



Michael Fairchild · University of Notre Dame

An amazing display of ignorance, or have you been bought and paid for. You fail to mention the nearly 1,600 architects and engineers that have literally laid their careers on the line in support of the fact that all three buildings were destroyed by controlled demolition. Why do you not dispute the scientific facts presented on the AE911Truth web site?

Reply · Like · 6 hours ago



Allen L Roland · Self Employed psychotherapist and consultant at Self Employed and Loving It!

I stand by every comment I made about Dick (Darth Vader) Cheney as do millions of intelligent people around the world ~ it's now common knowledge that Cheney deserves to be exposed and indicted for crimes against humanity.

Reply · Like · Thursday at 7:50pm

"Winston Churchill rightly explained that "(a) lie gets halfway around the world before the truth has a chance to get its pants on." Today, of course, it circulates everywhere instantly."

'9/11 Mythology: The Big Lie of Our Time'

<http://www.veteranstoday.com/2011/09/09/911-mythology-the-big-lie-of-our-time/>

It seems Alex is doing his utmost to continue perpetuating the official lie of 9/11, by attacking those who dispute this view [eyewitnesses, journalists, military & security contacts, professionals who examined video & physical evidence] by posting misleading opinions that - if continually repeated - may be accepted by gullible uninformed readers.

Several bloggers (in addition to this one) has challenged Alex's views; and when given compelling information that repudiates his DENIALIST view, his recourse is to toss in 'red herrings' or reply with ridicule tripe; tactics commonly used by DISINFO-SHILLS.

I encourage readers to access Alex's earlier DJ articles, to read blogger comments under those articles, for those who want to come to a knowledge of the truth.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 29, 2011 by [Steve K](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #3](#)

ADDENDUM to [#2] post:

As a service to readers to gain quick access to A-B's "attack articles", these are shown in sequence, from most recent:

'Op-Ed: 9/11 Truth – another loony has his say'

<http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/311968>

'Op-Ed: The ugly face of the 9/11 Truth Movement'

<http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/311516>

'Op-Ed: 9/11 Truth – governors, veterans, and loonies'

<http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/311375>

'Op-Ed: '9/11: Conspiracy Road Trip' to gaga land'

<http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/311297>

'The Twins of the Twin Towers'

<http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/311203>

'Op-Ed: September 11 – the day the world changed'

<http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/311042>

'Op-Ed: 'The Conspiracy Files' – 9/11 nonsense debunked'

<http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/310925>

Apart from DENIALIST ridicule tripe authored by Alex in above articles, and replies from bloggers (including this one), is an excellent article on 9/11 by DJ contributor Bill Lindner, entitled: 'Op-Ed: Time to review post-9/11 mentality and face reality'

<http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/299059>

It seems DENIALISTS are unable to face reality; some can't handle the truth. Then there are DISINFO-SHILLS whose role is to obfuscate truth by attacking those who dispute the official 'bogus' account; by making misleading allegations; by offering unsubstantiated opinions; and most importantly, by avoiding to address compelling info. that discredits the official account.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 29, 2011 by [Susan Lindauer](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #4](#)

I'm Susan Lindauer. My case illustrates the problem of 9/11 denialists in tearing down the Truth Community. The Justice Dept indicted me on the Patriot Act thirty days after I requested to testify on Capitol Hill about my direct contact with events related to Iraqi Pre-War Intelligence, the 9/11 warnings and Iraq's cooperation with the 9/11 investigation. After my arrest, it would have been very easy to establish my identity at trial.

Oh but a Trial would have exposed the deception and fraud of the superbly profitable War on Terrorism. Witnesses would have testified about the 9/11 warnings, the corruption of the Lockerbie case involving Libya, the real facts about Iraqi Pre-WAr Intelligence--- which are nothing remotely similar to what Republican leaders told the American people. Congress would have to face the people and t...ake responsibility for their actions. Why, a lot of Congressional leaders might lose re-election.

That's no fun. Who wants to give up a cushy gig like they've got on Capitol Hill! And so the Justice Department took action to deprive me of a trial, so that I would be silenced. The Court went so far as denying my demands for a hearing, which would have allowed witnesses to confirm my status as a long-time Asset and verify the 9/11 warnings in the pre-Trial phase.

The CIA and the Justice Dept ran a "psy-op" against me. Hey, I know the Intelligence world. It's a playground. These children play dirty under normal circumstances-- and this operation to shut down the Truth about 9/11 required the dirtiest tricks of all to succeed. They tried to kill me off.

They failed. Now the indictment's gone and I'm going to educate voters right up to Election Day in 2012 about the Fraud of the War on Terrorism--- which started with 9/11 and Iraq-- and why we should stop bankrupting our nation to finance this deception.

Of course some Americans still trust Congress. They think our govt speaks the truth. But those folks are waking up, too. People are realizing they'd better take another look at this War on Terrorism, which is devouring our resources. They recognize the laziness of the Corporate Media, and they're looking beyond Fox News. They'll hear this message.

You can insult me all you want. But you can never change the truth.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 29, 2011 by [Steve K](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #5](#)

** BLOGGER NOTE TO "DIGITAL JOURNAL" MANAGEMENT **

Why do you permit DENIALISTS [fools/disinfo-shills?] to post ongoing 'attack articles' on this Cdn site?

SHAME ON YOU ... DIGITAL JOURNAL!

While 'freedom of expression' is allowed to share one's views, it's inexcusable 'DJ' permitted Alex-B to publish - not 1, 2, or 3 opinionated attack articles, but at least 8 such articles on the same topic ... attacking far more credible sources than the infantile opinionated rants he has aired.

DIGITAL JOURNAL used to be perceived as a quality alternative news source that wasn't afraid to publish thoughtful (even controversial) views on 9/11 (like Bill Lindner's insight), contrails vs chemtrails, suspected vaccine ineffectiveness.

In recent times, encouraging denialists to post ongoing 'attack articles' based on prejudiced opinions, misleading arguments, etc., only raises the query if DJ mgt have regressed to the same level as Globalist MSM news skills. By not curtailing A-B's ongoing 'character attack articles', makes DJ complicit of endorsing these views.

SHAME ON YOU, DIGITAL JOURNAL! ... SHAME ON YOU!

Steve K ~ Toronto, Cda

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 29, 2011 by [Steve K](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #6](#)

Per Susan Lindauer [#4] posted response:

I want to thank you for taking time to repudiate Alex's 'character attack' rants. It's a favourite ploy of disinfo-shills, in attempts to discredit sources (i.e. damage control) of those who threaten to expose falsehood [lies] of the official account. I've read your article, among several others, posted on Veterans Today and Jeff Rense websites. My understanding is you diligently served U.S. Gov't for about a decade. In the real world, only those with intelligence, ability, dedication, and accomplishments, remain within an organization beyond initial 3-6 mo. trial period.

Enough said!

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 30, 2011 by [Alexander Baron](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #7](#)

A simple question for Miss Lindauer. Did you claim to be an angel, yes or no?

[quote](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 30, 2011 by [sumdume](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #8](#)

[Show quoted comment](#) from [Steve K](#)
@[Steve K](#)

** **BLOGGER NOTE TO "DIGITAL JOURNAL" MANAGEMENT** **

Why do you permit DENIALISTS [fools/disinfo-shills?] to post ongoing 'attack articles' on this Cdn site?

SHAME ON YOU ... DIGITAL JOURNAL!

While 'freedom of expression' is allowed to share one's views, it's inexcusable 'DJ' permitted Alex-B to publish - not 1, 2, or 3 opinionated attack articles, but at least 8 such articles on the same topic ... attacking far more credible sources than the infantile opinionated rants he has aired.

DIGITAL JOURNAL used to be perceived as a quality alternative news source that wasn't afraid to publish thoughtful (even controversial) views on 9/11 (like Bill Lindner's insight), contrails vs

chemtrails, suspected vaccine ineffectiveness.

In recent times, encouraging denialists to post ongoing 'attack articles' based on prejudiced opinions, misleading arguments, etc., only raises the query if DJ mgt have regressed to the same level as Globalist MSM news skills. By not curtailing A-B's ongoing 'character attack articles', makes DJ complicit of endorsing these views.

SHAME ON YOU, DIGITAL JOURNAL! ... SHAME ON YOU!

Steve K ~ Toronto, Cda

Are you saying the proper step is to censor what can be posted on Digital Journal? Who would have the responsibility of determining what is truthful? What will happen when the censor bans comments supported by loonies and liars?

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•
 Sep 30, 2011 by [Susan Lindauer](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #9](#)
 This is Susan Lindauer, answering the "simple question" by Alexander.

No. "Angel" was the Iraqis code name for me, though I was not aware of the moniker until after my arrest. It's typical of what Intelligence Agencies do.

If I'd been allowed to have trial, that ridiculous speculation would have been clarified in 30 seconds. The Justice Dept could only make accusations against me if I was denied a trial, or even a hearing to dispute it. My first attorney was a whiney, weak public defender who jumped at an easy way out of a complex, thorny case. My second attorney, Brian Shaughnessy, met me 2 weeks after my release from Carswell. He took my case for the sport of it. He's a brilliant, outstanding and highly seasoned international criminal attorney & former federal prosecutor in Washington. He had social and professional contact with some of my witnesses from the Lockerbie case, and he easily verified my story and thrived on the challenge of potentially knocking out key parts of the Patriot Act. But he was highly capable of attacking the challenge. The first guy was trying to cover his own butt. He threw my case even when my uncle, Ted Lindauer, also w/40 years experience practicing law stepped in to assist with witness interviews and strategy. Ted Lindauer quickly and easily confirmed my story, too. This was complex, but an experienced attorney could handle it.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•
 Sep 30, 2011 by [Steve K](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #10](#)
 Per sumdume's [#8] post:

"Are you saying the proper step is to censor what can be posted on Digital Journal?"

I believe most readers will understand the nature of my concern per [#5] post. It was clearly noted that while 'freedom of expression' is important so that ALL may have opportunity to share their views; it is NOT A LICENSE to post a series of opinionated "attack articles" [at least 8, per my count, on same topic] as one DJ contributor has done.

I've received feedback from DIGITAL JOURNAL that this concern has been duly noted.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•
 Sep 30, 2011 by [Alexander Baron](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #11](#)
 Since I started writing for Digital Journal I've published three articles that deal with the Bilderberg Group and other power elites.

I've written on the financial system and the over-riding need for taking the power away from the banks.

I've written on basic income.

My reward is for some muppet to brand me a globalist shill whatever that means, and suggest I'm working for the very same elite.

He does this not because he has evidence of base motives, but because I refuse to give any credence at all to his ludicrous conspiracy mongering, which consists not of rational argument but of posting reams of links from both doubtful and discredit sources alleging some vast, all-pervasive global conspiracy behind everything from the Kennedy Assassination to 9/11.

His sources include a loud talk show host, a Veterans website that falls for all manner of ludicrous crap, and a woman who believes she is an angel.

Do I or does Digital Journal really need to respond to this sort of stupid invective?

This website clearly takes a Libertarian position on these and most other issues. If you think you can do better, write an article based on facts and see if it can stand the test.

That is my FINAL word.

[quote](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 30, 2011 by [Susan Lindauer](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #12](#)

Alexander, you have just repeated a lie about me again. You repeated this nonsense that I think I am an angel, though you could read my explanation, which explains the actual facts of my case. Whatever other articles you write, if you behave this way--- slandering other individuals with false attacks on our reputations--- then Digital Journal should be very concerned about publishing your articles. You are engaged in dishonest smear tactics that qualify you as a disinformation shill.

You proved it in your comment.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 30, 2011 by [Steve K](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #13](#)

Per Alex [#11] rebuttal and Susan's [#12] follow-up:

I concur with Susan. Readers who take time to read Alex's 7 other articles and bloggers' feedback - per [#3] post above - will see the fallacy of his rebuttal. I stand behind [#2] post; per following repost, giving credence to this perception:

REPOST:

... No surprise to see Alex post latest ridicule nonsense.

1) A 'denialist' who rejects any possibility of U.S./UK gov't involvement in one or more of these nefarious activities:

- targeted hits on JFK (1963) / MLK & RK (1968); notwithstanding M L King's family lawsuit against U.S. gov't resulted in judicial system finding U.S. gov't complicit in 1968 MLK's murder

- suspected 9/11 false flag event; notwithstanding several compelling reasons such as motive, eyewitness testimonies, professional analysis of video & physical evidence, official report 'errors'/omissions, etc.

- suspected 2003 murder of Dr D Kelly; an authority of liability to UK gov't, Kelly & colleague testimony he was a targeted man, alleged handicap that would make self-inflicted wounds with dull knife virtually impossible, no fingerprints on his personal effects though he wore no gloves (suggesting his killers wiped traces of their own fingerprints), UK gov't refusal to perform proper forensic autopsy and sealing important details (cover-up?)

{Whether or not one chooses to believe official account or conspiracy view is a matter of personal choice. However, to post assertive dogmatic remarks (as A-B has done), predicated on opinion and not on

comprehensive facts, is either blind ignorance or willful falsehood.}

2) Alex previously posted on at least 2 occasions: "they are ALL wrong and I am right as usual"; notwithstanding 'they' include, but are not limited to, respected journalists, professionals (architects, engineers, doctors, law enforcement, etc.), eyewitness testimonies, credible insights based on plausible motives and/or study of these events.

{Perhaps Proverbial insights best sum up A-B's attitude: "The way of a fool is right in his own eyes ... A fool despises instruction ... A fool flaunts his folly ... A fool takes no pleasure in understanding, but only in expressing his opinion ..." And is it not so?}

No further comment is necessary!

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 30, 2011 by [sumdume](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #14](#)

[Show quoted comment](#) from [Steve K](#)
[@Steve K](#)

Per sumdume's [#8] post:

"Are you saying the proper step is to censor what can be posted on Digital Journal?"

I believe most readers will understand the nature of my concern per [#5] post. It was clearly noted that while 'freedom of expression' is important so that ALL may have opportunity to share their views; it is NOT A LICENSE to post a series of opinionated "attack articles" [at least 8, per my count, on same topic] as one DJ contributor has done.

I've received feedback from DIGITAL JOURNAL that this concern has been duly noted.

I do not see a problem with a journalist composing several articles on the same topic. It does not matter if I believe the articles to be entertaining, insightful or garbage.

In reality it is the same as an individual making several similar comments on articles.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 30, 2011 by [Susan Lindauer](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #15](#)

You have slandered me, Alexander. It's one thing to pose a blunt question, and expect an answer. It's another thing to keep repeating lies once they have been debunked. That makes you a disinformation skill.

A warning to you & your friends. I have no intention of allowing the GOP to escape responsibility for what GOP leaders in Congress did to me, so that they could deceive the American people about their leadership performance on anti-terrorism. It was malicious and corrupt, and the American people should stand in judgment of it.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

Sep 30, 2011 by [Steve K](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #16](#)

Per sumdume [#14] post:

"I do not see a problem ..."

Of course you don't see a problem with one posting "attack articles" on ongoing basis: slandering others, misleading allegations, avoiding to address legitimate arguments raised by others by tossing in red herrings and/or ridicule tripe as a foil. The two of you are 'birds of a similar feather' of whom I previously posted this insight:

"Your eye is the lamp of your body; when your eye is sound, your whole body is full of light; but when it is not sound, your body is full of darkness. If your eye is not sound, your whole body will be full of darkness. If then the light in you is darkness, how great is the darkness." (Lk. 11:34 / Mt. 6:23)

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•
yesterday by [Joseph Boltrukiewicz](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #17](#)

[Show quoted comment](#) from [Alexander Baron](#)
[@Alexander Baron](#)

.....

That is my FINAL word.

Is this your final word on DJ? Uff,....., what a relief!

Good luck in your future endeavours!

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•
yesterday by [Alexander Baron](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #18](#)

Miss Lindauer - what I repeated about you were findings of fact by a US court, so by definition they cannot be defamatory.

If you read my other writings such as *Afghanistan: Enough Is Enough*, you will see that on certain topics I am in 100% agreement with you. I have written the odd article on these subjects for many years, in fact I even attended an anti-war march in London, can't remember when but it was a good few years ago. I fully accept that you have the best of intentions, and that you have had a rough deal, but the all-powerful Illuminati didn't shut you up, and you have even published a book on the subject.

Remind me not to read it sometime.

[quote](#) | [delete](#)

•
21 hours ago by [sumdume](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #19](#)

[Show quoted comment](#) from [Steve K](#)
[@Steve K](#)

Per sumdume [#14] post:

"I do not see a problem ..."

Of course you don't see a problem with one posting "attack articles" on ongoing basis: slandering others, misleading allegations, avoiding to address legitimate arguments raised by others by tossing in red herrings and/or ridicule tripe as a foil. The two of you are 'birds of a similar feather' of whom I previously posted this insight:

"Your eye is the lamp of your body; when your eye is sound, your whole body is full of light; but when it is not sound, your body is full of darkness. If your eye is not sound, your whole body will be full of darkness. If then the light in you is darkness, how great is the darkness." (Lk. 11:34 / Mt. 6:23)

Steve K, What is the difference between Mr. Baron's alleged attack articles and your attack comments? Your comments are often full of slanderous, misleading and patently false information. If someone posts material

you disagree with you often insult them. You ignore well documented facts to promote theories that cannot be substantiated.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

19 hours ago by [Susan Lindauer](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment](#) [#20](#)

I got more than a "rough deal," Alexander. I was thrown in prison on a Texas military base without a trial or hearing and threatened with indefinite detention (up to 10 years), on the basis of Secret Charges, secret evidence and secret grand jury testimony. The whole purpose of my indictment was to stop the true facts from reaching the public about the CIA's 9/11 warnings, Iraq's contributions to the 9/11 investigation and the existence of a comprehensive peace framework that made War in Iraq wholly unnecessary.

In my case, the Justice Dept REWROTE my papers to submit to the Judge. There's no point in denying it. We have the originals, and they are not the same as what was given to Judge Mukasey--- who could see the ugliness of what was happening, and simply wanted a vehicle to get the case out of the federal courts.

My legal ordeal illustrates how terrible the Patriot Act is. A heads up for anyone else who thinks of attacking me. The War on Terror is based on a malicious public fraud. We're going to be fighting to raise the public knowledge of the depths of deception that has resulted in bankrupting our middle class and our federal coffers right up to election day.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

17 hours ago by [Steve K](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment](#) [#21](#)

Per sumdume's [#19] post:

• "Steve K, What is the difference between Mr. Baron's alleged attack articles and your attack comments?"

A lack of understanding on your part. He posted attack articles maligning many, based on personal 'opinions'. I criticised fallacy of his biased opinions and exposed his conduct to reproof, using one of the most worthy references, Biblical insights. To my knowledge, I did not 'accuse' Alex of being a fool / disinfo-shill. I provided info. on the attributes of fools & disinfo-shills, and made comparisons to Alex's posted contents, perceived ploys, and his reaction to reproof.

The Bible specifically warns against passing judgment [condemnation] on others. Yet it also commands the upright to judge [evaluate] false communications AND to judge [discern] those who abide in light from those who abide in darkness. It is a directive to stand up to false teachings and/or false communicators.

• "If someone posts material you disagree with you often insult them."

Sometimes I disagree with others, like Hans. Yet we've had cordial exchanges as Hans himself confirmed a few weeks ago. I've also thanked you for exposing a dubious reference source I used re: OBL's death [I accepted reproof in the spirit of seeking to provide accurate truthful insights]. Your accusation is baseless.

• "Your comments are often full of slanderous, misleading and patently false information."

My posted contents are referenced to numerous credible and diverse sources. In the past, I've been chided for not sharing personal views. I avoid doing so being mindful of warning on 'judgment', and I do so if I have personal experience, or factual info., or relevant sourced insights, that's applicable to the discussion.

This accusation is also untrue though not surprising, serving to reaffirm contents of [#14] post that perception sumdume abides in darkness of error & falsehood, like Alex, is accurate. As it is written: "by their fruits you will know." And so it is!

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

17 hours ago by [sumdume](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment](#) [#22](#)

I see! Mr. Baron is guilty because he attacks many and you are innocent because you attack few. What a great and logical response.

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

13 hours ago by [Steve K](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #23](#)

Per sumdume's [#22] accusation:

This Scripture came to mind: "You are of your father the devil, and your will is to do your father's desires. He ... has nothing to do with the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies."

Go figure!

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

13 hours ago by [Steve K](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #24](#)

FOOTNOTE to [#23]:

Oops! I forgot to include following passage as well.

".. for the ACCUSER of our brethren has been thrown down, who accuses them day and night before our God ..."

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

11 hours ago by [sumdume](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #25](#)

[Show quoted comment](#) from [Steve K](#)
[@Steve K](#)

FOOTNOTE to [#23]:

Oops! I forgot to include following passage as well.

".. for the ACCUSER of our brethren has been thrown down, who accuses them day and night before our God ..."

Gee, where does that leave us given the fact that you are making the accusations?

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

11 hours ago by [Steve K](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #26](#)

"Leave the presence of a fool, for there you do not meet words of knowledge." (Prov. 14:7)

Advice noted, sumdume!

[quote](#) | [flag as abuse](#) | [block user from view](#) | [delete](#)

•

4 mins ago by [Alexander Baron](#) flagged as abuse - [show comment #27](#)

At the request of the management of *Digital Journal*, I will not be writing anymore articles about the misnamed 9/11 Truth Movement; they feel the subject has been done to death, and frankly so do I.

I would though like to add a few general observations about the mentality of some of its proponents, including those who have commented on this site.

First, I have been accused of defaming some commenters here. The 9/11 Truth Movement openly accuses the leaders of the US Government up to and including the President, and at various times such diverse characters as unnamed FBI, CIA and other government agents, elements of the NYPD and the FDNY, Larry Silverstein, the Mayor of New York and the journalist Mike Walter of being active players in a conspiracy that resulted

in the deaths of nearly three thousand innocent people on American soil. The same people are deeply offended when I claim they are delusion, gullible or just plain dumb.

To accuse someone of mass murder without compelling evidence is criminal libel in Britain, and can result in a gaol sentence.

I have been repeatedly branded a denialist. Let us just take the case of Lee Harvey Oswald: he was in the building from where the shots were fired at the material time; his fingerprints were all over the sniper's nest and the gun, which he had bought and was photographed with; he murdered a police officer and drew his gun on the posse that arrested him. Do I deny any of this? No. I am branded a denialist because I don't reject all this hard evidence and swallow some loony conspiracy "theory" which is supported by no hard evidence but by a mass of links to articles by people who are three sandwiches short of a picnic.

Do I deny the suicide of Dr David Kelly? No, nor does his family.

Do I believe there is a connection between the Kennedy Assassination, 9/11 and the death of Dr Kelly? Yes, they all attract lurid and unsubstantiated speculation by total idiots whose *modus operandi* is to accuse all who refute their nonsense of being paid agents of the conspirators.

I have been called a globalist shill. What the hell does that mean? That I'm in the pay of David Rockefeller? He must just love all those articles I've written attacking the banks.

Now as I said, I must take my leave, like the staff of *Digital Journal* I am obviously in the pay of the Illuminati. Why else would I dare oppose the revealed truth of the people who can see so clearly what the best detectives and forensic investigators in the world cannot?