

RICHARD D HALL AND ANDREW JOHNSON written by SHARON ZAKI

The following is in response to my 11/3/13 email that I sent to a number of people [which didn't include those already widely exposed as shills] in the 'alternative media' which states, "I have come to realise how dangerous the 'controlled opposition' are to Truth as they are so successful at thwarting the efforts of genuine NWO warriors. Shills and fake 'victims' are insidious creatures and more dangerous than a corrupt establishment. Please see [http://www.sharonkilby.co.uk/site/WAR\\_ON\\_SHILLS.php](http://www.sharonkilby.co.uk/site/WAR_ON_SHILLS.php) for more.

I believe the Hollie Greig story holds the key to revealing many shills currently prominent in the so-called 'Truth Movement'.

If you are not a shill, please will you respond asap and show me where on your site you are now publicly declaring that the the HG story is a hoax. Please also let me know what you intend to do to expose the shills/fake 'victims' and also whether or not you intend to do your level best to find out and expose who is *really* behind the Hollie Greig story and why."

**Richard D Hall** of Richplanet TV has me reaching for his bullshit buzzer! I'm sure that you too will be hitting it when you have read our exchange of emails **which are published further down this pdf**. There is talk of him hosting a Hollie Hoax v Hollie Demands Justice debate [if the HDJ camp are brave enough to participate!] which might just make me change my mind about him. However, from what I've seen so far, I believe Richard D Hall is no more sincere than the snake man David Icke. There is compelling evidence that he is just another shill. The clues are as follows:

He is making me jump through hoops to get these two teams on his show. You'd think if he was serious about seeking the truth of the Hollie affair he'd be keen to organise this himself. See our email exchange **which is also published further down**. It is noteworthy that he refuses to interview the Hoax team only on his show. [He didn't have such reservations about interviewing the HDJ people, and giving them maximum publicity!] He makes it clear that both sides need to be represented. He knows that the HDJ hoaxers have no intention of going head to head with the truth team. But just to give them the benefit of the doubt I did send them an invitation .... to which they still haven't replied!

He is a fervent supporter of the HG story. He interviewed Anne, Hollie and Robert *without* doing any basic checks beforehand to test the veracity of the story. He is very dismissive of Mark Daly. A genuine truther would want to hear for himself what Daly has to say about the HG issue, rather than just casting him aside, just because of his view of the Panorama programme.

First he calls it a "slanging match" between the two teams, then he calls it a "heated debate". He tells me, "Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. Just because there isn't physical evidence doesn't mean abuse did not occur." *Well there has to be evidence!!! How about I go round saying he raped Hollie, even though I have no evidence. But that's ok because even though there is no evidence, that doesn't mean that he didn't ...!* He wants me to "list the evidence you have showing abuse **did not happen** and attach any supporting documents". *How do you prove abuse did not happen? How about I prove he was never abused! I can't, and neither can he. There is just no evidence he was abused ... because he wasn't. Likewise there is no evidence that Hollie was abused ... because she wasn't! [Well not by any paedophiles. She was/is being abused by the people who promote the Hollie Greig story.]* Is Richard D Hall a Tavistock graduate? He seems well trained in NLP. A sincere truther does not speak like he does. Neither does a sincere truther - especially an investigative journalist/reporter of his stature - ask an enquirer like *me* to send *him* evidence/documents to prove the HDJ campaign was planned and was a fraudulent campaign!!! He'll only be convinced it's a hoax if "one of the hoaxers came forward and admitted things and produced evidence of the hoax being planned"! Jesus wept. As if the HDJ gang of lying evildoers will ever come out with anything truthful! They're happy to keep up the pretence, secure in the knowledge that they have the Masonic Big Gun 'Truther' skills, like Richard D Hall to protect them.

Richard has no desire to determine the truth; he doesn't even acknowledge my suggestion that Anne could silence the sceptics if she showed us a video of her and Hollie engaging in normal conversation, which would prove that Hollie is capable of naming 22 alleged abusers etc. Richard is happy to continue the pretence of the HG story being "one of thousands of child abuse cases".

His final email to me is very telling as he states, "Frankly, I do not see this as a major issue for the truth movement. There are many far better ways of finding out shills than claiming this case to be a hoax." [If he was an honest, independent investigator he too would be shouting

from the rooftops that this case IS a hoax. As for exposing the shills, Richard does not make any suggestions as to how! He, just like Sabine, does not *want* to expose them. Wonder why!]

Richard and all the other 'truthers' REFUSE to do any digging re the HG affair, and with that, are ALL closed to the suggestion that there might be a bigger picture, which needs exploring. This just confirms my belief that there IS high level Masonic involvement, and that a large section [if not ALL] of the 'Truth Movement' figures are in on it.

He gives me a curt brush off re Sabine and Belinda Shill. He has no desire to look at the evidence against them or do any investigating of his own. He speaks in vague terms, saying he is aware of the 'suspicions' re Belinda. But that obviously doesn't bother him. Neither is he bothered that Belinda is a key figure in the HDJ campaign. He says he has stayed at her house once but has had little contact with her.

He entertains the likes of Bill Maloney on his show. Bill Maloney has not even bothered to reply to my mass mailout email! Or my follow up mail. [Or the previous two emails he received regarding Sabine and Belinda.] Maloney is another strong supporter of the HG story and he also refuses to look at the evidence which proves it's a hoax. Moreover he is in bed with Brian Gerrish, Lou Collins, Sabine and her clan. Shills stick together.

I think Richard Hall is bullshitting me re the issue of freemasonry. If he was a genuine campaigner against the NWO, why would he say, "[I think it should be illegal for anyone being paid by the public purse to be a member of a secret group and make allegiance secret groups then they should be serving the people who pay or vote for them.](#)"? He speaks like a mainstream establishment reporter when he talks of 'serving the people', 'illegalities' and 'voting'. He is supposed to be exposing the fact that there is no such thing as democracy and the rule of law whilst secret societies are in control, and that freemasonry [together with other secret societies] is the force which facilitates the NWO. He says he's discussed freemasonry on his shows, but in all the shows I've seen - and there have been LOTS - I've never seen him refer to freemasonry as being the controlling evil force in the background. He speaks of MI5. [Brian Gerrish also avoids blaming freemasonry! He says it's 'common purpose'.]

Richard D Hall's answers are very evasive; just like Richy's of 'Lawful Rebellion'!

My final reason for my shill suspicion is his fondness for frequent coverage of UFOs and Aliens. He believes they are a real threat and he wants more serious reporting of this subject in the mainstream news. [Remember, one of the ways the NWO can be pushed along is if the PTB can convince the public that we all need to unite under a world government to combat an extraterrestrial threat.]

You also have to ask the question, would the PTB allow someone like Richard D Hall such prominence on TV if he was truly independent and a serious threat to the establishment?

Take a look at these [interesting comments](#) on this [FORUM](#). Many people are questioning the integrity of Dr Judy Wood and Richard's friend Andrew Johnson. See also Simon Shack's 'shills' [discrediting tactis](#)', Richard D Hall - crop circle, UFO expert and 9/11 Holo-theorist and crop circle expert Nick Kollerstrom. Also [Richard D Hall](#) - Rich Planet - Exposed as Shill.

Note, on 13/9/15 **Andrew Johnson** asked me to publish his right of reply. **You will find that published just below too.** Andrew was one of the people I included in a mass email I sent out on 13/2/13 which stated: "Message text: WAR ON SHILLS - Please send viral. I'm trying to garner support for a war on shills and am particularly keen to expose the lower profile ones. See [http://www.sharonkilby.co.uk/site/WAR\\_ON\\_SHILLS.php](http://www.sharonkilby.co.uk/site/WAR_ON_SHILLS.php) I have just exposed Sabine McNeill. Please help." He replied: "Thanks for the info! I will try to study it more when time - stacked with work right now! I do wonder about some of these people!" **More than 2 ½ years on** and he's now telling me that he was *certainly* sceptical of the Hollie Greig 'case' *a few years ago* and he *certainly* became suspicious of Belinda McKenzie. Funny how he and Richard D Hall [who's view of the HG 'case', he tells me, "*has shifted somewhat now*" – not that the prick provided a link for me to check for myself] took so long to speak out. Do you think that had something to do with the HG *shill test* and the fact that the public are becoming all too aware now who the bullshit brigade are? More on that in my 'Hampstead Hoax PSY-OP' pdf. I can't see any evidence that Richard's view has 'shifted'. I've had a scout around on his website, but not found a statement to that effect or article or anything. In fact he still has this video interview he did with Anne and Hollie up <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ae4sc3v12fE> As for the forum comments, that link has now been deleted. It seems that comments made on forums by the bullshit detecting members of the

public and the enquiring minds just keep getting deleted by the masons. As for his friend Dr Judy Wood, is he aware that she spouts such nonsense as, "somebody may have had some, **like pennies on the windowsill**, that fell out, that might be falling down ..."?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0R4RRGjOSo0> As for his question have I met Richard D Hall or himself? No; I don't need to meet a shill to know one. I don't associate with shills on any level.

The following is an exchange of emails I had in March 2013 with Richard D Hall [Richard's replies are in navy blue ink]:

Thanks for your reply Richard.

You say you met Anne, Robert and Hollie once and interviewed them on the day you met them. You found them 100% genuine with no sign of the story being fake. Did alarm bells not start ringing when you saw for yourself that Hollie could say very little? As an investigative reporter, especially one of your experience and standing in the 'Truth Movement, I have to say I am surprised you didn't do any investigating before interviewing them on TV. This is the bit that is puzzling for me in the whole Hollie Greig saga, as you are not alone in this regard; it seems no-one else in the 'Alternative Media' 'Truth Movement' saw fit to investigate this story either!

No, no alarm bells went off at all. She was shy, as simple as that.

You say "The main reason for my outrage at this case was the people who were named as abusers were never questioned (or that is what I was told). I consulted an experienced police officer friend about this. He stated that even if the police suspect an allegation is bogus, they should do enough investigation to satisfy themselves the allegations are bogus before dropping the case. In this case, my police officer friend said he would investigate things such as the times and locations of where the alleged abuse took place to see whether circumstances would have allowed abuse to occur (for example: Was it routine for Hollie to be left alone with the alleged abuser?). I was informed the police did no investigation of this sort into the allegations, and did not interview any of those accused. This seemed very suspicious to me and indicative of a cover up. The alleged sectioning of Ann Greig also seemed to be part of this cover up." Rather than go to all that trouble, why didn't you just do some basic checks yourself, like Mark Daly of Panorama did? After only 4-5 hours of speaking to Anne, Hollie and Robert he was having doubts

and within a week he and his team knew that the story could not be substantiated.

Absence of evidence is no evidence of absence. Meaning just because this particular journalist couldn't find evidence doesn't mean Ann Greig was lying. I would not trust anyone associated with Panorama. It is one of the most disgusting dis-information shows on the TV.

I can see how people were taken in by Robert Green [I was one] as he does sound believable and he did say he would produce evidence. However, over time, he didn't produce any proof and instead much evidence has now come to light that the story is a hoax. So I don't see how you can now say that there is a slanging match going on with regards the HDJ camp and the HGH camp.

OK wrong choice of words. For example the event in London at the David Icke venue (The George) for example, a heated debate let's say.

You say "I've not seen any evidence to convince me this was a hoax", that "The evidence as far as I am aware is circumstantial and testimony based. I understand there is no hard proof - but there rarely is in child abuse cases." Well the evidence that the story is a hoax is all detailed here [http://sharonkilby.co.uk/site/Why the HG story may hold the key to revealing the shills..php](http://sharonkilby.co.uk/site/Why_the_HG_story_may_hold_the_key_to_revealing_the_shills..php) I note that you say you are "not an expert on this case and only those present at the time the abuse took place can be 100% sure what happened." I don't think one has to be an 'expert' to see whether or not a story can be backed up with evidence or whether it is totally without foundation. There's no point me re stating all of the evidence which shows that this story is a hoax, but I will just point out one thing which is stated on the 'Cutting through the Rubbish' blog; under point number 5 there is reference to a "*YouTube video of Major and Dragon Smith telling their side of the story and – perhaps most devastating – the 2008 report by the Scotland's Police Complaints Commissioner saying there was no evidence to support any of the campaign's claims.*" I know you are very busy with other important Richplanet topics but I think this ranks pretty high up on the priority scale and you really should spend time looking at all the links provided from the above link.

Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. Just because there isn't physical evidence doesn't mean abuse did not occur.

I think the best way for you to establish the truth would be to invite both the HDJ team and the HGH team onto your program. I think it would be

a good idea if Mark Daly was invited on as well. I know you say "As far as I can see at present, there is a slanging match goin on. One that I am not prepared to enter into unless evidence is conclusive" and "It probably sounds like I am sitting on the fence, but that is because there really isn't 100% proof either way (that I am aware of)." Well, with you chairing the debate I am sure this issue can be resolved once and for all. Having both teams on your program is the perfect opportunity for you to establish the truth and for the truth to reach a wide audience. I know that the Hoax team would really welcome this. Another way to find out some truth would be to see how good Hollie's language skills actually are. That can be tested if you were to film Anne and Hollie again, maybe in a more relaxed setting, such as in their home and let them just engage in everyday chit chat.

If both parties HDJ and HGH want to have a debate and me to chair it and film it then fine. Do you think all parties would agree? I mean the HDJ people would not attend the David Icke (George Pub) debate. Would they debate it for TV? Could it be arranged with just one person from each side? The reason I say that is from a technical perspective filming a debate where several people are speaking is much more difficult for me regarding cameras, microphones lighting etc. It is easier with just 2 guests. I would need to arrange a lot more help if there were several people on each side.

As for Robert Green, yes, I believe he's involved in the hoax; but I cannot know for sure why and I do not know who his handler is. He is not the only one in on the scam. This story has got me intrigued and I want help from genuine truthers, such as yourself, to piece the jigsaw together. There is far more to it than whether or not Hollie was abused by a high up paedo ring. I suspect a high level masonic plot. That is only my humble opinion. The big question is why did the leaders of the 'Truth Movement' in the AM run with this story without investigating it? It seems only Mark Daly did an investigation; he then dropped the story due to lack of evidence. The way I see it Robert Green is the plant; he along with Belinda Shill and others [under orders and protection from high up freemasons] have taken advantage of two vulnerable women - a mentally fragile mother who had lost her brother to suicide and her Downs syndrome daughter, to conjure up a story of sexual abuse... I think that Green was imprisoned to make the story *look* genuine. It looks good to have Hollie's hero imprisoned when he is trying to get the authorities to investigate and charge 22 alleged paedophiles. It backs up the HDJ claims of cover up and collusion. Green did have an easy

time of it in prison; he was treated very well by staff; spent his time writing fan mail. [He even replied to my letter!] It's all theatre. Shills are good actors. So are politicians.

I suppose anything is possible, but it's quite a hard one to swallow that he went to jail to make the hoax look real.

I have to say that Ann Greig did not seem mentally fragile to me at all. She seemed like a normal mother.

Regarding my request that you and others in the AM do your level best to find out and expose who is 'really' behind the Hollie Greig story and why, you say "Take a look at my website and realise that the entire Richplanet operation is carried out by me and me alone." I would say that this issue should come top of the priority list for any 'Truther' as it is only people like yourself in the 'alternative media' who can uncover this mystery. After all, there needs to be a resolution; it isn't going to just go away. 22 innocent people have been accused of awful crimes and they want answers. Wouldn't you, if you were one of those accused? I certainly would. To be honest, I'm surprised that you are not as keen as I am to get to the bottom of this; after all I, for one, think that you and others in the AM [David Icke, Brian Gerrish, Ian R Crane, Bill Maloney, Roger Hayes...] have been made to look like idiots. I'd be livid if I was in your shoes. Credibility [yours and others in the 'Truth Movement'] is at stake here, but you don't seem to realise it. Perhaps when you have taken a real good look at the links I've provided, you might. The fact is there is an abundance of evidence to show that this story is a hoax, such that anyone who believes otherwise is either a liar and a shill or is off with the fairies.

Sorry I do not agree that I should be livid as I am not convinced abuse did not take place. I am open minded that the whole thing could have been a hoax. And please don't take this as me copping out - I don't see that either side has produced 100% proof of their case, because there is no physical evidence (to my knowledge) to prove it either way. Unless one of the hoaxers came forward and admitted things and produced evidence of the hoax being planned etc.

You mention the sectioning of Anne; that is explained half way down here <http://www.theholliegreigcoverup.net/the-end-of-hdj.html> and 25 mins into this <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QlgYbPhPt1Q>



As for the question why did no-one sue if they are innocent, no-one did because of the cost to themselves. They ask the question, "Why should innocent people have to pay to defend themselves?"

See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BwFm8li6mJw> 1hr 10mins onwards.

You mention that there are hundreds of areas of research that expose the NWO, many being far more effective than the Hollie Greig case. I'm using the HG case as a means to expose the gatekeepers - shills, fake 'victims', trolls... not the NWO. That's your job.

You say "Regarding shills within the truth movement: There are a number of people I suspect (this list is growing) but cannot publicly name because I do not have enough evidence to bring out (yet). I have done this in the past in some of my films." Please can you tell me who you have named as shills and who you suspect are shills. Perhaps I can help you expose them?

Sharon, I have spent a fair bit of time discussing this with my friend Andrew Johnson. It is extremely frustrating, because it's impossible to get total proof of somebody being some kind of asset. And there are different types of asset. Some witting, some not, and some I suspect under mind control. I named John Lundburg and Mark Pilkington in one of my films and I have also named Andy Roberts and Dr David Clarke as probably being agents of some kind. Jenny Randals is another. These are predominantly people in the UFO field where I have more knowledge and can be very sure.

I don't think I know Sabine? I stayed at Belinda's once when I interviewed Muad Dib.

Please read: [http://sharonkilby.co.uk/site/PROVEN\\_SHILLS\\_-\\_SABINE\\_K\\_MCNEILL\\_AND\\_BELINDA\\_MCKENZIE.php](http://sharonkilby.co.uk/site/PROVEN_SHILLS_-_SABINE_K_MCNEILL_AND_BELINDA_MCKENZIE.php) and <http://nkhughes.wordpress.com/2013/02/24/sabine-mcneill-not-your-friend/> and <http://www.theholliegreigcoverup.net/latest-news.html> Will you expose Sabine and Belinda?

I am aware of all the suspicion about Belinda, but have had little contact with her other than staying at her house once. As I said to you, I will name people if I feel I have strong evidence. Even the ones I have named (listed above), I did not say "They are assets or agents", I say "the evidence I have just presented is compelling that these people are assets/agents", because they don't give them badges with MI5 written on. As Andy Roberts revealed in a rant "no paper trail". And that means

they don't make telephone calls or send email because both these leave a paper trail. I believe it may all be done "person to person". Which is where freemasonry (or other groups) comes in.

Just out of curiosity, can I ask you your view on freemasonry? Are you a mason? Do you believe there are 'good' masons? Do you believe freemasonry controls the skills? Do you believe freemasonry [in conjunction with other secret societies] is facilitating the NWO agenda? Do you expose freemasonry on Richplanet?

I have discussed freemasonry on my show yes. I am not one. I think the whole thing is pretty disgusting. The way they use this hidden hierarchy to wield power is totally wrong. I think it should be illegal for anyone being paid by the public purse to be a member of a secret group and make allegiance secret groups then they should be serving the people who pay or vote for them. I do not know if masonry controls the skills. I don't know if the people you mention are connected to freemasonry. I also think there are other secret societies that may be involved, such as Opus Day.

You end with "I did not investigate this case initially, I did a TV interview with Ann, Robert and Hollie. If conclusive evidence is uncovered by other investigators/researchers regarding the Hollie Greig case I will give this exposure on my show for sure." Please will you look again at all the evidence that is already available. I will be flabbergasted if you are still not convinced that this story is a hoax.

Finally, in answer to your remark, "If the evidence shows you are incorrect I hope you are brave enough to change your opinion" I will of course retract my statements if the HG case proves to be true.

Can you just list for me what the "evidence is" and email me any supporting documents. Is the evidence based purely on testimony?

Hope that answers your questions.

Richard

The following is an email exchange I had in March 2013 with Richard D Hall re both teams debating on Richplanet or publicity for the Hoax group:

Hi Richard,

Thank you for your swift and comprehensive answer.

You must agree this needs resolving.

Please will you write to both the HDJ and HGH camps and ask them to debate on your programme. If the HDJ group refuse, does that not tell you something? If they do refuse, please will you invite just the Hoax team on; and perhaps Mark Daly too. I think the more people from each camp you can have on your show, the better. You say you would have to arrange a lot more help if you were to have several people on each side; don't you think it would be worth it, in an effort to get to the truth, once and for all? After all the HDJ campaign is widely known in the UK and internationally and it is only fair now that the HGH people have their say to just as wide an audience. Perhaps, with your help, the truth will out and the people responsible for this scam [if that is what is uncovered] can be brought to justice. One thing I can almost put my life on - that show will give you your best Richplanet viewing figures ever!

You say "Can you just list for me what the "evidence is" and email me any supporting documents. Is the evidence based purely on testimony?" I do not possess any supporting documents. The evidence is outlined, with some supporting documentation here <http://www.thehollieregcoverup.net/the-end-of-hdj.htm> There is ample circumstantial evidence. What is clear is that there is evidence to show the story is a hoax and no evidence to show the story is true.

As said, one very simple way for Anne to shut the sceptics up is if she can show us that Hollie is capable of naming 22 paedophiles, and their addresses and occupations. She can do this by simply showing us a home made video of herself and Hollie engaging in everyday conversation in the comfort of their own home. Could you suggest this to Anne?

Regards,

Sharon

Hello Sharon

If you want me to film a debate then please contact both sides yourself and organise this.

Regarding interviewing just your side, please **list the evidence you have showing abuse did not happen** and attach any supporting

documents. Please also send evidence that the HDJ campaign was planned and was a fraudulent campaign, and attach supporting documents. All I have heard so far are accusations casting aspersions over people's characters, I haven't seen any convincing evidence. Please list what you have and attach it.

If sufficient evidence is not provided I would still be willing to film and/or chair a debate - but both sides need to be represented. You would need to organise this yourself and get back to me when the various parties have agreed.

Cheers,

Richard

Thank you for your reply, Richard.

I will do my best to bring both sides together to debate on your show. However, if the HDJ side do refuse as you hinted might be the case, please will you have just the Hoax team on as it is only fair that they now get a chance to set the record straight to just as wide an audience as the HDJ side have had.

I don't know why you keep stressing that I have to produce the evidence. The Hoax team have already provided enough. You were happy to interview Anne, Hollie and Robert when there was [and still is] no evidence to support the HG story. Yet here there is an abundance of evidence to show the story is a hoax and yet you are reluctant to interview the Hoax team on you show. Do you not want the truth to come out about this case?

Best,

Sharon.

Sharon,

Please, just list the evidence for me that you have in a bulleted list.

I listened to the Ben Emlyn Jones interview and I cannot recall any tangible evidence being discussed in that interview.

As I said, if the sides agree to a debate I will cover it.

Frankly, I do not see this as a major issue for the truth movement.

One case of thousands of others of child abuse. There are many far better ways of finding out shills than claiming this case to be a hoax. **If this is a hoax, which I have doubt over, the people involved will never admit it to it.**

Please list the evidence for me in a bullet pointed list and if it is convincing I will consider covering it in a show. You have so far not listed ANY evidence. I want you to list the points in an email, I do not want you to refer me to another document. List the evidence you have.

All the best

The following is Andrew Johnson's email to me dated 13/9/15:

**Subject Heading: Question Re Page on your site**

Hello Sharon

"Masonfreeparty" (I know who he is) drew your site to my attention. I found that I identify with some of what you wrote on this page:

[http://www.sharonkilby.co.uk/site/WAR\\_ON\\_SHILLS.php](http://www.sharonkilby.co.uk/site/WAR_ON_SHILLS.php)

I have seen what some of these people have said and posted too . However, you might find, for example that Richard D Hall's view of the Hollie Greig case has shifted somewhat, now. I certainly became more sceptical of it a few years ago - and I certainly became suspicious of Belinda McKenzie (for other reasons - not just because of the Hollie Greig case). Have you met Richard D Hall? Have you met me?

Anyway, I found this page:

[http://sharonkilby.co.uk/site/Interesting\\_comments\\_on\\_a\\_forum\\_re\\_RD\\_H\\_Dr\\_Judy\\_Wood\\_and\\_Andrew\\_Johnson.php](http://sharonkilby.co.uk/site/Interesting_comments_on_a_forum_re_RD_H_Dr_Judy_Wood_and_Andrew_Johnson.php)

On this page, you have some text, but it's not clear what the source is. This is the part that caught my interest:

And another says, "Looks very much to me as if advice has been taken from 'honest' Andrew here. **AJ:** "Do not allow the truth to be posted Richard... The buggers will blow you out of the water in seconds ... Months of hard bullshitting down the drain Richard ... Do what I do - delete all of their intellectual comments and ban them as soon as

possible." **Hall:** "Or stop them from exposing me by never allowing a new [non-sycophant] member to join." "Ah, yes!" replies the snake oil salesman AJ." It is how these fraudsters survive, a very sad, but very real indictment of the conspiratainment industry..."

Is AJ meant to be me? Can you advise what the source of these remarks is? I don't recall ever saying anything along these lines.

Lower down this page, you make a quote from an interview Dr Judy Wood did in 2006. You appear to be using this as a claim that Dr Wood has said the WTC was destroyed by "space beams". However, this is using an old quote in isolation. You provide no links to newer information - nor do you provide links to my free ebook <http://tinyurl.com/911ftb> which goes into a lot more detail about what happened after this was said.

What happened to the towers Sharon? Who else do you know that started a court case about it? And what is your goal? You seem to have posted an awful lot of stuff which has no relevance to your original case. Why is this?

Perhaps you might like to post this email on your page above, so that people have a chance to get a more complete picture. Don't get me wrong - I am sorry to hear what happened to you and your children, but I would like to ensure that what you have written about me and my friends is accurate. Of course, I too have website - and I can publish this email and any response that you may send.

Best Wishes