

Initial Complaint

Ted Graham Jackson
265 Glen Cove Drive
Avondale Estates, GA 30002
(Plaintiff Pro Se)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

Ted Graham Jackson)	
(Plaintiff - pro se))	
265 Glen Cove Drive)	
Avondale Estates, GA 30002)	
Vs)	Complaint for declaratory
)	and injunctive relief under 5
Federal Bureau of Investigation)	U.S.C. 552 (FOIA) and 5
(Defendant))	U.S.C. 552a (Privacy Act).
J. Edgar Hoover Building)	
10th & Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest)	Motion to compel discovery
Washington, D. C. 20530-00015)	
)	Habeas Corpus Petition
Central Intelligence Agency)	
(Defendant))	
Washington, D.C. 20505)	
)	

Parties

Plaintiff - Mr. Ted Jackson is 42 years old, a citizen of the state of Georgia,
and is the requester of the records and other court actions.

Initial Complaint

Defendants - The Federal Bureau of Investigation - an agency within the United States Department of Justice and the Central Intelligence Agency - an agency of the United States government

Jurisdiction and Venue

This court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552 (a)(4)(B) and 5 U.S.C. 552a. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a.

Introduction

1. This is an action under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. 552, as amended, and the Privacy Act of 1974 (“PA”), 5 U.S.C. 552a, as amended, to compel each of the named defendants (as appropriate to their current knowledge and technological and organizational participation) to produce the information requested within the following exhibit, a true and correct copy of those letters.

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_A_FOIA_Letters.pdf

By letters, dated May 30, 2007 to the FOIA/PA Managers of the named defendants, the plaintiff requested that information.

Initial Complaint

2. The defendants, through their respective FOIA/PA offices, each responded inadequately or evasively within their respective guidelines. The plaintiff promptly appealed those decisions within the guidelines of the FOIA.

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_A_FOIA_Letters.pdf

The defendants reaffirmed their earlier denials of information and those responses act as a statutorily defined exhaustion of the plaintiff's applicable administrative remedies (See 5 USC 552 (a)(b)(A)(i)).

3. The plaintiff has a statutory right to the records he seeks and the defendants are illegally refusing to disclose those records to the plaintiff. In its response letter to the plaintiff's FOIA appeal letter, the CIA's information and privacy office contends that it can both deny an FOIA request and also deny the right to appeal the denial. It also failed to take note of a change in the plaintiff's most recent request letter. As the plaintiff understands the law, it is the FOIA law itself and not the CIA that makes allowance for a citizen's right to appeal. In any case, that office simply ignored the plaintiff's FOIA appeal letter. The FBI claimed that it has no information relevant to the plaintiff's request. The plaintiff does not believe those claims, which have been refuted by many people (including former NSA and

Initial Complaint

FBI employees) as demonstrated within the plaintiff's exhibits (see below).

The defendants are simply not telling the truth.

4. a. The plaintiff has been subjected to a system of various clever, clandestine, ambiguous, conspiratorial and cruel technologies and tactics of surveillance, harassment and unwanted semi-communications for over twelve years since he was made aware of them with a surveillance aspect and other preparations that apparently extend over twenty-eight years back in time.
- b. The means are all geared toward providing that system itself, the defendants, and its many implementers perpetual anonymity and/or deniability - the main reason why it has existed for so long and remained all but impervious to legal challenge.
- c. That system, despite having apparently existed in some form for decades, has never been openly and officially acknowledged as existing at all by the state, law enforcement or investigative agencies, but has thrust many persons into psychiatry and/or prison under false and contrived circumstances, has controlled many through fear, physical pain, harassment and threat, has caused years of misery for many persons, and undoubtedly has lead to unacknowledged suicides and homicides as the plaintiff will seek to prove.

Initial Complaint

d. That the plaintiff and other similarly persecuted persons must work so hard to try to prove their persecutions at all is the most unlawful and abominable aspect of the plaintiff's situation - and all so that the defendants and their network of supporters can maintain their denial, immunity and avoidance of responsibility.

5. a. The plaintiff understands that the use of the means described herein appears to be centered around vice and crime (particularly sexually oriented crime), aberrant and/or unpopular sexual and other behaviors, threats to the safety and welfare of children, and heading off controversial, unpopular and/or unhealthy social trends in the long term. At least that is the impression that the defendant(s) and their numerous formally or informally cooperating individuals (hereafter referred to as 'the network') have sought through many years and great effort to suggest to the plaintiff directly and via implication and semi-fictional contexts to the public at large, as the plaintiff will seek to demonstrate, which helps to explain the continuing enthusiasm and determination by many to keep the means clandestine, secretive and useful and the large number of private individuals willing to take part.

Initial Complaint

b. The plaintiff does not claim to be a perfect person, but neither is he a monster. In the effort to prove his case, the plaintiff will play along with the defendants' brilliantly diabolical game of 'mirroring' sins, shames, embarrassments and crimes drawn from extraordinary surveillance into its cooperating individuals' media works by acknowledging some of those and will purposefully refrain from acknowledging/interpreting others. The plaintiff only seeks to question his own continuing persecution within that system and the fairness, legality and ethics of certain of its aspects, which many similarly targeted individuals have attempted to relate (with little success and usually after being maneuvered into psychiatry, prison, delusion, violent outbursts, confusion, cognitive dissonance or nervous breakdown rather than before) and which have been referred to by many names such as 'the machine', 'right wing conspiracy', 'mind control', 'alien abduction', 'hauntings and haunted houses', 'gang stalking', 'CIA or military state' and other terms like 'crystallized delusion' by the psychology/psychiatry industry.

c. That system can be applied against both high and low, can make people crazy or appear to be so, can function as a kind of prison/punishment, endless investigation/interrogation, deft end-run around all of the hard won laws protecting citizens from the state and from each other, torture and

Initial Complaint

mental cruelty, slavery, blackmail, vehicle for more conservative individuals to assume an unusual measure of power over their enemies, means of surreptitiously forcing people to self-incriminate, endless sermon, destabilizer, delusion enhancer, run-down, vigilantism, kangaroo court/mock trial, forced recruitment, media propaganda, social warfare, social engineering, frame-up and/or semi-psychiatry with the only common denominator to all of its various aspects being a suite of esoteric technologies and social tactics - all of which are oriented around ambiguity and deniability in the interest of perpetually protecting that system and its implementers from any unmanaged public disclosure and lawful accountability whatsoever. One thing that it is not is purely experimental, being a regime that has been in place in some form for as much as sixty years or more and involving a heavy public propaganda and heresay component, as the plaintiff will prove.

6. a. The technologies and tactics applied against the plaintiff have been mostly oriented around both unending psychological pressure (including the pressure of being surveilled in any and all places having a reasonable expectation of privacy), unending provocative and unwanted semi-communications, and on several occasions have included induced physical pain, discomfort and temporary physical handicapping.

Initial Complaint

b. It has also involved the media, making use of possibly illegally obtained surveillance information relating to the plaintiff and other persons that he knows and has known and possibly illegal methods of interrogation, information that has then been exaggerated, expounded upon, taken out of context, placed into fictional contexts and veiled in ambiguity in a process often referred to as 'mirroring' or 'mockingbird' so as to leave room for deniability but to still be clear enough as to seem obvious to the minds of many (particularly the plaintiff).

c. See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (AI: Artificial Intelligence: “Put him in show business”).

d. While applying continuous pressure to the plaintiff, the network has simultaneously sought to manage the perceptions of an expanding subset of the public (primarily the network itself) so as to (regardless of the ultimate outcome in terms of the plaintiff) insure and enjoy a victory for itself in terms of popular perceptions and remain indefinitely unchallenged and unchallengeable, as it has apparently done since its origins. All involved have proven to be ingenious at engendering vague suspicions about the plaintiff that are impossible to disprove. They have veiled the plaintiff's complete identity so as to prevent people from knowing that identity and

Initial Complaint

discovering the plaintiff's public postings and to avoid legal challenge by the plaintiff, while spending hundreds of hours prattling their own story on their own terms to some subset of the semi-knowledgeable public. They have engineered a modern day 'Goldstein', precisely according to the model set forth in Orwell's novel 1984 from which the network's techniques derive/complement, apparently serving a similar practical purpose. The more they have succeeded in painting an atrocious picture of the plaintiff in the media, the greater the effective size of the number of people (roughly defined here as the network) has apparently grown. The CIA alone understands that critical mass strategy very well through its experience in fomenting societal upheavals and regime changes in foreign nations. The FBI understands it well as part of its historical, nefarious Cointelpro activities in attempting to derail the civil rights movement.

e. In order to prove his case in the absence of concrete proofs, which the nature of that persecution is elegant in avoiding, the plaintiff will seek to establish the fact of the historical use of those technologies and techniques with a preponderance of self-consistent circumstantial evidence (most of it placed by members of the network themselves and strategically crafted so as to serve the interests described above) and seek to prove the fact of their use upon himself using more personally oriented examples.

Initial Complaint

7. The plaintiff will request the authority of the court in definitively determining which of the named defendants is/are the actual controlling authority/authorities responsible for leading, supporting, organizing, protecting, lending technological and informational resources to and otherwise assisting the network in the long persecution of the plaintiff using at one time or another all of the means listed in the FOIA request, in seeking relief from that persecution, and in obtaining official written and/or videotaped admissions from one or more members of the network as to the fact of the plaintiff's allegations and of the reality of similar persecutions of numerous other persons both currently and historically.

8. a. Because some members of the network have long made heavy use of the televised and film media in their work, short clips of video have been provided as exhibits and made available to the court on DVD. Those have been delivered by hand to the clerk of the court in perfect working order. The collected material may seem much like like madness, particularly in terms of its redaction from the original and the artistic genre, which in some sense borders on madness, in and of itself. The court should keep firmly in mind that madness or the perception thereof is one of the specialities of the defendants, particularly that of the CIA - perhaps the most insidious and dangerous organization that has ever existed.

Initial Complaint

b. Unfortunately, the video format is time consuming and inconvenient.

The plaintiff has done everything possible to make the review and understanding of that evidence as convenient as possible for the benefit of the court.

c. The inconvenient, ambiguous and dilute nature of the artistic medium is one of the reasons that help make its function in this context so impervious to legal analysis and review and so enticing a tool for the defendants in the first place.

d. Those and other broadcast media are the ONLY major public venues in which the existence and appropriateness of the persecutions of the plaintiff and other similarly persecuted persons are strategically hinted at within semi-fictional contexts via insinuation, symbol, allegory and metaphor, and those media regularly incorporate information drawn from the surveillance of the plaintiff and similarly persecuted persons (in a process sometimes called ‘mirroring’ and ‘mockingbird’), even as those persons themselves are regularly pressured and maneuvered into silence, even as the makers of such media have complete freedom to cast that system and facsimiles of targeted persons with whatever spin, point of view and additions of fiction they wish, and even as the major news media without exception refrain from reporting

Initial Complaint

the complaints of persecuted persons in any clear and unambiguous way and instead often cooperate in that system, choosing to play the role of ‘mockingbird’ and reporting only sound bytes following episodes of induced violence and seemingly irrational behaviors by some similarly persecuted individuals that, taken out of context and bereft of detail, make those persons appear crazy or delusional.

e. Those artistic media are, therefore, an essential and inseparable part of the plaintiff’s case. The plaintiff has spent hundreds of hours assembling that evidence. The network has spent countless more attacking the plaintiff. The plaintiff prays that the court will take the time to view all of it – some of it aimed at the plaintiff and some of it aimed at other people and/or of a more generally relevant nature. The larger issues deserve the court’s time and attention.

f. The film and televised media have been a component of the plaintiff’s long persecution on a personal basis and of other persons that he has known (including being a means of discreditation, character assassination, dissemination of surveillance information, interrogating and applying pressure).

Initial Complaint

g. The plaintiff will seek to prove that those broadcast media imply the existence of his and other historical persecutions via a preponderance of similarity in form and suggestive motive and technique, despite appearing in a wide range of overt contexts.

h. The plaintiff's effort is similar to attempting to demonstrate that John Gotti's telling a lieutenant to give a series of associates 'birthday gifts' and later finding each of those associates dead in dark alleys a few days later were actually a self-insulating assassination order. Or attempting to prove that the hand crawling motions of a bully who years before had once put a desert camel spider in your sleeping bag (a creature that has been known to chew your face off in your sleep) were cruel reminders of the prank. In other words, the techniques revolve around the use of code and obscure reference of various forms and the deniability that those can afford.

i. Because those are semi-legible and the implications intended by their creators can be easily missed by persons with no background in their sophisticated art of insinuation, the plaintiff is forced to imperfectly decode them (an effort which can never be perfectly accurate), although the court is of course free to interpret the insinuations however it wishes.

Initial Complaint

j. Depending on your honor's experience and point of view, the plaintiff's allegations may seem bizarre and extremely unlikely or may seem a social and technological inevitability. The plaintiff will assume that your honor is familiar with the subject matter.

k. Bringing this case to court is not at ALL fun, the plaintiff is NOT a public figure and has no wish to be, the plaintiff having been made into an object of ridicule and parody by the work of the network, his responses to that work and his failure to obey his would-be masters' wishes. However, the mere chance of freedom is worth doing so many times over, since a life without freedom and little hope of freedom while subjected to endless mental cruelty is not a life worth living.

9. a. Because the network's techniques are ambiguous, complex and enormously cross-referenced in what is in some sense a kind of ingeniously designed, linked metaphorical goose chase, this case, in seeking to pin them down, must unfortunately be somewhat complex as well.

b. To prove his case definitively would require a much greater volume of circumstantial evidence than can be stuffed into a single civil suit. The plaintiff will make his presentation of evidence and arguments as brief as

Initial Complaint

possible. The plaintiff apologizes for this case's length, but sees no other way to make the attempt.

10. a. The defendant(s) have proven extraordinarily meticulous and complete in hiding any definitive and unambiguous evidence of their own involvement in the plaintiff's long persecution and that system itself and the plaintiff is therefore forced to address his complaint to the several most likely controlling and enabling authorities.

b. However, some of the cooperating individuals working with information directly or indirectly provided by the defendants or via the use of technologies and tactics provided by the defendants have readily (although ambiguously and deniably) identified their own participation and cooperation, as the plaintiff will seek to prove.

c. In order to confirm their participation and to conclusively determine the identities of the ultimate controlling authority or authorities, the plaintiff will request the assistance of the court.

11. The plaintiff has no criminal history, no history with the psychiatric profession (beyond a brief and positive evaluation of fitness for work), no history of violence (and has never so much as slapped anyone despite by

Initial Complaint

now countless attempts by members of the network to pick fights with the plaintiff), was until recently a member of the research faculty (non-professorial) with the Institute of Paper Science and Technology division of the Georgia Institute of Technology and had been continuously employed there in good standing for fifteen years, until group harassments there lead to the end of his employment, even winning (along with his research team mates) one of Research and Development Magazine's top 100 inventions of the year awards shortly before his termination from IPST for their years of work in developing a laser ultrasonic measurement instrument for the paper manufacturing industry.

12. a. If your honor has any prior knowledge of or dedication to any of the techniques and/or technologies as described herein, has been exposed to any of the parodies of the plaintiff within the media or elsewhere, or has received any prior information, communications and/or conclusions about the plaintiff (still unchecked for accuracy by the plaintiff himself), then the plaintiff asks that your honor please include a statement to that effect in the case record.

b. If so and with all due respect, your honor may be already prejudiced by the many errors, exaggerations, inventions, omissions, magnifications,

Initial Complaint

additions of fiction and other distortions that those contain or may otherwise be handicapped by divided loyalties.

c. Since the plaintiff has never received a fair hearing or fair treatment by anyone involved on the giving end, as he understands his rights under Constitutional justice, that is a reasonable expectation.

d. Although virtually all US citizens have been both prejudiced on the one hand by similar artistic media works (primarily through the crafted linking of examples of extraordinary crimes and sins with hints at the technologies and tactics themselves, and the subtlety of suggestion that is an old hallmark of the artistic technique) and trained to be incredulous by the series of understandable failures by similarly persecuted persons to prove their persecutions (and the efforts of the network to expound upon those failures), the complicitous refusal of the major news media to examine the complaints of persecuted persons in depth, that of course cannot be helped and is a part of the injustice about which this case hinges – the absence of balanced, legitimate news and the prevalence of ‘cartoon news’ created primarily by knowledgeable cooperating individuals themselves and perhaps expanded by numerous others who recognize the patterns of suggestion and metaphor and

Initial Complaint

spontaneously undertake to play upon them within their own works, yet know little or nothing about the deeper reality.

13. a. Due to the widespread popular support underlying such persecutions (aided in large part by the concerted, organized and long-term use of the entertaining creative media in demonizing its targets in a general way and suggesting motives for those persecutions as the plaintiff will seek to demonstrate), the absence of concrete proofs (more than one attorney has told the plaintiff that the plaintiff's known persecutors will simply lie under oath, because they can do so), the power of the defendants and their cooperating individuals to infiltrate, exert pressure, manipulate and react instantly (owing to extraordinary surveillance) to the actions of the plaintiff, and for other reasons, the plaintiff has been unable to find an attorney to represent him (despite writing to hundreds of attorneys) and is forced to compose this complaint unassisted by legal council and to pursue this case pro-se.

b. The following exhibit is included as a testament of personal credibility, since this case may hinge upon that.

c. [http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit B Personal.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_B_Personal.pdf)

Complaint

14. The plaintiff alleges the following:

15. that over the course of approximately twelve years and for as much as twenty-eight or more, the network has subjected the plaintiff to a variety of clever forms of surveillance and harassment, all of which are designed and implemented so as to protect the network from responsibility for its members actions through invisibility, anonymity, ambiguity and/or deniability, adding and/or revealing more esoteric technologies and tactics as the plaintiff grew acclimated to the earlier ones.

16. that the plaintiff has been placed and left under daily, location-independent and apparently continuous round-the-clock surveillance in home and elsewhere during the entirety of those twelve years and for as much as twenty-eight or more. The plaintiff cannot even speak to an attorney, family or friends without those communications also falling within the realm of that surveillance within their places of residence and elsewhere both within and beyond the state of Georgia.

17. a. that the surveillance has been employed so as to inform members of the network as to the actions and whereabouts of the plaintiff and thus

Initial Complaint

allow those cooperating individuals to arrive at physical locations and virtual locations within the internet where the plaintiff travels to or happens to be so as to confront the plaintiff in clever, calculated ways that hide the true intentions behind and the planned nature of those confrontations (words intended to be overheard, coughing, laughing, body language, suggestive object placements, pretended interests and identities, etc.) in such a way as to mock, ridicule, pressure, discourage, interrogate, create a generalized suspicious mindset, etc. and yet appear to be coincidental, random and unplanned and thus defy the ability to prove the fact of those harassments and to shield the defendants and those cooperating individuals from social or lawful accountability.

b. The following example has proven all too typical.

From: sfitzgerald@reviewonline.com

To: postmaster@afafa.org

Subject: Re: [BULK] America's Virtual Torture Chambers

Date: Mon, 06 Aug 2007 16:10:18 +0000

Oh, for the love of Pete. Remove me from your mailing list.

c. The plaintiff heard that silly fusion of the expressions ‘Oh, for the love of God.’ and ‘Oh, for Pete’s sake.’ in high school twenty-five years before,

Initial Complaint

only repeated it once or twice since then privately and has never heard it uttered elsewhere. That is how members of the network clearly reveal themselves to the plaintiff in such a way that none but the plaintiff would understand the significance.

d. Often, such ‘mirrors’ leave no trail back to any source at all, except purely anecdotal (suggestive object placements for example like the dead bird that was left in the plaintiff’s driveway a few years ago).

e. Observing that the plaintiff is including that example as part of this court case, the defendants’ cooperating individuals within the televised media may well undertake (or have already undertaken) the circulation of that joke within their media so as to dilute and provide false counter-evidence of the plaintiff’s complaint herein or to otherwise mock the plaintiff. See below.

f. On December 21, 2004, the plaintiff received the following email on his office computer at IPST @ Georgia Tech:

g. http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_C_Represent.pdf

h. Considering that the plaintiff very rarely receives supportive emails outside of a very small community of subscribers to newlists protesting similar persecutions, that the mailer’s supposed name was identical to the

Initial Complaint

plaintiff's, the unlikelihood of seeing a word like 'persona' amongst such a string of simulated street talk, and that the supposedly supportive letter shows every likelihood of being just a platform to chastise the plaintiff once again, the letter was obviously just one more example of deniable harassment and another fake. Most of the fakes have not been that obvious.

18. a. that part of the ultimate intention and effect of those and numerous similar encounters has been to make the plaintiff suspicious and distrustful of ALL persons that he happens to meet, a psychological effect that can be falsely cast as paranoia or delusion.

b. According to formula, those persons never accuse or discuss their problems with the plaintiff, pretend ignorance of their intentions if confronted, and only 'sign' - a formula that perpetuates whatever they have been told or lead to believe, keeps the plaintiff perpetually ignorant of whatever that may be, and leaves the network in complete control of the situation.

c. It also perpetuates inaccuracies, mistaken beliefs and rumor, leverages false, incomplete and exaggerated insinuations by the defendants' cooperating individuals within the media (see below) and shields those

Initial Complaint

individuals from any of the accountabilities associated with accusations, clear and straightforward communication and normal social interaction.

19. a. that at some time during or prior to 1995, a co-worker named Chris Knerr at the then Institute of Paper Chemistry (later renamed the Institute of Paper Science and Technology following its merger with the Georgia Institute of Technology) gave the plaintiff an unmarked floppy disk. After arriving home, he discovered that the disk contained three images of bestiality.

b. Several months later, that co-worker, shortly after terminating his employment with the IPC, invited the plaintiff to lunch and proceeded to ask the plaintiff questions about the images while a stranger sat in an adjoining booth and appeared to be listening closely.

c. The plaintiff told Mr. Knerr that the images were basically gross. The plaintiff had never sought out such material, was not engaging in such behaviors, had no material of that sort prior to that time in his possession and challenges the defendants to come forward with any evidence to indicate otherwise.

Initial Complaint

d. Mr. Knerr was apparently a ‘killer’, who sought to entrap or otherwise obtain useful evidence of aberrant behaviors and attitudes useful to the defendants for the purposes of entrapment, ridicule and/or providing an excuse for psychological treatment.

e. [http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit D Methods of Attack.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_D_Methods_of_Attack.pdf)

(A Page from MKULTRA)

20. a. that at some time in early 1996, the plaintiff began to receive in the mail the following sales catalogs. Warning - the material is explicit and provocative. The plaintiff has partially censored that material for the court’s benefit:

b. [http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit E Sensations.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_E_Sensations.pdf)

c. The plaintiff ordered nothing from that company, did not wish to and had not previously sought to obtain the more provocative material of the sort pictured.

d. The plaintiff would like to suggest to the defendants that their partner in crime, Sensations.com, not include the following deceptive disclaimer:

e. “Because we are committed to a healthy exploration of sexuality, a team of psychologists review our videocassettes to ensure that they do not appeal

Initial Complaint

to a prurient or unhealthy type of interest in sex. There is never any violence, nor are there words or actions that are demeaning to men or women.” along with its attempts to seduce the defendant’s enemies to their own destruction, to ‘discredit by aberrant behaviors’, to provide an excuse for psychiatric commitment, to justify its surreptitious entry into their lives and/or to test psychological health and predispositions (or in the intentionally relevant and non-coincidental words of George Orwell - “Recycle for proletarian use”). There is no other likely explanation for the sending of such unsolicited material through the US Mail.

f. By now, the network has sent tens of thousands of slick email spam advertisements containing similar invitations to acquire similar material. It amazes the plaintiff that the network provides such an aggressive conduit to such material, any of which could have invited further trouble for the plaintiff.

21. that at some time during 1996, the plaintiff began to notice that he was being followed on the road

22. that at some time at about that time, the plaintiff was contacted within his office at the IPST division of the Georgia Institute of Technology by a man who called himself ‘John Bridges’, who left the phone number 770-

Initial Complaint

641-8879 on the plaintiff's workplace phone answering service and who later mentioned that he found the plaintiff's number in the 'blue pages', mentioned that he was 'under the radar' and mentioned that he did not expect to ever earn more than a few thousand dollars a year, even though the caller sounded perfectly intelligent and articulate. The person was apparently another fake whose intention was to threaten, pressure and/or warn the plaintiff.

23. that at about that time, the plaintiff received several phone calls on his company phone from mental health service professionals. None would indicate who referred them to the plaintiff or why.

24. that at about that time, the plaintiff pulled up to the drive-through window of a Taco Bell restaurant on Ponce de Leon Avenue near his apartment home at 734 Frederica St. NW, Atlanta, GA to hear a man in a large truck which had pulled up behind the plaintiff's car call out a provocative racial slur. A moment later, the woman at the window slammed the checkout window with such force that it sent the plaintiff's change flying onto the pavement next to his car door. After eating the food, the plaintiff became very ill for two days following, possibly 'mirrored' within the film 'Animatrix':

Initial Complaint

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (Animatrix: monkey with a stomach ache).

25. that at about that time, a man in a new model luxury car pulled up beside the plaintiff's and made a lewd, provocative gesture immediately prior to the Tennessee border, while the plaintiff was heading north from Georgia, while traveling on I85. The man pulled off to the side of the road immediately prior to the Georgia/Tennessee border.

26. a. that during that trip north toward East Tennessee, where he was born and where his family has lived all of his life, two 18-wheelers pulled alongside each other and remained in that position so as to prevent the plaintiff from passing over the course of about ten miles of two-lane interstate (I81).

b. While nearing his destination, a heavy snowstorm hit the area between Knoxville and the Tri-Cities area. While traveling slowly on the snow-obliterated highway (Interstate 81), a car came up behind the plaintiff's and followed the plaintiff at less than a car-length's distance with its brights on for several miles, causing a dangerous situation. When the plaintiff would slow down to allow the follower to pass, the follower would do so as well.

Initial Complaint

When the plaintiff would speed up, the follower would do so as well.

Eventually, the car fell back and the plaintiff lost sight of it.

27. a. that at about that time, the plaintiff got off of an aircraft in San Jose, California to find that the internals of his computer, which had been placed in a checked piece of luggage, had been wrecked and several components needed replacement.

b. A few days later, after returning from an errand to Pony Computer Co. to have the computer repaired, and while exiting from 75N/85N and exiting onto North Avenue, a mid-sized truck abruptly dived in front of the plaintiff's car just before stopping at the stop light at the end of the off-ramp at North Avenue.

c. Countering the plaintiff's attempts to get around the truck, the driver took steps to maintain its position immediately in front of the plaintiff's car. For the few miles while traveling down North Avenue and Ponce de Leon toward the North Highlands area, the truck proceeded to spew out a great volume of smoke from the cargo area, totally obscuring the plaintiff's visibility of the road several times.

Initial Complaint

28. that at about that time, a bank at the intersection of Frederica Street and Ponce de Leon Avenue and immediately adjacent to the plaintiff's upstairs apartment at 734 Frederica Street oriented one or more of its parking lot lights so as to shine into the plaintiff's upstairs apartment window. As has proven typical, the tactic was apparently, cleverly and deniably 'mirrored' within Ambien CR's recent ad campaign.

See Video Tape Exhibit - Ambien CR

29. that at about that time, while semi-conscious just after waking up, but before opening his eyes from sleep, three voices (at least one male and at least one female) made a horrid banshee sound in unison just below the plaintiff's open window. By the time the plaintiff got up to look out the window a few moments later, whoever the voices belonged to were gone.

30. that at about that time, the plaintiff drew up the blinds of his upstairs window, which he very rarely did, those blinds always remaining closed, and noticed that the residents of the immediately adjacent house on Frederica St. had placed a camera upon a tripod immediately inside their upstairs window closest to the plaintiff's window and had oriented it to point directly at the plaintiff's window. After about ten seconds, one of those

Initial Complaint

residents removed that camera and tripod as the plaintiff watched in disbelief.

31. that a few days before May 17, 1998, the plaintiff's car was smashed into causing approximately \$4000 worth of damage and no contact information was left with the car, while it was parked outside his Druid Valley Drive apartment ("The Park at Briarcliff"). With the help of a neighbor, the plaintiff was able to determine that it was a U-Haul truck which damaged his car, determine the license plate number and the fact that it was another neighbor who was moving out of state who had caused the damage. Although the management of "The Park at Briarcliff" knew the identity of the driver, its property manager refused to divulge it.

<http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit F Druid Valley.pdf>

32. a. that at some time on or about the year 1999, after leaving the previous Fulton County address and while living in his new apartment on Druid Valley Drive in Dekalb County, the plaintiff returned home from work to find his apartment door standing wide open with no sign of break-in and his television, computer and computer display missing.

Initial Complaint

- b. He immediately obtained a police report with the help of the Atlanta Police (DeKalb Co. Police Dept. case #99280002). The police officer refused to have the apartment dusted for fingerprints, claiming that the apartment was dusty.
- c. Two days later early in the morning those items were found by the plaintiff's neighbor (a young woman named Jeanine Davis who lived at the time in the immediately adjoining apartment and who has since moved to New York) to have been neatly stacked at some point during the night just outside the plaintiff's apartment door.
- d. No explanation or justification has ever been offered for that mysterious theft and return and thieves rarely return stolen goods. The network obviously had access to the plaintiff's home before and since and have had every opportunity to examine, copy, photograph or confiscate anything and everything therein that they wished.
- e. If damaging evidence or information against the plaintiff was found as to justify the plaintiff's endless persecution as described herein, then let the defendants come forward at long last and bring that material before the court and the plaintiff.

Initial Complaint

f. But let them also bring an official recognition of that persecution itself in all of its forms and details (including every last hateful bee sting and click/thump message – see below) and let the plaintiff make use of the full body of that surveillance information in his own defense.

g. The plaintiff is less afraid of the actual facts of his life than of his persecutors' many cruel machinations and the assumption that the persecution itself may never truly end.

33. a. that since approximately 1997 and continuing uninterrupted thereafter to the present, the plaintiff has been subjected (via presumably electromagnetic and other means) from locations unknown (while at home and elsewhere both within and outside the state of Georgia) to the perception of instantaneous click, tap and thump sounds, visual noise transients appearing on television screens and audible noise spikes heard on radio reception equipment that are precisely timed so as to be coincident with audible words, phrases and sentences within available and simultaneously surveilled linguistic material (radio, TV and spoken) so as to effectively hijack those moments and thus provide an eminently deniable and anonymous method of conveying messages intended by the hidden originators of those transients.

Initial Complaint

b. The method is sufficient to convey mockery, ridicule, commands, simple communications and embody many of the techniques of fear enhancement, threat, intimidation, trickery, lies, false promises, self-congratulation, etc. employed as part of traditional in-person hostile interrogations with some unique characteristics of its own (including a unique effect whereby faces appearing on television screens can evoke the illusion of being confronted with an actual person – a stressful effect that the plaintiff’s persecutors have readily made use of). The means is abysmal at conveying clear, conversational communications but is not needed for that purpose.

c. On the night that the click/stimulus messaging began (and in one form or other has never ceased), someone broke the glass of one of the panes of the community apartment door leading to the plaintiff’s residence.

d. Although the means is ingeniously unprovable and can be configured to emulate house settling and other environmental noises, the plaintiff can certainly describe his experience with them in great detail:

e. http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_D_Methods_of_Attack.pdf

(Click/stimulus messaging)

Initial Complaint

f. The method has been roughly and ambiguously mirrored within several media examples:

g. See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (Close Encounters: attic noises)

h. See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (A Beautiful Mind: noise from below)

i. and has been reported by other similarly persecuted (and lucid and rational) persons.

j. http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_G_Other_Victims.pdf

34. a. that throughout the plaintiff's stay at the Druid Valley Drive address, a man named Michael Lowe, the plaintiff's immediate upstairs neighbor, showed clear evidence of surveilling the plaintiff within his apartment by making thumping sounds on his floor immediately above the plaintiff's ceiling according to the techniques described in (33), dropping heavy objects upon his floor immediately above the plaintiff's bedroom so as to awaken him during the night, making sounds in clear response to the plaintiff's motions within his apartment, moving from room to room (based on the audible sound of Mr. Lowe's footsteps from above) as the plaintiff would move from room to room within his own apartment in an effort to

Initial Complaint

engender paranoia and stress and to interrogate and communicate with the plaintiff in unprovable ways.

b. Mr. Lowe also apparently made a point of banging the water pipes within his bathroom above the plaintiff's on two occasions within several minutes of moments when the water to the plaintiff's shower would turn instantly from warm to cold, and then after readjustment, would turn instantly hot.

c. One day, Mr. Lowe invited the plaintiff up to his apartment where Mr. Lowe left three stethoscopes within view, apparently to deniably indicate that Mr. Lowe was 'listening'. A large stack of video tapes was also in view.

d. While there, Mr. Lowe showed the plaintiff where he had taped four thin wires together, joining some cabling within his apartment, on the pretext that it provided him with better acoustic performance with his stereo. Mr. Lowe was apparently indicating in the usual deniable way that he had configured a groundloop as a means of surveilling the plaintiff's computer screen, exploiting the plaintiff's own belief at the time.

Initial Complaint

e. In hindsight, the plaintiff now understands that such primitive means of surveillance was not in use then or now and that the demonstration was simply a form of suggestion and distraction. Mr. Lowe denied having any knowledge of his own actions.

f. While living there, the plaintiff wrote a great deal about his past life, old friendships, old loves, attitudes and beliefs, never transmitting that text to the internet or otherwise beyond the confines of his own computer.

g. The volume of that material was apparently surveilled and then (along with other surveilled information) shared far and wide within the network (including within the media), a fact that Mr. Lowe through the method of thump messaging indicated on at least one occasion, material that apparently and astonishingly served as a partial basis for a considerable number of parodies upon that material within the film and televised media, although few of them have been particularly accurate (see below). Also while living there:

h. a fuse controlling the power to the plaintiff's apartment was apparently replaced with a maddeningly faulty one.

Initial Complaint

- i. See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (Close Encounters: “Big problem coming your way”)
- j. the plaintiff’s telephone service went dead (no dial tone). He called the phone company. They said that they were having a problem in the area. That night, Mr. Lowe made a point of having a (loud) conversation in his bedroom with lots of laughter, not long after the plaintiff went to bed in his bedroom immediately below Mr. Lowe’s. When the conversation was apparently over, Mr. Lowe slammed the phone down audibly enough for the plaintiff to be certain to hear it, apparently to make certain that the plaintiff was the only one ‘in the area’ who was having a problem.
- k. the plaintiff’s car windshield wipers were pulled off the glass and stuck upright during the night
- l. the lock of his mailbox at the apartment complex’s community mailbox was unscrewed such that it nearly fell off and a package that the plaintiff had ordered a few days before from a licensed company in California never arrived

Initial Complaint

m. someone placed a suggestive magazine on the path leading down to the track where he would run late at night within the twenty minutes during which he was running

n. and, although the plaintiff had never made a maintenance request, a representative of “The Park at Briarcliff” (just prior to 8/22/00) came to the plaintiff’s door to replace a light bulb and (despite the fact that the plaintiff told the representative that he made no maintenance request and needed no maintenance) later left a note within the apartment with the notation that “‘T’ broke the lightbulb” while the plaintiff was away (a note that indicated that the maintenance technician had been given permission to enter, although the plaintiff never offered such permission).

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit F Druid Valley.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_F_Druid_Valley.pdf)

35. that in August 2002, the plaintiff received the following (apparent) mis-mailing. Note the presence of the 37, a recurrent symbol within the network’s media works implying good:

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit H CSEL.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_H_CSEL.pdf)

36. that at about that time, while traveling to an industrial facility located in southern Georgia in preparation for a mill trial to demonstrate a

Initial Complaint

measurement technology that he and two co-workers had developed at IPST division of Georgia Tech in cooperation with Lawrence Berkley Lab, the plaintiff noticed that a car had stayed about 200 yards behind his own for about a hundred miles or so. Suspicious, he slowed to the minimum speed limit of 40 mph. The car pulled off to the side of the road. The plaintiff continued on his way south to the industrial facility and did not see the car again.

37. a. that for a period of approximately a week in mid 2005, the plaintiff was subjected to intense physical pain somehow aimed at the base of his neck, well beyond any headache pain that the plaintiff had experienced before, entirely incapacitating the plaintiff and causing him to howl in pain that amounted to clear physical torture and which had no prior physically explicable precedent or cause due to injury, overuse, exertion or otherwise.

b. The plaintiff's family called an ambulance on the plaintiff's behalf. The pain faded shortly before the arrival of the ambulance and during their brief examination and then resumed shortly after their departure. The plaintiff's mother drove down from Tennessee to help the plaintiff through the worst of the pain. The pain slowly faded over the course of a week during which sleep was all but impossible. Large doses of prescription pain

Initial Complaint

killers did not lessen the pain significantly. The rapid changes in intensity of the pain and other forms of harassment (see below) indicate that the pain was likely to have been somehow induced neuro-electromagnetically rather than chemically or naturally.

c. As has proven typical, that esoteric tactic has been mirrored within the creative media:

d. See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (Last Temptation of Christ: “Magdalene. Magdalene.”)

e. See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (The Game: “Have any aspirin?”)

f. See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (Close Encounters: “Headaches, Migraines?”)

g. Beyond a few several-second long, instantaneously on and then off demonstrations and other low intensity punishments and reminders of that pain, the plaintiff’s anonymous persecutors have not repeated that horrible experience although they have occasionally threatened to resume it.

38. a. that while the plaintiff was employed at the Institute of Paper Science and Technology, a division of the Georgia Institute of Technology,

Initial Complaint

several co-workers relentlessly engaged in antics such as coughing, sucking air through their teeth

b. Video Tape Exhibit – Devil’s Advocate (Office at Georgia Tech)

c. key rattling, laughter, suggestive object placement, body language and conversations intended to be overheard so as to annoy, harass, intimidate and pressure the plaintiff. The two examples in the exhibit are the only examples that the plaintiff managed to capture with a hidden camera from within his office before the man pictured, a Dr. Jeff Empie, and the other harassers promptly changed tactics so as to make the further collection of such evidence far more difficult by moving the behaviors to other locations than nearby the plaintiff’s office door.

d. The management of IPST and Georgia Tech refused to investigate or stop those behaviors. Requests by the plaintiff to discuss the matter with the named harassers in the presence of management were refused. An appeal to the Georgia Tech grievance committee for an investigation was refused and only an evasive report that did not mention any of those behaviors or harassers and instead sought to cast all blame on the plaintiff was produced.

Initial Complaint

e. The president of IPST, Dr. Jim Frederick, ultimately banned the plaintiff from the Georgia Tech campus and demanded that the plaintiff enter into continuing psychiatric treatment and sign a waiver allowing Georgia Tech to communicate directly with the psychiatrist as a condition of continuing employment, a demand that may not be within Georgia Tech's right to demand under Georgia Law and which was based on the pretext that the plaintiff:

I. Wrote a letter to IPST's computer systems manager consisting of "Do you get crap like this in your email? Why won't any of you tell me what the hell is going on?" after the plaintiff received the strange and provocative letter on his office computer:

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit C Represent.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_C_Represent.pdf)

II. Took a co-worker's picture

III. Made a provocative gesture, the details of which and the person making the claim were never revealed to the plaintiff

f. Certainly the antics of the plaintiff's harassers were against Georgia Tech policy calling for civil and respectful treatment between employees. Prior to the onset of the harassment, the plaintiff had been respectful and

Initial Complaint

courteous to all employees there and to the best of his knowledge had no enemies there.

g. At the time of being banned from campus and despite the pressure, which had actually eased somewhat, the plaintiff was not melting down nor shirking his duties. In fact, he and his co-workers had just returned from the stressful paper mill technological trial that wound up being moderately successful.

h. Other members of the IPST harassment gang included Dr. Fred Ahrens, Mr. Jeff Champine, Mr. Jerry Nunn, Miss Kennisha Collins and Miss Jasmin Frett. After the plaintiff continued to refuse the demand, Georgia Tech terminated the plaintiff's employment.

i. The behaviors, the demand and the termination may or may not have been a partial but unstated consequence of the plaintiff's email communication with IPST's former personnel director over the reasons for the mysterious gun-shot suicide death of an elder vice president of IPST (Dr. Barry Crouse), which seemed eerily like the plaintiff's own long workplace harassment.

Initial Complaint

j. Two co-workers (Dr. Emmanuel Lafond and Mr. David Bell) had independently told the plaintiff that Dr. Crouse had been having an affair with a younger IPST employee and that the personnel director, hearing of that, had set about calling all of his professional contacts about the matter. Later, Mr. Bell suggested that the elder vice president had committed suicide due to the natural death of his very aged mother, which seemed and seems most unlikely to the plaintiff, the plaintiff never having heard of such a thing occurring before. Mr. Bell was apparently attempting to protect that former personnel director.

k. Having endured so much harassment in public places and within the workplace, the plaintiff is forced to assume that he would have to endure a new round of such harassment were he to seek new employment elsewhere. The plaintiff's career has effectively been ended, as if it were possible to concentrate under such a withering barrage of bee-sting prattle (see below). When the thought of seeking new employment crosses the plaintiff's mind, the methods of bee stings and click messaging are frequently employed to convey the message that any attempt will be blocked, if the plaintiff does not do everything he is told, including terminating any protests (legal and otherwise) against this injustice. The plaintiff is being blackmailed and held hostage.

Initial Complaint

1. The harassment and termination from IPST were apparently 'mirrored' within the film 'The Manchurian Candidate' in terms of one character throwing down a newspaper with the headline "Mob kills Muslim at Yale University" in coincidence with the dialog "Paper or plastic?" (a phrase and a dilemma that was frequently heard at the Institute of Paper Science and Technology and was quite recognizable to the plaintiff and all others there):

See Video Tape Exhibit = Manchurian Candidate ("Paper or plastic?")

39. a. that over several months leading up to the month of June 2007, the plaintiff suffered frequent headaches as his left eye became progressively weaker and dimmer until the right eye dominated, resulting in severe diplopia (double vision). The diplopia continued through the month of June.

b. After obtaining an examination (but not treatment) by a local ophthalmology physician

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_I_Ophthalmologist.pdf

c. and after scheduling an MRI, but in the few days leading up to that MRI, the symptoms promptly disappeared and did not return.

Initial Complaint

d. The promptness of the disappearance of the symptoms again suggests that the debilitation was induced somehow neurologically via electromagnetic means unknown. Beyond the ambulance and ophthalmologist, the plaintiff has had no contact with the medical profession in the past twenty years (nor needed any, being generally healthy) – a measure of the extreme debilitation of those two apparent attacks.

e. Variations upon that odd and esoteric tactic have been reported by other similarly harassed persons:

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_G_Other_Victims.pdf

and have apparently been ‘mirrored’ on a personal basis within the form of a (briefly) medication addicted, medication thieving, eyeglass display case toppling, long haired, bearded, totally out of control ‘Jack’ in the TV series ‘Lost’, a series that is based on the loose premise of a kind of psychology experiment run by an organization named ‘DARMA’ (an apparent derivation of the acronym DARPA and the Buddhist/Hindu concepts of dharma/kharma) - the only real truth to it being that the plaintiff bought on approximately five occasions distributed over the course of approximately nine months single doses of legal stimulants from a local shop, suffered the induced diplopia and visited the ophthalmologist, allowed his hair to grow

Initial Complaint

long since being terminated from Georgia Tech, and now goes for days without shaving having no-one to impress.

f. That series is apparently engaged in parodying and ‘mirroring’ other similarly persecuted persons, particularly those complainants and activists of higher profile, determination and effectiveness in the process of so-called ‘mockingbird’, a few of whom the plaintiff believes he knows.

g. The CIA’s brutal MKULTRA psychological research appears to be continuing, albeit in more advanced, esoteric and remote forms, and/or that research has crystallized into a kind of de-facto, hidden, punitive regime and/or the FBI’s questionable COINTELPRO tactics of discreditation and pressure of the sixties continue, still involving a heavy reliance upon its contacts within the media. Or both.

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit J Supporting Documentation.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf)

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit K General Media.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_K_General_Media.pdf) (Mockingbird)

h. The bird symbol has long been a favorite of the intelligence community, to be found in everything from Project Bluebird to Project Mockingbird to the so-called ‘Aviary’ to the numerous uses of the bird symbol in the network’s media offerings – usually a phallic symbol, but

Initial Complaint

sometimes representing a surveillance or death sign (in the usual form of a crow).

See Video Tape Exhibit – Symbols Composite (birds)

i. That esoteric tactic of vision debilitation has apparently been ‘mirrored’ in the form of characters with eye-patches, missing or dead eyes, cats (suggestive) with dual colored eyes and otherwise.

See Video Tape Exhibit – Symbols Compilation (Cats: the lion with a dead eye that calls the unJesus an ambitious liar).

See Video Tape Exhibit – Tek Jansen (cat with double vision, man with eye patch, skeleton with one eye).

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (The Stand: “My eyes. They’re all funny.”)

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (The Game: “It’s out of your hands.”)

And in lyrics such as these:

Initial Complaint

“As quickly as it all began, the darkness overwhelms my joy. How is this so? How can it all be gone? Is there no solution? Welcome to my mind. Is there no help for me? Forever with unopened eye.” – Novembers Doom

“It’s doom alone that counts. And the one-eyed undertaker, he blows a futile horn.” – Bob Dylan

“Maybe a star will fall tonight. And maybe just one of my eyes will capture the light.” - Lake of Tears

the doubled irises from the film “In the Mouth of Madness” that includes a character who sees himself pictured in film, is eventually institutionalized, is forced to watch as his society descends into madness and violence that results from the evil machinations of a horror writer and not terribly unexpectedly, includes a character named Jackson

and the British production of Orwell’s 1984 in the moments in which the tortured Winston character is asked how many fingers he is being shown (and is told that he sees as many fingers as he is told to see).

40. a. that since approximately 2006 the plaintiff has been subjected via apparently electromagnetic means unknown to physical sensations upon the skin that are similar in sensation to the impact of small rain drops, pointed

Initial Complaint

objects dragged lightly across the skin, insects crawling upon the skin, and/or mosquito/flea bites that can be increased in intensity to the level of biting flies or mild bee stings (configured so as to punish or warn).

b. Those have been transmitted to the plaintiff at an approximate daily frequency during all waking hours of approximately two to three per minute and have been and are being employed so as to continuously consume the plaintiff's attention with hostile and other unwanted semi-communications (most of which is pure prattle serving no purpose but to simply annoy and anger as far as the plaintiff can determine) and keep the plaintiff continuously miserable in a way similar to the clandestine technique of click/stimulus messaging described above, although with greater sophistication and versatility.

c. Although that means is also designed not to be provable, it can be described in great detail based on the plaintiff's experience.

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_D_Methods_of_Attack.pdf (Bee Stings)

d. The tactic is confirmed by the reports of similarly persecuted persons

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_L_Reports_of_Bee_Stings.pdf

Initial Complaint

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (“Just one more couple suffering at the hands of... who exactly?”)

e. Those are a kind of torture in the fashion of Chinese water torture, yet are in some sense still worse in that every drop is a little drop of hate, negativity, ridicule, chastisement, command and other unwanted semi-communications - a rain that never seems to end.

f. Those are NOT simply punishment for bad behavior and only a relative few of them relate to the plaintiff’s sins at all. The transmission of lies has proven to be every bit as acceptable to the plaintiff’s persecutors as truths, as long as the result is pain and despair.

g. A person can be driven to rage or cognitive dissonance while only inches away from another person without the other person having the slightest idea as to what the first person is experiencing and reacting to. Lt. General Perroot's boast of being able to talk a person literally to death appears to be true.

h. The tactic, as has proven typical, is frequently being ‘mirrored’ within the media works of cooperating individuals, such as Steven King’s ‘Kingdom Hospital’ in the form of a man covered in ants, Adam Sandler’s

Initial Complaint

film comedy 'Little Nicki' in which actor Henry Winkler is pictured covered in bee stings and:

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (A Scanner Darkly: man covered in insects)

See Video Tape Exhibit – Tek Jansen (angry bees)

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (AI: Artificial Intelligence: pin prick)

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (Blade Runner: “You’re watching television when you feel a wasp crawling on your arm.”)

i. Being frequently felt upon locations of the skin that are below the body rather than above it, the plaintiff assumes that the means for producing those sensations is likely to involve the sophisticated manipulation of the plaintiff’s brain/nervous system directly rather than some electromagnetic beam impinging upon the skin itself. That belief corroborates well with the fact that persons who have lost limbs occasionally report itching or pain sensations within those lost limbs, implying that such a ‘cart-before-the-horse’ tactile sensation (ghost pain) could plausibly be induced by manipulation of the central nervous system itself.

Initial Complaint

j. That belief also corroborates well with the induced neck pain, period of mysterious vision debilitation/diplopia and with the accounts of numerous other persons reporting similar harassments. That belief also corroborates well with the following:

41. a. that astonishingly the plaintiff's unexpressed internal dialog (thought), mental imagery and memories (as recalled during the course of conscious thought) have somehow been under surveillance, at least since that fact was made known to the plaintiff some time in 2005, when the plaintiff's persecutors began transmitting substantive responses to that internal dialog primarily via the techniques of click/stimulus messaging and bee stings as a form of extraordinarily clandestine semi-communications feedback.

b. Such an extraordinary capability as the remote and clandestine surveillance of thought obviously falls beyond the capabilities of any unassisted state or local law enforcement or investigative agency or private persons. Only military and/or federal resources could have such a capability. Also, that surveillance has continued (as evidenced by those substantive responses), while the plaintiff has briefly dwelt in US locations outside of the state of Georgia. Thus, that aspect of the long persecution of

Initial Complaint

the plaintiff MUST involve the participation of federal and/or military resources, whether that participation has included only the providing of the equipment and technological infrastructure for state or local officials or private persons to apply.

c. The plaintiff can think of few situations more excruciatingly oppressive than having his very stream of thought literally and continuously laid bare for unknown and hostile persons to continuously mock, chastise, criticize, interrogate and otherwise comment upon on at their pleasure, in being unable to prove the fact of it owing to its clever leave-no-trace design, and in seeing his and other numerous complainants' emphatic protests forever ignored or disregarded as delusional, even as men like Kit Green of the Defense Intelligence Agency regularly lie boldfaced to the public as to the non-existence of the remote surveillance of thought in a recent interview with The Guardian newspaper.

d. In the plaintiff's experience, even the most innocent and mundane of thoughts and intentions are fodder for mockery, contradiction, criticism and so forth such that the intention appears to be the application of constant pressure in a general way.

Initial Complaint

e. The fact of that form of surveillance is not as fantastical as it might seem, the greatest technological hurdle being the surveillance of the tiny emanations (action potentials) within the brain and the mapping of temporal (rather than spatial/volumetric) patterns derived from that data to either sensory information surveilled directly from the sensory centers of the brain or from the simultaneous surveillance of a person's sensory environment. Controlling neural activity is presumably even easier by simply re-transmitting (via electromagnetic means) those temporally oriented patterns of action potentials unique to a given brain back at the brain and causing the brain to lock on to its own patterns of previously exhibited neural activity. The bulk of the scientific community appears to be focusing upon SPATIAL mappings of the brain, rather than TEMPORAL, which would seem to be the actual key to the method. Recall that the NSA has long been expert at detecting/deciphering electromagnetic emanations from great distance.

f. In terms of reading the internal verbal dialog, linguistic data for producing such a mapping is readily available from television, radio and spoken language, all of which are easily surveillable via conventional means. Assuming that neural activity corresponding to heard language has characteristics in common with read, spoken or contemplated language, then there exists a mechanism for getting to that internal dialog and, for example,

Initial Complaint

determining what a person is reading or thinking. Simply ask John Norseen of Lockheed-Martin, whose research, although on the right track, appears to be decades behind the current state of the art.

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf

(The Ethics Don't Concern Me)

g. Through an FOIA request, NASA recently admitted to a program to explore the feasibility of literally surveilling the minds of all air travelers in airports invisibly and without contact to an unknown degree of sophistication as they pass through one or more entranceways so as to identify persons with undue nervousness or diabolical intentions.

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf

(NASA plans to read terrorist's minds at airports)

h. As has proven typical, that extraordinary tactic has been parodied by members of the network within the media.

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (AI: Artificial Intelligence: Mecha boy surveilled by group of aliens)

Initial Complaint

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (12 Monkeys: “I know what you’re thinking.”)

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (The Final Cut)

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_K_General_Media.pdf (Orwell’s 1984)

i. In the following exhibit, notice U.S. intelligence’s determination (and fortunate failure due to the wisdom of one U.S. court) to completely dominate and monopolize technologies of neurological surveillance and influence that approach their own:

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf

(Patrick Flanagan's Neurophone)

j. If a boy could invent the neurophone in the mid seventies, imagine what billions in black budget research could come up with. In the following exhibit, notice U.S. Army intelligence’s interest in and research into directed energy methods of creating artificial hearing at a distance and of disrupting neurological function and creating epileptic seizures at a distance.

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf

Initial Complaint

(Bioeffects of Selected Nonlethal Weapons)

k. In the following exhibit, notice that the fact of the remote surveillance and manipulation of the central nervous system (particularly the so-called UCLA Violence Project) has already been established and is a matter of public record, were not the enormous volume over the last six decades of strategic media buzz surrounding these clandestine persecutions and numerous complaints by other persons proof enough of that fact:

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit J Supporting Documentation.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf)

l. In the following exhibit, notice the CIA's history of unethical and illegal research that shows some strong similarities to the plaintiff's own persecution and that of other persons. Although the laboratory/torture chamber is now a location-independent one rather than a single physical location, although the one-way window is a virtual one possibly involving implants, although more sophisticated means for transmitting negative messages than simple tape recorders are in use, and although other means than LSD for inducing confusion and cognitive dissonance exist (remote sleep deprivation, for example), the essence of so-called 'psychic driving' is still more or less in practice. It is now just infinitely more difficult or

Initial Complaint

impossible to prove and can continue for as much as a lifetime, while remaining as deniable as ever.

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf

(Montreal Court Case Nabs CIA for Illegal Mind-Control Experimentation)

m. Thus, all of the technological underpinnings to allow such means are clearly there and stark similarities are evident within them. Naturally, the defendants refuse to reveal the existence and use of their most powerful and clandestine technologies and methods and their attacks upon U.S. citizens and in all likelihood, no outright admission will ever be offered.

n. The plaintiff's complaint is neither fantastical nor delusional, the defendants clearly have motives for the creation of such an infrastructure, and the fact of the plausibility of the remote surveillance of the mind (even on a momentary basis) without contact or traces of that surveillance has already been established and the days when psychologists and psychiatrists could simply sweep aside complaints of such phenomena as delusional are gone, although in their ignorance, arrogance and in some cases complicity with the defendants, they will undoubtedly continue to do so, despite the fact that they have no published training or expertise to divine true psychological

Initial Complaint

disorder from the defendant's machinations, which are designed to emulate such disorder.

o. The plaintiff asks the court to consider what a much longer term and sophisticated use of such surveillance technology would be capable of as the plaintiff has attempted to described from his own experience with it.

p. The plaintiff is astonished that NASA admitted to such an intention at all, though is not surprised that NASA chose to reveal that aspect of the developing arsenal in the context of airport security and terrorism in which high courts have traditionally shown a strong measure of leniency in terms of invasions of personal privacy. The invasion in this case is the mind itself.

q. On at least one occasion, the plaintiff was visited by a bee sting denoting 'shoot you' an instant before an innocent friend uttered a statement that was readily interperable as a 'sign'. If true, that implies that the defendants' presume the right to peer into the minds of all persons at any given time or consider many or perhaps all citizens transgressors in one fashion or another and therefore subject to some of the means employed against the plaintiff himself. As part of his requests of the court below, the plaintiff will question that presumption and seek to determine the number of persons subject to any and/or all of the technological means employed

Initial Complaint

against the plaintiff and the precise criteria they refer to so as to justify such outrageous intrusions into the personal privacy of US citizens.

42. a. that, when thoughts of friends, family members and old acquaintances have crossed the plaintiff's mind, the methods of bee sting and stimulus messaging have been employed to convey singular suggestions including "Dumb", "Angry", "Fool", "Shoot you" (figurative) and so forth so as to apply additional pressure, forever remind the plaintiff of points of disagreements between the plaintiff and those persons and to enhance the plaintiff's sense of isolation and loneliness.

b. The plaintiff is now estranged from his entire family due mainly to ignorance, misunderstanding, disbelief, cultivated suspicion, presumed 'gaming' and the psychological power of those endless surreptitious suggestions that border on hypnotism. If the plaintiff's family is only pretending incredulity, then it would appear that they are compelled to do so, ultimately so as to protect the secrecy and security of the DEFENDANTS – a destructive force that similarly persecuted persons and their families should NOT have to endure, certainly not for multiple decades or a lifetime.

43. a. that the plaintiff's persecutors have established (through the long-term and round-the-clock use of the techniques of click/stimulus messaging,

Initial Complaint

bee-stings and ‘signing’) a large dictionary of alternate meanings for words and expressions.

b. Additionally, the EXPECTATION of receiving hidden intended meanings within overtly innocuous words, imagery and so forth has been established within the plaintiff’s mind.

c. Additionally, the plaintiff has been trained to involuntarily interpret many words and expressions as symbolic of other meanings and self-specific, even when they are not, crowding out to a significant degree the normal interpretation of words, despite the plaintiff being consciously aware of that change.

d. The changes are detrimental and debilitating, including an effect such that virtually any communications the plaintiff receives now produce feelings of suspicion and distrust – even of family and friends. If the plaintiff receives a sweater (red or otherwise) as a gift or if he is shown his friend’s blue parakeet, etc., etc., etc., he is trained to assume to some degree that each are a kind of slap in the face, even when they are not, a fact that ultimately helped cost the plaintiff his relationship with his family and ultimately cost him his last remaining friend - and all so that the network can

Initial Complaint

maintain it's damnable deniability and play its games with impunity. See each of the entertainment media video tape exhibits and:

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit D Methods of Attack.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_D_Methods_of_Attack.pdf) (Entrainment)

44. that the continuous surveillance of the plaintiff has collaterally placed under surveillance all family, friends and other acquaintances of the plaintiff who fall within the plaintiff's presence, whether within their own places of residence or elsewhere, within the state of Georgia and otherwise, the plaintiff's persecutors having felt perfectly free to employ the methods of bee sting and click/stimulus messaging within those locations as well, even responding to the spoken words of those family, friends and other acquaintances but unknown to those persons. Many of the plaintiff's experiences with those persons (from emails to phone calls to personal contact) have been thrown out to the network and its media contacts to do with as they have pleased as part of their mockingbird campaign against the plaintiff and those persons.

See Video Tape Exhibit – The Devil's Advocate, Tek Jansen, Cast Away, Contact, Field of Dreams, Airplane

Initial Complaint

45. a. that sometime during the night in mid August of 2006 when the plaintiff's friend Kevin, his wife and two children were making one of their once or twice per year visits to the plaintiff's home, the defendant's persecutors caused the plaintiff, via instantaneous and presumably neuro-electromagnetic means unknown, to momentarily lose all excretory control.

b. Prior to and after that moment, the plaintiff has never experienced any form of such incontinence before, however slight. The plaintiff has had no other visitors to his house beyond those very infrequent visits within the past several years. That that embarrassing phenomenon occurred during and only during one of those very infrequent visits is more than coincidental and testament to diabolical intention.

c. The plaintiff's persecutors specialize in the enhancement of embarrassing phenomena such as that, which, beyond being impossible to prove as being deliberately induced by external means, are that much more difficult to relate and discuss and in turn make good fodder for additional mockery and ridicule.

d. The method does not involve the simple momentary deadening of muscles. Based on the plaintiff's experience, it must involve the hijacking of higher brain functions that actually control the muscles. No, this is not at

Initial Complaint

all pleasant to discuss. That technological capability (or at least reports thereof) is well known to several members of the network within the creative media, who have, true to formula, ‘mirrored’ the attack tactic within their works:

See Video Tape Exhibit: Media MC (The Matrix Reloaded: “Causality”)

See Video Tape Exhibit: Media MC (The Stand: “People who play with fire”)

See Video Tape Exhibit: Media MC (The Game: “Real enough for you?”)

e. On another occasion within the past two years, the plaintiff happened to be watching an animated television series (‘Family Guy’?) in which a Santa Clause character mentions something to the effect of “Yes, we can do things like that.” (the Santa Legend having been bent through the course of many decades perhaps from its very conception (i.e. Satan Claws) to serve the usual good/evil duality formula in suggesting evil – deriving from the old Dutch “Old Nick” and more recently in films including ‘Close Encounters of the Third Kind’, ‘12 Monkeys’, ‘The Stand’, ‘The Mothman Prophecies’, ‘Little Niki’ and ‘Cast Away’).

Initial Complaint

f. In any case, at the uttering of the last word, the character proceeds to light up a cigarette (the dialog being presented in the context of a conversation unrelated to smoking). The plaintiff found to his considerable surprise that he had gotten out a cigarette during and prior to the speaking of the dialog and had flicked his lighter to light it at not just nearly but at **PRECISELY** the same moment at which the character did so as well.

g. The possibility that the remote neurological control capabilities of the defendants DO in fact include the ability to induce an URGE (not simply hijack muscular control) that even the conscious mind of the target is not aware were a surreptitious influence at all is strong. If so, then many sorts of horrors in terms of manufactured behaviors and even thoughts are possible (at least over brief periods). If so, the rudiments of the true surreptitious roboticization of human beings does exist, as numerous similarly persecuted persons have emphatically claimed do exist and are in use.

h. See Dr. Alfred Webre's account of his own research prior to his being targeted, himself.

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit G Other Victims.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_G_Other_Victims.pdf)

(Testimony of Dr. Alfred Lambremont Webre)

Initial Complaint

i. Also, notice the selected scene from the film 'The Mothman Prophecies', a typical creative media MC film in which the main character seemingly at random and on the fly picks a line and page from a book that serves the purposes (at least in terms of public impressions) of the attack on that character, effectively implying that the line and page were chosen not by that character, but by his attacker(s).

j. Also, notice the selected scene from the film 'Heavy Metal' that implies both that the target's ability to speak can be debilitated AND a strong sexual urge induced, which targeted people regularly report as part of attacks upon themselves.

Video Tape Exhibit: Heavy Metal ("Pretty. Pretty.")

k. When the fact of the clever use of the media to mirror the tactics and technologies of so-called 'mind control' is established and understood, then those scenes DO provide confirmation that the possibility of being maliciously used and framed via such means does exist and may be in use.

See Video Tape Exhibit: Media MC (The Mothman Propaganda)

l. The problem is certainty and proof, since of course the coincidence of the two events in the plaintiff's experience might have been simply random.

Initial Complaint

But considering the other influences that the plaintiff is certain of as described herein and the prevalence of the use of the Santa character, it seems likely to the plaintiff that both the writer of that television program was knowledgeable about that technological ability and that the moment was placed there precisely for such tactical use in conjunction with other modes of influence.

m. The plaintiff makes no claim that, beyond the bombardment of suggestion, psychological torment and physical pain (the artificiality of which his conscious mind has long been aware), none of his thoughts or attitudes have been influenced by such means so as to provide such manufactured evidence against himself (whether or not he may suspect otherwise) beyond the incidents described herein. However, considering the HUGE public relations effort that the network has invested in discrediting the plaintiff (and to a lesser degree other more prominent complainants) and the long period of time that the network has invested, would it not make sense to do precisely that?

46. that sometime during the year 2006, the plaintiff returned from an errand to find two large leaves left within his Avondale Estates house,

Initial Complaint

apparently to imply ('sign') the message "Leave!" in a deniable and anonymous way.

47. that in the month of September, 2007, the plaintiff ordered a bookcase from a company in Florida, which arrived in a buckled box. Upon inspection, two of the longest boards encompassing the length of the box were broken. A shoe print was clearly visible upon the outside of the box. Being shipped in its original packaging, only if the box were leaned up against a wall and then kicked are the long boards likely to have been broken in such a way. The company representative claims to have witnessed the box transferred to DHL's (the shipper's hands) in perfect condition and the plaintiff believes him. It appears that the swarm of hatred that the defendants have woven (through long and concerted effort) behind the back of the plaintiff has no scruples in being so well insulated from any and all consequences.

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit M Broken Bookcase.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_M_Broken_Bookcase.pdf)

48. that sometime during the night in mid August of 2007, the plaintiff awoke to find that the screen covering one of his windows was ripped off its frame and damaged and his gun, which the plaintiff has owned for approximately fifteen years and which the plaintiff has never discharged,

Initial Complaint

was stolen along with his video camera. The single bullet that the plaintiff kept in his possession for possible use with the gun was stolen as well. No other items of value were taken, although other small items of value were easily available for the taking. The gun and camera had been left in two places that would not be immediately obvious to an opportunistic burglar. Rather than some opportunistic burglary, the act once again appears to be the work of the plaintiff's persecutors. It is possible that the items have simply been hidden somewhere in the plaintiff's house in the interest of mind gaming rather than outright theft, not unlike the tactics of the former East German Stazi and their way of entering homes and removing bed sheets and such antics that, if reported to police, would draw laughter instead of concern, but which are still well suited to create paranoia, fear and suspicion, as reported recently on National Public Radio. During that night, one board of the plaintiff's fence was broken, indicating that entry to the house was from the populated, well-lit front yard rather than from the empty parking lot behind the plaintiff's home.

49. that the plaintiff has experienced a bombardment of suggestive emails, numerous inexplicable and mysterious disruptions in internet service, trojan horses that slip through firewalls and slow, stop or crash computer operation and hard drives, and momentary disruptions in house electrical power and

Initial Complaint

electrical equipment function. Had the defendants chosen to make full use of their capabilities, it would not have been possible to bring this case to court at all and the plaintiff would have had no definitive proof as to why. The defendants' surreptitious technological powers CANNOT be underestimated.

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit N Computer Attacks.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_N_Computer_Attacks.pdf)

50. a. that through the various methods of harassment and unwanted semi-communications in all places, the defendant's cooperating individuals have long proceeded on a continuous, round-the-clock basis to insult, pressure, chastise, taunt, interrogate, threaten, humiliate, intimidate, ridicule, belittle, mock, induce fear and paranoia, harass, punish, issue arbitrary orders and commands, seek to dominate and engender a mindset of obedience, discourage (including discouraging the right of free speech contrary to their opinions and the search for legal remedies), induce depression, mental exhaustion, paranoia and social isolation, encourage suicide, induce violent or seemingly irrational behaviors or speech, engender delusion, false beliefs, confusion, provide false grounds for diagnoses of propensity for violence, schizophrenia or other mental disorder, and

Initial Complaint

otherwise occupy and deliver unwanted semi-communications to the plaintiff for twelve long years.

b. If the plaintiff's persecutors limited their attack to discouraging only unhealthy thoughts and behaviors, the plaintiff would say so. However, the plaintiff's persecutors regularly (and constantly) mock, chastise and ridicule any thought, behavior, reminiscence, etc. no matter how innocent or well meaning. The intention of the attack seems neither to correct nor to heal, but simply to induce a continuous state of hopelessness and despair.

51. a. that the defendant's surveillors have shared selected aspects of the information gleaned from the long-term and possibly illegal surveillance and interrogation of the plaintiff with many of its 'mockingbird' contacts within the creative and news media for years without informing or seeking the consent of the plaintiff and setting the plaintiff up as a kind of straw man. Either at the instruction, advice or suggestion of the defendants and/or according to established tradition, those members of the media have then woven aspects of that material into both fictional and non-fictional contexts (even including National Public Radio and other news media).

b. Due to the juxtaposition of fictional and non-personal elements and contexts with actual ones, insinuation, exaggeration, endless repetition,

Initial Complaint

removal from real world context, clever language, and the use of often provocative metaphors and symbols with the kernels of truth relating to the plaintiff, those would appear to assist in defaming the plaintiff, inflaming public opinion about the plaintiff, providing a platform with which to entertain often provocative issues of interest to the network, and encouraging useful refutations by the plaintiff so as to encourage the plaintiff to pin himself to the material. There appears to be no criteria for accuracy as part of that formula. Some of the parodies have been absolutely outrageously and grotesquely inaccurate, often building upon earlier junk, which other strangers sign back at the plaintiff, apparently treating those as facts.

c. The method is ingenious in disguising the names and factual material of specific targeted persons in just enough ambiguity to avoid proof of the game being played (and thus immune to charges of defamation) but not enough to prevent the gaming from being recognizable to many who know how to 'read'. It would appear that the dropping of names of actual persons privately is sufficient to link all of the material to those persons. It is ingenious in forcing the plaintiff to attempt to clarify the ambiguities and correct the errors so as to attempt to prove the intentions behind them and thereby incriminate and/or embarrass himself, while still failing to prove anything.

Initial Complaint

52. a. that among the media aimed at the plaintiff personally and at persons he knows and has known include the film 'The Devil's Advocate',

See Video Tape Exhibit – The Devil's Advocate

That film:

- I. mentions a half-sister of the main character, a character named Melissa and a character named Leamon (the plaintiff has a half sister named Melissa who once had a best friend with the name Leamon.)
The 'Melissa Black' character also represents a kind of thank you for the participation of NPR and NPR reporter Miss Melissa Block, particularly considering the dialog "I heard weather coming on the news." written for that character and her and their role in receiving surveillance information about the plaintiff and mocking and providing pro-network spin corresponding to those and his public writing on the issues within their news media for the benefit of the consumption of some subset of the public and to apply pressure to the plaintiff personally.
- II. includes characters named Kevin and Eddie (the plaintiff has long had two and only two best friends by those names)

Initial Complaint

III. includes the dialog "Your neck of the woods at Georgia Tech" (the plaintiff worked for fifteen years at Georgia Tech after receiving his BS in electrical engineering from there)

IV. drops the name "Jacksonville" and includes a character named "Jackie" (the plaintiff's last name is Jackson)

V. drops the name "Alice". The plaintiff's other sister's middle name is Alice.

VI. includes a main character who is a trial lawyer (the plaintiff's father is a retired trial lawyer)

VII. drops the line "I'm on probation.", although the plaintiff has never set foot in court (other than for jury duty), nor been arrested, accused, tried or convicted of any crime

VIII. drops the line, "Pressure. Pressure. Changes everything. Pressure." (which appears to mirror the plaintiff's long surveillance and harassment of various forms).

IX. includes the dialog "I say we ride him as long as we can and then eat him."

Initial Complaint

X. includes the dialog "No problem. Arnold has a few reporters in his pocket. He'll just plant a story and destroy his credibility." and "If he doesn't come to us, he'll regret it." which appears an accurate mirror of some aspects of the plaintiff's twelve year persecution.

XI. includes the words "Mixing messages" shown prominently on a wall and a character who can hear things that no one else can hear and knows herself to be watched within her own home by her demonic tormentors.

b. The plaintiff invites your honor to view the film in its entirety and measure its ability to move even your honor's views and emotions, while containing very little actual truth about the plaintiff and people he has known and loved at all. In this and other works, the network has attacked the plaintiff's entire family and other friends and former friends with a mixture of surveillance facts and invented fictions. The fact is that there ARE hints of truths therein. Yes, the plaintiff HAS enjoyed marijuana. No, he has never murdered anyone. No, he has never seen his half-sister naked nor kissed her on the lips as pictured therein. If he is a defender of bad or errant people, that is only because he now understands the hidden tortures

Initial Complaint

that some of them are surely being subjected to and suffered their fate himself.

c. If the plaintiff has even succeeded in convincing your honor that details from the lives of the plaintiff and people the plaintiff has known are embedded therein rather than falsely convincing your honor that the plaintiff is a delusional (the first trap), then your honor will be tempted, will find it impossible to avoid, also believing things that are NOT true about the plaintiff and those persons (the second trap), and the filmmakers and the defendants STILL have all of the deniability in the world and the plaintiff has only succeeded in damaging himself and persons dear to him. That is part of the evil of ‘mockingbird’ and perpetual surveillance and harassment that leaves no trace and is never admitted to by the state. The plaintiff can provide a copy of the film in its entirety, if requested. If after reviewing this complaint and the network’s exhibits, the court thinks the plaintiff a hopelessly and recklessly promiscuous person, the plaintiff has had sex about twice per year on average over the course of 42 years of life and the great majority of those were with a very few steady sweethearts.

53. that still another is the film "Cast Away" (a play on words - one of many),

Initial Complaint

See Video Tape Exhibit – ‘Cast Away’

which mimics:

- a. The plaintiff’s occasional drug use twenty years ago in college via the 'Chemically altered' dialog and the 'Toad Licker Busted' posters on the walls (complementing a strategically aired NPR broadcast about hallucinogenic toads), the inclusion of the number '77' and the '286' on a FedEx truck implying that two have been sunk (86ed), ‘to sink someone’, or 'two partook of evil', the FedEx truck itself (a play on words and a common 'sign' these days employed to indicate the drug ‘ectasy’ and/or to partake of pornography), the talk about sin and of being sustained or destroyed (of which this film itself is a part).
- b. A private conversation that the plaintiff’s incredulous father had with the plaintiff about an old friend of his and retired psychiatrist who worked at Emory University. Like him, the plaintiff is also a long term resident of Atlanta.
- c. A blindfold implying how the plaintiff has been kept ignorant of the network’s machinations, until those have shown themselves within the media and otherwise.

Initial Complaint

- d. The words 'Bakersfield, Georgia' apparently implying 'to bake someone in Georgia' or 'to get baked in Georgia'.
- e. The fact that the plaintiff frequently traveled north along I-40 to visit friends and family in the East Tennessee area.
- f. The names of two of the very few romantic acquaintances that the plaintiff once knew in his past life, with first name Bettina and last name Cook. Those two women are innocent of any crime or other blemish to the best of the plaintiff's knowledge and experience and the plaintiff does not understand how the filmmakers have any business even knowing their names, much less toying with their identities. Other media venues have been much crueler and more libelous in their treatment of those few women, often suggesting that the plaintiff sought to betray and harm them (one venue currently suggesting that anyone the plaintiff touches promptly dies, metaphorical 'deaths' that are in fact entirely attributable to the network, their surveillance and their many machinations rather than to the plaintiff. The plaintiff only sought to defend them, after he noticed that their identities and pasts were being toyed with within the media). The network is expert in exploiting techniques for sewing suspicion and anger between friends, family and acquaintances via surreptitious suggestion, including building

Initial Complaint

public impressions that its enemies are ugly and evil (and thus to be avoided) in part so as to isolate and prevent them from providing mutually supportive testimony. The plaintiff will not mention those examples for fear of providing the defendants and their cooperating individuals further opportunities to do them harm nor will he attempt to contact them since the plaintiff's persecutors have worked so hard to turn the plaintiff into a pariah. Thus, in seeking to protect them from the defendants (their relative anonymity being their best modest defense against the defendant's machinations), the defendant's techniques of isolation effectively work from both directions.

g. The fact that in loneliness and need the plaintiff wrongfully took and kept a picture of an old acquaintance within a golden locket.

h. The repeated suggestions by the plaintiff's persecutors that he commit suicide and that he has been forced to seriously contemplate the possibility many times.

i. The film also appears to falsely suggest that the plaintiff has worn a dress. The plaintiff has never worn a dress or so much as held one up for inspection. Let those filmmakers back their insinuations with any data that they please dating as far back in time as they please.

54. that still another is the ‘Tales from the Darkside’ episode ‘The Impressionist’.

See Video Tape Exhibit – ‘Tales from the Darkside’

Released in late 1985, which recently reappeared more than two decades after its debut. That episode includes a prominent display of the initials TJ and other details that correspond reasonably well with the plaintiff’s experience at the time and some that do not, including one aberrant sexual behavior that the plaintiff had never engaged in nor seen an example of nor imagined engaging in. It appears that the network was spreading both lies and embarrassing truths about the plaintiff and preparing for a larger game over a decade before the plaintiff was even aware of it, by which time the plaintiff would be helpless against it, as he now is. Had the plaintiff seen that episode when it aired, the mere viewing would have added ten more years to the oppression of having to assume himself to be under an extraordinary form of location independent surveillance. Like the other examples, it is an example of so-called ‘Mockingbird’. To this day, the network is still constantly surveilling the plaintiff, looking for anything useful to it to spill onto the airwaves and elsewhere.

55. that still another is the ‘Tek Jansen’ cartoon series presented as part of the ‘Colbert Report’ television series and offered to this court in its entirety.

See Video Tape Exhibit – ‘Tek Jansen’

a. It includes the dialog, “Tek Jansen, wearer of star suits” that clearly suggests the plaintiff’s being ‘mirrored’ in media contexts such as the Tek Jansen cartoon series itself. The name Tek Jansen is an obvious derivation of the plaintiff’s name, Ted Jackson, and the fact that he was long associated with Georgia Tech.

b. introduces a character named Juliax, and the two characters are presented as attempting to make love when the two are thrown out of an airlock. The plaintiff’s older sister’s name is Julia and Mr. Colbert knows that fact. The plaintiff and his older sister have never done anything remotely resembling such a thing, the plaintiff has never entertained the thought and the plaintiff challenges Mr. Colbert and/or the defendants to produce the slightest SCRAP of evidence (even derived from the constant location-independent surveillance of the plaintiff and of his unspoken thought however far back in time such information is available – hereafter referred to as ‘The Eye’) to indicate otherwise. The defendants’ prattling media network is ingenious at implying surveillance data. Then let them come forward with proof of that

Initial Complaint

before the court. Let them explain what they themselves were seeking to insinuate for once. If they can not, then why would they go to all of the trouble of capturing and transferring such extraordinary surveillance data only to transform it only into parody, mockery, anecdote and hearsay and fail to maintain any definitive record other than to hide the fact of that surveillance and harassment and the cruel network that supports them? Although the scene is probably a mirror of the plaintiff's mentioning the Julia character from Orwell's novel 1984 and the fusion of that character with one of the plaintiff's old loves, it is a reckless one.

c. introduces a character named Admiral Allan Dorfer in a situation that evidently mirrors another targeted individual named Dr. Allen Barker, the administrator of one of the better anti-MC protest and information forums, and the group's discussions over the issue of the use of bulk email with which to contact the public. The Juliax character may or may not represent a trigger for Dr. Barker as well. As is implied therein, the plaintiff, in gaining no support for that idea, went ahead and mailed people in the tens of thousands alone and unassisted. That fact could only have been known via the surveillance of the plaintiff and/or through an informant within that private discussion forum.

Initial Complaint

- d. mirrors the fact that the plaintiff once knocked back his right side car rear-view mirror while driving into his garage, a fact that could only have been determined from the continuous surveillance of the plaintiff.
- e. pictures a character who sticks a fork into an alien creature, collects the fluid that issues from the creature in response, and then hands that fluid to a semi-transparent spectator (an apparent metaphor for the use of third persons for extracting information and the 'ghostly' defendants ultimately in control). That character also takes a moment to mock the plaintiff's loneliness and the complete absence, due to the defendant's machinations, of any love relationship whatsoever during the past twelve years. Elsewhere, they mock the plaintiff's having once sought a substitute for the lack.
- f. pictures an 'Employee of the Luna Cycle' award on a wall that mirrors the plaintiff's having won an 'Employee of the Quarter Award' while employed at the IPST division of Georgia Tech and includes the dialog "You don't know Galaxy Plaza? It's the ominous building with the dark windows that's always humming."
- g. includes the dialog, "The ship is full of bees!" and "Will Tek avoid the angry bees?", apparently reflecting the plaintiff's experience with and

Initial Complaint

description of what he and other similarly targeted persons have long termed ‘bee stings’.

h. includes a moment when the Tek character suggests to some children that they spend the night in a cave with him. The plaintiff challenges the defendants to produce any evidence, even deriving from the use of any of the means described herein that the plaintiff has ever similarly propositioned a child in any way, shape or form. If they exist, then let those children come forward.

i. suggests that a male infant belongs to the adult Tek character, which has no factual basis whatsoever.

j. suggests, according to the plaintiff’s own bee sting dictionary corresponding to the toes of his left foot

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_D_Methods_of_Attack.pdf (Bee Stings)

that if the plaintiff flings off the ring around his left index toe (implying ‘no shoot you too’ – figurative, implying complaints and protest) and the left middle toe (implying ‘no f__k you too’), the mockingbird will carry away the ring and will be destroyed by the torture device and the torture and the buzz saw (figurative) will stop. While the plaintiff appreciates the advice,

Initial Complaint

he does not believe that Mr. Colbert and company have the power or authority to make such a guarantee, finds that outcome insufficient, is tired of deniable metaphors and ambiguities and extraordinary surveillance, and cannot be certain exactly what is implied anyway.

k. that still another is the film 'Airplane' that appears to indicate that the plaintiff was under surveillance as far back as age THIRTEEN. Through the name 'Ted', it appears to mirror the plaintiff's name. Through the name 'Striker' and dialog 'Next, I'm going to teach them baseball', that he was an enthusiastic little league baseball player (but not a very good hitter) and that many years later, he would be teaching people some of the defendants' techniques. That through the mention of Atlanta, he would occasionally travel from East Tennessee to Atlanta. That through the flying premise and other details, that he was taking flying lessons. Notably, it mentions a 'hospital that can play tricks on your memory.' It also mirrors one or more of the plaintiff's boyhood mistakes and how the plaintiff would ultimately be put to further use by one or more of the defendants and their network. It also seems to suggest provocative behaviors that the plaintiff had not engaged in, which twenty-eight years later, the defendants' network is still energetically suggesting within their works. The plaintiff is surprised that a boy of thirteen can find himself a pawn of one or more of the defendants' and their

Initial Complaint

scurrilous network, apparently for isolated, inconsequential and self-terminated errors.

l. These are simply a few of the many media treatments of the plaintiff in the space of twenty-eight years or more. Not necessarily the kindest, the cruelest or the most accurate. The plaintiff simply chose those in their being the most likely to convince the court of the plaintiff's claims. It would be absurd to believe that the time and effort that went into their design and construction were merely for the plaintiff's notice. Those treatments must therefore be intended for the consumption of others, the by now large buzz that now exists being a confirmation of that fact.

m. Within their other broadcast mockingbird venues, over the years, the defendants' network has suggested that the plaintiff is or has been everything from a hopeless drug addict to a dealer in illicit substances or materials and far more detestable contexts along the way. The plaintiff is none of those and deeply resents the network's bizarre and ruthless treatment of the plaintiff, whose only common denominator is their own self-protection and cover. Having made the mistake of responding to Geico Corp.'s 'signs', Geico now feels free to suggest that the plaintiff is a sexist (among other things) or otherwise has that effect. The plaintiff is not a

Initial Complaint

sexist and likes to see women assume positions of authority and achievement.

n. Because the Tek Jansen cartoon series is an open ended series that can with relative convenience, low expense and brief production schedule add new installments to the series as its creators wish and because Mr. Colbert and his producers are aware of the plaintiff's choice to recognize the parody of the plaintiff and that the plaintiff intends to challenge those parodies in civil court, those persons may well have already undertaken in retaliation to continue the series with new levels of provocative suggestion, still and perhaps forever safe in deniability.

o. By now the advertising media is also filled with similar material not necessarily relating to the plaintiff, from a Georgia Lottery commercial picturing a piggy bank (pig symbol) that explodes in a microwave oven (microwave harassment symbol) to a commercial featuring a hardware store employee who conducts an impromptu 'Vulcan mind meld' on a customer to an Applebees commercial in which a man asks a red apple if anyone else can hear the apple to a commercial in which a family is tied up in metaphors/twine to the 'home office' to an Ad Council stroke awareness radio advertisement that directs listeners to 'sit and suffer' under 'mind

Initial Complaint

control’ and suggests that sufferers ‘cannot dance’ to a commercial in which a rooster harasses a woman at all hours of the night. Those are, of course, examples of modern day ‘newspeak’ that cleverly hint at the cruel reality.

56. that still another is the song ‘Close But No Cigar’ by Mr. Weird Al Yankovich, which attains new heights in provocative, intended and defamatory inaccuracy aimed at the plaintiff and his family.

[http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit O Yankovic.pdf](http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_O_Yankovic.pdf)

57. that during the defendants’ (and/or their predecessors’) post World War II history, the defendants:

a. did discover a means of clandestinely and remotely tracking, surveilling and manipulating with great sophistication the neural activity of living persons, developed other complimentary technologies and tactics of clandestine semi-communications and harassment with which to leverage and complement them, and conceived of a strategic master plan with which to apply those technologies perpetually, to hide them from the normal realm of political, law enforcement and investigative accountability, while regularly implying their existence in carefully crafted media contexts revolving around sin either overtly or implied. In the long term, the effort

Initial Complaint

would seem to prepare the nation for a present and future in which the use of such means becomes the de-facto norm and to assist in interrogating, pressuring, torturing, tormenting and defaming targeted persons without anyone in authority ever having to be responsible for anything, a structure that has apparently withstood any successful challenge for over six decades in part due to a cooperative news media's refusal to report the complaints of targeted persons thoroughly and fairly.

b. possibly influenced, via its contacts within psychiatry and psychiatric professional organizations, the evolution of the DSM criteria for diagnosis of mental disorders to include reports of 'the perception of hearing voices', belief in being persecuted and other phenomena within that criteria so as to assist in building a psychiatric 'catch-all' based mainly around popular perceptions of schizophrenia to complement its techniques of harassment and to blur the line between legitimate mental disorders and the influence of the numerous forms of technological and social harassments as described herein. Recall that the notorious Dr. Ewen Cameron, researcher into brutal 'psychic driving', was once the President of the American Psychiatry Association. According to Dr. Colin A. Ross, many other psychiatric leaders and researchers have worked for the CIA over the years and decades as well as part of its nefarious MKULTRA and other questionable research,

Initial Complaint

some working in the areas of implants, remote electronic punishments and surveillance, some on so-called 'remote viewing' (including project "Grill Flame", probably suggestive of cooking people over an open flame.

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf (Bluebird).

As part of their recent successful lawsuit by victims of the CIA's earlier nefarious 'mind control' research, the CIA attempted to argue its way out of liabilities in terms of statute of limitations based on the publication date of a semi-fictional novel called 'The Manchurian Candidate'. Will it now attempt to refute a well researched documentary text by a doctor of psychiatry?

c. have slowly recruited and trained (directly and indirectly) a large and mostly conservative and ultimately self-perpetuating and enthusiastic American subculture including a large portion of the film, television, advertising and news media that receives surveillance information about targeted individuals and is versed in mockingbird tactics of mirroring and in artful reflections of the actual reality that are obvious enough to lead public opinion, but being cast into fictional contexts are difficult or impossible to employ as proof of that effort - even a film so obvious as 'The Game'. A kind of information and power haves and have nots society appears to be in

Initial Complaint

the process of being built, quite beyond the usual one – a kind of moralist mafia – now and perhaps forever drunk with power and protection.

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_K_General_Media.pdf

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_P_Music_Industry.pdf

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC

d. possibly founded useful front organizations such as Psi Tech (whose leadership has a clear and acknowledged military/CIA background and a biblically oriented philosophy) dedicated to the training and use of techniques of so-called ‘remote viewing’, maintaining the mystique of bogus psychic phenomena and possibly inspiring (through the careful and clandestine use of some of the technologies described herein) persons to actually and erroneously believe that they have natural psychic abilities, and which may be clandestinely inclusive of some persons and exclusive of others (in terms of gaining bogus psychic abilities after bogus ‘training’).

e. Surely, such a mass of lies and half truths must someday be brought to light. Yet, it only seems to grow and grow, leveraging and growing the tendency of dumber Americans to believe in bogus psychic and supernatural phenomena and to disbelieve the reports of similarly persecuted individuals

Initial Complaint

– a brilliant, though diabolical, strategy for replacing justice with a kind of esoteric and hidden vigilantism, where some have extraordinary power and information and others have very little.

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf (Psi Tech)

f. created a kind of virtual where-you-go-it-goes concentration camp, involving generous participation of private citizens in terms of harassments of various forms, that is partly technological and partly social, that can be as cruel or as mild as its implementers choose with some possible benefits for the obedient and compliant and tortures for the noncompliant, and which proceeds directly from surveillance to indefinite inclusion without the chance of appeal or legal review at any time along the way. Having gleaned information via possibly illegal forms of surveillance and interrogation about persons known to a targeted individual, it can and does work those persons as well in similar enterprises in what appears to be a kind of clandestine war of eradication of certain transgressions, behaviors, subcultures and attitudes that runs rampant over hard won laws protecting citizens' rights, simply because it cannot be proven and is never admitted to.

Closing Arguments

Initial Complaint

58. The politics of hate and intolerance created these awful persecutions those keep them safe and secretive. The plaintiff has been confronted cruelly and continuously with ALL aspects of his life, whether matters of law or otherwise, dug up over time through extraordinary surveillance (including the surveillance of thought itself as far back as his memory extends), which persons not similarly persecuted (even accused multiple murderers) are not (officially) forced to endure. It is inevitable that many similarly persecuted persons have chosen suicide.

59. If the congress and/or senate has authorized this state of affairs, then they have clearly evaded the normal political checks, balances and accountabilities and allowed the defendants to provide themselves and their network consisting of some of the most conservative, intolerant and evangelical members of society the ability to run rampant over the rights and lives of others. That network does not represent a democracy and is more akin to a kind of closed, conspiratorial oligarchy – much as Orwell termed it. The game is simply too powerful, too hidden, too arbitrarily self-advertising, too exclusive of the voices of the persecuted themselves and apparently too much fun on the giving end to be allowed in the U.S. perpetually unchallenged and misunderstood as it has done for decades.

Initial Complaint

60. Doctor Colin A. Ross in his well-referenced and non-sensationalist book “Bluebird”

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf (Bluebird)

has described historical CIA research that:

- a. mentioned brain electrode research dating as far back as the mid seventies,
- b. mentioned the so-called ‘UCLA Violence Project’ intended to continuously monitor the brain waves of parolees and punish them via remote means making use of implanted devices, a project that was energetically condemned by UCLA students and
- c. mentioned so-called ‘remote viewing’ and ‘paranormal’ research, which represent a kind of disinformation with which to cover and cloud very real remote surveillance technologies and methods based upon them possibly involving no implanted assist at all

61. Although the plaintiff has not, himself, experienced it, numerous other similarly persecuted persons have reported induced tinnitus (ringing in the ears), also mirrored quite frequently:

Initial Complaint

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (‘The Game’ - the hearing test)

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (‘Close Encounters’ - tones on the phone, “agreeable ringing”)

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_G_Other_Victims.pdf

62. Although the plaintiff himself has experienced little or none of the reported tactic of dream manipulation (repeated, ugly, vivid, sexual and persecution specific dream content and even dream content that is very similar from targeted person to targeted person), which appear to represent just a few of the huge number of possible variations upon the defendants extraordinary technology of central nervous system manipulation, it has been reported by many similarly persecuted persons:

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_G_Other_Victims.pdf

and true to formula has been frequently mirrored within the media:

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (The Stand – “They can talk in my dreams.”)

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (The Devil’s Advocate – “I dreamt about this.”)

Initial Complaint

See Video Tape Exhibit – Media MC (12 Monkeys - “Experiments” / “Same dream”)

63. a. In becoming acquainted with (and being forcibly trained) to read the network’s veiled language of suggestion within the media relating to these persecutions, the plaintiff noticed a horror that appears to dwarf all of the others. It appears that the HIV epidemic were either a created or an allowed epidemic in the service of a twisted moral purpose.

b. It appears that thereafter, the epidemic has been employed as one major excuse for which to apply such persecutions as described herein, also in the service of basically the same goals. If the network would be so ruthless as to put its targets into little private hells as described herein for engaging in behaviors like sodomy and promiscuity, as the ‘signs’ appear to indicate, then they would surely also be ruthless enough to allow nature to assist with the effort.

See http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_Q_Timeline.pdf (source unknown)

c. The vulgar implied material contained within the portions of the films included in the exhibit below may well mesmerize the court into missing

Initial Complaint

those apparent deadly facts altogether and into believing that the HIV epidemic were somehow justified:

See Video Tape Exhibit – ‘Doctor Strangelove’

64. Recall that a woman recently won a restraining order against Mr. David Letterman for making presumably bogus ‘love intimations’ that she believed were aimed at her. The plaintiff, who almost never watches the David Letterman Show, just happened to turn it on one night to see a short bit about a personnel director named Ted chastising Mr. Letterman for being lazy in what (if it were indeed one more mirror of the plaintiff) was presumably a kind of chastizing role reversal, which left out the fact that there is little to do in the current environment except escape as much of the daily barrage as possible through sleep - career and work being quite out of the question until this matter is finally resolved. That sort of removal from context and manipulation of public opinion has proven to be par for the course.

65. a. Recall that Charles McCoy, the so-called ‘Highway Shooter’, in addition to complaining of being harassed by ‘mocking voices’, also complained of being imitated within the media by Regis Philbin.

Initial Complaint

b. According to Carrie Spencer of the Associated Press in her article “Defense: Highway Shooter Heard Mocking Voices”, *"The broad theme with [his] criminal conduct was anger, frustration, striking back in an effort to reduce harassment to him," McCoy never expressly intended to harm anyone but rather fired the shots to let his harassers know "he could strike back."*

c. Now infamous, Mr. McCoy is apparently again being mocked (post institutionalization) on the television series ‘Lost’ in the form of the rotund Hurley character (played by actor Jorge Garcia, chosen for the role in part due to his striking resemblance to Mr. McCoy in size and facial features), the ‘winning the lottery’ metaphor advanced in that television series being a reflection of Mr. McCoy’s having gone ballistic and having been thereafter processed by the judicial system.

d. That the makers of that series chose to devote an episode to an institutionalized Hurley is fairly clearly another parody of Mr. McCoy. The ‘call from Jesus’ to the Hurley character in an earlier episode and the Dave character within the institution is likely to be a vague reference to the plaintiff’s having publicly posted references to the McCoy case, defended

Initial Complaint

Mr. McCoy, and thereby associated himself with Mr. McCoy as the plaintiff is doing herein.

e. That Mr. McCoy, in being similarly ‘mirrored’ in other venues prior to his institutionalization, would become frustrated and enraged in response and in addition to other forms of clandestine harassment is understandable in that, as the plaintiff himself has found, it can be remarkably excruciating to have others put their own words in your mouth, lead public opinion about you, cleverly reflect your shames and secrets drawn from surveillance, occasionally appear to spread false insinuations about you, and place you in exaggerated contexts of their own creation with nothing that you can really do about it other than look the delusional in refuting it is understandable.

f. It is the plaintiff’s contention that the network were the actual motivating force behind that and other killings and that their refusal to take any responsibility for them whatsoever and to allow the public to entertain false beliefs as to the real motive forces behind such violence is a clear and continuing abomination of justice. Do not the families and the public have a right to know the truth?

g. It should now become clear why at least some people come forward with tales about, for example, receiving orders from ‘central command’ (as one

Initial Complaint

individual in Tennessee reported), that they have been abducted and probed (as millions of U.S. citizens have reported), that God is against them (as Mr. Charles Roberts reported), believe themselves to be Jesus or other religious figures (as John Nash reported according to Sylvia Nassar's biography) and Mr. David Vaughan Icke more recently reported, etc.

66. The defendants and/or their cooperating individuals, though it surely kept Mr. McCoy under close and continuous surveillance and harassment, particularly as his induced rage began to approach the point of melt-down, took NO responsibility for the violence that erupted as a result of the harassment and apparently made no attempt whatsoever to intervene, though they could have easily done so while preserving their anonymity and deniability by setting up a seemingly random traffic stop or 'chance' observation. The violence falsely increases the public perception of greater need for more draconian measures to protect against such violence. It appears that BOTH the false public impressions of schizophrenia and seeming inexplicable eruptions of violence serve the defendant's interests and those of its cooperating individuals for a more thoroughly surveilled and controlled society.

Initial Complaint

67. It is important for the court to realize that, in addition to heaping various combinations of harassments, tortures, intimidation and malice at targeted persons in such a way that they are utterly powerless (legally and otherwise) against it, the defendant's formula of sneaking into (and presumably sneaking back out of) their lives robs those persons even of the hope of a better day or the certainty that their persecutions have ended or might someday end, leaving them only with fear. That formula, as any fool can see, is the very RECIPE for violence. And the network never takes any responsibility for such episodes, the true causes are regularly dropped from the news or spun as products of delusion and the psychology/psychiatry industry has published no research on the subject.

68. The plaintiff:

- a. has illustrated a small portion of the wealth of self-consistent evidence of techniques, symbols and implied motives produced by the defendants' cooperating individuals within the media themselves
- b. has demonstrated how numerous known and similarly persecuted people are complaining of similar persecutions as confirmed by the works of those cooperating individuals within the media despite those works being dressed in ambiguity

Initial Complaint

c. has demonstrated that the intelligence community and military have a keen historical interest in the remote and surreptitious control of the functions of the electrochemical machine that is the brain via the tiny portion of the declassified research in that area that has been made available and

d. has demonstrated some of the details of his own long persecution.

70. a. The plaintiff prays that the court will not knowingly render a false judgement of delusion, schizophrenia or disbelief as to the plaintiff's allegations if it knows or believes otherwise, nor employ a word like 'delusion' to imply that the plaintiff is errant, bad, immoral, dead on right, or anything beyond the strict definition of the word, nor assume that the cited self-specific media are evidence against the plaintiff on the one hand, yet not evidence of anything in terms of the plaintiff's allegations on the other. If even courts are willing to be as slippery with their use of language as the network has proven to be or if that network already infests the federal bench, then the American system of justice is truly in jeopardy.

b. The plaintiff also prays that the court will not allow the court record to be 'lost', as happened with the so-called 'Levesque Cases' that revolved around similar allegations, or the public may never have the opportunity to understand those truths that the defendants would prefer to keep hidden.

Initial Complaint

c. If the court is waiting for some outright and voluntary admission from the defendants freely given, then the court will be waiting forever and the philosophy of leave-no-trace persecutions without due process will simply grow, as the defendants score yet another social coup de gras and learn from past mistakes.

71. Even if the plaintiff divulges publicly every last detail of his life, the network can continue to play their game as long as they wish until the plaintiff just self destructs. If he voluntarily enters into psychiatry or figures out some way to get himself into prison, there is nothing to stop the defendants from continuing the tortures and harassments indefinitely and the plaintiff knows it. One lucid, intelligent targeted individual with military and intelligence background and no hint of schizophrenia or other psychological maladies named Julianne McKinney has reported FORTY YEARS of harassments. One Root-Tilden scholar and forcibly retired attorney of similar disposition named Robert Starrett reports being similarly harassed for FIFTY YEARS! Another attorney named Joel Tondreau reports being prattled at surreptitiously while attempting to do his duty on behalf of his client within the courtroom. A retired agent in charge of the Los Angeles field office of the FBI, Mr. Ted Gunderson, also reports a similar form of harassment.

Initial Complaint

72. The defendants have realized their authoritarian dream of force, surveillance, punishment and control that goes where you go and leaves no trace, completely hides their involvement and thus shields themselves and their cooperating individuals from any responsibility for their actions with a mainstream news media that will not report it and a creative media that regularly plays it up on their own terms.

73. The plaintiff is willing to confront a record of the entirety of his lifetime, if the defendants have maintained such a record so as to confront any aspect of his life and predispositions that the defendants might wish to examine, as long as the entirety of that record is made available for his own use as well as that of the defendants. The plaintiff contends that the network's repeated and self-servingly crafted, embellished and exaggerated collages and parodies of his sins are NOT generally representative of his life and predispositions, leaving out, for example, the many tests that he HAS passed and other good works.

74. Many are aware of the CIA's techniques for organizing large-scale societal upheavals, regime changes and revolutions in foreign nations. Many are aware of the FBI's questionable forms of harassment and attempts to derail the civil rights movement in the sixties. The techniques described

Initial Complaint

herein (including the concerted and formulaic use of the creative media) appear to be one of the ways by which the defendants have built a base of clandestine, conspiratorial support for their ambitions of surveillance and harassment, play to the interests of conservatives, enhance national fears and hatreds, destroy and sweep aside human obstacles and opposing points of view that stand in their way, prime the nation to be agreeable to a past, present and future that includes large-scale conspiracy, directed energy harassments and tortures, concerted media influence and cooperation, very literal 'thought police' and effectively take over their own nation and deliver an extraordinary amount of power to their allies within the public in such a way that it can deny having ever done anything at all AND provide its allies with a means to shower their hatred down upon their enemies in secret and carefully yet deniably promote their interests in public AND deceive and make powerless the courts by robbing them of evidence of their activities AND leverage fears concerning terrorism and violence AND leverage that human tendency to inflict more pain than one otherwise would in being well insulated from the consequences of doing so AND promote and leverage societal delusions surrounding ghost, paranormal, alien visitation, angelic phenomena, delusion and schizophrenia.

Initial Complaint

75. a. The defendants and their cooperating individuals through their continuing clandestine surveillance and other machinations have destroyed the plaintiff's reputation, the plaintiff's opportunity to earn a decent living, and have made the plaintiff's latter twenties, thirties and early his forties a daily exercise in misery, despair and hopelessness.

b. The plaintiff has been effectively robbed of his privacy, his family, his career, his peace of mind, his reputation and any real hope for a happier future, not to mention seeking worthwhile love relationships and has not known so much as a kiss in a decade and a half. So effective are the defendant's means of hiding that even after twelve years and for as much as twenty-eight, the plaintiff is forced to guess as to the identity of the ultimate controllers of his long persecution.

c. The defendants show no believable sign that their activities and those of their cooperating individuals will ever truly cease until the plaintiff is dead, provoked to violence, silences his public protestations and/or portrays his persecution and persecutors in a favorable light, assumes the role of willing slave to the defendant's surreptitious commands and/or winds up homeless and penniless.

Initial Complaint

d. Even if all signs of those activities went altogether silent tomorrow, the plaintiff would remain a slave to a kind of twisted Miranda rule such that, “Anything you say or have said, anything do or have done, anyone you know or have known, and anything you even think or recall in the course of conscious thought can and will be surreptitiously stolen from and used against you or others whom you come in contact with for any reason by anyone at any time for the rest of your life (or you must assume as much). You may be for all practical purposes one of the very eyes and ears of big brother and the potential conduit of the persecution of anyone you know, have known or will know. You must now and forever fear not only being punished for straying beyond the bounds of the law, you must also fear being embarrassed or offending someone in seeing anything you do, say or even think (even within your own home or bedroom) being shared surreptitiously with strangers. You must suffer the hatred of strangers in public. You must fear an innocent or intentionally false condemnation of schizophrenia or delusion. You may see your electronic communications interrupted, your utilities and computer operation debilitated, slowed or interrupted, suffer headache, sleeplessness and other pain and physiological influence without knowing if those were artificial or random/natural. Get used to it. But just TRY to prove it. Or you can put a bullet in your head.

Initial Complaint

The choice is yours.” That formula works just great for the tyrant. Not quite as well for the slave.

76. The defendants will shortly proceed to stonewall, claim FOIA exclusions, resort to legal technicalities and provide inadequate information as to the facts of the pro-se plaintiff’s allegations and if allowed to, will continue to do so indefinitely just as they have done for decades. However, the defendants are clearly engaged in a profound conspiratorial crime, however arguably moral its ultimate intentions may be, and those claimed exclusions should rightly be disregarded and rejected. They may advance the premise that the plaintiff’s certain knowledge of the existence of sophisticated remote thought surveillance is an outright delusion or a product of other forms of psychological gaming. They may choose representative(s) who are not knowledgeable about that extraordinary and presumably compartmentalized technology. They may claim responsibility belongs to persons other than themselves. If so, they will be perjuring themselves.

77. Because the defendants’ cooperating individuals have ALREADY disseminated on behalf of the defendants the existence of the methods and technologies to the public as described herein for self-serving and strategic

Initial Complaint

reasons in veiled and deniable forms, the defendants surely cannot now claim that the releasing of official information admitting to its methods as described herein are secret and exempt from disclosure.

78. After succeeding in avoiding any responsibility for their possibly illegal activities against similarly targeted persons for decades, the plaintiff begs the court not to allow the defendants to avoid their own responsibilities any longer. The plaintiff and the numerous other similarly, unfairly and maliciously persecuted persons (and their families) deserve and have every right to more than nothing at all from the defendants. The defendants and their cooperating individuals must finally be responsible for their own actions as well.

79. Certainly something that approaches absolute power can accomplish a lot and in a fairer and more just contest, even the plaintiff would be in favor of some of its aspects, particularly as an alternative to prisons and prison culture. When you can hit a defenseless person with exquisite pain, surveill them wherever they go, steal the content of their thoughts, chatter at them on a more or less continuous basis conveniently, or make them go half blind, then you have something that approaches absolute power, the more so in terms of its deniability.

Initial Complaint

80. People are not Skinnerian lab rats, responding simply to instruction and to reward and punishment, and can perceive when an injustice has been done to them and can be expected to act accordingly. One clear, unambiguous demonstration of legitimate authority could probably have saved the plaintiff and his family years of torture and pain, whereas the greater the number of demonstrations of cruelty and punishment WITHOUT that authority and hope of a better day, the greater the anger and resistance. The current structure ignores those facts and assumes that, given enough pain, anyone will break eventually, even if it takes a lifetime, being helpless to stop or prove it.

81. a. The plaintiff is for all practical purposes a prisoner. A prisoner may file a petition for writ of habeas corpus in order to challenge the authority of the prison or jail warden to continue to hold him or to argue that his confinement is illegal. In this case, that well hidden authority has prevented any challenge to its authority via sheer anonymity, means that leave no trace, the use of third parties, who in turn employ ambiguities that are readily deniable.

b. The plaintiff asks this court to consider this complaint for all practical purposes a habeas corpus challenge to an unlawful imprisonment. Being

Initial Complaint

placed in a cage is certainly one kind of prison. But it is one officially having at least the certain knowledge of eventual freedom, clear terms of stay, one or more authorities clearly responsible for that confinement, privacy of thought, and the benefit of all of the protections for private citizens from the Miranda rule to the rigor and self-defense of a proper trial.

c. The plaintiff is very much in a kind of prison (and one that is in some respects one crueller than a simple cage), at an involuntary interrogation table, at an involuntary polygraph table and in a torture chamber, although those are abstract ones and the plaintiff is free to move around physically, whatever harassment he may receive there. In the technological age, there is obviously more than one form of prison and a metal cage should not represent the only definition of a prison.

82. The defendants may claim that, should they finally admit to the decades of their and their cooperating individuals' secretive and conspiratorial harassments of the plaintiff and others through the decades, then a rash of people claiming 'ghosts made me do it' can be expected. That may be. But if so, that is no one's fault but the defendants' and the best way to have avoided that scenario would probably have been for the defendants not to have departed from justice in favor of conspiratorial, directed-energy

Initial Complaint

and leave-no-trace harassments in the first place and to avoid continuously providing new and very real justifications for such claims.

83. The plaintiff is willing to undergo a polygraph as to the authenticity of his allegations, but only when and if the potential for the manipulation of his nervous system can be entirely ruled out and the professional administering the test is beyond reproach and has no association with the network as certified by the court.

84. The plaintiff is willing to undergo a psychiatric evaluation as to his psychological health, but only from a psychologist/psychiatrist who is knowledgeable about the methods of the defendants (more or less as described herein) and is willing to say so clearly, unambiguously and in writing as part of the court record. Otherwise, even if ordered by the court, the plaintiff will not cooperate with such an evaluation and will maintain a stony silence lest the very methods applied against the plaintiff serve as a false basis for diagnosis of schizophrenia, delusion, paranoia or other mental disorder.

85. a. With the lyrical, poetic, overtly fictitious and other suggestive works of cooperating individuals within the film, televised and music industries (and the complaints of targeted persons such as the plaintiff)

Initial Complaint

offering the only hints at the sorts of behaviors that may cause one to be targeted by 'the game' and of the reality of 'the game' itself, while the defendants lurk perpetually in obscurity and denial, with those media products suggesting that everything from child abuse to sodomy to smoking marijuana to disease containment to not wearing underwear to adult sexual behaviors like fellatio as being component criteria for being targeted, then is a part of the grand scheme intended to be for a large block of the public to live their lives in fear of the thought, "Might they someday come for me too? Might they already be watching me in my home, collecting what they can and waiting for a good moment to pounce? Might they already have brought their surveillance presence into my mind itself? Might that lost job have been the result of surveillance, conspiratorial information sharing, conspiratorial intent and unstated hate? Was that overheard cough or laughter intended for me? Might that migraine or dream have been artificially induced? Should I never dare to dissent or deviate from a strictly conservative way of living for fear of being similarly persecuted? Was that sound in my head the voice of God? Am I going crazy?"

b. A lovely formula for intelligence, law enforcement and the far and/or religious right, but one also dead set against the American experiment that is supposed to value clear laws, clear penalties, fair self defense and fair play,

Initial Complaint

responsibility by authority and private citizens if they would aggress against the rights of their fellow citizens to pursue happiness unhindered and enjoy privacy in places having a reasonable expectation of privacy, the hope and certainty of regained freedom after time served, unfettered debate and discourse, etc.

c. Does the media propaganda help to cover a regime of control, destabilization, force and/or experimentation that is not always justified by sin or crime at all? Who knows. Would it not make perfect sense to build a thick concrete wall of provocative suggestion surrounding crime and sin associated with the suggested tactics and technologies within the media so as to immobilize, discredit via osmosis and render socially and politically helpless even innocent targeted persons as well? Of course. How many people have been subjected to 'the game'? Who knows. Who determines who is targeted? Who knows. What are the exact criteria for getting in or out again? Who knows. How many people are involved on the giving end and within the information sharing network? Who knows. Who is excluded from that network and why? Who knows. Will courts, politicians and psychiatry ever officially recognize 'the game' as the reality that it is? Who knows. How many have committed aggravated suicides or homicides while under the pressure of being targeted? Who knows. Does the bulk of the

Initial Complaint

congress and the senate even know of its true reality? Who knows. Will 'the game' proceed to devour more space presumed to be occupied by Constitutional justice without there having been a single official announcement of the change? Who knows. Is there any power in the nation that can compel the defendants to admit that 'the game' is real? Probably not. Surely, there is simply too much darkness and too little light upon the game itself, as brutal as it can be.

d. If the court wishes that the plaintiff produce irrefutable evidence of the high technology components of the surveillance and harassment, then the court should keep in mind that doing so is IMPOSSIBLE and the court would only be congratulating the defendants and their cooperating individuals on their ability to snipe from the cover of various forms of cover.

e. Even if the plaintiff could contrive some antenna, receiver and indicator (as he once tried to do in vain), those persons can simply stop whatever they are doing until the effort is exhausted. If for some reason, they were careless and failed to do so, what would a trace on an oscilloscope or a beeping light or a jumping dial needle prove? Nothing.

f. If the surveillance component is passive in nature (a pure receiver that emits nothing) and involves no device(s) embedded in the flesh, then

Initial Complaint

collecting such proof is BY DEFINITION impossible. Thus, the ONLY way to prove the defendant's long harassment is via indirect means – from the reflection of surveilled information, from the antics of its cooperating individuals, from the medical evidence of the optometrist's examination, from honest admissions and so forth.

- g. The defendants and their cooperating individuals are waging this technologically enabled clandestine guerilla warfare from coast to coast. The plaintiff and all of the other helpless victims both past and present of that warfare deserve better than nothing whatsoever REGARDLESS of whatever they may or may not have done to earn the network's ire. The defendants must be checked at long last. If the structure is so good, moral and enjoys so much popular support, then why must its adherents sneak, slither, hide, insinuate, conspire, deny and avoid any fair debate and confrontation in all of their activities?
- h. The plaintiff is seeking no financial reward so as to avoid any suspicion that this case is some weird scam or money making scheme. The plaintiff seeks only the truth and relief from the persecution and begs the court to assist in that effort. Please don't allow the defendants to stonewall and deny any longer.

Requests of the Court

The plaintiff respectfully requests the following from the court:

86. to authorize the plaintiff, a private investigator hired by the plaintiff and/or an attorney appointed by the court to obtain videotaped affidavits, depositions, requests for admission or other form of discovery from one or more of the named and still living cooperating individuals mentioned herein, including the named individuals within the plaintiff's former workplace and including the known media participants (screenwriters and/or directors as appropriate). If so authorized, the plaintiff will then submit a discovery plan and seek to obtain information from those individuals as to the facts of the plaintiff's allegations. Those cooperating individuals can be expected to act as hostile witnesses and to resist divulging the facts of the plaintiff's allegations and to disregard those as nonsense for several reasons, not the least of which is that there is enormous pressure for members of the network to remain silent, pressure that can always be applied to those who would plainly tell it like it is, as the plaintiff himself has found.

87. to order the defendants to divulge the identities of all persons not formally employed by a law enforcement or investigative agency with whom surveillance information pertaining to the plaintiff has been shared and to

Initial Complaint

make available to the court and the plaintiff a copy of that information for their review, complete and unedited.

88. to order the defendants to promptly cause the termination of any and all actions against the plaintiff (and any and all persons known to the defendants or their cooperating individuals by virtue of the long-term surveillance of the plaintiff) that include:

- a. any form of surveillance within places having a reasonable expectation of privacy
- b. any technological means listed within the FOIA request letters
- c. any form of influence or disruption of the operation of his computer, equipment, appliances and utilities
- d. any gag order or threat of prosecution (if applicable) directed at any person who is not an official law enforcement employee in terms of discussing with or disclosing to the plaintiff the facts of the harassment, surveillance and previous torture of the plaintiff.
- e. any form of clandestine censorship or disruption of the plaintiff's ability to communicate electronically with others or their ability to receive

Initial Complaint

those communications or other information posted by the plaintiff at others' websites and locations and

f. to do so in such a way that the plaintiff and the court can be assured of that termination and that those activities will not resume in the future in the absence of traditional legal proceedings or the submission to the court and to the plaintiff of a clear, unambiguous, written justification for why those may lawfully continue or resume in the future.

g. In support of that and the following requests, the plaintiff cites each of the laws cited in the FOIA appeal letters, the Supreme Court ruling on the limits of surveillance technology

http://www.afafa.org/Exhibit_J_Supporting_Documentation.pdf

and (18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242), which states that it is a crime for one or more persons acting under color of law willfully to deprive or conspire to deprive another person of any right protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

90. to declare that no authority, private individual or other private or business entity within the borders of the United States can simply sneak into the homes and minds of US citizens through surveillance and share whatever

Initial Complaint

is found with whomever they wish for as long as they wish and torture and torment for as long as they wish, while denying those citizens any form of due process and intentionally structure those operations so as to make the fact of those operations impossible for those citizens to prove and to deny and avoid any official accountability for those operations indefinitely, regardless of the transgression, and that no court can lawfully authorize such a lynching.

91. to order the defendants to divulge the identity of the specific government agency or agencies, military branch or branches, and/or private entity or entities that are most directly responsible for the production, maintenance and operation of each and all of the technological means listed in the FOIA Request.

92. to order the defendants to divulge the identity of the authority or authorities most directly responsible for the authorization of the application of the means described in the FOIA request against the plaintiff and the dissemination of surveillance information pertaining to the plaintiff to members of the public.

93. to declare the defendants responsible for the prompt return of the plaintiff's burglarized property or for the production of a clear,

Initial Complaint

unambiguous, written and signed explanation for exactly why those items may continue to be retained.

94. to order the defendants to divulge to the court and to the plaintiff clearly, unambiguously and in writing the date of onset of each, any and all of the means employed against the plaintiff listed in the FOIA request and to divulge the criteria that served as the justification for the initiation of the use of those means.

95. to order the defendants to divulge to the court and to the plaintiff clearly, unambiguously and in writing whether departure from the US would free the plaintiff from all of the means listed in the FOIA request or if the defendants (with or without the cooperation of foreign governments) have already engineered a literal, world-wide 'prison planet' in terms of their use. If not, then what nations still fall beyond that iron curtain?

96. to declare that the defendant's failure to disclose the information requested by the plaintiff under FOIA is unlawful and to order the defendants to make the requested information available immediately at the defendants' expense.

Initial Complaint

97. to order the defendants to divulge to the court and to the public in clear, unambiguous, written form whether or not Mr. Charles McCoy were indeed subjected to any of the means described herein or other similarly clandestine and/or esoteric methods of harassment that lead to his violence.

98. to declare that the films “The Devil’s Advocate”, “Cast Away”, “The Manchurian Candidate”, “Contact”, “Field of Dreams” and “Airplane” do in fact intentionally incorporate information drawn from the surveillance of the plaintiff, and that those facts break (where appropriate) the stated disclaimer that “The characters and events depicted in this photoplay are fictitious.

Any similarity to actual persons, living or dead, is purely coincidental.”, and that those and the television productions “The Colbert Report’s Tek Jansen” series and the episode “Tales from the Darkside: The Impressionist” are intended to sway some subset of public opinion about the plaintiff and other persons that he has known.

99. to declare that, because the several films and other media that the plaintiff has referenced are designed and intended to serve a purpose that goes well beyond simple creative expression and serve, support and promote possibly illegal and unconstitutional activities of surveillance, interrogation, punishment, defamation and torture that are perpetually unopposed by any

Initial Complaint

allowed, open, balanced and unambiguous news and public discourse, because their makers have produced their works in direct and/or indirect cooperation with the defendants (often making use of surreptitiously obtained information pertaining to specific individuals), and because those facts cannot be adequately demonstrated without the use of those media themselves, the plaintiff will be allowed to post expository analyses of those films publicly (including exemplary excerpts from those films and other similarly designed creative works) without fear of legal retribution in terms of copyright law. That will qualify as 'fair use', as long as those excerpts and analyses are not for the purpose of personal financial gain. There is no other effective way to analyze the clandestine or suggestive function of visual imagery than the use of that imagery itself. Any interference by the network in terms of public access to those will be considered criminal interference.

100. to declare that some historical cases involving violence were undoubtedly partially or wholly misdiagnosed as having resulted from schizophrenia, delusion and/or paranoia by a psychology/psychiatry community that has shown little or no interest or evidence in terms of published research of understanding any of the defendants' methods of harassment (either as the result of ignorance or complicity) and were in fact

Initial Complaint

a result of the defendants' nefarious tactics and technologies as described herein and by other similarly persecuted persons.

101. to declare that if and when courts, law enforcement, investigative or intelligence agencies, psychiatrists/psychologists and/or journalists are knowledgeable about clandestine harassments similar to those described herein being aggravating factors in cases of violence and hide that knowledge or offer or imply false theories, diagnoses or judgements (for example - delusion, schizophrenia or mental disorder), even if such harassments were undertaken so as to repress and/or punish other behaviors, then the justice system is in danger of becoming a farce and façade, the real truth buried and the public misled as to the nature of mental disorders, the need for gun controls, the need for restrictions on civil liberties, etc.

102. to order the defendants to admit to their involvement in and knowledge of the years of surveillance, harassment and torture of the plaintiff; describe those harassments in all of their various forms honestly and in full; and make that admission a matter of clear, unambiguous, detailed, written record readily available to the plaintiff and the court.

Initial Complaint

103. to order the defendants to provide a ball park number of persons currently being subjected to or subject on short notice to each and all of the means listed in the FOIA request.

104. to declare that the long-term (multi-year), surreptitious surveillance of any aspect of the central nervous system without notice to, consent of or due process made available to persons subjected to such means while within the borders of the United States, whether for investigative, punitive, psychiatric, experimental or other purposes is in clear violation of rights against self-incrimination, the right to security in person and papers, intellectual property rights, and other hard won civil and individual rights, and is therefore unconstitutional and illegal in the absence of specific laws clearly, directly and unambiguously providing for the application of such means. That if it is to be employed in the context of domestic law enforcement or correction, then something that approaches absolute power, which has destroyed many lives and is capable of destroying many others MUST fall within the realm of public debate, discourse and accountability and not merely the simplistic babble of artists who are members of the network itself. And that the nation must not march into an age of 'thought police' inadequately informed.

Initial Complaint

105. to declare that the manipulation via remote, surreptitious means of any aspect of the central nervous system (that may include the induction of the sensation of migraine and other pain, burning and other tactile sensations, disruption of vision or hearing, induction of visual or audible hallucinations, manipulation of conscious or unconscious cognitive function, or manipulation of any aspect of musculature control) without notice to, consent of or clear and unambiguous due process made available to persons subjected to such means while within the borders of the United States, whether for investigative, punitive, psychiatric, experimental or other purposes is dangerous and all too readily available for misuse (including torture, mental cruelty and controlled behaviors and impulses) and is therefore illegal in the absence of specific laws clearly, directly and unambiguously providing for the application of such means. With such powerful, clandestine tools that can literally hijack the human mind and nervous system, accountability is particularly important and absolutely necessary.

106. to declare that long-term/indefinite (multi-year), location-independent, continuous surveillance and tracking of American citizens (with or without the assistance of devices embedded in the flesh) within places having a reasonable expectation of privacy without the consent of; clear,

Initial Complaint

unambiguous, written notice provided to; or clear and unambiguous due process made available to persons targeted by such means, while within the borders of the United States and that information is shared with persons not in the official employ of intelligence, investigative or law enforcement is clearly unconstitutional and illegal in the absence of specific laws clearly and unambiguously providing for the application of such means.

107. to declare that the surreptitious presence of intelligence, investigative or law enforcement personnel within decision-making positions in journalism or within or in conjunction with creative media creation and/or production represents a clear threat to democracy and to the integrity of those venues and represents a clear conflict of interests.

108. to declare that the use of surreptitious technological means to provide members of the public or persons operating under color of authority the ability (with or without the assistance of devices embedded in the flesh) to mock, deceive, ridicule, threaten, harass or otherwise deliver unwanted, clandestine semi-communications to other persons who have not requested such communications and do not wish to receive them in places having a reasonable expectation of privacy in such a way as to render those semi-communications perpetually unprovable as having occurred at all,

Initial Complaint

effectively hide the givers' identities and leave no trail of evidence back to their source in situations in which death, violence, child abuse or human slavery are not eminent or are not taking place or when lives have not been wrongfully taken, or espionage on behalf of foreign governments is not taking place is unconstitutional and illegal in the absence of clear, unambiguous and specific laws and/or court decisions made available in writing to persons targeted by such means and to the public that clearly provide for the application of such means.

109. to declare that the assaulting of duly incarcerated or institutionalized persons (and therefore trapped and helpless) with any of the sorts of means described in the FOIA request for any reason is to heap illegitimate, secretive punishments upon legitimate ones and is therefore unconstitutional and illegal. Otherwise, the justice system is in danger of becoming just a farce and a façade, which must not happen.

110. to order one or more of the defendants to assume court costs for this case, since it is clearly the defendants and their network who have created the hell that the plaintiff has been forced to endure for so long and the defendants and their network who have seen to it that the plaintiff cannot make a decent living and cost the plaintiff so much in other ways already.

Initial Complaint

111. to render a judgement as to whether the preponderance of signs intentionally and carefully placed within the several films 'Airplane', 'Dr. Strangelove', '2001: A Space Odyssey', 'Close Encounters of the Third Kind' and 'Heavy Metal' and within the novel 'The Stand' do indeed represent proof that the HIV epidemic were known by members of the network years before the first published reports of that epidemic and that the presence of that epidemic was kept secret and allowed to grow and take lives unhindered, even as they sang its praises.

112. to, if the court will provide the plaintiff no relief, order the defendants to go ahead and stop the plaintiff's heart, which the plaintiff knows the defendants are technologically capable of doing on a moment's notice, and complete the murder that they began back when the plaintiff was a boy.

113. to order the defendants to reveal to the court and to the plaintiff unambiguously and in writing the identities of all persons since the year 1950 against whom any of the technological means listed in the FOIA document or means of organized social attack described herein have been employed in situations that have resulted in collateral deaths.

Conclusion

The plaintiff will not accept the dictates of any secretive, anonymous and presumably non-legitimate authority, any authority that has not clearly and openly demonstrated the authority to compel the plaintiff, nor the opinions of any number of non-authorities, nor will he tolerate this persecution indefinitely. But even if the plaintiff finally chooses NOT to tolerate that persecution any longer, a complicitous news and creative media deeply in bed with federal powers and well primed to despise the plaintiff will make every effort to spin the plaintiff as a sick, crazy delusional, while leaving out key information and the game will go on, as impervious and misunderstood as ever.

The plaintiff bought into the baloney about fairness and justice served up in every venue from grade school to college to every other supposedly legitimate venue. That is what the plaintiff was trained to love about what he believed was the United States. And that is the same reason that he cannot now nor ever accept what amounts to conspiratorial slavery.

Initial Complaint

The plaintiff already knows exactly what to expect. That the defendant's games can destroy lives and change the course of the nation, but are never accepted as proof by the courts, except in the defendants' favor. That the haters will remain safely under their white sheets, will continue to rule public perceptions unopposed, and that the nation will continue its march towards absolute, absolutely unopposable and absolutely unprovable power. And the puppet show will continue.

Would your honor like to see every private moment of your own life and memories scrutinized, stolen, mocked and used against you by hostile well covered and anonymous strangers with or without your knowledge?

Become the instrument of (or at least the excuse for) your own family's, friends' and loved ones' embarrassment/harassment, while being powerless to stop it? Endure the bee stings? The headaches? The heresay? To be socially assassinated behind your back? Like to see it happen to someone your honor loves and be utterly powerless to stop it or even understand what is dragging them into the ground?

Dated ____/____/____

Respectfully submitted,

Ted Jackson (Plaintiff pro se)