

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

**Mary W Maxwell, PhD, LLB**

ISBN 979-8-89292-817-5

Copyright Mary Maxwell, 2022, 2023

Keywords:

Sandy Hook school shooting, Adam Lanza, psy-op, legalized lying, Robert David Steele, Court of Equity, extrinsic fraud, Maui fire, *Soto v Remington*, Oath Keepers, Philip Allott, Maureen Crowley, crisis actors, citizen-led grand jury, David Quigley, Charlottesville

Author's Email address: MaxwellMaryLLB@ gmail.com

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

Website: [www. Constitution And Truth. com](http://www.ConstitutionAndTruth.com)

Other books by this author:

Morality among Nations 1990

Prosecution for Treason, 2011

Fraud Upon the Court, 2015

Inquest: Siege in Sydney, 2017

Reunion: Judging the Family Court, 2019

Keep the Republic, Kill the Takeover, 2022

Get up, Australia, Get Up, 2023

Society Is the Authority, 2023

Stop Lying about the Marathon Bombing, 2024


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

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





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



*obamawhitehouse.archives.gov*

Thank you, Governor. To all the families, first responders, to the community of Newtown, clergy, guests --

... We know that when danger arrived in the halls of Sandy Hook Elementary, the school's staff did not flinch, they did not hesitate. Dawn Hochsprung and Mary Sherlach, Vicki Soto, Lauren Rousseau, Rachel Davino and Anne Marie Murphy -- they responded as we all hope we might respond in such terrifying circumstances -- with courage and with love, giving their lives to protect the children in their care.

We know that there were other teachers who barricaded themselves inside classrooms, and kept steady through it all, and reassured their students by saying "wait for the good guys, they're coming"; "show me your smile...."

"Let the little children come to me," Jesus said, "and do not hinder them -- for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven."

Charlotte. Daniel. Olivia. Josephine. Ana. Dylan. Madeleine. Catherine. Chase. Jesse. James. Grace. Emilie. Jack. Noah. Caroline. Jessica. Benjamin. Avielle. Allison.

God has called them all home. For those of us who remain, let us find the strength to carry on, and make our country worthy of their memory.... And may He bless and watch over this community, and the United States of America. [Holy smoke!]



## PREFACE

From the time of the event, in December 14, 2012, until 8 years later, I believed the Sandy Hook school shooting really happened. In fact, I published articles saying that the critics were wrong in calling it a hoax! However, in 2021, a law colleague showed me some dubious goings-on in the *Soto v Remington* lawsuit against the maker of the Bushmaster AR-15 rifle. Uh-oh. I got over my naivete, fast.

I call this book *The Human Mind* as there is a serious problem of the American public losing its tradition of criticism. The emphasis will be on ‘mind’ more than on Sandy Hook.

## Acknowledgements

I’m grateful to photographers and writers whose work I have used, and to Dee McLachlan for founding GumshoeNews.com. I thank James Perloff for blurbing my book thusly: “Mary Maxwell has done an excellent job of reviewing many aspects of the Sandy Hook controversy. Her legal background makes this book unique, as she sheds light on many laws pertinent to the case.”

I’m grateful for the stimulation contained in Robin Allott’s groundbreaking work on motor patterns of the brain, and for his brother Philip Allott’s never-say-die approach to idealism. I most especially thank Bill Scott of the New Jersey Bar for sharing key insights about the Sandy Hook case, and also for explaining the harms that result from ABA’s control of law schools. See Appendix C on that, below.

Pay no attention to the Alex Jones lawsuit. It was never adjudicated; Jones lost by default for not providing some financial records to the judge. In fact, pay no attention to anything that appears to ‘legally’ curtail free speech. Happily, folks are starting to reject censorship. And Covid let us see how governments lie to us with impunity.

But remember, “impunity” means *we* failed to deliver the punishment. There is a law maxim: *Impunitas semper deteriora invitat*. Impunity always invites worse. Maybe a new maxim will arise from this case!

Mary W Maxwell   Concord, New Hampshire   September 11, 2024

## Table of Contents

President Obama at the 18 December 2012 Vigil	5
PREFACE	7
Table of Authorities	10
<b>Introduction:</b>	
One Iconic Photo Kills a Whole Narrative	12
Who Was in Charge of the Sandy Hook “Shooting”?	15
A Note on Using the RICO Act in Civil Lawsuits	17
A Note on Lying and Trust	17
<b>Part One -- When Did We Stop Using ‘Reason’?</b>	
1. Fiction Is Not the Same As Fact	19
2. The Ethics and Legality of Crisis Acting	22
3. Orwell Knew! -- Your Mind Is the Target	27
4. Four Stages in the History of Critical Thought	32
5. Do Motor Patterns Dictate Your Thinking?	35
<b>Part Two – A Walk-through of “Sandy Hook Shooting”</b>	
6. The Official Narrative of the Massacre	41
7. The Sedensky Report: The Official Inquiry	44
8. Solid Criticisms of the Official Story	49
9. James Tracy Looks at Dr Wayne Carver’s Answers	53
10. What Is the Catholic Church Doing Here?	55

<b>Part Three -- Any Word from the Court?</b>	58
11. “Unstable Lucy” Harassed the Pozner Family	59
12. William Shanley: The Media Is Killing Us	61
13. Help Minors Who Were Trained To Lie	67
14. The Gun Manufacturer Shows His True Colors	70
15. Grand Juries and SCOTUS’ 9/11 Mistake	74
<b>Part Four -- It’s High Time for Citizen Power</b>	78
16. Proclaiming an Amnesty for Remorseful Fakers	79
17. Do You Know What’s in the Guarantee Clause?	81
18. Regain the Court of Equity, against Extrinsic Fraud	85
19. The Role of Militias and the Jan 6 Non-Insurrection	90
20. Conclusion	95
<b>The Appendices</b>	108
A. Some Angry Veterans Are Preparing for War	106
B. Food Shortage and How To Fix It (For the Bees)	108
C. William Sumner Scott on How To Oppose the ABA	110
D. Maui Teacher Testifies: “We Must Fight Government”	112
E. President Kennedy’s Son and MK-Ultra in Arizona	113
F. The Murder of Law? A Mother’s Case: <i>Liberti v Liberti</i>	114
G. The Charlottesville Connection? Susan Bro’s Bereavement	116
H. Handout from Homeland Security for Crisis Actors	119
J. Joel Sussman Enlightens His City Council in Canada	120
For Students	121
Bibliography	122
Index	123

## **Table of Laws and Court Cases Referred to in This Book**

### **The US Constitution**

Article III – all of the judiciary’s powers	74
Article III, sec 3 – treason	62
Article IV, sec 4 guarantees states a republican form of gov’t	81
Amendment I -- freedom of expression	61
Amendment II -- right to bear arms	72
Amendment XIII -- slavery is prohibited	68

### **United States Laws**

National Defense Authorization Act 2012	22
Smith-Mundt Act 1948 -- on domestic propaganda	24
Sherman Anti-Trust Act 1890, codified at 15 USC 1	65
Enslavement of minors, 18 USC 1591	68
Providing material support to terrorists, 18 USC 2339	61
Obstruction of justice, 18 USC 1503	84
Misprision, failure to report a felony, 18 USC 4	84
Sending a threatening email, 18 USC 875	59
Congress can challenge Electoral College votes, 3 USC	94
Lying, or covering-up, to Congress, 18 USC 1001	118
Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Org. Act, 18 USC 96	17
Forfeiture of assets, 18 USC 982	85

### **Connecticut State Laws**

CUTPA consumer law that reduced gunmaker’s immunity	71
Law virtually eliminating grand juries in Connecticut	76
crime of perjury CGS 53a-156 147	59

crime of larceny CT penal code 53A-119	83
crime of impairing child's morals CGS 53-21	68
whistleblower protection CGS31-379	52
crime of tampering with a witness CT 253a-151	73
Connecticut Freedom of Information Act 1975	71
Solicitation of Charitable Funds Act , Ch 419d, 1963	99
<b>Rulings by the United States Supreme Court</b>	.
Marbury v Madison 1803, US Supreme Court's Task	74
US v Reynolds 1953, national security excuse for secrecy	26
New York Times v Sullivan 1964, right to publish criticism	60
US v Throckmorton 1878, fraud vitiates everything	87
Citizens United v FEC 2010, campaign funds	65
Hazel-Atlas v Hartford-Empire 1944, error coram nobis	86
US v Korematsu 1944, internment of Japanese Americans	89
<b>Other Court Cases</b>	.
Pozner v Fetzer 2014, defamation re fake death certificate	60
Soto v Remington/Bushmaster 2014, assault weapon	70
Shanley v O'Prey 2016, fraud and terrorism by media	61
Bulloch v US 1985, where the court itself is corrupted	89
Remington bankruptcy case in Alabama	72
Grutter v Bollinger, 2003, discriminating at college admission	110
Rancman v Interim, 2003, on champerty and maintenance	73
<b>A Federal Rule</b> (which is not a law)	.
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60B, regarding fraud	86

## INTRODUCTION: The Iconic Photo Is All You Need

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

They screwed up in regard to Sandy Hook. They published, on that very morning (December 14, 2012), a photo of the crying children being led out of the school by a policewoman, and it went worldwide. It still appears in the Encyclopedia Britannica, in 2024. It's the 'iconic' photo of the 'tragic Sandy Hook massacre.' It was snapped by Shannon Hicks, a photographer from the *Newtown Bee*:



“Near”

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

One girl is clearly crying. Since it is my baseline that the massacre story is false, I speculate that she was instructed to cry. The photo may have been taken weeks earlier as part of a drill. This is supported by the photo below. I call it The “far” shot since whoever snapped it is standing farther away than the photograph of the “near” shot.

The policewoman in the far shot has now placed a little girl at the front. It's not a panic scene -- per the body language of the adults.





“Far”

It’s my policy NOT to study allegations of ‘hoax’ by way of photos. I prefer to use court transcripts. Pictures are often posted on the Internet, by someone who does not give his real name. He might be a plant. Also, I lack talent re photoshopping. But here a *Newtown Bee* photographer has openly admitted that she took the “Near” picture.

I offer this as the Introductory chapter so, if you’re reading along, and start to get nervous about calling Sandy Hook a hoax, you can come back to the Near-and-the-Far photos and rest assured. In fact, I’d like you to concede right now, that unless something new comes up to explain Near and Far, it is good proof that the shooting spree at Sandy Hook Elementary School (SHES) -- **did not** take place.

Moreover, I ask you to use this book for analyzing **why falseness has become a regular part of our culture**. A lot of the stuff in daily newspaper or on TV is nonsense. This is lowering both our intelligence (since we don’t try to counteract it) and is lowering our power (since we don’t try to counteract it). Probably that is what the guys at the top are aiming for: **a dumbed down, scared citizenry**.

Please, Americans, both old and young, please save our country. Get angry and don’t be worried or embarrassed about sticking out. Just stick out. “Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country by sticking out.”

Note: People elsewhere in the world are still hoping that we Yankees will start showing our traditional self-confidence. Most likely we can, and will, do this. But hurry: events are moving speedily.

George Orwell's *1984*

“Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it.

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

Aldous Huxley's Lecture at Berkeley, 1962

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

Philip Allott's *Eutopia* (2016)

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

## Who Was in Charge of the Sandy Hook “Shooting”?

I believe it was as much a federal as a state operation:



**Eric Holder, US Atty General    Robert Mueller, FBI Chief**



**CT Governor Dannel Malloy    Lt Paul Vance of CT Police**

Note: It's not a question of “Did they know it was a hoax?” They had to have known, in order to arrange the hoaxing. All four of the above officials are now retired, but if still in office they would be told to step down immediately.

Currently they await prosecution by the American people. Former President Obama is equally guilty. The only defense he might try to muster is that, as president, he thought he was doing a good thing for us by hoaxing!

**These Individuals Haven't Conceded That There Was a Hoax**  
(Showing page numbers of this book that mention him or her.)

Barack Obama, US president 5,  
Peter Lanza, father of Adam 41, Ryan Lanza 41,  
Kevin Riley, the mortician of Adam Lanza 41,  
Kaitlin Roig, teacher 42,  
TSC Macisco, cop 43,

Stephen Sedensky, State Attorney 44,  
Lt Paul Vance, Police Commissioner 44,  
Bob Ryser, editor at of *NewsTimes.com* 44,  
Natalie Hammond, survivor 54,  
Debra Pisani, survivor 54,

Laura Mc Mahon, of *The Sentinel Sun* 35,  
Judge James Cohn (in Lucy Richards' alleged case) 59,  
Monsignor Robert Weiss, pastor 55,  
Bishop Thomas Tobin 55,

Donna Soto, mother 20, Matthew Soto, brother 70,  
Remington Arms, defendant 41,  
Judge Frank Remington (in Prof Fetzer's case) 52,  
*Hartford Courant's* publisher Arthur Sulzberger, defendant 29,  
Judge Barbara Bellis (in Alex Jones' case) 39,

Police who arrested Jonathan Reich 57,  
Those who put Adam Heller in a mental hospital 57,  
Person at *New Haven Register* who blocked Maureen Crowley's  
comments on the suspicious death of Podgorski 57

And then there are myriad people behind the scenes in media, in  
crisis-actor companies, and among police, firefighters and first  
responders! Let me acknowledge that it's very hard to say "It didn't  
happen" when millions say "It did." But you can try!

## A Note on Filing a Civil RICO Suit

A video by Independent Media Solidarity contains *Google's clarifying* that the **United Way's** solicitation of funds for Sandy Hook went live no later than 6:58pm, December 14, 2012. It's impossible that United Way could so quickly establish a bank account (at Newtown Savings), and provide the graphics and text, etc. This smacks of *foreknowledge* of a crime, by a United Way-connected person.

Did you donate? If so, you can file a “**civil RICO**” lawsuit: Racketeer-Influenced and Corrupt Organization Act. If a racket makes you lose money, even a dollar, you can sue those who run the “Enterprise.” members. Indeed, thanks to RICO, one can sue, *en masse*, a variety of organizations that conspired in the hoax.

## A Note on Lying and Trust

Robert Steele, a CIA retiree, said, when writing about SHES (Sandy Hook Elementary School) in his online *Memo to Potus*, informed us:

“Individuals ordered to lie [to court and to media] are offered both full immunity and severe [!] penalties if they fail to lie as ordered.”

Wow. That statement appears in print, for the first time, in this book. In order to get help from hoax-participants who may well be sick of the whole damn thing, let's get the word out that such fancy-dancy CIA threats are themselves punishable. It is NOT true that some sort of “legal lying” has entered our judicial system.

How could it? The whole spirit of a republic is that the members of society work together and govern themselves. This requires trust of one's neighbor, or, in the case of bad neighbor, it requires discipline from the entity that we have established as disciplinarian. There can be no “Rule of Law” other than one that respects principles, such as honesty. If Steele's comment is accurate, everything about the CIA and the United States government must be called into question.

**PART ONE**

**WHEN DID WE**

**STOP USING 'REASON'?**

## Chapter 1. Fiction Is Not the Same As Fact



*Connecticut State Trooper Eddie Vayan*

Any library or bookstore has sections clearly marked “Fiction” and sections clearly marked “Non-Fiction.”

The mainstream media (the MSM) started a few decades ago to publish as “news” things that did not really happen. Perchance they just did not have enough to report that was real news, and had to fill up the space. More likely, though, they were trying us out to see if we could be lulled into believing any old thing. I imagine that those who had doubts were too embarrassed to speak out. They knew their neighbors loved the News hosts and would never call them liars.

Just after the SHES event, the state of Connecticut (allegedly) gave each of the bereaved families a state trooper for a month. He would live in their home and protect them from nosy parkers (like me). It had never been done before but as usual the MSM relied on people’s willingness to accept as normal whatever the News announced.

In the year after SHES, all the major networks and CNN covered the story again by interviewing parents about their “great loss.” CBS sent Scott Pelley to interview one of those homey state troopers:

“A guardian angel helps family heal in the aftermath of Newtown”  
by Scott Pelley, CBS EVENING NEWS March 27, 2013

Following the Newtown school shooting last December parents gathered at the Sandy Hook fire station to wait for news. Each family was assigned a Trooper as a guardian and guide. [So quick!]

This is a story of a relationship that changed the lives of the Hubbards. Matthew and Jenny had two children in school, Freddy and Catherine. But when Jenny arrived at the fire house, she could only find one.

*Jenny Hubbard:* The first thing I saw was -- was Freddy and he, as soon as he saw me he lost it because he kept saying to me, "Mama, I can't find Catherine". Thing about Catherine is she had fire red hair. I calmed him down and I said, "You stay with your teacher. I'm going to go find Catherine."

*Dad:* I was in Switzerland on a business trip and I got an email from somebody that something had happened in the school.

*Mom:* Some of the parents started calling the hospital and I didn't. I sat there with Freddy because I knew in my heart, I knew that Catherine was gone. Call it what you want. My belief is that God just wrapped me up, held me tight knowing what was to unfold...

*Dad:* I called you after I read that and your words -- I'll never forget "They assigned a trooper to us. You need to get home."

*Eddie Vayan:* I said, "My name's Eddie. I'm a trooper that's assigned to you. I'm here for whatever you need. I'm not going to leave your side." And she told me -- "I know my daughter's in heaven." And that's before the official word had gotten to her. And that's when tears filled my eyes."

*Pelley:* When you saw that picture of the prettiest little girl anybody ever saw, what did you think?

*Vayan:* How could this happen?

*Mom:* And one of the parents was like, "Enough. Just tell us what's going on," because we had been there for a long time and I'm not sure what the quote was or what was said specifically. It was, "If your child's not here they're probably a fatality." Other people in the room were screaming and they were on their knees just in pain.

Eddie Vayan stayed by Jenny, helped get Matthew home and used a photo to help identify Catherine so her parents didn't have to. He kept reporters away, became a big brother to Freddy and drove Jenny to pick out Catherine's last dress.

*Pelley:* Has Freddy asked you any questions about the shooting?



*Vayan:* The only concern Freddy has is, did my sister feel pain? .

*Dad:* Freddy asked him if he would stand by Catherine's casket, after the wake in full uniform and he did. [Truly beautiful]

*Pelley:* He also stood by them the day Freddy went back to school.

*Vayan:* I had got to school an hour early and I wrote a note for him and I put it on his desk, telling him he'll be okay, be brave. Here's my e-mail and cell phone number if you need to call me.

*Mom:* It's the kindness in him that goes far beyond what anybody could ever expect.

*Vayan:* December 14th, 2012 is the worst day of my life, but being part of the Hubbards' has been the most honorable time of my life. [Ahem.]

**YouTube comments under that Pelley interview were mostly sympathetic but some were sarcastic. For example:**

Freeman Bill. Stop with the lies already. It was a staged event.

Frankenstrat78. No parent in or out of their right mind would accept someone else's word that their child was dead.

C Vickrot. I'm thinking it's a way to keep Mom and Dad in line.

Hockeyguidedude25. These stories are so contrived it's truly unbelievable, and remarkable that most people fall for this trash!!!

AmaterasuSolar: Pathetic acting. sick psyopping, lies and fraud.

Note: I don't rule out that some of the negativity printed as the voice of the public is also fiction provided by the MSM. Around 2010 it was even announced that members of the US military had "desk jobs" sending in comments to YouTube and other social media.

## Chapter 2. The Ethics and Legality of Crisis-Acting



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

This chapter searches for any criminality that exists in the use of so-called crisis actors. But first I'll inventory the circumstances in which it is OK to play-act.

1. It's OK to play act a scene in a drama on stage. The audience knows that when they bought a ticket, they were going to see play-acting. Romeo struts onto the stage with Juliet in the balcony doing her monologue. How can anyone complain of being fooled?

2. It's also OK when an actor poses in a TV ad as a satisfied customer. "I love using this furniture polish on my dining room table." Quite possibly she has never polished furniture in her life; maybe she does not even have a dining room table, but it's OK because we have long accepted the custom of a business hiring an actor to show off its product.

3. Now for 'puffery.' Someone says, in an ad (or writes it on the packaging), "The sharpest razor in the world." It is by no means the sharpest in the world but "we all understand" that the promoter could not have measured the sharpness of all the world's razors. Thus, since we can guess that it's a meaningless claim, we won't fuss about it. I was surprised to learn in law school that the promoter won't be sue-able for telling lies, as it is considered "mere puffery."

But it's not so OK if an actor proclaims, in an ad, that he is a doctor (or dresses like one). When he says "This pill is good for migraines," the audience absorbs his doctor-like image *and* the claim about the medication into one message. But it *is* wrong. The pill manufacturer should get a real doctor to make the statement, giving his real name.

**Crisis Acting.** Now let's talk about actors who play a part in a scene that is meant to look authentic and be shown as News. Here, there won't be a chance for folks watching it to discount it, in the way we'd discount an advertisement as self-serving; it is being presented to us as reality. I say that it's not OK. So, let's pause to grade different types of crisis-acting scenes:

Type A -- a drill that is publicly announced in advance. In the Sydney photo shown above, folks were warned of an exercise to teach emergency workers how to deal with a plane crash onto city streets. Locals were informed that 700 persons would be playing the role of injured, bereaved, and spectators. Some "canned" wailing would be heard, and fake blood dropped but no one would go away thinking they had just seen a real crash. I judge this to be OK.

Type B – the practice of making warlike scenes for soldiers, before they have left their base to go to battle, to give them an idea of what they may encounter. For example, they may encounter a soldier whose leg has just been blown off. I judge this to be OK. (The guys playing the role of the legless would be an actor who was a real amputee, or for whom there is a way to hide the leg.)

Type C -- crisis actors are hired to make it look like some awful thing has occurred, for purposes of scaring people in general. This is not OK and is the crime of assault — the onlookers are assaulted mentally, or could even suffer a heart attack. Note: I think the scenes we saw in Melbourne of police beating elderly protestors (over the lockdown) were meant to **condition us all**.

Type D – crisis actors are hired to play the part of, say, "far-right wingers" or "Muslim jihadists," creating chaos or murder, for the purpose of having this group's reputation ruined. This is not OK. It happens a lot. I am guessing that the "white supremacist" turnout in Charlottesville in 2017 was such a false flag.

Type E -- which is sometimes intertwined with type D -- has the group doing wrong so that new laws can be passed to criminalize certain behavior. The common examples are laws against gun-toting and laws against terrorism. Of course, this is not OK. It is called **SCAD** — state crimes against democracy. We should develop this:

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

## **Is Government Propaganda OK?**

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

In 2012, the bill called for modification of the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948. That law had funded US overseas broadcasts, such as by the Voice of America and Liberty Radio. This was just after World War II ended, and the plan was to downsize a bit. Smith-Mundt forbade the stuff we send overseas from doubling back onto the US audience as propaganda.

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

## **There Is Definitely No License To Lie**

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

An individual who has been sued or prosecuted may be able to hide behind the national security mantra. This was seen in the 1953 case, *US v Reynolds*. Some widows of civilians who were in a military plane crash asked for damages. The defendant, the US military, wormed its way out of providing ‘Discovery’ by saying the cause of the (domestic) crash was classified. Note: Professor Louis Fisher says it was not classified. The ruling should be overturned.

That said, it seems OK to me for the US government to occasionally hide something for the purpose of hiding it from our enemy. But **to hide it from us has the effect of telling us who our real enemy is.** Ahem. Cough, cough.

My answer to the question “Is there a license to lie?” is: Hell, no! My answer to the question “Is it legal for government to propagandize citizens in any way, shape, or form?” is: “Surely you jest.”

Yet 60 years ago the Joint Chiefs of Staff took it in stride. They arranged for us to mimic a plane crash and blame it on Cuba, to justify us starting a war on Cuba. As shown in the Northwoods memo below, **we’d arrange some mock funerals for the (non)deceased.**



*For the children’s “funerals” at Sandy Hook in December 2012, the traffic cop is seen making way for a procession of mourners. Possibly the firemen men on the left, in dress uniform, are from Central Casting. (Or they may be out-of-staters who truly believed the story. Let’s hear from them!)*

Note: Later in this book, I recommend that we, the public, offer an amnesty from prosecution to any of the participants in fake funerals as long as they come forward, pronto, and give us the scoop.

## The Declassified “Northwoods Memo” of 1962

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

Joint Chiefs of Staff are to indicate brief but precise description of pretexts, which they consider, would provide justification for US military intervention in Cuba.... World opinion, and the United States forum should be favorably affected by developing the international image of the Cuban government as rash and irresponsible, and as an alarming and unpredictable threat to peace.  
a. Sabotage ship in harbor; large fires naphthalene ....

**Conduct funerals for mock victims...** c. Commence large- scale ... military operations.... We could **develop a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area**, or other Florida cities and even in Washington.... We could sink a boatload of Cubans en route to Florida (real or simulated). We could foster attempts on lives of Cuban refugees in the United States even to the extent of wounding in instances to be widely publicized.... **C-46 type aircraft could make cane-burning raids at night.** Soviet Bloc incendiaries could be found....

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

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

*Note: President Kennedy put the kibosh on this plan; it did not take place.*

## Chapter 3. Orwell Knew! The Human Mind Is the Target



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

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

It is my contention that courts no longer adhere to the value of honesty. They seem to be marching to a different drummer.

### **An Open Letter “to the Great Nine”**

In 2022, I published, at [GraniteGrok.com](http://GraniteGrok.com), the following “Open Letter” that places Sandy Hook in an Orwellian context

To the Nine American Justices,

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

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

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

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

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

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

“The Party said that Oceania had never been in alliance with Eurasia. He, Winston Smith, knew that Oceania had been in alliance with Eurasia as short a time as four years ago. But where did that



knowledge exist? **Only in his own consciousness, which in any case must soon be annihilated.** And if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed -- if all records told the same tale -- **then the lie passed into history and became truth.... All that was needed was an unending series of victories over your own memory. 'Reality control', they called it....**

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

## **The Defamation Lawsuit**

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

But instead, the circuit court judge for Dane County, WI made a summary judgment in Pozner’s favor ignoring Fetzer’s defenses and then called in a jury to set the amount of damages, to wit, \$450,000. The Wisconsin Appeals Court went along with this, despite Fetzer having been deprived of the basic due-process right to Discovery and the jury trial that was demanded. (Does that tell you something?)

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

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

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

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

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



1. That the 132KB, JPEG imaged Certificate of Death, for Noah Samuel Pozner age 6, (CoD1) as examined is an altered and unreliable document image. No determination of originality, or intentional act of forgery, can be supported due to the multi-generational copy degradation of printed image and the low resolution of the captured image.
2. That the obviously altered in shape and content, 1.7MB, JPEG imaged Certificate of Death, for Noah Samuel Pozner age 6, (CoD 2) is a forgery.
3. That the State of Connecticut, Registrar of Vital Statistics, has issued two different and certified as true versions (CoD 3 & 8) of state file number 2012-07- 078033, a Certificate of Death, for Noah Samuel Pozner age 6.
4. That for reasons disclosed and undisclosed, the content of state file number 2012-07- Case 2018CV003122 Document 178 Filed 06-07-2019 Page 7 of 22 Page 8 078033 has been digitally and physically altered.
5. That until such time as the State of Connecticut addresses and rectifies the conditions that allow this kind of record manipulation, any 'true copy of a record filed', certified by the Seal of State of Connecticut, Department of Public Health, should be considered suspect and treated as unreliable."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering this. Yours very respectfully,

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

[I repeat, the above is an Open Letter. Not sent to the addressee.]

[Alas. SCOTUS did not take the Fetzer-Pozner case.]

## Chapter 4. A Four-Stage History of Critical Thought



*The Acropolis of ancient Athens, Photo: GreekCityTimes.com*

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

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

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

The **third stage** was the **development of mass communication** through printing and then through electronics. Johannes Gutenberg introduced movable type in 1450. By 1900, about 20% of people in the world were literate. Today it is over 90%. Electronic broadcasting of information and entertainment began with radio in the 1920s and TV in the 1950s.

By 2000, the personal computer started to replace paper print. In the 1600s, philosopher Rene Descartes had opened a field of critical thought, *epistemology*, that asks How do we know what we know? Generally, that inquiry was prestigious in academia but now has taken a fall. It's politically incorrect to question things, as though people should just accept propaganda patriotically (!) Humans also get seduced into cults, wherein independent thinking is a sin.

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

### **Why the Rush to Artificial Intelligence & Transhumanism?**

Every one of the 8 billion humans alive today, is entitled to have a say in the proposed changes to human nature. No doubt those who were exercising some critical thought, would be inclined to say "Stop this train!" Here are some reasons for stopping this train:

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

\* No, we shouldn't trust persons, such as Bill Gates and Klaus Schwab) who don't even feel a responsibility to explain what is going on. (They appear to me to be "clinical cases.")

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


\* As of 1950, Sidney Gottlieb was in charge of the MK-Ultra program that wanted to find out how to wipe out an individual's memory and ego, using "clever tools" such as terror and humiliation. (Gee, how clever can you get?)

\*Mind control 'experiments' are going on in prisons right this minute. It may yet happen to you. You'll regret not opposing sooner. As Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn said, recalling life in the Soviet Gulag, "How we burned in the camps... [we mullied]: In Leningrad, when they arrested a quarter of the entire city, WHAT IF people had not simply sat there, paling with terror at every step on the staircase, but had understood they had nothing left to lose and had boldly set up an ambush of half a dozen people with axes, hammers, pokers...?"

\* Some of the victims in the US, UK, and Australia report that the mind control they underwent was done in the context of satanism. in which the leaders support evil as a good. (Such persons have also started wars, using the combatants as their playthings.) For them, a show of conscience would be considered a breach of etiquette!

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

## Chapter 5. Do Motor Patterns Dictate Your Thinking?



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

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

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

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

There were no houses in evolutionary times, much less mortgages, but *Homo sapiens* was evolving various ways to calculate his best advantage. Robin Allott tries to see how language evolved. He says it has to do with a connection between perception and action.

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

I want to tie Robin Allott’s ideas in with those of Joseph Giovannoli. We must ask “How do so many Americans seem blind to the truth about Sandy Hook?” Giovannoli was the author in 2000 of *The Biology of Belief*. In his 2019 work, *Seeing Reality As It Is*, he supplies a new term for the way we “inherit” the culture, and the beliefs, of our forebears. His term is **psycho-genes**. Sure, we have a biological way of carrying our ancestors’ genes, but we can also “carry” their ideas. They get handed down if they help survival.

I suspect that just as we have a program for physical actions -- like that robot ping-pong champ, we may have a program for thinking. It’s not all DNA. What we learn in childhood – hey, I can still recite the Latin Credo straight through – seeps down. The practices of one’s culture are “second nature.” New things, psycho genes, get into you, and you become their servant. Recall this song by Frederick Lowe: “It’s second nature to me now, like breathing out and breathing in, I was serenely independent and content before we met. Surely I could always be that way again and yet, I’ve grown accustomed to her face, it almost makes the day begin....” Etc.

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

“Today, through the media ... using propaganda ... power elites corrupt what the public believes, and thereby what businesses, governments and other entities do. If we permit this to continue by interpreting the constitutional protection of free speech to extend to corporations ... whose purpose is to thwart free speech, we are probably jeopardizing the right of future generations to open debate intended by the US Constitution.”



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

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

Doesn’t a rebellious spirit of the young counteract this? No. Observe the strong defense students give to the ‘woke’ ideology. As Bev Eakman has said, teachers have, for many years been advising students NOT to argue an idea through, not to deploy reasoning, not to disrupt the “consensus.” They have been given the rule ‘Don’t hurt anyone’s feelings.’ In his book *The Treason of the Experts* (2023), Thomas Harrington says each year his college students become quieter and quieter in class, afraid to say the wrong thing.

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

“In the Gulf War ... press coverage put heavy emphasis on the opinions of US military figures and their explanations of the technical genius of American-made military technology. ... War was presented to Americans as a sort of exciting video game devoid of any bloodshed and death. [Do you remember that?]

This process of desensitizing of the media, and from there, the American people, to the horrendous human effects of war-making culminated in the revolting spectacle, on January 30<sup>th</sup>, 1991 of reporters chuckling along with General Norman Schwarzkopf as he joked while showing them videos of supposed “smart bombs” killing people like ants from the safety of 30,000 feet’.”

Whew! Our ‘domestic enemy’ knows all the tricks of mind control and knows simple truths of how we operate unconsciously. Let’s imagine some globalist deciding that the US needs gun control. She

asks President Obama to create a scene that Americans can understand. He then tells Attorney General Holder to tell FBI Director Mueller to get with it. (By the way, Mueller came on board just weeks before 9/11 and quit right after the Marathon bombing.)

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

It is decided that a drill will be advertised. As James Perloff has pointed out, the point of having a simultaneous drill running may be to have a story ready to explain police behavior if the event falls apart. I notice that in the first month after the SHES ‘massacre,’ major media quoted only unnamed officials for its news.

Later, they specified their names. Were they waiting to see if a whistleblower emerged? Or if citizens threw a fit over the lying?

Note: They also plant immediate YouTube conspiracy theorists to be able to control the CTN (‘conspiracy theorist narrative’)! Right away there were claims in the CTN that that Lanza was seen storing his rifle in the trunk, and that Gene Rosen, a neighbor, had acting as his career. Someone “discovered” that the fake parents had got paid off by receiving a fully paid house 3 years earlier. Sincere sleuths may have originated some of those, but it’s hard to tell.

Control of insurance companies was needed, too. I’ve heard that some families sued Nancy Lanza’s Homeowners’ insurance policy and were paid \$96,000 each. Control of the CT legislature was needed for passage of a law making some gun manufacturers liable despite a federal exemption. And a law for kids’ privacy -- precisely stating that no one can look at children’s autopsies.

Control of courts was, sad to say, not much of a problem. I think corruption starts at the very top. I assume the case against Alex Jones (for a billion dollars for defamation?) was staged to teach us a lesson.

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

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

FBI creative writers also had to produce tons of drivel:

“When the shooter had his hair cut, he did not like to be touched and did not like the sound of clippers, so they were not used much. He would sit with his hands in his lap and always look down, giving one-word answers if the cutter tried to engage him in conversation. ... Those who worked on the property at 36 Yogananda Street never entered the home. They spoke with the mother outside in the yard or at the bottom of driveway. ...”

Consider how the Sandy Hook story insults your intelligence!

As of today, most Americans think Jones got what was coming to him, for insulting the families. He played along with that, acting as if he were hit with a billion-dollar judgment for ‘inflicting emotional distress.’ No. His case never got to the merits. The judge in Texas knew better than to let it get to the merits. She made a **default** judgement, on the grounds that he had failed to produce requested documents. And in Connecticut, Judge Barbara Bellis cited contempt of court as basis for a default judgement. She wrote:

“The Court’s authority here is rooted not only in Practice Book Section 13-14, but the Court also has **inherent sanctioning power**.

With respect to the issue of contempt, the Court finds by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant, Alex Jones, willfully and in bad faith **violated without justification several clear Court orders** requiring his attendance at his depositions on March 23 and March 24 [2-22].” [Emphasis added]

**PART TWO**

**A WALK-THROUGH OF THE**

**SANDY HOOK SHOOTING**

## Chapter 6. The Official Story of Sandy Hook Massacre



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

What is said to have happened at Sandy Hook Elementary School? Here I give statements made, even today, by officials and media:

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

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

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

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

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

a Glock and a Sig Sauer -- and a rifle:



(L) *The broken window*



(R) *Adam Lanza, a 3-gun-man!*

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

Lanza encountered four other staff members, including the principal, in the hallway and shot them dead. He then “turned the gun on himself” committing suicide. (None of this is captured by surveillance camera in the school, or outside, and there’s no blood.)

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

### **Detective Van Ness Swore This in an Affidavit [abridged]:**

“The undersigned, investigator, having been duly sworn, deposes: While on the scene this detective [me, Rachael Van Ness] observed there to be a small black vehicle parked in the fire lane to the right of the front doors was unaware of how it was involved in this scene. This detective recalls the officer exiting the building carrying a small girl, possibly a kindergartener on his hip, and holding the hand of another child as well. This detective was not advised as to where the

children have been found or why it was no adult faculty or staff member.... This detective was advised if they appeared to be the last, and brought the children down the hill to the firehouse.

“At one point while in parking lot this detective observed TSC Macisco number 906 to begin recording the registration plates of the vehicles in the parking lot. This detective documented several children’s as well as their parents names via ID .... The children were holding onto each other’s shoulders from behind walking in the single file line as directed. This detective observed many of the children were crying in front, in addition to being cold, and attempted to be encouraging while leading them to the back of the parking lot. “... to keep any of the parents present from pulling their children from the line [I] ran back across the lot and received the next group of children most of whom exited in the same manner and appeared to exhibit the same mix of emotions....



[I] remained with children from those grades who were not physically able to run, always walking behind the last child in the group in the effort to ensure that if additional shots were aimed at the children (as the theory that there could be another shooter in the wood line or in the building was still circulating) this detective would have the opportunity to gather and shield the stragglers.

This detective observed two white females to come running out of the building both wearing purple shirts. This detective observed that they were both crying and visibly shaken ... one appearing to be having an anxiety attack or suffering from a cardiac issue.... she was turned over to an EMS worker....”

## Chapter 7. Sedensky Report: The Official Inquiry



*The home of Nancy Lanza and her son Adam, now razed. NewsTimes.com*

Officer Van Ness's statement quoted above is found in the Sedensky Report, the state's inquiry. A summary is public at: [portal.ct.gov](http://portal.ct.gov). That report, "Final Report on Sandy Hook Investigation," was done by the State's Attorney for the Judicial District of Danbury. It was issued on November 25, 2013. One would expect it to be a forensic-type investigation, covering all the steps police carried out that day. Police Commissioner Lt Paul Vance was in charge.

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

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

(I haven't found parts that could be considered grim or haunting.)

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



“The release of the FBI documents, which a top prosecutor said Tuesday contain little new information for law enforcement, comes two months before the fifth remembrance of the Sandy Hook massacre and Newtown’s irreplaceable loss.

Nicole Hockley, who lost a son in the massacre, said she was reading the FBI documents with a sense of hope. “We are looking through all of this information to see if there is anything that could have pointed to an opportunity for intervention,” said Hockley. I hope this gives us some additional knowledge to point to signs and signals that were missed.’

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

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

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

“While the **vast majority of persons interviewed** had no explanation for the shooter’s actions, a review of electronic evidence or digital media that appeared to belong to the shooter, revealed that the shooter had a preoccupation with mass shootings, in particular the Columbine shootings and a strong interest in firearms. **For example, there was a spreadsheet with mass murders over the years** listing information about each shooting.”

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

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

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

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

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

During the search of 36 Yogananda Street, a **global positioning system (GPS) device was located in the shooter's room** with various routes in the memory from April 25, 2012, **through December 13, 2012**. Investigation revealed that the GPS was purchased for the shooter. The routes taken indicate a number of trips from 36 Yogananda Street to the area of a local theater where a commercial version of the game “Dance Dance Revolution” is located. Over that time period, trips were made that took the driver **in the vicinity of** some schools in Newtown, including SHES. [Sandy Hook Elementary School] [Emphasis added]

I note that other found items that Sedensky lists are: images of the shooter holding a rifle to his head (who took that picture?), a five-second video (dramatization) of children being shot, a computer game “School shooting “where the player controls a character who enters a school and shoots at students,” documents on weapons and a large amount of paper relating to the Columbine shooting.

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

Note: I assume the only party that could gift that land would be Nancy Lanza or her estate, if she had not bequeathed it to Ryan.

At the end of the Sedensky report, we find this bold statement: **“Based on a painstaking investigation it is determined that there will be no arrests or prosecutions.** The Connecticut State Police are to be commended for their tireless work....”

On the next page I insert, but you need only give it a glance, a ridiculous page from the “FBI report.” It was a mild and stupid report so there would not have been cause to redact anything.

**What’s Missing?** Try saying this to “Gus” who believes the story: “Gus, I am totally skeptical of the facts presented in the newspaper. Since when is there a big shootout with no blood stains? Since when would distraught Moms and Dads sit patiently in a principal’s office for hours to get word of their child’s fate? Since when do officials not dig deep into the cause of a massacre? Or this gunman’s life?

“Come on, Gus, does it all sound kosher to you? If you think it’s a bit weird, are you too scared to admit that? Would you be willing to say, in an interview, “I’d like to hear the details from school nurse Sally Cox. She says she hid under a desk and watched it through a hole in the desk.” Would you like to see a demo, on TV of how 15 kids could fit into a 3x4 bathroom? Does it strike you odd that the demolition workers had to sign Non-Disclosure agreements? Huh?”

## List of Redacted Items from the FBI's Sandy Hook Report

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



Assume that there is an official “redacter” in the employ of FBI. The above can’t possibly be a genuine search to take out information harmful to *national security* or to the *victims’ privacy*, can it? Reader, why do you put up with them insulting your intelligence?

## Chapter 8. Solid Criticisms of the Official Story



*Robert Steele (1952-2021)*

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

**First**, let's think about Robert Steele. I only lately discovered that he had written a short book called "Sandy Hook Truth: Memo to Potus," which is on the Internet. Before that, I had known of his work at the International Tribunal for Natural Justice, and have found him sincere and with a passion to get the truth out. Steele died of Covid, in a hospital but I'm guessing he was killed.

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

"I managed a false flag event for the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in my capacity as a Clandestine Operations Officer stationed overseas. I have personal experience with 'legalized lying' whereby ostensible orders 'from the highest authorities' mandate **lying to the Court** and lying to the media and the public, in support of national security objectives.

**"Individuals ordered to lie are offered both full immunity and severe penalties if they fail to lie as ordered."** -- Robert Steele [Emphasis added] Note: Lying to a court is the crime of perjury.

Now moving to a **second criticism of mine**, regarding the affidavit of Detective Rachael Van Ness, quoted in Chapter 6. She is the policewoman in the iconic photo. Her statements are **absurd**. They seem to have been made up to suit the photo, although that photo must have been snapped on a date before December 2014.

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

“This detective” said her duty was to keep any parents from pulling their kid out of line. What! The best possible thing for those kids would be to run to Mom or Dad. And why would any parent put up with being held back? The story is so crazy that I wonder of it was put in to test how far our gullibility for official narratives goes.

Not many people would have seen the affidavit in Sedensky’s report; I came by it by luck in 2021. Note: Possibly Van Ness was asked to say how she had performed at a “drill” in, say, November. OK, but she has not come forth to correct it.

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

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

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

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

In the iconic photo, only a few kids are shown. The population of the school was around 500. Where are the older students? Where are the teachers? How about some doctor's comments on the two persons who reportedly got wounded but survived?

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

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

Some people were accused of stalking, when they legitimately sought answers. Wolfgang Halbig says he was physically prevented, by security guards, from entering a public building in Hartford CT. A man named Matthew Mills was arrested by Stratford Police during a memorial race for Vicki Soto as he had asked Vicki's sister Jillian a question about a family picture. Mills was charged with interfering with police! I will discuss the case of another "harasser," Lucy Richards, in Part Three on courts.

My **sixth criticism** of the official story has to do with malfeasance by government, involving much of the state of Connecticut and the feds. Assuming, for the moment, that "Sandy Hook" was all a lie, why was it done? One leading theory is that it was part of President Obama's plan to undo the Second Amendment's promise of the citizen's right to bear arms. This would explain Sandy Hook parents' emphasis on gun control. (They also talk about kids' mental health.)

Another possibility is that all such false stories of violence are intended to put the public in a general state of apprehension or even terror. A recent headline was “Gunfire in two crowded buses in Harlem” (September 26, 2023). It’s normal Machiavellian strategy to get people to worry about their safety. “You’ll be able to rule them easily – they’ll even help you enforce your despotism.”

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

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

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

1. The late Dr Wayne Carver, coroner, said, publicly, “I hope the people of Newtown don’t have it crash on their head later.” That seems like something a doctor would say if he had been asked to make crazy claims about autopsies of non-existent children.
2. There was very little media coverage of any grandparents.
3. It’s odd that parents were forbidden to view their child’s corpses. As to whether the survivors of the six deceased staff members gained entry to the school to see their loved one, I have not heard.
4. And I did not see any news of the two allegedly wounded teachers, Natalie Hammond and Debra Pisani, being taken to hospital. The MSM declines to cover their story, but Ms Hammond has given a lengthy solo lecture for more than an hour, repeating all the government narrative and adding personal details. A citizen, codenamed Hook Worm, has preserved that lecture at Rumble.com.



## Chapter 9. James Tracy Looks at Dr Carver's Answers



*Dr Wayne Carver, at press conference, the day after, surrounded by state troopers, December 15, 2012*

At his website, [memoryholeblog.com](http://memoryholeblog.com), Professor James Tracy looks at the wording by the medical examiner Wayne Carver, MD.

PROFESSOR James Tracy notes:

“On December 19 the Connecticut State Police assigned [a cop to stay -- for a month -- at the home of] each of the 26 families who lost a loved one at Sandy Hook Elementary. ‘The families have requested no press interviews,’ State Police assert on their behalf.

“[At Carver’s press conference] the multiple gaffes, discrepancies, and hedges in response to reporters’ astute questions suggest that Dr Carver is either under coercion or an imposter.”

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

Reporter #1: So the rifle was the primary weapon? **Dr Wayne Carver:** Yes.

Reporter #2: Doctor, can you tell us about the nature of the wounds. Were they at very close range? Were the children shot at from across the room?

**Carver:** Uhm, I only did seven of the autopsies. The victims I had ranged from three to eleven wounds apiece and I only saw two with close range shooting.

Reporter #3: But you said that the long rifle was used? **Carver:** Yes.

Reporter #3: But the long rifle was discovered in the car.

**State Police Lieutenant Vance:** That's not correct, sir.

Unidentified reporter #4: How many bullets or bullet fragments did you find in the autopsy. Can you tell us that?

**Carver:** There were lots of them, OK? This type of weapon is not, uh ... the bullets are designed in such a fashion that the energy—this is very clinical. I shouldn't be saying this. But the energy is deposited in the tissue so the bullet stays in [the tissue]. [In fact, the Bushmaster .223 Connecticut police finally claimed was used in the shooting is designed for long range field use and utilizes high velocity bullets averaging 3,000 feet-per-second, the energy of which even at considerable distance would penetrate several bodies before finally coming to rest in tissue.]

Reporter #6: In what shape were the bodies when the families were brought to check... [inaudible]. **Carver:** Uh, we did not bring the bodies and the families into contact. We took pictures of them, uhm, of their facial features. We have, uh, uh -- it's easier on the families when you do that. Uh, there is, uh, a time and place for the up close and personal in the grieving process, but to accomplish this we thought it would be best to do it this way and, uh, you can sort of, uh ... You can control a situation depending on the photographer, and I have very good photographers. Uh, but uh—

Reporter #7: Do you know the difference of the time of death between the mother in the house and the bodies recovered? **Carver:** Uh, no, I don't. Sorry.

Reporter #8: Did the gunman kill himself with the rifle? **Carver:** No. I -- I don't know yet. I'll -- I'll examine him tomorrow morning. But, but I don't think so. [Why has Carver left arguably the most important specimen for last? And why doesn't he think Lanza didn't commit suicide with the rifle? -- James Tracy]

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

## Chapter 10. What Is the Catholic Church Doing Here?



(L) *Monsignor Robert Weiss at 50th anniversary of ordination, Photo: Newtown Bee* (R) *Maureen Crowley, truth activist, very Catholic*

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

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

But now I will show you how three priests acted wrongly. The first is Bishop Thomas Tobin in Providence, RI. In 2015, a Rhode Island lady, Maureen Crowley, a truth supporter, delivered an essay on the subject, to the office of the bishop. She later stated "He called the Rhode Island State Police, who then called to interrogate me."

(Maureen is a Catholic activist who passes information to any such official. I learned of her from an article by a physics professor from Georgia, Winfield Abbe, whom I'll quote below. He died in 2021.)

The second is Monsignor Weiss, pastor at St Rose of Lima which is located very close to SHES. He should speak in a fatherly way to conspiracy nutters like me. Does he answer queries from skeptical parishioners? I feel sorry for him having to play the hoax game.

Third is Cardinal Dolan, who compared one of the killed teachers to Jesus. I assure you, clergy do not speak way over the top like that. It must be that he was ordered to lay it on thick. See if you agree:

**Cardinal Dolan Compares Victim to Jesus**, by Ron Dicker at HuffPost, December 21, 2012

For trying to shield her student as both died in the gunfire, Sandy Hook School teacher Anne Marie Murphy earned perhaps the highest praise from New York Cardinal Timothy Dolan on Thursday. The Catholic leader, presiding over the 52-year-old Murphy's funeral, compared her to Jesus, NBC News reported.

"Like Jesus, Annie laid down her life for her friends," Dolan told mourners at St. Mary Church in Katonah, N.Y. "Like Jesus, Annie's life and death brings light, truth, goodness and love to a world often shrouded in darkness, evil, selfishness and death."

Murphy, a mother of four who was a special education teacher, was reportedly found with her arms wrapped around 6-year-old Dylan Hockley. She worked with Dylan one-on-one.... The Associated Press wrote that other children were discovered under Murphy's protective embrace as well.

"Like Jesus, Annie was an excellent teacher; like him, she had a favored place in her big, tender heart for children, especially those with struggles," Dolan said (per the *Poughkeepsie Journal*).

"I never had the honor of meeting Annie, so I'm at a disadvantage," Dolan said, according to the NY Times. "Then again, I never had the honor of physically meeting Jesus, yet my union with him is the most important thing in my life. And because I know Jesus, I feel as if I know Anne Marie McGowan Murphy quite well."

As for St Rose of Lima, if nothing else there have got to be kids in that school who are whispering "hoax." But they see teachers refusing to discuss it. I mean they see their teachers lying. I never, ever saw any teacher of mine telling a lie. It simply could not happen!

Now back to physics professor Winfield Abbe. He said the Sandy Hook hoax was "the most shameful episode of any during my lifetime of 81 years in America." (Maybe he has not heard of 9/11.) It was he who republished the essay by Maureen Crowley. Here it is, in her words, abridged and with bolding added by me:

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

Who on earth originally would have reason to not trust the heads of a state police department? It seemed inconceivable they were utilizing the federal agencies of DHS, FBI, FEMA, etc. for a massive fraud that also made use of, in my opinion, **organized crime** in Connecticut, to implement a massive agenda, of which gun control was but one component?...

Sandy Hook researcher and retired Florida Safe School Commissioner Wolfgang Halbig’s wife has been threatened where she works. NY resident **Jonathan Reich** was arrested and hit with a \$50,000 bond for legitimately asking questions of Connecticut medical examiner Wayne Carver, as to how bill 1054 got passed in CT. in 2011, that prohibited autopsies of juvenile murder victims from being made public.

A schoolteacher in NY, **Adam Heller**, who legally purchased a firearm, was met at his home by seven policemen, then tossed into a mental institution. He lost his job for questioning Sandy Hook. Connecticut State Police Major William **Podgorski** -- **a lead investigator into Sandy Hook** received minor surgery, then was transferred from Bristol Hospital to Yale’s New Haven facility.

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

Many participants in the scam have retired, as well. The school is sawdust, with construction workers employed in its demolition forced to sign non-disclosure agreements. ...There are tweeted pictures of Danbury Fire fighters, police cars, and fire engines filling up the parking lot of the firehouse (several feet away from Sandy Hook Elementary School) tweeted at 9:13 A.M. -- yet “Adam Lanza” according to the official report, did not arrive at the school until 9:30, with calls for ambulances going right up until 10:05. **There are even reports of the media filling up the very large local ball park, Treadwell Memorial, as early as 7 A.M.!”**

**PART THREE**  
**ANY WORD FROM THE COURT?**

## Chapter 11. Did Unstable Lucy Harass the Pozner Family?



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

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

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

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

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

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

Apparently that’s why Lucy was in a federal court, not a state court. US District Judge James Cohn sentenced her to five months in prison and three years of supervised release (now completed). Laura McMahan, writing in the *Sentinel Sun*, wrote:

“The judge ordered Richards to continue to receive mental health treatment and banned her from visiting several websites that promote conspiracy theories that falsely claim the Sandy Hook and other mass shootings never happened....

Though Richards has a history of mental health problems, Senior U.S. District Judge James Cohn told her he did not believe they were a major factor in her decision to commit the crime. [She] was part of a group of people who insist that some mass shootings are part of a government hoax or conspiracy to take away gun rights....

[He said]: ‘Your words were cruel and insensitive.... This is reality. There is no fiction [here] and there are no alternative facts.’”

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

**Was Lucy’s Case Real?** Lucy’s arrest has accomplished its purpose, i.e., it sent a message “Don’t be a conspicuous activist or it’s jail time for you.” I guess there’s a possibility that she was not the product of an abusive home but rather was recruited from Central Casting!


So what’s the scoop on free speech anyway? There have been no amendments to the US Constitution that would modify Amendment Numero Uno -- the right to freedom of expression. I have said in this book that “The Sandy Hook shooting did not take place.” It’s not a crime to speak, so government can’t prosecute me for that.

Can the families sue me for hurting their feelings? Well, there is a tort (basis to sue for damages) of “intentionally inflicted emotional distress.” But it’s hard to prove “intention.” The law says you can defame someone to the nth degree as long as your remarks are true. And you can defame a *public* person, per *NYTimes v Sullivan* (1964), unless you’ve used “actual malice” or “reckless disregard for truth.”

Pozner sued Fetzer for *defaming* him by “by saying the child’s birth certificate was fake.” A judge awarded the case to plaintiff without a trial. See Ron Avery’s new book, *The Judicial Plundering of James Fetzer*.



## Chapter 12. Let's Deal with the Media: They're Killing Us



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

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

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

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

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

Many people ridiculed him, including, I’m sorry to say, Mary W Maxwell. I had read only the headlines of the case and figured he was planted to file and lose, thus discouraging others from trying. I

also thought he had no standing, ‘Standing’ has been the bugaboo of my own efforts to “get” the government in court.

Shanley’s case was dismissed with prejudice (which means he cannot file it again). He also asked for a recusal of Judge Jeffrey Myers, to which that judge replied, on June 15, 2017:

“[No] because plaintiff has not established bias or an appearance of impropriety or other grounds for my disqualification under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a). Although my father used to serve as a legislator in Connecticut and supported gun control legislation, there is no basis to attribute my father’s views to me.”

Mr Shanley died on November 5, 2017. His followers say he was in good health, and they consider it a murder. Although I like to claim “No one died at Sandy Hook,” Shanley in some sense died there, and we all killed him. He was arrested and imprisoned for a year (2014-2015) for having bothered people about the hoax – and why not, it was his duty. First Amendment, anyone?

An extra sorrow he suffered was that his landlord evicted him and since he was not there to clean out his apartment, “they” threw everything away including his lifetime’s work of interviewing people.

### **Deaths of Whistle Blowers -- How about a Special Coroner?**

Many whistleblowers die. Or persons who know too much get bumped off before they speak out. I gladly admit that no matter how suspicious their death looks, it may have been by natural causes. Or, if they died in a car crash, it could have been genuinely accidental. Nevertheless, the matter needs attention. As Maureen Crowley noted earlier, CT State Police Major William **Podgorski**, a lead investigator into Sandy Hook, passed away at 49. I recommend that anyone who has obviously done some whistleblowing and then dies should be an automatic candidate for a Special Coroner to look at.

The following page shows that, before resorting to his famous lawsuit, Shanley approached Congress’s Committee on Oversight and US Senate Committee of Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. He wrote, on 23 October 2016:

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

The terrorism? -- producing the Sandy Hook Massacre psy-op.... Despite the official narrative, this was an exercise in which **there is no evidence anyone died....**

“I’m a documentary filmmaker, editor of popular books on Quantum science, a media analyst with 40 years’ experience ever since I worked for Jimmy Carter as his broadcast technician on the campaign trail **in 1976 and first noticed a difference between campaign reality and pseudo-reality in TV news.** My most recent popular science book, *Alice and the Quantum Cat* (2011), introduces the most advanced physics to non-scientists, without math.

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

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

“Given the controversial nature of my Complaints, I have not been able to get a lawyer here in Connecticut, so I have been doing the best I can proceeding pro se. This story is unprecedented in nature and scope and significance. **I know that you recognize that it is critical to the future of our Republic** that this story be investigated now. I’ll be looking forward to hearing from you.

“Cordially, Will Shanley, New Haven” [All bolding added]

## The Sherman Anti-Trust Act

The main culprit in the Sandy Hook hoax, if hoax it be, was the **mainstream media**. At YouTube, even now, we see clips from the major networks recorded on the very day, 14 December 2012 and interviewing many of the parents, weeks later. How is it that the media is able to get away with wholesale lies, and fake news?

Dr Zephyr Teachout, professor of law at Fordham, has given a TED talk about monopolies. Major industries -- food production, pharmaceuticals, finance, media and others, have become monopolies. That means all parts of an industry merge horizontally and vertically.

So, if you are a **chicken farmer**, you have to agree to use the one and only distribution system and buy the one and only brand of equipment or feed.

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

Zephyr Teachout refers to this as “the chickenization of America.” The media, she says, have destroyed journalism. They are able to reach so many people, and are wealthy enough to drub out any challengers, that they can publish anything at all.

### Can “Sherman” Limit the Scope of Media Corporations?

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

In any case, even once a corporation has become huge, the federal government can act to reduce its size under the Sherman Anti-trust Act. It is a short act, still in force, since 1890. Herewith the full text:

“Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is declared to be illegal.

“**Every person** who shall make any contract or engage in any combination or conspiracy hereby declared to be illegal **shall be deemed guilty of a felony**, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$100,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$1,000,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.”  
[Emphasis added] -- See 15 USC 1-38

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

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

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

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

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

William Brandon Shanley v

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signed under penalty of perjury, WS. Dec 17, 2014.

## Chapter 13. Help Minors Who Were Trained To Lie



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

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

But in recent decades there has been a training *to* lie. Entertainment for kids conveys admiration for the person who can succeed at a task by being cleverly deceptive. In 2021 at TheConversation.com, Gail Heyman described an experiment at U Cal San Diego where a kid was told to hide a treat under one of two cups:

“We found that, as expected, when children first started playing the game most of them made no effort to deceive, and lost to the experimenter every time. However, within the next few sessions most children discovered how to deceive in order to win the game – and **after their initial discovery they used deception consistently**. The experimenter noted that a theory of mind is needed “because when children lie, they intentionally communicate information that differs from what they themselves believe.” And they **must learn to “stop themselves from blurting out the truth** when they try to lie.”

We learn “**By mastering these skills**, they gain the power **to help shape social narratives** in ways that can have far-reaching consequences for themselves and for others.” [OMG]

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

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

For purposes of this chapter, I wish to point out that we still have laws on the books to criminalize deception. And there is law on the Connecticut books that helps protect children. In Chapter 939, Offenses against the Person, we find, in sec 53-21 (a):

"Any person who willfully or unlawfully permits any child under the age of 16 years to be placed in such a situation that the life or limb of such child is endangered, the health of such child is likely to be injured or the morals of such child are likely to be impaired, **or does any act likely to impair the health or morals of any such child** ... such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of which five years of the sentence imposed may not be suspended."

And don't forget the 13th Amendment to the US Constitution, which makes slavery a crime. Any child made to do immoral things for an adult, by coercion, is acting as a slave. The master will suffer:

18 USC 1589: "(a) Whoever knowingly provides or obtains the labor or services of a person ... (4) by means of any ... pattern intended to cause the person to believe that, if that person did not perform such labor or services, that person or another person would suffer serious harm or physical restraint, shall be (d) imprisoned not more than 20 years."

Was I ever surprised to find that Connecticut's Child Protection Service says: "Moral neglect is: Exposing, allowing, or encouraging the child to engage in illegal or reprehensible activities by the person responsible for the child's health, or care."



To repeat, it is my belief that the official story of Sandy Hook is untrue. So, possibly some persons could be charged with crime for forcing some pupils to lie. Also, some children of that school, once they reach age 18, could file a civil action for damages. *Without a lawyer, they can file pro se for \$402.* I've scripted a fictional court case here, as a very rough template:

## **United States District Court for the District of Connecticut**

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

Jury trial demanded

**I. Introduction.** An “active shooter drill” was scheduled to take place at the campus of the abandoned Mandy Brook School and its local firehouse on December 13th and 14th, 2012. It was run by a combination of local, state, and federal government personnel. The government planned to create a drama in which a nutjob would be said to have entered the school and shot 20 first- graders and 6 staff members.

The actual students, families, and teachers were subsequently told to uphold this false story. They were threatened with harm if they spoke out. ...

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

They are humiliated and often feel depressed, even suicidal. They ask the Court for damages of.... [etc]. *Repeat: This is a satire.*

## Chapter 14. Gun Manufacturer Shows His True Colors



*Economist.com*

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Why Didn't Remington/Bushmaster Fight the Case?**

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

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

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

1. Jim Fetzer, wishing to protect himself from that \$450K award to Pozner in Wisconsin, asked to intervene in the *Soto* case, on the side of "Lanza didn't do nuttin'." But Remington said: Get lost.

2. Remington asked to see the kids' school records, including their conduct records – how embarrassing! The parents asked the court to seal them up. The court obliged. In fact it went further and sealed the children's death certificates and even proof of their birth! Wow.

I think Remington initiated that bad-sounding request for the kids' conduct reports, *in order* to get the court to seal it! Thus we, the public, can't even see a record of kids' attendance at school or their exact names. Note: Connecticut's legislature could still modify this.

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

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

### **President Obama's Gun-Control Agenda**

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

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

### **What about the Fraud Aspect: Any Legal Implications?**

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

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

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

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

Anyway, let me read you the closing sentence of the 1878 US Supreme Court ruling in *US v Throckmorton*, which has not been obsoleted, as far as I know, and will be discussed in Chapter 18:

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

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

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

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

## Chapter 15. A 9/11 Ruling Validates Citizen-Led Grand Jury



*A poster to protest the ruling that gave immunity to President Trump. Photo: Michael McCoy*

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

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

I say SCOTUS killed the Fourth Amendment by allowing a man to be strip-searched when arrested for a traffic violation (2012, Albert Florence case). They scrunched up the Fifth Amendment's right to keep your castle (in *Kelo v London* 2005). They basically slaughtered democracy with *Citizens United v FEC*, in 2010, allowing SuperPACs to contribute limitless funds to candidates. In 2024 they allowed immunity for a president when he is exercising his "core powers."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As we saw, SCOTUS has recently shredded the parchment in, say, Florence, Kelo, and Citizens United. It misinterpreted clauses that no one had ever dreamed of misinterpreting. Those were *positive*

decisions, while the refusal to “grant Cert” in this 9/11 case is technically a non-ruling. But for SCOTUS to fail to stand up for the citizens’ right to direct a grand jury is far out, man. It’s far, far out. This must stop. Indeed, **if we don’t stop it, we are ‘conditioning’ ourselves for more of same.**

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

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

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

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

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

Spend a moment now to absorb some rare philosophical advice:



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Allott urges: MAKERS OF THE NEW WORLD, UNITE!

**PART FOUR**  
**IT'S TIME FOR CITIZEN POWER**

## Chapter 16. Proclaim an (Almost) Universal Amnesty



*Visiting the Cemetery*

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

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

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

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

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

The Connecticut situation is not “black and white” like that. But as an outsider to Connecticut, I can see that something needs to give. Here we are approaching another anniversary of the 2012 Sandy Hook ‘event’ and not one iota of compromise has been reached in regard to the sacking of Prof James Tracy, the failure of Wisconsin

judges to credit Fetzner's 'pixel' issue over Noah Pozner's death certificate, or the ridiculous inadequacy of the Sedensky Report.

Twice in US history there have been mass amnesties. In 1865, after the War between the States, President Andrew Johnson offered a pardon to thousands of soldiers who had joined the Confederacy. In 1978, President Carter granted a blanket pardon to the men who had "deserted" to Canada, or elsewhere to escape the draft. Betcha the Powers That Be ordered those historic amnesties in order to preempt any jurisprudence on the subject of secession and the illegality of the Vietnam War! But anyway, it brought relief.

### **Amnesty for Crisis Actors, OK?**

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

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

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

Nobody is gaining anything from the Sandy Hook psy-op now. (If folks need to argue over gun rights, they can do so on the merits.)

It is wrong to think that barriers to justice put up by "government" are insurmountable. That is silly. We run the place, don't we? I hereby make this informal offer: Dear Person who faked up on December 14, 2012 in Newtown, CT, if you confess to our TRC we will endeavor (but can't guarantee) to see that you get amnesty.



How and why did the Guarantee Clause come about? Remember, the Declaration of Independence is dated 1776, and the Constitution was not written until 1787, and came into force in 1789. Meanwhile, from 1781 to 1788, we had a ‘bridging’ government under the Articles of Confederation. The leaders at that time wanted to carefully to recruit all the eligible ex-colonies. Canada was invited to join but declined.

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

“An early version of the Guarantee Clause was among the resolutions of the Virginia Plan introduced at the Constitutional Convention by Edmund Randolph and attributed to James Madison.<sup>3</sup>

The resolution went through several formulations during the debates at the Convention.<sup>4</sup> During a key debate, Gouverneur Morris objected to the resolution because ‘[h]e should be very unwilling that such laws as exist in R[hode] Island ought to be guarantied.’<sup>5</sup> Randolph explained that, rather than cementing the existing laws of the states, the resolution had two objects: ‘1. to secure Republican Government[;] 2. to suppress domestic commotions.’

**6.** Along with concerns about rebellions, delegates expressed fears that a monarchy might arise in a particular state and ‘establish a tyranny over the whole [United States].’<sup>7</sup> ... **8** with Randolph then moving to add language that ‘no State shall be at liberty to form any other than a Republican [Government].’<sup>9</sup>

James Wilson then introduced, as a ‘better expression of the idea,’ ... similar to the final form of the Guarantee Clause, which the Convention approved unanimously.<sup>10</sup>”

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

**29 Persons.** Each of these persons appears, in James Tracy's Timeline of Sandy Hook, as making a specific contribution to the false story. For example, they described in detail (falsely) that windows were blown out during the shooting, or they made formal statements at memorial services, or they lobbied for a change in policy, such as to ban the release of death certificates.

Leo Aresimowicz, CT House majority leader  
Debbie Aurelio, Newtown Town Clerk  
Reuben Bradford, CT Emergency Services  
George Bensen, Newtown Land Use Director  
Richard Blumenthal, CT Atty Gen (later US Senator)  
Mitch Bolinsky, State Rep  
Dan Carden, State Rep  
Dr Wayne Carver, State Medical Examiner  
Sally Cox, School nurse at Sandy Hook  
Donna Curbell, District Health Director  
Douglas Fuchs, Redding CT Police Chief  
Bill Halstead, Fire Chief [rumored by conspiracy theorists on the Internet to have been a main coordinator of the drill]  
George Jepsen, State Attorney  
Ed Jutila, State Rep  
Kevin Kane, Chief State Attorney  
Patrick Kwanashie, Assistant Atty Gen  
Debbie Leidlein, School board chairman  
Patricia Llodra, First Selectman  
Kyle Lyddy, Committee Chair, Permanent Memorial  
Dannel P Malloy, Governor of CT  
Chris Murphy, Senator-elect (later, senator)  
William Rodgers, Second Selectman  
Dr John Reed, Interim school superintendent  
Janet Robinson, School superintendent  
Stephen Sedensky, State Attorney for Danbury district  
Timothy Sugrue, Assistant to state attorney Kane  
Paul Vance, State Police Chief of CT  
Paul Vance, Jr, CT Claims Commissioner

Among the many felonies committed re SHES are: racketeering, fraud, harming a child's morals, and Blackstonian crimes such as perjury, tampering with records, malicious prosecution.

**Obstruction of Justice.** Federal law includes 18 USC 1503 using threats or force against a juror, 18 USC 1512: against a witness or destroying of evidence. States have laws similar to these federal ones. An amazing crime, called **misprision**, is codified at 18 USC 4:

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

Media can be found guilty of **fraud** against the US, Plus, the FCC can punish broadcasters by removal of their license.

**Larceny.** Under Connecticut General Statutes 53a-119 (6) we see: Defrauding of public community. “A person is guilty of defrauding a public community who (A) authorizes, certifies, attests or **files a claim for benefits or reimbursement** from a local, state or federal agency which he knows is false; or (B) knowingly **accepts the benefits** from a claim he knows is false.” Also consider:

(5) **Extortion.** A person obtains property by extortion when he compels or induces another person to deliver ... by means of instilling in him a fear that, if the property is not so delivered, the actor or another will: (A) Cause physical injury to some person in the future; ... (D) accuse some person of a crime or **cause criminal charges to be instituted against him**; or (E) expose a secret or publicize an asserted fact, whether true or false, tending to subject a person to hatred, contempt or ridicule.

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



## Chapter 18. Regain the Court of Equity, vs Extrinsic Fraud



*Coronation of QEII in 1953, Photo: RadioTimes.com*

Equity! Oh, those were the days! In England, for centuries prior to the Judicature Act of 1873, there were the regular courts of law and, separately, a Court of Equity. In that court, the king could bend the law a bit to fit unusual circumstances of a case.

He could make “constructive remedies.” He could also order persons to “disgorge their ill-gotten gains.” Just imagine Bill Gates disgorging now. (Federal forfeiture-of-assets law is at 18 USC 982.)

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

“Receive the Royal Sceptre, the ensign of kingly power and justice” and puts the sceptre into her right hand. Then he puts the rod into her left hand and says: “Receive the Rod of equity and mercy. Be so merciful that you be not too remiss, so execute justice that you forget not mercy.”

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

## Court of Equity and Extrinsic Fraud

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

US federal law holds, in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60b: “On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: ... (3) fraud ....”

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no question of the general doctrine that **fraud vitiates** the most solemn contracts, documents, and even **judgments**.

There is also no question that many rights originally founded in fraud become -- **by lapse of time**, by the difficulty of proving the fraud, and by the protection which **the law throws around rights once established by formal judicial proceedings** -- no longer open to inquiry in the usual and ordinary methods.

If the court has been mistaken in the law, **there is a remedy by writ of error**. If the jury has been mistaken in the facts, the remedy is by motion for new trial. If there has been evidence discovered since the trial, a motion for a new trial will give appropriate relief.

...**There was in fact no adversary trial or decision of the issue in** [Throckmorton's case]. ... Where the unsuccessful party has been prevented from exhibiting fully his case, by fraud or deception practised on him by his opponent, as by keeping him away from court, a false promise of a compromise; or where the defendant never had knowledge of the suit, being kept in ignorance by the acts of the plaintiff;

or **where an attorney fraudulently or without authority assumes to represent a party and connives at his defeat**; or where the attorney regularly employed corruptly sells out his client's interest to the other side [Soto v Remington?] -- may be sustained to set aside and annul the former judgment or decree, and **open the case for a new and a fair hearing**.

In all these cases, and many others..., **relief has been granted**, on the ground that, by some fraud practised directly upon the party seeking relief against the judgment or decree, **that party has been prevented from presenting all of his case to the court**. Mr. Wells, in his very useful work on Res Adjudicata, says, sect. 499: **Fraud vitiates every thing**, and a judgment equally with a contract.... [Emphasis added]

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

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

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

In a 1945 Pennsylvania case, *Commonwealth v Harris*, we find:

“Coram nobis lies only where facts exist extrinsic of the record, unknown and unknowable by the exercise of diligence at the time of its rendition, and which would, if known, have prevented the judgment in its entirety or in the form in which it was rendered.”

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

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

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

To Judge Frank Remington, District Court of Wisconsin.

From Mary W Maxwell, October 3, 2023 [This is make-believe.]

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

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

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

In *Kenner C.I.R.*, the Seventh Circuit Court had said in 1968:

"A decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final." That accords with *US v Throckmorton* where the judge in 1878 said "Fraud vitiates everything and a judgement equally with a contract."

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

Respectfully yours, Mary Maxwell, PhD, LLB [not actually sent]

## Chapter 19. Role of Militias and the Jan 6 Non-Insurrection



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

We have now marked 60 years since JFK met his fate in Dallas on November 22, 1963. Although many of the guilty parties are known, none have suffered. We have also seen 28 years go by since the OKC bombing, surely an inside job, and 22 years have passed since 9/11 with no person even being called on the carpet.

What should we do? Here is one answer. Article 10 of the New Hampshire state Constitution, adopted in 1784:

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

**The January 6<sup>th</sup> Violence at the Capitol.** The Capitol Building houses the US legislature. It is not like the Greek forum, a place where citizens could have their say. It is open to visitors who wish to see their Congressperson, and to registered lobbyists, and to tourists, at times. The proper place for people to gather in protest is anywhere outdoors, or inside buildings which they have booked.

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

“If two or more persons in [the U.S.], conspire to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, **or delay the execution of any law of the United States**, or by force to seize, take, or possess any property of the United States contrary to the authority thereof, they shall each be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.” -- 18 USC 2384 [Emphasis added]

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

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

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

I want to emphasize the importance of definitions. Our mental furniture is getting more limited all the time. In contemporary politics, tribalism has helped reduce the available options. Let's say a US politician wants to object to the use of landmines. If he is a

Dem and the Repubs happen to be taking that position, he'll refrain from expressing it – to avoid being 'disloyal' to his tribe.

**“Double-Plus-Good?”** George Orwell knew, when he wrote *1984*, that “They” want to limit our brain. He put it sarcastically:

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

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

IN CONGRESS, July 4, 1776 [with bolding added]

– That whenever any Form of Government becomes **destructive** of these ends, it is the **Right of the People to alter** or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely **to effect their Safety and Happiness**. [W]hen a long train of abuses and usurpations... **evinces a design** to reduce them [to] Despotism, ... **it is their duty**, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.

### **Oath Keepers’ Leader Sentenced to 18 Years for Jan 6**

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



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

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

Elmer Rhodes, age 57, head of the Oath Keepers, had been emailing his men ever since the 2020 election looked like being stolen. Roger Parloff, at [lawfaremedia.com](http://lawfaremedia.com), tells us that Elmer Rhodes' emails became evidence used by the prosecution at trial:

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

“The Dem party has taken off the mask and revealed their totalitarian, Marxist, America-hating, and hate-filled agenda. They seek our destruction. They seek the destruction of all we swore to defend. We must defeat them. ... We must do what the people of Serbia did when Milosevic stole their election,’ Rhodes wrote.

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

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

Citizens are confused. MSM keeps it all under wraps, and says that terrorists, and white supremacists killed some people in the Capitol. Not true, only one person died, a protestor, Ashley Babbitt. The MSM also reported many *guilty pleas* of the thousand arrestees. But these were the result of plea bargaining. If a person wishes to plead Not Guilty, but has been in solitary (yes, they were put in solitary, illegally) he is likely say 'Guilty' to get away from such conditions.

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

We also lack the cultural furniture that we had 50 years ago, mainly a **love of truth**. The media constructs stories to guide us, as they did with Jan 6, Sandy Hook, and many other full-of-lies broadcasts. And that doesn't even touch the problem of scientific mind control.

I ask the reader to contemplate these real issues. A top priority is to support, and gather up, the many eager but isolated people who wish to put down the mighty from their seat. I am looking for that to be non-violent, to be carried out by the magic of rule of law. But violence has been the historic norm and right now our tyrannical bosses seem to have no conscience. They will use the most extreme violence, as they did in Lahaina, Hawaii on August 8, 2023. Technology has made it possible for a very small number of cuckoo individuals to destroy entire peoples and to wreck the planet.

## Chapter 20. Conclusion



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

Everyone knows that there was no Cinderella, and no prince gave her a glass slipper. And it will help if people stop believing that 20 first-graders and 6 staff members got killed at SHES. Apparently each of them is still walking the earth, which is happy news!

It is also very blessed that we can gain from the eleven-year attempt to reduce our brains to rubble. I hear people say “It’s all falling apart, we don’t have a safe society anymore.” Sure, that’s a likely state of affairs when you have guys at the top who intend to ‘depopulate’ us.

I now **ask the reader to noisily renounce the Sandy Hook hoax.** It is the patriotic duty of any American to clear the air of falsehoods which are currently “justifying” the rescinding of the Bill of Rights! That is, we are told we are no longer entitled to free speech, self-defense by guns, trial by jury, and due process of law. A pandemic was imposed on us to speed up our acceptance of this new regime.

### **The Completeness of Law**

Humans, over eons, have invented many things: agriculture, mining, art, religion, music, writing, the harnessing of electrical energy, sea travel, space travel, the computer, etc -- and law.

Law has a special tendency to improve itself. For one thing, intellectual leaders like to develop law and interpret in ways that meet a public need. For another, people’s acceptance of law is already there, by instinct. A baby obeys its parents, and as adults we still feel inclined to do what Authority specifies as good behavior.

Thus it’s vital for each person to know that he or she needs to be on constant guard against those who would betray us in law’s name.

## Three Principles of Law When Trouble Abounds

Past jurists have recognized that some members of society will try to get around the law. Why not? It's all part of our natural selfishness. So they put into place some laws for us to use in lawless settings.

1. **Self-defense.** Our forebears gave the All Clear to self-defense. If someone is harming you, or people close to you, and you've got a baseball bat handy, use it. They recognized the imbalance of power between conscience-laden good people and ruthless bad people.

They didn't say "Just lie there and take it." But many politicians today, and media people, and even academics (shame, shame on them), are enunciating a new religion of "taking it." They claim that those who don't take it – say, parents at a school board meeting who protest the teaching of sex to 8-year-olds – are terrorists.

2. **Citizen's arrest.** As we now know (consider just the malfeasance of cops in Newtown CT), there is no point in hoping that the men who wear the badge will sufficiently protect you. If good law says such-and-such is a crime, yet cops won't do the job, you can perform a citizen's arrest.

This is legal in all 50 states. It would have to be, as that is how the FBI non-cops make arrests (unless a city has deputized them as cops). For you to do it, google for your state's rules. Required: You must know that a felony has just been committed or is about to be committed, and you must announce to the person why he is being arrested. Try to say something Miranda-ish as you perform the ceremony. Note: You can be sued for using unnecessary violence. Once you've got your quarry, you must call the cops to collect him.

3. **The law of outlawry.** We did not always have cops. Think of the wild west -- bandits would station themselves on a highway and attack travelers. They were hard to punish, like pirates at sea. Society wisely made up the concept of Outlawry:

A man whom the law could not reach was declared an outlaw. You have a right to kill him -- and it's a crime to protect him or feed him! A few states have statutorily repealed the law of outlawry, so check yours. Otherwise, it holds. We Yanks inherited British common law.

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

Today you can’t “call Spencer St.” No officials are there to help. Law Enforcement has sided with the baddies, worldwide. Occasionally you meet a cop who “understands” and wants to help. But soon she will renege. She may be afraid of getting fired or is just afraid, period.

We are on our own. It’s up to you. This has happened before. People got together and came up with solutions. Don’t give up the ghost if a few individuals vehemently disagree with you -- that’s par for the course. Don’t be distressed that some of the good guys are actually infiltrators and spies. Spying is big, big business. You just have to put up with that occupational hazard.

Note that a major bad-guy is the Media. But fighting them shouldn’t feel quite as off-putting as fighting the Men in Blue, should it?

### **Recapping Earlier Suggestions for Regaining Solidarity**

Part Four of this book toyed with some ways in which we might unite to increase our strength, using what’s already on the law books:

Ch 16: Offer a generous amnesty to all the liars, so we can get back to normal. I think they are carrying a burden and wish it to end.

Ch 18: Use the old criterion of extrinsic fraud to catch the foul things that are going on in courts. And revive the Court of Equity, which aims for just remedies for unique situations like Sandy Hook.

Ch 17: Think about the Clause in which the US “guarantees” to each state a republican form of government. In the *res publica*, any citizen has a say. If Connecticut is being run by the makers of the hoax, who arrest those who challenge it, it’s not a republic.

Ch 19: There is a proper, constitutional role for militias. The Oath Keepers had a vague idea of showing their strength on January 6, 2021. (I don't mean vandalism or bodily injury.) But tricks were played by media, of course, and by whoever owns the media.

Another solidarity ploy was hinted at in Chapter 15 on Grand Juries. Trust me on this: The Constitution legitimizes citizen-led grand juries. Sandy Hook miscreants (including Obama) could be indicted by a Citizen-led Grand Jury. I said SCOTUS inadvertently justified such a thing the day it left the SDNY 9/11 case out in the rain!

Hello. Did you just say “Oh, not Obama anymore, as the Supreme Court recently ruled that a president is immune to indictment”? Well, they did specify certain circumstances. Anyway, even when SCOTUS rules wrongly we don't have to put up with it. What if they ruled “Slaughter all boys under age 2”?

Note: Indictment by a Grand Jury is not a verdict -- that comes with a trial by one's peers. GJ's are only a way for a citizen group to put to the state or federal attorney the news that a suspect is out there.

## **Recapping the Sandy Hook Court Material**

Part Three of this book presented two big cases, *Soto v Remington/Bushmaster*, and *Shanley v O'Prey*, and the smaller case of *Lucy Richards*, which was a criminal prosecution, not a lawsuit.

Here I will give an integrated picture of the various efforts made by whistleblower types to crank some justice out of the courts. The bottom line, in case you want to save yourself the time of reading it, is that courts in the US no longer work justly or honestly. Their personnel, perhaps under spell of mind control, work for the baddies. There are many cases identical to SHES in this regard.

Case 1. On the second anniversary of the 2012 event, William Brandon Shanley went to court (see Chapter 12 of this book) to ask for Declaratory relief and punitive damages in regard to the iconic photo. He sued New York Times, Hartford Courant, and others for “publishing the photograph and stating that it was taken at 10:09am on December 14, 2012 and that it shows an evacuation of Sandy Hook... [and is part of] a criminal conspiracy to terrorize mankind.”

Two exhibits were presented by Shanley: a sampling of AP-affiliated newspaper front pages from around the world, and a video from a cop's dash-cam at the scene showing no evidence of an emergency.

The case was dismissed. These next two actions also failed:

Case 2. James Fetzer sent a Motion to court, asking to intervene in the Soto case, to object to the silence of defendant Remington/Bushmaster on the issue of "Did it happen?" In refusing his request, on September 20, 2021, the Superior Court wrote:

"Intervention in the underlying matter would have absolutely no bearing on the Wisconsin matter [Pozner suing Fetzer for defamation]; it would only enable the petitioner to repeat these lies in a new venue. Nor does any other balancing factor support the Motion... [It] would provide no value to resolving the claims before the Court. Accordingly, the petitioner's Motion must be denied."

Note: You read in my Open Letter to SCOTUS (in Chapter 3) that Professor Fetzer obtained two expert witnesses to show a doctored birth certificate. But that wasn't an instance of Fetzer voluntarily approaching a court. He was a defendant in the defamation suit brought by Pozner. This judge -- and later the appeals judges -- declined to facilitate Fetzer's request for the court to obtain Noah's original birth certificate. That tells you everything, right?

Case 3. James Tracy, a professor of media at Florida Atlantic University, got fired for putting "conspiracy stuff" on the web. He sued his employer. He lost, despite submitting good evidence to win.

To get into court you have to have a "cause of action." I suggested that persons who donated money have cause to sue charities on the grounds of fraud, even unto filing a civil RICO suit. In Chapter 12, Zephyr Teachout urged use of Sherman Anti-Trust Act. It can be used to break up the media but that normally requires prosecution.

Another cause of action, identified in Chapter 13, was the harm done to children who were asked to lie. I modeled a case humorously:

“Jim Anxiety, Dina Depression, and Bruce Humiliation, plaintiffs, v Lind Loopish, Director of FEMA, Bobby Bluebird, Attorney General of Connecticut, and Gary Bull, official in charge at the Mandy Brook Fire Station. As kids, they were told that the false reporting had a good purpose and they must play along with it. Jim, Dina, and Bruce, now age 21, have been reading on social media that many folks ridicule the story. They often feel depressed, even suicidal...”

Note: As a separate matter I stated that certain parties can also be prosecuted for the Connecticut crime of harming children and even for the federal crime of enslaving them. But a prosecution is something you have to launch by persuading Authorities to launch it. Granted, there can be a Private Prosecution, but lawyers, to date, won't touch it. Note: Much of a court's work is called “private law” -- one citizen or organization sues another for harm done.

I proffer two more litigants: 1. Men who did the demolition of the Sandy Hook school, who were asked to sign NDA's -- non-disclosure agreements, i.e., gag orders. They can sue to be released from their NDA on the grounds that it violates their freedom of speech.

2. Also, creditors of bankrupt Remington have grounds to sue, as it paid \$73 million to the families without contesting the case properly.

### **Bringing “the Authorities” to Book**

Our great-grandchildren are going to think we were a bunch of milksops -- as indeed we are -- for not standing up to ‘officials’ in regard to the Sandy Hook hoax. We will have deprived our progeny of the great good luck that comes of being born American, as we feel stymied by “authority.” However, we ARE the authority in USA.

The badge-wearers, and White House dwellers, are our employees. It is our job to keep them in line. If they won't prosecute themselves, for their many crimes, and they won't, a citizen-led Grand Jury is the proper way to indict them and send them for trial. All of this can be done legally and constitutionally. There is no need to reach out to new means and no need to say “It's over. We lost.”



Granted, it is necessary to accept that crims have more power than we do, given that they disavow moral constraints. For them “All’s fair in love and war and in the effort to grab everything for ourselves and to beat the peasants down if they protest.”

I think the Sandy Hook clash of goodies and baddies is an ideal venue for proceeding with indictments -- as the event was not a tragic or a complicated one. It was a silly game in which childish men did some really pathetic things. It was a battle of lies against facts with most onlookers (including me) assuming the lies were correct. Please, let’s be embarrassed that we let our intelligence be insulted.

**RECAP.** The following “facts” were argued in this book:

1. The creating of false flags, to turn citizens emotions to a desired goal (say, to control gun ownership or to start a war), is common.
2. Probably a drill had been run in November as a rehearsal. (A school-shooter drill did take place in a nearby town on the very day.)
3. School shootings are designed to get media attention to the “problem of violence” and to scare parents everywhere.
4. President Obama, like all 21st century presidents, loves this stuff.
5. With the help of the mafia, traditionally used to control police, it is easy to get a community to look like they are solidly united. (“Boston strong” comes to mind.) (Ah, poor, weak Boston.)
6. The manager of the local fire station seems to have coordinated many pieces of the day’s action on December 14, 2012. (Why he?)
7. Shannon Hicks’ iconic photo was published that day and soon dozens of “reporters” filled out the tale, both with gory details and with hero stories. Even unto fake funerals, reminiscent of the 1962 Northwoods Memo.
8. The killing of Adam’s mom just before the event is a well-honed add-on; it ‘proved’ his mental derangement and deprived us of a best person to interview. Oddly, the dad, Peter Lanza, wasn’t quizzed.

9. All major networks did at-home chats with bereaved parents. But the ‘reporters’ couldn’t refer to any doubts about the event, as it is imperative to be polite and considerate of parents’ feelings. TV had also covered the funerals and teddy-bear decorations on the graves.

10. Soon doubts were expressed on the Internet -- some probably planted by officials, as is typical. Examples: Gene Rosen changed his story about the bus driver; Robby Parker was ‘caught’ smiling.

11. Both the school building and Lanza’s big house got demolished!

12. Sedensky’s report furnished no evidence of the deaths of 20 kids and 6 adults, or the suicide of the gunman. Not even a photo of blood. And a 2011 *law* forbids us to see autopsy reports of any child.

13. Wolfgang Halbig, pushing the envelope of questions, was harassed in Florida, as were Reich and Heller in New York. Lucy Richards was arrested, we are told, for bothering Pozner. The theme in America was “nasty, or paranoid, or attention-seeking folks ask questions” -- a harbinger of the way medico dissidents would get treated during Covid. “Free speech must bow to the greater good.”

14. The death, at age 49, of investigator Major Wm Podgorski of CT State Police, said to be from minor surgery, got no press coverage.

15. Sedensky: Lanza’s home contained “photocopied newspaper articles from 1891 pertaining to the shooting of school children.” Gee.

16. The FBI is often appointed to be the verifier of documents, even where it apparently has a stake in the result. *Nemo iudex in causa sua!*

17. A Catholic cardinal gave high praise to Jesus-like Ms Murphy.

18. Connecticut has corruption. Mafias scare all individuals. But as Solzhenitsyn once sighed, “How we burned in the camps...”

## **The Responsibilities of Judges**

In law school I did not get taught about how a judge should behave, as it is presumed to be axiomatic that he/she is devoted to law and to the rule of law, and has extra-high brain power to put it together.

So here I will be specific as to established ethics for judges:

**Positives.** On the positive side, judges should be well-mannered, neatly dressed, and not give rise to questions about their character. They should cause people to feel respect for the court system. A judge should listen to both sides, should manage the case and indeed is the supervisor of both sides' lawyers. All judges are in charge of 'behavior' in the courtroom and so can call out contempt of court.

When ruling on a case, the judge must not invent new law. His/her job is to apply existing statutes or common law. If the trial has a jury, the jury is the finder of fact. Jurors' findings cannot be undone by the judge. If no jury, the judge finds facts as well as applying the law. He/she has some discretion in determining fines and imprisonment. If the matter is a constitutional one, the parchment is the final word.

'Case management' includes noting any funny business that is going on. She can ask questions of plaintiff or defendant, including "Do you feel pressured to give a particular answer?" Judges are also responsible for taking 'judicial notice' of what is going on in society. As quoted above, a judge said Prof Fetzer would only tell more lies but didn't show on what basis he thought that. I don't know of any lies told by Fetzer. Rather the contrary, he's a blatant truther.

**Negatives.** At UScourts.gov we read:

"Deference to the judgments and rulings of courts depends on public confidence in the integrity and independence of judges. The integrity and independence of judges depend in turn on their acting without fear or favor."

But they can hardly "act without fear" if they are surrounded by threats. Or possibly judges belong to the very group that is set on destroying Rule of Law? Or they've culturally adapted (as people do culturally adapt) to the reality that there are hidden rulers in the US?

**Today's World and the 'Mind' Problem.** This book is not being written in a vacuum. Circumstances that surround us include: war in the Middle East, a forecast by the WHO that we are going to have a moneypox virus (yes seriously, they call it monkeypox), massive

migration everywhere with subsequent strife, and a plan to subject you to food shortage. (See my Appendix D).

I feel guilty asking anyone to put their time into such a relatively unimportant matter as Sandy Hook. But I'm confident we can use it to unite on. Other issues such as immigration and virus stir up opposing groups, pro and con -- but here's no 'con' for a hoax. (Needless to say, if someone comes forward with credible proof that Adam Lanza did what the fairy tale says he did, I'll beg forgiveness.)

Recall: Sandy Hook prompted a Marine captain and CIA-er, Robert Steele, to out himself and give us huge news. He revealed that he himself had told 'actors' to lie to the court *or else*. Thank you, Robert. That was a brilliant, if costly, move. And kudos for the late William Shanley whose anger toward media owners also proved costly.

Note: One shouldn't solely blame the Big Guys. I keep running into the likelihood that most people won't accept the truth. No doubt many prefer to live in a delusion. Year after year they put up with whoppers from officials. "Yeah, that's how it is. So what?" Ergo, any of us who want to improve the situation will have to keep trying.

I deem it unwise to preach that the storm is about to break. How could it? Would it be announced on CNN that, say, the Sandy Hook event never happened and the \$28 million collected by local charities ought to be returned and all the rogue judges sacked and the newspapers closed down? Will we learn that a secret friend who owns a satellite will help us obliterate 'the enemy'? Nonsense.

Serious attention by decent citizens -- schoolteachers, sportsmen, pastors, artists, single moms, bank tellers -- you know, everybody -- can help maintain the old value of truth, even if it hurts. If you are someone who is already involved and has been hurt for it, I salute you.

Never give up.

**WELCOME**

**TO**

**THE APPENDICES**

<b>A.</b> Some Angry Veterans Are Preparing for War	106
<b>B.</b> Food Shortage and How To Fix It (For the Bees)	108
<b>C.</b> William Sumner Scott on How To Oppose the ABA	110
<b>D.</b> Maui Teacher Testifies: “We Must Fight Government”	112
<b>E.</b> President Kennedy’s Son and MK-Ultra in Arizona	113
<b>F.</b> The Murder of Law? A Mother’s Case: <i>Liberti v Liberti</i>	114
<b>G.</b> The Charlottesville Connection? Susan Bro’s Bereavement	116
<b>H.</b> Handout from Homeland Security for Crisis Actors	119
<b>J.</b> Joel Sussman Enlightens His City Council in Canada	120

Appendix A. “Veterans Preparing for War” at pogsof.com, September 22, 2021, contributed by David DeGraw



## US Veterans Preparing for War

The Biden administration is denying VA healthcare to all non-vaxxed veterans. Make no mistake, it is the most devastating blow to military readiness in the history of the United States, and **it is a blatant act of war against the American people.**

Hundreds of thousands of newly discharged U.S. military service members, police, doctors and nurses are **now joining forces with veterans to defend our country against this global fascist takeover attempt.**

They are presently forming a decentralized asymmetric defense of our homeland. Here’s a brief statement to give you a little taste of what is featured in this courageous and awe-inspiring video:

“This is the land of the free. We will not allow forced injections, segregation, or an authoritarian surveillance and control grid passport system.

**We have sworn an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic. We will do everything in our power to keep the peace.**

We, the combat veterans and Special Forces veterans of America, know the horrors of war all too well. We will be strategic, disciplined and surgical.

**We know who the leading perpetrators are, and if they do not stand down, cease and desist, if they keep trying to oppress our people and enslave our nation, if they keep stripping away our freedom and rights, those fascist enemy combatants will be held personally accountable. Do you think we do not know what is going on? You released a bio-weapon.**

**Then you systemically shutdown life-saving treatments leading to millions of unnecessary deaths.**

You strategically censored doctors, nurses, medical experts, scientists, journalists, Intel Community members and soldiers. Now you are injecting millions of people with a weaponized spike protein in an immune-system-degrading, gene-altering nanotech vax.

You have committed Crimes Against Humanity on a global scale. **Your power-addicted pathological shortsighted greed has destroyed our economy** and inhibited people's abilities to provide for their families. You have rigged our political and economic system, burying people in inescapable debt.

**You have captured and corrupted both of our political parties** and t government agencies that are supposed to protect the civilian population from predatory global interests. You have captured and corrupted our information and communication systems.

You are trying to cut off our ability to get healthcare and move freely throughout our communities. **You are contaminating our water supply and now you are systematically destroying our food supply, which you have been systemically poisoning for years as standard operating procedure.**

**Your long list of systemic abuses and usurpations amount to absolute Despotism.** Your wickedly evil corruption is now infecting all aspects of our lives.

We Have Had Enough! The Line Has Been Drawn. We represent every race, creed, and ethnicity. Your divide and conquer PSYOPS don't fly here.

**We know how you tactically deploy PSYOPS and stoke identity politics to silo off regional civilian populations into the smallest possible demographics to incite tribalism and make us fight amongst each other, while distracting us from being laser-focused on you, the head of the snake..."**

**Appendix B. Food Shortages? Stop the Bee Killing** by Mary W Maxwell, published at GumshoeNews.com, April 17, 2023



[hbrc.ca/inside-the-beehive](http://hbrc.ca/inside-the-beehive)

This is a new time in human history. There is now a central rulership over all of mankind. The rulers have openly announced some “depopulation” plans -- breaking the food supply is a major way. Governments are now engaged in killing our livestock, and many food-processing plants have recently been destroyed.

An urgent need is to stop the killing of bees. Bees are needed for pollination. Yet the government of Australia has sent its agents out to bee-farms to pour petrol into beehives. The flimsy excuse is that the bees have a disease. I assume it is not true; it is merely averred. The only commonsense approach is to *prevent* further destruction of bees. *Now*. There is sufficient “legal law” to cover this. Let’s eavesdrop a conversation between Pam and Sam:

1. What if the agent knocks at my farm door? Don’t let him in. **If he insists, he is trespassing.** He is doing crime. 2. Oh, but isn’t there a law somewhere on the books (or maybe a “regulation”) that says he can enter to enforce a practice that was established for hygiene? **Yes but this does not apply to the bee-killing venture,** as it is won’t help hygiene. His saying it is for the common good doesn’t make it so. 3. Do I have a right to protect my property? **Yes. The bees are your property and your livelihood.** He is stealing your property. He is doing crime. 4. Shouldn’t he be allowed to shoot me or arrest me for blocking his mission? **No, as I just said, he is doing crime.** 5. Am I allowed to arrest him? **Yes.** Since he’s committing a felony, and you see that he’s about to do more of it, the law of citizen’s arrest applies. (Security guards legally use citizen’s arrest to protect private property from damage or theft.) 6. Am I allowed to use force on a criminal who is entering my land, even if he waves paper at me saying he is authorized by the state? **Yes,** but why do you think his papers have moral force when, as noted above, they reflect a malicious plan to wreck the food chain? 7. Is there any guide to justifiable homicide, where the person acted in self defense? **Yes, there is common law,** which also pertains in each of the 50



states of the US. 8. Can I use self-defense on behalf of the bees' lives? **I don't think so.** But you can invoke laws that protect the environment. There is the Environmental Modification Treaty of 1976, nicknamed En-mod. The US Senate voted 98-0 to ratify it. 9. I'm scared out of my wits. What should I do? **We are all scared.**

The thing is not to let these monsters proceed any further. 10. Should I ask the king to step down as it were? **I don't think he'd obey you. But there must be many layers** of officialdom under him that would like to get the hell out of the trap we are all in. 11. You said I can get a court order? **You can try. If the judge says No,** we will recognize greater loss of legitimacy of government. 12. They might arrest me outside the courthouse if I do this. **True,** but they may also arrest you just for existing. The decision of whether something is a crime finally comes down to common sense! 13. The badge of the officer has a big effect on my nerves. I hesitate to challenge him and he usually has a partner or five with him. you can show this list to friends and then you'll meet with cops six-on-six instead of six-on-one. 14. I find it easier to stick up for the bees, than for myself. **Yes,** that's a blessing, **we seem to have extra courage to be a good Samaritan.** 15. Is there a slogan I can share? **I kind of like this remark that was made by a clergyman in colonial days** of America., when the government was about to trespass on his land. He said: "I do not fear it, I can have anofe to assist me in that afare; let them Come in to my field if they Dare, I will split theaire braines out."

16. This is getting exciting, but if I can't do it, can I at least kick the bee hives over and let them go free? **It's better than nothing.** But spread the word urgently. 17. Any more advice? **You could have a written statement ready to hand** to the agents as well as to read to them. Practice it in the mirror. "You are committing crime. There is no justification for destroying my livestock. You are helping a program of economic sabotage intended to cause human starvation. **"Get out** [optional: before I split your braines out]!"

See the law maxim: *Necessitas non habet legem.* "Necessity has no law."

## **Appendix C. The ABA's Control of Legal Education Is Done via the Unconstitutional federal Department of Education!**

-- by William Sumner Scott, JD, Copyright 2022

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

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

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

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

After a 2003 court case about discrimination, *Grutter v Bollinger*, a group of law school deans urged NACIQI to recommend to the Secretary that the ABA right to accredit law schools be revoked. My contention and theirs was that ABA control interfered with the ability of law schools to admit the students and teach the subjects they wished. Hence, in 2006, NACIQI, voiced its intent to

recommend to the Secretary that the ABA be removed from the law school accreditation process.

In response, the ABA got Congress to freeze the 1965 authority granted to the Secretary of Education to determine which agencies may be authorized to grant accreditation. In 2008, Congress passed the Higher Education Opportunity Act which changed the NACIQI composition.

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

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


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

As public awareness of these things increases, there is hope!



*William Sumner Scott*

## Appendix D. Maui Testifier: “We Must Fight Government”



*Banyan tree in Lahaina*

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

“Aloha, I am Miss Lizzie. **People are literally dying of heartbreak.** To the families of Lahaina and the students I taught, whom I know and love, to your lineage, your Ohana, your island culture, to your home unto Hawaii. **Stand proud. I am sorry you have had to witness bombs, smoke, desolation, poverty and horror,** I am sorry there was no warning. I am sorry there was no communication when you were trapped in gridlock. When you were burnt, tired and hungry and shell-shocked ....

“Lahaina, we the people must work united against the government who has failed you, and work toward the self-sustaining goal of the Hawaiian Islands. **Fight against the government who barricaded you, who took your voice, and silenced you.** ... The mayor no listen to you. The DoE no listen to you. I spoke out at the DoE meeting on August 20<sup>th</sup>. My testimony has disappeared. All of our testimonies have disappeared. **[We demand] the return of our water; water is life....** Then after [changes], we can start to breathe with the sacred aloha of our island, not the tourist industry. God hear our prayers. Please send us angels.” [Emphasis added]

## Appendix E. Pres. Kennedy's Son and MK-Ultra in Arizona

A startling book came out in 2023, though I (M Maxwell) received it only as this *Human Mind* book was about to go to press. I review it on my substack.com account. 'David Quigley' is a new claimant to the Kennedy throne, as it were, and as far as I can tell he's for real. The book he wrote, *Stolen Identity*, says he was born in 1960 to JFK and Jacqueline and that he's the kid who saluted Dad's coffin.

Oh, wasn't that John-John who died in a 1999 plane crash with his wife Carolyn Bessette? No, says 'David Quigley' -- this being the name he was given when placed into *witness protection* circa 1969 by his mother, after she married Onassis and was terrified her son would be killed. Another guy, publicly known as John F Kennedy, Jr, is the one who died on that plane, near Cape Cod, at age 38.

A main reason I take this otherwise ludicrous account seriously is that David says he was subjected to cruel MK-Ultra mind control, a program to which I have given years of research. If he's right, he deserves major apologies from the nation (as do all the survivors). He is nicely interviewed by Dr Kia Pruitt on her Rumble.com site.

Assume for the moment that David is correct. Is that any crazier than "Adam Lanza"? Think how dependent we are on information from government and media -- we see those as authoritative, yet they spin junk. Even when there is an irrefutable clue against the official narrative, like the SHES iconic photo, we accept their junk.

Quigley is now age 63. The little boy shown in White House photos has detached, wobbly earlobes. The handsome 'JFK Jr' has attached earlobes -- irrefutable proof that *he* was not the White House kid!



(1) President JFK in 1961 (2) David Quigley of Arizona (3) Jackie with son sporting detached earlobes (4) Famous 'Junior' in 1998, with attached earlobes

**Appendix F. The Murder of Law? 2012 Judgment in *Liberti***  
Displays the Tactic of “Hide Behind Legalese To Avoid Reasoning.”

**Liberti v Liberti**, Appellate Court of Connecticut, at casetext.com

The plaintiff, Sunny G. Liberti, appeals from the trial court’s pendente lite order awarding the defendant, Robert D. Liberti, sole custody of the parties’ minor child and requiring the plaintiff to have supervised visitation with the child. On appeal, the plaintiff claims that the court (1) violated her right to procedural due process by holding an evidentiary hearing on the defendant’s emergency motion for immediate sole custody and supervised visitation and by requiring her to proceed with an attorney who requested to withdraw from representing her and (2) abused its discretion by denying her motion to reargue the order granting the defendant’s emergency. We disagree and, accordingly, affirm the judgment of the trial court....

The plaintiff also claims that the defendant’s emergency motion for immediate sole custody and supervised visitation failed to comply with Practice Book § 25–26(e) because it did not allege the specific factual or legal basis for the requested custody modification. The plaintiff did not file an objection to the motion and now speculates as to the effect of the defendant’s allegedly faulty motion. Further, the plaintiff did not file a motion for articulation of the court’s decision. Instead, to support her claim, the plaintiff, misconstruing relevant decisional law and constitutional provisions, alleges a constitutional right to due process in the context of custody under a jurisprudential scheme for property rights and argues that the court’s ruling on an insufficiently pleaded motion violated her right to be heard at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner. For the reasons articulated in part one of this opinion regarding unreserved claims, we decline to review this claim.

... The following factual and procedural history is relevant to our consideration of the plaintiff’s claims. On July 2, 2009, the plaintiff filed an action to dissolve the parties’ marriage, to which the defendant filed a counterclaim. The parties have one child, a son. On August 3, 2010, the defendant filed an ex parte motion for immediate sole custody of the minor child, which was scheduled for a hearing on August 6, 2010. Before the hearing date, however, the

parties participated in a special master's session through which they succeeded in securing an agreement to modify their parenting plan to include, among other provisions, shared physical custody of the child and increased visitation time for the defendant. The agreement made no mention of the prior requirement that the defendant's mother be present for overnight visitation.

During her deposition on November 3, 2010, the plaintiff made allegations of abuse against the defendant with respect to the child and disclosed documentation that allegedly demonstrated the abuse, which the defendant, defense counsel and the guardian ad litem had never seen prior to the deposition. The following day, the plaintiff's attorney filed a motion to withdraw his appearance, which was scheduled to be heard on November 8, 2010.

On November 8, 2010, the defendant filed an emergency motion for immediate sole custody and supervised visitation. The court informed the parties that the motion would be heard that day. No objection to the immediacy of the hearing was made by either party or the guardian ad litem. In addition, the plaintiff did not express any concern about having her attorney represent her despite his pending motion to withdraw.... Neither party requested a continuance to allow an opportunity to produce additional witnesses or documentary evidence, nor did they suggest that they were unable to present certain evidence due to the short notice. At the conclusion of evidence, the court granted the defendant's emergency motion for immediate sole custody and supervised visitation.

On November 29, 2010, the plaintiff, as a self-represented party, filed a motion to reargue in which she raised, for the first time, her claim that the court violated her due process rights in proceeding with the hearing on the emergency motion.... We do note, however, that there is nothing in the bare record provided to us from which we can discern that the court abused its discretion in denying the plaintiff's motion to reargue. The judgment is affirmed. (In this Opinion, the other judges concurred.)

*Note: The above is standard use of legal-logic when a court is in cahoots with a party. It easily makes a wrong sound moral and proper. -- MM*


**Appendix G. Donna Soto Resembles Susan Bro of the ‘Charlottesville’ White Supremacist’ Affair.** By Mary Maxwell, 9/11/24




*Photo from a YouTube video entitled “Our Hero Vicki Soto”*

The above photo is of Donna Soto receiving an award at Obama’s White House as the mom of teacher Vicki who was killed at age 26 by Adam Lanza. Donna is in green, with her husband Carlos Soto. To the right are Vicki’s siblings Jillian, Carlee, and Matthew.

There is a rumor that Donna also played the part of a bereaved mother, this time of “Heather Heyer” who was car-rampaged during a White Supremacy event at Charlottesville VA, by James Fields. This rumor may itself be a trick, to make Sandy Hook sceptics look crazy. But since I believe that Adam Lanza did not shoot anyone, I must logically assume that Vickie Soto did not die, and therefore her ‘mother’ Donna Soto is faking it. (Yes, *Soto* the anti-gun plaintiff.)



*(L) Donna Soto, CNN.com, 2013*



*(R) Susan Bro, WSIS.com, 2018*

It’s my guess that Donna Soto and her family never wanted to be part of a scam -- or two. Recall what was said by Robert Steele, ex-CIA man: “Individuals ordered to lie are offered both full immunity



and **severe penalties if they fail to lie as ordered.**” Crisis actors may be working under force. (Note: Slavery is criminal)



(L) Man at celebration of Vicki Soto



(R) Susan Bro, NY Post

The man on left could be Donna’s brother? The pix is from Jillian’s YouTube channel -- he resembles “Susan Bro,” on the right. The judge in *Soto* could ask plaintiff Soto if she is also Susan Bro.

One hint of the 2017 Charlottesville story being scripted is the fact that many big news outlets gave the mother, Susan Bro, airtime. She was asked to comment on the racial justice slogan “If you’re not outraged you’re not paying attention.” But what’s her background?

I note that Susan pronounces the letter “o” in the way Connecticut people do -- like “ah.” Here are a few examples: In the video “Susan Bro Continues Heather Heyer’s Legacy,” Mom says, at 2.20 minutes “set the proper [“prahper”] tone. At 5.30, Susan refers to “a rotten [“rahtten”] bunch.” During a hearing of Congress, Susan said, at 1.20 “in cahmmon,” and at 1.39 “the dahctor.” At Extra-TV, on August 29, 2017, she pronounced scholarships as “schahlorships.” In a speech to B’nai B’rith, she said “ahbviously” and “pahsitive.”

Note: Ellen DeGeneres gave Ms Bro a check for \$50,000 on “The Ellen Show.” And Newsy.com reported that Bro “raised a quarter of a million dollars for Heather’s funeral in less than 24 hours.” (Do funerals really cost more than ten grand?) The ‘proof’ that Susan Bro’s daughter died at Charlottesville comes from the court case of James Fields who pleaded guilty to the hate crime of ramming his car into an interracial group of protestors. James wasn’t a madman in a gang, fighting his challengers. He was alone, had driven down from Ohio for the event (did he attend any previous events?), was


driving down a hill, but when he saw the group coming up that hill, he reversed his car, backed up to the top, then drove madly down, hitting everyone. David Quigley, author of *Stolen Identity*, mentions that his MK-Ultra leader was able to casually instruct a man to drive into a fire hydrant, or go 150 mph, and the guy would calmly obey. It's possible this happened to James Fields. Why would a person risk injury to himself? And he'd know it would bring immediate arrest.



(L) Matthew Mills (C) Susan Bro (R) “Neo-Nazi” James Fields

The whole thing sounds crazy to me. This Charlottesville protest in 2017 was about the removal of a statue of Robert E Lee. Where are Americans saying “Wait a minute! This story is a very unlikely one.”

In Chapter 11, I expressed doubt that Lucy Richards was a harasser of Pozner. Her court case may not have been real. I vaguely think the Matthew Mills case is fake. He was arrested when he confronted Jillian Soto, saying Vicki did not die. **Young people reading that will think our right to free speech is gone!** So what did Mills argue at trial? Oh, I see, no trial; he copped a plea. Judge gave a suspended sentence. Fields, a ‘domestic terrorist,’ is doing two life terms.



The photo, which doesn't show Fields, won a Pulitzer prize for Ryan Kelly who said “I'd been all over town early that morning... I would say it was dumb luck I was there.” Personally, I doubt that. -- MM

## Appendix H. Handout for Crisis Actors, Form-68

### FEMA Homeland Security Emergency Exercise Handout

April 30, 2013. [This is not exclusively related to Sandy Hook.]

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

If you are assigned the role of a psychologically distressed person, please act upset, not out of control.

9. If you get hurt or have a real problem, say "This is a real emergency" to tell exercise staff you are not just acting.

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

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

## Appendix J. Citizen of Aurora Reduces WEF's Plans to a Matter for His City Council To Decide, *by Joel Sussman, citizen*



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

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

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

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

This is the same World Economic Forum whose chairman Klaus Schwab famously declared **you will own nothing and be happy**. This is the same Klaus Schwab who, referring to Canadian prime minister Justine Trudeau, boasted "We have penetrated more than half of his cabinet." We would ask Mayor Marakas and the councilors, why should the citizens of Aurora [Ontario] bow down to the intrusive dictates of an unelected foreign entity? The fact is we should not and **we will not**. [Emphasis added]

## FOR STUDENTS

Students, thank you very much for your interest in this book. After finishing it you should be able to hold forth for, say, 3 minutes, on each of the following topics. (*Of course, your considered opinion may diverge completely from that of Yours Truly.*)

How might one US State rescue another from a dire situation?

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

What do you look for in “the news,” to judge its truthfulness?

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

What is the Oath Keepers organization all about?

Which four stages in the history of thought were crucial?

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

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

What is the ‘chickenization’ of America?

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

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

Do you think William Brandon Shanley “asked for it”?

Did the Catholic Church hierarchy go with the flow in Newtown?

What does Philip Allott urge as a corrective for fatalism?

Why do people readily agree to obey a leader?

Legally, what is an insurrection?

# BIBLIOGRAPHY







## Index

- ABA, the, 7, 110, 111
- Abbe, Winfield, 55, 56
- active shooter drill, 69
- Allott, Philip, 7, 14, 77, 121
- Allott, Robin 7, 35-36
- Aurelio, Debbie, 83
- Australia, 34, 73, 88, 108
- autopsy, 41, 54, 102
- bees, saving the, 108-109
- Bellis, Judge Barbara, 17, 39
- Boston Marathon, 37, 45, 70
- Bro, Susan, 116-118
- Bryant, Martin, 88
- Bushmaster. See *Soto v Remington/Bushmaster*.
- Carver, Dr Wayne, 52, 57, 83
- Catholic Church, 55
- charities, 99, 104
- Charlottesville, 116-118
- child's morals, 68, 84
- CIA, 17, 26, 34, 49, 73, 80, 84, 104
- citizen's arrest, 96
- civil action, 69, 99
- civil rights, 82
- Cooper, Anderson, 61
- coram nobis, writ of, 88, 89
- corruption, 38, 63, 76, 102, cover-up, 66
- Covid, 7, 49, 102
- crisis actors, 22, 23, 80, 104
- Crowley, Maureen, 16, 55, 56, 62
- D'Avino, Rachel, 71
- Declaration of Independence, 82
- DeGeneres, Ellen 117
- discovery, 24, 29
- DoJ, Dept of Justice, 65
- Dolan, Cardinal T, 55, 56
- donations, 17, 84
- drill, 22, 23, 38, 50, 61, 66, 69, 83, 101
- equity, 85, 86, 97
- extrinsic fraud, 85, 97, 121
- false flag, 23, 49, 70, 79, 101
- FBI, 15, 38, 39, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 57, 96, 102
- FEMA, 57, 61, 70, 100, 117
- Fetzer, Prof James, 17, 27, 29, 31, 50, 60, 71, 72, 80, 86, 88, 89, 99, 103
- Fields, James, 117, 118
- Framers, the, 72, 74
- Fraud upon the court, 89
- free speech, 7, 36, 60, 93, 95, 100, 102



Giovannoli, Joseph, 36, 37  
glass door, 41, 42  
grand jury, 73, 74-76, 98  
Halbig, Wolfgang, 50, 51, 57,  
72, 102  
Hammond, N, 52, 70, 71  
Hicks, Shannon, 12, 66, 101  
Hochsprung, Dawn, 5  
Hockley, Nicole, 45, 71  
Holder, Eric, 15, 38  
Homeland Security, 62, 105,  
106, 119  
iconic photo, 12, 50, 51, 65,  
98, 101, 113  
janitor, 51  
Kelly, Ryan, 218  
Kennedy, John, 113  
Lanza, Adam, 17, 41, 42, 44,  
57, 89, 104  
Lanza, Nancy, 38, 41-45, 46,  
47, 50, 71, 89, 102, 104, 113  
Lanza, Peter, 16, 41, 102  
larceny, 84  
legalized lying, 38, 49  
Lemnitzer, Gen J, 26  
Liberti case, 114-115  
love, 14, 19, 31, 56, 81, 94  
Macisco, Officer, 16, 43  
Malloy, Gov Dannel, 15, 83  
Maxwell, Mary W, 7, 55, 61,  
89, 108-109, 116-118  
McLachlan, Dee, 7, 27  
*Memo to Potus*, 49  
Mills, Matthew 51, 118  
mind control, 31, 33, 34, 37,  
94, 98, 113  
misprision, 84  
MK-Ultra, 34, 113, 118  
mock funerals, 25, 26, 101  
Mueller, Robert, 15, 36, 39  
Murphy, Anne M, 5, 56, 102  
Myers, Judge Jeffrey, 62  
national security, 24, 48, 49  
NDAA, 24  
*Newtown Bee*, 12, 13, 55  
non-disclosure agreement,  
47, 57  
Northwoods memo, 26, 101  
Oath Keepers, 92, 93, 121  
Obama, President Barack, 5,  
16, 17, 38, 51, 72, 98, 101  
Orwell, George, 14, 27, 28,  
29, 31, 92  
outlawry, law of, 96, 97  
Pelley, Scott, 19-21  
Perloff, James, 7, 38  
Pisani, Debra, 16, 52, 70  
Podgorski, Major W, 16, 57,  
62, 102

Pozner, Leonard, 29-31, 59-60, 71-72, 80, 86-89, 99, 102  
 Practice Book, 39, 114  
 psy-op, 37, 63, 70, 73, 80, 89  
 Queen Elizabeth, 85  
 Quigley, David, 113, 118  
 reasoning, 32, 37, 114  
 recusal of Judge Myers, 62  
 Reich, Jonathon, 16, 57, 102  
 Remington Arms, 7,16, 70-72  
 Remington, Judge Frank, 16, 29, 89  
 Richards, Lucy, 59-60, 118  
 Riley, Kevin, 16, 41  
 Robertson, A P, 29, 30  
 Rousseau, Lauren, 5, 71  
 Rule 60b, 86  
 satanism, 34  
 Scott, William Sumner, 7, 70, 110-111  
 SCOTUS. See US Supreme Court.  
 Sedensky, Report, 44, 45, 47, 50, 80, 102  
 self-defense, law of, 77, 95-96, 107  
 settlement out of court, 72  
 severe penalties if they fail to lie, 49, 80  
 Shanley, William 50, 61-66, 84, 98, 99, 104  
 Sherlach, Mary, 5, 71  
 Sherman Anti-Trust, 64, 99  
 slavery, 68  
 Soros, George, 111  
*Soto v Remington/ Bush-master*, 7, 16, 54, 70-72, 98-99  
 Soto, Donna, 16, 70  
 Soto, Jillian, 51, 70, 116, 118  
 Special Coroner, 62  
 St Rose of Lima, 55, 56  
 statute of limitations, 76  
 Steele, Robert, 17, 49, 80, 104  
 students 121  
 Sussman, Joel, 120  
 Sydney Drill, 22, 23  
 Teachout, Zephyr, 61, 64, 65, 99  
 terrorism, 23, 61, 63, 66  
*Throckmorton*, 11, 73, 86, 87, 89  
 Tracy, Professor James, 8, 50, 53-54, 72, 79, 83, 99  
 US Supreme Court, 31, 76, 82, 86, 89, 98, 99  
 Van Ness, Rachael, 42, 43, 50  
 Vance, Lt J Paul, 16, 17, 44, 54, 83  
 Weiss, Monsignor R, 16, 55  
 Wheeler, Benjamin, 71  
 Wickstrom, Larry, 29, 30

