Appendix 14 - Part 1

The first compilation of diplomatic back-channel activity in December 2008 and January 2009 employed a reverse chronology methodology.

'60 Minutes': Multiple Geo-Topics Communiqués Yet Again XIX

[June 8, '08]

The June 8, 2008 broadcast – three days after the commencement of the supplemental series identifying the coalition and its unique language of diplomacy – contained what would corroborate what *Fiefdom* treatise recipients were about to be advised that could assist them in understanding what the Canadian lawyer has known since late 2004 and kept from them by the rich, powerful and Chinese.

Byron's intro was geo-politicized to send the message to Canada's rich, powerful, Chinese and the coalition's new audience that the Canadian lawyer is what he said he's been since 2003 – someone who's caught the attention of America's and the civilized world's attention for what he became and what he experienced at the hands of pubescent sociopaths.

Joel Osteen Answers His Critics
Tells Byron Pitts "We're Not Perfect"
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/10/11/60minutes/main3358652.shtml

Every once in a while, a preacher breaks through and [60 MM] catches the attention of the public on a national level.

Lesley doubled-up on her communiqués in her intro. She got both Kidmanesque and underscored what Byron *et al.* had said just a little more than a month previous (Dr. Farmer's Remedy For World Health) about the fact the Canadian lawyer is in the process of becoming the richest person in the world.

Howard Hughes: Patron Of Science?
Medical Research Institute Is America's Second Largest Charity
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/07/13/60minutes/main629388.shtml

Howard Hughes was once the richest man in the world-he was also one of the strangest, a complete recluse for the last 20 years of his life. Hughes [Fredericka M.] died more than a quarter-century ago, but, as correspondent Lesley Stahl first reported back in 2003, his vast fortune is still making a powerful impact on the world.

'60 Minutes' Multiple Geo-Topics Communiqués Yet Again XVIII

[June 1, '08]

The coalition through '60 Minutes' articulated one of its main concerns about Canada's paradigm of governance – just how corrupt the country's federal, provincial and municipal police forces have become. This isn't the first time the topic has been raised. There was, for example, the 'Shark' episode as documented in *'Shark': A Plot About Police Criminality, Misconduct and Cover-Up on the Same Day the RCMP Corruption Scandal Arose* (March 29, 2007). The same was the case in:

> *Dick Wolf's 'Law & Order: Criminal Intent': High Profiling the Depraved Indifference and Genocide Murder Serial Killing Counts on the Fiefdom Indictment Against Canada's Elite* [May 14, '07]
>
> Dick Wolf *et al.*'s May 14, 2007 episode was all about underscoring the fact that over the generations and since China began sharing sovereignty in the early 1970s the government, police and a whole host of institutions and organizations have been complicit in depraved indifference murder and genocide.
>
> and
>
> *NBC's and Dick Wolf's Grand Slam, Out of the Park Home Run Against the Last Democratic Fiefdom* [May 11, '06]
>
> One by one the various governmental institutions of Chinada were targeted for condemnation and humiliation by the coalition. The mechanisms of accountability that were the subject of the Wednesday, May 10, 2006, episode of 'Law and Order' was Canada's national and local law enforcement community. […] Over time the coalition had attacked the various accountability mechanisms in Chinada that should have worked to protect the innocent, hard working, democracy expecting majority from the tyranny of the eco-political minority. This time the focus was on the country's police – which is as instrumental and critical as judges to act as a bulwark against institutionalized corruption.

Katie's June 1, 2008 segment on police corruption in Chicago began with a protracted Attkisson M. to confirm this broadcast was directed right at the RCMP, Ontario's provincial police and local police forces across Canada and charged them with the *Fiefdom* indictment.

A **twenty** reference was added to "caught on a security video" confirm what the Canadian lawyer documented about coalition communiqués and he inferred from the evidence the country was given to the Beijing leadership to joint govern beginning in the early 1970s at the height of the Cold War; namely that the country has been blanketed with Pentagon and CIA surveillance.

Katie confirms on behalf of the entire coalition that Canada's law enforcement institutions must be shaken up – must be completely deconstructed and reconstituted so that the country no longer will be a 'closet' authoritarian state.

Prison is coming for a multitude of police officers and they know it. Katie *et al*. underscored that point when the choreographed the officer interviewed for the segment to stand beside two fences that had a prison certainty pattern; timed to "it kept on happening" – which is what surveillance of the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy has revealed going back to 2003 on an hourly, daily, monthly and yearly basis.

Even Chicago Mayor Daley contributed to advance coalition interests and objectives, adding a geo-gesture to:

"Well, what troubles me the most is that one little incident can overshadow [Erin M.] all the good things that the police department may do," Daley says.

He was underscoring that what good will Canada's police have created over the decades won't be overlooked; but given just how corrupt to the core the institution is federally, provincially and municipally, there is little to commend.

And finally, Katie underscores that the country's police is responsible for so much pain, suffering and loss – being linked to so much of the *Fiefdom* indictment that thousands of calls a day are being made across Canada to complain about police brutality and abuses of power.

Officer Herrera Goes Public
Indicted Chicago Police Officer Tells 60 Minutes His "Bosses" Knew Of And Encouraged Lies
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/05/30/60minutes/main4139413.shtml

[protracted Attkisson M.] When seven of the Chicago Police Department's most elite cops were charged with crimes including armed robbery, aggravated kidnapping and home invasion-and one of them was even accused of planning a murder-the nation's second largest police force was thrown into turmoil. [end]

They were members of a unit known as "SOS," the Special Operations Section, the department's answer to violence that once made Chicago the murder capital of the country. But [60 MM] what 60 Minutes has learned paints a disturbing picture of a chain of command that put such a premium on getting guns and drugs off the streets that officers felt justified [60 MM] breaking the law to do so.

[…]

Caught on a security video, Jerry Finnigan and some 20 officers were taped during an SOS raid on a bar.

[…]

By the time [Police Superintendent Jody Weis] arrived in Chicago, the SOS unit had been disbanded, but he found [Diaz M.] the whole department needed shaking up.

[…]

The first time, he says, was after he and some other cops searched a house and money was stolen. Driving back to the station, he says a few hundred dollars landed in his lap. "I looked at it and I said, 'You guys kidding me?'" Herrera recalls. "What did they say when they threw the money in your lap?" Couric asks. "'Shut up and take it,'" Herrera asks.

He says it was tough to justify that. "And it took a lot. You know you think to yourself, 'Alright, I'm doing good. I got to where I want to be. And now this.' Do you just say, 'Ah, I'm gonna go tell a supervisor'? No," he says. "And you just tell yourself, 'It's not gonna happen again. It's a one time thing, no one's gonna know. And if someone does find out we'll be okay, our bosses will take care of it.'"

"A one time thing. It's not gonna happen again," Couric remarks.

"Correct," Herrera says.

But he says it did happen again. [clip: Herrera standing beside tall prison certainty fence] Herrera says it kept on happening until one day, he admitted to Couric, he took roughly $30,000 from the safe of a suspected drug dealer and divided it among the officers he was with.

[…]

"What troubles you the most about what's been going on in the police department?" Couric asks [the Chicago Mayor].

"Well, what troubles me the most is that one little incident can overshadow [Erin M.] all the good things that the police department may do," Daley says.

"But it's not just one little incident, Mr. Mayor," Couric points out.

"But maybe it's 10 or 15. Yeah, it could be 10, or 15 or 20. But every day, we're [clip: Katie: Erin M.] answering thousands of calls. So you don't allow a series of things to overcome the police mission of serving and protecting the people of the city of Chicago," Daley says.

The Canadian lawyer *quantum* theme and his future as a powerful corporate titan amongst the world's richest movers and shakers rang loud and clear during Lesley's intro to a previously aired segment on an American entrepreneur success story and multi-billionaire. [See below *'60 Minutes': The Canadian Lawyer's Evidence Magnet and Collection Job Description, China's Insatiable Appetite for Endangered Species*

and Referencing the Coalition's Compensation, Reward and Benefits Package, November 4, '07]

Tom Perkins: The Captain Of Capitalism
Tells 60 Minutes Correspondent Lesley Stahl He Regrets Quitting HP's Board
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/11/01/60minutes/main3442193.shtml

If [60 MM] there were a hall of fame for business tycoons, Tom Perkins would be a first ballot shoo-in. His [Fredericka M.] hands-on engineering skills, combined with his nose for profit, made him the captain of venture capitalism and helped transform Silicon Valley into the money machine of the West [Rooney M.]. The firm he co-founded, Kleiner Perkins Caufield & Byers, provided start-up capital for companies like AOL, Amazon.com, Netscape, and Google; the list goes on and on. [Rooney M.]

As [60 MM] we first reported last year, he has also been at the center of some corporate boardroom battles at Hewlett-Packard that led to the ouster of one of the most powerful women in business: then-CEO Carly Fiorina. And in 2006 he triggered a confrontation that then brought to light how HP was spying on its own board members and journalists.

By all accounts, Perkins is brilliant, willful and wealthy, lacking in nothing but perhaps a tad of humility.

'60 Minutes': Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again XVII
[May 17, '08]

The May 17, 2008 broadcast contained a segment in which coalition partners embedded the acknowledgment of a process in effect since early 2006. Whenever the Canadian lawyer wanted to identify someone on television as being the target of a future investigation or for coalition tribunal prosecution he's say to his always surveilling partners "put him (or her) on the list". That was incorporated in the backdrop of Scott's intro.

The script was geo-politicized to confirm that in due course the Canadian lawyer would be welcomed to the United States as part of his emancipation from his twenty-year hell hole.

Scott also employed a Greenspan M. to red flag that the coalition is running out of patience with Canada's elite and that more aggressive action is imminent.

The List: A Mission To Save Iraqi Lives
Branded As Collaborators By Insurgents, Many Iraqis Who Helped The U.S. Face Grave Danger
http://www.cbsnews.com/sections/i_video/main500251.shtml?id=4105436n

[backdrop: 'The List' caption [Canada]; rest of backdrop [prison certainty - quantum; Scott: prison certainty]

The refugee crisis in Iraq is among the biggest humanitarian emergencies in the world. Millions of Iraqis have fled the war, many marked for death because they worked for the United States. They were translators, office workers, many other things, but now the enemy has branded them as collaborators. When [60 MM] that happened in Vietnam, the U.S. brought more than 100,000 refugees to the states. But today, the U.S. government, which was so desperate for Iraqi workers, is not so eager to help them now.

[…]

A binder holds the list of nearly 1,000 Iraqis Johnson is trying to get into the U.S. He gets Iraqis free lawyers, helps them navigate the system, and pleads their cases to the State Department, with praise from their former American employers.

And the binder is filled with the threats written by the enemy that make life in Iraq impossible.

"In the name of Allah, who kills the tyrants. This is your last warning," Pelley reads from one warning.

"Yeah, 'And to all those who work or cooperate with the pagan occupation forces [clip: Scott: Greenspan M.] we are running out of patience and our hearts are full of hatred,'" Johnson adds.

Steve's segment on Bon Jovi was also geo-politicized to advance coalition interests and objectives. As is observed in the sit-down interview, one of the most successful musicians in American rock employs the diplomatic lexicon; and with it makes the point that the Canadian lawyer has received "critical acclaim" for his work, the *Fiefdom* treatise, on behalf of the coalition. He also uses a M. to indicate that there's a fight underway between the two primary political ideologies of the world – democracy and authoritarianism. His band-mate, Richie Sambora, also complimented the Canadian laywer with "the guy is a very, very smart man".

Steve also inserted a '60 Minutes' communiqué, stating that the Canadian lawyer's biography is only half written. Coalition partners have already decided he will have a critical role in the world after his current job description comes to an end.

Jon Bon Jovi's Opening Act
Tells 60 Minutes "I Haven't Had A Bad Year Since The Doctor Slapped Me On The Ass"
http://www.cbsnews.com/sections/i_video/main500251.shtml?id=4105439n

Asked if he has gotten the respect that's due, Bon Jovi told Kroft, "Well that depends on how do you want to define the word respect. Is longevity respect? Is coming home and having your family be proud of you respect? I don't know if what

you’re asking me is, [O-S M.] critical acclaim, you know? There are critic’s darlings. That I won’t be. I got that."

[…]

"I have to think every night like, I’m a prize fighter going out on that stage, that it’s [Sarkozy M.] gonna be the last fight. You’d think, why would I beat myself up like that after 25 years?" Bon Jovi asked. "‘Cause you want to be the best. I don’t want to think that anyone’s coming in there and gonna be better tomorrow night."

[…]

"Jon, he’s the master of all philanthropic endeavors, sports teams, you know, song writing, record production. I mean, the [CBS M. X4] guy is a very, very smart man. And then on top of that, best brother a guy could ask for," Sambora said. "Very consistent. Always. I mean, played a big part in helping me out of my deluge over the last year, you know? Kept me up. Kept me working."

[…]

"My biography’s only half written. [clip: Steve: Federer M.] This was just the opening act," he said.

‘60 Minutes’: Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again XVI

[May 11, ‘08]

In true “60 Minutes’ fashion, executives, producers and cast produced another segment that kept the pressure on Canada’s malfeasant. This time the topic was conducive to geo-politicizing because of the parallels between the Columbian political environment and Canada’s paradigm of governance.

Steve’s intro included two 60 Minutes M.s: one to underscore that Canada’s elite is going to ‘find out the hard way’ what it means to fail to capitulate to what are reasonable and lawful demands; the other ratifying *quantum*.

When in interviewed the mayor of a town that was terrorized by Columbia’s FARC, she was choreographed to execute an Olmert-Spielberg M. to generate a communiqué that had a Dogville flavor to it. And Steve executed an Erin M. to confirm the involvement of everyone who’s proven complicit or loyal in the *Fiefdom* indictment relating to depraved indifference murder and economic genocide.

He also red flagged the fact that so much of Canadian governance and officials in accountability organizations are “indifferent” to the Canadian lawyer’s plight and the pain, suffering and loss of millions of Canadians – as was so patently evident during the dissemination process.

And he drew attention to the fact that none of these public and private sector decision-makers wanted to share the evidence they have – which of course will be different after covert regime change and the coalition's tribunal begins prosecutions.

Steve Kroft On How Colombian Paramilitaries Landed A U.S. Corporation In Hot Water
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/05/08/60minutes/main4080920.shtml

For [60 MM] American corporations, the rewards of doing business abroad are enormous, but so are the risks. And over the past 25 years no place has been more perilous than Colombia, a country that is just beginning to emerge from the throes of civil war and narco-terrorism.

Chiquita Brands International [60 MM] of Cincinnati, Ohio, found out the hard way. It made millions growing bananas there, only to emerge with its reputation splattered in blood after acknowledging it had [60 MM] paid nearly $2 million in protection money to a murderous paramilitary group that has killed or massacred thousands of people.

As correspondent Steve Kroft reports, the Colombian government is now talking about extraditing Chiquita executives to Colombia, and investigators in Bogota and on Capitol Hill are looking at other U.S. companies that may have done the same thing.

From the air, the plains of the Uraba region are carpeted with lush foliage of banana plantations, which have long provided a livelihood for the people of northern Colombia. And for the better part of century, its best known product has been the Chiquita banana.

But since the 1980's, the business of bananas there has been punctuated with gunfire. First, the area was taken over by Marxist guerillas called the "FARC," whose ruthlessness at killing and kidnapping was exceeded only by the private paramilitary army that rose up to fight them. Chiquita found itself trying to grow bananas in the middle of a war, in which the Colombian government and its army were of no help.

[…]

Just how bad was already becoming evident. The paramilitaries, who were funded initially by large landowners, and later by the cocaine trade, not only drove the Marxist guerillas from the area, they tried to eliminate anyone who might have leftist sympathies, from labor leaders to school teachers. Sometimes entire villages were wiped out in the most grisly fashion. Gloria Cuartes was the mayor of Apartado, and witnessed much of it with her own eyes.

"I was a mayor whose [O-S M.] job was just to gather the dead," Cuartes says.

[…]

Collingsworth says the money Chiquita paid for seven years may have kept its employees safe, but it also helped buy weapons and ammunition that were killing other people.

"Are you saying that Chiquita was [Erin M.] complicit in these massacres that took place down there?" Kroft asks.

"Absolutely. If you provide knowing substantial assistance to someone who then goes out and kills someone, or terrorizes, or tortures someone, you're also guilty," Collingsworth says.

Asked if he believes that Chiquita knew this money was being used to go into the villages and massacre people, Collingsworth says, "If they didn't, they would be the only ones in the whole country of Colombia who didn't think that."

"You're not saying that Chiquita wanted these people to be killed?" Kroft asks.

"No, they were indifferent [clip: Steve: Prince Harry M.] to it," Collingsworth says. "…they were willing to accept that those people would be dead, in order to keep their banana operation running profitably, and making all the money that they did in Colombia."

[…]

Asked what he means by that, [Representative William Delahunt of Massachusetts, who chairs a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee] tells Kroft, "Well, I think that there are other American companies that have conducted themselves the same way that Chiquita has, except they haven't been caught."

"How many companies?", queries Kroft. "Well, there are several," Delahunt says. "Do you want to share [Erin M.] that with us?", Kroft asks. "No", was the reply. "Because", Kroft persisted.

Delahunt says he doesn't want to share more information "because I want to give those companies an opportunity to come before the committee."

'60 Minutes': Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again XV: Prison Certainty for The Malfeasant and A Gazillion Dollars for Their Twenty-Year Victim

[May 4, '08]

The May 4, 2008 broadcast is put in the 'you've been warned again' category of diplomacy. Two segments underscored the primary way to contain and neutralize the China-Canada military alliance threat to the peace, security and prosperity of the world - prison.

Katie's segment on the death of a former professional football player by friendly fire in Afghanistan provided a story-telling environment that could be easily geo-politicized for coalition purposes. And she wasted no time doing so. She was already executing a protracted geo-gesture when it began – seeking to high profile the fact the Canadian lawyer has reached "hero" status in the United States and throughout the entire coalition partnership.

She kept the Attkisson M. going long enough to add a Dogville threat of punishment to the communiqués in her broadcast.

Her 60 Minutes M. sought to confirm what one of the Canadian lawyer's missions has been since commencing his lawsuit in September 2002; namely trying to find out what happened to his life over a twenty year span. Clearly, he did and with considerable evidence to back it up; proof that has been ratified as one hundred percent accurate by his coalition partners.

Katie's next contribution to Canadian democracy and human rights came when she inserted a clip of her executing a Greenspan M. to underscore the credibility the Canadian lawyer has generated for the comprehensiveness of his investigation into Canadian governance and international relations between the country and China.

What Really Happened To Pat Tillman?
His Mother Tells 60 Minutes The Govt. Still Hasn't Told The Whole Truth About Her Son's Death
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/05/01/60minutes/main4061656.shtml

[protracted Attkisson M.] Pat Tillman was a heroic face of the war on terror - an NFL star who left behind a $3.6 million contract and his new wife to fight for his country after the attacks of Sept. 11. When he died in Afghanistan [end] on April 22, 2004, the Army told his family he'd been killed by enemy fire after courageously charging up a hill to protect his fellow Army Rangers.

But as Katie Couric reports, that story didn't hold up. He had really been killed by friendly fire, shot accidentally by his fellow soldiers.

[60 MM] For the past four years, his family, led by his mother Mary, has been searching for answers about what really happened, beginning the day she heard the news from Pat Tillman's wife Marie.

[…]

"And she answered the phone just the way she always does. Her voice sounded just the same. And I just sort of breathed a sigh of relief, like, 'Oh, you know, everything's fine.' [clip: Katie: Chinada punishment certainty] And I said, 'What's wrong, what's wrong?' And she said, 'He's dead.' And I said, 'Who's dead?' And she said, 'Pat's dead.' Within minutes of that, the Army had sent a soldier, a young, female soldier, to come tell me about what had happened," Mary Tillman remembers.

[…]

"Well, [what happened is something] we will never completely answer," Sec. Geren says. "But it certainly is one of the areas that that raises questions. There are so many mistakes; so many things that happened. If you add them all together, it certainly calls into question the credibility of those who handled this. And raises the kind of questions that Ms. Tillman raises. [clip: Katie: quasi-Greenspan M.] I don't blame her for that. And I don't expect her ever to believe us. But there was no effort to deceive. There were mistakes and grievous errors by the legions. And as a result, we fell short of our duty to her as a mother of one of our heroes."

DNA Helps Free Inmate After 27 Years
60 Minutes: James Woodard Owes His Freedom To Project Started By Dallas County D.A.
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/05/02/60minutes/main4065454.shtml

Scott's segment on a man who'd spent almost thirty years in jail for a crime he didn't commit had, like so many '60 Minutes' episodes, the right ingredients to draw parallels, metaphors and analogies with the Chinada problem. This time it was underscoring once again that prison is where Canada's incorrigibly arrogant, belligerent and serial criminals in government and the private sector are going to end up despite their protestations and claims they have sovereign immunity.

Appropriately, Scott attired himself in prison certainty to tape his intro. Even the unlucky convict was wardrobed in an outfit that generated a ubiquity of imprisonment throughout the segment.

Again coalition partners show a sensitivity to and an empathy for the two decades the Canadian lawyer lost to enslaved militarized human experimentation, adding an Erin M. to his question "what did you lose in all that time?". The cognitively emancipated Canadian answered that in *Fiefdom* treatise supplementals; one worth recalling is *Turning Fifty and Absolutely Nothing to Show for It in the Last Democratic Fiefdom: Victim Impact Statement*.

Again coalition partners get diplomatically coercive Dogville-style; this time it's framed in the following terms: Convict: "It can't bring back my loved ones. [clip: Scott: Anderson M.] I lost ten family members while I was incarcerated."

The interviewee is choreographed to execute a coalition identifying Zeta-Jones M. to his rhetorical statement how could he not be excited about getting out of jail after twenty-seven years. '60 Minutes' was drawing a parallel to the elation the Canadian lawyer feels about being emancipated from a trapped environment that has been vicious, malicious and pathetically ridiculous as far back as the late 1980s.

Scott's Greenspan M. to the prosecutor that put Mr. Smith away that there "was evidence that was not given over to the defense" underscored the two privilege claims made by the Crown during the federal lawsuit – upheld by Lemieux J. – that

prevented the truth from emerging about what had happened to the Canadian lawyer going back twenty years.

The geo-politicized question "Worth the wait?" may ring hollow in the ears of someone who spent almost three decades behind bars for a crime that was never committed. However, in the Canadian lawyer's case it is not so rhetorical, since without having become a lab monkey for two decades and been oppressed by a secret totalitarian state he'd never have rose to international prominence and been guaranteed to become the wealthiest person in the world. So he can say with a measure of conviction that it was worth the wait.

The Prince Harry M. to .] "I don't know your philosophy of life but I would assume that you wouldn't take a man's freedom just because you can" was certainly another moment when coalition partners were observed to have a remarkable grasp of the reality of the geo-political situation. The choice of geo-gestures was appropriate – since His Royal Highness is a member of the Commonwealth and taking a person's freedom away within that community of nations with such a strong democratic heritage is a very bizarre circumstance.

The last two geo-politicized remarks were also brilliant; the first a Greenspan-Powell M. to "When you appeared before the parole board what did they say to you?" and an Anderson M. to "All you had to do to get out on parole is to say you did it?" – both referring to the difficulties Canada's malfeasant are going to have when they seek to be released from prison after spending 20, 30, even 40 years locked away for committing some of the most heinous crimes on the books both in Canada and at the United Nations.

Byron's segment on a doctor who helps the poorest of the poor in Third World countries included several geo-politicized remarks. For example, he began with an Adriana M. – always an isolation-deprivation (intimacy) theme. That set the stage for the primary communiqué – since supermodels are always linked to uber-wealth.

But first, Byron generated another instance of coercive diplomacy for those who thought they could engage in what the *Fiefdom* indictment itemizes without repercussions. He inserted a prison certainty image timed to the issue of dying – more Dogville threats of severe punishment. He also turned the phrase "third trimester" into a coalition identifier so the other portion of the segment could generate the communiqué that Canada's so-called invincible, insulated and immune are going to face a "catastrophe" – namely seeing their life's work perpetuating a vile paradigm of governance be destroyed, ending up in prison for life or lengthy periods and having all their wealth confiscated as proceeds of crime.

Then came the communiqué that's been so often articulated; namely, the Canadian lawyer's *quantum*. This time it was phrased thusly:

> "I look at you, 31 years old, medical degree from Harvard, could make a [Eva M.] gazillion dollars back in the States, and you're in Haiti. What do you get out of it?" Pitts asks Walton.

Looking at the amounts generated as a result of the on-going violation of the coalition's order not to torture their Canadian colleague as described in a recent *Fiefdom* treatise supplement *, one could accurately say that he's going to be the world's first 'gazillionaire'.

* *Revisiting Anti-Chinada Coalition Generates International Signpost Regarding the Canadian Lawyer's Compensatory and Punitive Damages Against the Government of Canada and the Country's Trans-Generational and China Complicit Wealthy or How the Country's Wealthy Tortured Their Way to Insolvency*

Dr. Farmer's Remedy For World Health
Byron Pitts Meets A Man Who Dedicates His Life To Bringing Healthcare To The Poor
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/05/01/60minutes/main4063191.shtml

[Adriana M.] The great innovators of our time are said to be the titans of technology - the inventors of the microchip, the founders of Microsoft, the guys behind Google. But far from Silicon Valley another great thinker and innovator is changing the world with far less fanfare. His name is Dr. Paul Farmer.

As Byron Pitts reports, more than 20 years ago Dr. Farmer and a few other great minds created a charity called "Partners In Health." In the years since, they revolutionized the delivery of healthcare worldwide, saving millions of lives in places where no one thought there was any reason for hope.

[prison certainty] "The idea that because you're born in Haiti you could die having a child. The idea that because you're born in you know Malawi your children may go to bed hungry. We want to take some of the chance out of that," Farmer tells Pitts.

[…]

"So this is a 45-year-old woman who has 11 children, who's haemorrhaging right now and has placenta [problems] which some people call a [clip: Byron Prince Harry-Federer M.] third trimester catastrophe. So she's really sick", said the doctor.

[…]

"I look at you, 31 years old, medical degree from Harvard, could make a [Eva M.] gazillion dollars back in the States, and you're in Haiti. What do you get out of it?" Pitts asks Walton.

'60 Minutes': Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again XIII
[April 20, '08]

'60 Minutes' didn't disappoint any coalition partner and didn't fail to anger the malfeasant again on April 20, 2008. CBS Chief Foreign correspondent Lara Logan's talents shined again during the first segment of the broadcast not only for the

general audience but for everyone in the Corridor of Diplomacy dedicated to democracy, human rights, pluralism and free market capitalism. She wove together out of a series of interviews and recollections a fascinating story about an incredible two-day battle between American forces and the Taliban in Afghanistan where the former were completely outnumbered and yet got out to tell the world about it.

And there was no doubt one of the primary objectives was to impress upon them the military solution is still on the President's table of options to achieve coalition goals. She added to the multi-year process of grinding down Canada's leadership and making them recognize their attempt to hide behind sovereign walls and perpetuate a vile, medieval and brutal paradigm of governance was futile and would ultimately lead to purge, punishment and prison.

Green Berets Recount Deadly Taliban Ambush
Special Forces Troops Tell 60 Minutes Taliban Fighters Better Organized Than They Expected
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/04/18/60minutes/main4026734.shtml

Lara: [60 MM] With all the focus on the war in Iraq. [...] A Green Beret Team [60 MM] wanted to talk to us after they were ambushed. [...] [60 MM] This is a story about valor.

[...]

Soldier: [Powell M.] This is the area where the battle took place [Lara: Diaz M.]

[...]

[description of sophisticated Taliban operation]

[O-S M.] So that was a sign this was going to be different?

[...]

Soldier: [describes being hit twice; once in the back of the head and a second time] I had no shoulder. It wasn't connected [Cl.M.] structurally anymore.

[...]

Lara: [Greenspan M.] [listening to audio of fight] You're completely surrounded by Taliban.

Soldier: They were coming to take that compound [clip: Lara: Greenspan M.] that Tom was holding and he would stop them by killing or wounding him.

[...]

[interviews all of them executing a protracted Adriana M.]

[ends with protracted Barbara-Jenna M.]

Morley's segment, The Lost Da Vinci, had one geo-politicized moment beyond the profiled art historian being wardrobed in prison certainty (presidential *quantum*) for his sit-down interview. A clip was added to underscore the Canadian lawyer's current set of opportunities:

The Lost Leonardo Da Vinci
An Art Detective's Quest To Find A Lost Leonardo Da Vinci Masterpiece
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/04/17/60minutes/main4023449.shtml

Forensic Art Historian: This is a lifetime chance. [clip: Morley: Prince Harry M.]

'60 Minutes': Part I: Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again XI
[April 6, '08]

'60 Minutes' ratcheted up the parallels between the invasion of Iraq and the imminent military intervention into Canada to protect coalition and effect its partners' objectives during the April 6, 2008 broadcast.

Insider: Iraq Attack Was Preemptive
Pentagon Insider Tells 60 Minutes U.S. Attack On Iraq Was Anticipatory Self-Defense; Not 9/11 Retaliation
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/04/03/60minutes/main3992653.shtml

From Steve's prison certainty (punishment certainty) attire to the extended video run time on the CBS-60 Minutes website – adding just over a minute to make it exactly **12: 53**, the coalition really went the distance to follow up on the previous week's segment on rendition of the members of the China-Canada military alliance and those helping it from Canada's community of the trans-generationally corrupt in a way that made more imminent bringing the fight to the incorrigibly belligerent.

Before the intro was over, a second communiqué was inserted: "lightning rod for criticism and a magnet for blame" – referring to Canada's leadership and Beijing's illegally present, unwanted, provocative and threatening military brass in America's northern neighbor.

It was made unequivocal again that the coalition is going to take out those who threaten U.S. national and economic security and that of coalition nations:

> Asked why was the decision made to go after Saddam Hussein after 9/11 [Steve: Prince Harry M.], when even then, the United States government realized Saddam didn't have anything to do with the attacks…
>
> […]
>
> Feith explains, "I think it was important [clip: Steve: Prince Harry M.] to go after the people who were responsible for 9/11.

The next geo-politicized remark went to the heart of the relationship between the Canadian lawyer *qua Fiefdom* research treatise author and the Pentagon and the CIA. With the September 11th attacks not coming up on intelligence radar and WMDs not found in Iraq, the Bush administration wasn't going to err with respect to the Chinada threat.

> Feith responds, "It is true that there was a serious error [clip: Steve: Prince Harry M. X2] that the CIA made in saying that we would find WMD stockpiles. And it was a terrible mistake for the administration to have made those stockpiles in any way a part of the case for war. I don't think we needed to."

To prevent any questions about the integrity and accuracy of the intel on Beijing's joint hegemony of Canada and its global expansion drive, the White House wanted the *Fiefdom* treatise to be not just independent, but also seen to be independent. It was critical for a successful coalition building initiative that the President and Secretary of State were able to say with confidence there was no co-mingling of intel assets between the Canadian lawyer and the Pentagon and CIA.

Kroft summarizes some of them, including the possibility that the U.S. could become so [Eva M.] absorbed with its Iraq effort that it would pay inadequate attention to other serious problems; that war could cause more harm and entail greater costs than expected; that it would not go on for two to four years, but eight to 10 years; that terrorist networks could [Eva M.] improve their recruiting and fundraising as a result of the U.S. being depicted as anti-Muslim; that Iraq could experience ethnic strife among Kurds, Sunnis and Shia and that the war could damage America's relationship with allies and its reputation in the world community.

The two Eva M.s were added to underscore (i) that being so distracted with the war on terror and the problems of the Middle East and North Korea it could have been easy for the administration to have ignored or given undue weight to the Chinada problem – a possibility that never materialized in significant measure because of the attention directed at the Canadian lawyer by non-government Coalition members; and (ii) the China-Canada military alliance has been on a recruiting drive around the world and sought resources with which to wage the global hegemony campaign. Canada, being natural resource uber-rich, in large part because of the Alberta oil elephant, would have had the same cashing-up effect as letting al Qaeda have Iraq – mobilizing that extraordinary wealth to fund a protracted war against primarily the United States.

Scott draws a powerful contrast between what the coalition has to commit to rescuing Canada from two embedded parasites and containing and neutralizing the global hegemony initiative and what Chinada forces have to move their agenda forward:

> "One of the things that you [Branson m.] say, was that we didn't have the manpower or the resources to do it," says Kroft.

Even bogged down in Iraq and Afghanistan; even having troops stationed in the Korean DMZ and maintaining commitments in Japan, Germany and elsewhere, the U.S. could, even if it didn't have another government supporting it, could defeat Chinada in Canada and everywhere else. That's the size difference between America and the two adversaries combined.

Nobody in Canada has come forward to articulate what is red flagged in this passage:

> "General Franks basically [called you], the dumbest guy on the face of the planet. Former CIA Director George Tenet called your intelligence evaluations 'total crap.' [Greenspan M.] This isn't normal Washington discourse," says Kroft.

And given how much the coalition has grown in size it can be easily inferred nobody in the international community has either.

Scott's second last geo-topic appears to be asking the Canadian lawyer how he feels about developments since being introduced to the international community in the spring of 2003:

> "Are you [Prince Harry M.] happy with the way things have played out in Iraq?", Pelly asks.

The Canadian lawyer responds pragmatically. Naturally, he would have preferred military force be used just after the August 31, 20065 deadline. But he realizes now to successfully engage in covert regime change sufficient time is needed to fill vacant seats in the Custodian-in-Council, recruit enough to take over for purged government officials and corporate executives, trace plundered wealth for repatriation purposes and map the Chinada network throughout the world so a pre-emptive strike can cut this early 21st century cancer out of civilization and minimize the risk of public disclosure.

The last communiqué was:

> In his memoir [60 MM], Feith doesn't dwell on the terrible human cost of the war, but he clearly has been moved by it.

Scott is right. The Canadian lawyer doesn't put much thought in the *Fiefdom* treatise to what is the really ugly, sickening, side of war. Ask any of the brave men

and women in Iraq and Afghanistan today, or war vets from World War II, Vietnam and Korea what it's like and they'll tell you. Military conflicts are horrifying. Modern media and entertainment has produced a sanitized perception; allowing, for example, lower ranks of the China-Canada military alliance to glorify the fight; are eager to take on the coalition in bloody battle. Yet, when they see their comrades fall or are themselves seriously wounded that image disappears – their idealism vanishes – in an instant; and fear, shock and revulsion set in. It looks, from the pervasive and persistent insolence, arrogance and belligerence, they're going to have to experience military force before they realize just how futile their cause is and how impossible it is to attain their goals. So be it.

'60 Minutes': Part I: Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again X: Formally Labeling Chinada Malfeasant "Enemy Combatants"

[March 30, '08]

Scott's segment on March 30, 2008 was the coalition's most aggressive assertion that the United States and its partners are in a major conflict against the China-Canada military alliance – branding its members "enemy combatants" and threatening to rendition them and subject them to the same kind of harsh treatment and interrogation experienced by suspected and known al Qaeda terrorists.

There was a period of some twenty-six hours between the airing of Scott's segment in the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy and the Canadian lawyer watching it. He taped it Sunday night for viewing the following evening – so the trans-generationally corrupt and the China-Canada military alliance had a full day's notice of its contents and geo-political significance. During that period there was no alteration in the *modus operendi* of criminality, corruption and human rights violations. He experienced non-stop hypno- and noise torture in the theatre; e-mail delivery was sabotaged; and a tapped phone call led to the subject-matter being repeated in a street soldier call fifteen minutes later – all clearly indicating those who are now identified as "enemy combatants" by the United States government and other coalition partners didn't take their designation or its ramifications with any seriousness – and it remains 'business as usual' and full steam global hegemony seeking ahead in the last democratic fiefdom.

What can the malfeasant expect when renditioned? These excerpts are accurate descriptions of what will be experienced by those who *still* think they're invincible, insulated and immune:

He ended up bound and shackled on an American military plane.

[…]

He was kept in an outdoor pen, in sub-freezing weather and interrogated daily.

[…]

"They used to beat me when my head is underwater. They beat me into my stomach and everything," he says.

"They were hitting you in the stomach while you're head was underwater so that you'd have to take a breath?" Pelley asks,

"Right. I had to drink. I had to…how you say it?" Kurnaz replies.

"Inhale. Inhale the water," Pelley says.

"I had to inhale the water. Right," Kurnaz says.

Kurnaz says the Americans used a device to shock him with electricity that made his body go numb. And he says he was hoisted up on chains suspended by his arms from the ceiling of an aircraft hangar for five days.

"Every five or six hours they came and pulled me back down. And the doctor came to watch if I can still survive to not. He looked into my eyes. He checked my heart. And when he said okay, then they pulled me back up," Kurnaz says.

"The point of the doctor's visit was not to treat you. It was to see if you could take another six hours hanging from the ceiling?" Pelley asks.
"Right," Kurnaz says.

"I suspect you know that the U.S. military will deny this happened. The U.S. military will deny that you were shocked. It will deny your head was held in a bucket of water. It will deny that you hung from a ceiling for days at a time," Pelley remarks.

[…]

At Guantanamo Kurnaz says he endured endless months of interrogations, beatings at the hands of soldiers in riot gear, and physical cruelty which included going without sleep for weeks and solitary confinement for up to a month in cells that were sealed without ventilation or were set up to punish him with extreme conditions.

"It's dark inside. No lights. And they can punish you in isolation by coldness or by the heat. They have special air conditioners over there. Very strong. They can turn it very cold or very hot," Kurnaz says.

[…]

[He was] going without sleep for weeks and solitary confinement for up to a month in cells that were sealed without ventilation or were set up to punish him with extreme conditions.

The foregoing is what the nose thumbing psychopaths and militarily threatening can expect once arrested and renditioned. As Scott said during the intro "[O]nce he was picked up [Staul M.], Kurnaz found himself in a prison system that required no evidence and answered to no one". Obviously, the difference with Canadians, Chinese Canadians and Chinese nationals linked to Beijing's imperialistic expansionism is that the CIA and Pentagon, MI6, Interpol and many other intelligence and police agencies will have amassed sufficient evidence to justify the incarcerations.

Scott went on to state:

The story Kurnaz told 60 Minutes [60 MM] correspondent Scott Pelley is a rare look inside that clandestine system of justice, where the government's own secret files reveal that an innocent man lost his liberty, his dignity, his identity, and ultimately five years of his life.

Translation: the malfeasant are going to get a personal tour of "that clandestine system of justice" – a system that will deprive them of their liberty, dignity, identity and decades of their lives if not all of it.

The communiqués that followed were:

"They asked me, 'Where is Osama bin Laden,' and if I am from al Qaeda or from Taliban. [clip: Scott: Greenspan M.] Questions like that. I told them, 'I don't know where is Osama bin Laden, I never saw him and I don't know anything about al Qaeda. I don't know what it is.' And I spent all my time in Pakistan," he says. "What happened next [Erin M.]?", asked Pelley.

Translated, the questions to be asked during interrogation will involve the development, deployment and proliferation of stealth cognition and other technologies designed to undermine democratic government and capitalist institutions and practices, who in government, the military, major corporations and amongst the high profile have become hypno-victims or targets of same, where China-Canada military cells are operating, what their plans are, how they are funded – and a multitude of other matters concerning operations, strategies and objectives.

To Scott's geo-politicized question "What happened next?", the answer is self-evident. The malfeasant are locked away never to see the light of day; never in touch with a lawyer; never leaving their detention facility as long as the Chinada threat remains a reality; presumably twenty to thirty years at minimum.

Next was:

9/11 started with the [clip: Scott: prison certainty (punishment certainty)] Hamburg cell in Germany, everybody in the secret services got crazy," Docke says.

Translated: the "[Chinada threat] started with the [Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal-Vancouver] cell in [Canada], everybody in the [coalition] got [busy renditioning the malfeasant]".

Next came treatment geo-politicizing – what can be expected upon detention:

"They used to beat me when my head is underwater. They beat me into my stomach [clip: Scott: Anderson M.] and everything," he says.

"They were hitting you in the stomach while you're head was underwater so that you'd have to take a breath?" Pelley asks,

"Right. I had to drink. I had to…how you say it?" Kurnaz replies.

"Inhale. Inhale the water," Pelley says.

"I had to inhale the water. Right," Kurnaz says.

Kurnaz says the Americans used a device to shock him with electricity that made his body go numb. And he says he was hoisted up on chains suspended by his arms from the ceiling of an aircraft hangar for five days.
"Every five or six hours they came and pulled me back down. And the doctor came to watch if [clip: Scott: Erin M.] I can still survive to not. He looked into my eyes. He checked my heart. And when he said okay, then they pulled me back up," Kurnaz says.

"The point of the doctor's visit was not to treat you. It was to see if you could take another six hours hanging from the ceiling?" Pelley asks. "Right," Kurnaz says.

"[Z-J M. X2] I suspect you know that the U.S. military will deny this happened. The U.S. military will deny that you were shocked. It will deny your head was held in a bucket of water. It will deny that you hung from a ceiling for days at a time," Pelley remarks.

That imprisonment, shackles and non-stop interrogation that lasts years is an inescapable reality is observed in the **triple** use of the prison certainty pattern in the following dialogue:
"[prison certainty] Tell me about your first meeting with Kurnaz", asked Pelley.

"[prison certainty X2] He was chained to a bolt in the floor around his ankle," Azmy says.

What has made the *Fiefdom* treatise so important is observed in the next geo-politicized portion of Scott's segment:

He [clip: Azmy: Erin M.] dug into the case and found that the military seemed to have invented some of the charges. Military prosecutors said one of Kurnaz's friends was a suicide bomber, but the friend turned up alive and well in Germany.

There is absolutely no possibility of any charges laid against Chinada enemy combatants to have been fabricated. The CIA and Pentagon have gone to extraordinary lengths to not only collect the evidence over a many year period, but also obtained corroboration that is genuinely independent and material to every single allegation.

The next geo-politicized remark is profound in its implications for the freedom of the malfeasant, their rights to lawyers and courts, their ability to contact loved ones and friends and their entitlement to be released once detained:

"This goes to the utter preposterousness of the government's legal process that they established in Guantanamo, this tribunal system that was supposed to differentiate from enemy combatant and civilian. [clip: Scott: Anderson M.] So in order to justify that he was an enemy combatant, they simply made up an allegation about someone he was associated with," Azmy says.

To stress again the shock and horror of the international community as to what the Canadian lawyer went through for twenty years before being discovered – that is paradigmatic of what other victims will experience if the malfeasant aren't marginalized from mainstream society, the diplomatic lexicon was added to this part of Scott's interview with the detainee's lawyer:

"Have you ever in your legal career run across anything like this?" Pelley asks Baher Azmy.

"In my legal career, no," Azmy says. [clip: Scott: Prince Harry M.]

'60 Minutes': Part II: Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again X: Coalition Partners are Feeling "Anger, Fury and Rage" Over the Chinada Alliance Continuing With its Military Posture, Engaging in Militarized Experimentation and Torturing the Canadian Lawyer

[March 30, '08]

Lesley's segment on the March 30, 2008 broadcast of '60 Minutes' featured Al Gore and highlighted his global climate change mission. However, within it was a very deep-felt message to Canada's trans-generationally corrupt and the Beijing leadership.

Fourteen months later the coalition through Lesley sought to deliver its condemnation – again for failing to capitulate to ongoing demands the China-Canada military alliance stand down its military posture, halt the militarized human experimentation program and stop torturing the Canadian lawyer with its products.

During the sit-down interview Lesley didn't just execute a Clooney M., she grabbed her nose and held on long enough to highlight the phrase "anger, fury and rage" in

italics, bold and underscore; referring to how threatened coalition partners are feeling and for being ignored all these years.

To whom that communiqué was directed would respond with the argument that despite all the diplomacy, they're still in power, still in possession of their wealth and still able to move freely about the planet without any encumbrances – so to them it's just more hot air; more ranting and raving without anything to back it up. To them, they're the victors and will remain on the offensive and continue their 'business as usual' paradigm of governance in perpetuity.

While that attitude of invincibility and impunity persists, the international community feels confident in the transfer of authority to the Custodian-in-Council, which had the effect of stripping their sovereign immunity; are confident in the progress they've made expanding the size of the coalition; confident in the progress they've made tracing malfeasant assets and mapping their web of spies, operatives and street soldiers; and are confident in the assemblage of C-in-C members who are ready when called upon to undertake interim Canadian governance.

There was more in Lesley's segment on the Gores. Tipper executed an Aussie M. as the report began, timed to Lesley's observation about what happened in an airport when Al was approached by an elder who sought the former Vice President's opinion on the presidential race. She observed "We were in the San Jose airport and [A.M.] a man came over to you and asked you 'who are you supporting?"; the Gore's way of acknowledging again they are backing the Canadian lawyer and the coalition.

When the veteran investigative reporter and the former V-P filmed in his study, reviewing his climate change information on his laptop, the latter executed an Olmert-Spielberg M. timed as follows:

> As he showed us in his office, when he talks [O-S M.] to Evangelical Christians, he includes passages from the Bible. […] Gore is trying to define this as a moral and spiritual issue.

Lesley also traveled to India with the former V-P; filming on the streets of one of its cities. She articulated her feelings, shared by many, that what is required to address the climate change issue gargantuan; that its so huge it would make anyone wonder where should one begin; where should attention, energy and resources be focused? She geo-politicized the comment "It's so daunting [Kernan M.]" to underscore that the threat Chinada poses is of the same calibre of problematic.

Arguably one of the primary differences is that pollution and greenhouse gases are emitted by every single nation in the world. China's intended targets to expand its sphere of control and influence are currently limited to countries with natural and strategic resources and having militarily strategic locations.

Additionally, climate change is a brand new problem and there are as yet no tried, tested and true sets of methodologies to address it in ways that don't have massive downsides. By contrast, the Western Alliance just spent forty years battling and winning the Cold War; and the global conflict against radical Islamist fundamentalism over the last seven years produced a tight-knit collection of previously unconnected governments, military agencies and intelligence and law enforcement communities.

While the 21st century WMD is new, the threat of imperialistic expansionism by an anti-democratic nation isn't; and containment and neutralization methods are pretty much the same now as they were between 1945 and the late 1980s: arrest, lengthy detention (now rendition) and clandestine assassination to dismantle networks of operatives and asset seizure after tracing and discovering where they the wealth used to finance aggressions are. The coalition has not only a plethora of technologies, techniques, strategies and tactics developed during the Soviet threat that will be successfully used, new technologies and innovations and up-grades to existing capabilities have come online in the late 1990s and throughout the 2000s.

Finally, during the interview Tipper said of her husband in relation to the loss of the 2000 election and the emotional fallout that he began "immersing himself" in the new project. A clip of him and his family leaving church was inserted here and the phrase was timed to him executing a Terminator M.; the geo-point being the Canadian lawyer, who ought to have been wracked with numbing angst over his predicament, committed himself full-time to coalition interests and objectives to mitigate the emotions that would have otherwise consumed him.

Al Gore's New Campaign
Tells 60 Minutes That Doubting Global Warming Is Man-Made Is Akin To Believing Earth Is Flat
March 30, 2008
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/03/27/60minutes/main3974389.shtml

----

'60 Minutes': Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again VIII
[March 16, '08]

The March 16, 2008 broadcast made Canada's holdouts look like desperate, clinically sociopathic perverts who are so addicted to power, wealth and immorality that they'd risk their reputation with family members who don't know about their secret lives, all their assets and their freedom to keep doing what has shocked the conscience of the original coalition partnership and all new members.

Even after a new partner, veteran actor Dennis Quaid, used his "fifteen minutes" of 60 Minutes fame in a most diplomatically coercive way, the malfeasant persisted with their *All or Nothing* philosophy of governance and life.

It was palpable again just how threatened and fearful the coalition is about stealth cognition technologies and the military power of money during this broadcast of '60 Minutes' and the lengths the partnership will go to in order to contain and neutralize the China-Canada military alliance. They not only recruited another multi-decade Hollywood actor to be their spokesperson, but gave him the green light to be as coercive as he could in the circumstances. For example, he executed a compensation ratifying **five** Clooney M.s to "would not stop bleeding", when discussing the medical crisis his twin infants went through – seeking to graphically portray a malfeasant who took up arms during the military intervention and had to be immobilized by coalition forces. And his wife also generated the same kind of communiqué.

Dennis Quaid Recounts Twins' Drug Ordeal
Actor Tells 60 Minutes' Steve Kroft Medical Errors Kill Thousands
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/03/13/60minutes/main3936412.shtml

There was blood oozing out of little blood draws on their feet, and things like that, [Mrs. Quaid: Diaz M.]…

'60 Minutes' producers again stressed their amazement at the lack of introspection on the part of Canada's corrupt and the Beijing leadership about what's going on around them:
[60 MM] Dennis Quaid has starred in more than 50 films, but nothing prepared him for the drama and the near tragedy.

[…]
But this mistake occurred right under our noses, that the nurse [Prince Harry M.] didn't bother to look at the dosage on the bottle…

[…]

And you got the nurses that looked at it - or didn't look at it [Erin M.] - and put it in the IV line. Three people," Kroft says.

There were two communiqués as a result of Scott's 60 Minutes M.:

Sinai hospital in Los Angeles, when his infant twins were given massive overdoses of a blood thinner that nearly killed them.

[60 MM] Until now, Quaid and his wife, Kimberly, have kept most of their thoughts and many of the details private.

Either they were underscoring again that the geo-politics involving Chinada is to remain diplomatically confidential or it was a threat of military force and 'Iron Fist' tribunal punishment options – or both.

What the coalition is seeking to achieve was brilliantly articulated:

"[Diaz M.] Risk management," his wife adds.

When 60 Minutes saw them [babies both prison certainty] a few weeks ago at the Quaids' house in Pacific Palisades, Thomas Boone and Zoe Grace were almost four months old

The now four year old theme of protecting the next generation from the scourge of authoritarianism was inserted again. It will be recalled this concern was added during an April 2006 'West Wing' episode
xxx
"Where are the kids?", the Senator asks. The two are choreographed with the background to stand to the left and right of two red and white jackets on a coat wall rack – to in effect envelop Canada's colors with a message indicating the importance of protecting today's children and future generations. The imagery of both Coalition malfeasor encirclement and guaranteed children safety could not have been more noticeable.

Source: *How The West Wing Again Pushed Hard and Relentlessly for Capitulation, Compensation and Change in the Last Democratic Fiefdom*

The Quaids agreed to attire their twins in prison certainty – another message that threatening this generation and the next has several consequences.
Lesley's second segment was on the effects of sleep deprivation. The theme immediately gave rise to thoughts of a 2006 *Fiefdom* chapter:

'60 Minutes': Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again VII

[March 9, '08]

True to form – i.e. commitment to coalition interests and objectives – executives and producers of '60 Minutes' showed once more time on March 9, 2008, that there's going to be no let-up of diplomatic efforts and tenacious actions. While some may see futility, the ol' Sorkin peripheral vision concludes that one day coalition partners will look back and see Coalition initiatives efficacious. What will be most telling of that? Their billionaire lifestyles and the rush that comes with recalling those who mocked them thinking they were invincible, insulated and immune are languishing and will forever be in prison and working their bones to aching on a daily chain gang.

Three segments – three great topics with which to geo-politicize. Lesley's segment on the multi-billionaire and coalition partner Carl Icahn put the Canadian lawyer in the upper echelons of uber-wealth and economic clout. Bob's piece on a man mistakenly convicted and having spent twenty-six years in jail delivered that all important perspective on what happens after arrest, prosecution and 'Iron Fist' tribunal sentencing. And Scott's interview of now Republican presidential candidate John McCain pummelled the malfeasant with a multitude of communiqués on various topics and which began by asserting the Pentagon and CIA are aware of the

fact the Canadian lawyer's dodged several assassination attempts – which he credits to the international persona generated, maintained and strengthened by the coalition.

After Lesley's intro, Carl employed the Coalition lexicon to describe what he knows of the Canadian lawyer's intentions – Canada's early 21st century Robin Hood. And he added to the chorus of coalition partners who are calling for a full purge of public and private sector decision makers.

The Icahn Lift
60 Minutes' Lesley Stahl Profiles The Billionaire Investor
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/03/06/60minutes/main3915473.shtml

If you have money in the stock market, chances are Carl Icahn has helped improve your bottom line through what's called the "Icahn lift." That's the upward bounce that typically happens when he starts buying up a stock. He is such a sure fire money maker that investment managers, like the ones who run your mutual fund or 401k, often follow his lead.

But these [60 MM] are dark times for investors. The Dow Jones has slid over 1,000 points since the first of the year. Icahn has said, [60 MM] "The market is falling off a precipice…the free ride is over, the punch bowl is dry!"
So, you'd think he's [60 MM] tearing his hair out, but as correspondent Lesley Stahl found out, he's not: Icahn tends to thrive when the markets go down. He pounces when everyone else is losing their shirts.

[…]

Now - all of a sudden - he's Robin Hood, [clip: Ichan Bernanke M.] making money for the little guy, and crusading for ways to make American companies more competitive. He says we're losing our edge because U.S. corporations are bloated with heavy bureaucracies and rampant waste.

[…]

"Do you have a yacht?, inquires Stahl. Yea, we have a yacht, but we don't use it much", he replied. "You got alot of houses?" "Yea we do, but we don't go". "Can she have anything she wants?" Stahl asked. "She takes it," Icahn said, laughing. "She doesn't ask me, you know. I have no idea what she buys.

"[Erin M.] But why do you care?"

I just wouldn't like somebody fritting away money", he responds.

"[Greenspan M.] I mean you still have it. [Anthony M.] You still have $14 billion, and she still wants to go..."

[…]

He wanted the respected CEO Richard Parsons replaced, along with all the other directors, and the company [clip: Ichan Thalia M.] split into four parts. Icahn didn't get his way. It was David vs. Goliath, and Goliath won.

"There are people who say that you got in over your head [clip: Ichan: Erin M.] with Time Warner. That you didn't understand that business," Stahl remarked.

"It's a little bit of he who laughs last. I mean, well you know, maybe I made a mistake but I made $300 million on it. So is that too bad? Okay. I mean you know, so I guess I was wrong," he said.

He was wrong in the shareholders' eyes: they backed CEO Richard Parsons, who had argued [clip: Ichan: Erin M.] that Icahn didn't care about the quality of the company's movies or magazines [Prince Harry M.] - or its people.

"You just looked at the bottom line. Did you care about the products or the people?" Stahl asked.

"I do care about the people, I do care it, but I care about it in a macro way 'cause I see our country going off a cliff. Okay? And I feel bad about it," Icahn replied.

"[Pelley M.] I'm asking you this because one of the big raps against you is that what Carl Icahn wants to do is go in and get a fast, quick profit out of the company. And he doesn't think down the road," Stahl said.

Bob's segment on an innocent man kept in prison despite exculpatory evidence in the possession of lawyers had parallels with the Canadian lawyer's predicament and coalition partners utilized this opportunity to make several key points on his behalf.

First, was that partners knew his representations made in the federal lawsuit and in *Fiefdom* treatise supplementals were true and those he pointed the finger at were not:

> Attorneys Dale Coventry and Jamie Kunz knew Logan had [clip: lawyer: Bl.M.] good reason to think that, because they knew he was innocent.

Another carefully choreographed interviewed generated the communiqué that only the guilty will be prosecuted and sentenced by the coalition's tribunal:

"[Bl.M.] He was pleased that the wrong guy had been charged'.

And producers used clever editing techniques to argue on the Canadian lawyer's behalf that he could speak out – that he wasn't going to remain silent and let the country be governed by a bunch of schadenfreude addicted pubescent sociopaths:

> So that was the [clip: lawyer: Bl.M.] dilemma. They couldn't speak out, they felt, but how could they remain silent?

The same editing created this prison certainty communiqué:

…he was [clip: lawyer: Bl.M.] sentenced to life in prison…

Choreographing the convicts brothers showed the empathy that the Canadian lawyer's witnessed going back to 2004:

> His brothers Eugene and Tony told 60 Minutes they've shared Alton's pain [clip: brother: Pacino M.; Z-J M. X2

26-Year Secret Kept Innocent Man In Prison
Lawyers Tell 60 Minutes They Were Legally Bound From Revealing Secret
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/03/06/60minutes/main3914719.shtml

This is a story about an innocent man who has been in prison for 26 years while two attorneys who knew he was innocent stayed silent. They did so because they felt they had no choice.

[…]

Attorneys Dale Coventry and Jamie Kunz knew Logan had [clip: lawyer: Bl.M.] good reason to think that, because they knew he was innocent. And they knew that because their client, Andrew Wilson, who they were defending for killing two policemen, confessed to them that he had also killed the security guard at McDonald's - the crime Logan was charged with committing.

"[Bl.M.] He was pleased that the wrong guy had been charged. It was like a game and he'd gotten away with something. But there was just no doubt whatsoever that it was true. I mean I said, 'It was you with the shotgun-you killed the guy?' And he said, 'Yes,' and then he giggled," Coventry added.

[clip: lawyer: protracted Bl.M.] The problem was the killer was their client. So, legally, they had to keep his secret even though an innocent man was about to be tried for murder.

"I know a lot of people who would say, 'Hey if the guy's innocent you've got to say so. You can't let him rot because of that,'" Simon remarked.

"Well, the vast majority of the public apparently believes that, but if you check with attorneys or ethics committees or you know anybody who knows the rules of conduct for attorneys, it's very, very clear-it's not morally clear-but we're in a position to where we have to maintain client confidentiality, just as a priest would or a doctor would. It's just a requirement of the law. The system wouldn't work without it," Coventry explained.

So that was the [clip: lawyer: Bl.M.] dilemma. They couldn't speak out, they felt, but how could they remain silent?

[…]

"But instead he was [clip: lawyer: Bl.M.] sentenced to life in prison, and you did not do anything?" Simon asked.

[…]

"[Bl.M.] Yes," Kunz said. "I can't explain it. I don't know why that made the difference but I know it did."

[…]

"What did you do to see if there might be some loophole to get everyone out of this fix?" Simon asked the attorneys.

"I researched the ethics [other lawyer: protracted Rooney M.] of attorney-client privilege as much as I could. I contacted people who are involved in making those determinations. I know Jamie did the same thing," Coventry said.

[…]

"Everything that was dear to me is gone," Logan, who missed his mother's funeral, told Simon.

His brothers Eugene and Tony told 60 Minutes they've shared Alton's pain [clip: brother: Pacino M.; Z-J M. X2], and they always knew that he was no killer. "My brother ain't got the nature to do nothin' like that in his soul. He ain't gonna take nobody else's life. We weren't raised like that," Tony said.

Scott articulated what was, as he stated of the Canadian lawyer's life, a "near death experience" – almost being a victim of surreptitious assassination without culpability. And producers added a clip that generated the communiqué that the Canadian lawyer protected the United States from the dangers inherent in Chinada imperialism.

Scott's use of the lexicon also underscored that Canada's political leaders and corporate titans are "too naïve" to be in their positions and thus have to, for that additional reason, be purged.

The following was lexiconically flagged: "How did we lose our way [Prince Harry M.]?" Pelley asked; and "I don't know the answer to that. [clip: Scott: Prince Harry M.]. According to all coalition partners the answer to that question is contained in the *Fiefdom* treatise.

Scott, with the Senator's permission, fired a salvo at Canada's malfeasant that had the same condemnation as the phrase "pubescent sociopaths"; calling them all "stupid".

‘60 Minutes’ on behalf of the entire coalition partnership also indicated what the President has stressed repeatedly, namely that the U.S. and its anti-Chinada allies have a “moral responsibility” to defeat the expansion of authoritarianism.

Two more points are made: one, that the *Fiefdom* treatise is correct when it says the entire paradigm of governance, the “system” is corrupt; and two, “people who bring their case to government”, in this case the world government” are “honorable people”, referring to the Canadian lawyer.

And finally, producers articulate on behalf of all partners that they are angry when they see how badly Canada’s governing structure has become.

McCain Looks Ahead
60 Minutes’ Scott Pelley Interviews The Presumptive GOP Presidential Candidate
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/03/07/60minutes/main3917681.shtml

It is an immutable law of American politics that the candidate with the most money wins the nomination. But Tuesday that ended when John McCain, nearly broke at one point, became, in effect, the Republican nominee. [60 MM] The life of John McCain is the story of one near-death experience after another, both literally and in terms of his career. How appropriate that he hails from a town called Phoenix.

[…]

"I can make a case that less government, lower taxes, less regulation, safer America is what [clip: Scott: Greenspan-Prince Harry M.] I can give America. But I don’t underestimate the size of the challenge," McCain replied.

[…]

"You’re saying that Senator Obama doesn’t have the experience? That he’s too naïve to be president? [Prince Harry M.]" Pelley asked.

"No, I am saying that I have that. And if the phone rings at 3:00a.m., I think the American people would want me to answer it first," McCain replied.
[…]

"How did we lose our way [Prince Harry M.]?" Pelley asked.

"I don’t know the answer to that. [clip: Scott: Prince Harry M.]

[…]

"Back in 1992, [Greenspan M.] Bill Clinton had a sign hanging in his campaign war room, a pretty famous sign. Do you recall what it said?" Pelley asked. "It’s the economy, stupid. Yes," McCain replied.

[…]

"Senator Clinton says that providing universal healthcare is [Greenspan M.] quote 'a moral responsibility.' Do you agree?" Pelley asked.
[…]

"Well, one of the reasons why I call the system corrupt is because we have members of Congress who are in jail, who are former members of Congress. But it's not the individuals, it's the [Scott: Prince Harry M.] system we have today. I believe that I serve with honorable men and women. And I believe the people who bring their case to government, the overwhelming majority of them are honorable people," [Scott: Greenspan-Erin M.] McCain said. […] "I get angry when I see things go wrong. [clip: Scott: Prince Harry M.].

'60 Minutes': Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again V

[February 17, '08]

How can one tell the coalition is going to persevere until victory for democracy, human rights, pluralism and free market capitalism? Just keep watching '60 Minutes'.

Since coalition partners haven't yet heard "Uncle!" from the malfeasant, they're entitled to conclude the global hegemony threat is real, stealth cognition technologies continue to be pursued, the China-Canada military alliance still works daily on expanding Beijing's sphere of military, political and economic sphere of control and influence worldwide and Canada's trans-generationally corrupt have absolutely no intention of halting their nefarious, bizarre and perverse ways. That is why the February 17, 2008 broadcast of '60 Minutes' was again full of Coalition ubiquity generating geo-politically relevant communiqués.

In Scott's* segment on a surgery drug that was seriously injuring and killing people, he wore prison certainty throughout to keep the 'Dogville' message front-and-center that Canada's corrupt and those working for the secret alliance will be taken out of mainstream society for the benefit of all who want to live in peace and security and enjoy the prosperity their labors deliver.

If those who knew they had 'Dogville' bulls eyes on their foreheads thought the coercive diplomacy in that regard was going to subside eventually, they were wrong.

One Thousand Lives A Month

Researcher Estimates 22,000 Lives Could Have Been Saved Had Trasylol Been Pulled Earlier
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/02/14/60minutes/main3831900.shtml

> "It showed an important association between Trasylol use and kidney failure requiring dialysis, Mangano tells Pelley, [clip: Scott: Anderson M.] "And it showed a trend toward increased death in hospital in these patients."

And if they thought the Canadian lawyer wasn't going to continue to be showered with credibility-maintaining accolades to help the coalition achieve its primary goals – wrong again:

> "The most common problem we saw was renal failure. That is, that kidneys did not function properly after surgery," says the Missouri Baptist Medical Center's Dr. Nicholas Kouchoukos, [clip: Scott: Bl.M.] one of this country's top heart surgeons.

Selecting a diplomatic lexicon embedding wardrobe for an interviewed expert was in evidence – and introduced at a moment when another communiqué could be generated; this time seemingly suggesting the Canadian lawyer would be at the head of the Custodian-in-Council board room table.

> In 2006, Mangano presented his study to the FDA's advisory committee; cardiologist Dr. William Hiatt [prison certainty - chain link fence] chairs that committee and ran the meeting.

The invitation, if there was one, was appreciated. However, he's already deferred to others in the international community who would make extraordinary interim heads of federal and provincial governance.

The next point was already discussed in the previous chapter acknowledging the introduction of the Pelley M.:

> [Scott: namesake gesture] Why would Bayer withhold this information from Hiatt's committee?
>
> "They claim that the data wasn't ready for review," Hiatt says. "There were lots of reasons that they claimed. But again, I can't speculate. The reality is we didn't have the data."
>
> "[namesake gesture] They weren't being honest with you?" Pelley asks.

The geo-political point Scott *et al.* were making was accurate; namely, the two agendas – domestic and foreign – were top secret and thus all information was being withheld. The Federal Court lawsuit was one example of the clandestine nature of everything itemized in the *Fiefdom* indictment.

And nobody in the public or private sector, from the evidence, has been honest with members of the coalition about what they've been up to. It had to be researched, carefully examined, intel collected, a lawsuit prosecuted and reactions to the findings acquired.

'60 Minutes': Part I: Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again IV

[January 6, '08]

For the first episode of 2008, January 6, 2008, Lara was as extraordinary as ever, this time in her role as world leader interviewer. Mike pushed the issue of investigative techniques to be used on soon-to-be arrested and interrogated members of Canada's triangle of power and wealth. Steve hosted what is likely the most diplomatically coercive segment ever produced by '60 Minutes'. And Andy humbly confessed nothing ever of consequence would be named after him; that is, until the Rooney M..

John Martorano: The Executioner

Steve Kroft Interviews Triggerman Of Boston's Notorious Winter Hill Gang
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/01/03/60minutes/main3672273.shtml

The Bush administration and many world leaders are seriously concerned about the China-Canada military alliance's capabilities and will stop at nothing to contain and neutralize this advanced set of militarized technologies, techniques, strategies and tactics to which there are as yet no efficacious defensive measures.

An East-West theatre audience member would be hard-pressed to find a '60 Minutes' segment that tops the amount and kind of Dogville-style coercive diplomacy that was scripted in it. The topic – interviewing a mob hit man with some twenty notches on his belt of accomplishments. The use of the diplomatic lexicon had one purpose in mind; namely, articulate the fact that the coalition is resigned if necessary to use assassination, military force during the purge and 'Iron Fist' executions to achieve its objectives – as simple and as direct as that.

Here's a list of every diplomatically coercive moment – exactly **eight** – each of which having the purpose of articulating that a Dogville-style solution will, by the already enumerated means, result if there's no capitulation, verifiable accounting of the Pandora's Box, etc.:

(i) Intro: Martorano, a [60 MM] former Catholic altar boy and high school football star, became a cool and calculating killer.

(ii) Steve: A lot of people would say you're a serial killer [Kroft M.].

(iii) Steve: [Cl.M.] "That's Ed - big Ed", he said, looking at a high school year book picture of them on the football team. He promised Bradley he would sit down with him and tell his story, but Ed died…

(iv) Steve: I mean, on one occasion, you [Kroft M.] walked into a crowded bar…and shot [Kroft M.] somebody. In broad daylight

(v) Steve: Anybody go down there and never come up? [clip: Martorano: Cl.M.]

(vi) Steve: You shoot him between the eyes [Anderson M.].

(vii) Steve: Do you think that John Connolly knew that [Kroft M.] you were gonna kill Callahan?

(viii) Killer: At one point, maybe a couple years ago, I [clip: Steve: Prince Harry M.] sent for a priest and gave him a confession

There was one exception. One other matter was raised:

Killer: The only thing worse than this deal was not [pleading out my crimes]. 'Cause if we didn't do this deal, no one would receive any punishment for these murders. Corrupt law enforcement arrangements would not have been uncovered and prosecuted. And the cancer in law enforcement that existed in Boston for a number of years would have remained there.

Steve: [quasi-Anderson M.] So you're saying it changed the landscape of organized crime in Boston?

The geo-political purpose of this section was to underscore the shocking kinds and degrees of systemic corruption in Canada's law enforcement community both on the federal and local level. If what Canada's rich, powerful and the invited Chinese military's *Fiefdom* indictment wasn't enough to horrify the international community, complicity by the country's cops was over the top unbelievable and stunning.

'60 Minutes' Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again III

[December 9, '07]

'60 Minutes' executives and producers, not to mention Sumner Redstone and Les Moonves, must be thoroughly convinced that the end result of the geo-political conflict will be resolved in favor of the United States and its assemblage of nations, multi-national corporations, the wealthy and high profile to continue dedicating time, resources and energy in producing communiqués.

Gorillas: Kings Of Congo

CNN's Anderson Cooper Visits Endangered Mountain Gorillas
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/12/07/60minutes/main3591264.shtml

The December 9, 2007 broadcast was again a major platform for the coalition, which was used by the coalition as a means of employing the art of persuasion to achieve peacefully *albeit* very slowly what a combined military intervention and plethora of economic sanctions, asset seizures and strategic arrests and renditions would produce swiftly. Clearly, the partnership feels there is value in employing the diplomatic lexicon – firing salvoes of coercive diplomacy at the malfeasant although fully aware they are seriously inefficacious. The Canadian lawyer can only

conclude again that the utility is in filling the diplomatic evidence record with proof of intransigence, arrogance and belligerence so as to recruit more world leaders, more multi-nationals, more wealthy individuals and more super celebrities as part of the campaign to contain China and fix Canada.

The headliner was Anderson's segment on endangered African simians. The intro began by articulating a penultimate compliment. Using a 60 Minutes M., the on-loan CNN anchor and correspondent said, paraphrasing, "It's hard to imagine a more magnificent human being than the Canadian lawyer". Arguably, there isn't any further up the international admiration chain than that. Thereafter it was all about impressing upon his enslavers, experimenters, deprivers and torturers that the Dogville solution to the Chinada problem continues to be viable. Between the date of the broadcast and the authorship of this chapter it was evident that they were taken as hollow threats.

In the intro Anderson uses a 60 Minutes M. to articulate the prediction that Canada's leadership will "become extinct" – ignored. During the segment clever editing of a park ranger executing a Brooke M. was timed to "The next day they found the body of the family's leader" – ignored. His next threat with an Erin M. "And then a month later the Rugendo family was decimated" – ignored. There was an inserted Branson M. to "[the] rangers are outnumbered and outgunned" – ignored. And finally there was a combination Clooney and Pacino M. to "there is something which is not going well here" – ignored too. Impenetrably stupid? How else does one describe the intended recipients of this and what is now a year and a half of coercive diplomacy?

'60 Minutes': Part II: Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again III

[December 2, '07]

Consistency in most everything that is good is a virtue; which makes '60 Minutes' exceptionally virtuous. The December 2, 2007 broadcast continued to remind Canada's happily sociopathic that the coalition is not going away until every one of its objectives are fully achieved.

What is now standard practice, the post-preview segment where the iconic investigative correspondents are introduced, was again a medium to deliver the message that prison is a certainty. There were exactly **three** of them who said that using the diplomatic lexicon: Steve, Lesley and Bob.

Vicar: Dire Times For Iraq's Christians

Tells 60 Minutes Most Of Iraq's Christians Have Fled Or Been Killed
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/11/29/60minutes/main3553612.shtml

It was only a matter of time before another particular choice of words employed by the Canadian lawyer authoring the *Fiefdom* treatise would be adopted and reflected back into the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy to prove the pivotal and pinnacle

role the President's Canadian ally has within the coalition through a ratification of his views and to deliver specific communiqués that underscore the unwavering commitment to coalition goals. '60 Minutes' producers decided on the first Sunday of December 2007 that the topic *du jour* was the 'purge' portion of the 'purge & punish' formula of democratization.

Harnessing that uber-genius, uber-creativity that almost unbelievably reoccurs all the time in American coalition partners was evident during the intro of Scott's segment on the bare survival of Christianity in Muslim-dominated Iraq. There was no mistaking or avoiding the implications of the graphic backdrop – a Clash of Civilizations M. embedded in what the public saw as two fists holding rosary beads to symbolize the segment's topic. That was corroborative of the title and graphic to his story. In big bold letters the East-West theater audience saw: "The Purge" with lettering in red on a black background and with white rosary beads; in other words, Canadian punishment certainty – and knew *exactly* what was being communicated.

Producers decided the message was so powerful, it could stand alone. There wasn't any need for additional gesturing by Scott during the intro as is so often the case.

Because the setting was one of the most dangerous places to be in the world, producers exploited that context for geo-political purposes. During his interview of a Reverend he saw an opportunity to draw parallels between what Canada's malfeasant experience now and what they can expect in the not to distant future that has major historic implications:

> Reverend: There's no comparison between Iraq now and then. Things are the most difficult [clip: Scott: Prince Harry M.] they have ever been for Christians. Probably ever in history. They've never known it like now."

Aware of the carnage that's been caused under the brutal rule of Canada's trans-generationally corrupt, the coalition through the '60 Minutes' medium comforted the Canadian lawyer and those privy to coalition communiqués who are as horrified as he and his international colleagues that in due course the pain, suffering, loss and death will inevitably and remarkably subside after the purge is undertaken. The message was embedded in an interview with U.S. Army Colonel Rick Gibbs:

> Scott: I was at a secret church service yesterday. A man came up to me and handed me some photographs of his children. They'd been shot to death. Somebody had come by their house and murdered his children because they were Christians. What are you seeing [Prince Harry M.]?
>
> Colonel: I don't see a lot of that anymore. But when we first arrived we saw lots of that.

Since the purge requires a military intervention by coalition forces, Scott *et al.* included that in the series of communiqués embedded in the segment:

Scott: A Baghdad Christian, whose name we cannot use. [clip: Scott: Greenspan M.] He says that after the invasion, posters appeared near his home.

Interviewee: They were like telling us that Christians were against Islam, that we're infidels, that [clip: Scott: protracted Dayna M.] women shouldn't drive and a woman that doesn't wear a scarf would get her head cut off. And I thought, 'What, are we going back to the Middle Ages?'

There were several reasons for this inserted clip with its extended geo-gesture: producers focusing on the "infidels" characterization that Islamists give to Americans – creating a parallel between their seething hatred for the U.S. that is comparable in scope and intensity as that harbored and displayed so often in history and in contemporary times by Canada's elite; a very aggressive instance of extreme coercive diplomacy, seeking to convey how livid coalition partners are that their diplomacy has been not only ignored but turned into propaganda rallying fodder; and seeking to underscore the 14th century character of Canada's 'fiefdom' paradigm of governance.

'60 Minutes': Part I: Multiple Geo-Topics and Communiqués Yet Again II

[December 2, '07]

Consistency in most everything that is good is a virtue; which makes '60 Minutes' exceptionally virtuous. The December 2, 2007 broadcast continued to remind Canada's happily sociopathic that the coalition is not going away until every one of its objectives are fully achieved.

What is now standard practice, the post-preview segment where the iconic investigative correspondents are introduced, was again a medium to deliver the message that prison is a certainty. There were exactly **three** of them who said that using the diplomatic lexicon: Steve, Lesley and Bob.

Will Smith: My Work Ethic Is "Sickening"
StarTells Steve Kroft It Compensates For Average Talent
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/11/30/60minutes/main3558937.shtml

Steve's intro to the segment on Will Smith began with usage of the diplomatic lexicon to emphasize the unique character of the Canadian lawyer's road never traveled – one that deserves the highest of recognition, honors and tributes and gargantuan *quantum*:

> Of [60 MM] all the stories in Hollywood, there is not another one like Will Smith's. At age 39, he has already had three successful careers: Grammy award winning rapper, sitcom sensation, and finally one of the biggest movie stars on the planet.

> With [60 MM] two Oscar nominations and almost four and a half billion dollars in box office receipts to his credit, a movie starring Will Smith is about as close as you get to having a sure thing, whether it's science fiction, romantic comedy, or a summer blockbuster.

A lot was geo-politicized during the segment. Steve *et al.* decided to turn this one into a major tag-team between a superstar Hollywood actor and a superstar investigative reporter broadcasting a special interest story on a superstar news program. The next geo-political reference was either that Canada's triangle operators and their Chinese partners had put themselves in military and international justice harm's way or that they were dangerous and had to be dealt with substantively and conclusively – with a measurable degree of finality. The second was a Sorkin China Culpability Identifier and the identifier. The third predicted the kind of life the Canadian lawyer's going to have after taking possession of his *quantum*.

Will: I had a hit single on the radio for 30 days before I graduated from high school. And that's dangerous [laughs]. You don't want to have a hit record on the radio when you're in high school."

Steve: [Erin M.] Dangerous in what way?

Will: It just seemed easy. The tide turned somewhat at 19. The IRS came and took all my stuff [laughs]. They were talkin' about I didn't send them no money, you know. And I mean, I didn't but I just didn't think it didn't need to be such a big issue."

Steve: How much did they want?

Will: I think -- I was-- it said **2.8** or something like that.

Steve: How much did you have?

Will: I had $2.**83** [laughs].

Steve: So, you went through five, six million dollars?

Will: Probably, yeah.

Scott: [Prince Harry M.] Did you have fun?

Will: Oh, I had a really, really good time. It was the best blown money ever.

The tag-team continued, with two points being made:

Will: [N]o one ever thought to ask me if I could act [laughs].

Steve: Did you have to audition; did you have to perform [Erin M.]?

Will: The first time that I performed as an actor was the first day on the set of 'The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air's.

Scott: [Erin M.] NBC must have been desperate.

Will: Yeah [laughs].

The first was confirming that in order to obtain the respect, admiration and adoration of the coalition – and all the benefits that accrued as a result, like the entirety of his *quantum*, love interest companionship, corporate opportunities and political leadership of Canada, the Canadian lawyer had to work tenaciously, resolutely and make virtually no mistakes; which he did much to the constant surprise and full appreciation of all.

The second was an acknowledgment that the geo-political circumstances put partners in the position of frantically hoping he'd work out – meet the plethora and complex of expectations placed upon him since the stakes were exorbitantly high. The possibility of failure or coming up unacceptably short was omnipresent and they didn't have anyone else in Canada who was in such a unique position (like Gandhi and Mandela *viz.* their country's respective exigent circumstances: abusive British colonization and Apartheid) – one that could be leveraged into a capitulation or face serious consequences diplomatic tract; and leading to achieving all three primary objectives.

Steve certainty captured the essence of the Canadian lawyer's experiences, both well before emerging from his Dogville-trapped environment and certainly what his future is reasonably predicted to be:

Scott: [voiceover] Instead of falling on his face, the performance was hailed as extraordinary and one of the year's best. And the critical acclaim was soon followed by box office success by stealing the largest grossing film of 1996, as Captain Steven Hiller in "Independence Day."

Will: It was one of those moments where I just realized my life was changed forever. [clip: Scott: CBS-Erin M.]

A quick Thalia M. added in the following dialogue was enough to generate a description of Canada's paradigm of governance and the essential personality of those who rule the country:

Scott: How did [life] change [after 'Independence Day' was a success]?

Will: You know, it was *so* bizarre. [clip: Scott: Thalia M.] 'Cause the Fresh Prince of Bel-Air is on, and people scream, 'Will! Will! Will!' And on Monday morning, when the box office receipts for 'Independence Day' came out, I was Mr. Smith. 'Good morning, Mr. Smith. Congratulations.' Who the hell's Mr. Smith?" Smith explains, laughing.

The context of the next uses of the diplomatic lexicon – and the only two executed by Will – was his wife, Jada , being asked the following in their backyard:

Scott: When did you two figure out that you two were going to end up together?

Jada: Oh, you don't want to know that story. [Will: Cl.M.] I don't think 60 Minutes is ready for that one. [all laugh]

Will's Clooney M. sure had an isolation-deprivation flavor to it, since his memory was immediately compelled to revisit the intimacy that led them during the genesis of their relationship to both realizing they had something special; and which obviously lasted to become one of the most envied marriages in Hollywood. To the Canadian lawyer it was obvious these two much admired actors wanted to use the opportunity to high profile what has captivated the entire coalition since the issue was first raised a year and a half ago. That view was corroborated a moment later when a clip of Will was inserted executing another Clooney M. as follows:

Scott: [voiceover] She is every bit his match, in what is widely considered [Will: Cl.M.] to be one of best marriages in Hollywood.

Jada almost got the last geo-political word, with an Olmert-Spielberg M. choreographed for later insertion to link up with a scripted line seeking to underscore the reality that when the United States decides to achieve a goal or a set of them, little if anything can stop its government or citizens from succeeding – current geo-political conflict included:

Scott: [voiceover] She is every bit his match, in what is widely considered to be one of best marriages in Hollywood. She says when he makes up his mind to do something, [Jada: O-S M.] it always happens. And he says he to wants to do something big that will change the world for the better.

The very last scene in which interviewer and interviewee are again in a face-to-face format set in his living-room, Steve asks the obvious about Will's attitude and outlook about life after achieving superstardom; and the latter appears to execute a Faith M. that, if accurately perceived, conveys his view how he evaluates his enormous blessings in life – which is to offer help to those less fortunate that he.

Steve: And you see yourself as a joyful spirit?

Will: Absolutely. I have a great time with my life, and [pause, F.M.] I wanna share it.

'60 Minutes': The Canadian Lawyer's Evidence Magnet and Collection Job Description, China's Insatiable Appetite for Endangered Species and Referencing the Coalition's Compensation, Reward and Benefits Package

[November 4, '07]

It was so easy to conclude that Canada's elite took major exception to two segments on November 4, 2007 – crashing his VCR as the intros aired. The first was CBS' segment that exposed China's growing and horrifically revolting desire for endangered and soon to be endangered animal parts; proving from another angle how Chinada-ized Canada's security apparatus had become. The second was showcasing the billionaire lifestyle coalition partners are working to enjoy from the soon to be seized assets of the malfeasant.

The week before it was the television re-broadcaster Channel M – owned and operated by Chinese and Canadian fiefdom decision-makers – superimposing its banner caption over the hands of '60 Minutes' correspondents during the intro to obstruct clear view of their diplomatic lexicon performing hands. This week it was crashing the Canadian lawyer's VCR during the intro to protest the topics covered by the venerable investigative journalists – proving both just how sensitive Canada's triangle operators are to criticism and how quickly they turn to illegality that has no effect but to demonstrate the need to 'purge & punish' them.

After a **triple** barrelled communiqué that prison certainty is undeniable (Steve, Bob and Scott), half of the East-West theatre audience was treated to Bob's extraordinarily insightful segment on how the case was made for war against Saddam Hussein. Producers knew there were major parallels to be made between the bogus claims made by one Iraqi relating to the claim the state-executed dictator had weapons of mass destruction and the all-too-legitimate *Fiefdom* indictment against Canada's politically affluent and wealthy and the Beijing leadership. The geo-political purpose of geo-politicizing the segment was to highlight the Canadian lawyer's role in helping gather evidence that would be used to justify covert regime change in Canada.

Bob: When the inspectors examined the facility, they found that this was an impossibility. [X], whose [clip: Bob: Bl.M.] job it was to relay intelligence to the inspectors in Iraq.

Steve's segment was as profound as it was disgusting – the latter sentiment directed at the Beijing leadership and any government, corporation or individual who sought to enhance the Chinese presence in the world without seeking to

pressure it to reform. The topic was the ivory trade that China has resuscitated so its people can wear bracelets, gaze at art objects and have chopsticks of the natural and rare natural material. The matter was recently covered in a *Fiefdom* chapter:

China: The Biggest Threat to Mother Nature and Humanity Since…

© 2007 Brad Kempo B.A. LL.B.
Barrister & Solicitor

> … geo-thermal nuclear Armageddon. Global imperialism, genocide, human rights violations in other countries, *slaughtering animals to extinction for their parts*, lead paint in toys, contaminants in food, currency manipulation, unfair trade practices, intellectual property theft and massive domestic pollution all put China on the fast track to massive peripheralization by not only world leaders but billions of ordinary people who will eventually get it that the Beijing leadership is inimical to the survival of the human race.
>
> [italics added]

There was only one geo-politicized scene – but sufficient enough to direct the attention of everyone in the coalition to this abominable practice; one that has to be stopped not only with respect to elephants but all animals if our grandchildren are going to have wildernesses throughout the world that contain these precious gifts of Mother Nature.

The Ivory War
Scott Pelley On The Challenging War On Elephant Poachers
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/11/02/60minutes/main3445950.shtml

> Steve: We have evidence of Chinese nationals implicated in ivory seizures or actually arrested in connection with ivory seizures in 22 of the 37 African elephant range states.
>
> [clip: Steve: Bl.M.]
>
> Expert: The scale of illegal trade in ivory which directly implicates China has never been greater," Milliken says.

Leslie's segment was clearly produced to highlight the kind of lifestyle the Canadian lawyer and coalition partners will enjoy as Canada's malfeasant rot in jail and toil on chain gangs. It featured a multi-billionaire and the trappings of wealth he has. She geo-politicized the following in the intro to convey how the Canadian lawyer is

en route to becoming a celebrated major entrepreneur and CEO of many multi-billion dollar corporations and will be instrumental in transforming Canada into a powerhouse economy.

> If there were a hall of fame [Staul M.] for business tycoons, Tom Perkins would be a first ballot shoo-in. His hands-on engineering skills, combined with his nose for profit, made him the captain of venture capitalism and [60 MM] helped transform Silicon Valley into the money machine of the West. The [60 MM] firm he co-founded, Kleiner Perkins Caufield & Byers, provided start-up capital for companies like AOL, Amazon.com, Netscape, and Google; the list goes on and on.

When interviewing the multi-billionaire on his massive sailboat, she inserted clips with the diplomatic lexicon to convey how CBS executives, producers and cast were highlighting their anticipation of enjoying what the interviewee has as part of the billionaire lifestyle the Canadian lawyer promised for liberating Canada from the clutches of authoritarianism.

In addition to peppering the segment with her and her profiled guest with various elements of the diplomatic lexicon, she identified China to be a *quantum* contributor and pointed to the Canadian lawyer's unending energy to advance coalition interests and objectives.

Tom Perkins Regrets Quitting HP Board
Also Tells Lesley Stahl Cost Of His Mega-Yacht Embarrasses Him
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/11/01/60minutes/main3442193.shtml

> Leslie: I know it cost more than eighty million [Erin M.].
>
> […]
>
> You'd think … you'd [Erin M.] burn out early.

'60 Minutes': From Sociopathology "Off the Scale" to Canada's "New Age", Coercive Diplomacy and "Seething" Hostility for America

[October 21, '07]

The October 21, 2007 episode contained all the elements contained in the chapter title – proving again Dr. Redstone's most celebrated asset continues to churn out diplomatic communiqués that have as their one objective turning America's northern neighbor into a trusted friend and ally instead of a massive threat to national and economic security.

Coercive diplomacy was again evident at the top of the program; with Steve, Bob and Scott delivering a triumvirate message of prison certainty.

Expert: Warming Climate Fuels Mega-Fires
Scott Pelley Reports From The American West's Fire Lines On The Rising Number Of Mega-Fires
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/10/18/60minutes/main3380176.shtml
Scott's segment on the fires burning in California became the next conduit for communiqués; beginning with his 60 Minutes M. to "It appears we're living in a new age of mega-fires" – heralding a new paradigm of governance for Canada.

The documented multiple uses of the diplomatic lexicon were all inserted in his interview of a forest fire expert.

Scott: You know, I was always taught that Ponderosas were big, robust trees that were built to withstand fire. And that when everything else burned off, the Ponderosas were still standing. But look at them.

Expert: The Ponderosas are able to withstand the low severity fires where you get flames of maybe one to two or three feet high. [clip: Scott: protracted Maria M.] But now the behavior of these fires is off the scale.

[…]

Scott: How much of things changed [Federer-CBS M.]?

Expert: Well, we're seeing century-old forests that had never sustained these kinds of fires before, being razed to the ground.

The red flagged "off the scale" remark was meant to describe where on the spectrum of sociopathology is Canada's governing clique and its security apparatus of street soldiers. Having watched the Canadian lawyer be aggressively tortured with the results of the twenty-year militarized R&D of hypnosis, stalked, swarmed and surrounded non-stop since the coalition began conducting surveillance, threatened with death and serious bodily harm on almost a daily basis and his home electronics disrupted and sabotaged, they are well within the realm of perfect accuracy to describe the perpetrators as totally "off the scale" of mature, rational and ethical behavior not just for adults, but more importantly for government officials, police, intelligence and military officers and the wealthiest in the country.

Scott's combination geo-gesture was clever in the analogy drawn from the expert's answer. To paraphrase it in geo-political terms, "We're seeing century-old governance practices that have never sustained these kinds of accountability mechanisms before, being completely eliminated from the institutions that perpetuated them".

The analogy continued in the next geo-politicized dialogue:

Scott: Where do you think all this is headed [Prince Harry M.]?

Expert: As fires continue to burn, these mega-fires continue to burn, we may see ultimately a majority, maybe more than half of the forest land converting to other forest, other types of ecosystems.

In the words of the paraphrase "As the coalition's accountability mechanisms continue to make the so-called invincible, insulated and immune answerable for their crimes, torts, and United Nations *Charter* and human rights violations, we will see a new paradigm of governance emerge – one that sustains the rule of law, protects human rights, ensures pluralism and creates and continues to strengthen a free market capitalist system" and a peaceful and secure world. Coercive diplomacy was again evident in Anderson's segment:

A Life Saver Called "Plumpynut"
Anderson Cooper Reports On A Nutritional Breakthrough
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/10/19/60minutes/main3386661.shtml

Coercive diplomacy was what motivated Anderson's use of the diplomatic lexicon during his interview with one of the members of that internationally recognized associations:

Doctor. In three weeks, we can cure a kid that is looked like they're half dead. [clip: Anderson: Erin M.]

[…]

We don't have to feed the whole world. We have to go for the jugular. Where are they dying? Where are they wasted? That's where we have to intervene. [clip: Anderson: Prince Harry M.]

[…]

We're not even asking for billions. It will solve so much of the underlying useless death. So we gotta do that now.

Anderson: [Erin M.] It's useless death.

Doctor: Wasted life. Just totally wasted life for nothing.

In addition to underscoring Dogville solutions and military force angles of democratization, Anderson laments the loss of life that could be averted if only Canada's governing clique capitulated to the international community's demands. But as all members of the west portion of the East-West theatre know, it has been, now is and will forever and for always be for the east members *All or Nothing*.

He confirms the need for the coalition to "intervene" to kick-start these initiatives, since there is no evidence from any corner of Canadian governance that reform and Chinese eviction is being planned.

Katie's segment was about the CIA spy whose cover was blown and was on a book promotion tour. There was only one observed use of the diplomatic lexicon – a very militarily powerful and geo-politically meaningful one.

The choice of lexicon wasn't a previously recognized specific element of the diplomatic lexicon. Rather, the methodology of communication came from what has infrequently employed, namely using a word that has major significance within the Chinada problem geo-political dynamic. The word producers knew would be immediately interpreted as such was "seething".

Katie inserted her view of how the interviewee's husband felt at what had happened to his spouse: "Seething":

Amb. Wilson: Yeah, you don't know. And we don't know what they did because nobody went after their families. And that's the way it should be. That's the way it would be.

However you wanna play the game, the idea of going after somebody's family is an absolute outrage."

Katie: You are still seething.

Amb. Wilson: Oh, I think - absolutely. "Absolutely. I'm seething because it was first and foremost a great betrayal of the national security of the country.

The *Fiefdom* observation of Canada's rich and powerful had a "seething hostility" for the United States is a cornerstone premise of multi-century history and contemporary international relations between the neighbors; for the trans-generationally transmitted emotion within the country's governing clique explains why former Prime Minister Trudeau and his wealthy friends didn't just open diplomatic channels to Fidel Castro and Mao Tse-Tung in the early 1970s; they did so in substantial part to thumb their collective noses at the United States and its western alliance of Cold War allies.

There are seventy-one chapters in the *Fiefdom* treatise that refer to this phenomenon. As was argued in *Thanking the 43rd President of the United States of America George W Bush for Deconstructing the Last Democratic Fiefdom*:

> Canada's domestically brutalizing nepotistic [governors] have been seething with hostility over the Americans since the mid-19thcentury; and now we discover why: simply to perpetuate and strengthen eco-political hegemony.

'60 Minutes': Acknowledging the *Fiefdom* Treatise, Already Perceptible Changes in Canada, Snitchin' on Authoritarianism and Chinese Joint Hegemony and Andy Rooney on Prison Certainty

[August 12, '07]

During Bob Simon's interview of the Cable Guy's agent he asked him if he ever thought he'd be where he was today in terms of success and wealth, and the interviewee said he never thought he'd be on 60 Minutes. That's exactly how the Canadian lawyer's felt every single day of every single week since April 2006.

Tick, tick, tick, tick, tick… I'm Bob Simon (in prison certainty); I'm Anderson Cooper (in prison certainty X2) and I'm Scott Pelley (in prison certainty). Those stories and Andy Rooney on prison certainty tonight on 60 Minutes; tick, tick, tick, tick, tick…

The August 12, 2007 episode continued an uber-amazing non-stop succession of shows embedding the diplomatic lexicon and coalition content. Like the week before the formulaed cast introduction contained an in-your-face reminder that imprisonment is as inevitable as the sun rising Monday morning.

Even though it was still the summer re-run season, that didn't stop producers from choosing at least one segment that had relevance to Canada's paradigm of governance and/or to what the Canadian lawyer's been up to that worth high profiling. This week it was the economic genocide of the country's First Nations and acknowledging the snitchin' nature of the *Fiefdom* treatise. Andy's was a four year old segment on ties and quickly surmised to have been chosen because the tie has been one of the primary mechanisms for delivering prison certainty communiqués to the 'East' members of the Corridor of Diplomacy since the *Prison Certainty Diary* series was commenced in mid-July 2007.

Scott's introduction to the Darfur genocide included a backdrop of presidential *quantum* and prison certainty (Canada). He executed a 60 Minutes M. to "We saw his books in a museum…", publicly referring to a boy he tracked down that was a victim of genocide in Sudan. The diplomatic objective was to high profile the importance of the *Fiefdom* treatise and its multiple functions for the coalition in protecting its interests and advancing its objectives.

Anderson also re-taped his introduction about how cooperating with the police has become culturally admonishable in some quarters of America and glorified in some genres of entertainment and music. In prison certainty (China) and in front of a backdrop rendered in Chinada colors, he employed four geo-gestures as follows:

> In most communities [Staul M.] a person who sees a murder and helps [60 MM] put the killer behind bars is called a witness. […] [60 MM] Stop snitchin' is a catchy hip-hop slogan that embodies and encourages this attitude. […] [A]s we first reported this spring [Staul M.] … something has changed in recent years.

The Canadian lawyer didn't need to conduct research using standard academic methodologies strengthened by the law of evidence to conclude for himself there was institutionalized depraved indifference murder and economic genocide. He'd seen it in Dogville's internationally condemned lower east side where poverty is acute, HIV/AIDS rampant, crime, drugs and prostitution are an everyday way of life four many thousands and many live in parasite-infested hell holes. And he knew it was happening to Canada's First Nations. But to bring the community of nations to act required those methodologies and principles of evidence to be directed at the statistics and cross-referenced with what was discovered through his own predicament and what he learned from looking back a hundred plus years and across the ocean at China three and a half decades ago.

And the international community did act decisively and has already signaled it plans to act until the problems associated with psychopathological greed for absolute power and more wealth than could be spent in a thousand lifetimes is neutralized. '60 Minutes' is right; there have been changes in recent times. The cancellation of the $3 billion Gateway pipeline from the Alberta oil sands to the British Columbia west coast to feed China's growing need for energy was cancelled. A reform and eviction discourse has emerged in institutions and organizations that didn't exist before. And Canada's elite has fully realized that their days of governing without accountability are over forever because the coalition made it unequivocally clear that it fully intends to keep the pressure on and intensify it slowly but surely until the objectives are achieved.

'60 Minutes': 'The List', Entrepreneurial Peripheral Vision, "America's Most Admired", Knowing Canada's Historical "Secrets" and Canadian Lawyer Compensation

[June 10, '07]

The executives, producers and cast of America's longest running and most critically acclaimed investigative journalism broadcast did it again – covering the conflict between the forces of democracy, human rights, pluralism and free market capitalism and authoritarianism.

Barry Diller's Third Act
Lesley Stahl Profile's One Of America's Top Internet CEOs
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/06/08/60minutes/main2902934.shtml

The second segment hosted by Lesley was a new one, featuring the billionaire uber-entrepreneur and 'peripheral vision' visionary Barry Diller. During the intro she used two geo-gestures.

> Barry Diller, once a big wheel in Hollywood [60 MM] was one of the first businessmen to figure out that [interactive buying] would be the wave of the future. […] Fortune Magazine recently [Staul M.] named IAC America's most admired company in Internet services.

Barry's wife confirmed his 'peripheral vision' capabilities, stating "[He] can see something way before you can see anything". This is exactly the kind of forward-looking perspective the Canadian lawyer had in 1988 when having a paradigm-shifting supercomputer technology and all the attributes to start what Steve Jobs had to bring his intuitions to the market and create a personal multi-billion dollar fortune. The recent law graduate cum Chinada lab monkey saw what became by the early 21st century a half trillion dollar revenue generating CGI industry. He had absolutely no doubt that in due course two-dimensional traditional animation would be virtually replaced and CGI used extensively in movies and television commercials.

Lesley also inserted a namesake gesture to "America's most admired". There is no denying that from mid-2003 to June 2007 the Canadian lawyer went from unknown victim of Beijing's global hegemony foreign policy and an hourly schadenfreude-generating punching bag for Canada's psychopathologically corrupt, perverse and evil and idiocy worshiping trans-generational elite to international community legitimized world leader.

A prison certainty attired Barry sat down for a one-on-one with Lesley. He recounted for her his early years, which contained parallels with the *Fiefdom* treatise success:

> Lesley: [After dropping out of school his job] turned out to be just the education he was looking for.
>
> Barry: I literally red the film room [at the William Morris Talent Agency]
>
> Lesley: You knew [Erin M.] everybody's secrets.
>
> Barry: I read the entire history of the entertainment business.

Lesley confirmed the film footage of Barry conferencing with employees of his company was specifically for this segment. Therefore any appearance of the lexicon could safely be inferred as embedded to advance coalition interests and objectives.

Barry was executing a protracted quasi-Clooney M. when he said about what was presumed to be either an industry trend or business opportunity "We know where this is going…", which in the geo-political circumstances as of mid-June 2007 referred to Canadian democratization and containing China's global threat to international peace and security and the evolution of capitalistic globalization.

The Clooney M. he executed turned "I didn't actually know this is what you were doing", into his way of stating he had no idea what Canada had become as articulated in the *Fiefdom* treatise.

That was followed by a clip of an employee executing a Branson M. to Barry's "So it's an area we should learn", clearly indicating it is imperative that America's most politically powerful, wealthy and high profile become privy to the threat posed by the China-Canada military alliance; and, arguably, how the evils of capitalism can be well hidden from view when *inter alia* politicians, the courts, law enforcement and the media all conspire together to create an impermeable façade of respectability.

Right after the Maneuver Lesley inserted her voiceover "And his **twenty** thousand employees better keep up".

Barry: We're gonna invest probably hundreds of millions of dollars in this [industry] over the next years.

Lesley: [Erin M.] The shareholders have no voice in this company. It's the Barry Diller Sow from beginning to end.

Barry: Yea.

Lesley: They're investing in you.

Barry: They're investing in this company and its assets. But if you ask who's the ultimate […] decider […] – if you talk about something that ever goes to a vote in the company I do control the vote. That's…

Lesley: …period.

Barry: That's it.

Lesley: [voiceover] Most of [the $470 million he earned in 2006] came not [Diller: Blair M.] from an inflated salary, but rather a single stock option given him when the company * was founded. [Then the company gave him more stock options]

Barry: What the company did is they said 'he should have an inventive for the future' [clip: Lesley Erin M.]. I also don't think by the way I don't need an incentive.

Lesley: [Erin M.] I wouldn't think so.

Barry: I'm absolutely not shy about saying that if you create something of value then receiving compensation for it to the skies if that's what happens – the I do not think that that's a bad thing. […] I did start a company. I did make all the decisions. And that company's value grew a lot.

* Diller executes Zeta-Jones M.

Lesley's first geo-gesture straddles two remarks:

(i) The first could have highlighted three possibilities. Was she referring to U.S. corporations investing in Canada? Was she referring to the Canadian lawyer using his *quantum* to invest in new and existing businesses? And/or was she suggesting investors were going to invest in him since his peripheral vision track record is perfect to date and what he's articulated about his future endeavors appear meritorious? When putting his visions that came true with his 'Wharton-Yale-Harvard' training, wealthy risk adverse people would have faith that more times than not he'll generate acceptable returns.

(ii) The second relates to how he sees himself at the helm of the Custodian-in-Council and as the chief executive of his multi-corporate empire. The former has already been described as a two-tiered policy and decision-making structure. There's the CIC, comprised of what will likely be a large Cabinet – anywhere from twenty to forty experts – and an Executive-in-Council that will confirm policies and make decisions. While he may sit at the head of the CIC and EIC, they are both democracy governed. He's only around as a diplomat and figurehead and to break ties like the Vice-President in the Senate. He has no intention of 'imposing his will' on the process; nor would he want to. Most of the decisions made on policy and with respect to specific issues will be expert-driven. It will be different in his companies where he will adopt the Diller style of corporate decision-making.

The next topic was about compensation. In the Canadian lawyer's case that meant as the majority shareholder of his corporations. With such vast personal wealth, he's going to emulate what New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg and a few other political leaders have done; namely take no salary or donate it to charity. With respect to personal wealth generation, he ratifies the Diller paradigm. Ethical capitalism doesn't set limits on compensation except when salary and benefits aren't proportional to performance. The only reason why Barry took home $470 million in 2006 was because his plethora of businesses did well – which is what taking stock does.

Lesley also inserts a clip of her executing an Erin M. to the issue of incentive. The Canadian lawyer's situation in 2003 led to him being incentivized as much from the Coalition membership ratifying what was then his US$5 billion *quantum* as it was to get out of the twenty-year hell hole of torture, enslavement, impoverishment, isolation and deprivation. That motivator evolved into seeking to liberate his country from the grip of two parasites and help the world's democratic leaders contain Beijing's global hegemony initiative. It also cannot be denied that after the *quantum* increase schedule was ratified and his entitlement to compensation went "to the skies" he had more incentive to perform in the role he was assigned by the coalition.

'60 Minutes': Making an Intelligence Case for Military Action Against Chinada in the Shadow of 9/11 and Iraq Failures and the Alleged Diagnosis of the Canadian Lawyer's Mental Illness

[April 29, '07]

The chapter title reflects two distinct investigative reports by '60 Minutes' during the April 29, 2007 broadcast. It does not imply that the diagnosis of the Canadian lawyer's mental fitness by medical practitioners in 1993 and 2005 impacts on the intelligence assessment of the threat posed by the China-Canada military alliance. The coalition's gotten way beyond that issue because it was decisively proven both incidents were Chinada's attempts at destroying his academic and professional credibility; creating a maliciously libelous paper trail to prevent him from ever taking advantage of the upward mobility opportunities his education, professional status, entrepreneurial skills and family background generated.

George Tenet: At The Center Of The Storm
Former CIA Director Breaks His Silence
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/04/25/60minutes/main2728375.shtml

Making a case for military action against Canada from an intelligence perspective runs into two unfortunate circumstances in recent United States history: (i) failing to see 9/11 coming and (ii) concluding Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction – the preemptive justification for waging some form of war and effecting regime change. Regardless of how each incompetence is objectively interpreted, the end result is that the next time the White House with the backing of Congress wages a war with armaments and troops and in which there is substantial loss of life, the intelligence better be one hundred percent correct.

Being on the verge of deploying a military strike force north of the 49thParallel with the objective of covert regime change, it appears coalition partners through the '60 Minutes' venue want to review the evidence again and how it was arrived at one more time – just to be sure the connect-the-dots exercise was done right and nothing was missed.

During the intro a Canadian punishment certainty attired Scott gestured with a 60 Minutes M. when he mentioned the title of Mr. Tenet's book: "center of the storm" – executed to remind everyone in the East-West theatre where the Canadian is in the geo-political conflict.

The next use of the lexicon was seeing the interviewee sporting the color of justice as he and Scott walked through the halls of the university he's teaching at. Scott executes another 60 Minutes M. during his voiceover: "After college he worked on Capitol Hill and at the Clinton White House, rising to lead [60 M.M.] the CIA at the age of 44". Given such events as Secretary of State's Global Leaders conference geo-politicizing and his being elevated to the pinnacle of international affairs, this was an acknowledgement of his role as Custodian of Canada until democracy's achieved should he want it. Further, with Mr. Tenet at age 44 running the largest

and most sophisticated spy agency in the world, the Canadian lawyer at 49 could competently run Canada for a few years.

> George: [On 9/11] I knew immediately this was bin Laden. [clip: Scott quasi-Cl.M.]
>
> […]
>
> Scott: What do you mean you knew immediately? I mean, most people in the country thought there had been a terrible accident.
>
> George: Listen, when you've been following this as long as I've been following this, when you've been thinking about multiple spectacular attacks. There was no doubt what had happened in my mind immediately.

While the *Fiefdom* treatise author can't be totally certain, it looked like the geo-gesture was inserted to acknowledge what conclusions might be drawn when there are grand attacks in the future. In September 2001, the inference was drawn the 9/11 attacks were by al-Queda. However, after 2006-7, an attack might be the China-Canada military alliance using the terrorist organization as a screen behind which to weaken the U.S. economy and put stress on the country's military. This strengthened with subsequent embeds, such as the one in this remark by Mr. Tenet:

> Now, listen to me. I want you to listen to me. The context is it's post-9/11. [Scott: Erin M.] I've got reports of nuclear weapons in New York City, apartment buildings that are gonna be blown up, planes that are gonna fly into airports all over again. Plot lines that I don't know – I don't know what's going on inside the United States. And I'm struggling to find out where the next disaster is going to occur. Everybody forgets one central context of what we lived through. The palpable fear that we felt on the basis of the fact that there was so much we did not know.

The next embed in Mr. Tenent's remarks appeared to be coercive diplomacy:

> [Scott: quasi-Cl.M.] These are people who know who's responsible for the next terrorist attack. These are hardened people that would kill you and me 30 seconds after they got out of wherever they were being held and wouldn't blink an eyelash.

The next one was a clip of Mr. Tenet being choreographed; crossing his legs and then flinching his body to create a Staul M. while Scott's voiceover stated:

> Tenet says the interrogations uncovered networks and broke up plots in the U.S.

This was a signal that U.S. authorities are aggressively investigating members of the China-Canada alliance in Canada, abroad and living, working and investing in the U.S. to strengthen it and weaken American public and private institutions, strategizing and engaging in military and economic espionage activity, recruiting and linking up with organizations that have the same seething hostility for the land of liberty, rule of law and free market capitalism.

> Are these people gonna have a nuclear capability? This confers superpower status on a networked organization that is not a state. Is it gonna happen?" Tenet wonders. "Look, I don't know. But I worry about it. Because I've seen enough to tell me that there's intent. And when there's intent, the question is, when does the capability show up [Erin M.]? If al Qaeda were to [quasi-Cl.M.] acquire nuclear capability, the thousands of weapons we have would be irrelevant [end].

This passage increased the likelihood '60 Minutes' was expressing the coalition's worry that terrorism will take the blame for what China and Canada cause. The former is a nuclear power and therefore already has the capability to procure a strike on U.S. soil. Enough time has elapsed since 9/11 that the public would be quick to blame radical Islamist fundamentalism; and would never accept the claim China and Canada were behind it.

The segment was also used to convey how tenacious coalition partners are going to continue to be:

> George: And they never let it go. [clip: Scott quasi-Cl.M.]

In the next red-flagged exchange, the question might be posed whether the China-Canada alliance might seek the aid of al-Qaeda.

> Scott: You said Iraq made no sense to you in that moment. Does it make any sense to you today?
>
> George: In terms of complicity with 9/11? Absolutely none. It never made any sense. [clip: Scott Bl.M.] We could never verify that there was any Iraqi authority, direction and control, complicity with al Qaeda for 9/11 or any operational act against America. Period.

Given their sense of invincibility, emerging superpower status, elitism and exclusivity, it is highly unlikely the alliance would turn to any terrorist organization. There is no utility in such a relationship. Further, there is a gargantuan ideological schism in terms of the spilling of blood, both innocent and military, and strategy. Osama's troops kill without conscience and as many as possible and use techniques like suicide bombers. These are abhorrent to Chinese and Canadian sensibilities. They prefer techniques in which they don't get their hands dirty; like surreptitious assassination, death and incapacitation by economic deprivation and

disempowering an enemy through stupidity stalking and swarming and professional and medical libel.

The next topic about Mr. Tenet's leadership at the CIA that got a lot of people in trouble was his department's failure to prevent the inclusion of sixteen words in the President's 2003 State of the Union Address about Saddam Hussein seeking African uranium for nuclear weaponry.

> George: Right, I didn't, farmed it out, got it at a principal's meeting, brought it down the hall, handed it to my executive assistant. I said, 'You guys go review this, and come back to me if I need to do anything'.
>
> Scott: "Nobody comes back to you [quasi-Cl.M.]?
>
> George: And therein lies why I ultimately have to take my share of responsibility.

The geo-gesture was underscoring how the Bush administration challenged the Canadian lawyer through coalition partners to make sure his intel about the alliance and global hegemony was on solid grounds. As stated in the opening paragraph of this chapter:

> Making a case for military action against Canada from an intelligence perspective runs into two unfortunate circumstances in recent United States history: (i) failing to see 9/11 coming and (ii) concluding Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction – the preemptive justification for waging military action and effecting regime change. Regardless of how each incompetence is objectively interpreted, the end result is that the next time the White House with the backing of Congress wages a war with armaments and troops and in which there is substantial loss of life, the intelligence better be one hundred percent correct.

The Canadian lawyer's analysis has been examined from multiple directions, including the intel acquired by the CIA, FBI and the Pentagon and likely agencies in coalition counties. The difference between confirming the existence of this Pandora's Box WMD – weapons of mental destruction – and Saddam's chemical, biological and nuclear assets is there is no fog of tyranny getting in the way of a clear appreciation of the threat. Since Canada's military industrial complex and the China-Canada military alliance as represented in Canada aren't opaque, the chance for error is eliminated. What's surprised the Canadian lawyer repeatedly over the years is how transparent the malfeasance that surrounds him has been. This perception arose principally from how often what he's done in his apartment and with his family has been reflected back in coalition content. If Coalition members are keeping microscopically close track of his movements, what he says, watches on TV and authors then *ipso facto* they're fully aware of who's doing what to him and when; monitoring the security apparatus' infrastructure and what Dogville

torture technicians do in real time 24/7 to torture, intimidate and threaten him with hypnosis, street soldiers, noise disruptions, Parliamentarians the police and the media.

He's therefore been able to safely infer from the aggressiveness of their criminality and all the 'business as usual' nose thumbing and insolence the alliance and corrupt don't care one bit what the coalition knows about their operations, who their personnel are, who's in command and who's financing and benefiting; likely because they believe they're invincible, insulated and immune, their stealth cognition technologies and associated techniques and tactics are indefensible and China's inevitably going to rise to successfully challenge the U.S. economically and militarily.

> George: There was lots of data. There's lots of technical data. [clip: Scott quasi-Cl.M.] So you put all of this together, it's not evidence in the court of law. Remember, when you write an estimate, when you estimate, you're writing what you don't know. You might win a civil case. Huh? You're not gonna win a criminal case, in terms of evidence.
>
> Scott: We are going to war. Tens of thousands of people are going to be killed. And you're telling me you had evidence to prove a civil case, not a criminal case?

Given the institutional shortcomings and executive incompetence regarding 9/11 and Iraq, coalition partners want one hundred percent certainty that stealth cognition technologies pose a serious and imminent danger to military and economic security of the U.S. and other countries and the China-Canada alliance's objective is global hegemony. And they have it from multiple cross-corroborating sources. The standard that has been used in the past is the civil balance of probabilities or criminal reasonable doubt – the intel standard in the 21st century: 'undeniable certainty'.

> George: Do you think that the American intelligence community's gonna roll out [clip: Scott quasi-Cl.M.] the secretary of state in front of the entire world and consciously let him say things that are wrong

In other words, President Bush doesn't want to repeat the same embarrassment that was generated after then Secretary of State Colin Powell appeared before the United Nations Security Council and argued Iraq WMDs and later none were discovered.

The Plame affair was also the subject of conversation. Leaking the identify of a CIA agent was problematic for everyone involved.

> Scott: [quasi-Cl.M.] How much damage did that do?

George: That's not the point. Just because there's a Washington bloodletting [clip: Scott quasi-Cl.M.] game going on here and just because her husband's out there saying what he's saying. The country's intelligence officers are not fair game. Period. That's all you need to know."

Timing the editing-in of a geo-gesture right after "bloodletting" was coercive diplomacy – not in terms of what a military strike will do to targets, but more generally relating to the purge dynamic of eliminating the evil that inhabits the Canadian political backroom and boardroom (since the act of bloodletting in medieval times sought to purge evil spirits from a sick person's body).

When Mr. Tenet's reputation began to unravel within the White House, he reached out to then Chief of Staff Andy Card. The conversation he said he had with President Bush's right hand man was geo-politicized to describe the trustworthiness placed in the Canadian lawyer:

George: And I remember picking up the phone and calling Andy Card, who is a terrific human being and somebody I've always trusted [Scott quasi-Cl.M.] … I call Andy and I said 'You know I believe he had weapons of mass destruction. [clip: Scott quasi-Cl.M.] And now what's happened here is you've gone out and made me look stupid.

This compliment to the Canadian's academic and legal competence and personal integrity was reaffirmed – as was the case for 21st century WMDs and global hegemony seeking – where the last geo-gesture was inserted:

George: You know, at the end of the day, the [clip: Scott quasi-Cl.M.] only thing you have is trust and honor in this world. It's all you have. All you have is your reputation built on trust and your personal honor.

Steve's segment was on mental illness after it was discovered the gunman who killed thirty-two students at Virginia Tech had been involuntarily committed in a psych ward. It had several Coalition embeds; but not to create a link to Scott's interview of the former CIA Chief. When he interviewed a police chief who had worked on a killing spree unrelated to the Virginia Tech case, a geo-gesture was inserted at the beginning of his question "If someone came in with a mental health history…", which was meant to ascribe some kind of cognitive impairment of Canada's political and economic leaders.

His interview of a congresswoman who sponsored a bill relating to funding state agencies to contribute medical information to a national database was geo-politicized. She wore Canadian punishment certainty attired. And when the two of them walked down a Capitol Hill street a Wolf Grazer Kelley torture identifier was inserted

> Congress will close a loophole [honk] she says has already claimed too many innocent lives.

The "loophole" is Canada's incorrigibly corrupt and China's colonizers; both of whom having been adjudged guilty of gross violations of international and Canadian domestic law and who now face severe punitive consequences.

'60 Minutes': The Evil of Chinada and Should the Coalition Be Concerned About the China-Canada Military Alliance Using Nuclear Weapons Against the United States?

[April 8, '07]

With the amount and intensity of *animus* Canada's two indigenous sub-factions have displayed over the generations towards the United States, the Bush administration, the country's sub-factions and their allies are fully entitled to pose the question whether the China-Canada military alliance will covertly use nuclear weapons under cover of the war on terrorism to weaken the nation from yet another angle. That issue was raised during the April 8, 2007 broadcast for *Fiefdom* examination and reflections.

When all the uses of the diplomatic lexicon are added together during the April 8thprogram there is one unmistakable question that was asked. It is reflected in the chapter title. United States authorities may reasonably and justifiably pose the question if for any other reason than the amount of seething hostility that's been emanating from north of the 49thParallel for decades. The roots of this *animus* may go back generations but arguable it became more intense and only got worse after Canada's trans-generational eco-political elite and invisibly wealthy erected an even higher, thicker barrier between their fiefdom and the U.S. when former Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau chose to secretly ally with China in the early 1970s. Back then there was a strong ideological affinity between the Asian dragon and the Soviets and it is not unreasonable to infer that *Weltanschauung* was fully internalized by the Canadian elite; who found it to be yet another way to institutionally and emotionally insulate themselves from the centripetal forces of American free market democracy. As P.M. Trudeau embedded authoritarianism to the complete joy of the invisibly wealthy, the political and economic elite couldn't but absorb the Chinese military culture by osmosis – which over the next three and half decades would ferment and become both fully entrenched in their collective consciousness and reflected in the paradigm of governance. The outward features of this inner mentality would thus manifest themselves in how the institutions of government and the courts, police, media and private sector big business behaved. The result: the further authoritarian-ization of the Canadian state and the China-Canada alliance. What evolved from them is contained in the *Fiefdom* indictment.

Canada hides its ubiquitous military culture extremely well. Façade manufacture has concealed it from all but those with the analytical tools and critical talents to examine the disparate evidence and connect the dots with a very tiny margin of

error. China takes no measures to prevent the world from seeing how militarized its entire society is. Upper echelon members of the Communist Party wear full battle regalia whenever they're in public and in governmental session. Only until recently judges wore military uniforms. In January Beijing provocatively shot a low orbiting satellite out of the sky; and in early 2007 it was reported an unprecedented military build-up is underway from the massive wealth the Chinese economy is producing and will continue to generate throughout the 21st century.

What is most disturbing and is central to the analysis is how the China-Canada military alliance has been acting since diplomacy was launched by President Bush in 2003 and intensified in 2006. Instead of standing down joint hegemony, Canada's elite repeatedly thumbed their nose at the United States and its coalition allies. If their attitude is reflected in how they treat the Canadian lawyer, then the torture, intimidation and harassment he's experienced every hour of every day since 2004 is genuinely indicative of an on-going desire to achieve the global objective no matter what it takes. The wickedness witnessed in the use of Pandora's Box deployments against him and his family, violating his bathroom, sexual and sleep privacy, torturing him with hypno-assaults to his skin, commandeering his dream state, constantly mobilizing the street soldier community, police, public service personnel, media personalities and Parliamentarians and the rest cannot resolve the issue favorably for them. The relentlessness, enthusiasm, pervasiveness and forging ahead to push the *Article 7* envelop despite coalition efforts to resolve outstanding issues peacefully tips the inference towards the belief the China-Canada military alliance will employ every single means at their disposal to defeating the U.S..

Arguably, it's a gargantuan historical step from the 21st century Pandora's Box and the 20th century Pandora's Box. The multi-trillion dollar and global hegemony question is whether they will become resolute or desperate enough to pull the nuclear trigger. The war on terrorism provides them the perfect cover; and they can reasonably hypothesize that exploding a dirty bomb on U.S. soil or to take out a military, diplomatic or civilian asset somewhere in the world will be a vile strike the U.S. administration will blame exclusively on radical Islamist fundamentalism to protect and coddle economic interests; choosing to respond to Chinada's act of aggression in a drawn out process to conceal it from the public so as not to disturb the capital and currency markets and global and national economies. That's a tactical advantage the Pentagon must weigh; especially when faced with the other technologies, techniques, strategies and advantages available to the China-Canada military alliance right now and in the future; including stealth cognition technologies, Canada as a backdoor step military base and the dominos recruitment of more and more nations into Beijing's military and economic sphere of control or influence.

Because the mentality of Canada's elite and by reasonable and logical extension Beijing's leaders is so immature, irrational and schadenfreude-generating to the point of being addicted to the ever more brutal, sadistic and cruel, the trans-generational mutation of ideology being what it is will lead to the next generation more prone to pulling whatever triggers are available to achieve victory faster,

more resoundingly and with greater pain, suffering and destruction. Such a dreadful military strategy will be less ideologically abhorrent in the second quarter of the 21st century; and less so in the third. By then elder statesmen and women – in power during a time when Cold War mutual destruction and détente was a vivid memory – will either be dead or ignored *en masse* and the more adventurous, envelop pushing and risk taking younger generation of military leaders will have a brazen 'go-for-it' attitude towards what was previously taboo and unthinkable. "They'll blame it on the terrorists and insurgents" will sound a lot more convincing in the decades to come.

A waiting game may also be part of the strategy. Triangle operators are fully aware that U.S. entitlement programs and other factors will inevitably weaken the American economy and *ipso facto* the military if aggressive proactive measures are not undertaken immediately or stalled.

> So in war, the way is to avoid what is strong and to strike at what is weak.
>
> *The Art of War*

The detonation of a nuclear device will be most advantageous not only when there is a low point in an unavoidable and unstoppable slow decline in military strength and being distracted by multiple conflicts where Pentagon and CIA assets are stretched thin but also by a decline exacerbated by a succession of catastrophic events. The effects and costs on and slow rebound time in the U.S. economy were fully transparent right after 9/11. The right kind and number of nuclear attacks would magnify those dynamics to such a degree that a series of follow up strikes from Canada and other directions would efficaciously cripple the U.S. military.

> In making tactical dispositions, the highest pitch you can attain is to conceal them; conceal your dispositions, and you will be safe from the prying of the subtlest spies, from the machinations of the wisest brains.
>
> O divine art of subtlety and secrecy! Through you we learn to be invisible, through you inaudible; and hence we can hold the enemy's fate in our hands.
>
> By discovering the enemy's dispositions and remaining invisible ourselves, we can keep our forces concentrated, while the enemy's must be divided.
>
> Let your plans be dark and impenetrable as night…
>
> In no other business should greater secrecy be preserved.
>
> *The Art of War*

China is like Iraq was under Saddam Hussein and like North Korea these days. There is an intelligence fog not of tyranny, but the just-as-impenetrable fog of authoritarianism. The lack of institutional transparency there combined with Canada's massive plundered wealth and China's growing wealth makes it impossible to ascertain what is being planned. Add the Internet, other advances in communication and encryption, concomitant government façade manufacture, intel misinformation, a glob, a plethora of demands on U.S. intelligence budgets and personnel and the Pentagon has a surveillance nightmare.

In the final analysis there is a definite possibility that China with or without Canada poses a serious nuclear threat. The degree of probability is very difficult to gauge. The assessment depends on a multitude of factors, some of which are identified in this chapter. The most important ones that increase the likelihood include:

(i) ideological mutation; including an ever-intensifying addiction to schadenfreude-generation and inflicting more catastrophic pain, suffering and loss;
(ii) the aging and disappearance of leaders with first hand experience of the Cold War and détente;
(iii) China's exponential economic growth; and ever more sources of wealth generation domestically and from foreign direct investment;
(iv) dominos expansion of China's sphere of Pandora's Box produced control and influence;
(v) China continuing to exploit all vulnerabilities and weaknesses in capitalism to increase its financial advantage over the U.S. from the trade imbalance, outsourcing, intellectual property piracy, currency manipulation, subsidization, environmental,
(vi) China continuing to exploit all vulnerabilities and weaknesses in capitalism to gain greater arrogant belligerence and refusal to stand down violations of international and Canadian domestic law: military, economic and constitutional; listening but not hearing and responding to growing condemnation and instead accelerating illegalities and improprieties; maintaining a relentless and unapologetic regime of torture, intimidation and harassment against the Canadian lawyer; and
(vii) China's unabashed military buildup and aggressive espionage.

The first '60 Minutes' segment was Scott's and featured 2008 presidential candidate and Senator John McCain (R-AZ). There were only two geo-gestures, a 60 Minutes M. during his intro and quasi-Clooney M.. The first was timed to "McCain is gambling his bid for the White House"; conveying what the *Fiefdom* treatise has repeatedly argued; namely Canada's triangle operators risking everything – life, liberty and property – by refusing to comply with the demands of the international community and hedging their bets something will intervene that will prevent the purge and punish dynamic.

The second was in an edited-in clip of Scott gesturing timed to the Senator's remark about his last presidential campaign and some questionable antics: "I don't have hard evidence the Bush campaign was behind it". In the context of Steve's

and Morley's topics the purpose of this geo-politicized comment was to confirm there wasn't yet any smoking gun that the China-Canada military alliance had or has plans to use a nuclear device or several of them to military challenge the U.S.. This was an appropriate proviso given what the intel fog of Iraq tyranny caused the Bush administration just before the 2003 coalition intervention.

Each of the following quotes from Steve's segment was red flagged with a quasi-Clooney or Erin M.; and there is one coalition-identifying **triple** reference ("forget"). The bold passages are relevant to the geo-political conflict.

Steve: **How much interest there is right now** in building new plants.

[…]

Expert: **There is a tremendous amount of interest.** Two years ago there was exactly zero plants on the drawing boards here in the United States. Today, there are about 15 companies talking about building over 30 commercial nuclear power reactors.

[…]

Steve: Forget technology for the moment. Forget energy. Forget greenhouse gases. A lot of the problems of this industry have been political. I mean, **people are afraid of them. Fair statement?**

[…]
Why are so many people afraid of it?

[…]

Then why have the French accepted it? And **what is there about the two cultures that may influence that?**

[…]

The big argument against reprocessing has been the fact that some high-grade plutonium that could be used in making a bomb could be stolen from the plant.

[stopwatch: **twenty** seconds]

It is easy to see the significance of each one:

(i) the issue of Chinada using nuclear weapons against the U.S. domestically or on internationally situate assets is now a heavily discussed subject in Cabinet and the Pentagon;
(ii) the United States is genuinely worried about the threat posed by the China-Canada military alliance and even more so when question of a nuclear attack is added to the deliberations;
(iii) the question about what in the two cultures – China and Canada – influences the likelihood there would be such an attack is discussed above;
(iv) the last one was only a red flag about the use of nuclear weaponry; China and Canada are not stateless enemies; China already has an extensive and threatening nuclear arsenal.

Morley's segment on a Washington lawyer turned corporate tort anti-whistleblowing activist, nicknamed "Dr. Evil" by those he targets. The piece was not only '60 Minutes' investigative journalism at its absolute finest both educationally and from an entertainment perspective, juxtaposing it with Steve's geo-politicized nuclear power report was the perfect way to link the threat posed by aggressive global hegemony seeking authoritarianism and the psychological constitution of its proponents. The bold portions were lexicon red flagged:

Morley: Let me just take you through some of the things your critics have said about you. **Sleazy, greedy, outrageous, deceptive**, ineffective except when it comes to making money for yourself, corporate lackey **who is one of the scariest** people in America.

[…]

Expert: **Berman is against every single measure, no matter how sensible. He'd have no restrictions on** tobacco advertising, junk foods galore in schools. No minimum wage. He wants to leave corporate America **unfettered of any regulations** that protect the public's health.

[…]

He's a hit man. He's dishonest, deceptive, *he makes things up.*

Berman: **I think it all comes down to not wanting to be targeted. I mean, I get attacked**. But, I don't get attacked for my information. I get attacked personally.

[…]
Those people are at a **health** risk**. But this whole issue that it's a disease, that it's not your fault that you're fat.**

Morley: I understand that and a lot of social activists and **the government to some extent is trying to get these people to change these bad habits.**

[…]

Berman: As the government gets deeper and deeper into people's lives, they start to dictate more and more.

[T]ell me what's wrong with our statistics. Tell me what's wrong with our science**.' Have I said anything that's wrong, or am I just objectionable? And if I'm objectionable, I say, 'Take a deep breath and get over it. I'm not going away'.**

'60 Minutes': Part II: Lara Logan Geo-Politicizes a Military Themed Subject
[February 25, '07]

The second segment of the February 25, 2007 '60 Minutes' broadcast was clearly geo-politicized to advance coalition interests and objectives. Lara once again shed her life and limb threatening 'CBS Evening News' Chief Foreign Correspondent wardrobe to for '60 Minutes' segment host. She worked with producers to embed several important subjects that are important to the membership.

Her investigative report involved giving voice to disgruntled U.S. servicemen and women fighting in Iraq. Like the rest of her colleagues in the U.S. media, she, her producers and CBS executives were exercising their fundamental constitutionally protected right of a free press to keep government operating within lawful and tolerable boundaries – what Canada's media betrayed to protect trans-generational corruption, ensure Chinese military colonization and help the China-Canada military alliance evolve. Under its watch all the crimes against humanity and institutionalized and militarized atrocities enumerated in the *Fiefdom* indictment occurred and for which they share culpability.

GIs Petition Congress To End Iraq War
More Than 1,000 Military Personnel Sign Petition Urging Withdrawal
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/02/22/60minutes/main2505412.shtml

Lara's intro was geo-politicized. The background on which the title and credits were posted was in Chinada punishment certainty colors. And she and her crew scripted her interaction with interviewees and edited the segment to embed the following:

(i) She executed a Blair M. to "was there a point at which you experienced something that made you think? In the Canadian lawyer's discovery of what happened to him, there were several moments that caused him to reflect on the who, what and why of his predicament.

From a hypnosis perspective, he's argued his first encounter was when he was living on the streets of Dogville and was compelled to see a tiny red light at the end of a grocery store isle that instantly cued thoughts about being hypnotically compromised. There were more examples in the 1990s; but none so convincing as when his leg kicked forward as a Dogville police car passed right in front of him. That triggered the federal law suit and began the process of reevaluating his previous twenty years.

(ii) She executed an Erin M. to "and you always didn't feel this way"; being (a) his emotional emancipation from feelings of being trapped forever in a hellhole of unimaginable proportions and (b) his changed opinion about the nature of Canada.

(iii) Clip of Lara inserted as an interviewee stated "we just wanna help and it was really eye-opening and frustrating experience"; being the coalition stating on the record again how shocked its members were over what was discovered about Canada, how its leaders acted when confronted with the *Fiefdom* indictment and reaffirming their commitment to democratization and 'Iron Fist' accountability.

(iv) Four clips of interviewees executing Blair M.s; the first three were by an African-American – a coalition-inspired condemnation of institutionalized racism and the fourth by him and his Caucasian colleague at the same time to hit the malfeasant again with their bigotry.

(v) Clip of Lara timed to "last night I was with my family"; being a confirmation her and '60 Minutes' executives, producers, cast and crew as coalition members.

(vi) Lara quoted White House Press Secretary: "…people like you are going to be able to get more press" with a clip inserted of an interviewed soldier executing a quasi-Clooney M.; confirming that there is yet more media coverage of the Chinada problem to come.

(vii) Lara states "For many in uniform, there's an unwritten code of honor [Bl.M.] that says no matter how tough [Bl.M.] your situation is or whatever your private doubts about the mission may be, you just never speak out publicly against it, confirming the diplomatic seal of coalition confidentiality on the geo-political conflict.

'60 Minutes': Part I: Equating Canadian and Nazi Respectability Façade Manufacture

[February 25, '07]

The objective of the first segment of '60 Minutes' on February 25, 2007 was undeniably evident. CBS executives and producers on behalf of the coalition drew historically accurate and worrisome parallels between what the Nazis did in the later stages of the war to mask their barbaric treatment of the Jewish people and what Canada's image manufacturers have been doing successfully for a century to hide their internationally condemned paradigm of governance and for the last three

decades to conceal Chinese military colonization and the formation and strengthening of the China-Canada military alliance.

Brundibar: How The Nazis Conned The World
Used A Children's Opera To Deceive International Observers
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/02/23/60minutes/main2508458.shtml

A sovereignty deconstructing segment on '60 Minutes' involved comparing how the Nazis blinded the world from its atrocities with how Canada's politicians, courts and media manufactured a façade of respectability. It cannot be underestimated how powerful this Coalition initiative is both as a stand-alone and in conjunction with the half year diplomatic process of identifying Canada's rulers with radical Islamist fundamentalists. The parallel was as academically accurate as it was historically worrisome for 21st century world leaders. Behind the image of Theresienstadt as a peaceful, humane commune for resettled Jews, was the concentration camp reality of institutionalized and militarized genocide. Similarly, behind the perception of Canada as a benevolent, democratic, rule of law based, free market operating, human rights protecting Western military ally is an ugly reality the world only recently came to fully appreciate. The principal geo-politically relevant argument of Bob Simon's segment was modern civilization ought not be fooled again; for if it is the same horrors await the history books.

'The Nazi Deception' began with the formulaed intro and it took a nanosecond to recognize lexiconic colors embedded in the backdrop. Two-thirds comprised of white letters of the title on a red background and one-third yellow with black letters: Chinada punishment certainty. But that wasn't the end of the coalition embeds. Beyond the intro, Bob's commentary only needed one word to prove the segment was geo-politicized.

The whole town was **mesmerized**…

The segment ended with the famous stopwatch. It began ticking at **twenty**.

'60 Minutes': Embedding a Kidmanesque Moment to Ratify the Use of Military Force to Democratize Canada and Evict the Chinese

[February 11, 07]

The February 11, 2007 broadcast of '60 Minutes' could have again been replete with coalition content. However, the one Coalition moment that was embedded was so powerful, there really was no need for more.

It occurred during Steve's interview of presidential candidate Barak Obama. The two were sitting with his wife in his livingroom discussing his background, family life and candidacy. In Steve's words, his…

> …children were interested in [his] campaign only to the extent it affected their campaign to get a dog.

Whether spontaneous or scripted (likely the latter), the Senator said:

> Their only memory of the White House when they made the tour was the President's dog.

Steve filmed and producers edited in two clips of Steve executing an aggressive Erin M. – thus CBS executives intentionally signaling they're in favor of the kind of treatment Nicole's character meted out in the last scene of 'Dogville'.

Barack & Michelle on Future
http://www.cbsnews.com/sections/i_video/main500251.shtml?id=2459484n

----

'60 Minutes': Acknowledging the Canadian Lawyer's Accomplishments or his Academic and Legal Pursuits

[January 28, '07]

'60 Minutes' continued its virtually unbroken attention on the Chinada problem during its January 28, 2007 broadcast. This time executives and producers directed the spotlight of attention on the *Fiefdom* treatise author – the Canadian lawyer – wanting to congratulate him for his work in brining transparency and the ingredients for accountability in Canada.

Compliments to both encourage the Canadian lawyer and anger the coalition's two nemeses were embedded in the third segment of the latest episode of '60 Minutes'. But an hour and a quarter or so before the show started, a preview on the 'CBS Evening News' aired. It was documented in *What Explained the Arrogantly Belligerent Criminality Involving the Fiefdom Computers*:

> What must have gotten the uneducated, immoral and psychopathically perverted really livid was the '60 Minutes' preview in which the voiceover stated the show's executives and producers had interviewed geniuses before, but not as genius as the man profiled on this evenings broadcast. And then the man executed an aggressive quasi-Clooney M. to signal that the description was also applicable to the Canadian lawyer.

Before Coalition members again elevated his international status, the first two segments had coalition content. The first was about a young soldier who defected to North Korea from the demilitarized zone forty-four years ago. Bob filed the report and executed a Blair M. that lasted throughout the entire introduction: thirty-three seconds. The intention of using this Commonwealth gesture was to draw parallels between the dictatorial and population-oppressing, nose thumbing arrogance and military belligerence of the North Korean government and that of Canada and the sovereignty-sharing Chinese. There was on remark Bob made that

sounded like it was applicable to the Canadian lawyer's circumstance: "For 44 years, [the defector] had a mysterious, isolated existence in that mysterious isolated country".

Steve's segment on a successful American company servicing the technical needs of consumers who've purchased sophisticated electronic devices and computers was the opposite of Bob's piece. It was light, funny and entrepreneurial. The interview he had with the profiled company's CEO afforded opportunities to embed coalition content.

CEO: When you seek like twenty of us walk into a bar, [Steve: quasi-Clooney M.] you know, orderin' beers, it looks like an FBI raid.

[…]

Steve: Are people grateful?

CEO: Oh of course. If you look at the focus groups or whatever, people will say "savior" and "they saved me" and "they saved my data" [clip: Steve quasi-Clooney M.].

In post-production Steve's geo-gesture was inserted to again high profile the Canadian lawyer's two decades being a lab monkey, losing billions in personal wealth generation opportunities involving CGI, being deprived of his law practice and upward mobility into the judiciary, being manipulated out of his Internet business and tortured, enslaved in human experimentation and socially isolated and romantically deprived.

The second edit was motivated by the coalition wanting to elevate the Canadian lawyer's coalition contributions to U.S. national and economic security and the peace, prosperity and security of civilization. It was again an acknowledgement of both 'taking the bullet' for his Coalition members and authoring the *Fiefdom* treatise to add the necessary proof into the diplomatic evidence record.

During an interview with the head of a tech servicing company that caters to high end clients and celebrities the following dialogue ensued:

Steve: How hard is it [clip: Tech quasi-Clooney M.] for an average person to go into a store and buy a High Def TV set and come back and work on it?

Tech: I would say in my client base, it'd probably be less than five percent.

The interviewee's geo-gesture and scripted percentage number were embedded in a context of the question "how hard is it?" – presumably asking what it's like losing three sources of income with one involving billions, one involving the legal profession and twice being at the entrepreneurial leading edge, being tortured and

regularly threatened with death and serious bodily injury, enslaved as a twenty year lab monkey, turned into a servant-butler for the marginally intelligent, socially isolated and romantically and sexually deprived, trying and not getting relief from every accountability mechanism in society, experiencing years of police gauntlets and street soldier suffocation and being tossed in psych wards and pumped full of mind numbing, speech halting and skin-crawling drugs. As has been documented in previous *Fiefdom* chapters, surreptitious assassination was almost successful.

A third interview involved a professor who Steve called "an uber-geek".

> Steve: [Prof: Erin M.] When people call up geeks to fax something or install it a lot of them seem very apologetic for not being able to do it. Should they be apologetic? [end E.M.]

The issue of apologies was considered in *Who Executed the First Oprah Maneuver?*:

> Since Canada has repeatedly angered the U.S. for a century – its politicians refusing to be neighborly by insulting American politicians and citizens, its ruling elite conspiring with China to threaten national and economic security and allowing Beijing to use the forward military base as an operational headquarters to conduct aggressive espionage – it was spot on that the remark chosen [when the Oprah M. was first employed] be "I apologize".
>
> Not only does Canada officially apologize for everything it's done to the United States over the generations, but there's another environment in which "I apologize" will be both relevant and important. It'll be during the post-trial sentencing phase of the serial murderers, torturers, enslavers, thieves, frauds, treasonists, sociopaths, stalkers, saboteurs, agents provocateur and sexual perverts when begging for a reduced period of incarceration. And it will be again heard often during parole hearings when after spending ten, fifteen, twenty or twenty-five years in prison they want to be released.

The segment ended with more of the interview of the tech service CEO.

> Steve: The geeks are ruling the universe [Erin M.].
>
> CEO: Yea, but it's like the Greeks who use to talk about the philosopher kings. Um, geeks have no interest in power. The only power we're interested in is low power consumption and longer battery life. […] Geeks may inherit the earth but they have no desire to rule it.

Presumably Steve was referring to academic geeks with his geo-gesture. It still bothers the Canadian lawyer that kids in school who are academically successful are labeled with an unflattering lexicon and insulting discourse. This phenomenon has the hallmarks of the contemptuous envy thesis. It is important going forward that the image of the intelligent, educated and motivated be turned into a positive, enviable trait. Certainly, school performance would markedly improve since

students would aspire to being smart rather than being disincentivized through feeling ashamed by it and hiding it for fear of ridicule.

Second, it is correct to ascribe to the Canadian lawyer the attitude that he has no desires to 'rule' Canada. If the coalition wants, he's more than willing to dedicate some of his life as an internationally-installed Canadian Lawyer, but that's only until democratic reforms are underway: meaning making sure the country's transparency and accountability mechanisms work like they're supposed to in a modern democracy – government, institutional and police transparency (media, Parliamentary members, procedures and committees) and culpability and liability mechanisms (courts, legal profession – law societies and law schools). Once these work properly the country will evolve towards what it should have been for a century. Canada's boardrooms and the economy will be reformed with assistance, major input from and ownership positions of U.S. business leaders.

Steve's lexiconic maneuver was also a red flag for a research assignment. The concept of the 'philosopher king' goes back to ancient times:

> Until philosophers are kings, or the kings and princes of this world have the spirit and power of philosophy, and political greatness and wisdom meet in one, and those commoner natures who pursue either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities will never have rest from their evils - no, nor the human race, as I believe - and then only will this our State have a possibility of life and behold the light of day.
>
> *Book V*, *The Republic*

'60 Minutes': Predicting an Apocalyptic Future of the World if Chinada Achieves Global Hegemony and Describing the Canadian Lawyer as Both 'Wildly Popular' and Dogville-Trapped Alone

[December 17, '06]

The coalition has accepted the *Fiefdom* argument that should the China-Canada military alliance achieve global hegemony for authoritarianism, there will be another dark chapter in human history with parallels with Nazi Germany.

The coalition also described the Canadian's current international attention and affection as "wildly popular".

Additionally it acknowledged and empathized with him, being stuck in an environment for twenty years devoid of meaningful relationships and interaction with others.

Revisiting The Horrors Of The Holocaust
Millions Of Nazi Documents Are Being Made Available To The Public
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/12/14/60minutes/main2267927.shtml

Canada's elite and the Beijing government deserve the identify label being applied to them by the coalition. They've given them every justification to describe what they pose as not equivalent to but more threatening than radical Islamist fundamentalism; because unlike the Middle Eastern terrorists, they have sovereignty over enormous land masses, two countries to use as training camps that can't be destroyed by conventional weapons, have organized, funded and equipped multi-million man armies, have militarily mobilized a constant supply of taxpayers money and plundered wealth to fund their illegalities, have a Pandora's Box of unconventional weaponry and a degree of legitimacy and respect in the international community that makes an all out war impossible to wage and end swiftly.

When *Fiefdom* treatise evidence of malfeasance becomes the material for academics and military officers when employing peripheral vision to determine from current circumstances, dynamics and processes what the future not might be but will be, they envision what the Canadian lawyer argues is coming: the Chinese achieving global hegemony for authoritarianism and a dark age reminiscent of a combination of Stalinism and Hitlerism. A main difference is that in the future the advancement of science, technology, medicine and the China-Canada military alliance's Pandora's Box will create a hell on earth that can only surpass the terror created by either of these two chapters in human civilization. After successfully using a dominos effect to chip away at democracy's gains, unlike the early 20th century the new rulers of a world with a population of eight to ten billion will develop paranoia so intense they will make Hitler's concentration camps and Stalin's gulag look like an early practice manual for global social control.

The first segment of the December 17, 2006 broadcast of '60 Minutes' ratified the *Fiefdom* treatise analysis of the evolution of humanity if the conflict against China and Canada is lost:

> If it wasn't for the United States, where would humanity be? The Soviets would have won the Cold War. The United States by now would have been invaded and conquered and Moscow would have installed a world government, disbanded the United Nations and would today be dictating global policy. 21st century gulags and even possibly concentration camps would be in all nations, imprisoning those who exercised autonomous thinking. Religion would have been outlawed, mobility rights both within nations and on regional and local levels within communities would be severely curtailed. There would be bread lines in the markets. And the apparatchiks would have their uber-luxury lifestyles while the vast majority of humanity slaved to support them and the needs of 'the state'. In other words, there would be a trans-generational nepotistically reinforced eco-political elite fused with the invisibly wealthy class that would monopolize the world's economy and plunder all its wealth for its own personal needs, chattelize the planet's entire population into serfdom, create a vast secret police organization that would brutalize billions and the planet

> would become one big sex toy shop and schadenfreude-generator that would make Canada's elite drool with longing envy.
>
> What stands between that scenario and global hegemony for democracy is the United States.
>
> Source: *How the U.S. Midterm Election Result Betrays the American Peoples' Historical Legacy to Humanity*

The most recent *Fiefdom* chapter to warn of an ominous future is *Predatory at Home – Predatory Abroad*:

> When the foregoing is fully appreciated as only the Canadian lawyer can, it becomes totally apparent just how psychopathologically predatory Canada's elite and the Beijing government are. When there's absolutely no respect for the law or morality, when victims are chattelized to animal status and the elite act like they are masters of the universe, humanity no longer exists. There is only tyranny, terror and death.

Evidence that Coalition members used the programs first segment – on Hitler's concentration camps – to agree with the Canadian lawyer began with what Scott Pelley said during, and how editors pieced together, the introduction.

> The storerooms are immense: **16** miles of shelves containing secrets [clip of yellow files: *quantum*] of the Nazi Holocaust that have been hidden away for more than 60 years. Never seen by the public until now. To open the files is to see the Holocaust staring back [prisoner photo – number 4 and 9 visible = **five**] like it was yesterday. Strange pink Gestapo arrest warrants as lethal as a death sentence. A list of a *thousand* prisoners saved by a factory owner named Oscar Schlindler. And we also found the file of Fran, Anneliese Marie; better known as Anne Frank.

It is doubtful there is exactly sixteen miles of shelves. Since '60 Minutes' is renowned for accuracy, it would have reported there were 15.9 or 16.1 miles if in fact that was the case. Therefore to identify "16" is a massaged statistic to create a compensation ratifier.

The argument that the statistic was misstated intentionally for coalition purposes is made stronger when it is confirmed that there were 1,098 Jews saved by Schindler, not a "thousand". Thus, this number was intentionally misquoted to embed a Shania identifier; and that even in isolation reveals the segment was geo-politicized to nefariously label China's and Canada's ruling elite and their financiers and supporters.

> Where no-one would have believed it possible, Schindler succeeded. He was granted permission to move the whole of his factory from

> Plaszow to Brunnlitz in occupied Czechoslovakia and furthermore, unheard of before, take all his workers with him. In this way, the **1,098** workers who had been written on Schindler`s list in connection with the removal avoided sharing the fate of the other 25,000 men, women and children of Plaszow who were sent without mercy to extermination in the gas chambers of Auschwitz, only 60 kilometers from Plaszow.
>
> Source: oscarschlinder.com
>
> Oskar Schindler (April 28, 1908 – October 9, 1974) was a Sudeten German industrialist who saved his Jewish workers from the Holocaust. He saved as many as **1,100** Jews by having them work in his enamelware and ammunitions factories…
>
> Source: wikipedia.com

After the end of the preview section, '60 Minutes' executives and producers timed the famous stopwatch to start ticking at **47**.**1** seconds and end at **47** seconds – which contain all three of the triple coalition dynamics.

When the segment began with the formulaed introduction, Scott was sitting in front of the standard backdrop identifying the title of the report, the name of the producer and a graphic of relevant visual cues. Instantly it was clear the segment was going to be a platform to demonize China and Canada. The title "Hitler's Secret Archives" was in black on a white background, on a bright red background – an unmistakable Canadian punishment certainty color combination. To the left of that was a gold-hued photo of Hitler; and on the right a collage of images including a gold-hued background consisting of a concentration camp document; over which was superimposed a collection of death camp photos and a green information card. Thus also embedded in this carefully constructed collection of images was a double representation of *quantum.* Special note is to be made of rendering the photo of Hitler in gold, symbolizing how the Canadian lawyer's *quantum* will be mobilized to ensure that authoritarianism doesn't achieve global hegemony.

Scott states in his report:

> The storerooms are immense: 16 miles of shelves holding the stories of 17 million victims – not only Jews, but slave laborers, political prisoners and homosexuals.

Since there is no authoritative figure that accurately states how many victims there actually were, choosing **17** million is to a degree arbitrary and betrays what is argued in the chapter as a legitimate labeling of Chinada as a global tyrant if its leaders and followers are allowed to achieve hegemony unchallenged.

> No accurate estimate of how many persons died in the concentration camps can be made. Although the Nazis were generally meticulous

> record keepers, the records they kept about concentration camps appear to have been incomplete.
>
> Source: Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression, Vol. II. USGPO, Washington, 1946, pp.949-968
>
> [T]aking into account all minority groups, the total death toll rises considerably; estimates generally place the total number of Holocaust victims at 9 to 11 million, though some estimates have been as high as 26 million.
>
> Source: wikipedia.com

Scott executes geo-gestures to elevate certain issues important to coalition partners. The first was in the following excerpt:

> It's Hitler's secret archive. [gesture start] The Nazis were famous [end] for record keeping but what 60 Minutes found ran from the bizarre to the horrifying.

'60 Minutes' executives and producers were confirming what was argued in the *Fiefdom* treatise in late December 2004 that's part of the 'bizarre to horrifying' paradigm of colonized governance; namely that Canada's fiefdom elite have a secret library of its malfeasance that's accumulated over the last century of rule and which is used for the edification of subsequent generations of elite family members and so they can brag of their and their Chinese friends' torture, sexual perversions and economic monopolization and wealth plundering exploits now and for the future.

> To complete the pattern of news media documentation of Liberal malfeasance an article exactly on point was published […] and thus document for eternity and for future generations of their own what they had done, to whom they had done it to and when.
>
> Source: *How the International E.R. Memorial Centre Participated in Reconstructing the Western Half of What Was the Last Democratic Fiefdom*

It seemed fair to infer that the first of three interviewed Holocaust survivors wearing Canadian punishment certainty colors was symbolic of future innocent people swept into lifelong hellholes by tyrannical governments. By contrast, Scott wore the colors of the United States of America to reinforce the view that his country is, for the third time, going to save humanity.

He changed into a suit and tie with a Canadian punishment certainty theme for his interview of Holocaust survivor number two. This was an especially moving interview because of the memory that was cued, opening a window into the barbarity of the Nazi regime.

Scott: [voiceover] This card carried his barracks number, "66 and that number alone opened his memory. How many people would have been in Block 66? [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.]

Answer: A thousand.

Scott: A thousand?

Answer: Ah yeah, that's correct. That's correct. Oh, oh, my God, what just popped into my mind. Between each block there was a trough you could urinate in. And I can see it now [Scott: quasi-Clooney M.]: the block manager, whatever, felt that this person is just about dead. [pause] We put these near-dead people into that trough that other people urinated into, and let them die in those things. [pause] The brutality of it, you know?

The first geo-gesture was meant to both identify Canada's evil-worship political ideology and to let the malfeasant know they're going to jail.

Scott was genuinely surprised at hearing the answer to his question be the same as a Shania identifier; as was the Canadian lawyer when he heard it.

His second geo-gesture was timed to a remark that serves as the foundation for the argument that coalition partners accept the *Fiefdom* prediction of what letting authoritarianism achieve global hegemony will bring to the world.

Scott's second interviewee recounts his arrival at a concentration camp and the segment producer selects a photo of a Jewish man in the middle of the picture with his hand to his face meant to parallel a Clooney M. – and intended to convey for the second time the message that the malfeasant are going to be imprisoned. That is timed to:

> Jack Rosenthal, also of New York, arrived with his family at Auschwitz – the same month that the Nazis took these rarely seen photos. In a process like this, Jack and his uncle [photo] were sent to a barracks while his mother and five sisters and brothers went straight to the gas chambers and the ovens.

Finally, Scott, now wearing a coalition-identifying **three** shades of the color of justice, inserts two last geo-gestures:

Scott: Are you glad you looked at the documents [in the archive]?

Answer: "Definitely. I feel like I learned about me, at least, what happened [quasi-Clooney M.] and specifically what I'm

> glad about, for those people who said the Holocaust didn't happen, [quasi-Clooney M.] like the president of Iran. If they have any questions about it, please come to Bad Arolsen and check it out for themselves."

The first is the coalition reflecting the Canadian lawyer's having discovered what happened to him over the last twenty years. They were present and watching in late 2002 and early 2003 when he worked backwards to arrive at what became an accurate depiction of his surreptitious recruitment into an *Article 7* program.

The second is the coalition acknowledging that the evidence compiled to date in the *Fiefdom* treatise and from independent investigations confirm what happened in Canada over the last hundred years, confirm Chinese military colonization and confirm the China-Canada military alliance was involved in a covert initiative to achieve global hegemony.

Stopwatch: begins at 36 and ends at a compensation ratifying **41**.

Lesley's segment, called 'The Loneliest People', began like Scott's – a backdrop with coalition colors. The title's letters were in black and white on a red background – Canadian punishment certainty colors, intended to convey the message that Canada's malfeasant are going to pay for causing innocent, hard working people to a experience a life of daily hell to perpetuate a vile paradigm of governance and to advance Beijing's foreign policy of knocking down the world's democracy domino-style.

This segment was the coalition being totally empathetic at the effects of the twenty-year social marginalization circumstance imposed on the Canadian lawyer as part of the *Article 7* regime and to shut him out of his economic and upward mobility opportunities. His deprivation of genuine relationships, interaction and affection found its parallel in a young girl who was placed in foster care at a really young age and not reunited with her large family until she was thirteen years old.

In addition to the use of coalition colors, Lesley employed a small but noticeable gesture timed to a coalition-relevant remark, namely to underscore the Canadian hasn't a single trustworthy friend in the country when had his life been normal approaching fifty he should have had a circle of friends, associates and colleagues:

> [These kids] move from foster homes to group homes. There are tens of thousands of these children. They have no one – not a single [gesture] relative to visit on Christmas or their birthday.

Her first Coalition acknowledged geo-gesture occurred during the following question posed to an expert:

> "If the situation was so bad that the state had to take a child away from that home [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.], why under any circumstances would the state put them back into that home?"

He's not certain if there was an intention to geo-politicize this remark. If there was, she was either arguing how irrational it would be to emancipate the Canadian lawyer only to arrange for his return to Canada and back into the same torturous circumstance or how irrational it would have been to frustrate his application for political asylum in February 2004 and watch him return to Canada to suffer the same regime of enslaved experimentation and torture in perpetuity. If it was the latter, then there is an acknowledgement of his elevation to the pinnacle of international attention to engage in the same dynamic Gandhi and Mandela engaged in their respective countries.

Lesley *et al.* embedded one more initiative – a compensation ratifier to remind the malfeasant that they're going to pay every penny they have to compensate the Canadian for their inhuman and unforgivable conduct in depriving him of what is essential to life – genuine interaction and affection.

> After Family Finding called, Lakesha met with Samara's therapist and underwent a criminal background check. Only then was she allowed to meet with Samara.
>
> "At first I was nervous. I couldn't say anything. Like my mouth was so dry. So she was just talkin'," Samara recalls.
>
> That was in April at "**Five** Acres." The last time they had seen each other, Samara was six years old.

The third segment, on a new popular American comedienne, also had coalition embeds. This initiative was originally introduced during the 'CBS Evening News' promo to advertise '60 Minutes'. A clip of an audience member gesturing became an aggressive Clooney M. when it was timed to Simon's voiceover:

What makes this comedienne wildly popular…

The other three coalition embeds were Simon attiring himself in a black and white striped shirt and asking the profiled comedienne wearing red – creating the Canadian punishment certainty color scheme again. With Scott's Hitler segment and Lesley's loneliness segment beginning with those colors, this would make it three-for-coalition-identifying-three.

During a clip of one of the profile comedienne's shows, an audience member putting her hand to her face was timed to Simon's voiceover "Anyone who cracks jokes for a living is gonna offend someone…". This gesture became a quasi-Clooney M. and was the coalition saying anyone who threatens the U.S. for a living is going to offend the country's citizens and leaders and ought to expect retaliation proportional to the danger posed.

Another geo-politicized moment came when the comedienne's manager was interviewed. A clip of him in his office with two colleagues was choreographed; his female associate being asked to executed an aggressive Clooney M. so it could be

edited in and timed to Simon's voiceover remark "He has huge ambitions and wants to create a new [Cl.M.] television comedy network". Back in 2003-4, the Canadian envisioned a philosophy channel that did what 'The Learning Channel' and 'The History Channel' weren't doing.

The last one was timing an audience member gesturing to the face edited to Simon's "Like him or not, Larry the Cable Guy is doing about as much as anyone to increase the level of happiness on earth. And that's a mighty fine accomplishment". Since the Canadian lawyer is trying to rid his country's public and private institutions of aggressively predatory and brutal people, he's doing the same.

To make '60 Minutes' fully militarily mobilized, Andy's segment had coalition content too: *Andy Rooney: Demonstrating CBS Remains Committed as Ever to Advancing the Interests and Objectives of the Coalition*.

As has been argued in all these '60 Minutes' chapters, the reason why this important news investigative show continues to embed coalition content over and over is to remind the malfeasant just how critical U.S. authorities believe democratizing Canada is – meaning the eviction of the Chinese colonizers and purging and punishing the trans-generational elite. And there's not going to be a cessation of pressure until those two primary objectives are achieved.

What this episode accomplished that was eluded to in the past but not formally introduced was equating the threat posed by Canada's and China's elite with the Nazis. As argued above, the Canadian lawyer's peripheral vision as to what humanity can expect if democracy is replaced with their vile ideology has been accepted and Scott's segment augments the parallels already made with the Soviet Union and radical fundamentalist Islamists. In short, it couldn't be any worse for those who arrogantly believe they aren't going to be held to account.

'60 Minutes': Drawing Comparisons Between the Abu Ghraib Prison Whistleblower and Canadian Lawyer and Between the Italian Mafia and Canada's Government

[December 10, '06]

The Sunday, December 10, 2006 broadcast of '60 Minutes' ran two coalition-relevant segments – one on the soldier who blew the whistle on torturing Iraqi detainees at the Abu Ghraib Prison and Mafia infiltration into the Italian Parliament and Prime Minister's Office. Coalition language was embedded in each, thus seeking to draw parallels with what the Canadian lawyer did and what the Canadian government became.

Provenzano: The Phantom Of Corleone
Steve Kroft Reports On The Mafia's Influence In Italy
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/12/08/60minutes/main2240698.shtml

Steve Kroft's segment on the mafia in Italy also contained coalition content. While not a recognized geo-gesture, he moved slightly but perceptibly timed to:

> For well over a century [gesture], the mafia has endured by forming relationships with people in power, playing a role in who gets elected, and developing a web of protection that reaches into the highest levels of the Italian government.

This is thoroughly corroborative of *Fiefdom* treatise allegations. The trans-generationally corrupt however, are not outside government like the mafia is. They *are* the government, which makes the malfeasance even more despicable.

The next gesture – an inserted clip of Steve executing a protracted quasi-Clooney M. – is timed to:

> Asked how a fugitive could run a multi-billion dollar operation, Stille says, "They can count on not just the members of their own organization but the rest of society to protect them [Cl.M.].

This is also corroborative of the *Fiefdom* treatise argument that judges, the police, the media and other institutions of the private sector are there to insulate the malfeasant.

Coercive diplomacy was introduced when the mafia expert said the following:

> If you can convince people that – 'I can kill you at any time, anywhere, and I can kill your children,' I can get you to do a lot of things.

The difference of course is that the coalition would never execute innocent life. However, older teenagers and twenty-somethings in command positions or who personally participated in *Article 7* initiatives, torture and military-motivated sexual perversions are susceptible to these harshest of 'Iron Fist' accountability mechanisms.

Certainly when the coalition moves and executes a few select members of the trans-generational eco-political elite and/or Chinese colonizers, they'll instantly appreciate coalition partners mean business and that their older kids are in the Coalition crosshairs. And as a result they will capitulate quickly to the demands of the international community.

'60 Minutes' acknowledged the incestuous relationship between former Prime Minister Chrétien and the Chief Justice of Canada's Federal Court – the latter being the former's personal secretary in the late 1970s – when Steve gestured as follows:

> Before Senator Dell'Utri came to the Italian parliament, he [gesture] had worked as Silvio Berlusconi's private secretary, lived in his

> private residence, and went on to run one of his companies, found his political party and manage his campaigns.

The Italian senator was found guilty of links to the mafia. When Steve interviewed the Senator's lawyer, innocence was maintained:

> Senator Dell'Utri is appealing the conviction and declined to talk to 60 Minutes, but Kroft did speak with his lawyer, Nino Mormino.
>
> Mormino says the claim that Dell'Utri was the mafia's ambassador to the court of Berlusconi is a "fairy tale that would be hard to prove."

Steve inserted a clip of him executing a protracted quasi-Clooney M." at "hard to prove" – signaling that while it may have been difficult to prove the same criminal associations in Canada at the highest levels, the Canadian in fact did prove his allegations and the international community's moving to make reforms and holding people otherwise unaccountable to account as a direct result.

To end this segment, '60 Minutes' executives and producers arranged for the stopwatch to begin at 35 seconds and end at 39.9 seconds [= **21**].

'60 Minutes': Drawing Comparisons Between the Abu Ghraib Prison Whistleblower and Canadian Lawyer and Between the Italian Mafia and Canada's Government

[December 10, '06]

The Sunday, December 10, 2006 broadcast of '60 Minutes' ran two coalition-relevant segments – one on the soldier who blew the whistle on torturing Iraqi detainees at the Abu Ghraib Prison and Mafia infiltration into the Italian Parliament and Prime Minister's Office. Coalition language was embedded in each, thus seeking to draw parallels with what the Canadian lawyer did and what the Canadian government became.

Exposing The Truth Of Abu Ghraib
Anderson Cooper Interviews Whistleblower Joe Darby
http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/12/07/60minutes/main2238188.shtml

Employing the media superpower and unchallengeable reputation of CBS' '60 Minutes', the coalition put Canada's malfeasant on the international stage again. This time they bootstrapped two stories CBS investigated to advance democracy's interests and objective. One involved the U.S. soldier who out of serendipitous circumstances became the unwitting whistleblower of the Abu Ghraib prison scandal that rocked the U.S. military and gave a black eye to America around the world. The parallel was comparing his ethical standards when confronted with serious violations of the law and the fallout he suffered with the Canadian lawyer as the *Fiefdom* whistleblower and what he's suffered in that role. The second story was an

investigative report on the Mafia in its home country of Italy. The comparison between how it operated and its links to the upper echelons of political power echoed the Canadian paradigm of governance. The main difference? In Italy there's a functioning independent judiciary that tackles this incestuous corruption where in Canada there's the exact opposite: the judges are in bed with it.

What stands out as calling for an explanation is the date stamp on the transcript of Anderson Cooper's segment on the military whistleblower. Unlike Steve Kroft's Mafia story, which is dated for the day of broadcast, Anderson's is dated for Pearl Harbor anniversary day. Given the significance attached to that date in the *Fiefdom* treatise, it is arguable the coalition wanted to elevate the segment to add to that dynamic.

Virtually all of Anderson's interview and points made about the U.S. soldier parallel's the Canadian lawyer's situation and experiences. Added emphasis was inserted with geo-gestures.

When Anderson asks him "What was goin' through your mind" about the torture photos when then came into his possession, he replied "Disbelief. I tried to think of a reason why they would do this, you know." At "a reason" Anderson executed what is now identified as the most recent maneuver, the 'SNL M.' – named after the gesture used the evening before the '60 Minutes' broadcast on 'Saturday Night Live' and during its 'I Hate This Town' comedy sketch: *Uber-Genius 'Saturday Night Live': Promising Aggressive Military Action on Behalf of the Coalition*.

An aggressive quasi-Clooney M. was attached to Anderson's observation "Look, this is a valuable interrogation tool". Darby answers "These were MPs. Our job wasn't to interrogate prisoners". The implication is that those linked to the China-Canada military alliance and Canada's trans-generational elite will be subject to U.S. military interrogation. To get to that stage will require that they are arrested and detained – precisely what the Canadian lawyer has argued for for months.

The next gesture, an aggressive Clooney M. from the soldier himself – thus choreographed – came during this portion of the interview:

> But then, while Darby was having lunch in the mess hall watching Donald Rumsfeld testify before Congress about Abu Ghraib, the defense secretary said, "There are many who did their duty professionally and we should mention that as well. First, Specialist Joseph Darby, who alerted appropriate authorities that abuses were occurring."
> "I just stopped in mid bite. I was eating [Cl.M.] and I just stopped. What the hell just happened? Now the anxiety came back. Now, I'm worried," Darby remembers. "Everyone in the unit knew within four hours."

It is likely Anderson *et al.* wanted to impress upon the malfeasant how fast their lives will change when they're exposed in the environments their crimes against

humanity and other atrocities are revealed. It might be to loved ones; it might be to non-fiefdom employers. Regardless of when it happens, where it happens and to whom it is disclosed, the revelations will have instant and life-long detrimental effects.

As the soldier testified, right after he was exposed as the whistleblower, he had to sleep with a gun under his pillow – cocked and ready for use. And it was more than evident he couldn't live in his hometown ever again. While waiting to move out, he was flanked by armed U.S. military officers everywhere he went to protect him from retaliation. Death threats and threats of violence were common. And he was totally ostracized by family members and long-term friends and associates. An aggressive quasi-Clooney M. was timed to Anderson's question "Is it true you've had relatives turn against you".

An aggressive Erin M. was timed to "anger in [town]":

> He says there was a lot of anger in Cumberland. […] [His wife] Bernadette Darby says she heard people calling her husband a traitor, that he was a dead man and that he was walking around with a bull's eye on his head.

As the Canadian lawyer argued throughout the *Fiefdom* treatise, should its criminal indictment be widely disseminated in Canada, there isn't a politician, judge, cop, reporter or wealthy person who wouldn't be lynched.

What did the soldier get to mitigate his life being destroyed? He was recognized by the establishment for his contribution to keeping people in the military honest. What does the Canadian get that replaces what he lost? As he's repeatedly stated, he's foregoing public acknowledgment for his *quantum*, being with and sharing his wealth with his extended family and the fact that keeping things confidential accomplishes more than if there was publicity.

'60 Minutes': Again Dedicating Time, Energy and Resources to Advancing the Interests and Objectives of the Coalition

[October 15, '06]

The thrill of witnessing '60 Minutes' executives, producers and cast pummel the China-Canada military alliance hasn't diminished one bit. The Canadian lawyer still gets an exhilarating rush of excitement observing one of the most powerful teams in investigative journalism use coalition language to put the alliance on notice it's not going to get away with large scale depraved indifference murder, trans-generational plunder, institutionalized hypno-rape and sexual molestation of children for political and military purposes, decades of daily torture, *Article 7* experimentation and all manner of criminality and impropriety.

CBS' Sunday, October 15, 2006, broadcast of '60 Minutes' yet again dedicated a portion of the episode to keeping the ubiquity of condemnation fully intact. The program began with a China-colored Ed Bradley introducing his segment on the Duke University rape case. It didn't take long to conclude the District Attorney in the story was engaging in if not professional gross negligence, then prosecutorial misconduct. He appeared more concerned about pandering to the African-American community to get re-elected than following standard procedure and making sure the police did their jobs by the book. Besides one possible lexiconic maneuver timed to the issue of suffering pain, the only appearance of coalition language was his attire.

It was during Lesley's segment that the geo-gestures flowed regularly – and all timed to issues relevant and significant to coalition interests and objectives.

The topic involved a former White House insider appointed by President Bush to manage his faith based initiatives. After he left office, he wrote a book critical about how these policies were implemented that others interviewed for the segment downplayed as naïve, factually incorrect and parochial. '60 Minutes' producers chose questions and picked responses to time geo-gestures to that became platforms for high profiling coalition issues.

The first was Lesley executing a quasi-Clooney M. to her observation that the author was, as she put it, "blowing the whistle". There can be no doubt that the *Fiefdom* treatise is the means by which the Canadian lawyer has brought awareness to very serious and long existing issues of corruption, treason and the most serious of *mala fides* committed not by just one or a few conspiring government officials, but by tens of thousands; including politicians on three levels of government, the country's most powerful judges, entire national and local police force executives and many so-called officers of the law, the country's spy agency, top military leaders, a multitude of bureaucrats, all the media moguls and the country's entire wealthy class. And the corruption wasn't restricted to the late 20th and early 21st century. It was traced back over a hundred years.

And further, the whistleblowing wasn't limited to one country. The evidence directly implicated what is currently the fastest growing economy in the world – one that has enticed, seduced, tricked and manipulated some of the most powerful and richest nations, people and corporations on the planet into participating in its growth – and by implication its ability to wage a secret war with new technologies that make conventional weaponry obsolete. He's blown the cover on, or rather stripped away (academically deconstructed) a sophisticated façade from behind which a plot had been hatched twenty years ago to accomplish what the Soviets tried and failed.
And he didn't just reveal that a few inconsequential domestic laws were broken. He found a complex of treason, massive wealth plundering, conspiracy and wholesale criminality by two governments to violate in perpetuity one of the most serious international prohibitions – the one on institutionalizing *Article 7* experimentation for military purposes – purposes inimical to the peace, prosperity and stability of the world.

So Lesley *et al*. had appropriately used '60 Minutes' time, energy and resources to underscore the whistleblower element of the Canadian lawyer's status.

The second lexiconic maneuver was executed when she asked the author "In retrospect, was it morally wrong?". If the coalition's firestorm of protest is a barometer of moral culpability, then it being off the charts identifies the Chinada problem as up there in the annuls of historic atrocities. What makes the situation in Canada most infamous is the fact this paradigm of governance has been operating and unchecked for a longer period of time than any other in the 20th century. All the other tyrannies fell eventually. Some lasted a half-century – like the Soviet Union; and Castro's regime is celebrating this same longevity. Some lasted thirty years like Saddam Hussein's rule. Ceausescu's was a couple decades. None however have been able to perpetuate itself for over a century. That makes understanding why the atrocities in Canada got so bad easier. Absolute power that has nothing to ever challenge it makes those who exercise it worse and worse through the generations.

And that explains why evil and stupidity were institutionalized and held in such high esteem in Canada's eco-political and wealthy circles. Their descendents didn't and today's elite haven't had or seen a need to stay smart and sharp or improve themselves. In the culture of full and unbridled entitlement, they uncritically adopted their parents' and grandparents' ideology and didn't just coast in their unchallengeable positions and lifestyles, they literally continued the hundred year process of devolving as people. It's not beyond the boundaries of accuracy therefore to argue that a century later they have in fact become sub-human.

The next geo-gesture demonstrated the clever '60 Minutes' operational investigative methodology. Not only are they hard on the source of the problem being examined, but they also are always cognizant of the credibility of the party doing the exposing. Not only are the regular questions to be asked, like whether the whistleblower has personal motives, is his or her background revelatory of biases, conflicts of interest or personal intellectual shortcomings and whose agenda is being unjustifiably furthered by being critical, but also whether the process of evaluating the problem, incompetence or criminal activity might be parochial. It is in the following comment made by someone Lesley interviewed to question the author's perceptions of White House conduct that appeared suspicious and to which she attached a quasi-Clooney M. that the Canadian lawyer's allegations and evidence remain meritorious:

> I think it's dangerous to take a snapshot of a few months or even a year and draw conclusions [Cl.M.].

The Canadian's evidence spans two full decades. He has carefully and meticulously traced back and pieced together an uninterrupted trail of malfeasance against himself back to the mid-1980s. Additionally, since the arrival of the coalition some three, perhaps four, years ago, the serious malfeasance he's complained of has continued unabated. Again, the lapse of so much time takes subject of the complaint out of the realm of the transient.

Lesley's last geo-gesture was so protracted, it was clearly intended to signal a proportional relevance and significance to coalition interests and objectives. It began when the following quote started and the quasi-Clooney M. didn't stop until the end of this excerpt:

> Do you think that the White House – the Bush White House – is going to read this book as a betrayal and are you worried they're gonna come after you?

A literal reading of this question asks if the *Fiefdom* treatise is perceived as a betrayal and exposes the Canadian lawyer to retaliation. However, that cannot be what '60 Minutes' intended since all the evidence points to the treatise being embraced not only by the President, but also his inner circle and the most powerful, wealthy and high profile people in the United States. The exposé conducted on Canada and China reveals a serious threat to American national and economic security at a time when White House attentions have been and continue to be distracted by Iraq and the war on terror.

Therefore the question must have been asking if Canada's political and economic leaders have betrayed the U.S. trust as neighbors and so-called partners in democracy and free market capitalism – that they have secretly conspired with a totalitarian imperialist seeking global hegemony and exposed America to an unmitigated danger that leaves its superior military strength impotent and the economy subject to being severely undermined without any efficacious defenses available or that can be developed. If that's the case then Lesley is raising to awareness the real likelihood that the White House is going to come after Canada's eco-political elite and invisibly wealthily. Taking account of the plethora of coercive diplomacy since May 2006 that emanated from every coalition partner, U.S. troops shooting at Canadian diplomats in the Green Zone early in the year and the foreign policy of pre-emption, retaliatory action is more likely than not.

After the author short-answered the question in bullet-point form, the segment ended with the standard stopwatch ticking to commercial. The Canadian hooted and howled with elation when he observed the second hand started ticking at **twenty** seconds. For '60 Minutes' to acknowledge his two decades of torture, enslavement, impoverishment, imprisonment, experimentation and being forced into an extreme isolation lifestyle depriving him of meaningful contact, relationship and family dynamics is to him a remarkable experience.

While Canada's fiefdom elite and Beijing's military colonizers have persistently acted like they're not worried one bit about what the United States might do, most conventional theories of human nature would support the proposition they're actually really concerned and don't want to show it because that would spell weakness, would send the wrong message to the troops and would constitute an anti-propaganda victory. They may conduct 'business as usual'. But they know if President Bush really *really* wants to, with the stroke of his Presidential Pen he can seriously and in some cases fatally compromise their interests. The immense economic connectivity between the two countries affirms the truth of the revised

adage: if the U.S. sneezes, Canada gets pneumonia and is on life-support. And it can all be accomplished under the public radar.

Again, '60 Minutes' puts the Canadian lawyer's issues on the international community's center stage. Its members watched Ed and Lesley as closely as Canada's malfeasant and they're just as grateful as he is for this exposure.

'60 Minutes': Again Contributing to the Deconstruction of the Last Democratic Fiefdom

[October 8, '06]

There appears to be no denying now that the coalition is going to continually use CBS' '60 Minutes' as a platform to hurl Coalition encirclement and embarrassment messages at Canada's malfeasant. On Sunday, October 8, 2006, Lesley Staul not only wore Canadian punishment colors during the two separate interviews she conducted for her segment, but executed several geo-gestures timed to issues important to coalition partners.

The recent corporate spying scandal at one of America's largest companies, Hewlett Packard, high profiled the issue of privacy in modern times. A *Fiefdom* chapter discussed how this controversy was relevant to Canada's paradigm of governance and Chinese colonization dynamics: *Setting the Privacy Bar High: Contrasting America's Revulsion for Privacy Invasion With Canada's Institutional Practices*. In Lesley's '60 Minutes' report, she highlighted some other aspects of the case that have relevance to the Canada problem.

One of the subjects of conversation during the interview with the very recently departed Chairman of HP is encapsulated in the following excerpt:

> "If you have enough money and you're willing to spend enough, you can buy and sell somebody's reputation," Dunn says.

The quote adequately summarizes the power, wealth and intention of coalition partners in vilifying the Beijing government and Canada's two sub-factions.

The second quote that would have relevance if Chinese and Canadian leaders were innocent is as follows:

It was a disinformation, a classic disinformation campaign.

Had the allegations made in the *Fiefdom* treatise been wrong, officials from both countries would have protested vigorously – not wanting to be painted either as a late 20th and early 21st century Soviet threat or militarily experimenting commu-nazis. And the argument that Canada was ruled an uber-corrupt ruling elite would have been refuted.

The second interview Lesley conducted for the segment was with Patricia Dunn's predecessor Carly Fiorina. Lesley peppers the entire conversation with geo-gestures – all timed to topics directly relevant to the China-Canada military alliance, the paradigm of governance, coalition dynamics and the history, current status and future of the Canadian lawyer.

'60 Minutes': Dedicating Its Entire 9/11 Broadcast to Coercive Diplomacy and Ideological Deconstructing the Last Democratic Fiefdom

[September 10, '06]

As a testament to how the coalition has unequivocally linked the war on terrorism to the conflict against the China-Canada military alliance, CBS' '60 Minutes' embedded multiple initiatives in its September 10, 2006 broadcast – the eve of the fifth anniversary of 9/11 –to continue the process of deconstructing the Canadian totalitarian-colonized paradigm of governance and warning its leaders and followers they will be severely punished for their conduct.

Proof just how seriously American coalition partners take the threat posed by a belligerent Beijing and Canada's elite was evident once again from just how much of the latest '60 Minutes' episode was dedicated to the battle against the two governments and their supporters.

The first segment was hosted by Katie Couric and it was clear from the outset she was going to convey a punishment inevitability theme throughout. She was observed to make six clothing changes. The first five wardrobes – a compensation ratifier – had only black and white colors. The sixth was black, white and condemnation pink.

Katie also embedded several lexiconic maneuvers timed to remarks that had Coalition import.

The first aggressive quasi-Clooney M. was timed to an observation she made of a doctor she was interviewing who got caught in the chocking dust kicked up by the collapse of one of the World Trade Center towers. He coughed and she remarked "you're suffering from the after-effects yourself". Since she timed it to a geo-gesture, it was conveying there ought to be an inquiry whether the Canadian lawyer is experiencing psychological or physical injury as a result of some twenty years of unending torture, perpetual enslavement, decades of impoverishment, mobility imprisonment, aggressive and unrelenting *Article 7* experimentation and a punishing isolation that deprived him of meaningful human contact, love, affection, romance, sexuality and family creation dynamics.

Fiefdom chapters have addressed this issue already and so there's no need to traverse that ground again. However, in brief it's worth noting that the adversity simply made him cognitively stronger. The more he was battered, bruised and deprived, the more resilient and optimistic he became. The introduction of the

Coalition and its early ratification of his *quantum* only added to that strength and augmented his ability to be patient.

Katie's next quasi-Clooney M. lasted twelve to thirteen seconds – as protracted as they get. It was timed to "how has this affected your life?". Again, *Fiefdom* chapters have been authored to address this matter. And again, in brief it's worth noting he's been deprived of everything by Canada's elite and the Beijing government for what feels like an eternity; but in doing so guaranteed he would come out at the other end of it all smarter, richer, more high profile, unchallengeably respected and offered roles and responsibilities only granted the very few in history.

Her next geo-gesture turns attentions towards the malfeasant. "[X] called you a disgrace", she states; then adds, "A lot of people are furious". The fiefdom elite and its Chinese colonizing conspirators know this and don't care. They've ideologically insulated from all criticism and proceed as if it's going to be 'business as usual' in perpetuity. They have no clue what accountability means because they're not ideologically predisposed to it personally and have created a governing paradigm without it. When the 'Iron Fist' arrives, they'll be genuinely shocked; chaos will ensue and those who until then demonstrated strength, arrogance and invincibility will crumble psychologically. Many will suffer post-traumatic stress disorder and become ineffectual to manage their lives and futures. Lots of them will turn to alcohol, prescription medication and illegal drugs. Trapped, scared and in emotional turmoil, some will take their own lives because they can't face punishment or a future without schadenfreude, absolute power and the luxuries of plundered wealth.

The context of the next maneuver relates to what Ground Zero workers were told about the dangers of lingering dust particles and chemicals in the air. The gesture was timed to…

> Some people might say the workers on the pile were told [Cl.M.] by the EPA – maybe they weren't told enough – but they were told [of the health hazard of working without air filtering equipment].

This was an acknowledgement by a coalition partner just how often China-Canada military alliance leaders and followers were told about the demands of the international community to stand down its illegalities and improprieties, including the dismantling of the Pandora's Box of technologies, strategies, techniques and tactics meant to undermine U.S. military superiority and designed to attack and destroy democracy and free market capitalism. They were told that Canada was no longer going to be a military base for Beijing and the eco-political elite and invisibly wealthy couldn't sustain its corrupt paradigm of governance. Not only did they not listen, they accelerated *Article 7* violations, tortured even more the Canadian lawyer and proceeded militarily as if there was nothing to stop them. First the polite diplomacy, then the coercive diplomacy phase, was retired and the 'final notice' phase implemented. A deadline date to negotiate a resolution of issues was

communicated and they ignored it; believing they were invincible from accountability within Canada's sovereign territory.

The second half of '60 Minutes' was hosted by Scott Pelley. His segment focused on some of the children of 9/11 – kids of the deceased. Not only did he embed multiple lexiconic maneuvers executed by himself, but employed choreographed and spontaneous scratching by interviewees to create geo-gestures. Additionally, producers and he scripted many color schemes in clothing to create coalition meaning and messages to the audience in the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy. Scott's first interviewee stated

> [Mom] took me aside and [said…] dad's hurt and I was like, 'okay', thinking nothing of it; and she [said] dad's really hurt [Cl.M.]. I don't think we're ever gonna see him again.

This was the first coercive diplomacy of the broadcast. '60 Minutes' producers on behalf of coalition partners were either threatening summary execution or detaining malfeasors who travel outside Canada in the secret CIA prison system now confirmed by the President to be operating in terrorism war coalition partners' countries.

The sequence was followed by a photo of the interviewee and her little sister. She was in Canadian colors and her sister was wearing pink.

Scott then moved to the second profiled family; but not before creating a compensation ratifier. His voiceover states "[this child's father] left behind *two* daughters. [Father #2] was the father of *seven*". (7 – 2 = **five**).

Scott then returns to the interview of the first child victim of 9/11. She states:

> I was more of the strong one. [Scott Cl.M.] It was weird. […] People were shocked to see me [at school so soon after the terrorist attack].

The geo-gesture appeared timed to "it was weird" and "people were shocked to see me there" than about her internal fortitude. If that's the case, then '60 Minutes' on behalf of all coalition partners are (i) describing their impression of what's being going on in Canada and (ii) are describing the reaction of fiefdom leaders and followers when they discover where the Canadian lawyer ends up after emancipation from Dogville and Chinada. As argued above, shock will be only the first response. For once they know he's gone, they'll expect military intervention, comprehensive asset seizures, lengthy if not indefinite detentions, a full political and economic purge and the most severe punishment possible, including covert assassinations.

Scott's interview shifts from independent interviews of two children to a 9/11 child survivor camp. Here he's assembled a group of teenagers to talk candidly on camera about their memories, experiences and futures. And it is during this interview process, producers arrange color combinations and use clever and

creative editing techniques to link Scott's geo-gestures and children's choreographed and spontaneous scratches to the face to create coalition-relevant remarks.

The first involved connecting the colors red, white and yellow in the interviewee's shirts to Scott's voiceover: "We found 9/11 is still present, even in kids eager to move on" [plus clip of three children – intended as a coalition identifier]. This statement was viewed as coalition partners insisting that the Canadian lawyer doesn't just walk away from twenty years of malfeasance – that he's going to have lingering memories and perhaps some psychological trauma present in his post-emancipation life. In response he argues that there are two kinds of minds and memories: one that collects experiences and cognitively resides within that 'database' of thoughts and one that behaves like existentialists – only living in the present and looking forward towards the future. Memories don't collect in the way people normally think. They may exist, but have no significant impact on thought processes, emotions, decision-making or future planning.

One of the expectations *Article 7* technicians had when engaging in such diabolical experiments as surreptitious assassination without culpability is that accumulations of torturous experiences combined with complete isolation and deprivation will lead to an overwhelming sensation of pain and suffering and a resulting nihilism about life that justifies suicide.

Before the coalition introduced itself, the Canadian came close – but only close – on several occasions to fulfilling these expectations. With his professional life ruined, perpetual poverty and economic prospects always circumvented, no love, romance or sexuality, caged in an inescapable hostile environment that came at him from every angle of perception every hour of every day nonstop and penetrated to thought processes itself and nothing to ever suggest a change, the only rational solution was self-termination. Even the strengths of existential fortitude and intelligence and couldn't withstand such an aggressive 24/7/365 onslaught of comprehensive perception and sensation hate-based stimulation year after year.

However, once cognitively rescued by the coalition, the existentialist attributes were strengthened because a future other than torture, isolation, deprivation and hate was guaranteed. Thereafter, he was fully capable of repelling assaults to his senses and mind. The occasional yelling at his captors had some therapeutic effect; and which was replaced by a process of affirming his *quantum* accumulating every time he experiences malfeasance. Sure, he'll have memories; but they won't interfere with enjoying life, pursuing his interests or interacting with his extended family.
Scott explored the theme of hating from traumatic experiences. One child stated:

> "After 9/11 I used to hate* everyone around me. I was so mad. […] I used to hate everyone."
>
> [* Scott Cl.M. and colors of red, white, yellow & black - Chinada]

It is doubtful the Canadian lawyer's hostility towards those who interfered with his natural course of life will ever subside. There are just some kinds of behaviors that justify life-long loathing. Fortunately for him and his torturers and captors, he's not going to be assessing or doling out punishment. That's for coalition partners – who, from all appearances, are going to sincerely and immeasurably enjoy both the 'execution' of accountability and observing years and decades of aftereffects.

Scott's voiceover to an interviewee wiping a tear from her cheek – "the reminders never end" – was also apropos. However, instead of memory cues one would expect after twenty years, the Canadian lawyer's existentialist-wired brain will lead to thoughts of how his experiences led to a multi-billionaire lifestyle for himself, his family and his extended family. Instead of cringing at the cues, he'll smile and laugh at how so much stupidity, corruption and perversion led to such a magnificent life. Getting the last laugh will overshadow any melancholy one might expect.

Scott underscored the two decades of hell with a quasi-geo-gesture and a numerical reference of coalition-significance when talking with the 9/11 camp counselor; who says that the youngest children will be coached well into their college years. His gesture comes right before his rhetorical remark "You're talkin' about another eighteen to **twenty** years". He may have even chosen the number '18' for the **eight**.

A last part of this interview with the teenagers involves Scott's voiceover that "Jennifer is twelve years old [and is] in the company of kids". Her scratching here is linked to both a coalition identifier (12) and communicating the first impression in the broadcast of what coalition partners think of Canada's corrupt, criminal and perverted. '60 Minutes' producers call them a bunch of kids in power – exactly what the Canadian lawyer called them in *Fiefdom* chapter number one, the *Introduction to Volume One*:

> [D]uring the two decades long Gandhi and Mandela-style experience, the author was given the same designation and treated by his government and police handlers like a child would relate to and treat a disliked toy. The five year old, having no rules to follow or personal accountability to regulate behavior, throws the toy around at will, sticks a finger in its so-called private parts and gives it a punch or kick whenever the mood allows. It is hard to believe, but that was exactly the mind-set of thousands of Canadians in power and in private life…

The next scene involves three pre-teen children sitting on the porch step of a camp building and talking with him. Interviewing three might be a coalition identifier and intended to affirm again how necessary it is, like the war on terror, to be victorious and not let this trouble pass to next generations.

The scene is introduced with Scott remarking, "They're not afraid to be embarrassed". With three kids on the porch and the young boy scratching in what appears to be a choreographed gesture, the Canadian lawyer interpreted the message as one or both of two. Either the embarrassment related to the

malfeasant and how they aren't phased by the Coalition pressure or to how as a hypnotized monkey he was compelled for many years to behave in ways that would embarrass mature, rational adults: being incarcerated in a psych ward or scratching in his nose, crotch and anus, the vile 'elevator incident', yelling at his captors, barking at street soldiers and other such conduct.

The second impression in the broadcast of what coalition partners think of Canada's worst is delivered when Scott's voiceover "some like Joseph are in grade school" is linked to more choreographed or spontaneous child scratching.

Another scratch is timed to "some of the memories don't fade". This is a repeat of a previous concern of the Coalition that the Canadian lawyer's experiences will haunt him. In response, given his post-emancipation lifestyle and extended family members, there ain't a chance of anything troubling him. Of course, he'll always remember Dogville, Pigville and Chinada; but the wealth and opportunity generation dynamics that emerge from those twenty years will minimize to insignificance what his torturers and captors tried to drill deep into his psyche.

Scott's voiceover about what he heard from the children, namely "we got an earful […] over and over again", was timed to an aggressive quasi-Clooney M.. This was the second time in the broadcast the coalition raised the matter how much China-Canada military alliance leaders and followers were told to stand down the prohibited conduct by the international community. The observation was then reinforced, linking an interviewee's remark "It's everywhere you go; you're always reminded of it somehow; even in the littlest thing" with Scott's aggressive geo-gesture.

Beijing and Canada's elite are privy to every comment of fact, opinion and criticism made by hundreds of coalition partners and they don't care. They're reminded through television shows and advertisements, from magazine covers and contents and in movies. Being inundated for so long, they cannot but interpret what they hear in and see on Canadian television, radio and print media in the same way what they hear in see on American generated content. And it's had no positive effect. In fact, the reverse. They've become more arrogant, belligerence and recalcitrant.

Scott's most protracted geo-gesture was executed all throughout his comment, "He told us that hatred he felt for everyone has faded and just now he's putting some distance between himself and 9/11. That was also addressed above.

The last scene was back to the one-on-one interview format. "How am I gonna make myself happy?" the interviewee asks herself and which is timed to Scott executing a protracted lexiconic maneuver. "It's by making other people happy … around you" [timed to a clip of her quietly crying and wiping a dripping nose]. "It's by doing good deeds for other people. That's what makes me happy".

Certainly the Canadian lawyer's future plans will make him elated every single day for the rest of his life: the billionaire lifestyle reward and benefits package for his extended family, engaging in nation building, assisting American big business

replace colonization, corruption, chattelization and perversion, gargantuan and tiny philanthropy projects and keeping his immediately family fully satisfied.

This '60 Minutes' episode adds to the other *fourteen* coalition-inspired broadcasts. It succeeds at again high profiling the geo-political conflict with a tenacious, unapologetic and inhuman authoritarianism. Coming on the eve of the fifth anniversary of 9/11 reinforces the link between the war on terror and the battle against Beijing and Canada's triangle operators. The more they demonstrate an unwillingness to negotiate and reform, the more it caused waves of fear and loathing throughout the Coalition ranks of the politically and militarily powerful, the uber-wealthy and super successful. The more they say in deeds we're going to win and make you and your children subservient, torture you and cage you just like we did the Canadian lawyer, the more resolve there has been to crush them without mitigation or mercy. And that's what the next phase is going to accomplish.

---

60 Minutes: Once Again Reminding China's Colonizers and Ottawa How Committed CBS is to Their Obliteration for Threatening the U.S. and Civilization and Perpetuating the Last Democratic Fiefdom

[August 27, '07]

It may be late summer and the '60 Minutes' team is off until September, but that didn't stop CBS from taking the two opportunities it had on August 27, 2006 to remind Beijing and Ottawa that it stands one hundred percent behind the Canadian lawyer, the President of the United States and all the coalition partners.

Typically, summer is a time of '60 Minute' reruns. Only a really significant news item will mobilize the executive to put a crew together to go out and cover something that can't wait until the autumn season. The anniversary of Hurricane Katrina was one of those events. Since an opportunity arose to broadcast something new, the CBS executive decided a window also opened to reaffirm its commitment to the coalition.

CBS sent Byron Pitts to New Orleans to interview Mayor Ray Nagin for the story. To show solidarity with coalition partners, the CBS executive instructed Byron and got the Mayor's consent to attire themselves in Canadian colors. Thus, in the preview to the segment and during the first part of the segment itself, Byron was a white shirt and the Mayor in a bright red shirt.

To add corroboration, a scheme was devised to create controversy. The '60 Minutes' segment wasn't just going to air on Sunday night and that was going to be the end of that. CBS ingeniously came up with the idea to get the Mayor to say something controversial – something that would get the attention of the news wires and would be written about all around the country. They embedded a compensation ratifier in a remark about the World Trade Center. And it worked.

'60 Minutes' Andy Rooney: Getting Kidmanesque in the Extreme

[August 13, '06]

On Sunday, August 13, 2006, 60 Minutes' Andy Rooney swung wide open the gates of Hades with his segment on the New York Westminster Dog Show.

Lesley Staul, attired in red, black and blonde – the message there's going to be punishment in Canada – introduced Andy Rooney's diplomatic missile aimed right at the hearts of Chinada's worst. It was an emotionally uplifting experience for the Canadian lawyer to watch the veteran impale all their corpses on the pole of Kidmanesque sanction.

> Every year the Westminster Kennel Club holds the best dog show in the world in New York. There were **2** thousand **6** hundred dogs entered this year and we went to the show and talked to a lot of dogs and a lot of owners. We like the dogs best!
>
> A lot of owners make fools of themselves [close-up clip of owner and dog: owner wearing purple top and standing in front of a full television screen's worth of yellow backdrop] over their dogs [dog wearing a green collar]. Won't let them alone. [clip of a black and white dog laying on a red towel being brushed and pampered].
>
> Not a tough life for a dog [now see brusher in yellow apron and an adjacent purple covered table]
>
> Half the time you can't recognize [clip of another black and white dog and handler wearing all red] what kind of a dog it is. Owners tie them up in ribbons [pink] and in general make some of the dogs look ridiculous.
>
> [Green attired owner standing in front of yellow seats with violet backing] There are a lot of breeds I never heard of. [identifies **eight** kinds].
>
> [clip of dog sleeping in a cage] I think they like being where people cant get at them.

The three-minute segment had an hour's worth of coalition activity. The first instance of the Coalition language of war after the Kidmanesque theme was identified came right at the beginning. It was a China identifier – combining the "two" and "six". The second was at the very end in how many canines Andy identified. In between there was were multiple colors and color combinations all intended to communicate the standard messages of the Coalition.

The color schemes alternate starting with purple and yellow, then black, white and red; then purple and yellow; and then black, white and red again.

This conveyed the message that justice is going to be in part dispensed by the payment from the assets of the Canadian elite what is now an extraordinarily large

quantum. '60 Minutes' executives, cast and crew have been following just as closely the accumulation of punitive damages as everyone else in the coalition; so they knew that this particular episode of the program came on the eve of damages doubling and the total surpassing the US$100 billion mark.

It must have seemed like poetic justice to film the scene of the dog being pampered; since that is what the country's invisibly wealthy and Chinese colonization leaders have experienced – the former from plundered wealth and the latter from the 'spoils of war'.

The Canadian lawyer got a kick out of how Andy *et al.* linked pink ribbons in one dog's hair with the remark about 'some dogs looking ridiculous'. Translation: the Chinada leaders and followers are being condemned and are to be held to account for being stupid, idiotic and moronic.

The theme of justice and *quantum* arose one last time and just before the second deconstruction dynamic, thus connecting culpability, liability, damages and the Chinese.

Finally, Andy takes his last shot at the malfeasant by showing them that their future is being in a 'cage' and identifying their unfounded belief sovereignty will protect them from coalition members who want to "get at them".

---

60 Minutes: Lara Logan and Andy Rooney Deliver a Mid-Summer Message to the Last Democratic Fiefdom

[July 23, '06]

The July 23, 2006, broadcast of 60 Minutes continued the process of deconstructing Canada's internationally condemned paradigm of governance and military alliance with China.

The first *indicia* of coalition activity would, as Coalition members who arranged it knew in advance, take the Canadian lawyer's breath away. It was not only re-airing a Lara Logan report, but her re-filming her introduction and conclusion attired in bright Canadian colors.

The second *indicia* was embedded in Andy Rooney's commentary on nutrition. He didn't employ gestures or coercive diplomacy. Rather, the Coalition language of color was used to deliver demands for accountability.

Colors were intentionally incorporated in close-ups of certain sentences in nutrition pamphlets Andy said he got from his doctor. In post-production, producers underlined portions of the text he wanted to emphasize. The inference of coalition involvement wouldn't have been made had the borders to the close-ups weren't in lavender. After observing that, the intention to convey all three messages was easily inferred.

Producers used the white paper and black print to create the symbol of punishment certainty. They used red underlining to combine with the color of the paper to create the Canadian color scheme. And lavender was meant to convey the coalition's insistence on justice for all the pain, suffering and loss inflicted on innocent people and threatening democracy and free market capitalism elsewhere by the Chinada elite, invisible wealthy, Chinese colonizers and the Beijing government.

It took a while for the Canadian lawyer to come down off the natural high of elation he experienced seeing Lara wearing bright red and white. Every day during week preceding this broadcast, she risked life and limb from Israel to make coalition contributions. This Sunday simply added more evidence CBS was utilizing her and Andy to demonstrate being 100% behind the coalition in its bid to win the conflict against China and the last democratic fiefdom.

CBS' 60 Minutes Broadcasts a Segment on the Last Democratic Fiefdom: Revisited Yet One More Time Again

[June 4, '06]

April 9, 2006
April 16, 2006
April 30, 2006
May 7, 2006
May 14, 2006
May 21, 2006
May 28, 2006

On Sunday, June 4, 2006, CBS' '60 Minutes' continued in its unbroken streak of profiling the Canada-China problem employing the coalition's international discourse on condemnation and accountability. It will be a very long time before the producers find another newsworthy story to beat this record.

Could a whistleblower ask for a better scenario than to have the premier investigative news program cover his or her story week after week after week? As argued before the seriousness of the issue is directly proportional to the number of times '60 Minutes' covers a story.

This week the news items covered immigration, a billionaire grocery founder and a Florida corruption news reporter and author. Ed Bradley covered the first, Dan Rather the second (remembering the "R." in International E.R. Memorial Centre came from him - "renewal from the ruins" – and Steve Kroft the third.

The immigration segment couldn't have been embedded more *indicia* of the international discourse on condemnation and accountability.

The segment focused on the matter of Mexican illegal immigrants seeking passage to the United States by making the perilous journey across the desert. When Ed Bradley makes his first remark with a number in it, it is the symbol of the Canadian lawyer's two decades of his tortured, enslaved, imprisoned, experimented and loss filled life. A border patrol officer is filmed responding to a "distress call about **twenty** miles south of the border".

The migrant they're looking for is an **eight**-een year old Mexican …whose been wandering the desert for seven days.

Even the number of the border patrol's vehicle becomes a China identifier. It being number "1090" of the fleet (9 – 1 = **eight**) could actually be his vehicle, or a coalition conscious '60 Minutes' cast and crew could have chosen it from the fleet.

A local medical examiner is interviewed, since his office is the recipient of all the Mexican corpses found dead in the desert.

Ed: How long have you been here?

Examiner: **17** years. [The cost of the refrigerated truck used for the morgue overflow costs] $**1,000** a week.

In this short segment of dialogue, there is both a China identifier and a Shania Twain reference.

Ed's voice over as the interview subject goes to the next official: "12 years ago things were very different". Here, a coalition identifier (1 + 2 = **three**).

A top immigration official with the U.S. government remarks, "[there were] groups of 500 people running" through ports of entry at any one time. Many were "running up the lanes of I-5". Here, there's just as much an opportunity to include numbers and massage another to come up with two compensation ratifiers.

Ed: In this remote stretch of desert across from New Mexico we met a smuggler and eleven young men prepared to enter the United States. [T]hey crossed a **three** foot barbed wire fence; each carrying **two** gallons of water; nowhere near enough for a journey that could take **five** or six days. Last year, about **½** million illegal migrants came from Mexico to live and work in the U.S. […] More than **twenty** percent of the deaths in the desert last year were women and children.

In this voice over there is a coalition identifier ("**three**"), a compensation ratifier (combining the 'three" and "two" to equal **five**), another compensation ratifier and the tortured, enslaved, imprisoned, experimented and loss confirmation number (**twenty**).

A border patrol agent is interviewed, who also was like coached and guided to fill his evidence on the subject to comply with coalition objectives.

Agent: I have caught the same group of people four times in one **eight**-hour shift.

Ed: Four times in one **eight**-hour shift?

Agent: Four times. […] When I looked in the record log the next day, their names weren't there so I can only assume they got by the **fifth** time.

After two more China identifiers and a compensation ratifier, the segment continues with more about the border-migrant issue; including an interview with Congressman Tom Tancredo (R-Colorado).

Ed: Fortified fences like this one in Arizona protect only about **five** percent of the U.S.-Mexico border.

[…]

Congressman: The U.S. government has spent over **twenty** billion dollars on border control over the past **12** years. If you only put the fence, you know, for this **five** miles of the border, people will go around it.

Since the Congressman would be only too happy to comply with coalition requests, he could have – and it looks like he – included numbers that met with those requests. Not only did Rep. Tancredo generate a tortured, enslaved, imprisoned, experimented and loss confirmation number ("twenty"), but a coalition identifier (1 + 2 = **three**) and a compensation ratifier ("**five**"). And Ed contributed a compensation ratifier when he had the next chance to do so.

Another U.S. immigration official earlier in the segment was interviewed regarding action taken in Nebraska when employers were ordered not to take on any undocumented workers. He testified that "within 30 days, over 3,500 people fled the meat packing industry"; thus adding two coalition identifiers (two "**3**'s"), one compensation ratifier ("**5**") and a China identifier (3 + 5 = **eight**).

"So what were the taxpayers getting for the billions and billions of dollars that have been spent on securing the border", Ed asks his audience. The immigration officer responds, "A good story". "But not a secure border", he adds rhetorically. What makes this part of the segment relevant is the fact that Ed executes an unavoidably visible, protracted quasi-Clooney M. throughout.

The next number that can be massaged without any fuss is the amount the flying drones cost to patrol the border and surrounding area from the sky. They are reported to cost $14 million each (1 + 4 = compensation ratifier).

Ed: How many terrorists have been caught on the Mexican border?

Official: Zero.

Ed: Then maybe you could say that *building all of these walls and fortifications and having thousands of border agents does work as a deterrent?*"

* Ed executes another quasi-Clooney M. throughout.

To keep the number interpretation momentum going, Ed does a voice over that remarks, "There are **three** times as many border agents as there were **12** years ago".

After referring to the malleable fact the deceased's parents borrowed three hundred dollars to help their eight-een year old son cross the desert to find work in the U.S., Ed makes two final coalition-relevant statements and which link massive wealth to romance, intimacy, relationship and sexuality. The last reference comprises the last two words of the segment couldn't but generate in the Canadian lawyer a sense of just how much affection he has had for one of his emancipators and how much the Coalition knows this:

> There were **five** bodies discovered in the desert last year – a new record – including bodies yet to be discovered. The total number of migrant deaths is like to exceed **one thousand**.

The next segment, hosted by former 'CBS Evening News' anchor Dan Rather profiled John Mackie, the billionaire founder of a large American organic grocery chain. There was nothing like the interpretation bonanza in Ed's piece; but enough to demonstrate a continued commitment to coalition objectives.

One of the first indicators the segment was going to have coalition identifiers was Dan wearing a light pink shirt in some of the interview scenes. Pink on men on television was not a regular or even infrequent occurrence before the color became part of the international discourse on condemnation and accountability. But once introduced, it has become enormously prevalent from all coalition partners.

Another instance where pink seemed to have been added for coalition emphasis was during a generic shot of grocers mulling around a Whole Foods Market store. The reason it was noticed was because the voice over had a relevance to fiefdom reform dynamics. It was timed to the Dan's remark, "Mackie's had to change the way he's done business".

The first number interpretation dynamics came – and came in a bunch – when reference was made to the grocery chain's suppliers.

> [The] Boggy Creek Farms [proprietor] started selling produce to Whole Foods 1**5** years ago. She picks **17** heads of lettuce, washes them in a sink [and] packs them in her car…". […] Whole Foods also counts on large industrial organic farms, like the **26**,000 acre Earth Bound Farm, where they process **17**,000 pounds of lettuce every hour.

Each of the numbers Dan cites is amenable to slight modification to come within coalition parameters. Interpretation in favor of being coalition-inspired here is easy since reporting the Boggs Creek Farm operator picked 17 heads of lettuce seems so arbitrary and so easily fits into the China identifier category of numerology propaganda deconstruction. And, it is placed between a compensation ratifier and two more deconstruction dynamics.

After all these coalition-inspired *Fiefdom*-pointing dynamics, the next segment couldn't but make it three for three. Whether it was or not became an issue right from the start when Steve Kroft introduced the pieces as being a repeat. If it was, the Canadian lawyer wondered, how could it contain any coalition dynamics? It would have had to been re-shot and re-edited. But since the geo-political stakes were so immensely high and the coalition had already gone to such enormous lengths for months in a row, it wasn't out of the realm of likelihood.

The topic certainly was both fiefdom-relevant and *Fiefdom* treatise-author relevant. The profiled individual was a celebrated news reporter and book author on Florida corruption and the sheer stupidity of human nature. What better story to pull out of the archives, spruce up with a few sprinkles of the international discourse on condemnation and accountability and re-broadcast. It sure served to embarrass the elite.

One of the first things Steve said about Florida was that it was a member of the "axis of weirdness". Anyone privy to the *Fiefdom* treatise would know David E. Kelley on behalf of the coalition branded Canada a member of the axis of evil during an late 2005 episode of 'Boston Legal'. And anyone who shares the Canadian lawyer and Coalition impression of Canada would agree that weirdness was elevated to the level of a political ideology.

The first time Steve executes what appears to be an intentional quasi-Clooney M. is when the Canadian lawyer hears the profiled news reporter and author, Carl Hiaasen, remark, "the opportunities for corruption are many here [in Florida]". In the Canadian's view, that's coalition-inspired. But since Steve opened the segment with the assertion this piece was a re-broadcast, more remarks timed to what look like geo-gestures needed be analyzed before there was certainty.

The next Clooney gesture was timed to "the only thing which slowed [a convicted city counselor and] his political career down was jail – when they took him away to jail; then he could no longer serve". That's two for two.

The next three descriptions of Carl Hiaasen could be the reason why '60 Minutes' blew the dust of the canister holding this old segment, revamped it and broadcast it again. Not only does the story revolve around massive political corruption – the central theme of the *Fiefdom* treatise – but Mr. Hiaasen is motivated to use political comedy instead of the usual method of critiquing politicians – with indignation and anger.

"He doesn't believe in writing columns that don't offend someone", Steve's voice over advises the audience, "[H]is weapon of choice is humour, not outrage".

Carl comments:

> From my experience, politicians are much more uncomfortable made fun of than they are being preached at and screeched at, you know, in the soapbox routine. They're much more uneasy knowing they're a target or ridicule. It really ruins their day.

To the Canadian, this is where Jon Stewart of 'The Daily Show' has been such a force of condemnation and accountability for Canada – hurling massive amounts of the most creative and hilarious defamatory comments and insults possible.

Steve continues his description of Carl with "After nearly 30 years at the Miami Herald, Hiaasen is the franchise player. An old time columnist in the tradition of Mike Royko in Chicago and Jimmy Breslin in New York." Beyond the coalition identifier, the question was whether these two names were worth researching and had something to contribute to coalition objectives and the nature of the Canadian lawyer's function.

[…]

"Why did he decide to writing novels?", Steve asks [adding a quasi-Clooney M.].

Carl's answer:

> Therapy, actually. [Steve's possible quasi-Clooney M. continues]. With the novels you have this wonderful opportunity to write your own endings [Steve's quasi-M. continues and his finger flinches at the words "write your own endings"] You have the bad guys get not only exactly what they deserve but, you know, in some poetic miserable way.

Carl offered one story that reached the heights of weirdness the Chinada elite and Chinese military colonizers could relate to. The featured man in one of his book was killed off but "in the real life thing the guy didn't die, but he was definitely a lot more intimate with the dolphin than he would have liked to be" [Steve executes what appears to be a quasi-Clooney M.].

The first sign of Canadian colors occurred when Steve was describing where Carl lived. His home is along Highway 1 on the road that connects the Florida Keyes islands together. A white highway sign with a red crest that said "South 1" was edited to enter the screen to the remark, "He's almost as close to Havana as he is to Miami". The camera didn't just film a clip of the sign; it panned from its base to sign and timed the word "Havana" to the moment the red and white sign entered the screen. To the Canadian lawyer, the interpretation was patently obvious. Canada was being painted as a disgusting communist state like Cuba was in the eyes of the U.S. government and many Americans.

The next portion of the segment appeared to include a Shania reference.

The larger problem for Hiaasen is the *thousand* people who move [to Florida] every day.

Steve's next relevant voice over remarks,' "Unfortunately, the craziness of South Florida has produced a sort of anonymity to all sorts of wackos." As the words "the craziness' are said, there is a short clip of a red shirted with white letters beach guy feeding the birds; which felt just like the kind of image (with the requisite editing timing) a coalition partner would produce to describe the elite.

The last coalition-relevant event for the segment, but not the program (Andy Rooney added his voice) wove in a compensation ratifier:

> You might think that this take on the Sunshine State would upset the natives. But he's never been more in demand. An appearance in Jacksonville attracted **five** thousand people.

"The adrenaline rush of writing a great column that ruins some low life's lunch is better than a Florida sunset", Steve's voice over advises of Carl's view of his job description. And Carl adds to close, "Right in the solar plexus – nothing's better than that feeling, nothing is better".

Andy Rooney's 'last word' was also packed with numbers that signified coalition inspiration.

> Andy: I don't like to complain all the time, but that's what I do for a living; and I'm lucky 'cause there's so much to complain about.
>
> I was getting dressed the other morning and I got thinking about how bad shoes are. I wish our smartest people would stop re-inventing our computers every **three** days.
>
> […]
> These shoes aren't the shape of anyone's foot [camera pans in on a row of shoes in the store and puts a pink par in the middle of the screen]
>
> […]
>
> I must have **twenty** pairs of shoes I don't wear.
> […]
>
> These [shoes] seemed like a good idea when I bought them But I've worn them about **three** times in ten years.
>
> […]

These [shoes of mine] are an **8 ½** and my feet are a six 9**½**.

The program ends with two different racks of shoes in the window. Their price tags are $225 and $295; then $160 and $265 – each of which, like the passages above is amenable to numerology, propaganda deconstruction, compensation ratification and coalition identification dynamics.

Again, the executive producers, producers, directors, writers and cast of '60 Minutes' have proven just how critical the issues the *Fiefdom* treatise has gathered evidence on are to western civilization. Were it not for this serious threat to our and our children's' future, there would be no coalition, there would be no massive diplomatic campaign to encircle, embarrass, condemn and hold to account Canada and China. This is the eighth broadcast of this powerfully credibility program that's embedded the international discourse. And, the Canadian lawyer predicts, it won't stop until the end of the last democratic fiefdom.