a strong tradition since 1945 of not taking part in
war. So Mr Fujita was at least able to find a context in which to express his disapproval of the US’s invasion of Afghanistan.

Consider how lacking we are now in the ability to state such a value! If a European like Laurent, or an Australian like… um… can’t think of one, were to say “We shouldn’t be killing people,” that speaker is immediately suspect. He or she is considered a fool, a crazy, or downright lacking in loyalty.

This is why Laurent Louis is my man. He is my man because he puts forth rather normal values! He talks sense. He hates spin. His pedopile speech (on Youtube) is watermelon city.

**Anger Has Its Place**

How can one express one’s anger and frustration with the terrible set-up in which we now find ourselves? The actual phrase Louis used was “J’emmerde So-and-So”, meaning, more or less “I spread excrement on so-and-so.” Like “Fuck you” in English it is a way of assaulting someone verbally.

Shakespeare might have said “Fie on So-and-So.” Aussies would say “You bastard! Scumbag!” It doesn’t matter what word is used. The point is to condemn what is being done. Laurent Louis is saying “The wars are not being fought in self defense; they are genocidal.” I myself am trying to say this all the time. I am also saying that the natural disasters such as tornados are fake-natural; they are high-tech genocide. Ditto for the epidemics. Ask me about autism.

Personally, it wouldn’t suit me to scream “Eff you.” Yet, by keeping anger out of the picture we miss out on a big advantage. Humans evolved to have anger as a weapon against anyone causing harm. We’re supposed to lower the boom on them. They, in turn, have a shame mechanism in them to make them respond. To hold back on anger is to frustrate the biological mechanism. Monsieur Louis was screaming about his legislature’s plan to aid a cruel war in Africa. Please send Louis a compliment.

*At Youtube channel ‘Mary W Maxwell,’ see “Anger Management.”*
AN AUSTRALIAN DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE
by Mary W Maxwell, December 21, 2013

Last week the High Court of Australia struck down as unconstitutional a statute allowing same-sex marriage. That act had been passed by the legislatures of one of Australia’s territories, namely, the Australian Capital Territory of Canberra, in an area of law in which it lacked authority.

Ah, but the High Court, in rolling back the offending law, also said that the gay men and women who were legally married during the life of that law are no longer married today. Sorry, High Court, no can do. This is not in your jurisdiction.

Your jurisdiction is only law, not biological reality. In reality, once a couple receives the blessing of society for its union, as these couples did, something else kicks in. I know it happened to me when I married my (opposite sex) partner in 1980. It is a biological-psychological thing. The expression of approval by the society, and the implied promise of society’s support, greatly increases the effect of the union.

Must have been God (or if you prefer, Evolution) that arranged this, and there is nothing a judicial entity should do, or can do, to alter it. A lifelong commitment, irrespective of any paperwork that happens to accompany it, marks a huge physiological change. What occurs at a wedding is as close to “sacred” as anything can be, and societies back to the Year Dot have acknowledged that sacredness.

Can we please respect that? Note: be it bloke-bloke, Sheila-Sheila, or bloke-Sheila, it’s EXACTLY THE SAME THING. How could it be otherwise? There is only one “program” for adoring the beloved. As Helen E Fisher points out in her excellent book,
Why We Love, there is brain chemistry in the human make-up that makes marriage NATURAL, pleasant, and secure.

In Australia, the legal principle of “ultra vires” (“beyond power”) applies. When a government official, or the whole government, acts ultra vires, such as by making laws that the Constitution does not given them the power to make, the act can be subsequently wiped out. Such correction is vitally important, as any extant laws that violate the Constitution have a way of conditioning people to a weak and wimpy constitution, and we don’t want that.

So let me not be accused of disparaging the High Court’s rollback of offending legislation (even if I think it is monstrous of Parliament to deprive any adult of the right to marry). I side with Sir Walter Scott who, in 1828, accused Napoleon of parricide – killing of a parent – for his killing of the French Constitution, as necessary to the life of the French nation as a parent is to a child.

In the US, I am on record demanding Supreme Court rollback of such outrageously unconstitutional acts as the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 and the Homeland Security (how could Congress use words like that!) Act of 2002. My statement here is only that there is NO WAY to unmarry the same-sex couples who got married in Canberra when they were told it was legal to do so. Biology trumps the judiciary. Love trumps legalism.

I recall being astonished, a few days after my wedding, by the changes wrought in me by having had our marriage legalized. Absolute magic happened when the celebrant said “I now pronounce you man and wife, according to the laws of Australia.” What if someone today popped up to tell me I am no longer married because the celebrant, or the Registry clerk, acted ultra vires (perhaps because they were unqualified to hold the job)? Would I insist that I am married no matter what? Of course I would, and the Canberra couples should do like wise.

Come on, High Court, let’s show some respect for the human race.
A Plague on Your House, or Theirs?

by Mary W Maxwell, December 6, 2014

A review of Plague: One Scientist’s Intrepid Search for the Truth about Human Retroviruses and Chronic Fatigue Syndrome, Autism, and Other Diseases, by Kent Heckenlively, JD, and Judy Mikovits, PhD.

“Plague” is a very refreshing book. It’s all about honesty, and an honest gal, Judy Mikovits. (I’ve met Judy; she’s very likable as well as super-smart.)

The book reveals massive dishonesty in science. Yep, that sort of became the norm a couple of decades ago. The author, Kent Heckenlively, gives scientists a great drubbing here. He has been a careful chronicler of exactly what went on in Judy’s case, which had to do with her finding a retrovirus, XMRV, in the disease known as chronic fatigue syndrome (CFS), which is also called myalgic encephalomyelitis (ME).

She was arrested, without a warrant, for stealing her own research notes. It was a case without any merit but we are in a law-disrespecting world. The purpose of the arrest, you can bet on this, was to send a message to all biologists: Keep your mitts off the subject matter of CFS and autism.

I think Heckenlively and Mikovits have missed a point about something, or maybe they feel they mustn’t say it, so I will say it. Namely, the attack on Judy, which involved putting her in jail, and making her declare bankruptcy, and slandering her in the journals, must have been orchestrated at a much higher level than that of
her apparent attackers, the family of Harvey Whittemore.

I judge Whittemore himself to be a victim. I think he was ‘in place’ all along to assure that US Senator Harry Reid would be able to stay in the senate. For that matter, I think Reid is a victim, too. It’s the Way High Ups that run us all, and Reid is only their servant. An example: Reid said of Chuck Hagel, when Hagel recently resigned as US Defense Secretary:

“He was a leader in the fight to get our Iraq policy right. [Ahem, getting ‘policy’ right is not the job of the Pentagon.] He also worked hard to ensure that our veterans had the resources they needed.”

(Seriously, folks, he said that, and I’ll bet he didn’t even blush.)

So when will Americans stop talking nonsense? I think this book will go a long way toward putting honesty, and reality, back on the map. I think it will also help correct the currently upside-down situation in “Medicine,” in which the suffering of the patient has no claim on the attention of decision makers!

Mikovits has correctly pointed to the absolutely awful way CFS victims were accused of making their symptoms up, or were labeled as having a “Yuppie Flu.” That pitch must itself have been well orchestrated by the media (Ask: why?), and it did indeed keep respectable researchers away from the topic for twenty years after the disease emerged in the 1980s! Meanwhile the worst-off patients endure a more or less living hell.

The book ends on a low note, suggesting that CFS research cannot now go ahead. I say it can go full steam ahead thanks to this elegant presentation of the outrages that are occurring on a regular basis in such institutions as the NIH, the CDC, and the journal “Science.” But this will require a changeover from the standard meek approach. Those who are harming us, i.e., the Way High Ups, and their thousands of servants, have to be dealt with. Sorry, but there is no other way. Spending energy on proving the details of retroviruses is not going to do it.

Do you want to be involved? Have you had it up to the eyeballs with falsity and ‘spin’? Do you want to take on these bastards? The world is waiting for you to do something.
We Are All Aborigines Now

by Mary W Maxwell, March 4, 2015

Yesterday, at Adelaide Writer’s Week, one of the speakers was Sam Wagan Watson, an Australian poet. He is also the son of a poet, Sam Watson. They are Aboriginal. The son’s new book is “Love Poems and Death Threats.”

The son reached into his ‘archives’ and read a poem about “deaths in custody” (1996). That’s a story that we Aussies are -- unforgivably -- very familiar with. I was moved to go to the microphone, when the audience was invited to comment, and say “We are all Aborigines now.”

I asked the poet if he could help us “in the face of the coming violence.” I added “You’ve had two centuries to deal with your shock, but we have only barely started to acknowledge our shock.” Mr Watson did not hesitate to show that he is on my wavelength. He said he wants to help, but needs time to think about it.

Zheesh! It was so nice to have somebody understand.

A young woman approached me afterward and said she shares the same view. She and I discussed the Port Arthur massacre and wrong imprisonment of Martin Bryant. Martin is not yet a “death in custody.” But may qualify ere long. I’ve read that he has attempted suicide several times -- though when a suicide occurs in a jail, who can ever know if it was really a suicide?

We need to be just as ashamed of Martin Bryant’s unfair incarceration as that of the many indigenous people.

Still, my comment to Poet Watson was by no means simply about deaths in custody. It’s about the way in which the people of Australia are now like “colonials.” Quite possibly, all peoples today
are lorded over by World Government with as much violence as any of the old empires used in lording it over their colonials. We are in massive trouble. (Sam Watson is well aware of this.)

I have been claiming, at Gumshoe News, that I “got it.” But now, with the new dimension of seeing us as being in a position similar to the one that Australia’s indigenous population has long been in, I want to re-think the matter.

My position had been that the explanation for people’s silence about the extremely obvious crime of 9-11 – I mean, obvious that it was an inside job -- is that we are loathe to consider our leaders as bad. (Bad-silly, yes, but bad-murderous and treacherous, no.) Replying to Dee Mae Lachlan’s article about Danish scientist Neils Harrit (a libel case against a journalist who called him a ‘crackpot’ for his theory of the 9-11 building collapse), I commented to Gumshoe:

“What we don’t have the ability to deal with, is an enemy that looks like us and is occupying prestigious roles in our society. Might as well call this The Daddy Syndrome. We simply cannot haul our own Dad into jail. Let’s see if the Danish court dares to accuse Daddy.”

I suggested that the Danish court simply cannot find in favor of Professor Harrit, as that would entail an admission that the WTC probably came down by high-tech means, rather than by boxcutter-wielding, zealous hijackers. I predicted that the Danish judges, like every American judge that has so far handled a 9-11-related case, will twist the law, or simply break the law, and protect “Daddy.”

[Update: Yes, Harrit lost his appeal.]

On Being Walloped by an Imperial Power
After hearing Sam Wagan Watson speak, under the lovely treetop blue tent at Adelaide, I am tempted to change my approach, or at least broaden it. Picture the Aboriginal locals in Botany Bay who ‘greeted’ Captain Cook in 1788. What options did they have for repelling this invader?
Most likely they had no option. Their best strategy was to run away. For individuals, a reasonable strategy is to adapt, to accept bad treatment. Isn’t this what most of us do when facing a great imbalance of power? We have a biological mechanism for coping with inferior status; all species that have pecking orders do this.

So now I am pursuing the idea that our reluctance to arrest officials for 9-11 isn’t entirely due to The Daddy Syndrome. It could rest on a correct calculation that World Government, with its unlimited weaponry (taxpayer-funded!), is so able to clobber us that we shouldn’t even resist. Better to be in denial.

The Loss of Solidarity
Despite humans being competitive, it is possible for a group – if it has no outside attackers – to achieve a more or less harmonious life. Today, communities have been broken up, by quite deliberate planning. Since sometime in the 1980s, I’d say, it has become unfashionable to celebrate tradition! One is supposed to prefer constant change. This new outlook was itself carefully engineered as a way to weaken us.

Thus we Australians now find ourselves without solidarity or even the mateship for which we were once famous. It’s worse than having one’s guns taken away; actual emotional changes have been designed. They create the motivation for each person to look out mainly for himself. That’s really shocking, isn’t it?

Add to that, that the members of professions have somehow learned that their loyalty is exclusively to the status quo of their group. If that conflicts with the community’s needs, stiff biccies.

The Coming Violence
‘Someone’ is now trying to condition us to be more accepting of violence. Video games in which you are encouraged to kill people are a sign of that; much of rap music is, too. The biggest conditioning we are getting has to do with torture, and police crackdowns on citizens. For instance, we were told on March 2, 2015 that the FBI had murdered a man in his home, Ibragim
Todashev, friend of Boson Marathon man Tsarnaev. Amazing. A few days earlier The Guardian had described life in Honan Square Prison in Chicago as follows:

“Prisoners were kicked in the genitals while helpless and bound [fathom it!], put in ‘kennels for humans’, and they heard the bloodcurdling screams of other helpless victims. One man ended up being shackled to the “little circular thing behind the bench,” arms spread open, being fed only twice in 3 days.”

Also, Sgt Graner, one of the men court-martialled for abusing prisoners at Abu Ghraib, had a record of horrible acts in the US prior to going overseas. However, the stateside prisoner who had complained about Graner was released “and lost sight of.” That (quite unnecessarily) closed the case.

Help Sam Wagan Watson To Help Us
The poet of the day says he will try to think of something, so that Oz does not capitulate en masse today. You, too, can canvass ideas. Picture our dilemma like this: If the real Port Arthur killers (not Bryant) were identified, what would happen?

Is there a justice system in Australia that could go after those murderers, no matter how hard the media pressed for suppression of the truth? Or are all our officials “prevented” from thinking along those lines?

If members of the justice system are prevented merely by habit, by custom, or by the ever-present fear of sticking out, perhaps someone could get them to eschew such nonsensical behavior!

After all, if ever there was an institution that allows the less-powerful to throw its combined weight against the very powerful, it is the law, nicht wahr?

What a difference it would make, all around, if legal personnel would resume talking as if they understood the law to be a power in itself! It is, undoubtedly, our best hope against having to ignominiously surrender all our rights to the new and disgusting empire of World Government.
Sins committed by authorities bespeak a flaw in our social arrangements. My book \textit{Prosecution for Treason} calls for indictment of legislators who make policy, and judges who do wrong by failing to identify as illegal the laws that “make war on the people.” In 1995, US legislators made no response to eyewitness testimony by victims of MK-Ultra mind control, such as Claudia Mullen. \textit{This is treason on legislators’ part, in the form of being an ‘accomplice to treason,’ or ‘accessory after the fact.’}  

This article is about the role of doctors. In another book of mine, \textit{(Consider the Lilies: A Review of 18 Cures for Cancer)}. I was sympathetic to doctors. Lately I’m more willing to place blame on all doctors for the sin of silence committed by their official groups, such as the American Medical Association and the Royal College of Physicians.  

The prestige of the big medical institutions is often used to diminish the public’s awareness of medical evil. A doctor, who might otherwise rail against evil doctors, is overwhelmed by the glory of his profession (as members of all professions are) and accepts their silence.  

This has got to stop. The public surely wants their doctors to be forthright about anything that is going wrong in the profession. \textit{They should indeed be angry at their particular doctor} if he, by his silence, endorses what those big medical institutions do.  

\textbf{The Case of Aubrey Levin, MD}  
As reported by Dee McLachlan in Gumshoeneews, a doctor from South Africa forcibly subjected gay men in the military to gender reassignment, during the apartheid era. Can you imagine! Levin escaped to Canada and was prosecuted there, this year, “on another matter.” He is now in jail. (Or so they say -- but do we really know?) I’ll bet his Canadian crime was concocted to prevent him being held accountable for the bigger issue in South Africa.
Anyway, some interesting details came out in his case. First of all, he was able to immigrate to Canada, despite having refused to testify to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa. I ask: Who reviewed his case for admission to Canada? Who reviewed the granting of his medical license in Alberta? Who decided that he would be appointed as adjunct professor of psychiatry at the University of Calgary? Who interviewed him?

My sense of those kinds of vetting is that they are rigorous. Hence it’s likely that he is a protected sort of person. Having been naughty in one country he is able to find haven in another, all by way of the interconnectedness of the powerful, globally.

The case for which Aubrey Levin is now serving a 5-year sentence has to do with his sexual assault on a patient, during treatment. The man said he reported it to authorities but was not believed. This patient then purchased a spy-camera ring and caught the doctor on video making sexual advances to him during treatment.

Dr Levin’s main group of patients were prisoners. Again we may ask: Who decided that this doctor would hold a job that has huge power over helpless prisoners? God help us all when we are imprisoned someday.

What Should Be Done about Levin’s Behavior?
I don’t know the particulars of Levin’s South African misdeeds. I do know that it is always easy for a doctor, even regarding the “aversion therapy” given to gays, to claim that it was being done to help the patient! I’ll bet a doctor could do absolutely anything
to anyone and say it was meant therapeutically -- and most people would accept that interpretation.

The solution here is to battle such an interpretation the minute it is enunciated. The proper place to do this is at the Licensing Board. Each state and province has a board, made up of a majority of doctors and a few citizens, that can revoke licenses. It may give the lesser disciplinary penalty: temporary suspension of license. (Lesser, but still something any doctor dreads, as it affects his reputation forever.)

Typical causes of revocation or suspension are: incompetence, unethical practice (say, taking money for a false insurance claim), and the prescribing of narcotics to the doctor's family members. Meetings of the licensing board are held on a regular schedule and the results are published. Revocation of license is not a criminal matter.

But judicial procedures can additionally take place, of course. A patient can sue and the state can indict. Most people opt for suing the doctor. Consider this important fact in human nature: if you take your complaint about a doctor to your lawyer, she can envision drawing a fee from your winnings in a lawsuit, **but she will get little for urging you to push for a prosecution.**

Were she to push prosecution she may find her tyres slashed. (Or she may get strontium 38, a point about which Dee has just received a message that sounds like a threat – “Tiny piece of SR38 would mean the end of her.” in the Comments to her 9-11 article on National Institute of Standards and Technology!!)

**Is a Vaccination an Assault?**

Let’s talk about patients’ rights. Every doctor and nurse is aware that he can give medication only to a consenting patient. *(Consent is assumed if the person is unconscious).* It’s a brave nurse who forces a shot on a resisting adult! Yet the public does not know this. We tend to think a decision made by a doctor or a hospital for our own good is enforceable at their pleasure. *We think:* “They need to act this way, as they would get in trouble for not doing so.”
Forget it. You are in charge of what goes into your body. If someone puts something into you against your will, that is plainly an assault, by law. (If they merely put a cotton bud in your ear, against your will, that’s an assault – and they know it.) Regarding babies, see the stunning collection of reports at Followingvaccinations.com, Joan Campbell’s website in the UK. It is a list of assaults, but it does not mention the issue of criminality.

The giving of a Hepatitis-B shot to a newborn requires positive written consent from the mother. Many mothers say No, but they later find that the nurse gave the shot “by mistake.” What is the correct procedure here? The mother or father should lay an information with police. It is plainly an assault. If the police won’t let them, they should bring a short report to the local courthouse.

I venture to guess that the nurse did not ‘forget.’ Rather she is operating under pressure from doctors. (Note: the Hep-B shot is typically given before the baby is one-hour old!) She may be hoping you will complain officially, and then she will be freed from the pressure. I’ll bet doctors, also, want to stop giving Hep-B to newborns.

In sum, there has been a crazy immunity granted, by the public, to all doctors. Despite my mention of “gender-reassignment” and Hep-B shots, I’m not arguing the case (at the moment) against those. I am arguing that every doctor is equal to every non-doctor when it comes to crime. Blame them for anything bad they do to society. Don’t just absolve them.

Note: For the best rundown on vaccines by an autism parent, see Tim Welsh’s April 2014 article at ageofautism.com entitled “Tanner’s Dad: 20 Reasons I Question Vaccine Safety.” (Welsh is, IMHO, right up there with Laurent Louis for willingness to speak truth to power.)
Anyone who has been following Dee’s articles for a few months, knows that she wrote to Trade Minister Andrew Robb’s office several times to ask if he had read the proposed agreement known as the Trans Pacific Partnership, TPP.

Astonishingly, she could not get a Yes answer. The person in charge (i.e., in charge of fobbing off intelligent citizens) kept using this phrase: “He is engaged in the process.”

I take that to be a ‘No.’ The relevant minister DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IS IN A CONTRACT THAT AUSTRALIA IS READY TO BECOME PARTY TO.

Are you fainting? Do you need your smelling salts? Oh Aussies, dear Aussies, I have just said that one of our leaders is about to oblige us to follow some new rules that are neither of Australia’s making, nor have they been discussed!!! This is a whole new concept in yielding of the nation’s sovereignty. IT MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO HAPPEN.

Robb may as well say, à la Menzies, “It is my melancholy duty to inform you that some globalists have designed a new system of law and political power-sharing among the nations of the Pacific, and hence, we will no longer be able to make certain laws in Parliament. Yes, that’s the deal. May God bless us all, etc, etc.”

Back in 1939, when Menzies took Australia into Britain’s war, he possibly committed treason. I don’t know and haven’t looked into it. But there cannot be the slightest doubt that anyone who signs this country into a deal as wicked as the TPP is committing treason.

**Traitor Mary?**

I pause to say that I am a dual citizen of US and Australia. You may be thinking of calling me a traitor to my old nation, as the US appears to be the sponsor of the TPP.

Wrong. Any official of the US government who signs the TPP is also committing treason. There is not the slightest room in
the Constitution of 1787 for the Great Republic to surrender its powers of lawmaking. Ever. In any way.

Incidentally, I haven’t time to check, but it’s my guess that the American public, once known for jealously guarding the Con, is possibly unaware that pens are poised in Hawaii, even as we speak, to carry out this dastardly deed.

**Traitor Andrew? Traitor Tony?**
The law against the crime of treason is found in Australia’s Criminal Code of 2002 (which updated the Crimes Act of 1914). *Go to Part 5.1, Division 80.1.* It provides a penalty of life imprisonment (the parallel law in the US orders death) for a person who “levies war, or does any act preparatory to levying war, against the Commonwealth.”

Your first reaction may be “Hey, wait a minute, signing the TPP has nothing to do with levying war.” Yes it does.

What if some blokes (foreign or native) walked into Parliament House in Canberra and shot the members of Cabinet – would that be levying war against the Commonwealth? Yes, by tradition such a thing would easily qualify.

I say once we have kowtowed to the globalists by giving up the powers of parliament, Australia will be attackable. The men who would be on duty, say, the Cabinet, will have been “removed” (even if they do not, as in my example, fall dead on the floor).

Am I saying that to sign away the sovereignty of the nation is on a par with walking into Parliament House and slaying the occupants? Yes, precisely. And there’s jurisprudence to that effect.

**Mental Furniture Needs To Be Refreshed**
We have come a long way from being ready to punish, personally, a bad politician. Instead we joke about them. *At worst we “threaten” to vote them out at the next election.* This suggests that our mental furniture is “off.”

The pieces of furniture in our mind need to include such items as “nation” “loyalty” “sovereignty” “virility” (ah, Aeneas!) “treason” and “crime.” Something has clearly happened, since
around 1980, to make people see the government at a separate entity from the people.

Australians sometimes say the government is acting against the national interest. This is logically impossible. The pollies are representatives of the people. They must act for the citizens. If they are acting for bosses outside the nation, they have stopped being what their title says they are. They are interlopers and have to be stopped. They are traitors.

I have just read an article on a serious website, about the imminent signing of the “Trans Pacific Partnership” — TPP — to which hundreds of citizens sent intelligent comments. But none of them said “This must stop.”

Isn’t that crazy? Of course it must stop. Our pollies must say, “No, thank you.” (And, as I said, ‘Obamanation’ must also say “No, thank you” to the TPP.)

Pressures from Here and There
Is your reply to me that “Mr Abbott, Ms Bishop, Mr Robb, and others are under pressure, so they have to sign?”

How dare you think that way? What pressures are you talking about? We have a whole continent to ourselves. We have an educated population. We have resources galore. Why would these three personages be forced to do anything?

Who is the boss of Tony Abbott? To whom is he accountable? I suspect some may say “To Murdoch” or “To Wesfarmers” or to the such-and-such institute. Well, excu-u-use me! Tony Abbott, as prime minister of Australia, has only one boss. Look in the mirror and you will see who that is. The prime minister is accountable to you – exclusively. As for Mr Robb, he may be overseas, in a fancy boardroom in Hawaii, but he is entirely accountable to you. Please, Aussies, get ahold of yourself.

The Wrong Mental Furniture Leads to the Wrong Ideas
I wrote in a Gumshoenews article of October 7, 2014:

“A traitor is considered a loathsome creature. This is partly because it’s so surprising that anyone would help an enemy group, instead of being loyal to his own group, the very basis
of his existence and sustenance. Indeed it would pay us today to inquire as to how, psychologically, anyone might be tempted into committing treason.”

Aussies, this whole thing is our fault. We have been timid in the extreme when it comes to calling the shots. Are you old enough to remember the tremendous turnout of protesters on March 13, 2003? Every man and his dog and cat and cockatoo, and whatever else, marched in the downtown area of the capital cities, to instruct John Howard not to feel that it was his melancholy duty to kiss George W Bush’s arse.

The nation said, in the clearest terms it has ever used (that is, it used body mass): “Government, oppose any Oz involvement in the invasion of Iraq.” Then, on March 17, without any apparent shame or even hesitation, parliament voted to involve Oz in the invasion of Iraq. At that moment we should have arranged for the arrest of the members of government. Whatever gave them the notion that they could do that?

Please challenge me if you think otherwise; I’ll be fascinated to learn of your theory as to how it be OK for Canberra to rule in direct contradiction of the people’s orders.

**Arrest the Smaller Fry**

American journalist Wayne Madsen has often pointed out that when the Biggies are doing something outrageous, it is reasonable and effective to chase after the lesserites, whom he calls “small fry.”

Indeed, as nonagenarian whistleblower Rodney Stich often
notes, there is a law in place that allows you to go for the lesserites without bringing the full criminal case against them. This is the law of “misprision.”

Is it too overwhelming to think of getting Andrew Robb, or Attorney General George Brandis for treason in regard to the TPP? Relax. You can go for those who know of those men’s crime but fail to report it. Of course that could mean anyone, including the cashier at your supermarket (if she be well-informed).

Section 2b, of the same treason law quoted above, says:

“A person commits an offence if the person: knowing that another person intends to commit treason, does not inform a constable of it within a reasonable time or use other reasonable endeavours to prevent the commission of the offence.”

Amazingly, the penalty (for this crime of misprision, i.e., non-reporting) is: “Imprisonment for life.”

Who Is Nuts Today?
Surely you must be thinking I’m nuts. (Don’t worry, I have that feeling, too). But really it’s the government and the whole citizenry, who would believe for a minute that we should TPP it, that is ready for the nuthouse.

Please note that the punishments in China today for even small infractions of the law are absolutely atrocious. Is that what you want your children to experience? That is what happens when bullies run a country and no one dares speak out.

Fetch a megaphone. Or at least write a few emails. To government? Hell, no. That did not work for Dee and it will not work for you. Just write to your best friends.

As soon as the government members realize they are getting pressure from below instead of merely getting pressure from above, they will do the right thing. That pressure from below consists of your knowing what you gonna do.

Trust me. It will be easy to turn this thing around. Believing it to be impossible is the main thing which is causing such nonsense to occur. Just get a grip. You’ll be right, Mate.
**UPDATE** Why are we putting everyone in the world in peril over absolutely nothing the non-terrorist event of 9-11?

1. More than 2,000 people were killed in New York on 9-11, and Manhattan’s environment remained polluted for years.

2. The US, on no basis at all, proceeded immediately to bomb Afghanistan, then Iraq, causing an estimated 1.4 million deaths, with depleted-uranium weapons causing horrific birth defects.

3. Muslims were persecuted without restraint, and Americans had their civil liberties trashed. Surveillance became pervasive.

4. Soldiers of the ‘coalition countries’ were taught to torture, and the young generation in America has grown up thinking it’s OK to bomb any nation and to make regime change at will.

5. To continue the cover-up, the judicial system has become a hive of lies and word-twisting.

6. The population is in fear, and is in a state of denial about that fear, and intellectuals are afraid to speak of sweet reason.

In high school, we had to learn Cicero’s “*Quo usque tandem abutere, Catalina, patientia nostra?*” “How long, O Cataline, will you continue to abuse our patience?” Shouldn’t that question be asked today re 9-11? God help us all.
In 1983, Ed Griffin interviewed Russian defector Yuri Bezmenov. There was no Youtube then, but it’s been made into a Youtube video. A seven-minute investment of your time will be quite rewarding. This Russian guy knew everything about how to condition Americans. And he didn’t like doing it!

Bezmenov says his assignment was “demoralization.” He and colleagues were told to “change the perception of reality to such an extent that, despite the amount of information available, no one is able to come to sensible conclusions in the defense of himself, his family, his community or his country.” (Now will you believe me, dear Reader?)

I wonder if Ivan Pavlov was, like Bezmenov, a sort of Russian worker for Tavistock. Pavlov won the 1904 Nobel Prize in physiology, for making a dog salivate when a bell rang, as the dog had been conditioned to associate the bell with a nice juicy steak.

Although the Tavistock Institute did not open its doors in London until 1921, there’s evidence that British Intelligence was skilled in psychological warfare way before that. Not that it took a salivating dog to teach the covert agencies how to condition their fellow man. I think they had only to watch how human nature works. Much of our behavior is sub-rational. We are so easily taken advantage of it’s almost a joke!
Conditioning is, mainly, a natural phenomenon. When we’re little, we get used to whatever foods are customary in our locale. Might be caviar, might be witchety grubs. We like whatever “is.” How else would children pick up culture if they weren’t predisposed to like that which “is”? 

I think we also absorb anything that is “about to be.” **I can condition you to a new reality merely by telling you that it’s going to happen.** (hence the danger of reports of “trending”)

TIME magazine cover does this most adeptly. On the empty white background we see a picture of a high-heeled shoe. The caption was: “**Can anyone stop Hillary?**” Talk about cryptic!

On the date it was published (January 2014), Hillary Clinton wasn’t anywhere near being unstoppable. She had no power base, no campaign, no nothing. But who needs a power base when you’ve got someone broadcasting the wish-fulfillment of her unstoppability? Hillary will indeed be unstoppable if the conditioning works as intended! We’ll know in 2016....

Hillary Clinton’s move from the Senate to the Cabinet was actually unconstitutional, but did Americans care? Apparently not, since **they had been conditioned to believe that the Constitution is no longer the controlling document.** Obama (aka “Barry Soetoro”) had recently defied all lawsuits related to the concealment of his birth certificate.

Possibly Obama’s certificate was in good order, but Seppo’s needed to have it shown to them that parchmentarianism is strictly old hat. (I’m a Seppo and I know the Constitution is not old hat but I don’t have Tavvi’s budget for getting the word around.)
I note that, in 2004, Dubbya Bush announced, from the Rose Garden of all places, that “Bioshield legislation” was making it possible for him to acquire 75 million serves of anti-anthrax vaccine. This rode in on the panic that had been stoked when some letters arrived in the halls of Congress with white powder in them. Hmm. Gotta watch out for that white powder.

Tavistock also likes us to be in a panic for what you might call general purposes. People in a panic are automatically obedient. For instance, if you’re caught in a fire or a landslide, your desire for autonomy goes right down the gurgler.

Hmm. “The Panic of 1908” comes to mind. Panic-making is a business, like cloud-making. (Uh-oh, don’t get me started on clouds….) How in the world were we ever stupid enough to let this be done to us?

Maybe it was the fluoride. Oops, don’t get me started on fluoride. It is soooo disgusting. Don’t accept these insulting games. And please watch that short Yuri Bezmenov video, or a longer one about his Dad in the KGB. It’s embarrassing to note that even this Russian psy-war expert exhorts us to stop being such fools.

Thank you, thank you, Dee McLachlan, for saying that we should simply wake up to the conditioning stuff and resist it.
Welcome to Section 5

Mary’s articles on
Government Killings via False Flags
You may have heard that the Port Arthur massacre of 1996 is called “Australia’s 9-11.” It resembles incidents that we have since come to refer to as “terrorist attacks.” A man walked into a café in Tasmania and, with no apparent motive, shot many of the customers dead. He later killed more folks outside the café; the total was 35 people.

That would hardly make for a subject that could be discussed with the merriment that characterizes entertainment at the Adelaide Fringe. So we decided to change the story line a bit and portray the convicted killer, Martin Bryant, as having had his conviction overturned.
Basically it was found that another man was the shooter (who has – in fiction – confessed, how kind of him), and Martin was not on the premises at all.

Indeed things go very well in our story. The principal witness, Wendy Scurr, who has long stood up for Martin’s innocence, is given a special surprise in our show. She is appointed a vice-regal, yes, Governor of Queensland, to thank her for her integrity and to signal that persons with a mind for truth will now be listened to.

**Inquisitive Students at an Aussie High School**

As part of the Fringe story, we might show a High School teacher asking her students (after the exoneration of Bryant) to analyze the original case. She’ll ask them to identify some factors about Martin Bryant’s arrest that *should have raised red flags*. E.g:

1. Martin did not have a trial, despite his being on a disability pension for mental illness.
2. The shooter shot with right hand, **Martin is a leftie!!!!!!!**
3. Local police were called away to a phony drug bust at the critical moment, a long distance from Port Arthur.
4. **The single-bullets to the heads of 19 of the victims could only have done by a marksman.**
5. Wendy Scurr, who was at Port Arthur all day, and had attended the victims, **was not asked to testify.**
6. Media published a front-page photo of Martin before witnesses could identify him from their recollections.
7. **The only café person who knew Martin, said ‘It’s not him.’**
8. Broad Arrow café was torn down, hiding the evidence.
9. Martin can be heard on a police walkie-talkie at Seascape Cottage, using a calm voice, perhaps with scripted lines.
10. Contrary to state law, Tassie’s Coroners Act 1995, Part V, section 24, no coronial inquest was held. Hence the case is thoroughly suspicious.
In the Opinion of Officer Phil Pyke

Oddly, as recently as 17 months ago, Murdoch’s news.com.au published an article, “My Time with Mass Killer Martin Bryant.” It’s by the police officer, Phil Pyke, who had sat in the hospital room guarding the prisoner.

Recall that Martin Bryant had escaped from the Seascape Cottage with his back on fire. Here he is in the Royal Hobart Hospital, in extreme pain, and yet is handcuffed, in the bed. (“Gotta hate those spree killers,” right?). In his short article, Pyke mentions four times that Martin gave a look of “pure evil.”

I have learned from psychological-warfare literature that if the human ear hears something three times in a short space, the brain cannot resist believing it. The normally critical function of the cerebrum gets overridden.

By the way, should it turn out that Bryant never killed a flea, the alleged “look of pure evil” will have to be accounted for in some other way. Such as that Pyke imagined it?

This policeman also said – but he got this by hearsay – that Bryant made shooting gestures at the nurses, which frightened them. Bit hard to make any gesture in handcuffs, isn’t it?

Pyke went on, in his post-1996 career, to be Media officer for the police and subsequently public relations officer for the Australian Defence Forces.

Maurice Bryant Committed Suicide in 1993

It is worth noting that Pyke built his report about Martin’s awfulness, partly on the basis that he, Pyke, was, coincidentally, the officer who found Martin’s Dad, Maurice Bryant, in a dam on the property in 1995.

The bereaved son “laughed,” he said. By the way, the Dad was reportedly found wearing a weighted belt, to assure his death by drowning. We all have a weighted belt in our wardrobe, don’t we? And a sign was hung on the house: “Get the police.” How very peculiar, if Maurice hung it.
The Mom, Carleen Bryant
It has come out in the medical reports of Martin Bryant that he was connected to the Tavistock Clinic in the UK from an early age, and traveled there several times on his own as an adult. This does not seem to match his diagnosis as mentally retarded. It’s often mentioned that Bryant’s IQ is 66, but do we really know that? Lately I see they are using the word “Asperger’s” in his diagnosis.

The Tavistock connection makes me think that his Mother, Carleen, is also controlled in some way. In the years after 1996, she was said to have been traveling around Australia in a campervan (something one cannot easily verify). It has also often been published that Martin refused prison visits from his Mom. Personally I take that with a grain of salt.

Carleen recently gave Sixty Minutes a chat, vaguely suggesting Martin’s innocence. Would she ever have been allowed to appear on TV like that, if media didn’t feel sure that her message would be pretty tame? Am I suggesting that the media desires that we “keep our shirts on” regarding the Port Arthur massacre? Yes.

Please Get on the Case -- This Is a Do-able
There are various supporters of Bryant around Oz and around the world, but the only one I absolutely trust, so far, is Wendy Scurr, who reportedly is in hiding. She was present at Port Arthur and helped the survivors. Her detailed account can be seen at Youtube.

Why don’t we see any legal eagles pursuing the matter? When I was in law school, a High Court Justice came over to Adelaide to participate in the un-doing of an unfair criminal case that happened a century ago. Just open your eyes, students. There is “material” you can use today….

Wendy Scurr
A “killer bee story” is one that is made up from whole cloth. The name harks back to a time when Murdoch took over a newspaper in Texas. His writer reportedly came up with a fiction and presented it as fact. An early forerunner, perhaps, of the marvelous story of 19 Arab hijackers getting onto 4 planes without benefit of a boarding pass!

In the original killer-bee story, it was said that killer bees would soon be flying up from South America and crossing the Gulf of Mexico into Texas, making life difficult and scary. Never mind that the offending bees did not exist.

Memphis, Tennessee, of All Places

The killer-bee story I wish to discuss today is the one that Wikipedia (i.e., CIA) recalls in its article on our late Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser, under the heading “The Memphis Trousers Affair.” Wikipedia says this:

“On 14 October 1986 [3 years after Hawke succeeded him at the Lodge], Fraser, then the Chairman of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group, was found in the foyer of the Admiral Benbow Inn, a seedy Memphis hotel, wearing only a pair of knickers and confused as to where his trousers were. The hotel was an establishment popular with prostitutes and drug dealers. Though it was rumoured at the time that the former Prime Minister had been with a prostitute, his wife stated that Fraser had no recollection of the events and that she believes it more likely that he was the victim of a practical joke by his fellow delegates.”

Actually, it’s quite decent of the CIA to include that disclaimer. I recall reading the incident in 1986, or hearing it on radio. I don’t recall any disclaimer. Had there been one, I wouldn’t have believed it anyway. We were told outright, with no hesitation, that
Malcolm got rolled by a prostitute — i.e., had his cash taken — and then she took his pants, too. The eminent (humiliated) man had to call his wife, to get some clothes with which to leave the motel!

It’s only been a few years since I realized that the story is strictly killer bee. For one thing, do you know Mr Fraser? Hardly the prostitute type! Also, nothing would motivate a ‘call girl’ to do the pants-theft. It had to have been done by an enemy. And if so, the enemy may as well do the whole thing without there being any prostitute.

For at least 30 years before “Memphis,” the CIA had been getting people to lose their senses by slipping a mickey into their drink. Clearly, Oz’s prime minister was done in by agents and then by the media, no? I admit to having found him ‘unimpressive’ after the putative event. My apologies to you now, Sir. And to Tamie.

What a crazy world we live in, with perhaps thousands of people making a living by smearing persons who try to be good. Pa-the-tic.

Malcolm treated me cordially one time when I was working on an article commissioned by the Carnegie Institute. (I almost never get commissioned work!) My spouse had noticed in the literature that Jimmy Carter, Malcolm Fraser, and a few others had collaborated on an unusual declaration — “The Universal
Declaration of Human Responsibilities.” He suggested I pop over to Collins Street to interview Fraser.

This stuff was right up my sociobiological alley. I can’t stand any talk of “universal human rights.” What a crock! You only have rights if your conspecifics have a willingness to protect you from the perennial and ubiquitous bullies in your society. Really, it’s a shame that people are taught that rights somehow exist on their own.

Anyway, I went to town with the article and just now looked it up so I could quote from it. However, one has to pay to read it! If you have a library code, you can find it under the title “Toward a Moral System for World Society: A Reflection on Human Responsibilities” (1998).

I note Mr Fraser’s daughter said yesterday that she and the family were shocked by his sudden, unexpected death. I hope it was not by foul play. But you can’t rule it out, can you? Have you ever seen the Youtube video from 1967 regarding Prime Minister Harry Holt’s “accidental” death by drowning? Absolutely nobody raised an eyebrow — and he was a serving prime minister! Just one of those bad currents in the water, you know.

POSTSCRIPT

Dee has asked me to document my remark about the CIA slipping things into drinks. (Oh, if only that were the worst they got up to!) Well, OK:

Forty years ago, the then vice president of the US, Nelson Rockefeller (who himself died “on the job” or as they sometimes say “in the saddle”), put together a royal commission, as it were, to investigate, in 1975, so-called excesses of the CIA. (In other words, to cover up the really hot ones.)

They found that the CIA’s “Technical Services Division” (always be wary of names like that) had studied both the use of radiation and hallucinogenic drugs, to alter or control human behavior. You can read about this in Frank Rochelle’s current lawsuit on behalf of many veterans who were cruelly radiated. One of them, Wray Forrest, is shown at far right in the following picture:
“The program was a big umbrella with different things under it,” recalled Scott Breckenridge, a C.I.A. deputy inspector general in the 1970s and author of *C.I.A. and the Cold War* (Praeger, 1993). “Could it help with interrogations as a truth serum? [Yep] Could we program people to block their memory to defend them against interrogation? [Yep] At first they thought of it in defensive terms [or claimed to]. But then they began to think of it as something they might use on the opposition.” - New York Times, January 5, 1984

Ah, the opposition. That means us. Everybody who isn’t a member of the Technical Services Division. Wait, wait! Or even someone who is! After all, Fort Detrick scientist Frank Olson’s family was compensated many years ago when a mickey of LSD – served non-consensually to Frank – caused his suicide. He jumped out the window of a hotel. Really that’s only the cover story. He was hurled out of the window by the CIA. Apparently Olson had raised a few forbidden questions at Fort Detrick.

Well, now that we are on the subject of Fort Detrick, do you recall my article of December 6, 2014, reviewing the book, *Plague*, by Kent Heckenlively and Judy Mikovits? Judy also knows too much, from her days at Ft Detrick. Not about LSD — that’s old hat. She knows how viruses are lab-created and inserted into human cell lines. I’m not going to go there today, as this article is supposed to be a tribute to Malcolm Fraser.
Comment from Maree Baker:
A German passenger aircraft (Germanwings) went down last night flying a French Airbus 320 over the French Alps. A terrible tragedy. What do the French and Germans have in common? Both just signed up to join the China Development Bank (AIIB)
Just saying......

Comment from freedomfromfalseflagterror:
Speaking of keeping those truth speakers in line...with Malaysia losing two airliners in 2014, after a Revisiting 9-11 conference was held in late 2013 in Kuala Lampur, by a prominent group...is there a ‘keep in line’ message there? I wouldn’t put it past them.

Comment from Dee McLachlan:
Maybe “they” were sending the former PM a message, that they could do anything to him – and that he should “keep in line”.

Comment from Mary Maxwell:
Listen to this. From Telegraph by Matthew Benns, March 21, the day after Malcolm died:

“Taxi driver Roy Wilson gave the stricken former PM a pair of his own trousers. ‘Ah never got nothing for them. That man didn’t even say thank you. They was good trousers,’ he said later.”

Jeepers, when you start doing a second-read of these things you wonder how the media has the chutzpah. Look, how many taxi drivers do you know that carry a spare pair of trousers? How many men are enormously tall like Fraser? Have you ever known a public schooler (Fraser: Geelong) to omit the thank you?

Was the deal to be understood as a loan? How was the lender (“Mr Roy Wilson” no less) going to collect the trousers back? If he drove the eminent person to his hotel, dressed in the loan garb (I mean where else could Fraser be going other than to his room?), wouldn’t he just wait and take the goods back, on the spot?

I now show you, O Gumshoe Fans, the next sentence in the Telegraph: “The unproven suggestion was that Mr Fraser had been rolled by an attractive woman he met at the Peabody.” Um. Let’s see. It’s not given as a quote. It is a “suggestion.” OK, then, whose suggestion?
UPDATE (March 28, 2015)
I am in shock from attending the Fraser funeral. Pleasant shock. Outside the church stood hundreds of Vietnamese Australians (they stood in the cold for over 2 hours) holding signs such as “Thank you, Mr Fraser, you were the voice of humanity” (referring to his protection of refugees).

Despite three prime ministers attending, there was not the slightest hint of Canberra politics. Although described as a state funeral, it was completely run by the family. And what a family! Sons Hugh and Mark spoke forcefully. Hey, when did you last see a man speak forcefully? The Scots Church priest did likewise.

The real kicker was Rachael, the granddaughter. Fraser’s offspring have no inhibitions about saying the man was great. Granddaughter Hester eulogized him in song: “May your humanity integrity and wisdom Always serve to remind us that the world can be a better place if good men speak their minds, With fire in their hearts…” Crikey!

Silly old Australia, on some kind of egalitarian kick, has always outlawed high praise. That startled me when I moved here 35 years ago. I now say Good riddance to Tall Poppy Syndrome. When I got back to Adelaide last evening I was touched to see the Oz flag and the Aboriginal flag flying at half-mast for a “fallen leader.”

OK everybody, we can be great now. So let’s get on with it.
YOUR BASIC TARGETTED INDIVIDUAL – JOHN FINCH
by Mary W Maxwell PhD, LLB, February 21, 2015

What can you do if the law lets you down? Dee harps on the way in which media persons -- and also scientists (Hello, Dr Karl) -- let us down. But what if the law lets you down? What if courts and academic lawyers won’t touch an issue with a forty-foot barge pole?

I received a heart-rending letter last week from a man who lives in a city where someone, perhaps the military, I don’t know, plays with his brain by sending electronic hits that are excruciatingly painful. His friends keep asking legal organizations to help him, but they always get the bedbug letter. The guy cannot get relief.

Ah, I forgot to say what city he lives in. How about Melbourne? Yes. That would be Melbourne, as in Oz. You don’t believe me? Frankly you shouldn’t. There is no basis on which to believe it. A preposterous story. Get the bedbug letter going!

Except I happen to know it’s true. Long story short, I was recruited into a Truth and Reconciliation Coalition in America in 2010, which dealt with certain mind control victims whose story I can definitely vouch for. I also see that the “electronic torture” stories are largely true. One that I doubt is John St Clair Akwei who filed a suit saying “they” read his thoughts. I’d need to see proof.

Until 1970 the medical literature was accessible. Ross Adey, an Adelaide pediatrician, experimented on the brains of animals – and that includes us, last time I looked. In 1968 Stuart Mackay published “Biomedical Telemetry” which showed how to manipulate the brain by remote control.

Of course, many experiments take place in prisons. They also can occur in public, since folks refuse to believe what is right before their eyes.

On Youtube you can see an American soldier, Marc Burnell, claiming (I’ll bet accurately) that he gets hits all the time right there on the army base. It is outrageous that he gets no protection. The Melbourne man, John Finch, has asked for the protection of a safe house, so far without luck.
Finch’s group expresses gratitude for little scraps of non-ostracism. A member of a small UK political party Mr Andrew Reed, gave advice to them in Strasbourg. He said: “The abuse of power is the essence of moral evil. Moral evil occurs, when the authorities refuse to accept the responsibility for the welfare of those who are logically under their care. When there are no close ties with the citizens, moral evil and tort are common practice. We are governed by a distant political elite, which has lost all contact with the people.” Good point. Human sympathy requires actual interaction with the aggrieved party. Finch also said three lawyers spoke to his group. But they concluded: “Your difficulty is that we have practically no legal evidence of the attacks, so we have to make do with: a) statistics b) similarities in symptoms and experiences c) similarities of torture cases d) existence of weapons’ patents e) existence of the technology patents for the use of V2K and f) complicity of a number of psychiatrists worldwide.”

I actually disagree that the thing is so legally difficult. Any person who reports that he is injured can have his story judged by a jury. It is not at all impossible.

Blocked, Blocked, Blocked
My issue is not the psychotronic torture itself. Rather, I can see that targeted individuals are not going to get any help until we unlock the social institutions mentioned above: the police, the legal profession, and the parliament.

It’s indisputable that IT IS THEIR DUTY to help a citizen such as John Finch. If they are not doing so, it’s not because they lack the means. Do they lack the will, and if so, why? We need to concentrate on this, not on the torture.

For now I believe we’ll have to use any small social setting to stir people up. I doubt if folks are willing to get on a train or
bus and start lecturing, but you could seat yourself several rows away from a friend (a ‘confederate’) on the bus and chat with him about, say, Marc Burnell.

Or you could invite neighbors to your verandah. Promise them they won’t be asked to offer John Finch a safe house, but say you’d like to go over the theoretical possibilities for cracking the case. Call it a brainstorming session. When our institutions are AWOL, society has to step in and do the job.

You should do it. To let the targeted individuals go unanswered is to hasten the day when you get tortured. I strongly recommend you watch the Youtube video, “Studies on Bioethical Issues” for testimonials.

If you are reading this in New Zealand, google for “Janine Jones of Rotorua” and see her lengthy petition to the Crown for relief from a Delgado stimoceiver. Maybe it would be easier for Kiwis to discuss ‘our’ problem (e.g., John Finch) and for Aussies to talk about Janine. That’s OK, any talk helps. Another victim you can check up on is Alex Constantine. He is a wonderful, serious publisher of books on mind control, including ones that expose agents provocateurs and organized crime. Many targeted individuals don’t know why they were selected as targets, but Constantine, who is being electronically punished everyday, surely ‘earned’ the ‘honor’ by working hard for America in the investigatory line. We owe him extra solidarity. Thank you, Alex!

UPDATE: Mike Patrick in Stop the Torment says to fellow victims: “Most importantly, hang in there! We will identify the perpetrators. Help us spread the word. We need as many people as possible talking about this issue, asking questions and looking for answers. These criminals are accustomed to operating in the dark.”
**Comment From “Jacques”:**

Sorry Mary, but this article seems really silly. Are you trying to be completely absurd, is it ironic? IF not: I think this type of speculative nonsense doesn’t bear up to any scrutiny. While it is 100% true that Governments around the world have engaged in despicable mind control programs, illegal covert drug testing, and every other imaginable spook horror -- unsubstantiated accounts of some individual targeted by unknown organizations, for unknown reasons, by unknown technologies are just fanciful nonsense.

... I am writing this because I think speculative conspiracy theories like this are used by certain parties to throw doubt and mud onto claims of provable, known conspiracies. 9/11 truth suffers from similar ‘fringe’ claims: micro-nukes, particle beams, holographic airplanes. …I believe many of these provably absurd theories are actively promoted by Cass Sunstein’s filthy little ‘cognitive infiltrators’.

Do I doubt that US gov agencies have tried to invent mind control machines? No, not for a second. Of course they have. Do I believe THIS story about some poor Mr Finch? Not for a second. Those voices people hear in their heads -- almost always originate ‘in their heads’.

**Reply From Mary W Maxwell:**

Dear Jacques, You yourself wrote: “While it is 100% true that Governments around the world have engaged in despicable mind control programs, illegal covert drug testing, and every other imaginable spook horror …” Jacques, when the recipients of such bad treatment told people about it, do you reckon the listener said “Wow, I believe you and I am eager to help you?” Not at all. The victims had to face the stunningly hurtful fact that they couldn’t get anyone to believe them. They were very lucky that Senator Frank Church held hearings in 1975, at which some of the truth came out.

More came out when President Clinton held hearings in 1995 for army men who had been radiated. Google ‘Claudia Mullen.’ Today you said: “UNSUBSTANTIATED ACCOUNTS OF SOME INDIVIDUAL TARGETED BY UNKNOWN ORGANIZATIONS, FOR UNKNOWN REASONS, BY UNKNOWN TECHNOLOGIES – ARE JUST FANCIFUL NONSENSE.” But, as I said, the technology is not unknown. Go to any medical library and peruse the journals of
psychiatry around 1955. People like Jose Delgado (professor at Yale Medical School) were boasting about what they did to their experimental victims. Or just read Mary Gregory’s book, “The Science behind Microwave War.” Are you aware of “The Body Electric,” written in 1985 by Robert O Becker, a surgeon at a VA hospital? He had trouble being believed, and lost his job, but now his book is adored, as well it should be.

Of course you know that members of the US embassy staff in Moscow received compo from Uncle Sam for suffering the kind of electronic hits that our John Finch is having today. So, per your words, did those hits in Moscow come from “unknown organizations for unknown reasons”? Perhaps you’d say “Nope, it was the USSR trying to hurt the USA.” But I wouldn’t say that. I think the “organization” involved is still “unknown.” America deliberately allowed the embassy staff to suffer for ten years.

This indicates they were in on it, don’t you think? Yet “the organization” is no more “the USA” than is true of 9-11. My American constitutional government (granted, that’s an abstraction) does not blow up buildings in New York. I mean it’s not in the job description of the mayor of New York (Giuliani) or the vice president (Dickus) to kill off a raft of firemen, s’far as I know. So somebody else arranged it. Do you know who?

I don’t claim to know the names of the persons that decided the WTC should be attacked in 2001. But logic leads me to think that it’s the same guys who are hurting folks in Melbourne. In particular, I can see that the ones who did 9-11 are able to control the police from making any relevant arrests. Silverstein strolls down the street, “happy as Larry.” Being able to control the police, and the staff of the Department of Public Prosecutor, is a remarkable achievement.

They will forever prevent John Finch from getting legal satisfaction. John showed me the tons of bedbug letters his group has received. It’s so shameful that no one in the law enforcement profession gives a damn. Jacques, if you decide to reply to me, please say what you think are “the reasons” those mean old mind-control programs were invented and carried out.
Attention Dog Lovers: A Human Cancer Cure

By Mary W Maxwell, PhD, LLB, October 23, 2014

Distemper, an illness of dogs, is sometimes fatal. It involves loss of appetite, discharge from eyes and nose, vomiting, and possible paralysis from demyelination of nerve tissue. For over a hundred years, there has been an excellent cure – but The Powers That Be won’t let it be used. Thus many dogs have suffered unnecessarily.

Why would such suppression of a cure take place? I assume it’s because if the cure for canine distemper were revealed, anyone with a bit of medical training could figure out that the same cure may work for flu and other ‘viruses’ in humans.

Per my understanding of the real power structure of society, good health is not allowed. A major way for the powerful to keep everybody weak and distracted is to have them chasing doctor’s appointments and worrying about major illness.

Note: I don’t buy the popular theory that it’s the profit motive of drug companies that keeps disease running. I’m sure it’s a power move, directed from the very top of World Government. When I was doing research of old medical studies for my book Consider the Lilies; A Review of 18 Cures for Cancer and Their Legal Status, I came upon this time and time again.

Introduction to the ‘Debate’ on Pleomorphism

The claim I am about to make, based on a 1936 book by William Crofton, MD, entitled The True Nature of Viruses, is that distemper is caused by bacteria, specifically a bacillus (that is, a rod-shaped bacterium). The Powers That Be insist, rather, that the cause of distemper is a virus. Thus there is no cure for it.
What’s in a name? If you are told that something has a viral cause you will likely accept the prevailing wisdom that it’s incurable. A virus cannot be cultured in the lab, as a bacterium can, to yield an antigen that will make the patient’s immune system fight the infection. (In recent years there are Interferons and high-tech antiviral medicines, but they are treatments rather than cures.)

You may be surprised to hear that the way in which microbes first got categorized as virus, versus bacteria, had to do merely with size. If the critter can pass through a ceramic filter (and is therefore called ‘filterable’), it must be a virus.

Some ‘dissident’ researchers found that a virus isn’t always a virus. It seems to be part of a life cycle of certain microbes; at times it morphs into a bacillus (or even, perhaps, a fungus). This theory is called pleo-morphism – ‘many shapes or forms.’

The original expert on pleomorphism was Edward Rosenow, MD, who published about it in umpteen journals prior to 1950. Roughly he said “If you want to cure polio (a virus) get its other form, a bacillus, and culture it.” He did cure polio, in 1917.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REMEDY FOR INFANTILE PARALYSIS (Polio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Edward C. Rosenow of the Mayo Clinic Tried His Serum on Children with Brilliant Results During Epidemic in Davenport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By MARY B. MULLETT November 18, 1917, The New York Times Magazine, Page SM3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“EVERY father and mother in the country will feel a throb of relief and of hope over what has just happened at Davenport, Iowa. An epidemic of infantile paralysis in that city has ended with a banquet and an ovation.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rosenow also cured MS and schizophrenia. How’s that for shocking?

Alan Cantwell, MD, routinely finds bacilli in cancer. He published this in journals from 1968 to 1990, but nowadays he can get ink only in the dissident press! Lida Mattman and Gerald Domingue have added the crucial discovery that some microbes are cell-wall-deficient.
**Distemper Is Caused by a Bacillus**

In 1900, Monkton Copeman published that distemper was caused by a bacillus. By 1910, Newell Ferry also isolated it and called it *Bacillus bronchisepticus*. In 1911, JP McGowan wrote it up in Volume xv of the *Journal of Pathology*. Trust me: scientists did proper experiments and shared them with all and sundry. ‘Funny business’ had not yet crept in. (I correct myself; it had crept in on John Beard’s cancer research as early as 1905, but we are talking about dogs at the moment.) Many of these old articles are accessible via Google Scholar.

Hands-on experiments were often carried out by dog breeders who, of course, had the most to lose financially. Crofton quotes from FB Carrell in the April, 1911 edition of The Kennel:

> “For the first 5 years of my breeding dogs for exhibition I knew nothing of inoculation, and the mortality from distemper in my kennels was at the rate of two deaths out of three affected animals…. The disease was, in every case, contracted at the bigger two and three day shows…. I decided that the disappointments of dog-breeding far outbalanced its pleasures.

> At this juncture a friend told me of Dr. Copeman’s vaccine. He had, two months before, inoculated two Smooth Collie pups and, at the time a few miles away, was a kennel of Griffons all affected with distemper. To find the worth of Dr. Copeman’s Vaccine, the nostrils of these two inoculated puppies were pushed against those of the diseased Griffons, and some of the mucus from the eyes and noses of the Griffons was inserted into the nostrils of the inoculated Collie pups.

> One Collie was not affected at all, temperature normal, appetite good. The temperature of the other Collie rose to 105°F, appetite capricious and puppy rather irritable. This lasted about a week, after which he became perfectly healthy. Both these puppies were afterwards exhibited all over England. My own next litter of puppies was inoculated at the age of four months. Three pups of the four had a good reaction, by that I mean that at the end of three or four days the temperatures rose to 105°F and
remained so for about ten days, and the patients were irritable and fed indifferently during that time.

Of the puppies that were inoculated but turned out not quite good enough to exhibit, and were sold as workers or companions, few have ever had distemper, or if they have, it has been so slight as to be unnoticed by their owners. Where the puppies have been kept by myself, and, of course, frequently exhibited, they have, I think, in every case eventually taken the disease, but always so slightly that a week or ten days sees them right again.”

OK, that’s immunization. But can the bacillus also be curative? Crofton states:

“If grown on blood agar the microbe is quite easy to isolate, very much easier, for instance, than the influenza bacillus, which will not grow on ordinary agar. I have never failed to isolate the bacillus in every phase of the disease from all the discharges, nose, throat, [etc]. If isolated early and the dog inoculated subcutaneously with a quarter to one million, followed by a small series if necessary, the disease will be aborted and even the most extreme cases can be recovered in many instances…. I have found the microbe in the throats in cases of canine hysteria and other nervous symptoms and cured the dog with an antigen of it.”

Crofton asks “With all this overwhelming evidence of pathogenicity, why was it that this distemper bacillus was not firmly established as the cause? [Why was] a £25,000 fund raised to find the cause and ten years or more spent on laborious investigation to rediscover the virus?”

I’ve got the answer to that last question! The stage was being set to train physicians and veterinarians in the fallacy that it is not possible for a microbe that passes through a tiny filter to be the morph of a bacillus. Note how easy it is to indoctrinate members of the species Homo sapiens! You only need to tell them that such-and-such is the rule. Add to that, people’s great unwillingness to believe that anything in the health field might be done to harm a patient deliberately.
But Perhaps You Don’t Have a Dog?
What Crofton says of distemper he also said of the 1918 influenza pandemic (a ‘pandemic’ is an epidemic covering a large area). The bacillus of flu had been isolated by the German bacteriologist Richard Pfeiffer in 1891. From it, Crofton was able to prepare an inoculation. As regards 61 students at University College dormitory in Dublin in 1918, he had the following success: Of the 35 who were not inoculated, 100% caught the flu. Of the 26 who were inoculated, only 3.8% got the flu. Just think, he may have been able to prevent the millions of deaths that did in fact occur in Europe in 1918. Remember his cure was based on a bacillus.

The following is of major importance: Crofton considers the Pfeiffer bacillus to be found also in measles, mumps, and chicken pox. He says:

“If an antigen is rushed through when the first spots appear in chicken-pox … no further spots appear. Likewise in mumps if a culture is made from material at the opening of the parotid duct one obtains a swarming growth (on blood-agar) of bacilli. A one-million dose of this, followed by others at suitable intervals, rapidly aborts the disease.

For instance, my younger boy developed the typical swelling -- a culture was made; next morning there was sufficient growth to make an antigen. A one-million dose was given. Next morning the swelling had almost disappeared. Next day the other side began to swell. A two-million dose was given. Next day it had subsided. A day or two after, there were no bacilli on culture [!] and he was released among his fellows without infecting them.”

In general the ‘experts’ in virology, most of whom work for the military, hold info about viruses pretty close to the chest. See the 1994 book by Kung and Wood, entitled Interactions between Retroviruses and Herpesviruses. I found it quite macabre.

Be you a dog lover, or be you a human lover, or be you, like me, basically a Nosey Parker, you should have a critical look into the whole matter of incurable viruses, and perhaps into the matter of ‘viruses’ de tout.
On March 13, 1996, in Dunblane, Scotland, 16 children ages 5 and 6 were shot to death in the gymnasium. Their teacher Gwen Mayor also was shot dead. Twelve other kids and two teachers were wounded but survived. The general belief is that the event was the work of Thomas Hamilton, a local, who “acted alone.” The event led to a ban on handguns in Scotland.

One resident of Dunblane, Sandra Uttley, who was 26 years old at the time, was the friend of a man who lost his daughter in the shootout. She was unhappy with the Cullen Inquiry that was held in 1997, but had no knowledge of wrongdoing by Inquiry members until she read an online item in 1999. She got on the case brilliantly and by 2006 she had published a book. Uttley’s book, *Dunblane Unburied*, tells us the following:

1. Hamilton supposedly turned the gun on himself after the shooting spree, but this can’t be correct as he had two shots to the head.
2. Parents were kept locked in an office for hours before being told that their child was dead – the extra time being needed
for “identification of the victims.” (Uttley says this was to let the crime scene in the gym be tampered with.)

3. An off-duty cop, Grant McCutcheon, happened to be in the building and gave an apparently correct description of what he saw, yet he was not called as a witness at Cullen Inquiry!

4. The Head Teacher said he called the police office’s regular line, not 999, but records seem to show he called 999. Can we sort that out by listening to calls? No, the case is under a 100-year seal.

5. A Dunblane child told his Dad that Hamilton had asked him, not once but many times over a 2-year period, to tell him the layout of the school, e.g., which door led to the gym, and what time the school’s morning assemblies were held.

6. Hamilton was a pedophile and a seller of photos of scantily clad boys, in days before the upsurge of kiddie porn that came with the Internet.

7. Hamilton was very interested in guns and had, in 1996, asked an instructor at the shooting club to help him improve his 10-yard range.

8. Money was paid to the victims and to the community from a not-openly-accountable Dunblane Fund of six million pounds.

9. Hamilton was a loner. He had owned a shop selling cameras, but his main occupation was running Boy’s Clubs and summer camps. He over-disciplined the youngsters in a dictatorial style.

10. On numerous occasions, parents filed complaints with police. These never had the effect of preventing Hamilton from getting leases on school campuses to run his camps. They also did not result in police refusal to renew his gun licenses.
11. Hamilton always seized the moral high ground by sending complaints about being harassed authorities, even writing to the Queen the very week before the massacre. Those who complained about him were threatened with libel suits.

12. Except for Doreen Hagger, mother of a camper whom Hamilton mistreated, no one took an angry position during the Inquiry. Hagger, however, was beaten down during cross-examination, and her “drinking” was mentioned. (She doesn’t drink but multiple sclerosis causes her words to sound slurred.)

The Big Picture

Sandra Uttley’s careful research is a marvel. She was aided by the aforementioned Ms Hagger and by a businessman William W Scott. The online item that had caught Uttley’s attention was a request by a man who had read the first edition of The Scotsman newspaper on the final day of the inquiry. It said that Police Commissioner McMurdo’s chauffeur testified that he had often driven his boss to visit Hamilton at home in the evening.

Editions did not carry the item and the newspaper denies that it ever published that fact.

On May 12, 1998, as recorded in Hansard, Lord Burton stated that he had, in June 1994, made a report to the Ministry of Defence about the Queen Victoria School, at which Hamilton was a frequent visitor. Lord Burton said: “Nothing of this was in the Cullen Report. Cullen is a Mason with a duty to protect brother Masons. There is evidence to show corruption and maladministration by the police.” Talk about incriminating!

Uttley’s book is more than sufficient proof that Lord Cullen committed the crime of cover-up. Police officers perjured themselves. Hardly anyone who testified was cross-examined. Contradictions were flagrantly left unresolved, such as the highway cameras showing Hamilton driving in a different direction from his itinerary according to the official story!

I will give but one quote to show obfuscation in the investigation.
From page 70 of Uttley’s *Dunblane Unburied*:

“[The parents of one child] state that they saw two bullet holes in the south wall of the gym, about 2 inches apart and just 6 inches from the ground. Their statement continues, ‘There were no other bullet holes in that wall and I noticed that there were quite a few bullet holes in the other walls which would confirm my…(words are blanked out here) that he fired into the wall at the bottom end of the gym where Hamilton had entered the gym.’ So WHO fired into the walls?”

**The Even Bigger Picture.**

It looks as though Hamilton was a player in what we all now know to be a roaring trade in pedophile literature. Because of this he was blackmailable. Police seemed to come to his house for ‘friendship’ but Hamilton’s personality was said to be creepy, hostile, and strange. Hard to see how anyone would find his company enjoyable. I speculate he was being turned into a robot that could carry out tasks for World Government.

I suspect he was programmed to ask that child those repetitive questions about the layout of the school building, and to ask the gun instructor to help him with his 10-yard shooting range.

There are many cases in which a patsy lays a trail, starting years earlier, which the media can then pounce on to prove his guilt. And there was Hamilton’s clever harassment of people who complained about him. It helped police keep him in business.

As far as I know, there is such a thing as a lust for blood and Hamilton may have desired to commit multiple murders that day. Yet it is also possible that he was hypnotized to do it. Clearly he didn’t commit suicide. Someone shot him. I think it was a person working for the Big Boys that took him out, and then the police created the scene of a Lone Gunman.
When you take a closer look, it is always an event instantly interpreted by media, followed by a wholly inadequate government inquiry. The public now takes it as given that a lone individual can carry off the most complicated activity without help. This is ridiculous.

**How Court Proceedings Reveal the Truth**

I have found in numerous false-flag and lone-nutter cases that the court procedure is so irregular that there has to be malfeasance. The judiciary is supposed to have integrity. In Hamilton’s case (an Inquiry not a trial), the give-away is that no one balked at the finding that the shooter ‘turned the gun on himself’ yet had two bullets in his head. Also transcripts are sealed for 100 years!

Any law-trained person and perhaps any man on the street can see dishonesty in the following insulting cross-examination of a sincere witness, Doreen Hagger.

Mr Hardie, QC: Did you tell your daughter about Mr Hamilton coming to the house in a van on the occasion you have spoken about?
Mrs Hagger: No.
Mr Hardie: So you are saying that at no time between 1989 and the present day did you tell your daughter that Mr Hamilton had come in a van and had had a gun?
Mrs Hagger: My daughter was there.
Mr Hardie: Well listen to the question and remember at the beginning you took an…
Mrs Hagger: She would have heard me saying….
Mr Hardie: Could you let me finish please, can you remember that you took an oath to tell the truth today; did you between 1989 and today tell your daughter about Mr Hamilton coming to the house in a van?
Mrs Hagger: My daughter was there when he came in the van, I didn’t have to tell her.
Mr Hardie: Do you understand the question, Mrs Hagger?...
Clearly that exchange had a sinister purpose. The QC (Queen’s Counsel) must have been designing a basis for discrediting all of Hagger’s testimony. When this sort of thing happens, we must suspect governmental guilt.

**Rhyme or Reason**

So why are these things done? Again, I’m guessing. I propose that the main goal is to break up community’s security and leave us all waiting to see which disaster will strike next. Maybe an earthquake or maybe an epidemic, maybe a spree-killer? All of this renders us weak in the face of creeping totalitarianism.

Many onlookers say the shoot-outs are done to take our arms away. Granted, gun control laws do often follow. But what good are guns today when the powerful have so many ways to prevent our getting at them? They have drones, chemicals, radiation, and they have the mainstream media to keep everyone in ignorance, plus a major enterprise in education to make sure children come out of school ignorant of history.

I also think, judging by the grotesque nature of some of the events (I’d include the Haiti earthquake in that, and certainly the Dunblane kindergarten massacre), that a few men at the top are so perverted that they do these things for fun. They are extremely pathetic individuals. (See Kay Griggs’ report on Henry Kissinger.) And they must constantly demonstrate their loyalty to one another. They are stuck in a rut. Poor things.

Yet I continue to blame ourselves, the citizens of a free country. We really don’t have to be so accepting of dishonesty, do we? Or so afraid to take a stand? Sandra Uttley’s book has not had one Amazon review in the eight year’s of its life. Would a reviewer be risking his life? Yep. But he is risking his life every day by not speaking out.

Take a chance. Speak out. Lord Burton did.
When I saw German journo Udo Ulfkotte’s video on Gumshoe last week, I was pretty sure he was genuine. He whined about how he was led down the wrong path, to produce pro-war propaganda for the CIA. He kept saying “I am ashamed of myself; I don’t want to bring a new war to Europe.” Still, many such confessions are really plants, so my skepticism took over.

Then, however, having googlized the situation, I found a statement that Udo made seven years ago. He was in the middle of being persecuted, in 2007, by the German authorities, for saying that Islamic extremists were causing trouble. Huh? Yes, they went after him if he tried to publish anti-Muslim news reports.

By gosh, I think I know what was really happening here and that Udo himself seems to be unaware of it. Let’s go through the history again, starting with the Brzezinski stuff. It’s pretty critical for understanding the Syria business, and the psychological tricks that have been used on journalists for years. They are fed disinformation as if it were hot news.

I catalogue several historical developments as follows:

1. The Brzezinski interview. This refers to the fact that a US official admitted to our having trained the “Mujahidin warriors” (which included bin Laden, by the way), as a means of fighting the Soviets who invaded Afghanistan in 1979.

Per my understanding of the great World Government plan for war-making, that was not really America’s way of harming Russia, or of helping those poor old Afghans. It was all in preparation for the major mess-up of the Middle East, and the “Wesley Clark” stuff.

(Maybe I shouldn’t complicate the story here, but I think the Soviet’s “domestically disastrous” Afghan mission, like that of the US in Vietnam, was meant to prepare for the breakup of Communism. I take the World Government to be both the...
instigator of Communism in 1917 and the breaker-upper of Communism circa 1990.)

2. The recent revelations (YouTube, 2014) by German journalist Udo Ulfkotte. Having decided to divorce the CIA, for whom he had worked semi-willingly, Udo looked back at its modus operandi. The CIA (or whoever it was) bribed him and colleagues with money, trips, and job promotions, and then sucked them into telling lies. For example, he was asked to write articles supporting Europe’s need for certain weapons. Udo admits to having taken what are now called “daily talking points” from whoever was in charge! Embarrassing, eh?

3. Udo’s persecution, starting in 2006. He was harassed by police, subjected to lawsuits, impoverished, almost prosecuted for revealing state secrets, all the usual stuff. His wife had an accountancy business, and pictures of her office building appeared in the newspapers so locals would know they should stay away from her. My interpretation (my Eureka of the day) is that the intelligence agencies were not doing this because he was writing about bad Muslims. They were doing it because they spotted a journalist with a conscience. He was too young to be given the standard heart attack, so it had to be lawsuits, etc.

Funnily enough, they made a bad choice. They should have gone for the heart attack. (Pardon me, Udo.) Maybe they “wish away” the problem that we have a Youtube nowadays, and websites like Gumshoenews! So in front of the camera goes one infuriated Udo, who has lost so much that he doesn’t have anything to lose. He spells out the way in which all – repeat all – of his colleagues are “bought.” Personally, I think there’s loads of room for forgiveness of these guys, and they should all come forth now and ask for our assistance.

Currently, Udo should be able to tell us the names of the sources or leaks about “bad Muslims.” I am not going to argue that Muslims are angels. Let’s assume some were out to build, as Alexander Downer has said, a new Caliphate. But most of the ideological extremists were trained as Mujahidin warriors
by persons of a distinctly Christian hue. (It has been claimed elsewhere that the Muslim Brotherhood was an early British phase of this same thing. I think it’s true of most wars!)

4. The Bojinka stuff. If Udo knows who told him the scoop, we’ll soon recognize the source of other scoops! My fave is the one that was used as background for the all-American hit on the Oklahoma City Murray Building in 1995. It was said that Muslims (combined with Filipinos) were planning to hijack eight planes and blow them up, all in the one day. The alleged Bojinka caper always sounded false to me. (Timothy McVeigh was executed for the OKC bombing; the Muslim involvement was axed from the script at the last minute. Don’t know why.)

5. The casual info shared after lectures. Despite Udo’s troubles, someone arranged for him to teach a National Security course at a university. (Who teaches it at your school? Have a chat with them.) Udo was pleased when various students, mostly related to government, approached him confidentially after class, with some hot info about the bad Muslims. That is to say, they supplied him with canned disinformation. Bojinka-type nonsense. Come on, Udo, name some names, please.

6. The “Wesley Clark” stuff. A former Rhodes scholar, General Clark was Supreme Commander of Europe’s part of NATO. He had been a biggie at the Pentagon, and after retirement he was visiting his buddies there who showed him a list of countries who were to be dispatched to God a.s.a.p. Wesley Clark later, when considering a run for US prexy, told an interviewer that these countries were Iraq, Somalia, Libya, Sudan, Lebanon, Syria, “and we’ll finish off with Iran.”

It is unthinkable that any man of Clark’s credentials (Rhodes scholar, Pentagon bloke, candidate for White House) could have been acting that day as a whistleblower. No. He must have been assigned to reveal the Pentagon’s laundry list as a way of conditioning us to what would happen. Perhaps it was also a trial balloon to see if there would be any objection.

As there was no noticeable cry of objection, the planned kill-
off of countries proceeded. In every case, the action was, of course, seen to be blamable on local rebels or even, God forbid, religious leaders who like to spoil women’s rights. Maybe even leaders who – get this – “harm their own people.” We seem to have come a ways from the 2002 need to show that a leader had “weapons of mass destruction.” Even a small sin is sufficient now to bring the bombers en masse overhead.

7. The death of Robin Cook. I’m just throwing this in to show how a Speaker of the House of Commons can use the prestige of the British Parliament to resign in protest against the invasion of Iraq and yet “nothing happens.” Well, something happened to Cook (death by heart attack), but nothing happened to the Wesley Clark seven-country extravaganza. (I apologize for the humorous lingo.)

The only country still waiting to be hit is Iran. I have been saying for years that the leaders of Iran are in on this. Maybe every leader of a besieged nation is part of a fifth column! Patriotic heroism seems to have gone out with long drawers. (Actually I don’t think Gaddafi participated in the plan to take Libya off the map. Do you?)

Speaking of going off the map, Thomas Barnett published a book in 2005, The Pentagon’s New Map. Inside the front cover of the book is a normal-looking map of the world, except that all of Africa and Southeast Asia, and parts of South America are missing. The code Barnett uses to describe this is “non-core countries.” He portrays them as ones that just couldn’t make the grade economically.

That said, when are we going to stop putting up with this? Was there no Brit who could have screamed “Foul play” when Robin Cook was killed? Is there no American who can say “Thank you Pentagon, but I don’t support genocide”? Is there any reader of the article at hand who wants to restore decency?

We have to start somewhere. It is human nature to be overwhelmed, and to let whatever bad things are happening
continue to happen. But we’ve often overcome human nature, haven’t we? Much of civilization, which makes for pleasant existence, takes the form of controlling our human nature. (As EO Wilson once said, human nature was “jerrybuilt in the Pleistocene.”) At the very least, it is the duty of intellectuals to talk sense, in order to let the population know that there are alternatives to, say, wiping countries off the map. (Perhaps the plan is to use Ebola on our country as well?)

Finally, back to the German journalist Udo Ulfkotte. He is to be thanked for his honesty. His parents are to be thanked for drilling it into him! In his Youtube video, he clarifies the method used by the CIA to make him dishonest. I claim that his 2007 incident of being harassed for discovering “scoops” about Muslim extremists is the key to seeing how such scoops are delivered to already-believing journalists.

Putting it all together: Zbigniew Brzezinski (National Security advisor) had shown us that Muslim rebels and “extremists” (Mujahidin) were cynically created by Western training camps. Muslim rebels thus were available to take the blame for Oklahoma City bombing in 1975, as they were planning “Bojinka,” a multiple plane explosion. (But President Clinton decided instead to have Timothy McVeigh cop the blame.) Robin Cook, an honest Parliamentarian in UK, saw the falsity of blaming Iraq in 2003 and resigned as Speaker. Later, in a supposedly candid interview, NATO man Wesley Clark said that the Pentagon was planning to get rid of seven countries.

(Clark is no whistle-blower; his revelations were meant to get us into an accepting mode for multiple genocides.)

We can turn this thing around. The genocidalists are very sick people. We are presently enabling them. We can stop enabling them.

Zbigniew Brzezinski Explains Why US Does Terrorism

Back in 1998, perhaps in a fit of pique, Mr Brzezinski, no longer a member of Cabinet, gave a revealing interview to Le Nouvel Observateur (See “Les Révélations d’un Ancien Conseiller de Carter”, January 15-21, 1998). The following is a translation by William Blum and David Gibbs:
Question: The former director of the CIA, Robert Gates, stated in his memoirs that the American intelligence services began to aid the Mujahiddin in Afghanistan six months before the [1979] Soviet intervention. … You therefore played a key role in this affair. Is this correct?

Brzezinski: Yes. …

Q: When the Soviets justified their intervention by asserting that they intended to fight against secret US involvement in Afghanistan, nobody believed them. However, there was an element of truth in this. You don’t regret any of this today?

B: Regret what? That secret operation was an excellent idea. It had the effect of drawing the Russians into the Afghan trap and you want me to regret it? …

Q: And neither do you regret having supported Islamic fundamentalism, which has given arms and advice to future terrorists?

B: What is more important in world history? The Taliban or the collapse of the Soviet empire? Some agitated Moslems or the liberation of Central Europe and the end of the cold war?

Q: “Some agitated Moslems”? But it has been said and repeated: Islamic fundamentalism represents a world menace today...

B: Nonsense! It is said that the West has a global policy in regard to Islam. That is stupid: There isn’t a global Islam. Look at Islam in a rational manner, without demagoguery or emotionalism. It is the leading religion of the world with 1.5 billion followers. But what is there in common among fundamentalist Saudi Arabia, moderate Morocco, militarist Pakistan, pro-Western Egypt, or secularist Central Asia? Nothing more than what unites the Christian countries....
Huge Compensation for Victims of 9-11, Marathon

by Mary W Maxwell, March 22, 2015

Outside the Boston courthouse, during this week’s trial of Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, sit some of the amputees. Mention is not made that they have received more than a million dollars compensation. Families of the three deceased victims got $2 million. It comes from a private (!) fund of $60 million. The man distributing the money is Kenneth Feinberg, who also distributed the 9-11 funds (approximately $2 million per family).

James Oliphant of the The National Journal interviewed Feinberg in August, 2013. How did Congress choose him as to be the 9-11 Compensator? Feinberg says it was because he had done similar work for the court settlement of Agent Orange to Vietnam veterans for 52,000 vets. The top payout there was only $13K.

He also handled a court settlement of $20 billion (yes, twenty thousand million!) for the BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill in 2010, in the Gulf of Mexico. The same man distributed, from a private fund of $11 million, the payments to parents of Sandy Hook children. Feinberg is also involved with compensation for the Virginia Tech shootout – isn’t that amazing -- and the destruction of grandstands at the Indiana State Fair.

(Note: Oliphant’s interview with Feinberg is my only source for the existence of the various alleged payments, except 9-11 which Feinberg wrote about in What Is a Life Worth?)

Does mention of the grandstand collapse bring to mind the prediction by Dr Richard Day in 1969? According to Lawrence Dunegan, MD, he heard Day say that, in future: “Buildings and bridges would be made so that they would collapse after a while. All of this to contribute to the feeling of insecurity, that nothing was safe.” Oh my.

Congress had almost no precedent for doing what it did in setting up the 9-11 fund. I assume those huge payouts (never mentioned by the media) are a way to prevent lawsuits by those injured at the WTC site. Of course it’s possible that some of the alleged plane passengers did not die and yet may have received the two million dollars.
What’s the drill on sedition these days?
The definition of “sedition” in the American Heritage Dictionary is “Acts that incite rebellion or civil disorder against an established government.”

I am writing this in reply to two hard-hitting articles by Dee McLachlan at Gumshoenews.com, entitled “Austyranny, the New Australia,” and “Teetering Towards Totalitarianism.” She suggests that the new sedition laws in Australia, which criminalize some of our free speech, will lead to the shut-down of honest journalism. McLachlan says she lived in South Africa under the Botha government and can smell this sort of thing. (Well you would, wouldn’t you.)

Canberra has couched the new laws in terms of the terrorist issue. Indeed, the legislation was passed hard on the heels of a reported beheading of a Pommie by – who else – Islamic extremists. As was the case when the US Congress passed The Patriot Act shortly after 9-11, there was little or no discussion about our proud history of limiting the power of government to control the citizen’s speech or thought.

Back in 2002, the Commonwealth passed a “Security Legislation Amendment.” According to Parliament’s website, this was a
response to UN Security Council Resolution 1373, which obliged member states to provide laws against aiding terrorists, such as by financial means.

Then, in 2005, Attorney General Philip Ruddock declared that we needed better laws because of the London bombings (ahem). By December, his Anti-Terrorism law was passed, with Labor and Liberal agreeing and the Dems and Greens opposing.

This 2005 legislation repeated a definition of sedition from the Federal Crimes Act (1914), which had said that we are not allowed to “urge disaffection” against the sovereign, the Constitution, or “either House of Parliament.” (Wait a minute, didn’t Paul Keating, when he was an MP, call his colleagues scumbags? Penalty is up to seven years in prison. Off you go, Paul.)

The 2005 law also enables Control Orders (say, to put you under house arrest, or confiscate your passport). These are diagnostic of a totalitarian government. They imply a death of the rule of law.

It’s pleasing to note that the Australian Law Reform Commission, which is a federal body, was tasked with making critical recommendations about the 2005 law, and it made 32 of them. Almost all were accepted by the government in 2006! ALRC president David Weisbrot said:

“[Our] Report recognised that free speech and robust political debate are the cornerstones of our democratic society…. The basic thrust of our recommendations was to create a bright line in the law between free speech — however robust, confronting or unpopular — and conduct calculated to incite violence in the community, which properly should be regarded as criminal activity.

The law also has to be clear enough to ensure that media commentators, satirists, artists and activists are not only safe from criminal prosecution, but also from the ‘chilling effect’ of uncertainty.”
Well, there you go. A law professor (Weisbrot) can restore all balance. But now it is 2014. The man in the Attorney General seat is Liberal Senator George Brandis. No Tom Paine, he. Hence, journalist McLachlan felt (or smelled) the chilling effect straightaway when Brandis said:

“Covert operations may expose intelligence personnel or sources to legal liability in the course of their work. For this reason, some significant covert operations do not commence or are ceased [as well they should be, no?]. To address this issue, the Bill implements the recommendation to create a limited immunity for participants in authorised, covert operations….”

Crikey! That introduces not a slippery slope but something more like an Alpine giant slalom. If a covert operator (and pardon moi, but how do we know he works for Oz if he is “covert”?!) can’t get into trouble for what he does to you, you don’t want to be in his clutches. The way “sedition” sneaks back in is that one of the things a journalist mustn’t do is keep tabs on, say, ASIO. “Do not report any naughtiness.” Hush.

A word about the existence of Commonwealth criminal law: The Australian Constitution does not give the federal government power to legislate against crime other than for offences against federal law. The states make criminal law. (New South Wales, South Australia, and Victoria rely on common law. The other three states and the territories have a codified criminal law.) If Oz starts to imitate the US, there will soon be more federal police nosing into local affairs. That’s equally unconstitutional in Seppo Land, but when you have Muslims beheading Mom and Pop, there is no limit to the surrender of local power to national power, right?

In 1798, Congress passed a sedition law that any schoolgirl could see was an effrontery to the Bill of Rights. The folks of Kentucky and Virginia were ropable, God love ’em, and passed
resolutions rejecting it. Kentucky enumerated the few crimes that were under the jurisdiction of the US (e.g., counterfeiting and piracy). Virginia employed the following quaint terms to criticize the federal usurpation of state powers:

“In case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of [unconstitutional powers], the states ... have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose, for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties, appertaining to them.”

Fine. We could use some arresting of the progress of evil. We’ve got appurtenances. How about arresting persons who say that Muslim extremists did such-and-such when it was all done in quiet boardrooms? How about checking out Ruddock’s and Brandis’s claims that we need laws to prevent Australians from helping terrorists. (Hello?)

I love it when Dee McLachlan says the members of ASIO with all their experience must be aware of what really took place on 9-11. If they do know, isn’t all this hoopla about anti-terrorism law treasonous? Or murderous? Or something?

When three Indonesian men were executed in 2008 for the Bali bombings (their poor wives!) I wondered: If they had

3 **were executed as the Bali bombers. Who really did it?**
the inclination and skill to do that, why didn’t they engage in similar things earlier in life? (I’m doing things in my 60s that were predictable when I was 20.) Just now I went to the Internet to revisit the Bali tragedy and found an Age article from 2002. Maybe I’m paranoid but it all sounds a bit peculiar to me:

‘BIN LADEN’ VOICES NEW THREAT TO AUSTRALIA
by Tony Parkinson, National Editor Nov 14, 2002

The Bali bombings were in direct retaliation for support of the United States’ war on terror and Australia’s role in the liberation of East Timor, according to a taped message attributed to terrorist chief Osama bin Laden.

“Australia was warned about its participation in Afghanistan, and its ignoble contribution to the separation of East Timor,” the tape says. “But it ignored this warning until it was awakened by the echoes of explosions in Bali.” If authenticated, the tape represents the first substantive evidence that bin Laden survived [the 2001] US-led military campaign in Afghanistan to crush the Islamic terror cells blamed for the September 11 attacks.

Although some senior US officials had concluded that bin Laden was dead, the emergence of the tape adds weight to the theory that he escaped. The tape singles out Australia as a close ally of Washington…. “You will be killed just as you kill, and will be bombed just as you bomb,” it says. “Expect more that will further distress you.” …

Australia’s security agencies are running their own analysis. But Foreign Minister Alexander Downer said that even if the tape was verified as genuine, the Howard Government would not be blackmailed. – end of Age article.

So was the tape ever verified as genuine? If it wasn’t genuine, who dunnit? Who thought up the bit about East Timor?
Why has so much confusing material been published about the Sandy Hook massacre of December 14, 2012? I think I’ve figured out what’s going on! Namely, there are disinfo artists who have been told to make extreme statements, such as “no massacre occurred at all” in order to discredit the real citizen-sleuths. And their nonsense will pave the way for law criminalizing those of us who publish conspiracy theory.

I noticed that many Sandy Hook critics don’t seem to be ordinary critics. They’ve done amazing work digging up data that people like myself would never think of looking for. I was almost tempted to believe their Youtube ‘evidence.’

For instance, one man claims that the homes of families whose children later died at Sandy Hook, were purchased on a public holiday (Christmas Day, no less!), and that the price of each house was under a dollar. The notion a reader may take away from this is that some individuals were paid to make up a story that a child of theirs had been killed. But beware: That is the logic being laid into your brain.

Note: such Youtubers never identify themselves. I give my real name, and doubt all who don’t.

In Boston, too, there was a lot of ‘noise.’ Let me say here that while I no longer think the Sandy Hook story is fabricated, I do think that the story of the brothers Tsarnaev is untrue, just like the young guys who supposedly blew up the London tube (on July 7, 2005).

I think the Marathon bombing was a made-for-public-terror event. Did actual bombs explode? If they did, it was probably a covert agency such as the CIA that did it. Purpose? The usual: to create general insecurity. (Recall Dr Day’s 1969 lecture!) And, additionally, to spoil the pleasure of outdoor events – you know, wholesome family stuff.

The Boston Globe gave us a complicated report of a man who was carjacked by the Tsarnaevs. I say the story is false on its face. The
carjackee (unnamed!) said that Dzhokhar Tsarnaev boasted to him about having done the Marathon bombing. How ridiculous! A man running away from the police would **never admit guilt like that.** The *Globe* disinfo artist must have felt confident that it would strike a chord in our brain, as all humans like to brag now and again.

**The Shanley Lawsuit Is the Clue!**
On December 27, 2014, a press release informed us that William Brandon Shanley has filed a lawsuit, naming as defendants some famous mainstream media persons (even Rupert) In his pleadings to the District Court, Shanley says:

> “Defendants entered in a multi-year conspiracy... 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 Exercise ... These crimes were undertaken with the intent of subverting the US Constitution and to affect national, state and local laws. This fraud involved lying to the public, faking news, ... censoring reality, suppressing facts, and deliberately skewing the news to shift public perceptions.”

I hypothesize that Shanley’s lawsuit was NOT written in good faith. His pitch is so poorly constructed as to suggest that he didn’t even get legal advice. If you were going to ask for a trillion-dollar ruling (as he did) on a socially vital matter, wouldn’t you make your case solid and persuasive?

**Framing the Debate**
The plot thickens. Today I read a 2014 piece by Deanna Spingola, “Unraveling Sofia Smallstorm’s Video on Sandy Hook, Part 1.” Deanna has looked at some of the very-early reports about Sandy Hook; they strike her as having been placed there by baddies, in order to **“frame the debate.”**

Then suddenly there’s the Shanley lawsuit, saying that no child died at Sandy Hook! William Shanley, who is a film producer, doesn’t offer credible evidence for his claim. I think the general public will feel he has acted outrageously. After all, can any person be more deeply bereaved than a parent who has lost a precious 5- or 6-year-old?
old daughter or son? No. The families will quite reasonably be seen to have been hurt by such offensive publicity, and all of us who deal earnestly with investigating such events will cop the flack.

Dee has been saying that legislators have been on a mad kick lately to criminalize acts by journalists that have the effect of exposing crime in government. Can’t you just see them proposing to outlaw Youtube criticism of “terrorist” acts, because of Sandy Hook? I’ll bet the fake-hoax reports will pave the way for legislation that will forbid discussion, on Youtube, of any crimes that we are supposed to dutifully believe in, be it 9-11, Marathon, or worse things yet to come!

The Laws against Holocaust Denial
There is precedent for this. Some European nations have made it a crime to express doubt that the Nazis took the lives of six million Jews. In Canada, Ernst Zündel, wrote a pamphlet “Did Six Million Really Die?” A Canadian Jewish group took him to court under an antiquated law: “spreading false news;” a jury found him guilty. In 1993 the Canadian Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional and quashed his convictions. He then emigrated to the USA, where an alleged immigration infringement caused him, in 2003, to be deported back to Canada where he spent two years in detention, and was extradited for trial to Germany!

During his trial, his defense lawyer, Sylvia Stolz, was not allowed to submit, in his defense, anything to support the truth of what Zündel had written. Try to imagine his frustration.

When Stolz talked about it, she was arrested. (She was actually physically carried out of the courtroom by guards.) Per Section 130 of German Criminal Code she “defamed the memory of the dead.” This has sent a message to all lawyers!

Free Speech in Australia
Australia had a case in 2009, which was not strictly about Holocaust denial. Fredrick Toben, a retired teacher, served three months in a low security prison labor camp, Cadell Training Centre, SA, for disobeying a court order related to material at AdelaideInstitute.org website, questioning a part of the Holocaust, which a judge deemed insulting to Jews. The Human Rights Commission in
Australia is legally enabled to intervene when an ethnic group complains, but it has no legal enforcing powers of the Commission’s findings.

Toben’s refusal to remove a link brought him under a court order. I attended his court case and was surprised that no one showed up to advocate for free expression. In the end, he was awarded costs against him. By selling his home he raised the $75,000. But then another cost demand was made for $175,000; he could not meet it so was declared bankrupt.

Judges. I recommend that every judge have a goodly supply of ‘bench warrants,’ to nab, on the spot, any government prosecutor who would have the audacity to prosecute a good citizen for bringing forth information about crimes being committed by members of government, or more generally, by the Powers That Be. (I can dream, can’t I?)

By the way, whilst I can still utter it, the fact that I accused covert organizations, above, of being the likely bombers at the Boston Marathon, means that they should be charged with murder, posthaste. There’s no way around this.

Moreover, if my interpretation be on target, we can see that the bombers must have required plenty of assistance from media. Dozens of media owners, reporters, and news anchormen, may be charged as accomplices and as accessories after the fact. Likewise, assuming that young Adam Lanza wasn’t the murderer at Sandy Hook, we must track down the killer. Let’s dragnet everybody who made those too-smart Youtubes.

Oh, aren’t I supposed to be in favor of free speech? Yes I am, but I approve of the laws against murder, or against being an accessory to murder. There are times when what you publish on the Internet is not considered “protected free speech.” It is considered evidence.

Note: The media tell us of the arrest of yet another ‘rude’ Internet user. His name is Ross Lorraine. He is charged by the Scottish
police with ‘malicious communication.’ It has to do with a horrific road accident in which six “Christmas shoppers” died. Ross lives in Northumbria, England, age 19. His alleged crime consists of his having tweeted: “So a bin lorry has apparently driven into 100 people in Glasgow eh, probably the most trash it’s picked up in one day.” He was then arrested. I thins it is reasonable to speculate that the crash was made to occur for this purpose.

I even think the killing of 132 kids in Pakistan was for a strategic purpose, on December 16, 2014 (day after Sydney siege). One suspicious aspect is that a photo of Noah Pozner, a 6-year-old who was killed at Sandy Hook, showed up on a board of photos of children in Pakistan.

Another telling bit is that the Taliban are accused. I found this comment on a blog. (From memory): “The people of Pakistan like the Taliban. They would not approve of the government killing 500 Taliban prisoners, but now that they are accused of the school murder it will be easy.”

The child on far right is Noah. Who, exactly, posted his photo?

Please remember that a court has already ruled that it was the military that blew up the Bologna Railway station in 1980 (to make the Lefties look bad). Many Italians died. Also, the FBI admitted to knowing that the 1993 bombing of the WTC basement would occur as part of a sting.

Before she died in 1988, Mae Brussell had worked out the guilty party in scores of political murders. The Sandy Hook and Pakistan children died because, year after year, we are unwilling to deal with murderous officials. Stupid us.
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The Bilderbergers’ 2014 Meeting
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Dutch Prince (consort) Bernhard (1911-2004)

The Bilderbergers are a clique of men and women, mostly European, who continue to plan our world on behalf of … um … on behalf of whom? Certainly not on behalf of humanity.

The name is derived from the Bilderberg Hotel in Oosterbeek, where these would-be gods gathered in 1954. The “leader” was Prince Bernhard, who fathered the recently retired Queen Beatrix. He is also known as the founder of World Wildlife Fund. How’s that for confusing?

When the group meets, in great secrecy, its guest list includes royalty, industry, a US president or presidential candidate, a senator or two, and some pathetic media personnel (huh? “meets in great secrecy” but has media there?).

I note an unexpected remark in Wikipedia [i.e., CIA]:

“Prince Bernhard asked to work in British Intelligence [during WWII] but the War Admiralty, and later General Eisenhower’s Allied Command offices, did not trust him sufficiently to allow him access to sensitive intelligence information. However … after being personally screened by intelligence officer Ian Fleming at the behest of Churchill, he was later permitted to work in the Allied War Planning Councils.”

Good heavens. Anyway, a few of the Bilderberg meetings have been gate-crashed by Daniel Estulin. Or at least he peeked through the keyhole enough to write The True Story of the Bilderberg Group. (Trine Day Press).
This year we’ve been given a full transcript, leaked in French, of a wrap-up speech by Charles Sannat. (Vous allez a lecontrarien.com.) I take it to be authentic, mainly because it’s pretty spacey and those guys are spacey. Granted, I can’t prove the attribution to Sannat. He is “Directeur des Etudes Economiques du site AuCoffre.com.” Probably a hard-working lackey.

**Want To Stick Around for a Long Time?**
The 2014 Bildies went over some of their old ground, but much of it had never been said before. Sannat highlighted two main themes: The first is “Transhumanism,” which has something to do with an already-found fountain of youth, only for the elite of course. (Did they ever notice this could limit the pool of breeders for their progeny requirements?)

Basically they are aiming for partial immortality — about two hundred years per man. This they consider their “Ideology,” although I think they would have to flesh it out a bit more before it would deserve to be labeled an ideology.

Stem cells are seen by the Bildies as the key to a perfectly healthy body. No wonder that young Japanese scientist Haruko Obokate recently had her celebration of “stem cells for the masses” retracted by a journal. (And now her boss has committed suicide, Oops.)

Oh, and also we will be reworking the human genome to include some animal parts, or whatever. (Spacey, n’est-ce pas?)

**A Work-free Society**
Now for the second theme, quite the eye-opener. The heading for it, in the leaked speech, is “Beyond Capitalism: Crossing the New Frontier.” Remember how, under capitalism, people had jobs? This, Sannat says, was a sort of gift to the people. “We” let them be motivated to work so they could feed themselves — something about two arms needed to do the work that fills the mouth with food; he attributes it the phrasing to Mao.

But really “we” were just letting them partake of a little bit of wealth to keep them occupied so they wouldn’t notice other
things, like the breathtaking inequality vis à vis the elite. Now here’s the surprise part: “We” are not going to let them have this privilege of feeding themselves anymore.

How so? We’ll take away their “arms.” That is, almost all jobs will disappear, to be replaced by robotization. This made me think of self-checkout in the supermarket, and Internet banking. Then I remembered there is to be no feeding. Who need supermarkets if mouths will be going out of style?

Oops, and no banking either. Nothing to bank, as the new prole type (Sannat did not actually use that Orwellian term) won’t crave money, he predicts, the way our generation did. *Radix malorum est cupiditas* will go out the window. So there.

**Aiming Higher and Higher**

Did I tell you the 2014 Bilderbergs are getting innovative? The reason I think the document may be true (the speaker says it was collated from their “Committee meetings”) is that there is a constant effort to justify, however skimpily, what is being said. Words like this:

“*The objective which we pursue is obviously the one of the eternal life.* Of a superman. Our technologies allow us from now on to possess said tools of ‘augmented reality,’ our researches perfectly succeeded as regards ‘the increased man.’”
Talk about daft! Did Sannat feel a bit silly saying these things? But I’ll have to say I agree with him about stewardship of the planet (sort of). He says:

“We all have now acquired the certainty that the long-term survival of the human species, and the sustainability of a viable biosphere in harmony with the human activities requires a total reorganization of our modes of thought, organization and production…. We all know that an infinite growth, including demographics, in a finite world is an intellectual aberration.”

He continues: “We all understood that to divide the world into two castes, that of the mortal and the immortal, would simply be impossible, as, in one case we suggest to live and to the others to die, putting mainstream masses in a situation where they would have nothing to lose any more [Wow]. Except I remind you that the main tool of the control of the peoples [has consisted of] granting benefits calculated to give the illusion of a loss in case of rebellion.” [Double wow].

Sannat’s next bit has a sweetener in it: “The initial objective is the massive depopulation in protecting the environment, which is tantamount to exclude from the fields of our possible use any nuclear weapons … inflicting irreparable damage to our so small planet.” Yay! (Will he ban depleted uranium?)

**However, We’ll Have To Get Nasty…**

“We think that to reach our objective of 500 million human beings alive is illusory, and that in spite of all our efforts of reduction, pockets of survivors will remain almost everywhere. Nevertheless, these pockets should not raise major problems, because of their disorganization, their isolation, and their incapacity to master all the techniques. Their weak number should limit considerably their power of nuisance.” My, oh my. Imagine being a nuisance.

Now here’s a surprise: “We think that many will disappear and that little who will remain will return more or less quickly to the wild in a few generations. [But naturally] any group that threatens us is, in all cases, treated quickly.”
“The main enemy to the implementation of our plans was the national states. [But] globalization, European institutions, mass immigration were tools that we have used with great success for 30 years. National identities and feelings of belonging were significantly reduced. Nations, as we hoped, became fragile and can now be destabilized from within.” [I wonder: is he referring to parliaments and judiciaries?]

“When we shall provoke the economic collapse, then the most absurd communitarianism which we have developed in every country [what is Sannat referring to there?] will conduct the largest part of these countries towards large-scale civil wars where every community will take charge, for our sake, to kill the largest number of the members of the opposite community.”

“Finally, when the wars destroy countries, we shall take advantage of it to amplify the distribution of viruses such as our project of ebola 2.0 modified genetically which we test at present with efficiency. … We also visualize our capacity to saturate systems of care which will be already considerably degraded, in every case, by the civil wars which we shall have created on the example of the two Ukraines.” [This is very serious business.]

Gallows Humor
I try never to end a bad-news article without shouting that it is unacceptable and that something can, of course, be done. Here the Bildies have just declared their murderous plans and their current murders, either of which can send them to the gallows. (Recall above: “Any group that threatens us is treated quickly.” No jury would interpret the verb “treated” to mean “treated to an ice cream.”)

Don’t forget, there is a possibility that the Bilderberg 2014 speech was leaked deliberately, in order to condition us to the new reality. I well remember that famously anti-torture nation, the USA, getting used to the idea that “we torture.” Nothing else really needed to be said, just a few pictures here and there of “what we do.”
The “On High” is not about God, at least as far as I know. But it certainly is about the top level of our species. The deciders. That top level has to be composed of humans (men and women? my guess is: all men). Their names? We don’t know.

Their nationalities? Mixed, if the Bilderberg group is any guide. Whole continents may be unrepresented, viz., South America, Africa, and Australia. In 1973, David Rockefeller included Japan, bigtime, in the Trilateral Commission; Henry Kissinger brought ‘Red’ China into the world’s fold by shaking hands with Mao Zedong in 1973. Still, the identity of those higher up than David and Henry is a secret.

Presumably there’s a constant stream of messages coming down from “on high.” For example “Run a terrorist incident today,” or “Change your nation’s TV from analog to digital next decade.” How do the secretive governors of the world pass instructions to, say, the Supreme Court of Canada, the legislature of Florida, or the premier of Western Australia? Clearly they do accomplish this.

Governments Must Be among the Perps
I have recently published articles showing that the ‘cover story’ of many famous killings cannot possibly be true, and that, since
governments zealously promote the cover stories, they must have guilty knowledge as to who the perpetrators are. How do we know? Because they control the police and the courts. (The courts? No innocent patsy ever gets cleared, does he?) Yet we have to note that these killers are, by definition, sociopathic.

As to the meaning of ‘sociopathic,’ it’s relative. We can only say that some persons hate society more than others do. Probably we all hate our fellow man a bit, since the life of every member of *H sapiens* is competitive. Yet it’s very normal to care about, and have obligations to, others. The Top Level guys I’m describing *admit to no caring, and they categorically eschew obligation.*

I have yet to hear of any top dog expressing remorse -- though they are busy hiding in order to avoid legal punishment, *so aren’t really in a position to talk* confession-style. Dee Ferdinand has posted testimony about her Dad’s deathbed regret concerning his life *as a* drug dealer for the NYPD, mafia, and CIA – combined! Wow. A triple dipper. However, he was low-echelon.

An important aside here. A friend of mine who was abused as a child, and is now a very good psychology counselor, told me it’s standard knowledge that some *persons who have had bad things done to them think it’s OK to harm others.* (I wonder if military trainers hurt their soldiers terribly so they will suppress the moral instinct.)

**My Shyness about Sydney**

It’s hard to be objective about an incident so close to home as Martin Place was on December 15, 2014. By contrast it’s easy for an Australian to analyze Paris’s Charlie Hebdo incident. For instance, Gumshoenews has talked about the ease with which the accused escaped.

In regard to the Sydney siege, various Australian critics, including myself, have wondered aloud about the fact that the *police knew early in the day* that there was only one gunman, *yet kept the public on tenterhooks.* Journalists, even in the mainstream, have mentioned that the patsy, Man Haron Monis,
was a ‘media mascot’ for a few years prior to the so-called siege. (For other mascots, google “the Finsbury Mosque.”)

But who dares say, that if the world record shows there is government involvement, Sydney must have been an inside job by Oz officialdom? You may have seen my Youtube video chastising the prime minister for laying a bouquet of flowers in Martin Place. I will go that far. I will say that the PM is in on the scene-setting, to make this a national tragedy. But more?

Not Quite So Shy about Boston

In May, 2013, I happened to be giving a paper at the Law and Society Association meeting in Boston. The famous Marathon had occurred only a month before. I thought it a bit peculiar that the LSA’s printed program expressed solidarity with the people of Boston in the aftermath of the Marathon. And vendors in the hotel lobby were selling “Boston Strong” tee shirts like hotcakes. Like the flowers at Martin Place, rubbing the message in: we have been violated.

Yes we were violated, but it was by the Top Level, wasn’t it? I am a Bostonian as well as an Adelaidian. I feel certain that the Marathon and the Sydney siege were both scripted. OK, I’ll leave a sliver of room for Monis or the Tsarnaevs to have acted alone, and to have received no ideological brainwashing from Western governments. (Forgive me, Zbigniew Brzezinski.)

But slivers don’t count; Occam’s razor says go for the simplest explanation. That would be “These events were inside jobs.”
How Do the Messages Get Passed Down? But how does it work? The top level sent a message to Oz, or maybe direct to NSW or even direct to the city of Sydney? The message was: “Run a terrorist incident.” I assume this led to Monis being robotized to do what he did.

So far, no harm done, but by 2am next day three Australians had been killed, reportedly by police. (Yes, I am counting Crazy-man Monis as an Australian.) We seem to have a crime here. Probably murder. Who committed it? Anybody want to own up to it? The ‘criminal’ is not necessarily the one who pulled the trigger. The responsible party is Top Level.

In the wee hours of today, 26 January, I uploaded to Rumor Mill News an article entitled “Australia Day, 2015: Terrorism Problem Solved. Thanks, Dr Lawrence Dunegan!”

I had re-read the account, by Dunegan, of a ‘conspiratorial’ speech that Dr Richard Day gave to a medical audience, back in 1969. By 1988, Dr Dunegan couldn’t hold it in any longer. He spilled the beans, on the Randy Engels radio show. He said:

“There was a discussion [by Dr Day] of terrorism. Terrorism would be used widely in Europe and in other parts of the world. At that time it was thought terrorism would not be necessary in the United States. It could become necessary in the United States if the United States did not move rapidly enough into accepting the system. … just a little bit of terrorism would help convince Americans that the world is indeed a dangerous place, or can be if we don’t relinquish control to the proper authorities.”

Note: When Dunegan said the above in 1988, there still hadn’t been even a whiff of terrorism in the US. (I’m not counting the terror to which prisoners and racial minorities are often subjected.)

Baseball and Roe v Wade

Not only does Day’s lecture prove that terrorism comes from on high, it proves that umpteen other things do, too. To give but one example, Dr Day said “Abortion will no longer be a crime.” How did they get all the governments to decriminalize it? They
must have done so. OK, one more example. Day said, and this was at the height of American devotion to baseball, “Baseball will be downplayed in favor of soccer.” How could Dr Day divine that? He did not divine it. The Top Level made it happen. He even described how they would do it. They would raise the players’ salary so high that folks would stop feeling loyal to a team.

Is There an Antidote for Shyness?
You sense that I want to call a spade a spade re Martin Place, but I lack the mettle. I have no supporters that I know of, except the editor of Gumshoe (which is a lot, God bless Dee, but not enough). So I want to put out this tempting tidbit, to any takers. Follow my logic:

It would be very wise to act now, despite big risks. Later, when push comes to shove (i.e., when you are being pushed and shoved around in Room 101), you will think, “Wow I had every opportunity to speak out and appeal to the law. But I was too shy.”

Is there going to be a Room 101? Yes. How do we know? Simple science. When tyrants take over, they do that. It’s been proven, time and again.

It has also been proven, though, that tyrants do not have the last word. Bullies can be dealt with if you’ve got the numbers.

Note: Mary W Maxwell lives in Adelaide and would be glad to rendezvous on the steps of Parliament House with anyone who feels like verbalizing. At the moment she is doing her ‘cloud thing.’
SURREALISM: UNABOMBER’S LAWYER DEFENDS TSARNAEV

by Mary W Maxwell, PhD (Politics), LLB, April 11, 2015

If Dzhokhar (nickname Jahar) Tsarnaev, or his late brother, thought up the idea of bombing the Boston Marathon, I’ll be a monkey’s uncle. If Eric Rudolph (who had allegedly bombed an abortion clinic and a lesbian bar) thought up the idea of bombing the Atlanta Olympics, I’ll eat my hat.

Such terrorist acts are probably thought up at Quantico headquarters, FBI. Let me float here the conjecture that all abortion-clinic violence, all serial murders, all attention-gabbing murders, such as a Mom drowning her kids, come straight from QHQ. They are all part of the media-related effort to set the tone for our culture, and distract us.

Wikipedia says that the judge liked the way Judy Clarke acted as Public Defender of Susan Smith, a Mom who drowned her kids, so he raised her fee to $83K. Judy seems to be ‘on call’ for the feds to defend anyone according to their wishes. Hence, I interpret her position as defender of the Marathon bomber to mean the feds did the bombing!

Mind Control Could Be the Key Here

If the Susan Smith case was even for-real (could be killer-bee stuff), then my guess is that Susan did those murders under mind control. Production of Manchurian Candidates is big business in the CIA and is now also used by the mafia. (You know the Mafia and the CIA are wed, right?)

Daniel McGowan’s book, Programmed To Kill, shows that the courtroom goings-on for most famous murder cases were ludicrous. Albert DeSalvo could not have been the Boston Strangler, given the way the Law dealt with him. Yes, please follow my Retrospective Logic here. The lawyer appointed to defend Albert, F. Lee Bailey, cooked up a mean trick. He had Albert tried for a much lesser crime, and during the case he, the defender, mentioned to the jury that Albert had told a prison inmate that he was the Strangler.

You can be sure that jury members, knowing that their neighbors read that in the news, would not dare stick up for the accused. Note: there was no cross-examination to challenge any aspect of Albert’s having done those murders!
By the way, it would now pay to look up all of Bailey’s famous cases. The various crimes were probably all scripted.

Another of Judy Clarke’s clients (besides Smith and Tsarnaev) was Eric Rudolph. Did he really do the exploding shrapnel violence at the 1996 Olympics? I doubt it. And consider his role as ‘religious devotee’ in the matter of bombing an abortion clinic. If he wanted to protect fetuses from abortion, would he be likely to become a killer in order to bring about that end? Nonsense.

Note, too, that Eric was said to have hid for five years in the hills while on the FBI’s Most Wanted List. Are you able to believe that? Isn’t it more likely that he was in custody of his mind-controllers? I wager he did some other killings or robberies during that time. Had he been caught, the police could say “Voila! We found our escapee!” What a system.

I think lawyer Judy Clarke herself is mind-controlled. Her Dad died when she was 15. In my research of MK-Ultra I find it too-frequent that the victim has lost a parent early in life. Would it be asking too much for someone to study this? I think you’d find that the Powers That Be knock off the family members of a person they hope to control.

If a whole family can be mind-controlled, you will also have built-in commentators when the crime is committed. In the case of Ted Kaczynski, it was a brother who turned him in. The newspaper had displayed Ted’s handwriting in a note, and the Bro ‘recognized’ it, and said (I paraphrase) “Gee I’ll bet my brother is the Unabomber. Tsk tsk.”
Was There Really a Case for Tsarnaev To Answer?

Let’s look at the legality of the Marathon case, and to Judy Clarke’s outrageous failure to use normal procedure to raise jurors’ reasonable doubt. First of all, an accused is protected by a British law (of pre-Norman vintage) that was repeated in the US Constitution as the Fifth Amendment. It says “No person shall be held to answer for a capital...crime, unless on presentment or indictment by a grand jury.”

It seems that Jahar (Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, who was age 19 at the time) was not graced with that privilege. Rather, a cop named Daniel Genck went to federal district court and filed a criminal complaint (You, too, can do that! Hooray!). It says:

“I have reviewed videotape footage taken from a security camera ... At approximately 2:38 p.m. (11 minutes before the first explosion) -- two young men can be seen turning left (eastward) onto Boylston from Gloucester Street.... Both men are carrying large knapsacks. At approximately 2:45 p.m., Bomber Two [Genck has already designated the brothers as Bomber One and Two] can be seen detaching himself from the crowd and walking east toward the Marathon finishing line. He appears to have the thumb of his right hand hooked under the strap of his knapsack and a cell phone in his left hand. ... He then can be seen apparently slipping his knapsack onto the ground.”

(“Apparently? Why the “apparently”?"

Did Jahar Get a Phone Call from His Handler?

“Approximately 30 seconds before the first explosion, he lifts his phone to his ear and keeps it there for approximately 18 seconds. A few seconds after he finishes the call, the large crowd of people around him can be seen reacting to the explosion....” – That remark by Genck seems to have sealed Jahar’s fate. As though the boy was receiving a call from a baddy. But can’t the call be traced? I suggest it came from the persons who set this whole thing up. Officer Genck continues, in his filing with the Court:

“I have reviewed images of two men taken at approximately 12:17 a.m. by a security camera at the ATM and the gas station/convenience store where the two carjackers drove with the victim in his car. Based on the men’s close physical resemblance to [Massachusetts Vehicle Registry] photos of Tamerlan and Dhokhar, I believe the two men
who carjacked, kidnapped, and robbed the victim are Tamerlan and Dzhokhar Tsarnaev….”

That is an astonishing non sequitur. I must disclose that my grades in law school were mediocre, but even I can see that all Genck is entitled to say is: “I looked at who was on the security camera at the ATM. I compared it with the driver’s-licence photos of the brothers and found a good match.” He can’t claim to have ‘witnessed’ in any way (as far as I know) that they did any carjacking or robbing of the victim!

Further down the page we see Genck reporting second-hand: “A gunfight ensued between the car’s occupants and law enforcement officers in which numerous shots were fired. One of the men [Tamerlan] was severely injured and remained at the scene; the other [Jahar] managed to escape in the car.”

“That car was later found abandoned a short distance away, and an intact low-grade explosive device was discovered inside it. In addition, from the scene of the shootout in Watertown, the FBI has recovered two unexploded IEDs.”

Next, Genck offers connecting evidence as follows:

“On April 21, 2013, the FBI searched [Jahar’s] dormitory room… They seized among other things, a large pyrotechnic, a black jacket and a white hat of the same general appearance as those worn by Bomber Two at the Boston Marathon on April 15, 2013, and BBs.”

Seriously, Folks. They found a baseball cap in a dorm room.

**FBI: A Crime Organization, with Guaranteed Secrecy!**
The jury has now returned a verdict of Guilty. I think Jahar will be executed. Is there a good-hearted lawyer out there, from the old school, who could represent him? If I were in the role I would not hesitate to say that the case is being tampered with, and that is a felony -- Obstruction of Justice. I’d call for investigation of the FBI’s killing of Ibragim Todashev, a friend of Jahar. I believe the feds wanted to deprive Jahar of any friends’ support, so they went to Ibragim’s home. Just as he was (allegedly) penning a confession to a triple-murder in Waltham, the FBI guy killed him.
Unbelievably, the State of Florida and the feds decided:

“My conclusion, based upon the facts presented to me in this investigation, is that the actions of the special agent of the FBI were justified in self-defense and in defense of another,” said State Attorney Jeffrey L. Ashton, the top prosecutor in Orlando. Separately, the Justice Department said “there is no question” the agent acted correctly and that Todashev had motive to attack, “having just confessed to complicity in a triple murder.”

Whom Do I Blame?

I say it’s the fault of citizens for not arresting them. We should long ago have arrested the FBI for its admitted involvement in the 1993 bombing of the WTC basement. (Three Arabs are in jail for it, and so was the lawyer Lynne Stewart who tried to help them. I kid you not. She was released in 2013, age 74, on compassionate grounds: terminal cancer. I might point out that her sentence included punishment for perjury. S’truth.)

I plan to have a word to the professional licensing board of certain states about the ethics of certain lawyers. As for judges, did you know that they keep their (extremely well-paid) jobs “on good behavior.” In the Constitution of the US it is worded like this: “The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior.” In Australia it is a bit harder to give them the flick. “The Justices of the High Court and of the other courts created by Parliament shall not be removed except by the Governor-General in Council, on an address from both Houses of the Parliament in the same session, praying for such removal on the ground of proved misbehaviour or incapacity.”

The Tsarnaev judge, George O’Toole, earns – I use the term ‘earns’ loosely -- $199K, pa. I will give him the benefit of the doubt, that he’s never seen a website about 9-11, and that he assumes the brothers of Marathon fame had everything to do with the bombing. Even in that case, he still failed miserably in managing the case. Why did he let everyone say the defense is allowed to ‘strategize’ to save a person from execution? A trial is a trial and must be conducted properly. I hear he instructed the jury not to be influenced emotionally by the gory scenes. Does he think that gets him off the hook? Didn’t fool me!
How fabulous to see the royal baby looking so healthy at 9 hours old! May she grow up with unlimited opportunity to do what all females excel at: to produce love.

Herewith a clip of the baby’s late Grandma interviewed by Martin Bashir in 1995:

DIANA: I’ve been in a privileged position for 15 years. I’ve got tremendous knowledge about people and how to communicate. I’ve learnt that, I’ve got it, and I want to use it. And when I look at people in public life … I think the biggest disease this world suffers from in this day and age is the disease of people feeling unloved, and I know that I can give love for a minute, for half an hour, for a day, for a month, but I can give -- I’m very happy to do that and I want to do that.

Interviewer: Do you think the British people are happy with you?

DIANA: I think the British people need someone in public life to give affection, to make them feel important, to support them, to give them light in their dark tunnels.

I see it as a possibly unique role, and yes, I’ve had difficulties, as everybody has witnessed over the years, but let’s now use the knowledge I’ve gathered to help other people in distress.

Interviewer: Do you think you can?

DIANA: I know I can, I know I can, yes.
The Restoration
These days we could use a “restoration” — we need to restore normalcy and common sense. Let’s have a quick, nostalgic look at the 1660 Restoration when the British monarchy got restored. This followed the years in which there was a civil war, a Protectorate, and a brief republic.

Nowadays we speak as if only Muslims go in for beheadings, but the king of England, Charles I, was decapitated in 1649. It was done by an order of Parliament, signed by 59 men. (Granted, it was not a very legitimate parliament, as many members had been forced out; the remainder were called the Rump parliament.)

In 1660, Parliament passed An Act of Free and General Pardon, Indemnity, and Oblivion. It gave amnesty to subjects who had taken part in various hostilities, but not to those who had committed regicide. Ten of them were hanged for treason. (Some who had already died were exhumed and beheaded. Talk about disgusting! But I guess folks didn’t suppress their anger in those days.)

Amnesty for Port Arthur, 9-11, and Everything Else?
Dee McLachlan has asked me to float an idea regarding 9-11. She thinks an amnesty for 9-11 wrongdoers may be “a way to start the ball rolling” to restore normalcy. It could be run like the South African end-of-apartheid Truth and Reconciliation Commission, but by laypersons only. Sinners would have to specify what they did and show how they are going to change their ways.

I favor this, but folks do need to see punishment occur, too. A show trial for at least one of the 9-11 criminals could suffice. A fictional name, John Doe, can be used.

I recall my Dad being glued to the TV in 1974 when Senator Sam Ervin was holding impeachment hearings against President Nixon. Americans had simply forgotten that the law is ABOVE any and all personnel. It was remarkable to hear Ervin simply quote the law. Magic.

(Note: for a guide to persons who could be indicted for 9-11, see Richard Ryan’s Another Nineteen, or the comprehensive website whodidit.org. Also see Hijacking America’s Mind on 9-11, by Elias Davidsson. It dissects all the 9-11 phone calls.)
It’s Way Too Soon To Give Up on Law
Even if we remain unsure of the identity of our enemy, it still pays to concentrate on what the law has to say. Law is so powerful that it is in fact one of the main weapons the baddies use to harm us. They create legislation to thwart our powers, and they stranglehold the judges – as indeed they must, since Court is where the power of all persons (and society itself) would otherwise come through.

Rule of law must be restored forthwith! Prof Anita Bernstein of Brooklyn Law School has written a “Manifesto for the Training of Lawyers.” She says that students may go to law school to do good things, but

> “Once these entrants arrive at law school, the sense of inspiration with which they began often fades, and an inchoate pessimism, if not full-blown cynicism or depression, takes its place.”

Was I ever surprised (actually I was shocked) when, after graduating from Law School and attending a meeting of fellow newbies at the Law Society, we were handed a list of psychologists we could visit. Why? Because “new lawyers tend to be depressed!” Hey, I can think of a better solution than taking Prozac. How about restoring the love of the law that law deserves?

Please, professionals of the law, get a grip. Even if many other institutions are in need of repair, it is this one that is key. Law is the normal, irreplaceable means to constrain harmful behavior. **Not doing your job here is lethal.**

Please see Bill Windsor’s brilliant efforts on this matter in US. He’s riding around like a Lone Ranger, to revitalize law. He happens to be in jail for doing so. But don’t let that worry you. It just shows how “dangerous” it is to tout the blessings of Rule-of-Law. Yippee!
It Is Essential To Discuss “the Jews” Very Openly

We can’t wait any longer to deal with the treason of 9-11, but there is a stumbling block. Many of the most accusatory websites allege that Mossad (Israel’s spies) did 9-11. Personally, I consider that no more interesting than “the FBI did it,” or “the mafia did it.” Undoubtedly Mossad, FBI, and mafia did do 9-11. They do such things routinely. They work together, rather than for a particular nation. They’re enslaved, like mafia hit men, and would probably like to be set free.

(The FBI’s involvement in the first attack on the WTC, which occurred in 1993, has been admitted to!! And don’t miss what the FBI did to Kenneth Trentadue in jail.)

Researcher Mae Brussell, before her death in 1988, had worked out the connections among the men who do all sorts of things: major assassinations, mind control, famines and droughts, serial killings, etc. I only found her book this year, but I had already worked out the same idea.

You can’t miss these guys. They are able to control any court, any police or military. ( Heck, they run the Pentagon; no way do US presidents or Congress run that.) They can suppress books. They have the media under tight wraps.

Brussell (see her on Youtube) pins down the culprits to those associated with the Nazis, including Allen Dulles, who became CIA director in 1953 (see whale.to), John McCloy, head of Chase Manhattan Bank, and the Vatican which handled the transfer of many Nazis to the US.

She considers the blaming of Jews to be a cover. I agree. I am not trying to say no Jews were involved; they very likely played a big part in those things. I’ve read The Synagogue of Satan by AC Hitchcock and do not disagree with it as factual history. But to say that some Jews did this or that, is not to say that “the Jews” did so. And I doubt that Jews run the show. I’m disgusted with the fact that so many people fall into the trap about Jews-and-9-11, and that this then prevents them from acting to indict anyone. See? That is how it works!

Mae Brussell, a Jewish lady of California, did as much as anyone
could do, to interpret what was going on, especially during the Vietnam war. She wrote: “A body of citizens met [to protest the killings]. Those individuals became enemies of the state... and had to be discredited.” (Talk about spot on!) She also said: “SWAT teams, intelligence infiltration, torture and other horrors [were] brought from Vietnam to the US. If we can see this, perhaps clandestine operations of this kind will be halted. If we don’t see the comparisons, they will escalate.” (in Alex Constantine, ed. *The Essential Mae Brussell*, 2014.)

Brussell shows how entertainers, too, such as John Belushi and Bob Marley, have to be bumped off because they are able to draw a following. (“Can’t have leaders!”)

**They Are Tired and Want To Quit Anyway**

My theory is that the Top Dogs’ drive toward total domination is just as biologically guided in the species *Homo sapiens* as it is in that of the fur seal (See my Gumshoe article “Three Ways To Arrange a Society”).

Once the Top Dogs started to have success, they didn’t know what to do with themselves. We humans always repeat what we’ve done before, right? So these guys kept making more and more elaborate schemes, even wholly absurd ones.

They now control thousands — Fritz Springmeier says millions — of mind-controlled slaves. (*See Springmeier’s interview at Henry Makow’s website.*)

As I said in my article on “The Devil,” they’ve even bothered to make a religious underpinning for their naughty deeds. The whole thing is so pathetic. Hadn’t we better stop standing around staring at it and start to do something about it?

I don’t think it’s just wish fulfillment on my part when I say the Top Dogs must be sick of the whole damn thing. It has got completely out of hand. They need a rest.

Help the Top Dogs take a rest.
Today I have been reading books by two high-up men in the CIA and MI6. They are, respectively, William Colby (1920-1996) and Christopher Creighton (1924-2013). My view of the covert agencies is usually pretty scathing. Nevertheless, the authors of these two books strike me as men of conscience.

The fact that Colby was found, as they say, “floating face-down in the East River,” or in his case, the Potomac, may suggest that his conscience did not suit his position as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Colby’s 1978 autobiography is entitled “Honorable Men.”

Creighton’s 1996 book, “OPJB,” which stands for “Operation James Bond,” is an autobiographical work. We now know that Charles Creighton was really John Ainsworth-Davis, who worked closely with Desmond Morton, better known simply as “M.” Creighton did some wild killings, e.g., of mates who were poised to reveal secrets, but he felt terrible about it. This makes OPJB quite a touching book.
It is more exciting, or should I say titillating, to get these details from Creighton if you have already accepted the amazing theory by New Zealand spy Greg Hallett. Namely, that **World War II was an Illuminati exercise.** Full text of Greg Hallett’s book, “Hitler Was a British Agent” (2006) is downloadable, at least for the moment, at archive.org.

Hallett argues that all the participants at Yalta (Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin) — but also the Nazi’s! — were agents for the Illuminati. In Charles Creighton’s book, OPJB, the main man for the Allies, was Martin Bormann, stationed right there in Hitler’s office. (There’s a Youtube investigation of Bormann’s death in Paraguay.)

The wartime head of MI6, Desmond Morton (“M”) **was the boss even of Churchill.** One reason I find it fascinating that John Ainsworth-Davis (“Creighton”) was a man of integrity, is that he was partly brought up by Desmond Morton! Henry Makow has suggested that Morton was a satanic figure **who abused Creighton from age 15 onwards.**

**De-Satanning Satan**
That said, I have been wanting for some time to knock ‘Satanism’ off its perch, and today’s the day. Interest in the (rehabilitated) devil seems to be becoming a popular cultural item, along with witchcraft, numerology, and anything occult.

Just now I googled the word “satanism” and the first item to pop up was “JoyOfSatan.org.” That indicates that the owners of that website have paid to have it listed prominently. (Perhaps they are an entity with ‘funding’?)

Inspecting that website, one finds: “We know Satan as a real being…the true father and creator of humanity.” Hmm. And, “The serpent, a symbol of Satan, represents the firey kundalini force coiled at the base of the spine, which upon ascending, transforms the human mind and soul to a much higher level of understanding and ability.” (Something for everybody…)
On the other hand, there are the more ‘orthodox’ images of Satan as evil, as runs in heavy metal music, Bohemian grove, images of Baphomet, the number 666, and all that.

The Satanic movement can rest on any one of several bases. The “Church of Satan,” founded by Anton LaVey, is registered as a church in San Francisco, and thus can apply for the right to have its chaplains employed by the US military, and, wouldn’t you know, it has in fact done so.

As for the judiciary, the *Los Angeles Times* reported in 2004, that at least one Justice of the US Supreme Court, Clarence Thomas, listed on his tax returns an in-kind gift of air travel to attend the Bohemian Grove. At the Grove, an effigy of a person (we hope it’s only an effigy) gets burnt on an altar. Is this where we want judges to spend their vacations?

Ironic as it may sound, I think the whole kit and caboodle of Satanism is a reflection of the human instinct to be good. Hello? What? Put it this way: “Those who claim to be worshipping Satan do so because it fits in with the same emotional proclivities as those who align themselves to a good cause.”

We all want social approval, a pat on the back. Or, to put it slightly more negatively, I could say that persons who are doing dastardly deeds for their own benefit are more comfortable doing so if they can ascribe it to a noble mission. The Luciferians out there today speak proudly of Lucifer, the light bearer, the same way many of us speak of God.
Killing Children for Lucifer’s Sake

I wish to put paid to any excuse for the torture of children. If someone uses a satanic justification, I want to deal with them!

My introduction to Satanic ‘philosophy,’ was part of my discovery, in 2005, of MK-Ultra. Around 1950, the US Government (and no doubt other governments) created a mind control program. They relied on work done in experimental psychology, psychopharmacology, and neuroscience. They figured out ways to clear a person’s mind of his or her experiences, and send him or her down a new path.

Many child survivors of MK-Ultra, whom I have met, say they were tortured in clinic-like settings on military bases. But many also say their parents were in a religious cult that held rituals (hence the term “ritual abuse”) in which some sort of “worship” and “sacrifice on the altar” took place. They were taught to fear that they would be the next sacrifice. That certainly quickened their acceptance of orders.

I don’t know when child sacrifice began in modern life. Rabbi Martin Antelman, in his book “To Eliminate the Opiate” (2002) traces it, among Jews, to the Sabbatian sect, of which Eva Frank was a proponent. Child sacrifice is also a big feature in some underground Christian cults in the US. It may have been part of the occult group in the UK, the Golden Dawn.

A famous member of the Golden Dawn was Aleister Crowley (1875-1947), who worked for MI6. He was pleased to be called “the wickedest man in the world.” Barbara Bush (b. 1925), First Lady of the United States from 1989 to 1993, is said to be his out-of-wedlock daughter. She certainly has a remarkable resemblance to him.

Crowley and Barbara Bush

Wikipedia notes of Aleister Crowley:

“His mother had a strained relationship with her son; she described him as ‘the Beast,’ a name that he revelled in…. Crowley’s
father was particularly devout, spending his time as a travelling preacher…. Following the death of their baby daughter in 1880, the family moved to Surrey. At age 8, Crowley was sent to evangelical Christian boarding school, and then to Ebor school, run by the Reverend Henry Champney, whom Crowley considered a sadist.”

When reading the book “Barbara Bush, a Memoir” (1994), I was startled to see that Barbara had been required to leave her 7-year-old son George and her newborn son Jeb, for many months, to be with her daughter Robin who was at Sloan-Kettering Hospital in New York. Three-year-old Robin had leukemia (with the highest white blood cell count her doctor in Texas had ever seen).

Barbara mentions that when little Robin died, the child’s body was handed over, by the hospital, to her mother-in-law, Mrs Prescott Bush and a Skull-and-Bones colleague of her husband, for burial. A bit unusual, to say the least. To me, the chapter on Robin in Barbara’s memoir sounds like a call for help. Of course, I could be wrong. Maybe they are a normal family.
Although I have read Orwell’s *1984* a few times, I’ve only just noticed that he actually uses the term “controlled insanity” to tell us that the men in charge really do want us to be insane. **It’s their goal.** They engineer it. Wow.

Orwell died in 1950. I wonder if he foresaw that when society is deprived of its sanity, this will backfire on the elite.

Here are but 25 things that strike me as insane:

1. We are changing life forms, à la God.
2. We use depleted uranium, despite irreversible harm.
3. We allow fraudulent vote-counting at election time.
4. We reduce the English language to make it ‘simpler.’
5. We are trashing the values of privacy and autonomy.
6. We merge businesses into monopolies, at a global level.
7. We’ve invented new diseases that can hurt everyone.
8. We teach soldiers and prison guards how to torture.
9. We let courts and bureaucracies break up families.
10. We let population numbers increase unchecked.
11. We teach males to not be strong protectors of society.
12. We no longer try to care for everyone’s dignity.
13. We create weapons that are unbelievably expensive.
14. We practice *transmigrasei* to undo established cultures.
15. We teach young people that their elders are stupid.
16. We frighten everyone with the new police state.
17. We are reducing the age of puberty for children.
18. We adore everything big and new and technological.
19. We’ve agreed that sex should no longer be intimate.
20. We encourage distrust, instead of cultivating trust.
21. We let our political ‘representatives’ sell us out.
22. We make finance impossible for farmers so they quit.
23. We genetically modify crops – with no discussion.
24. We send mothers of infants to be soldiers in battle.
25. We fail to publish science that contradicts the bosses.
How Did We Get Stupidized?
Of the 25 stupid things listed above, most or all could be turned around immediately. Yet people seem stuck. How is it that smart, good-hearted individuals feel unable even to debate these issues?

Allow me to proffer three explanations for our stupidization. The first has to do with the trait known as doublethink. The second has to with electronic mind control. The third is ‘Tavistockian’ repetition of stories, as is used by media

Here is Orwell’s quote on doublethink in which he introduces the concept of “controlled insanity.”
(Taken from 1984, abridged):

“The prevailing mental condition is controlled insanity.
In a Party member not even the smallest deviation of opinion can be tolerated. And if it is necessary to rearrange one’s memories or to tamper with written records, then it is necessary to forget that one has done so. The trick of doing this can be learned like any other mental technique.

The Party intellectual knows in which direction his memories must be altered; he therefore knows that he is playing tricks with reality; but by the exercise of doublethink he also satisfies himself that reality is not violated. The process has to be conscious, or it would not be carried out with sufficient precision, but it also has to be unconscious, or it would bring with it a feeling of falsity and hence of guilt.

[T]he essential act of the Party is to use conscious deception while retaining the firmness of purpose that goes with complete honesty. By using the word doublethink one admits that one is tampering with reality; by a fresh act of doublethink one erases this knowledge; and so on, indefinitely, with the lie always one leap ahead of the truth.” (Emphasis added)
Electronic Mind Control, e.g., from Satellites
Now to something more esoteric. As noted in my article about Melbourne citizen John Finch, thousands of people around the world report that they receive painful hits from electro-magnetic weapons. (They believe it comes from satellites, but the hits could just as well be coming from earth-based devices.)

Nick Begich, Jr is the son of a US Congressman who was on a plane that disappeared in 1972. As Nick lives in Alaska, it’s not surprising that he keeps an eye on the High Frequency Active Aural Research Program. The relevant patent (go to see uspto.gov for all patents) shows HAARP is a heater of the ionosphere!

Nick Begich, Jr

The US proudly announced in 1958 that it had made nuclear explosions way up there -- out of scientific curiosity! The US military now says it will “own the weather” by 2025. HAARP can make earthquakes (Alaska is not the only source; there may be a HAARP thingie in Oz).

Please listen to Nick Begich speak, on Youtube, about mind control. He shows how easily HAARP can send out an electromagnetic pulse that slightly alters human brain waves, en masse. This can put people into a susceptible mood, and then they will believe whatever they are told to believe. Another type of pulse can make everyone anxious, the precondition for obedience. Begich now says that it is easy to mess up the mind merely by altering the frequencies in the flickering of the TV screen.

Fluoride, V2K, etc
It is also widely claimed that the use of fluoride in the water, supposedly to help kids’ teeth, is really meant to tranquilize the population. I tend to believe this, using the following reasoning (which I call ‘boomerang reasoning’): Doctors who try to get
their critical studies of fluorine published hit a brick wall. My cancer research (2013) taught me that censorship of scientists mainly occurs when they are onto something.

As to V2K, meaning voice-to-skull communications, the website of the Federation of American Scientists quotes a military definition: V2K is “a neuro-electromagnetic device which uses microwave transmission of sound into the skull of persons or animals by way of pulse-modulated microwave radiation” It mentions that V2K is used as “an electronic scarecrow to frighten birds in the vicinity of airports.” Messages thus trigger a motor response which is involuntary.

I won’t endeavor to list other advanced mind control techniques. It should simply go without saying that powerful people will try to ‘disarm’ the individual of his most useful weapon: his brain.

Mind Control Is a Natural Part of Power Relations

Mind control is perfectly ordinary. I engage in it all the time by trying to influence my readers. Of course one can try to deceive one’s readers. Indeed there is the opportunity, if you have access to mass audience, to accomplish vast changes in thinking. As early as 1928, Edward Bernays – “the father of public relations” – wrote the following in his 1928 book, *Propaganda*:

“The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country. … In the sphere of politics or business, in social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by the relatively small number of persons…who understand the mental processes and social patterns of the masses. It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind. [87 years ago!] (Emphasis added)
A Great Insight into Media’s Control of ‘the Story’

It is well understood that there are ways to make an idea go deep into a person’s brain. Four such ways are: 1. Tell it to persons when they are very young. 2. Have an authority figure deliver it. 3. Associate the theme with a powerful emotion. 4. Repeat it often.

William Pepper is a lawyer who left no stone unturned in trying to find out who killed Martin Luther King. He proved in court, in the civil action *King v Loyd Jowers*, that the assassination was not done by James Earl Ray. Only one local reporter attended the court sessions. (Can you imagine!) Years on, the media are still routinely saying Ray did it. I call this JOURNALISTIC RECIDIVISM.

In his 2003 book, *An Act of State*, Pepper credits William Schapp, an expert on the government’s use of the media for disinformation and propaganda, with teaching him one simple trick: that it pays to repeat your story:

“The neurological impact upon human cognizance, and reasoned decision-making [is great] when the same story is told over and over again. That impact makes the story a knee-jerk part of the people who are exposed to it. Even if they are convinced on one occasion by powerful evidence to the contrary, the next day will usually find them reverting back to their long-held beliefs.”

That may sound outrageous but it’s actually good news. Children can easily be taught that we have this teeny-weeny brain deficit and can overcome it! At the very least one can repeat a competing phrase or idea the same number of times!

Similarly, we can make a big dent in the doublethink problem, just by exposing it. As with our other evolved traits, the trick is to work *with* them. They are not going to go away but neither do they have to be our absolute undoing.
My wonderful late husband, George Maxwell, MD, was the professor of paediatrics at University of Adelaide. As I recall, he had full faith in childhood vaccination. But if he were alive today and saw the new research on vax, I think he would do a turn-around.

He’d be sad that his teachers at Edinburgh did not tip him off to the fact that Edward Jenner, who fired the first ‘shot’ in 1796, was a con artist. (Charles Creighton, MD, showed that in an essay in 1875.) All doctors today stand to be embarrassed by this, but let’s just get the embarrassment over quickly.

As for the visit to Oz of a doctor named Sherri Tenpenny, George would certainly approve of her offering her opinion on vax, even if it were diametrically opposed to his. Isn’t that what science is all about? If her message were harmful, George would be licking his chops at the thought of combatting her ideas.

Bound for Botany Bay
Yesterday I wrote a ditty about Tenpenny to the melody of “Bound for Botany Bay.” You know, like the convicts’ song “Farewell to the well-known Old Bailey, where I used for to cut such a swell”? – the tune can be found at Youtube, with John Williams singing it).
Botany Bay for the Vaccine-Cautious

I’m Sherri Tenpenny, a doctor,  
I hail from the US of A.  
They invited me to go on a  
lecture tour,  
So I was bound for Botany Bay.

Chorus: Singing toorali, oorali, addity  
Toorali oorali-ay Singing toorali, oorali,  
Addity I was bound for Botany Bay.

Then a rumpus broke out in the media  
I never made it to Melbourne or Perth,  
But is Hep-B an honest necessity  
When your child’s just an hour from birth?

Not everyone knows about Jenner  
The inventor of vaccine was a fraud,  
He caused much more smallpox than he prevented  
And it’s like that today, swear to God.  

Chorus

Some doctors have questioned my sanity  
The Gold Coast and Brisbane did, too.  
But where is the commonsense in all of this:  
Twenty shots before your child reaches two?

Pharmaceuticals provide package inserts  
You’ll find them quite shocking, I say.  
They admit they’ve done no safety studies!  
That’s what I must tell parents today.  

Chorus

Adelaide thought about cancelling me.  
They said “You’re not for freedom of speech.”  
I said “That’s true, I am going to Adelaide  
Simply to surf at their lovely West Beach.”

Now mind, all ye young dukes and duchesses,  
Better listen what I’ve got to say,  
Your immune system is the Lord’s handiwork,  
It’s got no plans to be going away.  

Chorus
I posted the song at a website known to be very critical of vaccines, namely, ageofautism.com. To my surprise, an American lady named Jenny Allen responded immediately with specifics about the cancellation of Dr Tenpenny’s Oz tour. It’s worse than I reckoned. Here is what Ms Allen told us:

“It’s very sad Dr Tenpenny has decided to cancel, not only her speaking engagements in Australia, but her planned holiday as well. The venue hosts were being threatened and the organisers could not guarantee the safety of attendees including some young children. These are threats of violence and thuggery pure and simple. It’s illegal, but the Aussie police plainly don’t want to know, at least when vaccines are being questioned....

Dr. Sherri Tenpenny announced that she has cancelled speaking appearances scheduled for Brisbane, Sydney, Adelaide, Melbourne, and Gold Coast. The reason was due to pro-vaccine extremists calling for violence and making bomb threats against venue owners and their families in some cities. Fellow vaccine lecturer Stephanie Messenger jointly decided to cancel her appearances along with Dr. Tenpenny.” [Emphasis added]

I say again, what’s wrong with the George Maxwell method? Take Tenpenny’s ideas one by one and demolish them if you can. If, instead, you bully her, WE KNOW YOU DO NOT HAVE A SCIENTIFIC COMEBACK FOR HER.

I am ashamed of any physician that doesn’t take “the George approach.” By the way, if you want a free copy of George’s 1984 Oxford U Press book, *Principles of Paediatric Pharmacology*, just ask me. But frankly you’d be as well off going to the whale.to website run by John Scudamore in UK, which has all the dirt about Jenner, Robert Gallo, Albert Sabin, and much more.

**Blame the Doctors -- and Nurses, Too**

In regard to vaccines, I don’t join the ageofautism writers in blaming the media and/or the legislature for vaccine-damage to children. I blame the doctors -- and nurses, too.
Recall recent Gumshoe articles on the Dr Richard Day revelations of 1969. He ‘prophesied’ that doctors would no longer be independent. Why must docs put up with this takeover by corporations and government? Wasn’t the life of a GP considered very noble, and very personally rewarding?

Old docs should come out of retirement to tell the medical students that they have options. Old nurses should make their thoughts known in this great controversy, about the absurdity of filling a baby on his first day of life with several vaccines.

As for the public, they needn’t file lawsuits to get a miscreant doctor struck off the register. They have only to go to the licensing board of their state and file a simple complaint which, by law, MUST be dealt with, and will be dealt with by the disciplinary committee of the profession. And all results are published. Isn’t that nice?

Your complaint does not have to be “He broke my carotid artery.” It can be “He refused to continue to care for my child because I opted out of vax.” Note: in Oz the full Centerlink payments are not payable to mothers unless their children get the full schedule of vaccines.

Note: Readers of the Vaccination chapter in my book “Consider the Lilies” will know that I take a much stronger line than Tenpenny does. I claim the smallpox campaigns of both the 1800s and the WHO-sponsored one around 1978, were out-and-out genocide.

**UPDATE**

Oh-oh. False flags are at it again. It seems that Dr Tenpenny was not refused a visa, nor did “pro-vaxxers” make threats. Rather, a man in Adelaide named “Frankie” Vazquez called some of the venues (such as Rydges South Park) to say he would do violence if the venues cancelled Tenpenny. That is supposed to be proof of his strong anti-vax stance. Totally not plausible, Folks! But the give-away here is that he was not arrested. He threatened terrorism, right? But “that’s OK.”
COMMENT FROM MARY W MAXWELL:
I saw this new item from Andrew Wakefield on Youtube, uploaded March 25, 2015:

“Matthew Downing was a little boy in California. At the age of five and a half months he received eight vaccines on the same day, Hep-B, Hep-A, DPT, polio, and several others. His behaviour changed immediately, he became fractious, he became irritable and that lasted for 48 hours and then he died.

For those of you who have concerns on vaccine safety that will reinforce your position. For those of you who trust in the CDC and pharmaceutical industry to look after your best interests, you will say that that was a coincidence, or that that death was acceptable collateral in the war on infectious diseases. Let me put one thing to bed immediately: the medical history confirmed that it was not coincidence, that his immunisation and his death were a continuum linked by his change in behaviour, it was not a coincidence. Here is the real problem at the heart of it. Never in the history of this planet has there ever been any safety study of that combination of vaccines. But there’s a problem

The doctor refused that the death caused by a nurse in his office was a vaccine injury, therefore it never went down in the records as a vaccine injury, thereby contributing to our continued ignorance about vaccine safety. Not only that, because it was not in the opinion of the doctor a medical injury, a vaccine injury, the parents were put on a high risk register, whether they knew it or not, for potentially dangerous and violent parents. So here’s the irony: Crystal Downing, Matthews mother, is pregnant again and if these bills pass in California, when that child is born she will have no choice, zero choice but to expose her new child to the vaccines that killed her previous child. That is the dilemma she faces, and if she refuses which she should rightfully do, for medical reasons, her child will be taken away from her, particularly because she is already on a high risk register for abusive or potentially abusive parents and she will never see that child again, except perhaps his ashes in an urn.”

[Note: Wakefield lost his UK medical license, but his Sydney-grad colleague John Walker-Smith did not. In 1988 they wrote a well-reasoned “case series” that the Lancet ‘retracted’ under political pressure. Pity doctors don’t complain about that!]
GALLIPOLI – A HUNDRED YEARS IS ENOUGH

by Mary W Maxwell, April 21, 2015

This must stop. People snuffing each other out for no reason. At Gallipoli tens of thousands of boys died in their absolute prime. Total deaths for “the great war” (great war?) around 20 million; in World War II countless civilian deaths. Widows in every neighborhood.

What’s the cause of all this killing? Is it based on an instinct to “get” the foreigner? Nope. Competition for resources? Surprisingly, no. Thanks to that fantastic educational breakthrough, the Internet, it’s now possible for us to realize what it was really all about. Might as well toss out all the books written on the subject.

The fact is – I believe it is fact – both world wars came off the drawing board of a small group of men in England. I would call these men ‘disturbed,’ wouldn’t you?

Imagine planning three world wars – the two just mentioned, and the one that your son will be invited to join any day now in the Middle East. What made them do it? Quite simply, they needed to put all young men to work as a way of keeping themselves from being noticed.

Anzac Day ‘Trance.’ What will happen this year at the hundreds of Dawn Services in Australia? Prayers will be whispered, ideals will be invoked, and a bugler will play The Last Post. We’ll solemnly murmur “Lest we forget.”

Wait a minute! Hold your horses please. We aren’t likely to “forget,” as we never thought it out in the first place. I think it’s time we learned who screwed Australia in WWI. Humans like to honor the dead – I agree that that’s a very good habit. But it needn’t force us to say that the average lad at Gallipoli was doing Oz a favor. He didn’t do anyone a favor. Certainly not himself or the family he left behind. Rather, he actually participated in the oppression of our nation!

Gallipoli was a slaughter and was caused by the idiots – Top Dogs -- who are committed to having a bunch of lads be canon fodder. You know that they regularly support both sides in a
conflict, even today, right? So don’t be afraid to face the fact that they did that in 1915.

Beautiful Anzac Day ceremonies could be part of the game to keep us in the routine of these dreadful things. I apologize for saying that. I don’t want to say it. But I don’t want to live in a trance. Shouldn’t we face what’s going on around us? Can you name any MP, or bishop, or professor today who invites a sober consideration of our ‘foreign engagements’? The military themselves can’t broach a topic such as “Hey, what are we doing in the Middle East?” I ask: Are any mechanisms in place that could stop another Gallipoli from occurring? NO!

I confess I do not know who the top dogs are. They appear to me to run every nation, even the ones they pretend not to, such as North Korea and Iran. How do I know? First, I know it merely by logic. If Kim Il Sung or the Ayatollah were really independent-minded they’d have met up with a car crash or a heart attack. If, instead, they live long, they must be in the top dogs’ good graces.

Second, I know it by researching the many leaks that occur. For instance, Robert Dreyfuss found that the 1979 take-over of Iran (allegedly by the Ayatollah) was really a booting out of the Shah by the US. But weren’t American hostages held for a year? Yes, but that’s all in a day’s work for the CIA. The CIA and MI6 admit ousting Iran’s popular leader, Dr Mossadegh, in 1953. What’s the diff?

Not To Worry about the Archduke Ferdinand, 1914
Whatever was said to be the cause of WWI, you can be sure it was as fake as the cause of our attack on Libya, say. The chess-players up there decide all sorts of conflicts for folks to enter into, and the media assure us that it’s the people’s silly old xenophobia that incites these things.

Even the cause of WWII, the invasion of Poland by the guy with the unique mustache, was a put-up job. Prescott Bush,
sire of a US prexy, helped Wall Street organize the funds Hitler needed. Yes! It’s now undisputed that “Wall Street” also arranged the Commie takeover in Russia in 1917. “They do it all.” Sort of a one-stop shopping outfit.

**Basic Sociobiology Covers All the Ground**

Fact is, we are a mammal species and even a third-year student of zoology can see that a species has ways for individuals to deal with each other, alone or as group members. I learned (mis-learned) in philosophy class that human behavior is ideationally guided. Rubbish. We always operate with what our instincts provide for us. Nearly all behavior has a subconscious impetus.

Here’s the drill, Folks. Humans compete with one another. They need resources and often prey on the weak. I know I prey on the weak. When I open the fridge I see food that I never planted or harvested. Some poor soul did it at rotten wages. And that’s not all I do to him. I let my “Pentagon” (cough, cough) drive him insane with bombs, humiliation, etc -- for seemingly any old reason.

The good part is that this particular species of mammal can find out how its instincts work! So, I can see that I am preying on others. Equally well, I can see (here comes the conspiracy theory) that some Top Dogs prey on me! They do things like urge me to lay flowers at Martin Place, to help me believe Australia was attacked on December 15, 2015. Then, while I’m weeping about that, they get my MP to sneak some draconian legislation in. Amazing.

**“We Were Jerrybuilt on the Pleistocene” – EO Wilson**

Nature does not build by advance planning. Things evolve according to what’s already out there. So, modern humans are stuck with quite a few habits that must, in the past, have been adaptive to our Pleistocene situation. If the habits hadn’t been useful, the genes would not have survived.

But when we act on our instincts today, in changed circumstances (for example, non-natural chemicals now abound), we are likely to make big mistakes. We figure out a way to make a nice predatory
profit selling chemicals and then wreck the planet. Whole routines get set in place, as if there is no way to stop such things. Ah, but we have at least some cerebral capacity to stop and re-think it all.

We really do not have to persist in a ridiculous chase.

They say the brain shuts down, and all reasoning ceases, if people get into a panic. I assume that will happen to me if the crunch really comes. But it hasn’t come yet, and we can do a lot of things to prevent it coming. Really, you should take heart. Tell your fears to hit the road, Jack.

The Point of the World Wars: To Help Top Dogs
Recently, I studied what happened to eighteen doctors who found various ways to treat cancer without using chemo. Consistently, those docs were punished. I wrote this up in a book in 2013. (Shortcut: see my article “How To Deal with the Many Advertised Cancer Cures” at Gumshoe, January 23, 2015.) I can say for sure that the fate of those doctors cannot have been coincidental. The attack on them was clever, well-funded, secret, ruthless.

Another proof that our lives can be directed from the top is Charlotte Iserbyt’s book Deliberate Dumbing Down. Who would dream that governments go all outdoors to make sure kids don’t end up educated? Charlotte’s got all the inside papers to show how they carried it out. Case closed.

It’s the same guys who prevent good medicine that also establish bad schooling. They want “the masses” to be sick, stupid, and well entertained. It all has to do with their need to maintain their position of power. “Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown.” By 1770, and probably before that, a group was organized to run everything, worldwide.

I don’t think there’s time now to chase around after the details of the Top Dog Situation. Let’s proceed to act, and if it turns out to have been a false alarm, no harm done.

So start with the premise that, just as in 1915, we are being made fools of like mad. We need to coordinate with each other, and resist. If the official roles in society (politics, media, clergy,
academia, judiciary) are filled with persons who can’t seem to break out of the rut, we have to set up some pretend institutions, mere clubs I suppose.

Anyone can start a club. You don’t need permission. It is legal. I should say it is legal at the moment. Parliament has passed laws in recent months (“since Martin Place”) that forbid people to reveal crimes they see government commit. Woo-hoo, isn’t that out-and-out obstruction of justice? That is a felony; we should arrest these criminals.

Century
We’re nearing Gallipoli’s 100th anniversary and should mark the date by ‘turning over a new leaf.’ Standard obstacles to initiating change are: belief that an issue can always be postponed a few more months; reluctance to upset the social routine; fear (well justified) of being hated for saying there’s anything wrong with our way of life. Hmm. What a bunch of stupid reasons for deciding to take no action against a lethal foe.

Well, there’s a task for your club! Identify anyone who seems bent on harming Oz from inside. Any person who holds a position of public trust and who puts up barriers to discussion is harming us. See? The sins can seem quite minor but they add up. Don’t let ‘politeness’ blind you.

I think a new World War is scheduled. So whose job is it to get sensible? The citizenry. That means you. Honest, it does. Come on, shake a leg. Why be a gutless wonder when you could be the sexiest kid on the block, for staving off World War III?

Diggers may have thought they were fighting for Oz but, no, they were actually fighting to keep Oz oppressed!
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My First Year in Journalism
by Dee McLachlan

2014 was my first step into reporting the news and trying to provide an alternative voice to the mainstream narrative. It was a year of hot issues, much learning and pleasant surprises. I am very grateful to all who contributed, advised me along the way.

We live in extraordinary ‘Big Brother’ times – and 1984 has come to fruition where the few control the screens and print for our consumption. What ‘dangerous’ times!

While scanning the newspapers in late December (2014), I noticed The Age editorial (below), which reads: ‘Gathering the news without fear or favour’. Well, that’s a joke.

The editor referred to an 1896 remark by Adolf Ochs that the goal of the New York Times was “to give the news impartially, without fear or favour, regardless of party, sect, or interests involved”. He then said “At The Age we continually strive to uphold such lofty ambitions.”

Well so much for The New York Times’s lofty goals. They managed to ignore the 29-foot billboard outside their offices that pointed out the demise of Building 7. I challenge the editor of The Age to publish the facts surrounding Building 7 (for a start). What about a double-page spread with “Let Us Remember That A Third Tower Collapsed on 9/11”? It would probably boost readership.

The article would remind a hypnotized public that a 47-storey skyscraper just ‘pancaked’ in what looked like a perfect demolition job that afternoon. That would be a good start in reporting without fear or favour, and then maybe move on to Port Arthur.

One of the highlights in 2014 for Gumshoenews was interviewing
Malcolm Fraser. He said that both leading parties (Liberal and Labor) are “beyond reform”, and that Australia’s alliance with the US was “dangerous”.

Jon Faine (ABC 774) had tried to denigrate Mr Fraser’s view on air – as did many others in the media – including Gerard Henderson, of the The Sydney Institute and Media Watch Dog (!!), who wrote disparagingly: “Former prime minister Malcolm Fraser identifies with the conspiracy theory that Israel consciously bombed the USS Liberty in 1967”. Neither The Australian nor Henderson would bother to consider the personal accounts and facts provided by USS Liberty survivors Joe Meadors or Ron Kukal.

I was also pleased when a family member of the 9-11 tragedy, Matt Campbell, got in touch with me. I suppose the turning point for me was Building 7. It was bad enough understanding that shadow governments are doing terrible things, but my second realization, that the media is complicit in this huge cover up, had just as much of an impact on me.

Imagine if you had lost a loved one in this most appalling crime, then: No one in authority believed your version? But, not only did they not believe you, they refused to do a proper investigation of the crime. Julia Gillard, Prime Minister, called your view “Stupid and wrong”.

If that weren’t bad enough, the mainstream media went out of its way to make a fool of you. E.g., ABC popular 774 talk show host Jon Faine compared investigating 9-11 to “lunatic fringe” and to “debate whether the earth is flat”.

Matt Campbell told me that the death of his brother had numbed him for nearly a decade, and then, when he realized the fraud and silence of the media (over the 9-11) it sparked anger in him. It seems he will continue fighting to get the murder of his brother heard. We’ll support you, Matt!

In October, 2014, I was invited to hash things out with professor of engineering, Jonathan Barnett. I assumed he would be able to make a normal scientific argument about 9-11’s collapsed buildings. No, not at all! It was truly a surreal experience for me to “converse” with him – if you could call it that. Perhaps he is under mind
control. It was as if Barnett had been through some form of thought manipulation. By the way, I am still waiting for Dr Karl to provide a sensible reply regarding Building 7. But what can you expect from an ABC-supported scientist?

It seems that governments and the status quo are suffocating journalism. Reporters without Borders listed that 975 journalists (professional and citizen) had been arrested around the world this year.

You only need to read between the lines in the mainstream media to realize that much of the Western world has voluntarily imposed forms of a police state on their societies.

I am new to this reporting game. My christening had to do with the so-called investigation of the MH17 crash. That was when I was when I found out the huge disconnect between the West’s political narrative and reality. Immediately after the Malaysian Airline Flight MH17 went down over Ukraine, a YouTube clip was published, showing that the Pro-Russian Ukrainian ‘rebels’ may be the culprit. Our Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, was one of the first to blame President Putin – never mind that witness accounts and images of “bullet holes” told a different story.

The Australian MSM reported only the NATO-Washington narrative – not giving any air to the facts, or even to (OSCE) International Monitor, Michael Bociurkiw’s observations on the ground. I was staggered.

Over the months I wrote, many times, to the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade and Foreign Minister Julie Bishop’s office.
I provided Internet links to unbiased evidence. I initially (and naively) thought that Canberra might tone down the Putin blame game, but it only escalated to the PM’s promise to “shirtfront” Putin.

It was as if I was talking to a brick wall. It seems that the lawmakers and politicians become disconnected from reality – part of this thought manipulation. They seem to ‘trapped’ in a vortex that has them propagating an odd narrative.

These are the media presstitutes waiting for their next media briefing to blame Putin (‘Pik, pik, pik…. Putin, pik)

I want to do more research, but my limitations are resources and funding. Media organisations have billions of dollars, thousands of employees and journalists working away. Yet with all this, they can’t even report the truth – most of the time.

We need to monetize Gumshoe. Some heavyweight investors with a conscience may decide it’s time to ramp up competition for News Corp, Fairfax and the ABCNews.

We can write, have highly critical and intelligent people on board, and can produce award-winning television. I guess with 1% of their funding we could start dominating 20% of the market in three years. People have an insatiable desire to hear the truth – when they actually start hearing it.

Let me end with a Comment that Gumshoe reader Christopher Brooks sent on April 20, 2015, in response to my article “‘Operation Riding’ Averts Melbourne Terror Attack” (the name appears to refer sarcastically to the fact that they entered homes before the occupants woke up).

Christopher generously tells us he is available to discuss such things with any interested journalist. Thank you, Sir.
A Plea for Truth, by Christopher Brooks

I am very alarmed at the brutality reported by the ABC surrounding the recently conducted police raids. It is impossible to not conclude that these boys and their families are the victims of decades of lies and criminal wars and foreign policies based on myths and outright deceptions.

We cannot yet know the exact nature of the “plot” that allegedly justifies these police invasions of homes in the early morning but anyone with a memory knows that the early sensational “terror” and immediate fear version of events will evaporate into a flimsy more complex and murky tale of obscure influence and possibly entrapment by invisible characters who are beyond scrutiny and cross examination.

Secrecy is the rule in the new Australian Police State that is now frequently dosed with Orwellian theatre. Only last week a Muslim school principal was castigated and threatened by all and sundry because he was stating ISIS was a tool of US and Israeli foreign policy. He is supported by the facts but you would not know that if you read this article in The Age: “The Dangers of Feeding Lies to Muslim Children.”

…Western power has purposefully developed ISIS, just another Al Qaeda death squad brand, because it is a covert warfare strategy that achieves the destabilization and Balkanization of Muslim regions of the world by spilling the blood of Muslim men and women on both sides.

The ABC just ignores the evidenced pattern of history. If Australians, ABC journalists and otherwise, participate in fueling totally false versions of the real power and motivations driving the Syria/Iraq conflicts, where does true responsibility rest? …

Australia needs courageous honest journalism that reports the full mature and objective picture and asks the real questions regarding who is really responsible and what is really happening.

It is a very deep concern that we are creeping towards a security-state mentality.

We do not have to proceed down this path. It is the road to hell. Truth is the path to a much better place.
Tips for Journalism Students
by Dee McLachlan

When I was growing up in South Africa, it was ingrained in us to not ask the difficult and challenging questions. “Why are there separate toilets for blacks and whites? Why are there laws forcing black people to carry pass books?” “Because that’s the way it is, and now don’t start all that nonsense and make a fuss. You will just get into a lot of trouble.”

Nothing has changed, except the questions are different. Society still does not encourage the challenging questions. The law even threatens those who do, and in some cases jails them. So the impression many folks have of a “journalist” is that of a paid stooge sitting in a political briefing room with a list of questions he or she can ask. If he or she asks the “bad” questions – they’ll be out of a job or barred. So why become a journalist in the first place?

It is sad when I read some reports from investigative journalists. It is clear that they have taken the bait, and dished up a biased story -- based on a hidden agenda. What we really need is young people that can see through the bullshit and brainwashing, and dissect information with clarity. The other requirement for a journalist is to be acquainted with all sides of the debate, or to be exceptionally well read (like Mary Maxwell).

So, before taking on the career of journalist, decide if you are prepared for the hard road of investigating the truth. If not, accept that you will be a media stooge.

I am not yet experienced enough to advise, except in areas where I think I have noticed what’s really going on. The following 20 pages contain tips on three things: how one needs to be persistent with sources, such as the NSW police; what a great store of interviewees there is out there, such as individuals who understand the meaning of ‘debt’; and how, when you are reporting a Royal Commission, you can’t take the goings-on at face value.
TIP ONE:
PERSISTENCE WHEN
THE SOURCE IS EVASIVE

The first time I encountered what may be a fake story was in 2014 (Recall my “Brandis’ 1984 Red-letter Day”). Then Mary wrote it up in a Gumshoe article. I will let her tell of my adventures:

Bella Vista Incident. Here Comes Doubting Thomas
August 9, 2015 by Mary W Maxwell

As far as I know, Dee McLachlan is the only media person who has picked up on this. The day was 25 September 2014. Almost one year ago. All of your basic MSMs — Australian, SBS, SMH, The Guardian, Business Insider — reported on the case of an Australian soldier being physically assaulted, right here on the sunny shores, wearing his uniform.

Not many legal scholars specialize in treason but there’s one in Adelaide and she recognized right away that such an assault is treason. I mean we cannot have our people attacking our soldiers — or the prime minister or the monarch, etc. Such personages stand for the nation and an attack on them is “war.” (This is black-letter law, I’m not making it up.) You can be sure the police, and perhaps special forces, were sent to capture the miscreant.

Well, actually, they weren’t. We later found out that it was a quiet day at the office. But the ink spent in those MSM journals did have a payout! That very evening, September 25, the Senate agreed to a new law that can put journalists and whistleblower types behind bars for 10 years. By the way, the soldier turns out to have been a sailor, age 41. We are not provided with his name.

Admittedly, it’s conspiratorial of me to say that there was a “payout.” I can’t offer proof. I’m only guessing. But what if you were to hear that the reported Incident never took place? Would you then demand to know who provided the ‘facts’ to those press
outlets? Would you see a connection between the Incident and the legislation? I mean, who had the motive? Who started it?

The original report did name the alleged location: the Bella Vista district of Sydney. Here it is, per smh.com.au on the very day (Sept 25): “Thursday morning, at 6.30 am a member of the Australian Defence Force (ADF) was attacked. The 41-year-old man told police he was threatened and assaulted by two men of Middle Eastern appearance while wearing his full uniform at Bella Vista, Sydney. Suffering ‘minor bruising,’ he reported the matter to police and then attended Kings Cross police station in person.”

Withdrawal
So OK, we know which police station to look to, for further information. But the next day, Friday, September 26, the media reported that that the victim had withdrawn the charge!! I do realize that some people may think there can be no further action against the assaulter once the victim withdraws a charge. But that is not true; the Public Prosecutor can forge ahead.

Anyway, three days ago, on the 8th of August in the Year of Our Lord 2015, Dee McLachlan decided to phone the police media office to follow up on the 25 September, 2014 Incident. An officer said he would check and call her back. The next day he did call her back, all very friendly and said “We don’t believe it happened.” (That’s a lot more than “He withdrew the charge.”)

Harking Back One Week Anti-beheading Task Force
Dee reminds us that “On 18 September, there had been a raid. 800 police launched synchronised raids on houses and vehicles.” That is MAJOR manpower (more than at the Olympics?) in Steak and Kidney and Brissie. The ABC headline ran: “Authorities thwart ‘beheading’ plot in Australia’s biggest ever counter-terrorism raids” You should go to the actual ABC page; it is astonishing.

After a few arrests were made, some people protested, in Lakemba district of Sydney. As Dee has pointed out, one of the featured ‘speakers’ was Man Haron Monis – later to be featured
again at the Lindt Café (where, as far as we know, he died, but maybe someone someday will withdraw that story too? I mean if story-withdrawal is now standard, who’s to know what to believe?).

Then, on September 23, 2014, an 18-year-old man with one of those names if you know what I mean, Numan Haider, made trouble and got himself shot dead by cops.

“23rd September – 18-year-old Numan Haider, a terrorism suspect, is shot dead by a Victoria Police officer outside Endeavour Hills police station after stabbing the officers.” I quote The Age: Police said the two officers met the Narre Warren man outside the police station before he lashed out at the officers with a sharp instrument. Mr Lay refuted reports that he was running towards the police station when he was shot. Onlookers — who did not want to be named — (well, did the police or the media get their names? Is there a standard of journalism re witnesses?) said the dead man had been shouting insults at Prime Minister Tony Abbott.

When To Be a Doubting Thomas
I’d just like to throw in a new rule, about When To Be A Doubting Thomas. Pretend I am the baddy who is shouting remarks about the PM, even really outrageous remarks. The question is: WOULD I ACTUALLY run at the police as though to attack them? If so, I’d know my days were numbered, right? So we are basically describing a suicidal gesture. Is an 18-year-old so “devoted to the cause” that he wants to end his life? Show me such a person. I know a little zoology; I know an injured bird will fight vigorously for life. There really is a life instinct.

Hence I must invoke the Doubting Thomas rule. If I hear of something that does not make sense to me prima facie, I doubt it. So, I doubt that Numan What’s-His-Name ever lunged at police, causing them to need self-defence. I say he values his life. Only a babe of 18.

Still, if it happened, if he did put the cops in danger, I certainly agree that they should use self-defense. Is there any video of it? Can we see the hospital reports regarding the officer’s wounds? I know you feel I am being impolite. I feel very impolite myself. I wasn’t
brought up to ridicule cops. By the way, The Age described it as “two officers stabbed.” Really? One guy with a sharp thingie was able to wound two strong-built policemen? Doubting Thomas, please sign in.

**How Many Shoots Can a Shooter-Shoot Shoot?**

Anyway, how is killing the Numan fellow a proportionate response? Aren’t there other ways the cops can protect themselves? What does their training tell them to do? I had the general impression that they could use IRA–type kneecapping, as a way to stop the guy in his tracks. Even that is pretty fierce but it leaves the boy with a life.

As I reported in my harangue about the Marathon case, Tsarnaev’s friend Todashev was killed outright in his home “in self defense” by an FBI person (who had earlier been the subject of complaints for his thuggery).

No doubt we are supposed to be resigned to it. So long as there are religious ideologues out there knocking down our skyscrapers right, left, and center we have to go a bit overboard in protecting the nation.

**Wait! There Was an Apology!**

Ah I celebrate our Gumshoe editor for being the only media person to yak about the on-again off-again assault of an ADF uniformed person at Bella Vista. That is, Dee McLachlan queried if it was a convenient story for the purpose of arm-twisting Parliament.

But the Daily Mail did come forward, right smack dab on September 26, with an apology from the ADF:

“DF Commander Mark Binskin has confirmed that the man has withdrawn the claims … At a news conference today he said ‘on behalf of the Australian Defence Force I would like to apologise to the Australian community and in particular the Middle Eastern community for any angst this has caused’.”

Angst? But who is the sailor? Will he be punished? Does “withdrawn his claims” mean “he admits no one attacked him?” “NSW Police have also revealed they are looking into the reasons
behind the allegations being brought to them, in the first place. ‘We are now investigating why those allegations came to us,’ a NSW Police spokeswoman said.”

Oh excellent. We do need to know. I hope Dee is up for pursuing that angle: “Why were the allegations brought in the first place?”

Plus – just out of sheer stickybeakism – exactly how and when did the Incident get released to the media.

I need to know. “Thomas” wants to know, too, whether there was ever a sailor who made any such report. Thomas reckons it’s classic killer bee.

**Questions for Journalists to Think About:**

1. Did any ADF man actually go to Kings Cros and file a police complaint?  
2. Can we see it?  
3. When he said “I hereby drop the charge” was he interviewed as to why?  
4. Is that in writing?  
5. At what point did the NSW police come to think the Incident never occurred?  
6. Have they, in other cases, recommended punishment for a complainer who lays an information with false charges?  
7. What standard of journalism exists such that no Australian journalist (other than Dee) entertains the idea of foul play?  
8. Were our Parliamentarians manipulated?  
9. Will any of them fuss over this?  
10. Is it now policy to shoot a man dead if he is a Muslim?  
11. From whence do police policies on use of force originate?  
12. Is there a cop somewhere in Oz who finds the new approach a bit disturbing?  
13. Is there an ombudsperson to whom such a cop could go?  
14. Has the sanctity of the home now outlived its time on earth?  
15. Would MSM please publish details of stabbings done by Numan?
Students, have you done any interviews yet? If not, go ask your grandmother for an interview. You will immediately discover two things: First, people are pleased to be asked.

Second, there are countless people out there who either have an interesting story to tell, or who have knowledge and wisdom on a given subject. They may or may not possess particular credentials for the topic, but who cares?

It’s not for me to say what kind of contract you enter into with the interviewee. Presumably your employer has a set protocol. If you are working free-lance I can at least suggest that you do come to an agreement in advance. This will include whether or not the person will receive any pay, and how much control he or she will have over the editing. I like to give the person as much control as possible. I make the video first, then show it to them so we can delete bits.

As an example of “open season interviewing,” I print here a transcript of my interview with Greg Buck about the 2015 debt crisis in Greece. It’s better to watch it on Youtube. (And you might compare it to Buck’s August 9, 2015 Gumshoe interview on the Australian economy.)

This is a case of a layperson being able to illuminate the actual Greek situation better than someone who is an expert either on Greece or on finance. Why? Because Greg sees the big picture, the political game of deliberate debt creation that started over a century ago.

Of course most people can’t give such a well-structured talk without notes. You can go over the plan with them in advance and supply them with big cue cards if necessary.
Dee interviews Greg Buck on the Greek financial crisis.

Greg: So you’ve got all these bailouts now, coming to a head, you see, this whole idea of a Greek bailout is couched in this language as if it’s something that’s designed to bail out the Greeks.

Everyone talks about “the Greek bail out.” Well it’s not a Greek bail out. A whole lot of banks lent a whole lot of money to Greece, when Greece was bankrupt, and now it looks like they’re not going to get their money back so there has to be a bailout so that they can get paid back. It’s not a “Greek bailout,” it’s an “all the banks who lent Greece bailout.”

You’ve got a real crisis of capitalism happening here. I would argue that fraudulently issued debt should not be repaid and I think it’s very important that it not be repaid. The Number One reason is that it’s fraud -- to issue fraudulent debt is fraud. So straight out, you don’t repay it.

Why do I say the debt issued to Greece was fraudulently issued? Because at the time that Greece was saddled with this debt, Greece was effectively already bankrupt!

Now if you’re a banker and you make a loan to someone who’s bankrupt and the bankrupt person can’t pay your money back, who is on the hook for that? the bankrupt person or the banker? It’s not very clear that it’s just the bankrupt person’s fault. The banker shouldn’t have issued the line in the first place because the receiver of the loan was bankrupt at the time and couldn’t repay the loan.

Dee: But doesn’t this go to explain all about what the banking system does?

Greg: Yeah, it does it does and this is the thing that I find really curious is: we come back to the whole argument about the creation of money and where money comes from.

Dee: So explain that.
Greg: It’s very important to understand that you know money is loaned into creation. So the point I’m trying to make here is that the money loaned to Greece came out of nowhere. A bunch of bankers, whoever they may be, bankers loaned a whole lot of money to Greece and where did they get that money from to loan to Greece? They conjured it out of thin air. One moment there is nothing, next moment there are 360 billion euros.

Dee: With interest.

Greg: Yes, it’s going to be paid back with interest. But the bankers who issued that money to Greece didn’t have to work for that money or slave for that money, or save that money or build up any capital, before they could lend that money. What they did was basically lobby a whole bunch of politicians to turn the political and economic system into something where they and only they have the power to issue money out of nothing.

They then turn around and claim that whoever borrowed the money now has to pay them back with interest. So what you can do as a bank is actually go and target “likely not to be able to repay” kinds of institutions or people. You can conjure loans out of thin air.

You can give the loans to those people you can then turn around and say “Oh, you can’t repay now I want all your assets, now. I want your children to work for the rest they life to pay me back.

It is fraudulent, it is criminal, it shouldn’t be allowed. Which is why actually in the beginning, when bankers were given this extraordinary privilege of being able to lend money out of nothing, there were controls on them. There were things like reserve ratios, and loan to asset ratios, you had to not be a crook to be a banker, and all these sorts of things back in the old days when banking was banking. That was the reason why these rules were in place, as one can very easily imagine a situation that gets out of control.

Dee: Why are the banks so upset now, because there’s a referendum?

Greg: The banks are really upset now because if Greece has a
referendum, and if people start actually waking up to the fact that they have the power, they’ll have the power to say “No, we are not paying the loan back.”

All of a sudden everything that the bankers and the politicians profess to believe in -- market forces, capitalism, the free market -- all these kind of things that they talk about endlessly, this shit might actually happen if the Greeks turn around and say we are not paying the money back.

Dee: you mean capitalism might actually come back.

Greg: Capitalism might come back. You lend someone money at risk if the risk goes up, the interest rate goes up; that’s what capitalism does and the reason why the interest rate goes up is because you might lose your money, and if you might lose your money you demand more return on your loan to compensate you for the risk.

But when you have a situation where all the central bank’s and all the bankers are all conspiring to keep interest rights at zero, so that everyone can lend everyone money no matter how poor their credit rating is, you don’t have any price discovery. You don’t have any capitalism. You have countries like Greece that are completely bankrupt able to borrow money at one percent for ten years. It is a completely absurd situation. It cannot continue, or the entire financial system is going to blow up.

Dee: Is that what the bankers are afraid of? that Italy and the rest are going to follow?

Greg: They may well follow. The next lot who are now under the thumb of the bankers might turn around and say well we are not going to repay you either and then the next lot and the next lot.

But that’s not a calamity; that’s how it should be! People say God forbid interest rates are going to rise. Well, that’s what capitalism is. You can’t have a system with no feedback, no price discovery In our current system you can’t know what anything costs anymore.

Some people can pay anything for these assets. They don’t have to work for the money to pay for the assets. They can pay anything, be
it houses or works of art. So the price for the assets goes up. Instead let’s have everyone who has to work for their money say “No, those things are too expensive, sorry, can’t buy it.”

What is happening is that interest rates get artificially lowered and lowered and lowered. So your average Joe can borrow more and more and more money. Then, one day, capitalism returns, interest rates ratchet up from 0.1 percent to 1 percent and all a sudden everyone’s insolvent and that is the world we are currently looking at.

Greece is just the start of it because there is just too much debt and there is too much debt because there has to be too much debt when there’s no price discovery, no capitalism, money conjured out of nothing. The only way the system can work is for exponentially increasing debt. Every single time there is any attempt to rein in the madness things slow down a bit, that’s called all that’s a calamity.

Because of human nature, capitalism is the best way to rein it in, and capitalism is the best way to let the market decide. We’ve now got a situation where our financial system cannot any more solve any other problems because it stopped working because they are no signals, there’s no price discovery, everything’s rigged.

Even now, in Greece, here we are on the cusp and you’ve got this tiny population with this massive debt and the only thing that no one will admit and realize is that the debt can’t be repaid. There are all kinds shenanigans going on to try and keep a completely insolvent situation going. Now how is that capitalism?

Back in the old days, if you’re bankrupt you went bankrupt and next time around you thought about it before doing it the same way. But now we’ve got Greece getting told, “Please we know your insolvent. We know you can’t repay your debts but please do us a favor, take on a whole lot more debt please just to save us.”

How ridiculous is that?

(The above interview was carried on GumshoeNews, as a video, with my byline, as “The Bankers-Who-Lent-Money-to Greece Bailout, Money Creation, and Capitalism” on June 28, 2015)
Comment by Christopher Brooks -- July 6, 2015

My report to ABC Current Affairs desk this morning:

Let’s be honest about the situation we now find ourselves! The Mafia Banking cartels are now in shock because the Greek Government went off script and have tipped up the monopoly board because they know the games is rigged and cheats are looting the world with their money trick which issues trillions from thin air as debt and demands the community keep paying under threat just like any Mafia operates to preserve it’s rackets.

There is no racket that equals Banking for enriching the criminal cabals at the apex of the murderous game. Wealth has never been concentrating at a more rapid pace than is now taking place. War is waging on the Nations that would not submit to the crime gang behind the fraudulent “war on terror”.

ISIS is made in USA to serve the agenda of the US empire. Fear and panic now threaten to infect the world economies as values of “markets” fall towards rendering the “debt” drenched players insolvent when their asset goes “under water”.

The hidden and unaccountable derivatives bomb, said to be hundreds of trillions in scale, is lurking in the shadows just waiting to blow up the world economic stability in ways of which most people have zero understanding, because corruption has ruled our media and political landscape for many decades.

The situation is very alarming indeed for the power cabals who may be forced to impose desperate solutions on Greece to try and rescue the very ugly unfolding situation. I mean tricky business like “instability”, “conflict” and “terror”. This is the bread and butter of Mafia and we can see it playing out in many parts of the world already. The Media is bought by the Mafia and stays silent. What is at stake?

Greece can play it’s own game of Monopoly with a new banker of it’s own design and new rules that make the game fun for Greeks in a short time if done with wisdom.

Their wealth is abundant, they only need to stop the looting
by the “Banksters” who have “odiously” hijacked their lives.

The “Internationalist” Monopoly board thugs know that if Greece escapes their control, their power and fear game might become totally exposed out into the light of popular understanding.

Other countries might follow with courageous and honest leadership and the Dragon Mafia money printing cabals could become deeply wounded. Iceland is prosecuting and jailing their Banking Mafia.

History teaches us that World War, nothing less if needed, will be inflicted on mankind to protect the Global Mafia power base and reorganize the political landscape to destroy opposition with the deadly distractions and chaos war brings to those sucked in to that murderous activity.

Only the sanity that flows from truth can rescue the situation. Will the ABC Current Affairs join the fight for sanity or continue to throw fuel on the inferno with lies and deceptions that Mafia types rely on from their “friends”?

-- Christopher Brooks (Citizen of Australia)
If you are sent to cover a coronial inquest or a royal commission, is it your job merely to tell your audience what you heard? Hell, no. The event is itself “theatre”. You need to snoop, preferably in advance, to find out what each player’s motivation is. What are the agenda?

Most importantly, check the stated terms of reference for the inquiry. It is often quite narrow, and thus if you merely report what is said, you would mislead us. There is also the matter of inadmissibility of evidence in court cases (although I can’t advise you on that; your duty when a case is sub judice is something you’ll have to learn).

When I was filming the movie The Jammed, about sex trafficking, I attended a trial in which the defense lawyer was trying to get his client, the pimp, off the hook by showing that the trafficked woman from Thailand was working voluntarily. He showed a photo of her smiling, at a party, as proof of her enjoyment. I was floored!

In any case, you owe it to your profession to do more than parrot the officials. They may well be engaged in a well-scripted cover-up. Below I will use an article by Mary in which she suggests that the Chelmsford Royal Commission of 1988 was indeed meant to hide the real goings-on, namely Dr Harry Bailey’s mind-control work.

Mary told me that she got wise to the “royal commission racket” from studying a case in England in 1893. It had to do with the British public’s complaint against compulsory vaccination (sound familiar?) The House of Commons ran an inquiry, and but for the sharp eye of Alfred Russell Wallace, FRS, we might never have known how “fixed” the results were before the data was even collected. He made a stunning comparison of the final report with the thousands of pages of testimony. You can do this too. Indeed you can hunt down the inquests of the last decade and hypothesize the ‘agenda.’
Mind Control: When To Arrest the Practitioners

By Mary W Maxwell, August 14, 2015

Mind control is, of course, normal. We try to control each other’s minds every day in small, harmless ways. On a bigger scale a whole society tries to control the development of young people through education and propaganda. Note: the word *propaganda* comes from the Catholic Church’s office of “propagating the Faith.” *(propagandum fidei)*

So the question is: how much is too much? Or: what areas, what subject matters – if any — should be forbidden in mind control? I am exasperated that so many wrongdoers have been exposed and yet the public accepts the accompanying line that “the work had been authorized, even if wrongly, and so no criminal indictments will be sought.” What a load of nonsense.

We now know of the following utterly scandalous mind control experiments. In Canada, with Dr Ewen Cameron at McGill, and in Australia, at Chelmsford Hospital with Dr Harry Bailey, there was an attempt to wipe out an adult’s mind completely. It was done by “deep sleep,” a sort of coma interrupted by shock treatments given without sedation.

Another “experiment” that is going on today has to do with so-called electronic harassment. I wrote about it in “Your Basic Targeted Individual,” referring to John Finch in Melbourne. I’m ashamed of my inability to be of any help to such persons. (Yes, even as we speak, they are being tortured in their homes in Oz. Think about it).

Royal Commissions

Dr Harry Bailey did his Deep Sleep thing in Sydney for decades. You may be amazed to hear that 24 patients died from the treatment, but no one had to take the blame, despite a royal commission. So let us pause here to ask what a royal commission is. Is it judicial? No. Is it parliamentary? Well, not exactly. The state or commonwealth parliament usually breathes it into existence, but it can only make
recommendations. I think it might be wise for us to theorize at the outset that a royal commission is a bad form to use when there has been a notable wrongdoing. Personally, I’d go further and say that the likely reason why this format is chosen is persons in power wants something covered up.

If you were in charge of a newspaper, what would you ask your reporters attending the Royal Commission’s hearings to look for? Surely the lascivious stuff, right? The gossip, the divorces or affairs, the bank accounts and swindles, the let’s-hate-government themes, family feuds, etc. That will (falsely) give people the idea that the Commission “stops at nothing.”

The Chelmsford Royal Commission of 1988-1990
Partly owing to the public’s fears of what was going on in mental institutions generally, the state of NSW set up a royal commission. It then gravitated toward discussing the Deep Sleep therapy, and so, it’s informally called the Chelmsford Royal Commission. A judge was in charge of it (but this doesn’t mean it is judicial).

A Royal Commission is a talk shop of some sort, all dressed up to look official, but without any authority to crack down on the bad guys. I think it is a time waster at best and an assistor of crime at worst. Where was the leader who would ask the main questions, such as: “Why was this so-called therapy started? Who was behind it? [Tavistock? Hello?] What scientific basis was there for it?

What ethical rules were followed in choosing the participants for the experiment?” (None, actually; the patients were often given a consent form to sign when they were ill, and some who refused to participate were nonetheless forced into it.)

Other questions: Is anyone to be given immunity for his testimony? Are all relevant personnel such as Chelmsford’s nurses going to be subpoenaed to testify? What role did the NSW medical licensing board play? Had it never been called upon to cancel the license of this mad doctor?

The Book
The book *Deep Sleep*, by the late law lecturer Brian Bromberger and
journalist Janet Fife-Yeomans, was published by Simon & Schuster in 1991. Bailey himself had died in 1985, by suicide, supposedly because he had been harassed by Scientologists regarding the therapy. (My wild guess is that this religious group was made to play a part in the first place so as to confuse the issue).

Much of the book is devoted to Bailey’s “love life.” If I may be permitted another wild guess, Bailey himself was probably thoroughly mind-controlled. His womanizing could have been something he was instructed to do. It certainly muddled the case up nicely. One patient said to the Commission that Bailey told her “What you need is a good fuck and I am just the one to do it.”

Note: Dr Bailey’s private sins seemed to make his medical crimes unreachable. You know what I mean? If he is crazy we don’t think of him as accountable professionally. Media was used to help distract the public from the fact that 24 murders, or at least manslaughters were committed. (An additional 19 patients died within a year of leaving hospital.)

Fathom it – 24 dead, or 43 – right there in Sydney.

Note: Bailey’s demise did not have to prevent his helpers – Dr John Herron and Dr Ian Gardiner – from getting punished. (As you might expect, the Commissioner did call attention to the fraudulent billing practices of all three doctors. It’s safe to talk about money, but not mind control!)

The Canadian Connection

Dr Ewen Cameron (1901-1967) invented the sleep idea. He said he could de-pattern the patient, i.e., take away the person’s normalcy. This was of course said to be aimed at helping them get over their psychiatric problem. What an incredible cheek. One lady who showed up at his hospital (Allen Memorial) was simply having post partum depression. Cameron wrecked her memory. Much later she was able to sue for damages (Orlikow v US) and won compensation. The Canadian government then invited others to sue likewise and several were awarded a payment.

The only successful lawsuit in the US, that I know of, was filed by the sons of Frank Olson, who suffered from Fort Detrick handouts
of LSD. Frank Rochelle currently has a federal suit in behalf of himself and other 1950s US Army veterans who received not only experimental radiation but experimental tampering with their brain.

Note: Some states in US have “victim’s compensation funds” and several MK-Ultra victims have received some money in that way, but with no blame for doctors. One victim, Claudia Mullen, got to say her piece at a presidential hearing in 1995. Mullen’s social worker, Valerie Wolf also spoke, and blamed Martin Orne, MD, of Harvard. Orne later figured in a group saying that False Memory Syndrome explains the victims’ false stories about what happened to them. Yeah, right.

**Good News, and It’s Down to Gumshoe!**
The book *Deep Sleep* provides a quote from the obituary of Bailey in 1985. Is it ever helpful! It says:

> “In the 1950s the Health Department had a blueprint for a neuropsychiatric institute. The first director, Dr Gibson from McGill University, after two years of frustration, left Australia. Dr Bailey had worked at Broughton Hall Insulin Clinic with Bleuler [who coined the term *schizophrenia* in 1911] and Sakel [who invented insulin therapy that gave the mental patient hypoglycemia] in Zurich. At this time sedation treatment was the only known treatment for schizophrenia. During 1955-57 Dr Bailey held a WHO fellowship [fascinating!] which enabled him to study sedation methods with Sem-Jacobsen at the Mayo Clinic with Sargent and Grey-Walker in England. He also worked with Lars Leksel in Lund, Sweden. In 1959 [he opened] the Cerebral Surgery Research Unit in Australia.”

The name Sem-Jacobsen led me to a Youtube video “The Race for the Brain,” made in Norway, which named Lars Druggard as an investigator of implants! This is marvelous. He has at least ascertained with a Geiger counter that some victims are emitting radio frequencies. So John Finch in Australia, Alex Constantine in the US, Janine Jones in New Zealand, and Blanche Chavoustie who has disappeared, will have the dignity of being believed by folks who’d never take their word for it.
COMMENT FROM TERRY SHULZE, A NSW BARRISTER

Here’s my story in regards to ‘Chelmsford’. I got a ‘flick’ brief from one of the guys on my floor that got ‘jammed’ (his trial went over an extra day and he gave me the brief for the following day). It was simple ‘compensation’ claim with doctor reports and taking the witness through her evidence – no biggie, I’d done heaps of them.

The NSW Government had allocated some money for victims of the ‘negligence’ of Chelmsford hospital and she was one of them. Some background on me, I’m a Vietnam vet that had been a PTSD counsellor (I started the first ‘group’ sessions in Oz). I had some understanding of working with people with psychiatric issues.

The next morning I took my new client through her story – I was stunned. She had suffered depression from the break-up of a relationship and was referred to Chelmsford. What they did to her with ‘deep sleep’ therapy and electro shock was beyond anything I could comprehend for dealing with psychiatric problems…. She had attempted to escape twice. The first time she only got down the block in her gown when they caught her. They dragged her kicking and screaming for help back to Chelmsford and gave her another electro shock. The second time she managed to get away for a couple of hours, then back for another shock.

She eventually was discharged, a completely broken wreck with a 7 different pills to take each day. She took a sea cruise of the Greek Islands to help recover and one day just dumped all the pills over the side of the ship. It took her a week to withdraw from the medications, but she made it.

Fast forward some years and I read about Dr. Cameron in North America. When I heard ‘deep sleep with barbituates’ and electro shock, I remembered that Chelmsford case. At that time on the Internet there was the evidence from an inquiry on Dr. Cameron. I started going through the various documents and eventually found correspondence between Dr. Bailey of Chelmsford and Cameron in Canada.

I had read heaps of medical records, reports and clinical notes related to previous medical cases, I didn’t expect any problems
reading the Chemlsford stuff – but I did. I could understand the dosage, duration of sleep and a few other things, but the ‘clinical notes’ were gobblygook. The notes were unreadable, the sentence structures were odd, the phraseology didn’t make sense – then I realised they were discussing the results in CODE. Unfortunately, I couldn’t find anything in the documents to help me decipher it.

The NSW Government allocated money for ‘negligence’, but this was not a medical negligence issue – this was intentional medical malfeasance. Perhaps you could argue that the first death was a manslaughter, but after that they knew what they were doing could and WOULD kill people. Yeah, murder charges should have been brought. What happens? The government (tax payers) paid money to make the whole thing go away.

Postscript by Mary Maxwell, Concerning Court Case
Barry Hart had been kept at Chelmsford against his will and suffered many disabilities as a result. In 1980, he sued Dr Herron. The NSW jury awarded Hart $6,000 for false imprisonment; $18,000 for assault and battery, and $36,000 in damages. (Please see chart of these “intentional torts,” at the website of the Judicial Commission of NSW.) However, Judge Fisher required Hart to pay for half the other side’s costs, to the tune of $169,205. Hart noted that there had been many complaints about Chelmsford dating back to 1967 but the Health Authority studiously “sat on them.” He credits the Sydney Morning Herald and The Age with publicizing his case enough to get the Royal Commission started and says his MP, Pat Rogan, gave crucial help.

Note: In 1991, The Nine Network won a Logie award for best documentary for “The Chelmsford Scream,” exposing at least some of the Chelmsford scandal. This publicity enabled other patients to come forward. Still, no one has got to the bottom of it yet, as to the mission that Bailey was on in cahoots with Cameron.
A Note on Journalism Awards
by Dee McLachlan

The best-known awards are the ones presented annually by the Walkley Foundation, the Gold Walkleys. I mentioned them a bit critically in Section 1 of this book but they are worth striving for. There are also the famous Logies, but these are mostly for TV entertainment. The show Home and Away often wins a Logie, as does Four Corners.

Students might like to think about lesser-known awards. There is the Les Kennedy award for crime reporting, named for an Australian crime reporter, Les Kennedy, who died too early, at age 53 in 2011. It is only for NSW writers in “investigative, political, justice, digital, features and photographic reporting.”

There is the Australian Catholics Young Journalist award, given each year “for stories that matter.”

There is a very new one called the Silver Spankley award put out by none other than GumshoeNews. It will crop up at irregular intervals and be open to all.

I myself would love to win, or see Ms Maxwell win, the Martha Gellhorn prize for Journalism, established in 1999. The Gellhorn Trust says:

“The award will be for the kind of reporting that distinguished Martha: in her own words ‘the view from the ground.’ This is essentially a human story that penetrates the established version of events and illuminates an urgent issue buried by prevailing fashions of what makes news. We would expect the winner to tell an unpalatable truth, validated by powerful facts, that exposes establishment conduct and its propaganda, or ‘official drivel,’ as Martha called it.

The prize is awarded annually to journalists writing in English whose work has appeared in print or in a reputable Internet publication.
Dear Students, you will no doubt take a course in media law. This section tries to put some of the laws in context.

The Modern Basis for the Right to Free Speech
Humans love authority. They desire orthodoxy. In past centuries, the Church had great power in Europe; it told people what to do. Few individuals even contemplated criticizing the Church, but starting in 1517, Martin Luther advised the folks that “Rome” was playing tricks. An important shift against papal power had begun when John Wycliffe translated the bible into English around 1390.

By 1450, when Johannes Gutenberg invented ‘movable type’ (before that, books were hand-copied), it became possible for anyone to learn anything. The majority of the people, however, remained illiterate until the 20th century.

England specified a right to free speech, in the 1689 Bill of Rights. It was only for parliamentarians, but even that was good. In 1948, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man. Article 19 says “Everyone has a right to freedom of opinion and expression.” (Note: the UN cannot make law. It is just a talk shop.)

Free Speech Guarantees in Australia
Since Oz does not have a Bill of Rights, the status of the right to speak freely was in question until the High Court ruled on a case in 1992. In Australian Capital Television v the Commonwealth it was held that our Constitution contains an implied right to freedom of political speech. That was reaffirmed in 1997 in Lange v Australian Broadcasting Corporation.

Another major principle is the openness of government, in a democracy. The state of Queensland has a Right To Information Act (2009). It says “Information in the government’s possession or under the government’s control is a public resource”--
justified by the “participation of the community in the democratic process.” Isn't that lovely?

**NSW in the Vanguard.** In 2009, New South Wales replaced its Freedom of Information Act with a Government Information (Public Access) Act. If you have a complaint in that state, write to the Judicial Commission (judcom@judcom.gov.nsw.au.). It will warm your heart to know that that body has a Code of Conduct that is “based upon the premise that staff members will act with integrity, honesty, fairness, conscientiousness, compassion [!] and LOYALTY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST [capitalization mine] and that they will, in carrying out their duties, adhere to the spirit and intention of the Judicial Officers Act 1986.”

You cannot ask for better than that. A 2004 case, *John Fairfax v District Court of NSW* proves that “The principle of open justice is a fundamental aspect of the system of justice There is no inherent power of the court to exclude the public.”

**Ways in Which the Law Can Curtail Free Speech**

That said, there are three famous legal restrictions on absolute free speech. First is the law of **libel**. In some countries, it’s a crime to badmouth an individual. In Australia, the offended party can bring a **civil action** against someone who damages her reputation and may be awarded damages up to $250,000.

Second, there’s **blasphemy**. In Muslim societies it’s a crime to verbally offend the official religion, and it was that way in Christian countries in the past. Of course, such laws often get used, slyly, for the purpose of defeating any challenge to the rulers.

The third restriction, which is going at full tilt at the moment, is called **national security law**. To keep a nation secure from outsiders (or from insider saboteurs, known as Fifth Column) there have been State Secret laws, espionage laws, and laws against **sedition**. That word comes from Latin *sed* apart and *ire*, to go. The implication is that it’s bad for people try to break society up. Sure, but what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander: I say it’s a crime if **pollies** do anything to break society up. How dare they!
Can You Leak?
Surprise! *The Guardian* and other major presses, along with academics, *will wonders never cease*, have signed a letter to protest the prosecution of a “leaker.” The duchy of Luxembourg has accused 28-year-old Antoine Deltour of crimes, based on charges brought by his employer PricewaterhouseCoopers.

It is being called the LuxLeaks affair and has to do with the discovery that some countries give favorable tax rulings to the big multinationals, such as Fiat and Amazon. Luxembourg’s finance minister Pierre Gramegna described the LuxLeaks affair as a “game changer” that had transformed the way European regulators were scrutinising such tax rulings.

Not only has the media come out in support of the leaker, so have elected members of Parliament of Australia, UK, and elsewhere. *The Guardian* notes “The majority of political signatories were from the left, but there was also support from Liberal Democrats in the UK and the centre-right UMP in France, led by Sarkozy. US Congressman Lloyd Doggett, a member of the Ways and Means Committee that has held a number of hearings on tax avoidance, gave his John Hancock.

PwC’s head of tax in the UK has been summoned to face a grilling on the matter. Unions, also, have signed the letter of protest. In UK that includes Mark Serwotka, general secretary of the Public and Communications Services union.

In Oz, signatories included Ged Kearney, president of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, and Rev Prof Andrew Dutney, president of the Uniting Church in Australia. Deltour is charged with theft and “illegally accessing a database.”

Please see Dee’s August 17, 2015 article, “Three Dangerous Men,” concerning the favors done to society by revelations of:

Bradley (now Chelsea) Manning, Edward Snowden, Antoine Deltour
Anti-Terrorism, So-Called

To repeat, we have a long and admirable tradition of the right to speak freely in a democratic society in regard to political matters. (And what matter isn’t political?) But we now have anti-terrorist legislation. It came about as a consequence of UN Security Council Resolution 1373 telling all nations to establish similar laws. Ahem, ahem.

Terrorists can thrive when they have financial support. (I’ll say). Hence, each nation was told to make it a crime to send money to a terrorist organization. So when you go to your bank to send money overseas, you get asked questions. This is provided for in the “Security Legislation Amendment Act” of 2002. (I’m passing over the fact that, as Wesley Clark admits, the NATO governments are training the “Islamic extremists,” or that Monis was a media mascot, OK?)

In 2005, with the London tube bombings as the stated prompt, our Commonwealth passed the Anti-Terrorism Act. It reasserts part of the 1914 Crimes Act, criminalizing speech that “urges disaffection” against the monarch, the Constitution, or Parliament.

I think the 2005 law shouldn’t have passed. You don’t dump the wisdom of forbears just because there’s a “9-11.” (Or even a Port Arthur massacre, when you think of it.)

Of course, Australia’s attorney general makes no claim that he has examined our ancestors’ hard work on free speech and found mistakes. He can’t. Freedom of speech IS the main means by which humans fight the powerful. This is unlikely ever to change.

Note: I am old and don’t have much to lose, so I can speak boldly. Can I ask students to follow suit? Part of me says “No. They have to guard their life.” But what life is there going to be? You ought to read Orwell’s 1984. That life is unattractive in the extreme! The main hero in it, Winston Smith, has no ability to find anyone to trust, or even to talk to. He is forced to lie, and even deny his own sensory perceptions. How unhealthy!

I’m pretty sure we can avoid this. Christopher Brooks tells Gumshoe that he actually “gets somewhere” when he phones Canberra. He especially finds that Parliament’s younger staff members realize that there are options. So don’t give up prematurely, OK? Say what you think, and condemn silence.
Legal Control over the Media by the WTO?
As Marshall McLuhan once said, “The medium is the message.” The fact that journalists have been so obliging to the powerful reflects the control that a few ‘moguls’ hold.
Thanks to the limited airwaves available for radio bands, you have to ask governments permission to broadcast. The Broadcast Services Act (1992) laid out some sensible rules restricting cross-ownership. It forbade a single news source to own the majority of print, TV, and radio in a given city.

This was controlled by licensing. However, in 1995, the World Trade Organization was established. William Pepper has argued, in An Act of State (2003), that the WTO shows us what the corporate-state is all about. It is a world-state! By agreeing to join the WTO, supposedly for all the benefits of international trade, Oz surrendered a lot of its sovereignty.

The main stick with which the WTO beats a nation is the seemingly nice ‘equality’ rule, that you mustn’t treat foreign companies differently from your domestic firms. See Dee’s article on the TPP, which demonstrates how Cabinet looks to the globalists for direction. Why do we allow this treason?
About the Author: Dee McLachlan

Dee McLachlan is a filmmaker and screenwriter. Her film THE JAMMED, a thriller on sex trafficking in Melbourne, was claimed by several top critics as the best Australian film of 2007.

Dee is the founder of GUMSHOE NEWS, an online report with criticism. No topic is taboo! You can also find her on Facebook and Youtube.

“There are many excellent alternative news sources, but the more we all speak out, the better. I’m tired of hearing the same old BS intent on numbing down the populace, and feeding us lies. I am sure I won’t get it right all the time, but I will surely try”.

She is also a children’s author, under the nom de plume Dalia Mae Lachlan. Her series of AWAKEN YOUR KIDS books attempts to show kids how to think.

Dee has lived in Los Angeles and in London, and is now settled in Australia. She has a teenage son and daughter that are “much smarter than I am.”

Dee was born in South Africa, and as a youth was passionate about rock-climbing on Table Mountain in Cape Town. She holds an Honours degree in Botany and has written environmental impact reports.

Her first film was an adventure documentary in Patagonia, and her first professional employment was as a film editor of the weekly movie newsreels for Ster Kinekor for the South African cinema screens. She has directed television, corporate and seven feature films across the globe.
Children’s Books by Dalia Mae Lachlan

The People Who Refused To Be Sheeple – destiny under a global dictator. *Illustrated by Niharika Singh.*

*Additional verse Tricia Church.*

The Big FAT Bank – about the money merry-go-round. *Illustrated by Niharika Singh.*

The Factory That Made Guns – for made up wars. *Illustrated by Charity Russell.*

(all books graphically designed by Diana Taki)

Great Monster Corn – about invented GMO seeds. *Illustrated by Georgia Stylou.*

The Three Tall Buildings – The day that changed everything (9/11). *Illustrated by Mariana Santos.*

Order books on www.awakenyourkids.com
About the Author: Mary Maxwell

Mary W Maxwell, of Adelaide, and before that, of Boston, is the author of several university-press “proper” books, mainly in sociobiology, and now quite a few improper ones. The latter include: “A Balm in Gilead: Curing Severe Autism and Awakening the Physicians,” which is looking for a publisher.

Mary’s two fave jobs in life were as a wife, and as a children’s choir director. She is amazed to have completed a law degree, and a PhD in Politics, both at the beautiful University of Adelaide. Her websites are: ProsecutionForTreason.com and maryWmaxwell.com.

And how did Mary meet up with dear Dee (a.k.a. Dalia)? You would never guess. In 2011 Mary published a nifty book, Prosecution for Treason. Did anyone phone her to say “Psychedelic!” Yes, one person in the whole world. Dee.

What is our Mary (your Mary) all about? She is about not putting up with the media’s falseness. She truly can’t stand it. It makes us all look like jerks. We’re not jerks, are we?

Let’s get something going. The planet is falling apart. Aussies are well placed to defend the outdoors. Contact us!

On her Youtube channel, “Mary W Maxwell” picks a fight with the PM after the so-called siege in Sydney.

Some 9-11 Related Happiness for the Fourth of July
Jew-Christian-Muslim Collaboration, Please
Sad Day at the Royal (Agricultural) Show in Australia
Australia for the Australians: New Thoughts on Lucky Country
Ode to Joy, Multiplied by Ten
Calling Novena Catholics and Bilderberg Critics
I Was in Prison and You Visited Me (Matthew 25:36)
Proposal for an Addendum to the American Constitution
A Poignant Reference to JFK at the Brisbane G20 Meeting
Grassy Knollers and 9-11 Truthers; There’s a Meta-Issue Here
It’s Easier To Use Law Than the Sword Type Thing
Thinking about John Yoo, David Addington, and Jay Bybee
Terrorists, My Arse (re the Sydney Siege)
The Siege of Sydney, and a Memory of Robin Cook
Something about Jews, A Reply to Ken O’Keefe
Sydney Had Its Own Underwear Bomber
Rayelan Is Our Mom
Lawless America: Bill Windsor Incarcerated
Happiness Is Having a Spy (Bill Windsor) in the Klink
Brice Taylor’s Memories and the Shanley Lawsuit
They Youtubed Their Way to a Guilty Verdict
Game Changer, Game Changer, Game Changer
Letter to My Late Parents, Part One: Marathon Bombing
Headed for a Major War? Do Not Go Gentle into It
Mossad, May I Have a Word?
Terrorism Problem Solved. Thanks Dr Lawrence Dunegan!
My Country, Wrong or Wrong
What the Typical Non-skeptic Citizen Believes in 2015
Why I Am a Card-Carrying Conspiracy Theorist
Telling the Boston Marathon Jury about Separation of Powers
Anzac Day, 2015
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF YOUTUBE VIDEOS

In the daily edition of Gumshoenews, online, the story is sometimes accompanied by a pertinent Youtube video. In this book we can’t make electronic links, so please look these up by name. All are well worth viewing, even the lengthy ones.

“Everything wrong with Humanity” (about the environment), 3-minute animated cartoon by Steve Cutts

“Is Australia Up for Sale?” on mergers and foreign takeovers, Greg Buck interviewed by Dee McLachlan, 12 mins

“UK Parliament Debates Money Creation, Highlights,” 1 hour

“Congress must probe ISIL creation by US, Israel and Saudi Arabia: Dankof.” Says no excuse for regime-changing, 2 mins

“Must Watch: Wise Old Lady Stands Up against ISIS,” 4 mins

“Cyclone Tracy Hits Darwin Christmas Day 1974,” 8 mins

“Fascism, Fakes and Reflecting on 2013” Greg Buck, 9 mins

“Port Arthur Massacre, Martin Bryant Set Up,” Wendy Scurr, Part I. (115,000 Views, as at February, 2015), 59 mins

“JFK to 9-11: Everything Is a Rich Man’s Trick,” over 3 hours

“PM Tony Abbott’s G20 Speech Translated,” 2 mins, hilarious

“Laurent LOUIS Dénonce le Réseau Pédophile,” 31 mins

“The Day Harry Holt Went Missing, 17 December 1967,” Amazing how we questioned nothing in those days, 3 mins

“Are Vaccines Really Safe?” Dr Sherri Tenpenny, OD, 4 mins

“Malcolm Fraser on Australia’s Dangerous Dependence to US” (Dee’s interview, re forces in Darwin, Pine Gap, etc), 6 mins
“Kay Griggs Blows the Lid on the Question,” 9 min teaser
“Redgum – I Was Only 19” (Aussie in Vietnam War), 4 mins
“Rare Amateur 9-11 Footage” -- best -- Rick Siegel, 2 hours
“Larry Silverstein Suffers from Deep Depression,” 1 min, and “Larry Silverstein Admits WTC7 Was Pulled Down on 9-11”
“Soldiers Talk about What They Saw and Did in Iraq,” 6 mins
“Part 2. Beneficiaries of the scam” (corporate asset purchasing)
“America Needs To Know! TV-Panel Discussion on Mind Control.” Sufferer Elizabeth Adams asks you to step up to the plate and say “No. We’re not having it anymore,” 1 hour
“The Women of Masanjia Labor Camp (China),” 1 hour
“BOSTON BOMBING: Naomi Wolf Exposes Fake News,” 9 mins
“Johnny Cash -- San Quentin (Live from Prison),” 3 mins

For Those Who Don’t Accept Conspiracy Theory:
“Terror Within: Former DHS Officer Julia Davis Speaks Out” (best evidence of US made terror) 0.5 million hits, 18 mins
“Illuminati Hypersexualization of Children Exposed!” (terrible proof of the designing of culture) 1 million hits, 36 mins
“Conspiracy Theory: Academic Proofs. Maxwell,” 76 hits, 9 mins
“Shocking Stories of Abu Ghraib”, 3.5 million hits, 26 mins
“Inventor Pat Flanagan’s Genius (on brain, longevity),” 36 mins
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