CBS: New Lawyer’s Television Drama ‘Shark’ Embeds Coalition Initiatives  
[September 28, ’06]

The post-pilot episode of the new CBS legal drama ‘Shark’ on Thursday, September 28, 2006 included a couple instances of the lexicon of diplomacy being employed. For example, there was family tension between the principal actor of the new series, played by James Woods, and his daughter written into the first show’s plot. During the last scene of the pilot she’s scripted to paint the walls of her bedroom whatever color she wanted. Of the dozens available, writers chose a bold purple, justice, to advance the issue of protecting the young from a future of imperialistic authoritarianism; a matter of concern that has been high profiled so often.

The second episode on Thursday, October 5th was watched very closely for coalition content. There was only one initiative. The remark was scripted with an aggressive Clooney M.:

I’ll have a list sent over

* Recall “the list” referred to in Appendix “U” Part II, pg. 132, where it is stated:

    Aaron was embedding the phrase the Canadian lawyer used in the East-West Corridor hundreds of time to identify those on television who ought to be investigated and prosecuted because they were in their actions or words revealing their membership in trans-generational corruption, militarization and the China-Canada alliance.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

CBS: Deploying a ‘Shark’ to Defeat the Last Democratic Fiefdom  
[October 12, ’06]

The first two episode of CBS’ new legal crime drama ‘Shark’ were a conduit for coalition activity: CBS: New Lawyer’s Television Drama ‘Shark’Embeds Coalition Initiatives. The third one of the season confirmed that inference.

It didn’t take long during the third episode to conclude the program is the latest CBS show to become a platform for coalition initiatives. This time it was scripted to start with a reference that caused eyebrows to lift on both sides of the isle in the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy.

During the opening sequence, James Woods’ father character is discussing educational issues with his daughter when she says “My physics teacher is a Nazi”. Him executing a Letterman M. confirmed CBS was agreeing with the Canadian lawyer that institutionalizing and militarizing Article 7 violations is sanctionable. Doing so also shows coalition partners are going to pound the China-Canada
alliance every chance they get over the research, development, field testing, refinement and deployment of stealth cognition technologies.

During the crime scene sequence there is the first scripted coercive diplomacy. As James’ character utters “last words of Tracy Powers” – the name given to the shot to death victim – the audience sees a black and white – punishment certainty – attired Assistant District Attorney.

The name of the house owner where the double homicide takes place certainly gets the Canadian lawyer and country’s security apparatus’ attention. While it might just be phonetics, he definitely heard throughout the show the name ‘Rousseau’ – as in the French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau. Was this another research assignment?

Jean Jacques Rousseau contributed to many branches of social philosophy. The Social Contract is a classic defense of the democratic form of government. Rousseau trusted the "general will" of a democratic people, as expressed by a vote of the majority, to make all important decisions. This trust in the majority contrasts greatly with the ideas of philosophers who championed minority and individual rights.

While John Locke developed a theory of testing for the validity of knowledge and John Comenius established that children learn better from experience, Jean Jacques Rousseau, who supported these educational approaches, wrote the influential Emile (1762). Rousseau expounded a new theory of education emphasizing the importance of expression rather than repression to produce a well-balanced, freethinking child. He explained his views on the benefits of health and physical exercise, and the belief that knowledge acquisition occurs through experience and that reason and investigation should replace arbitrary authority. He also proposed that education should follow natural inclination impulses and feelings.

Source: Donald Clark, nwlink.com

_Emile: Or, On Education_ is a book by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, composed of five parts, and published in 1762. The subject of book is education, or specifically, "the art of training men" (Foreword). It remains to this day one of the most popular and widely read books on the subject of education.

Source: wikipedia.com

When Shark’s* key witness is interrogated by the District Attorney herself, she’s attired in the official colors of China. That was certainly a welcome sign as it displayed an affirmation that the Beijing government has a lot of serious culpability to deal with _viz._ Canada, the United States and the rest of the world. And just like the authoritarian regime, here the witness refuses to be cooperative.
When the witnesses in a later scene finally agrees to participate, he and Shark get together in the mock courtroom the latter has built in his basement. Instead of a gym, recreational lounge or other amenity, producers decided to make fun of his love for the law by portraying him as someone so dedicated to the profession he built a lifelike courtroom in his home to practice in. When his witness ‘takes the stand’, he asks “where are your flying monkeys”. Since there were no other reference points to that animal, it was interpreted as relating to the Canadian lawyer’s status within his country’s covert authoritarianism-nazi experimentation community.

* James Woods’ character is scripted by producers as “Stark”, but Fiefdom treatise documentations adopt the show’s title as his name, Shark

During the trial, videotape evidence is introduced to destroy the witness’ credibility. He said he was where the video proof said he wasn’t. There were two time stamps on the tape. The first, where the proof started, was 1:02 p.m.. And the second, where the tape stopped because the evidence was conclusive, was scripted to be 3:01:33. That’s four coalition identifiers.

Later the witness is manipulated into fully cooperating after his perjury. He’s told there’s a “discovery”, a deposition of sorts, in Room “Three”. That’s a reference to the process of coalition partners discovering the full extent of the malfeasance that’s been going on for years.

Another discussion between the witness and Shark is scripted to embed more coalition numbers. There’s a “30 seconds”, twenty years” and “five seconds” all in the space of a few lines – putting all the main lexiconic constituents of the confidential language together in one place.

The second last coalition-inspired scene involved embedding a technique of noise disruption. As has been documented in chapters on ‘Law & Order’ and ‘Saturday Night Live’, a siren was inserted* to highlight a remark in the script. This time it was “Nobody complains when he wins”.

The end of the show was scripted with a coalition identifier that had as its intended purpose to predict the future of Canada’s malfeasant. It was embedded in the closing scene and in the song chosen to overlay the fade to black – “Feel like I’m goin’ down, down, down”.

Just like ‘Studio 60 on the Sunset Strip’ and other coalition product, the first scene and the last scene – and many in between – contained coalition condemnation.

* A Sorkin Grazer Kelley torture identifier

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
CBS’ ‘Shark’: An Even Louder Platform This Week Telling Beijing to Go Home and Canada’s Rulers the ‘Iron Fist’ is Coming

[October 19, ‘06]

Sharks are by definition predatory animals that swim non-stop and feed on virtually anything. Sounds like members of Canada’s elite. But aside the humor, CBS again turned one of its prime-time television series into a platform to advance the coalition’s interests for a democratic Canada and to reinforce the objective of evicting China’s military and intelligence assets from the continent.

It’s now confirmed. CBS’ ‘Shark’ has joined the coalition full time along with other evening television shows in its genre like ‘Studio 60 on the Sunset Strip’, ‘Law & Order’ and ‘Saturday Night Live’ to maintain the ubiquity of condemnation. The Thursday, October 19, 2006, episode began and ended in true coalition form with coalition content.

The plot of the show was ripped from America news headlines. The Duke University rape case got national attention.

**Duke Lacrosse Rape Claim Spurs Outrage**
ABCNews.com
March 26, 2006

Following accusations that several Duke University lacrosse team members raped a dancer, [...] Durham Police Cpl. David Addison said [...] "We're not saying that all 46 were involved," recently. "But we do know that some of the players inside that house on that evening knew what transpired and we need them to come forward."

So far, no charges have been filed against any of the players. The team, which is currently ranked No. 2 and has been considered a favorite to win this year's national championship, forfeited two games — one yesterday and one that would have been played on this coming Tuesday — because of the allegations.

'Totally Deplorable'

"If what is alleged is in fact true, it's totally deplorable," Duke spokesman John Burness told ABC station WTVD-TV in Duhram this past week. "That is not what this institution stands for nor do we believe it's what our students stand for."

According to a search warrant, the victim and another woman went to a university-owned house on March 13, where three members of the team live. When the men became aggressive, the women left but another player apologized and convinced them to return.
The women returned to the house, but were separated. The victim alleges she was forced into a bathroom and assaulted. The men also allegedly yelled racial slurs at the women.

But before the plot was revealed, assisting the coalition was on the minds of executives, producers and writers. The opening scene involved Assistant District Attorney Shark in his living-room watching a football game. “You made the same play five times” he screams at the TV. This demonstrates what’s exceptionally high on coalition partners’ agenda – the Canadian lawyer’s quantum.

When the rape victim is interviewed she claims “There were three of them. They grabbed my throat ... I fought back but they were too strong”. The coalition identifier acknowledged the degree of force mounted against the Canadian before the coalition membership arrived. He too fought back – with the only resources available to him, namely democratic accountability mechanisms (the media, academia and courts).

To demonstrate how much coalition partners want the Canadian to get his quantum, writers again embed a quantum ratifier. Shark’s on the steps of the police station talking to his bookie: “Give me five on Arizona Saturday” and then executes an aggressive quasi-Clooney M.. Then to add corroboration, he’s choreographed to stop walking when he reaches an area where the police station’s street address is visible. There’s a twenty in the building’s number: “220”.

During the police line-up, the Canadian lawyer notices immediately there are five men. The victim first identifies number “two” and then chooses number “five” – which when subtracted from each other is three. Again the coalition membership is in genius form, linking possession of quantum with coalition efforts.

During a scene that discusses the accused retaining a hot-shot lawyer as defense counsel, Shark is scripted to state “If Jefferies wants to play games, let the games begin”. Coalition partners were saying if Canada and China want to play games, then let’s see who comes out the victor.

The scene cuts to news crews at the courthouse and their vans have coalition numbers as station identifiers. One is Channel Eight (China) and the other is Channel Three (The U.S. and its allies). Choreographed in front of the courthouse signaled that it will be the principles and values in the administration of international justice that will determine the outcome of this so-called ‘game’.

The sub-plot involves Shark’s daughter being accused of plagiarism at school. When he meets with a school administrator to discuss the charge, an aggressive quasi-Clooney M. is choreographed and timed to the remark “The evidence against her is strong” – the coalition’s way of telling Ottawa and Beijing that proof of what the Fiefdom treatise alleges has been evaluated, cross-checked with intelligence reports and double cross-checked by conducting intense surveillance on the Canadian lawyer for years – and everything says he’s telling the truth.
The Canadian howls with laughter when Shark serves the administrator with a lawsuit alleging “defamation and slander” and tells him he’s seeking five million in damages. Not only is the aggressive paternalism endearing, but connecting a quantum ratifier to the same litigious circumstances the Canadian lawyer found himself in delivered a massive kick of hilarity*.

* Amended Statement of Claim, para. 49 (c), 54, 64(g), 65, 77, 78(q), 291(c), 401, 494, 485

It will be recalled the Canadian lawyer was able to piece together parts of the internationally condemned paradigm of governance by linking two instances of malicious defamation involving himself and another western Canadian who had lived over a hundred years ago and who also fell victim to vile nepotistically-restrictive upward mobility exclusionary tactics. Both were subject to ‘the establishment’ seeking to discredit them by fabricating false personas that made them appear totally unworthy of responsibility and higher callings. The difference was the Canadian’s was contemporaneous with his life; the other occurred a century or so after upward mobility was circumvented.

In Volume One’s *How the Nexus of History, Hi-Technology and Hollywood Crushed Any Resistance to Reforming the Last Democratic Fiefdom*, the author analyzed how a member of the late 19th century Northwest Mounted Police, Superintendent Sam Steele, was treated by Ottawa politicians, who utterly destroyed his upward mobility opportunities and preferred to reward a member of the trans-generational nepotistic elite...

Source: *Corroborative Proof of Over 100 Years of the Condemned Paradigm of Governance Operating in the Last Democratic Fiefdom*

Then a hundred years later University of Alberta academics criminally libeled the Northwest Mounted Police officer:

Having been deprived of his welfare through criminal libel; having almost having his precious freedom replaced with a padded cell, he decided to attend at the Vancouver Public Library to conduct general research on his nemeses. He didn’t except it. Nor did the Liberals. Nor did the coalition of international human rights enforcers who were monitoring his every move and the content of every *Fiefdom* chapter. But it was there, in Liberal published black and white: Colonel Sam Steele criminally libelled in print in 1992 for rubbing up against the nepotistic rot a hundred or so years ago the Canadian lawyer experienced a century later.

Source: *How and When the Liberals Played Fast and Loose with the History of the Last Democratic Fiefdom: Again*

[Steele] is portrayed by the academics publishing out of the University of Alberta as both not too intelligent, for his “[l]ogic was never one of [his] strong points...” and completely unworthy of mention as opposed to an Indian
scout of some passing local reputation. The excerpt that is attributed to him is woven with a racism and stereo-typing...

Source: How the Nexus of History, Hi-Technology and Hollywood Crushed Any Resistance to Halting Reform in the Last Democratic Fiefdom

During one of the very last scenes after the conviction, Shark and two of his associates are discussing the fact that the rapists got “five years apiece”; and Shark states “they’ll be out in three” – thus closing the show with a both an affirmation that the coalition’s going to arrange quantum possession and a adds there will be prison for the malfeasant.

In the last scene, Shark consoles his daughter over the plagiarism charge. And the last opportunity to embed coalition activity isn’t allowed to slip by. The choice of messages to send into the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy again highlights what’s uppermost on the minds of the coalition partners – quantum.

“You’re the only one that believed in me”, she tells him. “It only took 16 years to figure that out”, he replies.

-------------------------------------------------------------

CBS’ ‘Shark’: How Steven Bochco and Spike Lee Mobilized Their Talents to Pummel the Last Democratic Fiefdom

[October 26, ´06]

Again the new hit television legal drama ‘Shark’ proved it was being used as a military platform to pummel Canada’s rich, powerful and the Chinese. The executive credits included Steven Bochco and Spike Lee.

What was different about the October 26, 2006 episode was the fact it was the series pilot. It began right at the very beginning with the principal character as he was before being recruited by the Mayor to join the District Attorney’s Office. Thus, the opening scene involved James Woods’ character defending, as opposed to prosecuting, someone.

The new series had also been chosen as a geo-platform, beginning right from the opening moments when Shark was doing his closing arguments to the jury. “Justice” was the first word of the new show and immediately the camera cut to the jury box and as it panned left the words had only just left the lawyer’s mouth when into full view came a jurywoman attired in all green.

Justice. What does that word mean? Today, for example, it means that when an individual is charged with attempted murder, that charge must be proven beyond any reasonable doubt. And in order to prove attempted murder, only one thing matters – intent.
The definition of ‘reasonable doubt’ is worth recording in the *Fiefdom* treatise, since that’s the accepted standard of proof for establishing the guilt or innocence of Canada’s career murderers, torturers, enslavers, thieves, frauds, treasonists, psychopaths, stalkers, saboteurs, agents provocateur and sexual perverts.

The standard used to determine the guilt or innocence of a person criminally charged. To be guilty of a crime, one must be proved guilty “beyond a reasonable doubt”. Reasonable doubt which will justify acquittal is doubt based on reason and arising from evidence or lack of evidence, and it is doubt which a reasonable man or woman might entertain, and it is not fanciful doubt, is not imagined doubt, and is not doubt that a juror might conjure up to avoid performing the unpleasant task or duty. Reasonable doubt is such a doubt as would cause prudent men to hesitate before acting in matters of importance to themselves. Doubt based on reason which arises from evidence or lack of evidence.

*Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Ed.*

The murder scene of a young woman dressed in white and her head in a large pool of blood (Canadian colors) could have been the series’ first use of coercive diplomacy dynamics. If so, it was a powerful way to begin after using the color of *quantum* in the jury box.

Another geo-political theme came during the first brainstorming between Shark and his team of A.D.A.s. In the middle of the conference table was a red bottle. Since it was surrounded by actors wardrobed with something that had white in it, there wasn’t a single camera angle that didn’t capture Canadian colors. This was that genius of conception, design and execution the coalition’s been employing since diplomacy began in earnest in early 2006.

Additionally, there were several geo-gestures timed to remarks that had coalition relevance. “Truth’s relative” was one. “Unethical” was another. And a Letterman M. was timed to Sharks rallying cry: “Let’s get to work”.

One of the first sub-plots involved a custody issue with his daughter. Since it was the pilot, whether his 16-year-old ought to move to New York with his ex-wife or stay in California with dad became an issue to explore. When this theme was first introduced at his home and he and his wife were discussing the matter, Shark was wearing a full body of purple clothing. The walking around pillar of justice executed a quasi-Clooney M. to “You thought this one through”. Since the geo-gesture triggered coalition relevance, the remark was either referring to the basis for *Fiefdom* allegations or what happens going forward or both. As already authored chapters attest, the allegations have been thoroughly thought through and what happens going forward has been fully reflected upon and the Canadian lawyer offers a clear and relatively comprehensive game plan during and after the purge.

During the second brainstorming session with his A.D.A.s, there was another diplomatically coercive moment. Shark’s previously given each assistant a task to
perform to prepare the prosecution’s case. One of them involved getting jury pool information from a loose-lipped jury guard. He’s told that after making inquiries no information was forthcoming because the jury guard was sick on the day the A.D.A. went to his office. “I hope he dies” Shark responds – to which an aggressive quasi-Clooney M. is inserted. This was clearly intended to be diplomatically coercive.

A touching scene involving Shark and his daughter was scripted to play out at her school. Two coalition elements were embedded. The actress playing the daughter executed an aggressive quasi-Clooney M. to his “I was in the neighborhood” excuse for showing up. And she responded with him not having come to her school “since Grade three”. Combined, the two communicated that coalition partners are both in various strategic locations in Canada and especially Dogville protecting coalition members’ and the Canadian lawyer’s interests and advancing their collective objectives.

When the crime that’s being prosecuted goes to court, much to the Canadian’s surprise, an aggressive Letterman M. is embedded and timed to defense counsel’s remark to the deceased’s mother “First let me extend my deepest sympathy”. Coalition partners were clearly offering their empathy for what they discovered of the Canadian’s past and current circumstances.

During the third brainstorming session, Shark said something that really put into context the Canadian’s current situation in terms of his international persona and his benefits going forward:

There isn’t a lawyer in this building who wouldn’t trade places with you in a minute.

An enslavement theme was inserted in the scene where the A.D.A.s stage a mock trial at Shark’s home. It will be recalled in previous episodes Shark turned his basement into a courtroom in which to practice. In the pilot, he brings his A.D.A.s home so they can properly prepare. When the question is asked “Have you engaged in bondage?”, the cute blond A.D.A. executed an aggressive protracted Clooney M.. The Canadian lawyer was of course elated that the coalition would again high profile the fact he’s been enslaved as a human lab monkey for most of his adult life.

The rest of the show didn’t have any more recognizable signs of coalition activity.

The foregoing demonstrates that from its inception, CBS executives decided the network would add another platform to its already enormous lineup dedicated to advancing the interests and objectives of coalition partners. In doing so, they upped the pressure on Canada’s elite by making them realize there’s going to be more and more resources dedicated to taking them out. If the malfeasant think that by simply hunkering down and waiting long enough everyone will get tired, bored or frustrated and walk away, they’re mistaken. In fact the opposite is true and launching ‘Shark’ is proof. The more torture is intended for the Canadian and more time, effort and resources are committed with no positive results, it means the threat posed by Canada and China is all that more dangerous. And the more
dangerous the alliance appears, the more adamant coalition members are that Canada’s elite has to be obliterated. It’s the failure to stand down the illegalities, account for the Pandora’s Box and undertake institutional reform that’s going to lead to an eventual military intervention. What’s preventing it from happening now is a U.S. president who wants history to record he didn’t act until all the diplomatic options were attempted and exhausted.

‘Shark’: Holding Authoritarians Accountable for Institutional Abuses of Little Girls

[November 9, ‘06]

It’s one thing for an individual to be convicted. It’s quite another when the criminality is institutionalized – when police, the political and economic elite, judges, the media and a foreign government’s assets are the perpetrators or involved in the cover-up – which makes those accessories after the fact and just as guilty.

That’s what the world community has become shockingly aware has been and is going on in Canada. When the country’s elite and the Beijing government decided to open the gates of hell on the Canadian lawyer in the late 1980s, nothing prevented them – no conscience, no politicians, no courts, no media, no academia, no church – from reaching to the depths of psychopathological perversion and criminality. Then the international community said “no more” in 2004. To that, Canada’s ruling clique and Beijing thumbed their collective nose and proceeded as if they were invincible and totally unaccountable. Now they’re on notice that severe punishment is a certainty and there is no escape, mitigation or mercy.

The November 9th episode of ‘Shark’ begins with the prosecuting protagonist engaging in an evening’s outing with his lady. As they’re walking up the steps of the Googenheim Museum to attend a jazz concert his phone rings and is advised the body of a missing girl has been discovered and he has to attend at the crime scene. His date executes an aggressive Clooney M. when she says “You’re off duty”.

Shark: [to the caller] Yea. Huh-huh. I know where that is. I’ll be right there. [to date] They found Emily Forrester.

Date: The girl who went missing. Well that’s great. Oh my God. She was eight years old.

Shark: Found her body in a field north of here. [...] This is gonna make jazz fusion seem like paradise.

As the next scene begins, an evidence searching line of five police officers is in progress and then a red ambulance with a white stripe is driven through camera
range. By this early stage, it was corroboratively clear this plot was also geo-
politically motivated.

When Shark and his A.D.A. begin to view the body, she executes a Clooney M.
to “I’ve never seen anything like this”; which was how the coalition membership
perceived what’s been discovered about how Canada’s federal, provincial and
municipal governments, the police, courts and media and how in complicity with
Beijing they’ve collectively been treating the country’s citizens.

A new sub-plot between father and daughter is introduced in this episode. The
infidelity theme is first introduced when she gets a weird phone call and asks her
dad about it. He recognizes the name she was given but covers up the details.

    Shark: Forget about it. Probably a telemarketer. Those guys are
          relentless [she executes protracted aggressive quasi-
          Clooney M.]. Can you make me an English muffin?

The geo-gesture obviously red flags the description of the China-Canada alliance’s
aggressiveness in pursuing violations of international and Canadian domestic law.
The conduct its leaders, officers, financial supporters and rank and file members are
guilty of is even more egregious when it’s not only done in full view of the
international community but it actually gets worse over the course of the three plus
years it was being observed.

The question arises ‘why an English muffin’? There are thousands of different food
items to choose from. Could it be a subtle reference to the Commonwealth – that
collection of nations that in the past have formed coalitions against rogue member
states to procure reform and accountability? Alternatively and just as likely, it’s a
reference to the destination on the Canadian lawyer’s exercise walkabout – ‘English
Bay’ – where so much stalk, swarm, surround, nose wiping death threat and idiot
talk stuffing communication has been experienced.

In the office the Jr. A.D.A. asks Shark how he knows the puffy lacerations on the
victim’s mouth are acid. “I’m psychic”, he replies. This was a prelude to his next
conversation with another of his A.D.A.s. He pulls her to the side and assigns her a
special task:

    Shark: Ah-hem. [to get her attention]
    A.D.A.: [quasi-Clooney M.]
    Shark: I need you to look into a similar case on an eight-year-
          old girl: Echo Park 1991. [...] Don’t discuss this with
          anyone. Not with anyone.

The coalition relevance indicators identify two issues. First, China’s to be held
accountable; and second, keeping all Fiefdom treatise matters confidential.
The next scene is a sequence of clips edited together of the two female A.D.A.s interviewing suspects. A total of three men are brought in and questioned – a foreshadowing of the interrogations that will be used during the reform, accountability and Chinese eviction process.

An early twist is that the 1991 case involved the same means of killing – pouring acid down the throat of the victim – it was defended by Shark, it was prosecuted by the D.A. he now works for and the defendant back then was convicted. Because of the same method of causing death, this new murder casts doubt on the veracity of that fifteen year old guilty verdict.

When Shark goes to visit his former client in jail, two sets of numbers are quickly introduced. The first is his prisoner ID number. It was interesting that when first made observable in this interview room, the seven digit number was difficult to the point of being almost impossible to make out. After reviewing the VCR tape several times, the Canadian lawyer couldn’t be absolutely certain the number he recorded was an exact reproduction. Later however, as documented below, when the D.A. confronts the prisoner to prep him for trial the number becomes totally visible and easy to record. So there must have been a reason to introduce those numbers in that fashion. The second set was the exact time the prisoner had been in jail: 15 years, 7 months and 13 days. None of them individually contain any coalition signifiers. But added together they come to 26, which added together is eight.

Yellow is introduced into the scene’s bland color scheme and timed in such a way that its use was Presidential quantum. It’s first observed when the prisoner complained his letters to Shark after the conviction went unanswered: “You could’ve let me know you gave a damn”; the coalition’s way of saying they not only care a lot, but are arranging quantum to show that they do and how much they do.

To demonstrate that coalition partners mean business, Grazer et al. choreograph a jail guard to assertively pass through the set to “Emily Forrester was killed with the same M.O. as Tanya Blake in 1991; I believe the same person could have committed both murders” – which was meant as a sign that there will be multiple crimes to pay for and all the malfeasant are going to be seeing a lot of prison guards in their future.

The falsely convicted prisoner identifies one man from the photos Shark brings as the guy he saw in the park that day in 1991; and so the man is brought in for questioning. After the cute A.D.A. and Shark finish the interview there’s a brainstorming session.

A.D.A.: I reviewed the police file. A woman reported some guy spoke inappropriately to her daughter at the park the same day Emily Forrester disappeared.

Shark: Guy have a name?
A.D.A.: Kevin Olmstead. L.A.P.D. interviewed and released him. NO local record but I ran a national check and he has a child abuse record in Tacoma.

Shark: How old is he?


Shark: Keep tabs on him, but we got our guy.

Since this incidental suspect could have been any age between puberty and pensioner, the choice must have been coalition-motivated to create a China identifier. And given where it appears in the script, it’s making relevant how those in Canada’s elite and the Beijing government not directly related to ongoing investigations in Canada to discover who all the guilty parties are are under surveillance.

In a hallway conversation between the D.A. and Shark, a geo-gesture is inserted to make another matter relevant:

D.A.: I hear you’re seeking a search warrant for Sam Beamus [who you’d just interviewed].


Grazer et al. have just confirmed what the Fiefdom treatise has documented; namely how quickly the information loop expanded about what’s been proven to have occurred and continues to occur in Canada. The addition of new coalition members in 2006 is a testament to just how swiftly the most powerful, wealthiest and high profile were learning of these decades of shocking atrocities and were seeking to be acknowledged as a coalition partner.

The next scene adds an important milestone in the three plus year investigation. Shark’s chatting with his ex-wife who in the first episode moved to New York to start a new life. He’s pursuing the infidelity issue since his daughter’s wondering about that strange phone call in which a name he recognized was mentioned. The ex hangs up on him and as he walks into his office from the balcony he engages a couple A.D.A.s. Shark says something inaudible which could have been something like “Don’t get married” because the reply was “I thought you were divorced”. Whatever it was, these lines of the script were a prelude to setting up a geo-gesture. After “I thought you were divorced” Shark responds with “I rest my case” and he then executes an aggressive Stewart M. – signaling that the coalition’s principal investigation is concluded and the partners are ready to proceed to the next stage.

This acknowledgement comes on the heels of two other coalition partners affirmatively asserting the evidence has been collected: Stephen Colbert et al.: Confirming the Coalition Has Hard Evidence to Put Away Leaders and Followers of
the Last Democratic Fiefdom (October 10, 2006) and David Letterman et al.: Reminding the China-Canada Alliance the Coalition Has Electronic and Videotape Evidence of Its Malfeasance (November 8, 2006).

China is mentioned by name in the script and in a context that confirms what Canada’s political and economic leaders already know – massive reform is coming:

A.D.A.: The landscaping firm Sam Beamus worked for in 1991 was part of an urban renewal project in Chinatown...

As the circumstantial case mounts against the prime suspect of both murders, the D.A. has a heavy heart since she is scripted to have omitted to deliver valuable exculpatory evidence to Shark when he was defending his client in 1991. She made a name for herself back then because of the massive publicity the child murder trial got and so her reputation all these years later is vulnerable.

A perhaps intended parallel was being made – and if not the Canadian lawyer can make one – involving the various authoritarian compatriots who were involved in destroying the Canadian in and around 1991. That was the year he was being surreptitiously attacked from every conceivable by the alliance in Dead-monton. And an inferential case can be made that successful malfeasance against targets was rewarded with perks and promotions of all sorts. So those who were in the lower ranks fifteen years ago would be up high in the echelons of power and influence and their reputations susceptible to being shredded now that their conduct is being exposed.

If there’s one case that can be pointed to for this upward mobility based on successful heinous complicity is none other than the Chief Justice of Canada’s Federal Court. Is it a coincidence Lutfy C.J. was elevated from Associate Chief Justice to the position of ‘Top Dog’ because of his role in railroading and tanking the Canadian’s lawsuit and participating in other cases in the same malicious way?

It is arguable this parallel was intended because the D.A. was scripted to arrive at Shark’s home to make full confession and seek absolution. The lexiconic flags were her being attired in a black and white outfit (punishment certainty) and upon departing was choreographed to walk past an abstract painting hanging on Shark’s entranceway wall that was all red – thus creating the Canadian punishment certainty color combination. Shark says “Thanks” as she’s walking out the door – something the Canadian conveys to his extended family on an ongoing basis every moment of every day.

A legal dilemma arises when the evidence to convict on the 2006 murder charge is weak and the evidence on the 1991 case is stronger. The added problematic is that proceeding with the old case puts the D.A potentially in hot water because of her unethical conduct suppressing evidence that would have cleared the man who’s served fifteen years as a child molesting murderer for a crime he didn’t commit. As he begins his submissions, Shark executes an unrecognized, but nonetheless,
clearly interpretable geo-gesture to red flag his submissions to the court as coalition-relevant:

Shark: Your Honor [gesture]. We’d like to add new charges against the defendant.

Judge: Proceed.

[...]

Shark: The People wish to proceed with the 1991 case. The murder of Tanya Blake.

[Defense counsel objects]

Judge: Counselor, you were put on notice these issues would be relevant. You’ve had adequate time to prepare. Sam Bemus will stand trial for the 1991 murder [reverse Colbert M.] of Tanya Blake.

[Defense counsel moves to remove Shark as prosecutor on conflict of interest grounds]

Judge: Effective immediately, Mr. Stark you’re off the case.

Geo-relevance by Grazer et al. emerges by the insertion of a short clip as the show goes to commercial of the accused in 1991 just after he’s put the eight year old girl into the trunk of his car. He’s wardrobed in a red hat and white shirt. Either it was linking Canada to the pedophile-murder of little girls or the coalition was red-flagging the conflict of interest issue.

If it was the latter, which is not the Canadian’s first inferential choice, it is arguable that him being a victim of the malfeasance automatically prevents him from having any prosecutorial or adjudicative input into the accountability process.

After the hearing the D.A. and Shark discuss the case.

Shark: [sarcastic] That went according to plan. [...] I miscalculated [Clooney M.] I never thought the judge would uphold the conflict ruling.

[...]

[As for your 1991 error] You rarely get a chance to make things right.

[next clip is a generic scene of red ambulance with white stripe on the street]
The geo-gesture is meant to identify the illogicity in the thinking processes of the ruling elite. They never thought there would be so much accountability attention directed at them ever, which simply fueled their culture of entitlement, chattelization and all the atrocities. The Canadian color scheme was meant to indicate some latitude in affording the malfeasant an opportunity to straighten themselves out before the ‘Iron Fist’ arrives – which would go to punishment mitigation not culpability.

The trial begins and the first scene involves the D.A. showing a picture to the witness that was excluded from testifying at the 1991 trial.

D.A.: Is this the blond girl you saw talking to Mr. Beamus that day?

Witness: Yea, that’s her.

[pink coat on girl in photo]

D.A.: Let the record show Mr. Damkins he’s identified a photograph of the late Tanya Blake.

[clip of Asian in jury box wearing a pink sweater; a total of five members of jury shown]

[...]

Defense: Nothing...

[clip of pink attired Asian]

During a court recess the D.A. and Shark have a hallway conversation about the case.

D.A.: We got Damkins ID. We got the chemicals on the body. We’ve got the payphone call from Beamus’ office. What more do you want?

Choreography as this remark is made involves the D.A. and Shark bringing their stride down the hallway to a halt. He stops and she does a pivot around him and stops to expose her backside; and then executes a sexually laden body stance to accentuate her curves. Since the mechanics of this sensual choreography is timed to “What more do you want?”, the Canadian couldn’t but interpret this as identical to what Wolf et al. have done on at least two occasions where the breasts of female actors have been accentuated to high profile his twenty years of isolation and deprivation. Dick Wolf’s ‘Law & Order’: Picking Up Where He Left Off to Continue Condemning Beijing and the Last Democratic Fiefdom and Dick Wolf’s ‘Law & Order’: High Profiling the Role of the Jewish People as Global Article 7 Police and Trans-Generational Contemptuous Envy.
Is this a rhetorical question or was it inserted with sexual overtones to elicit an answer? If it was the latter, a quick inventory of his expected post-emancipation life would indicate there is nothing in the world he will be in need of.

The heart-tugging jail scene when the D.A. has to bear her accountability soul to the man she was principally responsible for putting away is next. And this is where the prison ID number of the falsely accused convict is crystal clear:

91 – A – 0119

That’s a triple eight according to the Fiefdom lexicon. A coalition-identifying triple eight. In other words, many Chinese military and intelligence agents in Canada who don’t vacate the country will be going to jail for a very long time.

The prison ID number becomes recordably visible for the very first time when Shark’s former client says “I don’t belong here”. The D.A. responds (and on behalf of the coalition) “I thought you were guilty”.

When the trial scene resumes, the prisoner is shown a photograph of the accused wearing a baseball uniform and posing with his softball team. Early in the show there was evidence that the perpetrator worked at a pizza outlet, but the accused didn’t have any connection to such a restaurant. It wouldn’t be until trial that the connection was made that he didn’t work for a pizza delivery firm but his team was the recipient of softball jerseys that had the pizza logo on the chest. And it would be the falsely accused convict who was able to help the prosecution win its case by authenticating the photograph as portraying the pizza shirt he told the police he saw on the man who was with the 1991 victim. The softball jersey took on a geopolitical importance when the audience in the East-West Corridor saw the colors of the jersey were red, white and green – thus linking the pedophile-murder to Canada’s ruling elite and to the Canadian lawyer’s reform-directed quantum.

The corroboration this was intended came immediately after the audience saw the photograph and colors. A clip was edited in of not only five jurors, but to make the Beijing culpability link to the heinous crime, within that group was a hitherto unobserved Chinese woman. When the photograph is shown to the audience again, the next clip was of the jury box again, but this time it was the pink-attired Asian and four others to create the condemnation-quantum ratifier combination.

When the falsely accused says the name of the restaurant – “Pizza Castle” – not only was the next edit of five jurors to again raise the specter of paying damages, but the word “castle” couldn’t but procure a fiefdom context that delivered the reason why they were due and owing.

To create a theatrical representation of the reality of adjudicating the fate of Canada’s malfeasant, a gallery member is scripted to execute a protracted quasi-Erin M. to the judge stating “This court is now in session”.

The jury forewoman is the Asian and when she stands up to read the guilty verdict the East-West audience sees that not only is she wearing pink, but her skirt consists of a muted gold color with a checkered design: condemnation and Presidential *quantum*.

The judge turns to the falsely accused convict and orders him released immediately just after the pedophile-murderer is hauled away.

The last scene is at Shark’s home and involves him and his daughter working their way through the now revealed secret that her mother was the bad apple for having affairs. She had grown up hating him and now realized that was a misplaced sentiment. As the episode ends, they’re facing one another and both are emitting a warm glow. He tells her that when her mom and he first started their relationship it was fantastic. He then relates to her how her birth was the best day of his life.

“Today was a good day”, she states. “How was yours?”. **Five** seconds is scripted to pass before he states “I wish I could tell you that life gets less complicated, but it really doesn’t”. That was indicating that when the Canadian lawyer takes possession of his *quantum*, his life is going to involve a lot more matters to deal with.

The last coalition *indicia* consist of coercive diplomacy, warning Canada’s judges their lives and freedom hang in the balance:

```
Daughter: Will you tell me about [the day I was born]?

Shark: [chuckle] I was in the middle of a **triple** murder. A call comes in: ‘your mom’s in labor’. I go bolting out of the courtroom in the middle of my cross[-examination]. The judge – his head nearly exploded [quasi-Clooney M.]...

Daughter: [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.]

[fade to black]
```

**Shark: High Profiling Institutionalized Slavery in the Last Democratic Fiefdom**

[November 2, ’06]

There must be another major coalition push underway to bring finality and closure to the conflict against the authoritarians. Not since the ‘final notice’ phase in August 2006 has so many of the main topics of condemnation been embedded in coalition content. After so many notable subjects were high profiled, it came as a welcome surprise that institutionalized slavery was profiled in a Sumner Redstone approved broadcast.
The opening scene involved a fire in a garment factory in Los Angeles that killed four employees. A coalition-identifying three actors are scripted to start the show after the program intro. They’re in front of City Hall waiting for the Mayor to arrive. The opening scene became coercive when during this huddle between Shark, the District Attorney and the Mayor’s assistant, it is revealed the name of the factory owner is “Hong”. Linking multiple deaths to a Chinese name couldn’t but be signaling that the entire show was going to be committed to underscoring Beijing’s involvement in the sovereign affairs of Canada and that government involvement in those that died in the country while it enjoyed de facto governance.

When the Mayor arrives, his black suit, white shirt and violet tie speaks volumes about the nature of the geo-political sub-context: justice will be delivered to the Canadian and his country when the coalition moves.

The garment fire is first treated as merely the result of fire and safety code violations, not as a mass homicide. One of Shark’s A.D.A.s (hereafter “Jr. A.D.A.”) – also wardrobed in black and white – identifies with the plight of the workers because they like he are Hispanic – members of the Mexican immigrant workforce who are employed by large high profit motivated, low-paying corporations, and who are compelled by the circumstances of their illegal status and American society generally to work very long hours and are inhumanely treated by bosses and managers. He demonstrates the appropriate level of empathy and argues that there was something more nefarious involved in the fire. To change Shark’s mind, he reminds him there were four deaths and he produces portraits of them. To add coalition relevance, he’s scripted to lay on the desk in front of Shark not all four, but three while he announces all four names. This multiple linking of deaths to coalition dynamics involving China was the coalition blaming Beijing for all the deaths that occurred in Canada – whether through surreptitious assassination or from economy monopolization and wealth plundering.

After the commercial break Jr. A.D.A.’s wardrobe has undergone a change. Instead of just black and white, he’s in a black suit, white shirt and a red and white striped tie – Canadian prison colors.

Of the scripted five people in the brainstorming session, one of the A.D.A.s became more profiled in this episode. Her attractiveness and sexuality were subtlety but still noticeably accentuated. It eventually appeared the actress playing the character ‘Madeline’ was being groomed to be another love interest for the Canadian’s during his post-emancipation life (hereafter identified as the “cute A.D.A.”).

Cute A.D.A.: Who’s the target [of the indictment]?

Jr. A.D.A.: Benny Hong. He owns three shops in Los Angeles – each of which has been repeatedly cited for health and safety violations. [...] We need to talk to survivors. I’ve tracked down [Claudia and Victoria Reus] – a mother and daughter who escaped the fire.
As in many previous instances, names for characters – at the sole discretion of executives, producers and principal writers who exercise the unlimited scope of literary license – have been used to identify various people in the Canadian’s past. In addition to family members, others, like his best friend Michael, have been employed. And there are few times the names of street soldiers socially engineered into his and his family’s lives were used. The most often used was ‘Lydia’ – the name of a street soldier who befriended his sister. Well, it is arguable the same dynamic was present in this episode. ‘Victoria Goldner’ was someone out of the blue presented herself as a friend of a neighbor on his floor who thereafter became a ‘friend’.

A fourth relevant topic is immediately thereafter introduced when sex is linked to the number ‘twenty’. The Jr. A.D.A. is asked if he’s still sleeping with the reporter to whom he leaked the fire deaths story. When he admits it, a bet between Shark and another A.D.A. is revealed and which leads to the payment of a twenty dollar bill to the boss. Even before the first five minutes of the show has elapsed, CBS writers have canvassed several of the important general topics to the conflict with Beijing and Canada’s elite: China’s complicity and liability for quantum, coercive diplomacy, quantum ratification, the coalition and twenty years of hell.

During the first interview of the two survivors the color of condemnation and punishment certainty are embedded in the daughter’s attire. The A.D.A. is wearing the color of justice.

A.D.A.: Tell me about the fire.

Daughter: We were workin’ on a really big order. There was a lot of material in the shop. […] The window was painted shut so we had to break [them] with our bear hands.

She raises up both arms to expose her palms. The Canadian lawyer carefully counted the number of lacerations: eight on her right hand and four on her left hand, equaling 12 – a coalition identifier. Additionally, when she refers to “a really big order” the camera was on her mom. Then an edit puts the daughter in full audience view already executing a quasi-Clooney M. when she starts the next sentence: “There was a lot of material…”, referring to the size of the Fiefdom treatise and proof of atrocities in the diplomatic evidence record.

Linking China and the coalition in this fashion was symbolic of the Canadian lawyer trying desperately to break free from his inferno of torture, enslavement, impoverishment, imprisonment, experimentation, isolation and deprivation.

At the scene of the fire the following dialogue was scripted between the cute A.D.A., one of her colleagues and the city fire inspector:
Cute A.D.A.: How many people worked here?

Inspector: Depending on the workload, between eight-y and a hundred a shift.

A.D.A.: This place should hold 50 max.

Inspector: L.A.’s the sweatshop capital of the world – five thousand in a twenty-mile radius and eight inspectors like me to monitor all of them.

A.D.A.: Why don’t you shut ’em down?

Inspector: We do, but they just relocate.

It’s scenes like this one that cannot but corroborate what Canada’s security apparatus has concluded about coalition intentions. In the space of three lines of script, Brian Grazer’s writer(s) was/were able to cram in two China identifiers, two quantum ratifiers and a reference to twenty years of hell – and in a context of multiple deaths meant as coercive diplomacy.

The subsequent plea bargain scene between the Chinese garment factory owner and the District Attorney’s Office embeds even more coalition-relevant numbers:

Defense: Manslaughter’s a joke. Reckless endangerment – five years.

Jr. A.D.A.: Even without manslaughter 117 code violations, each carrying 90 days – that’s 30 years. [9 + 3 = 12; 1 + 2 = three].

Shark then pulls his subordinate aside and tries to convince him that five years is a great deal. When the negotiation resumes, Shark gets shocked:

Jr. A.D.A.: Twenty years.

Hong: Why are you doin’ this to me. I’m an honest businessman.

Jr. A.D.A.: No, you exploit innocent people. Twenty years or I’ll see you in court.

Hong: Why don’t you go after the other?

Jr. A.D.A.: What others?

Defense: We’re done.
Hong: No. Why do you think the electrical system broke down? It was a rush order. Big. They said if I didn’t come through, they weren’t going to use me anymore. They’re my number one customer.

Jr. A.D.A.: All right, if you want any shot from getting out from under this you better tell me everything you know.

Defense: You want my client’s help, we’re talkin’ full immunity.

In the first three lines, squashed between references to being an honest businessperson and exploiting innocent people are the two time periods representing hell on earth for the Canadian lawyer. The authoritarian ideology has lead to Canada’s elite being impervious to the argument they are not honest people and they don’t exploit people. When chattelization is so engrained as it is in Canada, then political, economic and military leaders are incapable of making the distinction between ethical practices and medieval ones.

The other issue raised is about flipping the small fry to get at the big wigs. It might have been an option open to street soldiers and those at the lower rungs of the China-Canada alliance command structure a couple years ago. However, U.S. military intelligence has been watching all of them so microscopically for the last three and half to four years, and presumably longer, and identities, job descriptions and culpability have already been established, this bargaining dynamic isn’t available to anybody. They can squeal on whomever they want with whatever they have, but it won’t matter. They have nothing of value to negotiate with.

During another five-person brainstorming session while defense counsel and his client are sitting in the conference room the following debate takes place:

Shark: No way five years for reckless endangerment is a gift.

Jr. A.D.A.: This goes higher than Benny Hong.

Shark: All of a sudden he’s Oliver Stone. It always goes higher. The question is who can you get. Case closed.

A.D.A.: [The Jr. A.D.A.] is right. People are suffering. Unless you nail the big money, it’s just going to happen again.

Shark: Five years and no immunity.

Jr. goes into the conference room alone with these instructions from his boss and comes out saying he’s granted Hong full immunity. In exchange, he gets the name of the party responsible for his negligence: Ezekiel Pruitt of Pruitt Fashions.

Cute A.D.A.: Pruitt? That’s the hottest designer in the country. Every teenage girl on the planet wears their stuff.
Shark executes an aggressive quasi-Clooney M. to point to street soldier recruitment.

The cute A.D.A. is endeared to the Canadian lawyer when in the next scene she’s attired in black and white. She and three others are eating lunch in the park and discussing the case. Jr. pushes the merits of the case. He’s aggressively pursued it despite being told earlier by Shark that if he loses the case, he loses his job.

A.D.A.: You really want to lose your job over this Martin? [Colbert M.]

Jr. A.D.A.: If it wasn’t for people like the women who died in that fire, I wouldn’t have this job.

The point was simply made, namely that everyone who participated in advancing the interests of the China-Canada alliance and the paradigm of governance will be unemployed and like the Canadian lawyer, living below the poverty line for the rest of their lives. The adages ‘do unto others as you would have them do to you’, eye for an eye’ and ‘what goes around comes around’ are applicable here.

An interesting dynamic emerges in the scene where Shark’s having lunch with a Canadian punishment certainty color attired Mayor. The Mayor is disincentivized from proceeding with a criminal indictment against Pruitt because, as he says “He underwrites my schools uniform program’. The conflict of interest leads to a multitude of implications for Canada’s malfeasant who through extreme trans-generational nepotism and patronage and having political, financial and Chinese-centric geo-political interests are incapable of escaping the same criticism. Pruitt’s defense counsel approaches them to extort a favorable attitude from the Mayor:

Defense: ‘Zeik’s asked me to tell you he’s looking forward to expanding your school uniform program Mr. Mayor. Nothing’s too good for the kids.

Mayor: [Newman M.]

The embedded geo-gesture confirms the coalition is making an issue of the inescapable conflicts of interest that permeates all of Canada’s hierarchy of power, wealth and influence.

Shark’s gotten fired up over this blatant attempt to steer culpability away by this underhanded attempt at influence peddling. He’s now convinced there is something to this criminal angle and empowers his subordinate to get aggressive. He walks into the office to rally the prosecutorial troops. The cute A.D.A.’s still in black and white; her colleague is in black and red – creating an always present Canadian punishment certainty color scheme for the scene.
Shark: I want you guys at Elliot Dasher’s firm in one hour.

Jr. A.D.A.: Why?

Shark: Because he represents Pruitt Fashions and it’s time to rattle his cage.

Cute A.D.A.: It’s a pretty big cage.

A.D.A.: 300 hundred lawyers.

Shark: 350 and we’re still gonna kick their asses.

Embedding two coalition identifiers and a quantum ratifier along with Canadian punishment certainty colors and in a context involving getting aggressive against a big law firm is an indictment of Canada’s legal profession. Occasionally the country’s lawyers have come under fire being complicit in perpetuating over a hundred years of corruption, criminality and perversion and advancing China’s interests. Now they’re on notice they’re going to feel the sting of international justice for their nefarious conduct.

The Mayor’s conflict of interest is Topic One during Shark’s visit to his superior’s office. She only responds with “Hmm” to him saying “[O]ur beloved Mayor is publicly linked to Pruitt Fashions; this could embarrass him big time”.

The issue of Dogville’s Mayors is thus put on the front burner. Why is it not surprising that the last Mayor was elevated to Canada’s federal Senate after his four year tenure as head of what is now the center of an international furor? As the Fiefdom treatise documented, Mayor Larry Campbell went public with his knowledge the coalition had ‘Dogville-ized’ his city back in 2004 – bragging about it having become the Article 7, torture, enslavement, deprivation and perversion capital of the western world: Dogville and its Lasting Impact on the Last Democratic Fiefdom: Revisited.

The subpoena Shark served on Pruitt’s corporate lawyers led to a disclosure the Canadian lawyer would have cheered about had the same happened to him during his Federal Court lawsuit. In the scene involving disclosure, Grazer et al. filled a large office with boxes piled to chest level. There are two and then three A.D.A.s about to start sifting through the voluminous material. The cute A.D.A. walks in to answer a question that had just been asked:

A.D.A.: How do we fight back?

Cute A.D.A.: Dirty.

Both combined have wardrobe that spells in coalition language Canadian punishment certainty.
The first scene at home with his daughter follows. The plagiarism issue that was introduced last episode is developed further. This time father’s advising daughter how to respond to questions she’ll be asked during the administrative tribunal.

Shark: It’s like I tell the kids at work – truth is relative. Sometimes you have to...

Daughter: ...Shave the truth?

Even though there were no coalition relevance flags, the script raises an important point that is worth reflecting upon. While bending, manipulating or otherwise mildly distorting the truth of matters in contention might be not ethically unacceptable, when issues of life, liberty and wealth are involved, truth is critical. And that is why both the Canadian lawyer and U.S. military intelligence have spent the better part of three years meticulously gathering incriminating evidence of malfeasance. When the coalition moves to install ‘Iron Fist’ accountability mechanisms, there will not have been any bending of the truth. And further, the highest of value is placed on the veracity of his and U.S. evidence since it could lead to the death penalty, life in prison and asset confiscation. So both he and America’s intelligence services have protected credibility throughout these times at all costs.

When the show returns to the office, Shark is scripted to walk into the document discovery office with five cups of coffee for his hard working A.D.A.s.

Shark: Oh-h, why so glum?

A.D.A.: Because it is 16 hours later and we still have no idea who authorized those extra sewing machines.

Shark: These cappuccinos should help.

A.D.A.: There are 12 hundred Pruitt employees in L.A. alone.

The quantum ratifier ($6 - 1 = \text{five}$) relates to the fact the Canadian lawyer is no longer “glum”, now experiencing and being in store for an envious life. The coalition identifier ($1 + 2 = \text{three}$) relates to the size of Pruitt’s workforce and thus reflects an appreciation that the coalition community is enormous.

Shark then reveals he’s discovered two of Pruitt’s employees having been transferred out of the city in recent days – which generally in litigation is a sign the defendant wants to evade liability and thus is getting rid of critical evidence. And how does he know this? Because, as he states “[when] corporate tools move someone, they change the locks on their offices”.


Cute A.D.A.: Locksmiths!

Shark: Ah-ha! I knew ‘em all from my previous life. They come in handy when you need to know what’s going on behind closed doors. Regal Security changed two Pruitt locks last night – Catherine Elliot, 62, sent to Sante Fe for her asthma and Brian Clark transferred to Malaysia.

Cute A.D.A.: No extradition. [black & white attire and aggressive quasi-Clooney M.]

A.D.A.: [red attire] And plenty of sweat shops.

Jr. A.D.A.: Okay, here it is. [finds incriminating e-mails; aggressive double Clooney M.] No excuses.

There’s a China identifier, the colors of punishment certainty followed by Canadian punishment certainty and geo-gestures embedded in the script; and there are several fictitious names. Again literary license made choosing names at the total discretion of executives, producers and writers. If there was an intention to link China to somebody in the Canadian lawyer’s past named “Catherine”, “Elliot”, ‘Brian” or “Clark”, it would be “Clark” since Rob Clark is the street soldier socially engineered into his life through The Roxy Nightclub to look like a millionaire and with that façade manipulate and eventually destroy the Canadian’s Internet legal research service.


Clark was also the thug who played brutalizing mind games with him in the middle of the forest during a fly-fishing trip in September 2002 and a couple weeks after Chief Justice Lutfy’s anti-American ruling* that led to the following final entry in the Volume One’s fourth chapter Disempowering Brilliance in the Last Democratic Fiefdom:

What was a putative fly fishing tip for recreational purposes with a so-called business partner soon after appearing before a federal judge in September ’02 for a 3½ hour marathon evidence submitting motion became a scene out of Hollywood feature films about the America mafia, The Godfather and Goodfellas. Only our protagonist in this one pathetic episode of thousands of psychologically torturous experiences was allowed to leave the Coastal Mountain Range alive.

The incident was described in detail in the federal Statement of Claim:

The two left very early on the morning of September 26, 2002, anticipating a four to five hour drive to Gold Bridge. The drive, fishing and partial return to Vancouver went without incident. They decided to fly-fish another day, turned around half way to Vancouver at around 11 o’clock p.m. and headed
back to Gold Bridge with the intention of getting a room for the night and fish the next day.

At one point, Clark turned to the Plaintiff as he was driving and out of the blue told the Plaintiff he was going to pull the vehicle over and kill him. Clark, an adult male easily capable of overpowering the Plaintiff, had never exhibited any forms of aggressive or assaultive behaviour. The Plaintiff was not sure how to take the comment and aggressive body language and tried to make light of his statements. Clark repeated his threat. The Plaintiff again attempted to seek a humorous solution. It worked and what little conversation there was between them of any substance returned to normal.

Within the hour, Clark agreed to pull the car over. The Plaintiff was seeking a bathroom break and an opportunity to stretch his legs. After relieving himself, he joined Clark in the middle of the gravel road.

Except for the headlights, it was pitchblack. Over the 150 or so mile stretch of dirt road between Pemberton and Gold Bridge, the Plaintiff had seen perhaps two vehicles. Clark turned to the Plaintiff already having his right hand firmly in the area of his back right pocket and stated “I’ve got a gun, step back”. He repeated the statement. The Plaintiff sought a quick humorous response and did not receive one. Without clarifying, Clark ordered the Plaintiff to take fifty paces in front of the SUV and stand there in the middle of the road. The Plaintiff joked with him. Clark was serious. He was not going to change his stance or insistence until the Plaintiff complied.

The Plaintiff began at this point to fear for his life. He was in the mountains in absolutely the middle of nowhere at around 11:00 o’clock p.m. with someone who was a complete stranger to the Plaintiff’s family. Acting completely out of character, Clark’s threatening movements and accumulating assaulting comments at that moment made the Plaintiff numb and unable to respond. He was not about to physically defend himself for fear of inciting a deadly response. He complied and walked twenty or so paces in front of the SUV, smiling nervously and in shock waiting for what he believed the Defendant had planned for him.

Clark pulled out what appeared to be an object in his hand. Because he was behind the headlights, the Plaintiff was unable to observe with clarity what Clark was doing and waited, frozen in his spot for an impact on his head or chest or some other catastrophic event. The primary explosion came and a secondary explosion occurred within arm’s length of his head. The gun powder-sourced explosion near his head was an augmented explosion, making an exceptionally loud “crack” when its charge and illuminated remnants filled the Plaintiff’s immediate vicinity.

The Defendant maliciously caused the Plaintiff to suffer grave nervous shock by staging and executing the assault and battery. Although identifying his
weapon as a gun, Clark had discharged an exploding bear stun and repellant device at him (something he had never experienced or seen before).

The China identifier and the issue of extradition in the script is meant to signal that those who conspired with the China-Canada alliance will be brought to justice and the only way to escape it is to move to a country that doesn’t have an extradition treaty with the country. But these days, that might not be sufficient to evade accountability. There have been several reported incidents where countries have still put fugitives on planes destined for the U.S. even without such an agreement because U.S. officials have offered incentives to the hosting country in exchange for a diplomatic favor.

With proof of intent to cause depraved indifference murder, Pruitt is arrested. In grand coalition style, he’s scripted to be having a big penthouse party – complete with dozens of bikini-clad women and an ice sculpture at the buffet table. The host is attired in a silver housecoat with black trim and black shirt – punishment certainty colors clearly intended – and arrested in front of the national press covering the event. As Elliot Dasher, his attorney, is complaining about this public arrest, the audience in the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy see in the immediate background two tables draped with bold purple tablecloths and behind them two pink patio umbrellas: condemnation and justice. The signal couldn’t have been more explicit. The communiqué to Canada’s elite is that the party’s over and ‘you’re under arrest’ for multiple counts of murder.

After the arrest reaches the Mayor’s office, there’s a meeting with Shark to discuss this development.

**Mayor:** You know how many jobs Pruitt brings to this city? If Pruitt falls so do dozens of other ancillary businesses. Who does that help?

**Shark:** Those are sweat shop jobs.

**Mayor:** And if they go away do you think these people are gonna stop comin’ here? They won’t. Destroy these jobs, crime and homelessness [Shark: double aggressive quasi-Clooney M.] is goon go through the roof.

**Shark:** Wait a minute. All of a sudden you’re pro- sweat shop?

**Mayor:** I’ve been working for immigrant rights for twenty year. What have you done? There are many ways to improve things. Bringing down businesses like Pruitt’s isn’t one of them.

**Shark:** I’m sorry you let the genie out of the bottle. I’m stuck with voodoo. I can’t turn back now.

“What happens to several million people who lose their jobs as street soldiers when their superiors are arrested *en masse* during the early stages of the purge?” is the
geo-political question being raised here. And what of the financial havoc suffocating that revenue stream for thousands of businesses that form part of the secret society economy is going to have? Companies throughout Canada became successful because street soldiers were instructed to patronize them in large numbers because their owners were clique members or favored associates of clique members. In response, there will be an adjustment period in which Canada’s otherwise extra-healthy economy will feel the tiny pinch. But in the short to medium term, purge dynamics that affect national, regional and local economies will be mitigated because of the economy’s own internal strengths. And, it will be even more vibrant from plenty of direct foreign investment by coalition partners filling the void left by the purge. As for street soldiers and commanders, they’ll be in prison growing organic vegetables, raising organic farm animals, engaged in light industry and involved in public infrastructure development and maintenance. When released from prison they’re going to join the lumpenproletariat and work in low-wage jobs so they can’t sabotage what was accomplished during their lengthy incarceration. They definitely won’t be welcome in the ‘new Canada’.

Shark’s scripted to execute an aggressive geo-gesture to the phenomena of crime and homelessness. Coalition partners already know from the Canadian’s writings his plan is to aggressive address the country’s poverty. So much wealth was plundered that once reintroduced back into the system it will reverse what has been a growing trend for decades. And Parliament 1989 joint and unanimous resolution to eradicate child poverty, instead of being a hollow public relations exercise for votes, will actually be followed through with all the urgency and tenacity required to deliver results.

After a judge rules in favor of Pruitt that the e-mails found in the documents were inadmissible, Jr. A.D.A. is frustrated. He’s now without a smoking gun to prove his case. He and another A.D.A. are scripted to have a discussion about what options are left open to him. His interlocutor mentioned the matter of slavery, which lit a light bulb in his mind, and he races off to discuss it with Shark.

That’s when it became clear what the geo-political plot of this episode was. As the new theme is developed, the Canadian lawyer watched with utter amazement that one of his principal predicaments was getting major airtime – and especially after so many topics had been high profiled by coalition partners in the previous few weeks. He again sensed what had become a new surge of coalition aggressiveness as articulated in Dick Wolf’s ‘Law & Order Criminal Intent’: Linking Serial Torture with the Last Democratic Fiefdom where he identified over fifty topics covered in geo-content:

The danger to Canada’s children and young people because of the trans-generational paradigm of governance, coalition evidence of malfeasance to be used if capitulation isn’t forthcoming, linking the China-Canada alliance with radical Islamist fundamentalism, torture, enslavement, impoverishment, imprisonment, experimentation and twenty years of isolation and deprivation, the diagnosis of paranoid schizophrenia, privacy invasion, noise disruption techniques, linking cider, pumpkins, Herb Capozzi and summary
execution ‘Dogville’ style, linking Canada and Beijing with Nazi Germany, causing existential nihilism, Canadian betrayal and U.S. military and uber-wealthy retaliation, treason, the paradigm of governance (punk capitalism), quantum entitlement, demanding the Canadian’s emancipation, the sub-humanization of Canada’s and Beijing’s elite, witnessing history in the making, the metamorphosis of the Canadian from poverty and peripheralization to the global pinnacle of wealth, corporate success and philanthropic involvement, the ‘elevator incident’, presidential impatience, street soldiers infiltrating the Canadian’s family, lab monkeys and marionettes, fiefdom vilification, the dream girl connection, the superpower strength of the U.S. and the relative military and economic impotence of China, celebrating the death and imprisonment of the malfeasant, the Roxy Nightclub, regime change, the refusal to acknowledge guilt, the anniversary of judicial complicity in authoritarianism and massive domestic corruption, media complicity in depraved indifference murder, the nature of political accountability and the French Revolution.

This kind of ubiquity of signals was last witnessed during the ‘final notice’ phase in August 2006.

Shark: Please tell me you’re kidding. You’re not kidding. [*]


Shark: A judge would laugh a slavery charge out of court.

Jr. A.D.A.: Those workers were systematically brutalized.

Shark: They were still paid for their work. They were free to quit.


Shark: You know, ...might almost be [aggressive Clooney M.] worth doing just to see the look on Elliot Dasher’s face – slavery!

Jr. A.D.A.: Anybody can sell this, you can.

Shark: No. Maybe you can.

Jr. A.D.A.: Me? Why?

Shark: Because you’re the best young lawyer in this office.

Jr. A.D.A.: Really?

Shark Of course not. You’re Hispanic, genius. I look more like Zeik Pruitt than someone who looks someone who understands the
plight of these dead workers. Your colleague would sell their mothers for a shot at this Martin. What’s the problem?

Jr. A.D.A.: It’s no problem. It’s a tricky argument and Dasher’s really good.

The asterisk is where not one, but two red signs with white letters are prominently displayed on the wall of the lobby the two walk into at the beginning of this scene. That was the coalition red flag that made this scene Canada-relevant. Therefore being “systematically brutalized” has now been acknowledged as an integral component of the Canadian lawyer’s enslavement as a human experimentation victim.

Also the issue of being paid for work is raised. The Canadian lawyer was forced into a multi-decade situation of not being paid; prevented from having any form of employment, his entrepreneurial opportunities shredded and even welfare cut off (July 2004). As a result of being turned into a lab monkey and not being paid, he included in his federal lawsuit damages being reimbursed for quantum meruit (receiving a benefit without paying for it) for being an experimentation victim. He calculated the damages based on an hourly rate over the relevant period of time.

504. The Plaintiff has suffered loss, injury and damage as a direct and indirect result of the Defendant’s campaign. The Plaintiff seeks the following relief:

[...]

(a) for pecuniary damages, to wit, quantum meruit, in the amount of $17,080,000 (seventeen million, eighty-two thousand dollars);

The issue of being capable of quitting was also raised. This, as is obvious from the evidence, was not an option for the Canadian lawyer. He was enslaved to the maximum because he couldn’t escape being an experimentation subject. When he moved provinces or residences, it followed him.

And finally there’s the comment “Your colleague would sell their mothers for a shot at this”. It’s reminiscent of the remark made in the October 26th episode (CBS’ ‘Shark’: How Steven Bochco and Spike Lee Mobilized Their Talents to Pummel the Last Democratic Fiefdom): “There isn’t a lawyer in this building who wouldn’t trade places with you in a minute”.

The court hearing to amend the indictment to drop the manslaughter charges and substitute them with slavery continued the means by which coalition issues to high profile the Canadian lawyer’s predicament. This motion and the trial’s witness examination, cross-examination and closing arguments were all used as platforms to thoroughly canvass everything that demonstrates the merits of the Canadian’s case.
Jr. A.D.A.: We intend to prove that the workers employed by the defendant had their free will intentionally and systematically broken.

Defense: This is patently absurd. There were no shackles Your Honor. No armed guards.

Judge: The penal code on slavery doesn’t require physical restraint. [*] The section was passed after World War II Mr. Hiende in response to Japanese internment camps.

Jr. A.D.A.: Yes, with all due respect Your Honor, whatever it was designed for, it’s still on the books.

Judge: Mr. Stark, would you like to be a part of this discussion.

Defense: He can’t make this argument with a straight face.

[...]

Shark: Mr. Hiende speaks for the people.

Judge: Slavery... it’s thin, but it’s interesting.

Shark: The issue’s never been litigated Your Honor. The Court has an opportunity to define a critical area of the law.

Defense: You can’t seriously be considering this motion.

Judge: Actually, I can. The complaint is amended. Manslaughter is out. Slavery is in.

[court adjourns]

Pruitt: This is a vendetta.

There were several instances of choreography and coalition embeds that are worth exploring before getting to the *indicia* of slavery identified in this script excerpt. The first is the fact that judge was attired in a black robe and sticking out at neck level was a shirt that was clearly composed of a red and white print – Canadian punishment colors. That translated into the coalition stating for the diplomatic record it agreed there was sufficient evidence of slavery to warrant an indictment.

In addition to the judge’s unequivocal wardrobe colors, the Jr. A.D.A. was in black & white, black & white – black suit, white shirt, black and white tie. So both principal actors in the scene were aggressive attired in lexiconic colors.
At the first asterisk, the phrase “physical restraint” triggered Shark to execute an aggressive Clooney M., followed by a gallery member executing one too. That signaled the need to explore the issue of how the Canadian lawyer was restrained in a way that differed from garment workers. Like the immigrants working at these low paying jobs, he wasn’t shackled. So, that historical means of keeping slaves demoralized and from bolting or causing trouble wasn’t present over the last twenty years. He was restrained in other ways. To him a modern form of slavery comprises being forced into an activity against one’s will and being deprived of the means to avoid that activity.

The Article 7 regime was surreptitious. He was unaware of it until just before he launched his federal lawsuit in the summer of 2002. One cannot therefore be said to be forced against one’s will. But that doesn’t mean the activity is not being forced on someone in another sense. It’s semantics and an unreasonable twist of logic and reason to say the Canadian lawyer wasn’t being forced to be a lab monkey. The objective fact, aside his subjective perceptions, was he was a human experimentation victim. His external life circumstances were being molded not by his autonomous will and serendipity, but actively and comprehensively socially engineered by covert maneuverings of his circumstances. His internal circumstances were also being manipulated through hypnotic commands that steered him in behavioral direction not of his own volition. So in both senses he had no free will, since his desires were to advance his CGI, law and Internet opportunities. Instead, he was a lab monkey 24/7/365 with no measurable ability to manifest his intentions, interests or goals.

To the latter, since his money supply was secretly being sabotaged completely starting in the late 1980s, his ability to avoid being an Article 7 subject was eliminated completely. He didn’t have the means to escape the country and sustain himself anywhere in the world.

With the slavery indictment argued, it was time to marshal the witnesses to prove the prosecution’s case. That brought the mother and daughter referred to above back into plot development relevance.

A.D.A.: We need you to describe a normal day at Hong’s Fabrics. [*] The jury has to hear it from you. [**]

[...]

Daughter: We usually worked 7 days a week.

A.D.A.: How many hours a day?

Daughter: Depending on when Mr. Hong needed the order: 15 hours – 18 on a rush order.

Shark pulls his A.D.A. out of the conference room to brainstorm with her.
Shark: You’re a lawyer. You want to help these people, act like one. [The mother is] a perfect witness to prove slavery. The daughter still has free will. [***] The mother’s gone.

A.D.A.: It’s sad to see someone like that.

Shark: Let’s hope the jury agrees.

With Hong being Chinese, the name triggers coalition relevance as does two geo-gestures. The first asterisk identifies where the film edits in a clip of the mother already executing a quasi-Clooney M.. The second is a close-up of the geo-gesture. Thus the remark “the jury has to hear it from you” is meant to confirm it was incumbent on the Canadian lawyer to submit his evidence to the diplomatic evidence record in order to justify both his quantum as well as international intervention in Canada’s otherwise sovereign affairs.

The quantum ratifier and China identifier is less like a means of saying the China-Canada alliance was trying to rush the Article 7 regime than it was to raise the point the malfeasant were taking all the time they needed to achieve superior results. Thus enormous quantum is justified because the Beijing government took a full two decades of an innocent person’s life to achieve military objectives.

The third asterisk is where the mother executes an aggressive Clooney M.. Since this is where there’s a differentiation between someone with free will and someone without, it reinforces what was previously discussed about the nature of having the ability to walk away from an otherwise enslaving environment. Again, in the circumstances the Canadian found himself, he had no free will. It had been covertly circumvented.

The last two lines of the excerpt, while not red flagged are certainly apropos. Who wouldn’t feel empathy for the Canadian or anyone else in that situation and measured in periods of time involving not a few months but decades and thus vast chucks of a person’s adult life. And when it comes to the jury, all indications are the relevant triers of fact qua coalition members are unanimous that slavery has been proven not beyond a reasonable doubt, but all doubt.

In the other plot the plagiarism allegation is ruled in his daughter’s favor. As Shark and his vindicated child are discussing the matter there’s a knock at the door. Two A.D.A.s show up to advise him that the mother and daughter have vanished. “No one would hire them, or their family or their friends” when the accused found out they were going to testify. Shark is obviously outraged at this development and states

“You come up with a way to win a slavery trial without producing any slaves, let me know; ‘cause our entire case just headed south of the border”.

While there weren’t any red flags, this last remark evoked a powerful thought in the Canadian. He sought political asylum in February 2004 to evade an aggressive
push to surreptitiously assassinate him after former Prime Minister Paul Martin came to power in December 2003. The consequence of him “head[ing] south of the border” was that slavery and all the other counts on the *Fiefdom* indictment would never be proved because he’d have abandoned prosecuting the federal lawsuit and that would have left all the issues his case involved unresolved. And he would have not conducted the research and exposed domestic corruption and the geo-political threat posed by the China-Canada alliance.

At trial Pruitt took the stand in his defense, arguing he was a respectable businessman, had no knowledge of the working conditions and he’s since severed ties with those with questionable safety records.

The coalition relevant portion of the script came when an expert on slavery gave testimony for the prosecution. Even before she begins a jury member is instructed to execute an aggressive Clooney M. — thus making everything she says applicable to the Canadian’s circumstances.

Jr. A.D.A.:
Mrs. Chambers, you’ve written several books on the working poor.

Expert: That’s correct.

Jr. A.D.A.:
And in your book ‘Trapped’ you likened the working conditions in the clothing factories of Los Angeles to slave labor.

Jr. A.D.A.:
Workers are forced to work up to twenty hours in unsanitary conditions with poor ventilation. They can’t leave the work floor without encountering management, which is often threatening(1) and confrontational. [...] [Those I’ve interviewed and studied] exhibited symptoms of what I call ‘slave psychosis’.

Jr. A.D.A.:
What are those symptoms? (2)

Expert: Limited self-awareness; subservience; absence of free will.

Jr. A.D.A.:
The defendant will argue it’s impossible to be a slave if you’re able to come and go freely.

Expert: In some ways slavery without actual physical restraint is more insidious. It negates any sense of autonomy.

Defense: Are you familiar with California Penal Code 181 Professor?

Expert: Yes, it’s an anti-slavery law.

Defense: Have you ever heard of anyone being prosecuted(3) under this law?
Expert: No.

Defense: Well, you’re not alone there. Did you ever visit Hong Fabrics?

Expert: No.

Defense: Then your knowledge of the working conditions upon which you base your conclusion that workers were enslaved comes solely from the workers themselves. (5)

Expert: Yes, but they all described similar patterns of abuse.

Defense: By all you mean two workers out of the hundreds employed by Pruitt Fashions in southern California; only two came forward.


Defense: Were employees at Hong Fabrics paid for their labor?

Expert: Yes, but hardly...

Defense: ...To your knowledge, were workers bought and sold?

Expert: No.

Defense: In fact, with the exception of earning less than many of us in this room and choosing to work longer hours, these workers were treated very much like the rest of us.

Expert: Their lives are much harder.

Defense: You’re right, but that’s because they’re poor [Jr. A.D.A. Clooney M.] and not because they’re slaves. Poverty, whole unfortunate, is not a crime for which my client can be prosecuted.

Shark’s cross-examination of Pruitt leads to him to acknowledging he made $30 million in salary, his stock price appreciated that year and he became a wealthy man employing cheap labor in sweat shops. “Should I apologize for running a successful company” the accused retorts. A gallery member is choreographed to execute a quasi-Clooney M. to underscore how Canada’s invisibly wealthy were also rich because they enslaved an enormous number of the country’s citizenry. But there’s more to it than that. They were involved with Beijing not just to advance their mutual geo-political interests but both were also seeking to use Article 7 and other Pandora’s Box research to discover and develop ways to even more enslave already chattelized Canadian and Chinese citizens. As stated in Whose National Security? The Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies, Kinsman, Buse and Steedman (Between the Lines, Toronto, 2000):
The ultimate purpose of [the secret mind control experiments in the mid 20th century] [...] remained the same as in all forms of surveillance: the state and its allies sought ever more ways to find out about and to control its citizens.

The script excerpt contained several coalition red flags. The first was using the number ‘twenty’ in the context that factory workers were “forced to work” that long. The same is almost true of the Canadian. The difference is that he was forced to work all twenty-four hours, since one aspect of the Article 7 regime was to explore the sleep state.

The ‘twenty’ is also in close proximity to the issue of the inability to “leave the work floor without encountering management”. As the Canadian’s Fiefdom evidence attests and the U.S. military surveillance of him corroborates, not only could he not “leave the work floor”, there was nowhere he could go in the country without “encountering” the secret army. And her testimony refers to encountering corporate personnel that was “often threatening and confrontational”. (An already in progress quasi-Clooney M. was inserted where the asterisk is placed in the excerpt.) The same can be said of the Canadian’s circumstances. The stalk, swarm, surround and suffocate dynamic was frequently employed after he left his apartment – the work floor – to include death threats, threats of violence and physical intimidation.

’S'\textit{Slave psychosis}’ is tagged by the coalition with a quasi-Clooney M.. The condition is described as involving “limited self-awareness, subservience [and] absence of free will”. Did this form an integral part of the Canadian’s psychological make-up? Unlike low wage earners who have nominal education, the Canadian’s exceptional academic training and broad based knowledge of history, politics, philosophy, sociology, human psychology and law made it impossible for him to have limited self-awareness. Second, once he recognized he had become enslaved, he didn’t cave in to the regime and remain subservient. In fact the opposite occurred. He fought it with every resource at his disposal. He challenged the surreptitious hypnotic commands. He asserted what free will he had that hadn’t been compromised. He commenced a lawsuit in the federal court and tried to commence a second (in the British Columbia provincial court). He aggressively contacted politicians, the Canadian brass, the media, academics and even the church in a bid to challenge the paradigm of governance that had eliminated his physical and cognitive autonomy. And, of course, he diligently proceeded with authoring the Fiefdom treatise.

This is where a clip of the defense table was inserted where there was seated a coalition-identifying three actors: defense counsel, the defendant and co-counsel. Since the context involved asking the question whether the expert had “ever heard of [someone] being prosecuted under [the slavery] law”, using a coalition identifier was meant to signal on the diplomatic level the coalition membership is going to prosecute the malfeasant for slavery violations.
The flag of relevance involved three gallery members executing a coalition-identifying three Clooney M.s. It’s a rare event indeed that a triple geo-gesture is employed. The context certainly was amenable to there being coalition relevance. Defense counsel’s question began with “your knowledge of the working conditions”. U.S. military intelligence has been making electronic and video recordings of what has been going on around the Canadian for the last three and a half to four years. Coalition partners therefore have a plethora of evidence as to the conditions of his surreptitious employment as a lab monkey. Recall again coalition partners affirmatively asserting such evidence has been collected: Stephen Colbert et al.: Confirming the Coalition Has Hard Evidence to Put Away Leaders and Followers of the Last Democratic Fiefdom (October 10, 2006) and David Letterman et al.: Reminding the China-Canada Alliance the Coalition Has Electronic and Videotape Evidence of Its Malfeasance (November 8, 2006).

The next gesture that flagged coalition relevance wasn’t an acknowledged element of the coalition’s lexicon. Editing in a jury member gesturing aggressively to take notes as if choreographed to do so assertively raised the likelihood this was meant to cue significance. Taking notes was the equivalent of the Canadian lawyer’s Fiefdom diary of daily illegalities, tortious conduct and human rights violations and U.S. military intelligence using its resources to focus on his long-term enslavement.

The last flag of importance to coalition interests and objectives was the Jr. A.D.A. executing a Clooney geo-gesture to defense counsel’s remark “because they’re poor”. This was a way to acknowledge that the Canadian was kept poor in order to maintain his state of enslavement.

To again insert Chinese culpability for slavery, Brian Grazer et al. choreographed a scene involving a news correspondent standing outside the courthouse reporting on the trial’s developments. The fact she was wearing a red jacket and white shirt and holding a microphone with a station logo that contained yellow created the color scheme to identify that half of the military alliance. While she was scripted to state “As the jury continues to deliberate...”, the current status of the charges against Canada’s elite and the Beijing government is that the verdict has been rendered.

After Pruitt is found guilty the storyline is scripted to include public reaction. Five A.D.A.s are congregating around an office television watching huge street protests. The guilty verdict causes not Pruitt but the ‘invisible’ top gun at Pruitt Fashions to seek a meeting with Shark. The “Chairman of the Board” and defense counsel show up as the victorious team are watching the backlash. Counsel offers to resolve the sentencing issue in terms most favorable to the client. Shark counters, beginning with calling Pruitt a “sacrificial lamb” and following with his prediction that the victory and bad P.R. will affect the corporation’s stock evaluations. He demands the company plead guilty to slavery and it takes out an apology in every major newspaper in the country. The Jr. A.D.A. adds that the families of the deceased get $1 million each, wages go up 50% within a year and Pruitt gets 18 months in prison. He anticipates “He’ll be out it 6”. Had the numbers been
$900,000, wages up 60%, 24 months in prison and he’ll be out in 9, these numbers wouldn’t have sought to create a **triple quantum** ratifier and a double link to Chinese culpability for liability to slavery in Canada. Corroboration came in the form of the cute A.D.A. being wardrobed in black and white and Jr. in red, white and black – with a touch of blue to create the colors of ‘Americanada’.

Since they won, they’re off to celebrate. Jokingly Shark informs Jr. he has to stay behind and clean up the office. “I gotta clean up the mess all by myself”, he asks. A double entendre was created when Shark walks out with the other A.D.A.s executing an aggressive Clooney M. followed by a quasi-Clooney M.. Combined they signaled the Canadian lawyer’s not going to have to “clean up the mess” created by the country’s two parasite by himself. The process of democratization and molding a free market capitalist system out of a centralized economy will take a lengthy and concerted effort by many parties to the coalition.

Digging deep into the minutia of slavery is reflective of the coalition’s desire to tie up some loose ends in evidence collection. By scripting the topic and inserting coalition relevance flags where they were identified was meant to elicit responses that completed the process of assessing guilt against the malfeasant as much as it was to put Ottawa and Beijing on notice that the coalition intends on securing the Canadian lawyer’s *quantum* for these serious violations of international and Canadian domestic law. As far as he’s concerned, he’s just glad this seemingly infinite road of hell is drawing to a close and a new ‘chapter’ is about to be authored about his life in *The Last Democratic Fiefdom*.

----

‘Shark’: High Profiling the Corruption-Protecting Mobilization of Bar Maids, Bartenders and Bouncers in the Last Democratic Fiefdom

[November 16, ‘06]

As soon as the Canadian lawyer heard the script use the name “Erica” in the November 16, 2006 episode of ‘Shark’, he knew coalition partners were identifying another aspect of the stalk, swarm, surround, suffocate, sabotage, isolation, deprivation, experimentation and torture regime he suffered for twenty years. He knew instantly coalition members were identifying another category of street soldier – all the barmaids, bartenders and bouncers in Canadian nightclubs who not only conduct surveillance, but actively engage in criminal behavior on behalf of the state.

One can sense the meticulous analysis of all aspects of the Canadian federal, provincial and municipal paradigm of governance and the China-Canada alliance by coalition partners. Since the commencement of the ‘final notice’ phase in mid- to late July 2006, coalition members have high profiled dozens upon dozens of topics that have a bearing on these two lynchpins of governance and foreign policy. And it is a testament to just how vile Canada’s become over the generations that by the end of November there were still topics that hadn’t yet been given its due in the diplomatic evidence record.
It was as instantaneous as could be when he heard the name “Erica” during the November 16th episode of ‘Shark’. He knew instantly coalition partners were going to hold Canada’s nightclub, lounge and up-scale restaurant owners, waitresses, bartenders and security staff to full legal account for their active and enthusiastic conspiratorial participation.

Doing so doesn’t just have implications for Canada but is applicable to other countries as well. Since bars, lounges, nightclubs and up-scale restaurants are places where large numbers of people congregate regularly and often, they naturally have become targets for intense surveillance by the state’s security apparatus. From its multi-decade introduction to western culture through its secret alliance with Canada, the Chinese leadership discovered that in free societies, people attend these places not only unaware they are visiting places where the police plant agents and install listening devices but expecting that their use of the venue includes privacy. While there’s nothing sinister when the surveillance and evidence collection is for bona fide purposes and has court approval – organized crime and terrorism for example – it becomes so when ruling elites like in Canada saturate these places to advance their personal, political and economic interests at the expense of the rest of the citizenry. Free markets mean a level playing field. And when those linked to the state and its security apparatus seek advantages through the security network that competitors don’t have or who steal from or sabotage competitors with the collected information, then by definition the country is totalitarian, authoritarian, despotic or communist.

It was revelatory when coalition partner Bono forwarded an observation he had in Africa. During the October 13, 2006 interview on ‘Larry King’ and when he was linked to the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy, he offered the following:

Everywhere you go in Africa, by the way – I was just there a few months ago – you find you know Chinese people in the bars.

Source: Bono: Superstar and World Leading Philanthropist Aggressively Asserts the Anti-Treason, anti-Punk Capitalism Moral Imperative at Beijing and the Last Democratic Fiefdom

It is a modern corporate practice to discuss and complete deals not in the boardroom, but over a drink or dinner. Unsuspecting corporate executives therefore put their company’s and personal interests at risk not aware that in countries with unscrupulous governments and who align themselves with the corrupt, immature and predatory – like what the Beijing leadership has proven to be – discussing acquisitions, expansions, mergers, financing, trade secrets, human resources issues and the like is inviting these unsavory types to gain an unwarranted advantage.

There are several ways to recruit bar, nightclub and restaurant employees. They can become street soldiers outside the workplace and take their covert operations with them when employed. They can be asked by an owner or superior to participate. And fellow employees can recruit them. Therefore evidence the
Chinese are in the bars in Africa means there is active recruitment going on utilizing these methodologies – and employing the perks of money, gifts, vacations, residence upgrades and others to incentivize individuals to join a secret surveillance organization.

Typically the hospitality industry has a built-in bias towards attractive and charismatic people. Waitresses and even coat check women in bars, lounges and restaurants are usually good looking, extroverted and have sex appeal. They therefore are able to break down privacy and security barriers. They can not only cultivate trusting friendships relatively swiftly, but can use their bodies in a state prostitute function to gain access to the inner world of the up-and-comers, the successful and the rich, powerful and affluent. They get invited out to parties, are offered to go on vacations and get gifts just because they’re attractive and bubbly.

The Canadian lawyer had no clue until he began reconstructing his twenty year past for the federal court lawsuit just how much western Canada’s bars, lounges and restaurants were infested with the street soldier community both in Dogville and Dead-monton.

There are a multitude of examples the Canadian lawyer can point to that makes the case. However, one will suffice. Lesa Cipriano, the super-stunning Sicilian-Brazilian that was socially engineered into his life in the late 1990s could have married uber-wealthy and gotten jobs in any manner of industry. But she was recruited early in her life in Dogville and was assigned by street soldier commanders to the downtown nightclub scene simply because her exceptional beauty was an irresistible magnet. Her being a nightclub hostess and the coat check employee made her more accessible than being a waitress who had to be by job description constantly moving. She could be visited and revisited and thus the opportunity to develop an acquaintanceship that could evolve to become something outside work.

Lesa’s introduction and involvement in the Canadian lawyer’s life was fully explored when Stephen Colbert embedded her name in his August 2, 2006 episode: *Stephen Colbert et al.: Social Engineering, Surreptitious Assassination, Eco-Facilities and Confirming World War Between the Coalition and the China Alliance with the Last Democratic Fiefdom.*

Lesa Cipriano was socially engineered into the Canadian lawyer’s life in the late 1990s. He saw it coming, because by the time she was introduced he had caught on to the way street soldiers were socially engineered into his life to wreak havoc, turmoil, pain and suffering. However, the eternal optimist, he entertained her on whatever level she approached him on. First, it was the same way many street soldiers had wiggled their way into his life – legal services. When the so-called relationship matured, she got him to help her with her university studies. This extraordinarily stunning woman presented herself as an ethical, hard working single mom of two who was putting herself through higher education to get out of the rut of being a Dogville nightclub employee. When the relationship bond strengthened even more
over time, she stopped using him as a tutor and recruited him to write all her assignment essays.

Lesa wasn’t just an innocent student of academia. She was maneuvered into his life so the fiefdom elite could extract both schadenfreude and work towards achieving extreme schadenfreude. She was there to add to the plethora of deprivations that were intended to compel him to suicide.

Instead of enjoying a meaningful, progressive and mature relationship, he was totally isolated and denigrated into years of self-sexual satisfaction dreaming about having such an attractive, intellectually striving, hard-working woman for a soul mate.

The manipulations and deprivation he suffered using this woman were as many as they were extreme. He was taunted and tag-teamed repeatedly in multiple situations – all with the objective of making him yearn for a wonderful, caring and lovable companion and feel the pull of suicide for the suffering he was forced to experience.

How many times did she come over to his place to ‘study’ dressed in the most sexy outfits, using suggestively sexual body language and acting like the needy student who’s future depended on him to helping her achieve her scholastic goals? How many times did she court his attention working as the coat-check girl or the nightclub hostess at the Roxy owned nightclub ‘Babalu’s’, only to give him the constant cold shoulder when he was drawn in by her womanly ways? How many times did she invite him over to her home to interact with her young children? How many times did she look past him and aggressively pursue a boyfriend relationship that supposedly included a Dogville police officer and a Vancouver Canucks hockey team member, only to ‘cry on his shoulder’ when they didn’t work out? And who do you think stared at him across the Babalu’s nightclub after the ‘elevator’ perversion manipulation incident, appearing as if she was totally embarrassed knowing him?

Another young woman who was part of this extended family of braindead beauties was Roxy Nightclub senior waitress Erica. Inside the venue she was accessible, keen, warm, polite and bubbly. Running into her or any other fiefdom soldier on the streets of Dogville who was instructed not to engage him gave him short shrift to advance the Article 7 regime of isolation, deprivation and sexual manipulation. Where over the years daily interaction – every day, after day, after day for years in the nightclub – one would reasonably expect that would lead to friendships outside work. However, the zero success rate over some eight years proves just how pervasive and tight knit the street soldier community in Dogville and by implication across Canada is. No waitress, bartender, busboy, coat check employee or manager in any club, bar or restaurant even tried to cultivate a friendship outside work... except Lesa – the most beautiful, charming and sexy of them all by leaps and bounds.
Proof the Chinese Military and Canada’s Security Apparatus Were Collaboratively Stalking Canadians Since the Early 1980s to Advance Chinada’s Nefarious Domestic and Foreign Policies

With that general and personal context in mind, one can then appreciate what referring to ‘Erica’ in the latest episode of ‘Shark’ meant to him.

The plot of the show revolved around a hit and run during a teenage party that had initial indicia of murder.

As with so many coalition shows during the autumn of 2006, within the very first few frames of film there’s a geo-embed. In this episode it was an aggressive Clooney M. of the hit and run victim as she departed the party and was walking on the side of the road. Other indicia of coalition activity was the crime being shot in black and white and the license plate of the offending vehicle began with the digits “A03” – literally translated as “a coalition identifier”.

When the crime was committed Shark was at home getting a massage from a cute girlfriend. He’s on a purple mat on his back and the woman who’s on top of him is attired in black and white. Therefore not even before a minute has expired there’s been a coalition identifier and the lexiconic symbols of punishment certainty and justice.

Shark: Oh-h-h yea. Nice, sort of.
Masseuse: Breathe.
Shark: I’m breathing. This is me breathing. Oh-h-h, ah-h-h.
Masseuse: Focus. Find your center.
Shark: I’d rather find yours.
Masseuse: Are you gonna take this seriously?
Shark: Can I tell you honestly about getting me to do yoga? It’s like getting Satan to meditate.
Masseuse: Ready for down facing dog?
Shark: I’d thought you’d never ask.

Within the context of accentuating the Canadian lawyer’s forced isolation and deprivation from genuine physical contact are references to the evil-worship of Chinada’s ruling elite and the punishment recommendation for that ideological tenet. What immediately follows in the script is a quantum ratifier that is placed in a context of the economic affluence Canada’s malfeasant have and use to advance the vile interests and nefarious objectives of the China-Canada alliance and the
trans-generational elite. To do so links his isolation and deprivation with both the
death penalty and asset seizure.

TV News: A 16-year old girl was leaving a party in this affluent
Brentwood neighbor.

Shark panics because he knows his daughter is at that party and begins to call her
on his cell phone. His executing a double aggressive Clooney M. and a quasi-M.
totaling three) was meant to tie his high anxiety generated for the love of his
daughter and the possibility she could have been the hit and run victim with the
same kind of paternal and maternal agony of coalition members for their children in
light of the danger posed by an aggressively imperialistic authoritarianism. They’ve
seen from the Canadian lawyer’s experiences just how revolting and dangerous
Chinada’s elite have been for two decades and continued to be even when exposed
to the civilized world for what they’ve become – and it’s that anguish that fuels the
massive drive to win the war and its that track record that justifies the death
penalty and sentences that impose life in prison and full asset seizure.

When he gets her voicemail he panics and drives to the crime scene. When an
officer lifts the white sheet full of (red) blood over the deceased’s body the
audience sees the young woman attired in a white shirt and red bra – that’s two
Canada color schemes enveloping a dead body.

Shark’s daughter, Julia, advises him the name of the dead teenager is “Erica”.
That’s when the Canadian lawyer instantly concluded this was a premeditated
moment of coercive diplomacy involving the death penalty for barmaids, bartenders
and others in the hospitality industry who participate in and benefit from the illegal
alliance and vile paradigm of governance.

Shark: I tried your cell phone. [extra in background: Clooney M.]  
   Why wasn’t your cell on?

Julia: My battery was dead [end Clooney M.]. I’m sorry. I’m
   okay. Look, the girl – her name is Erica Hartford.

The mother of the deceased shows up and begins to wail in excruciating pain –
graphically displaying the emotions Chinada leaders are going to experience when
their street soldier children are arrested, prosecuted, sentenced and punished by
the coalition. The scene was meant to convey the sentiment it is imperative they
capitulate to the demands of the international community or face that totally
avoidable prospect.

The corroboration this is exactly what was intended came in the form of Shark and
the two A.D.A.s on scene all executing Clooney M.s at the same time. To make
sure the point is driven home, there are two different camera angles taken of the
gestures so that when all was said and done there was a quantum ratifying five
geo-gestures associated with the pain the tormented mother was experiencing.
During the first office scene, the script was written to ascribe names to all but one of the A.D.A.s. The cute A.D.A. is named “Madeline”. The non-“Jr.” A.D.A. is Martin, the Latino-African American A.D.A. is “Raina”. And Jr. is “Casey”.

Another actor is introduced in this episode and who becomes the D.A. office investigator. His name is “Isaac”. Shark and Isaac have a history. Isaac used to be a police officer but had to retire from the force when their paths crossed during a case where Isaac sought to achieve justice where the system failed. He planted evidence to implicate the real murderer of his partner. They are reunited when Shark needs someone to do the legwork on this murder case because being African-American he can be efficacious in the African-American community where the deceased is from.

Shark’s scene with Isaac embeds a condemnation symbol when during his request for assistance an extra passes behind them in a pink shirt. So when the East-West audience hears his request, “You wouldn’t mind helpin’ me out”, they immediately interpret this as a plea to the coalition from Canada’s only democratic reform principal.

Isaac’s scripted to be employed as a bodyguard by a rich, successful and, for a chuckle, arrogant rap music performer. They’re in a retail outlet when this conversation takes place; and when they walk out of the shop the rapper’s wearing a bright red and white jacket and green hat and his trophy girlfriend’s in pink. Aside the arrogance, the use of these colors was meant to mirror the lifestyle the Canadian lawyer will have after emancipation.

Because Shark’s daughter was at the party she’s a legitimate subject to interrogate. The interview occurs at his home. Madeline’s in a black dress, white necklace and yellow tan jacket to continue the theme that punishment is coming for posing a serious threat to the young people of the United States and other countries targeted by the China-Canada alliance.

After the A.D.A.s leave, a discussion ensues between Shark and Julia.

Julia: [her in red, background white; aggressive quasi-Clooney M.] So some kids at school are saying that the police are focusing on Erica’s friends from Compton.

Shark: I can’t speak for the police, but my team is talking to everyone. I need you to be careful Jules. This is a very emotional case.

[...]

Julia: Why would someone kill Erica?

Shark: [Clooney M. “sniff”] That’s what I’m trying to find out.
The first sentence in this script excerpt confirms that the coalition’s investigation is much broader than just those at the Roxy nightclub and includes all hospitality industry personnel across the country.

Grazer et al. double up on the isolation-deprivation post-emancipation twenty-year make-up theme when they cast a young attractive blond to be interviewed by the cute A.D.A., Madeline. The young party attendee is wardrobed in a fluorescent pink bikini top and interviewed by the gorgeous actress playing this A.D.A. in her parents’ backyard – with pool.

After the Isaac and Raina interview a gang member (attired in black, white and black) who knew the victim the next scene begins with another TV clip; this time of an African-American activist railing against an already perceived injustice in the handling of the case. Only when the scene reveals the TV is in the D.A.’s office and being watched by Shark and the deep silky purple –attired District Attorney (shirt and adorning tie) is a coercive diplomacy theme evident:

Reporter: The reality is that of Erica Hartford were white and she’d been killed outside a party in South Central, the driver of that car would either be in jail or dead at the hands of the LAPD.

D.A.: It’s like he wants a damn riot.

Shark: You know what? It cuts both ways. You know how many e-mails I’ve gotten urging me to nail the black bastards who did this.

D.A.: Think people would have learned something from Rodney King [Stewart M.]

The coalition red flagging of the Rodney King event is another instance of coalition synergy. On November 5, 2006 the Canadian lawyer used that police brutality incident in the breakthrough Fiefdom chapter Investigating the Dream State to Manipulate, Disrupt and Disturb: Pushing the Hypnosis Experimentation Envelop in the Last Democratic Fiefdom. He equated the Article 7 and torture regime equivalent to “being pummeled every morning for years with Rodney King –like cognitive head kicks”. So it’s now standard practice for a coalition partner to reflect his arguments and evidence in coalition content.

A rallying of the coalition troops is behind a twenty reference in the next portion of the script. The scene involved the interrogation of the boyfriend of the first accused: “I guess word got around [about the party] and twenty people showed up”.

The pressure of the impending charges was too much for the accused and she tried to commit suicide. Isaac and an A.D.A. find her unconscious on the floor of her mother’s house and rush her to hospital. This creates an opportunity for the
coalition to again recommend to the malfeasant who believe in the “all or nothing” philosophy of life, namely be a monster or be dead, they can chose to terminate their own lives instead of facing international justice. The scene is the hospital with Shark, a couple A.D.A.s and an attending nurse:

Shark: I want a police officer posted at her door.

Nurse: She’s in no shape to run away. [green attired intern enters]

Raina: What’d she take?

Nurse: Combination of prescription sleeping pills and alcohol.

Shark: She tried to kill herself or not? [pink curtain enters and he executes aggressive Clooney M.]

Nurse: Too many sleeping pills for an accident. Not enough to kill her. [more pink curtain]

Chambers application to assess the competence of the accused to stand trial after her suicide attempt:

Judge: Are you sure you’re ready for trial.

Accused: Yes. [gallery member: aggressive quasi-Clooney M.]

Judge: I’ve read the evaluation of both experts and taking into account the age of this defendant...

Shark: ... What about the age of the victim Your Honor? Do I need to remind the Court of the brutal nature of this crime?

Judge: No.

Shark: Then I’ll confine my remarks to the high profile nature of this case and its potential explosive impact on the community. [clip of defendant’s counsel in red, white and blue] [...] It’s your call judge. But personally, I’d rather not drive home through a war zone tonight.

The geo-gesture is an acknowledgment that the coalition has sufficient evidence to convict everyone associated with the China-Canada alliance and Canada’s corrupt paradigm of governance.

While red, white and blue is not part of the recognized coalition lexicon, its presence can at time be interpreted to be representative of the U.S. component of
the coalition membership. Thus, its embed in this portion of the script would be a “shock and awe” kind of reference and a caution that Canada’s government officials and their colleagues are in a ‘war zone’ at the moment.

Back in the office there’s a portion of the discussion between Shark and his A.D.A.s that has coalition relevance:

Raina: [The judge] denied our motion for a change of venue. Trial stays on the west side.

Shark: [purple tie] Forget the venue. Let’s focus on our theory.

Madeline: [with 2 chopsticks in her hair bun] Which is?


Martin: [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.] We’re gonna have to prove Erica and Ben hooked up that night.

At trial, Grazer et al. copied what Wolf et al. has done several times in ‘Law & Order’ episodes; namely scripted a Chinese person in the jury so that the link between China can be made with coalition content. The first time that is scripted it’s to the word “furious” – meant to identify how the coalition partners think of the Beijing leadership. And who wouldn’t be? American politicians and business leaders hold out their hand of friendship and what do they get in return? Large scale aggressive espionage to steal military and trade secrets, an intentionally maintained unlevel economic, commerce and monetary playing field, the authoritarian-ization of the U.S.’s backyard, tens of billions lost to copyright infringements and now a paradigm shift in the arms race: the new Pandora’s Box.

Raina: In a jealous rage [the accused] ran Erica down [three jurors, then mom and friend in gallery = five] Erica didn’t deserve to die for it. Katherine Crosby ended a life full of potential and promise [ffive jurors and one executes aggressive quasi-Clooney M.]. She needs to pay for that.

The point here is attributing blame to the China-Canada alliance and Canada’s elite for “end[ing] a life full of potential and promise” – the Canadian lawyer’s. The evidence proves his opportunities were extraordinarily enormous and spanned both entrepreneurial and professional avenues. And each malfeasant “needs to pay for that”.

While the trial’s on Shark’s in the office talking to Madeline and his daughter walks in to support her friend, the accused, claiming she shouldn’t be charged with the murder.
Julia: Kat is a really sweet girl [red and yellow emerge in set decoration]. Okay. She’s always gone out of her way to help people. She’s smart. She’s funny.

Shark: And she made a big mistake.

Julia: Just because you say so.

Shark: No, because she had motive and opportunity and all credible evidence points to her. There’s nothing I can do sweetie.

[in walks Martin, knocking three times, making that three actors in view]

Martin: Hey Jules; sorry to interrupt but it’s important. [...] Cops tracked down everyone who charged gas at that service station between midnight and three a.m..

Three coalition identifiers creates a coalition identifier. Thus what is said in this portion of the script has extra important significance. The topics covered: the malfeasant “had motive” (more economy monopolization, more wealth plundering, perpetuate absolute power paradigm of governance, more schadenfreude generation, more hypno-rape and other perversions, more torture, enslavement and other high crimes, protecting the China-Canada alliance) “and opportunity” (Canada’s elite ran the institutions of government, the economy, the police, media and military) “and all credible evidence” (Fiefdom treatise and U.S. intelligence) “points to [Canada’s elite and the Beijing government]”.

What Martin says is another affirmation that U.S. authorities and other coalition partners have completed their investigations for the most part and everyone who should be charged has been, and but for the formalities of prosecution have been found guilty.

During an interrogation of the boyfriend, he’s placed in the shoes of the malfeasant. As he’s saying “this whole thing was all my fault” he executes three quasi-Clooney M.s and a Clooney M.].

During a meeting with the accused’s mom and in which there are a total of five actors in the scene, Shark recommends that the defendant “take the deal” being offered to plead this matter out. The mother is adamant that her daughter “is not going to jail”. Grazer et al. then use this opportunity to tell Canada’s elite that if they don’t take whatever deal the coalition offers them when approached they’ll face the death penalty. Shark is scripted to state “I’m tryin’ to throw you a bone here...”. Mirroring what is already known about the obstinate, arrogant and belligerent, defense counsel states “The mother won’t budge”.
In a park-located chat the D.A. and Shark discuss the case. This time she’s dressed in a silky pink outfit. The topic is Shark being advised that his daughter has submitted her opinion on the case to her school newspaper:

D.A.: She’s made a few comments to her school newspaper. She thinks Kat’s innocent.

Shark: That’s gotta be a mistake. Julia would never do that. Anyways, who cares. Circulation is what two hundred?

D.A.: Try **twenty** million. The editor’s mom runs the local office of the Associated Press.

Shark: The Associated Press picked it up?

D.A.: And ran with it. [new camera angle adds a **third** actor]

The point made here is that the malfeasance is so bad – in the Canadian lawyer’s case spanning two decades – news of it spread amongst all the major United States media outlets. And when they became privy to it all, they “ran with it”; which is another way of saying CBS, NBC, CNBC, CNN and others became aggressive advancing the interests and objectives of the coalition.

The next trial scene embeds coalition red flags, identifying the topics of the malfeasant assisting the coalition by committing suicide and an interesting sidebar – the accuracy of the evidence in the diplomatic evidence record to prove the case against China; with the point being that all allegations in the Fiefdom indictment having been made out without any room for error.

Defense counsel called an accident reconstruction expert to argue the death was an accident. Shark used the expert when he was in private practice; so he knew of an instance where the witness’ testimony, claimed to be accurate, was proved wrong. The previous case involved the crash of a small plane and the allegation of a manufacture error. The reconstructionist used a software program to argue that perception.

Shark: So I imagine it was a bit of a shock when the pilot’s suicide note was discovered [Chinese jurywoman and two jurors close-up = **three**] at the crash site.

Expert: No program is perfect.

Shark: Right. But 99.37% - that is the accuracy that you claimed right.

Expert: Well yes but...
Shark: ...So your plane crash recreation must have snuck into that pesky .63% [gallery member aggressive Clooney M.] error zone. I guess that’s the problem with computer simulation.

[CGI simulation shown of red and white plane plunging to earth and crashing with two green instrument panel gauges]

Sometimes you just crash and burn. [end Clooney M.] No more questions Your Honor.

[close-up of defense counsel in black, white and gold]

The consequence of the Canadian lawyer being 100% accurate in all of his allegations justifies his *quantum*.

When Shark returns to the office triumphant over his cross-examination of the reconstructionist, Madeline’s scripted to use a word that got the Canadian lawyer scrambling for a dictionary. Attired in pink she remarks “Leave it to you to eviscerate an expert witness”. Eviscerate means to ‘disembowel’. Since she’s wearing the color of condemnation, the coalition was describing a medieval way to execute the guilty – fitting for those running a fiefdom.

Madeline executes what the following day was confirmed to be a new geo-gesture: the Dayna M.. She’s in Shark’s basement mock courtroom prepping the boyfriend.

Madeline: Tell the truth. [...] And there’s going to be a lot of questions about sex. Your relationship with Kat and Erica.

Boyfriend: I understand.

Madeline: [Dayna M.]

Since the Canadian lawyer’s sexuality was a target for the human experimentation and torture regimes, the *Fiefdom* treatise had to cover that very personal subject. Given the nature of the crimes committed against him, he’s surrendered his privacy to the coalition knowing its members couldn’t achieve the desired results without full disclosure; like the ‘elevator incident’* which to most would be unbearable to reveal in detail to others.

To demonstrate again how empathetic coalition partners are to his two-decade plight involving isolation and deprivation, Grazer *et al.* script a scene between Shark and his daughter which both pushes the plot forward and geo-politicizes this area of concern. The script highlights the issue of eternal love and exciting sexual conduct.
Shark: You ever make a CD; burn a bunch of stuff off ITunes: “you’re the love of my life”, “never forget me”, all that kind of thing? [quasi-Clooney M.]

Julia: [purple dress] No, I just e-mail him nude pictures of myself. It takes less time.

Shark: [flustered] Yea, but if you were to make him a CD, would you remember the songs you chose, say six months later?

Julia: Yes of course. I’d remember them forever. [double quasi-Clooney M.]

To articulate just how unsocial, unsexed and unloved the Canadian lawyer has been for the last two decades because of his enslavement in the human experimentation regime, Grazer et al. script a scene about the boyfriend being taken on a drive by Isaac and Raina to shake his credibility over his assertion he and Erica were intimate. They drive him to a location they say is where she lived and to which he agrees. Thus, when she says in a phone call to Shark “We’re twenty blocks from Erica’s house; Ben’s never been here in his life”, it became a platform to argue that those commanding street soldiers like Erica intended that the Canadian never have a genuine, autonomous love life.

The issue of Julia writing her opinion in the school newspaper was resolved in the following manner. She was scripted to show up at her dad’s office to offer her apology. This scene became a platform to acknowledge the Canadian lawyer’s Fiefdom workload is heavy, that the relationship between him and his coalition partners will be “lasting”.

The scene begins with a slow pan of Madeline from knees to head in that now coalition trademark way of choreographing post-emancipation sexuality.

Shark: [upon Julia’s arrival] Everything okay? [slow pan of Madeline]

Julia: I just need a second.

Madeline: I’ll go pull the crime scene photos. [“pull” meant sexually]

Julia: I know you’re swamped [aggressive Mary M.]

[she apologizes for the school newspaper report]

The first time I fell in love.

Shark: O-o-o, do I really want to hear about this?
Julia: Paul Denarg, seventh grad; we went out for a month; spoke maybe three times.

Shark: Sounds like a recipe for a lasting relationship.

Julia: [laughs; quasi-Mary M.] Well, we used to pour our hearts out in these long notes. [...] I kept every single one of them.

The final scene embeds more coalition red flags. The first is a vindication theme where coalition members acknowledge that when the ‘Iron Fist’ arrives the Canadian lawyer and coalition partners will be able to say to the death row inmates, lifers and the asset-less “I told you so”. The second is an admission on the part of his extended family they’re not comfortable being involved in the most private parts of his life – something everyone knows is unavoidable in the circumstances if justice is going to prevail and the coalition’s interests and objectives are going to be advanced. They also indicate that for having his entire life exposed he will be completely compensated; and further, in the future his private life will be kept private. The episode ends with an affirmation of the deep affection coalition members have for him.

The scene begins with Shark pulling bottles of wine out of a drawer as he talks to his daughter. When he pulls out bottle number three he states:

Shark: I kinda figured you’d be saying ‘I told you so’ right about now. You knew Kat was innocent.

Julia: You think I’m that childish?

Shark: ['what do you think’ body language]

Julia: I told you so.

Shark: And I should have listened.

Julia: Eventually you’ll learn I’m always right – took mom a while too.

Shark: Jules, [taps fingers three times on bottle] you know there are certain subjects I’m not exactly comfortable discussing with you.

Julia: You mean like sex and drugs?

Shark: [five fingers extended hand up] Excellent examples; and when they come up now I always say ‘I just don’t wanna know’.

Shark: I wanna know.

[scene ends with song and lyric “Is this love?” repeated three times]

‘Shark’: Eight Gun Shots Heard ‘Round the World  [November 23, ‘06]

The November 23, 2006 episode of ‘Shark’ continued the now three month unbroken pattern of the coalition partners’ evening television dramas opening with coalition content. This time was not only coercive, it was undeniably aggressively coercive: eight gunshots – shots heard from Ottawa to Beijing.

Reminiscent of Provocation Week* just a week earlier, CBS’ ‘Shark’ began its November 23rd episode with the execution-style murder of an Assistant District Attorney and his mistress in which the murder-for-hire killer pumped a China-identifying eight bullets into the victims’ car. Only a partial visual of the license plate of the murderer’s car was scripted, but that was all that was needed to confirm who was taking full responsibility for this threat of capital punishment. “3”.

* “Provocation Week” was the seven day period before the November 2006 APEC Summit in which coalition partners employed so much geo-activity that it provoked Canada’s elite into ratcheting up the hypno-torture, threats and harassment – the purpose being to provide fresh evidence for world leaders to view Canada as it is, not as its façade represents. That proof was thereafter used to recruit more coalition partner governments

That wasn’t all in the opening scene that was embedded to identify the coalition was making another profound statement of intent. The license plate of the victims’ car – “20 CE 265” – the twenty reference, plus “C” for coalition; plus 2+6 to create a China identifier; plus “5” to create a quantum ratifier.

Just before Shark gets the call about the double homicide he’s shopping with his daughter.

Julia: Dad, I don’t need a $2,000 dress.

Shark: Well, $1,700. And ‘need’ is a relative term.

[phone rings]

Shark: Hold on.

Julia: [aggressive quasi-Clooney M. and a Newman M.]
Shark: Gotta go.

[...] [Office scene]

Madeline: [The deceased A.D.A. and I] worked a spousal abuse case together.

Isaac: Was he a straight-up guy?

Madeline: Yea, he’s kinda quiet, but he worked his butt off [double quasi-Clooney M.]

[...]

Raina: The female victim was Allison Adams, 26. Single, moved to L.A. five years ago from Omaha.

In these two scenes following the shooting the script embeds more coalition content. The first one is a China-identifier and is linked to the issue of shopping – something the Canadian lawyer’s never done since being evicted from the practice of law in January 1993.

Sticking a coalition-identifying three geo-gestures between “hold on” and “gotta go” certainly sends mixed signals on one level but is clear on another. The Canadian lawyer’s got to hang on for a little while longer while coalition partners make arrangements to get rid of the elite.

In the office scene there are more red flags. When combined the coalition sends the message that because the Canadian lawyer’s worked so hard, especially in 2006 to address Chinese joint hegemony his quantum is assured.

At the home of the widow of the slain A.D.A. a Kidmanesque theme is inserted.

Madeline: How’s your son?

Widow: Everyone’s been really kind. [sits down beside toy dog that’s white with black spots – punishment certainty] My mom took him in just so I can make the [funeral] arrangements.

Raina: We’re gonna find the person who did this. [dog again]

Widow: I assume you want to know where I was last night. I’m a prosecutor’s wife. I know the drill [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.].

In addition to the Grazer et al. acknowledging on the Canadian lawyer’s behalf how extraordinarily special coalition partners have been during the last three and a half
years, it’s stated for the record they’re going to track down every person responsible for all that is contained in the *Fiefdom* indictment and by now the malfeasant know what the process is going to be: a military intervention, rounding up all those on the surveillance tapes wherever they reside across Canada, conducting trials and assessing punishment.

Grazer *et al.* decided to insert a scene from Russell Crowe’s movie ‘A Beautiful Mind’. The widow took the A.D.A.s out to the garage where the walls were filled with the same notes and connect the dot dynamics that was central to that film. This was used to describe the intricate case the deceased was working on before his death.

The woman the A.D.A. was with when killed was identified as a high-class prostitute. So as part of the investigation Raina and Isaac tracked down one of her friends. As they walked into a lounge to interrogate her, the music in the background sounded like a coalition plant - paraphrasing Shania’s hit song: “I’m gonna getcha if it’s the last thing I do”.

The Mayor held a press conference to announce everything was going to be done to bring the killer to justice.

The city is outraged. [cop walks in front and embellishes a gesture] by the brutal slaying of Deputy District Attorney Gorman [close-up of Mayor in punishment certainty and quantum colors]. Every law enforcement agency is working to apprehend its killers [close up of D.A. in red] and we extend our deepest condolences to his wife [from her red to his yellow].

Shark, Mayor and D.A. have a stairwell conversation. As they enter the East-West audience observe that Grazer *et al.* painted an electrical box red so it stands out from the white wall; the door is black and by introducing Canadian punishment certainty colors makes the conversation geo-politically relevant.

Mayor: So what’s the bottom line?

Shark: [double aggressive quasi-Clooney M.] Gorman was willing to sell his soul for a transfer over to narcotics.

The translation here is easy and profound; for it acknowledges that Canada’s elite were willing to ‘sell their collective and individual souls’ to repeatedly experience what modern civilization has banned. Torture for pleasure sake; sexual atrocities for pleasure sake; wealth plundering on a massive scale for pleasure’s; and enslavement for pleasure sake. And in return they’re going to be sent straight to Hades as soon as the leaders of the coalition decide enough time has lapsed to let diplomacy work.

The following is the dialogue during a brainstorming session in the office.
Raina: Freddie Hopper found out that his some-time girlfriend Allison Adams was feeding information about his drug operation to Dean Gorman. [Isaac: quasi-Erin M.]. He killed em both.

Madeline: Cell phone [Isaac: neck gesture] records link both men to Allison on the day of the murder.

Shark: What about Freddie’s gun?

Isaac: Ballistics say slugs from the scene are a solid match.

Shark: Anything off Gormans’ [beautiful mind] crime board?

Casey: He tracked Freddie’s movements in elaborate detail but there’s several gaps in the days that he...

Shark: Okay, we’re almost home. Isaac, help Casey track every lead off that board. [Madeline gestures] See if your pals at LAPD narcotics can help. You three. Freddie Hopper’s a cowboy. [Madeline gestures again] He must have shot his mouth off all over town. Start with Monica’s girls [the Madam]. Find me a witness [Stewart M.].

The Erin M. is timed to the issue of “feeding information”, which has been happening for years now. Canada’s secret security apparatus is full of leaks. There are a multitude of situations where the Canadian lawyer’s seen evidence of his conduct that could only have been received and acted upon because some Canadian or Chinese joint hegemony protecting asset has forwarded it to U.S. intelligence. The issue of how U.S. authorities have come into possession of useful information was in Aaron Sorkin’s second episode of the season: Uber-Genius Aaron Sorkin: Proving that NBC’s Going to Dedicate Another Hit Television Drama to Deconstructing the Last Democratic Fiefdom.

Chairman: [...] Disgruntled ex-boyfriend, a co-worker. They don’t have to be disgruntled. The cop; a book; somebody else recognizes your picture. [...] You’ll be amazed what five hundred bucks can buy. So now you know. Thieves get rich, saints get shot and God don’t answer prayers a lot.

[...]

U.S. military intelligence departments are some of the most heavily funded agencies in the federal government. The CIA, Pentagon and affiliated organizations have hundreds of billions of dollars at their discretionary disposal each year to conduct clandestine intelligence operations in every country. The more significant to U.S. national and economic security, the more resources are poured into that country to
keep tabs on the who, what, when, where and why of politics, the economy, the military and other institutions. It is critical to continued U.S. superiority that information be gathered, assessed and communicated up the bureaucracy hierarchy.

[...]

Aaron delves into the mechanisms of intelligence gathering. How is it acquired he rhetorically asks his audience in the East-West Corridor. The means and methods he refers to in the script are the tip of the iceberg of intelligence methodologies. He refers to the standard, common and widely employed means of gathering intelligence; ones used even in regular police investigative work. Beyond usual sources and paying small amounts of money to buy information, he expressly refers to “a book” – interpreted as the writings of dissidents, investigative reporters and others critically vocal of ruling elites, their financial backers, the military, courts and police. The *Fiefdom* treatise is likely what Aaron had in mind in this instance.

For obvious reasons, he isn’t going to describe more involved intelligence gathering methodologies; like the technologies and techniques of the U.S. military surveillance, evidence collection and communication system – which has been exceptionally vital to being real time informed of Dogville dynamics.

So to Canada’s malfeasant who wonder how the coalition has known so much every day for the last three and half years, Aaron ends the topic by scripting the remark “Now you know”.

During another interview of a prostitute, this time in a hotel room, Madeline’s choreographed in a way that is immediately recognizable as a gesture Shania’s photographed doing in one of the pictures the Canadian’s got in his library of photos on his computer. When the interview is over she states:

Madeline: Seems like a shame to waste a perfectly good hotel room.

Casey: In the middle of the case?

Madeline: [groans loudly as her hand is filmed tightening her grip on the bedcover]

This was more confirmation of the electron microscope surveillance of the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy and reflecting that fact back at Canada’s security apparatus.

Grazer *et al.* script a photograph of the deceased A.D.A.. The Canadian lawyer noticed that the *eight* numbers on the picture added up to a *quantum* ratifying 16: “04172002”. That put the Canadian in the same category of affection, protection
and revenge sentiment as what was felt for the A.D.A. in his department by his boss and his colleagues.

That same emotion was put into words when the Madam was finally identified as the one who ordered the hit. A replay of the opening scene’s shooting followed. Only this time there were five shots instead of eight.

After a Chambers application to dismiss Shark from prosecuting the Madam for murder because his name was in her database, he and the D.A. run into the Mayor in the hallway.

Mayor: Hell of a mess [black, white and violet tie].

D.A.: Tell me about it.

Mayor: Gotten over thirty calls from prominent members of the community screaming about being named clients of [the Madam] Monica Tanner.

This situation is directly parallel to has happened and to this day is happening in Canada and became a rich source of intelligence for the coalition. During 2006 as the diplomacy commenced, then when it became coercive, and then during the ‘final notice’ phase, then after August 31st and then during Provocation Week – and all the time in between – U.S. intelligence was listening in on all the phone calls amongst the so-called “prominent members of the [Canadian] community” to collect evidence. Since they felt invincible, insulated and immune – the Triple “I” of idiocy – they didn’t hold back what they were saying to each other. They conveyed their anger, communicated their frustrations or howled with laughter at being untouchable.

The following is Shark’s opening statement at the trial:

Our legal system defines [black & white necklace on defense counsel] certain crimes as so vicious an amoral they belong in a separate category called ‘special circumstances’. [...] Now there is a powerful and compelling reason why murder for hire is punishable by death. [defense counsel’s black & white again].

[...]

By ordering the killing of Ms. Adams [defense counsel again] Miss Tanner took it upon herself to put a dollar value on a human life. Monica Tanner murdered for profit and it is your job to make sure she pays for it. [Judge: quasi-Clooney M.]

Defense counsel counters:
D.A. Gorman was investigating Mr. Hopper. [moves aside to reveal big breasted juror with red shirt and white name tag; five actors in view]. [...] We will show [moves aside again revealing juror again] ...

In these two excerpts from the opening statements to the jury Grazer et al. accomplish two things to advance the interests and objectives of the coalition. First, they embed the principle of culpability that the Fiefdom treatise argues attaches to those who seek absolute political and economic power that causes pain, injury, suffering and loss of life. This is in coalition partners’ minds equivalent to ‘special circumstances’. What they did is so vicious and amoral, the most severe punishment is warranted: the death penalty. They put a dollar value on the human lives they chattelized and marginalized: zero. And as the coalition states through Grazer et al. it is the international community’s job to “make sure [each one of them] pays for it”. With the use of coalition colors, more coalition partners are signaling they’re in favor of capital punishment in these circumstances.

The next coalition embed relates to the Canadian lawyer’s decades of isolation and deprivation. Producers carry on the tradition started by Wolf et al. by scripting the issue of love, romance, intimacy, relationships and sexuality using coalition language – not once, but twice – and adding a quantum ratifier to confirm that once cashed up he won’t have any trouble finding quality companionship.

During a parade of witnesses where a question or two were asked and answered before the next one was edited in, one question was “Did Monica Tanner ever threaten you?”. The black and white attired prostitute replied

She threatened everybody. You don’t want to cross Monica. She would definitely make you pay.

The parallel is easy to draw in Canada. Those who were either in competition or were perceived to be in competition or a threat to the ruling elite were threatened repeatedly. It’s part of the “climate of fear” generated to keep the rich and powerful in control.

To prep for trial, Shark, Raina and Madeline go to the city jail to see the shooter – who’s agreed to a plea bargain. However, before they get there he was murdered. The guard who tells them this happened remarks “What can I tell you. Jail’s a dangerous place” – to which Madeline executes an aggressive Clooney M. That was meant to send a signal to the malfeasant who think they’re Triple “I”, when they are imprisoned they will faced all the nastiness that federal prison entails.

A red, white and blue combination on the Chambers judge was an interesting sight in the context in which it appeared. Knowing his star witness is dead, Shark still tries to get the Madam to plead out her murder charge. His bluff fails.

Judge: Let me get this straight. You attempted to elicit a plea from the defendant based on the testimony of a witness you knew to be [red, white and blue] dead?
Shark lies to the judge, telling him he didn’t know. The judge responded that if he finds out he was being deceived, because there are cameras and log-in books at the prison, he’ll have him disbarred. When confronted with the possibility he may be found out, Shark confesses he got prison officials to alter the tapes and change the visitors’ log – arguing that when the murder of an A.D.A. is involved, everyone in the system works for justice. The parallel in terms of the international community rallying together was strong here and affirmed that the U.S. and other coalition nations are doing everything they can to make sure the malfeasant are brought to justice even if there are going to be a few minor corner-cutting dynamics involved.

During an office-brainstorming scene the deceased’s ‘beautiful mind’ evidence board is featured again. Martin examined is and says:

Martin: Everything’s here but Freddie, except for certain critical omissions.

Casey: Maybe he was just a lousy lawyer.

Martin: No way. The gaps are surgical, like he intentionally took out the important parts.

Madeline: [quasi-Clooney M.; and wearing punishment certainty colors]

After the defendant was pressured into taking a new deal, the D.A. came to see Shark for a job well done. To get his attention when she arrives at his door she knocks a coalition-identifying three times. Shark then taps sheets of paper on his desk two times to create a quantum ratifier. That’s followed by the D.A. being choreographed to thump her thumb on the side of the wall on which she’s leaning three times.

D.A.: Spoke to [the widow]. She wanted [thumb taps] me to say ‘thanks’.

The scene with the D.A. and Shark ends with her thanking him for protecting the District Attorney’s Office and defending the system from those who would seek to undermine it. The parallel with what the Canadian lawyer’s doing both domestically and geo-politically is present here. He’s done his part not only to save Canada’s administration of justice – for it was, as an independent organ of accountability, gone generations ago – but also to help begin the process of turning it into what it is supposed to be. Same can be said for international justice. Arguably, the United Nations has, inter alia, failed to live up to its historical and contemporary mandate of enforcing international human rights codes. Back in 2002 when the Canadian lawyer sent a formal complaint to Geneva nothing became of it – thus proving the normative provisions in for instance Article 7 and those relating to slavery and torture weren’t worth the paper they were written on. That’s now changed too – and dramatically.
The final scene was meant to be a huge coalition zone. The colors used to light the garage where Shark and the Mayor have their revealing discussion, camera angles used and clever editing produced several powerful coalition moments and East-West Corridor messages.

The principal color used was the one representing quantum. And there is a bit of bright yellow gold – Presidential quantum – to incorporate both colors of the Canadian lawyer’s massive wealth. As the scene begins all the walls of the underground garage are lit up with bright green. That is supplemented with the cement pillars that are white and there’s a red horizontal strip to create the Canadian prison colors combination.

Mayor: I owe you one.

Shark: That’s an understatement.

[squeal of tires in the background]

Mayor: I never thought this would come back and bite you in the ass.

Shark: I was your lawyer. You had a problem. I took care of it.

[...]

Mayor: I won’t forget this. You took a bullet for me.

Shark: Well, next time I’m gonna duck.

Worthy of mention is the color combination at the Mayor’s “I owe you one” remark. Behind Shark is half green, two stripes of bright yellow gold and a red horizontal strip.

Next is the squeal of tires – indicative of both the honks and sirens used by Dogville torture technicians to saturate the Canadian lawyer’s residence in a ubiquity of stupidity and the occasional use of vehicles squealing tires and motorcycles crossing the Burrard Street Bridge.

Shark’s “I was your lawyer” response, imbued with green and yellow gold, is a coalition-identifying three-part reply. And the same can be said of the Canadian lawyer. Arguably, he was a lawyer not for clients per se, but for Canada’s system of justice, the country’s entire legal profession, Parliament, all provincial Legislatures, all municipal councils and thirty-some million Canadian citizens.

In that context it is understandable why he proceeded with full appreciation of his rule, duties and obligations as an advocate. As the Canadian Bar Association’s Code of Profession Conduct says in Chapter IX: “When acting as an advocate, the
lawyer must ... represent the client resolutely, honorably and within the limits of the law”. And in particular it states:

The advocate’s duty to the client [is to] “fearlessly ... raise every issue, advance every argument, and ask every question, however distasteful which he thinks will help his client’s case” and to endeavor “to obtain for his client the benefit of any and every remedy and defense which is authorized by law” [and the duty] must always be discharged by fair and honorable means, without illegality and in a manner consistent with the lawyer's duty to treat the court with candor, fairness, courtesy and respect. […]

The lawyer must not, for example:

(e) knowingly attempt to deceive or participate in the deception of a tribunal or influence the course of justice by offering false evidence, misstating facts or law, ... suppressing what ought to be disclosed or otherwise assisting in any fraud, crime or illegal conduct;

(f) knowingly misstate the contents of a document, the testimony of a witness, the substance of an argument or the provisions of a statute or like authority;

(g) knowingly assert something for which there is no reasonable basis in evidence, or the admissibility of which must first be established;

[and]

(h) deliberately refrain from informing the tribunal of any pertinent adverse authority that the lawyer considers to be directly in point and that has not been mentioned by an opponent;.

[...]

When opposing interests are not represented, for example in ex parte or uncontested matters, or in other situations where the full proof and argument inherent in the adversary system cannot be obtained, the lawyer must take particular care to be accurate, candid and comprehensive in presenting the client’s case so as to ensure that the court is not misled.

[...]

The principles of this Rule apply generally to the lawyer as advocate and therefore extend not only to court proceedings but also to appearances and proceedings before boards, administrative tribunals and other bodies, regardless of their function or the informality of their procedures.

Chapter XIII says: “The lawyer should ... try to improve the administration of justice”: and in particular it states:

The lawyer, by training, opportunity and experience is in a position to observe the workings and discover the strengths and weaknesses of laws, legal institutions and public authorities. The lawyer should, therefore, lead in
seeking improvements in the legal system, but any criticisms and proposals should be *bona fide* and reasoned.

The traditional barrister’s oath includes the remark “…to protect and defend the right and interests of such of your fellow-citizens as may employ you...”. Additionally the rule states in a footnote: “The lawyer is more than a mere citizen...”. “[L]awyers, because of *what* they are as opposed to *who* they are ... are required to assume responsibilities of citizenship well beyond [the basic requirements of good citizenship].

And in Chapter XV: “The lawyer should assist in maintaining the integrity of the profession”.

When the Mayor states he won’t forget Shark taking a bullet for him, the background is two parts yellow and one part green. And when Shark jokes he’s going to duck next time, the background is all green – both signaling that being in the position the Canadian lawyer was put in is one which attracts major compensation.

The situation Shark had to keep quiet involved why his name appeared in the prostitute Madam’s book of clients. He took a hit publicly, in the office and at home to protect the fact that it was the Mayor who was involved with the prostitution ring and which if exposed would have ruined his professional career in politics.

The episode began with **eight** gun shots – ringing around the world diplomatically. The incorrigibility of Canada’s elite and Beijing has led to the perception that under no circumstances will they give up their illegally gotten gains and it will require preemptive military action to set them on their heels. Then in a one-two punch, the ‘Iron Fist’ of accountability will enter their world; and after that they’ll never recover to threaten the U.S. or the world again.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

‘Shark’: High Profiling Canada’s Rich and Powerful Intermingling with Thugs, Punks, Drug Dealers and Other Miscreants to Advance the Interests of Trans-Generational Corruption and the China-Canada Alliance

[December 7, ’06]

The last episode of CBS’ ‘Shark’ before the Christmas holidays (December 7, 2006) raised to prominence an issue that previously hadn’t been identified as relevant by coalition partners; but nonetheless was a critically important strength and arguably a fatal weakness within the China-Canada alliance: a heavy reliance on recruiting miscreants for the army of street soldiers.

While Canada’s elite thought it could assemble and manage millions of the country’s incorrigible petty criminals in their street soldier community, doing so becomes one of their Achilles Heels, since these thugs, punks and drug dealers are loyal only to
those who give them money. Political ideology and dreams of achieving global hegemony are furthest from their intellectually challenged minds.

Grazer et al. brilliantly highlighted this weakest link situation. They don’t cost much and are easy to organize, train and instruct.

The ‘Shark’ episode begins in a drug-den. As with other coalition-inspired evening dramas, a lexiconic embed is included in the opening scene. Grazer et al. chose a justice-colored filter to film the scene where the resident is shot to death. “Come on baby, we can work this out” begs the victim before being killed. To the Canadian lawyer, this is the kind of plea one might hear come from the mouths of the malfeasant as they become aware that their lives are about to change forever or even end. However, as much as they might plead for their lives, they’ll have to remember at that moment when their freedom ends or their mortality greets them, they had more than ample opportunity from 2003 to 2006 to negotiate a settlement; and instead they chose to be arrogantly belligerent, aggressively petulant and disgustingly insolent.

The killer inexplicably hangs around and confesses to police she shot the victim and was having an affair with him.

Martin: So she came here to break it off?
Shark: [double handed quasi-Clooney M.]

[...]

Martin: Why does a rich beautiful woman like Sarah Metcalf step out on one of the wealthiest men in Los Angeles for Larry the Lowlife.
Shark: Because (a) they’re beautiful people that aren’t near as perfect as they look and (b) after a thousand of those rubber chicken lunches at the Beverly Wilshire, Larry the Lowlife look pretty good.

In addition to affirming that Canada’s going to be forced to “break if off” with China, the point being made here is there’s a quirk amongst some successful, wealthy and powerful people. They become so bored in their lives of comfort, leisure and luxury that they get a thrill associating with down-and-outers. Doing so reestablishes perceptions of advantage and power. And in some instances they are looking for that aspect of civil society that isn’t superficial and devoid of challenge.

In the next scene, (a condemnation-justice attired) Shark is having breakfast with (a double black & white and red scarf attired) Martin. Raina is checking newspaper headlines about the murder.
Waitress: Morning papers anyone?

Martin: “Society Sweetheart Guns down Sleazy Romeo”.

[five actors in scene]

Shark: Ha, ha. Charming. How about ‘The Times’?

[car honk]


Shark: Oh, they buried it. Nice to have the publisher on speed dial. So who’s our sleaze-ball on the floor of the crack house?

[visual of magazine: “Spotlight (white) Queen (yellow & red)”]

Martin: Jeremy Clinton’s been in L.A. for a year. Frenchman. Three-year stretch in McNeil Island for robbing three 7-11s in one night. Well, he’s not exactly a sympathetic victim is he?

The first instance of coercive diplomacy is embedded in this breakfast-on-the-patio scene. Grazer et al. follow Aaron Sorkin’s September 2006 strategy of choreographing principals and extras to create triple coalition dynamics – in this case a quantum ratifier timed to the headline “…Guns down Sleazy Romeo”. Translation: Canada’s most seriously culpable get executed and the Canadian lawyer gets their wealth; which is a fitting resolution since the guilty sought his death and to deprive him of revenue generating opportunities over a twenty year period and would have continued the despicable practice in perpetuity but for the intervention of the coalition. It has an element of the ancient principles of justice: ‘an eye for an eye’ and ‘do unto others’.

Just like Wolf et al. in ‘Law & Order’ scripts, Grazer embeds car honks to acknowledge the noise torture – thought manipulation – privacy invasion technique used incessantly by Dogville torture technicians almost every day going back to November 1994. It’s scripted just before and to create the second instance of coercive diplomacy – timed to the second headline that includes the phrase “shooting death” and to Shark’s remarks “they buried it” and malfeasant description “sleaze-ball”. Additionally, the page the story’s scripted to be on is an acronym identifying the Canadian lawyer by his first name and linking it with the number in western culture that represents good luck: “B-7”.

When Shark and the District Attorney discuss the case the former is persuaded to keep an open mind about the guilt of the shooter, even though she provided a full confession, because the latter admits to having a personal relationship with her.
D.A.: And if she did kill this guy, you can bet it was self-defense.

Shark: Well how can you be so sure of that?

D.A.: ‘Cause I know Sarah.

[...]

Shark: I promise to give your friend a fair shake.

And the same can be said for how coalition partners approached the guilt and innocence of Canada’s rich and politically powerful. That didn’t happen; and when they’re held to account they’ll have only themselves to blame for not taking the opportunity.

During the next scene, in the office with his A.D.A.s and his investigator, there is a geo-gesture timed to a China identifier in the context of the building of a billion dollar empire – the Canadian lawyer’s.

Shark: We need to find a way to knock the halo off Sarah Metcalf.


Shark: Yada, yada, yada. She’s a saint. And she just happened to kill a guy.

[ballistic report comes in]

Isaac: Slugs came out of Jeremy Clinton came from two different guns.

Martin: Oh, perfect.

Shark: You get your piece on you?

Isaac: Yep.

Shark: Why don’t you step over here and blow my brains out.

Martin: [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.] We should ask for a continuance to regroup.
Shark: No way. The prelim’s tomorrow. Look, Cook’s under the gun [Isaac: aggressive quasi-Clooney M.] to show a self-defense theory, right? So let’s just keep the heat on.

Another diplomatically coercive moment is scripted when it is revealed that a 38 caliber gun was used. In other shows, like ‘Law & Order’, of many different makes and models of hand guns on the market, script writers choosing the .38 is intended to be coercive.

Part One of the trial proves to be interesting for coalition purposes. When defense counsel calls an expert witness, Martin whispers to Shark

Is that Russell-Barry-Harvard-professor-[who-hasn’t-lost]-a-murder-trial-in-the-last twenty- years Russell Barry?

Shark replies, “in a nutshell, this isn’t good”. The juxtaposition of the word “murder” and the number representing the Fiefdom indictment creates another instance of coercive diplomacy.

Defense: Dr. Barry, have you reviewed the M.E. report and what have you concluded?

Barry: I found the report to be quite competently prepared.

Shark: [aggressive protracted quasi-Clooney M.] Here it comes...

The purpose of transcribing this portion of the trial is that Grazer et al. complimented the Canadian lawyer’s ‘report’, namely the Fiefdom treatise, without which it would be next to impossible for the international community to prosecute Canada’s leaders, financiers and followers. With a comprehensive and competently prepared documentation of these crimes encompassing a twenty-year period, it was relatively easy to convince coalition partners who have to make life and death decisions about the fate of the guilty that punishment is justified and necessary.

In part one of the trial, the judge dismisses the murder charge after hearing the expert’s testimony that the gun that killed the victim wasn’t the one found on the defendant.

A plot twist is scripted in relating to the accused’s past. Private investigative work reveals a link between the deceased and the accused going back many years. Shark then takes this damaging evidence to his superior who is shocked to learn that the Sarah Metcalf she’s come to adore and admire has skeletons in her closet. At first the D.A. can’t believe what she’s hearing, but soon comes around to the realization she’s been duped by her so-called friend.

D.A.: I get it. Julian Cook made you look like an idiot in open court and now you’ve lost your mind.
Shark: So I suppose this is just a hallucination: [file states] Angela Weston; reported missing; age 17; Tacoma Washington 1989. Sarah Metcalf doesn’t exist. Angela Weston made her up when she got to L.A. [...] There’s Angela’s record. Three arrests for drug possession. Three for prostitution. [Newman M.] Unfortunately for Angela, her past caught up to her.

D.A.: How is this possible?

Shark: People come to L.A. to change their lives.

[...]

D.A.: So what’s your theory [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.]? [...] I just can’t believe this [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.].

Shark: I’m really sorry Jess. People aren’t always what they seem.

D.A.: Just doesn’t make any sense. I don’t care who she used to be. Sarah Metcalf is one of the best people I know.

Shark: And maybe she’s also a murderer.

Much to the Canadian lawyer’s surprise and what immediately generated immeasurable gratitude, Grazer et al. embed not one but two people from his tortured past that deserve demonization. The China identifier and two coalition identifiers were added to make this connection.

The first is the judge who presided over the solicitor fraud case: Justice Allan Cooke (East of the Rock and West of the Hard Place in the Last Democratic Fiefdom). He became pivotal because he made the Canadian look “like an idiot in open court” that led to disciplinary charges and losing his reputation in the Dead-monton judicial and legal community for alleging fraud against a lawyer supposedly without any evidence. Cooke J. not only prevented the damning evidence into the court record by refusing to enforce subpoenas if lawfully issued. He then claimed in his ruling to have seen no evidence; and so the corruption perpetuating and Chinese helper granted a non-suit application by Heiser’s defense counsel.

Canada’s malfeasant decided to keep the Cooke J. miscarriage of justice alive in the Canadian lawyer’s mind. When he was socially engineered into the life of the penthouse-living realtor, he was introduced to his landlord’s so-called real estate partner Allan Cook. So to see Grazer et al. embed the name ‘Cook’ was very much appreciated. In fact so were all the street soldier embeds throughout 2006. In November and December, Wolf et al. and Grazer et al. inserted the names of several street soldiers: Erica, the Roxy barmaid, Nikki the Roxy introduced look-
but-don’t-touch young sex kitten, Drew the Dead-monton street soldier and his sister’s stalker Lydia.

The second name in the ‘Shark’ script that instantly rang a bell is ‘Angela’. She was the street soldier socially engineered into his life at The Roxy and who was instructed to be as nice as possible and then plead homelessness to manipulate him into offering her his residence as a temporary shelter. After being treated to his generous hospitality for a couple months she stole his bankcard on instructions from her handlers and wiped out his $3,000 bank account – money he was using to fund his Internet legal research service start-up business. The same weekend as the thief Dogville torture technicians arranged to have him beat up in front of his apartment building – then broke into the building superintendent’s office and stole the surveillance videotape.

How even more totally weird and pathetic Canada’s elite and Beijing’s representatives are emerge in the fact she showed him a private investigator’s card with the name ‘Angela Klit’ – a perverted way of identifying a woman’s sexual organ. He pled the facts in his federal lawsuit at para. 318.

In addition to these two street soldier identifications, this portion of the script raises the point made in the script; namely that “people aren’t always what they seem”. That also was a great way to refer to the respectability façade the Fiefdom treatise uncovered. Canada’s politicians wealthy, cops, judges, reporters and military brass all appear on the outside to be normal, mature, rational people. But strip away the fake perception and one finds monsters. The Canadian lawyer called them “sub-humans” and quickly several coalition partners agreed: Coalition Agreement That Canada’s Elite Has Devolved to Sub-Human Status.

The District Attorney is choreographed to execute a geo-gesture to the question “so what’s your theory?”. Wynton Marsalis answered it well as was recorded in the April 2006 Fiefdom chapter to document his contribution: Greed. Greed for political power, greed for wealth, greed for more perverted sex and greed to generate more schadenfreude – including knowing one is responsible for tens of thousands of deaths each year that occur because of economy monopolization and wealth plundering.

When the District Attorney confronts her friend, Grazer et al. use the occasion to geo-politicizes what’s seen and heard.

Sarah: [red shirt, white earrings] Angela did horrible things.

D.A.: [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.]

Sarah: Are you the same person you were in your twenties?

Cops and Shark show up after this discussion with a search warrant, looking for another gun in the house safe]
D.A.: I’m sorry Richard, you need to open the safe.

Sarah: [aggressive protracted Execution M.] He had nothing to do with this.

Shark: Then it shouldn’t be a problem, should it?

[Richard walks over to safe to open it and executes aggressive Clooney M.]

Isaac: Now would you mind stepping back, please?

Richard: [aggressive Clooney M.]

[gun discovered in the safe]

Shark: Looks like we get to have a trial after all.

[as show goes to commercial a purple imbued clip of the death scene is replayed]

The Canadian colors and the number twenty timed to “Angela did horrible things” was again an accurate depiction of what happened in late summer 1999 and thereafter. It was gratifying to see a coalition partner acknowledge those terrible days when the Canadian lawyer was being manipulated without conscience. He had been beaten up, robbed and otherwise toyed with like he had no rights whatsoever. And now so many years later he discovers he was not only a regular punching bag, but a two decade lab monkey for a bunch of thugs, punks, morons and racists. So there’s a lot of joy in him knowing he’s about to watch the whole lot of them face the international community’s ‘Iron Fist’ accountability mechanism and the justice they deprived him of when he sought relief in the federal court.

Because of the Clooney M.s, this part of the script confirmed the fact that the coalition had the ‘smoking gun’ of trans-generational corruption, Chinese joint hegemony, Article 7 R&D and global imperialism.

Another office scene is scripted:

Shark: Life’s full of surprises. [...] She was at the crime scene; she has motive.

[...]

Martin: Now that we know her history, Sarah’s motive isn’t just a broke affair. Jeremy was trying to destroy [aggressive Execution M.] the new life that she built.
Raina: And her criminal record makes her much less sympathetic to the jury.

Martin: [still Execution M.] And she had access to both guns.

Shark: You got it kid.

It was again great to see an acknowledgement in the script of how after returning from law school the malfeasant were “trying to destroy the new life that [he] built” regarding his law aspirations and what he was building in the CGI industry. And it was also great to see the extended geo-gesture – the throat grab used so many times to threaten the Canadian lawyer when going about his business – and it being timed to a reference to the military’s way of forcing capitulation and delivering justice; namely at the point of a gun.

To drive home how much the international community’s going to hold Canada’s political leaders and wealthy accountable for behavior going back twenty years, the next scene is authored. The setting is the judge’s private chambers where defense counsel has brought a motion to suppress Sarah’s criminal record.

Shark: Miss Metcalf’s criminal record is absolutely relevant to this proceeding Your Honor.

Defense: It’s highly prejudicial and the violations occurred nearly twenty years ago.

Judge: Mr. Stark?

Shark: The defendant’s criminal record clearly establishes her motive for killing the victim.

[...]

Judge: I’ll allow general references to their past, but the motion is granted. Miss Metcalf’s criminal record is off limits.

Unlike real life where there are situations where it would unduly sway a jury considering guilt and innocence to hear of crimes committed two decades ago when evaluating a most recent allegation of criminal wrongdoing, the same concern isn’t present when the coalition is reviewing Fiefdom and U.S. intelligence agencies’ evidence. Unlike a jury, comprised of regular, law-uneducated people, coalition members are able to control their emotional reactions, are sophisticated people and can impartially and objectively judge the evidence.

The opening statements of part two of the trial also had coalition content.

Shark: Angela [...] moved to Los Angeles. She changed her name, married, had a beautiful daughter – lived a life of privilege. She re-invented herself [clip of purple attired daughter in
gallary] and never told a single human being about her past.

[clip of jury box: two aggressive quasi-Clooney M.s]

[...] The evidence will show [Jeremy Clinton] demanded money. She paid him. As his demands grew, so did Sarah’s desperation.

[clip of Chinese extra in gallery: three aggressive quasi-Clooney M.s]

Richard Metcalf knew that something untoward was happening.

[...] Defense: The fact is that the gun found at the crime scene with my client’s fingerprints on it did not kill Mr. Clinton. [clip: daughter in purple now with white necklace and this time gallery extra in black]. It is that simple fact that the prosecution cannot overcome. Who killed Jeremy Clinton? Well, your guess is as good as mine. But one thing [Shark: double aggressive Clooney M.] is beyond doubt. It wasn’t Sarah Metcalf.

[clip of jury and gallery totaling eight extras]

The next geo-gesture and its context are most interesting. Again a coalition partner resorts to using a Chinese extra to create a China identifier and time the observation to a remark to create coalition relevance. Adding a coalition-identifying triple quasi-Clooney M. heightens the importance of the point being made; which in this case is that as the demands of the international community to capitulate grew and there were only signs of aggressive belligerence, increased petulance and more intense insolence, coalition members got more desperate because this reactionary behavior was viewed as guilty conscience evidence of Fiefdom allegations that the China-Canada alliance had in fact created the Pandora’s Box with the intention of undermining democracies, the free market capitalist system and U.S. military superiority on Beijing’s quest for global domination. And proof of this only increased the resolve to contain the threat using whatever means necessary.

What followed were the colors of punishment certainty and justice, followed by Shark executing a double geo-gesture in the sentence “one thing is beyond doubt” and a collection of eight extras. In other words, having arrived at the conclusion this is what Beijing is planning, then it is imperative that the responsible parties be punished with the ‘Iron Fist’ accountability mechanism.
To keep the audience, especially in the East-West Corridor, riveted, a big twist is introduced. DNA at the crime scene leads to the unavoidable conclusion that Sarah’s daughter isn’t the product of pro-creation with her husband, but rather the deceased. This instantly creates the need to come up with a whole new theory about the murder.

Sarah: He beat me up and he raped me.

Shark: And you got pregnant.

Sarah: Yes. I knew I had to get out of Tacoma so I just disappeared.


The throat-grabbing and coercive diplomacy intended geo-gesture is timed to create the message that China leave Canada and the country’s indigenous political elite and wealth leave their posts as leaders of the nation.

Then for the next twice counted eighty seconds, several clips of the D.A. executing a quasi-Clooney M. are inserted to create the perception it was one long gesture. As Sarah describes the whole story she implicates her daughter as the shooter.

Another instance of coercive diplomacy is interjected. This time one of those clips is edited in when the remark “I heard a shot” is scripted.

The second last scene of the episode cleverly wove in the Canadian lawyer’s ‘elevator incident’ to underscore the coalition’s condemnation of the development of stealth cognition technologies to achieve the objectives stated above.

As the D.A. and Shark exit the elevator they see Sarah kissing her family members goodbye just before she’s escorted to jail by hovering corrections officers. Shark executes an aggressive quasi-Clooney M. to this interaction to underscore how the malfeasant parties are going to go through the same ritual after they’re convicted.

D.A.: So Sarah’s finally brought her past and her present together.

Shark: And the world didn’t come to an end.

D.A.: I thought you were determined to punish Sarah Metcalf.

[background right between D.A. and Shark: extra embellishes three distinct gestures]

Shark: The bad guy is dead. In my book that’s justice.
D.A.: [The daughter] kills Jeremy Clinton [two extras handshake in background.] so you’ve let a murderer go free.

Shark: Ah, justice isn’t perfect.

D.A.: But you are?

Shark: Thank-you for finally noticing.

[Sarah executes aggressive Clooney M. and daughter a quasi-Clooney M.]

Grazer et al. cleverly enhance the ‘elevator incident’ and other condemnations throughout the episode in this last scene by weaving in more than just the dialogue between the two principals. Behind them are two extras who are used to gesture in the same way street soldiers throw their hands around to catch the attention of stalking victims. This was done to give more kick to the next line in the script: “the bad guy is dead”; thus conveying the coalition community’s disgust at using punks, thugs and other miscreants on the streets of Canada’s cities to swarm, surround and suffocate innocent people.

And finally the scene reveals the coalition membership’s striving for full, perfect, justice.

The episode ends with the formulaed home scene with Shark and his daughter. Julia’s attired in the color of quantum and the first thing the audience sees when the scene begins is an aggressive Clooney M.. Shark walks in with a “How’s it going?” She’s at the kitchen table doing homework and right next to her is a fruit bowl. The pieces of fruit closest to the camera are...bananas – representative of what lab monkeys eat. The audience sees them when Julia’s says ”I hate you“ and Shark replies ”I know“ – meant to convey what coalition partners think of what Canada’s rich and powerful did to the Canadian lawyer and what they and the Chinese had planned for the rest of the world – something that’s not going to happen now that the threat has been fully researched, evaluated and proactively challenged.

The scene winds down over the issue of Julia being scolded for appearing to misrepresent the fact her and her boyfriend were stranded at his parent’s cottage last episode because of car trouble. In the last scripted lines is a message to the malfeasant both about them being unable to stop the coalition from emancipating the lawyer and providing him the wealth and companionship they so condemably deprived him of for two decades and stopping coalition forces from delivering democracy to Canada, evicting the Chinese and holding them to full account:

Julia: You know you never even asked if Eddie and I had sex.

Shark: [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.] Did you?
Julia: No. [...] I hate to break it to you [Shark: quasi-Clooney M.] but some things are out of your control.

‘Shark’: Embedding More of the Canadian Lawyer’s Personal History in Coalition Content and Identifying Canada’s Malfeasant as Psychopathic Freaks and Serial Murderers

[January 18, ’07]

The names of four people in the Canadian lawyer’s past were embedded in the January 18, 2007 episode of ‘Shark’: three friends and one street soldier. Additionally, the show was used by the coalition to again state on the diplomatic record that the evidence clearly proves Canada’s trans-generational elite and Chinese are serial murderers.

Transcribing the latest episode of ‘Shark’ for this chapter was a unique process because for the first time ever the Canadian lawyer wasn’t in the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy alone. He had his best friend of thirty years, Mike Chase, working on his computer and assembling one for his ex-girlfriend. Mike’s rough character traits aside, he is a very intelligent, well read and knowledgeable from non-academic sources; and a very astute person. For years he’s been in receipt of Fiefdom evidence and despite all of it is still unable to accept Canada’s been jointly governed in effect, there is a China-Canada alliance, the existence of the coalition, or his friend has been a two decade victim of human experimentation.

Mike would make a great judge. He’s always maintained that to be convinced of these claims he wants to see the proverbial ‘smoking gun’. ‘Connect the dots’ inference making is not sufficient to prove the allegations made. Since such direct evidence won’t be available until he’s on a private jet to wherever he wants to go, the circumstantial case was again attempted during the transcription of ‘Shark’. It was really interesting that of all the coalition initiatives being readied for documentation in the Fiefdom treatise, this one had the names of three people he knew very well. ‘Janet’, who in ‘Shark’ was the victim, is the name of Mike’s first girlfriend in the early 1970s and who he was dating when the two of them and the Canadian became friends. She was the principal financier of the paradigm shifting Myrias supercomputer that was going to propel the Canadian into the economic stratosphere viz. CGI and who got secretly tag-teamed and railroaded out of the company. ‘Wayne’, the accused serial killer, is the name of Janet’s husband. And ‘Jane’, the judge presiding over the trial, is the name of Mike’s other long-term girlfriend and whose computer he was assembling as the transcribing was taking place.

During the first scene, as per coalition protocol, lexiconic content was embedded. The Canadian gave Mike what one might call the first class in ‘Coalition Diplomatic Lexicon 101’, showing him the aggressive double Clooney M. timed to the introduction of the name ‘Janet’; followed by the double quantum ratifier; and then later made him watch a scene where the name ‘Wayne’ was used. And periodically
throughout the show he pointed to other *indicia* of coalition activity in an attempt to provide sufficient proof of the coalition’s encirclement and embarrassment dynamic.

It is a testament to the genius of the coalition partnership that its existence and intentionally cryptic lexicon of diplomacy, even after being pointed out, remain impossible to comprehend. Mike would likely be more if not completely convinced if he read every one of the over 2,400 chapters in the *Fiefdom* treatise that had been authored to date. But since he and the general public haven’t, there’s no way they can pick up on the fact there is a geo-political conflict raging with China and Canada and there’s a coalition of democracy, human rights, pluralism and free market capitalism advocates who’ve come together to challenge the threat, defeat the enemy and punish the malfeasant.

The episode was about catching a serial killer who tortured his victims to death. Throughout the script coalition embeds conveyed the diplomatic purpose of the show was to again label members of Canada’s elite as serial murderers and torturers. And there was the other element mentioned above – identifying people in the Canadian lawyer’s past to confirm how much his background has been researched to demonstrate to the China-Canada alliance and trans-generationally corrupt one more time he’s being monitored closely, he’s critically important to the coalition and he enjoys international high profile status.

The embeds occurred within the first few lines of the script. After the opening scene of the victim scrambling from the perps residence, Shark and his private investigator, Isaac, are racing to the hospital where they meet up with a police office.

**Issac:** [punishment certainty attire and double Clooney M.]

**Shark:** Hi, you Garlan?

**Garlan:** Yes.

**Shark:** What have you got?


[...]

**Shark:** Did she identify her attacker?

**Garlan:** She’s in pretty bad shape. You know, maybe it’s better that we wait.
Shark:  **Five** missing women in a **five** block radius in the past **three** months. Waiting is not an option.

Within the first dozen lines of the script there are **eight** indicia of coalition activity.

The first geo-gesture was embedded to red flag the name “Janet Butler”. As stated above ‘Janet’ is the name of the original financier of the supercomputer technology the Canadian lawyer was going to use to generate billions of dollars in the CGI industry. The malfeasance he became a victim of was as much what caused his gargantuan losses as it was one piece in a complex puzzle of ‘connect the dots’ evidence proving Canada’s trans-generational corruption: *The Paradigm of Governing the Last Democratic Fiefdom.*

The other half of the name “Butler” was to identify what Canada’s elite turned him into instead of engaging in his entrepreneurial and professional adventures. As part of the Article 7 and nepotistic marginalization processes, he was turned into a servant of Dogville’s street soldier community when invited to live in the realtor’s penthouse in 1996. Thus combining ‘Janet’ and ‘butler’ is an uber-genius way of encapsulating his massive opportunities and the last twenty years of pain, suffering, isolation, deprivation and loss.

Isaac’s second geo-gesture is timed to “Somebody did a number on her and “Very twisted”. Anybody privy to the *Fiefdom* treatise would agree that both Canada’s elite “did a number” on the Canadian lawyer and that those responsible are “very twisted” people. That latter description is augmented a couple minutes later when Shark is scripted to call the perp – and by intended extension every one of Canada’s ruling elite. Beijing’s personnel and street soldiers – a “freak”.

A coalition-identifying three indicia are contained in the last sentence of this excerpt. Clearly, the message is being sent that the coalition getting the Canadian his quantum is not something that should be delayed.

The victim is observed to be in a hospital bed. The bedding is condemnation pink. With her in the background, the following dialogue is heard:

Isaac: Letting her live is a pretty big screw-up.

Shark: Maybe he’s throwin’ us a bone.

Isaac: What, you think he let her go on purpose?

Shark: I don’t know [Newman M.]. But if he wants to get caught, let’s not disappoint him.

In addition to an implicit Kidmanesque reference, the verbal geo-gesture is an acknowledgement that members of Canada’s elite don’t care if the evidence accumulates against them. Their ideological culture of entitlement and not ever having been subject to accountability mechanisms has led to them not taking any...
notice that they’ve fed the international community all the evidence necessary to arrest, charge, convict and punish them. So, in a sarcastic vein, Grazer et al. state the coalition’s not going to “disappoint” those who act as if they don’t care whether or not they’re caught and punished.

The plot briefly involves a ruse against the perpetrator of this torture and attempted murder. The Mayor announces that the victim died hoping the news would draw the criminal out. During the scene in which he’s making a public statement, the D.A. is choreographed to stand beside him and was wardrobed create a death penalty message:

Mayor: It’s my sad duty to report that Janet Butler died from her wounds. [D.A.: punishment certainty] early this morning.

To create the link between the public plot and the Canadian lawyer’s torturous hell and quantum entitlement, when Madeleine and Raina interview the victim, her flashbacks of being tortured are given a strong golden hue during post-production.

Madeleine: You’ve been a great help Janet. We’re gonna catch this guy.

Janet: I won’t have to testify, right?

Raina: Hopefully it won’t come to that.

Janet: Because this guy was like, he was in my head. I don’t want to see him again.

This was a curious part of the script, since there were no preceding references to or subsequent plot elements involving cognitive penetration except about the perp learning everything he could about his victims before torturing them with past experiences that haunted from. Framing that issue with this choice of language was clumsy except in a coalition context of an Article 7 – hypnosis reference.

The next relevant scene introduced the next person in the Canadian lawyer’s past. As stated above, ‘Wayne’ was Janet’s husband.

Shark: Anything in the car [Janet said she saw]?

Casey: There are 28 red Saabs with the [license plate] letter ‘P’ registered in the Hollywood Hills area.

Shark: Anyone jump out?

Isaac: [punishment certainty colors] Wayne Calison. Cops interviewed him a month ago. His car was spotted in the vicinity when the third victim was snatched.
Shark: What’s his story?


Shark: Where does he live?

Isaac: **Three** quarters of a mile from where they found Janet Butler [protracted Erin M.].

Shark: Yes! Get a search warrant. Nice work.

Seeing Isaac’s punishment certainty colors are timed to the reference to being “snatched” – what coalition military and law enforcement forces are going to do to those they want to interrogate or arrest to face the ‘Iron Fist’ accountability mechanism. And he’s also scripted to use a coalition identifier timed to what can only reasonably be interpreted as a death penalty reference. Also a geo-gesture is timed to the phrase “creative writing” – a reference to the *Fiefdom* treatise.

When murdering, torturing Wayne is interrogated by Shark after **five** bodies are discovered under his brother’s patio, the room the interview is conducted in is labeled Room “**9116**” – a double China identifier and double *quantum* ratifier. As was the case in the script and is the case in Dogville as it relates to street soldier and torture technician activity, Shark is scripted to state “If he jay-walks, I want to know about it”.

More of that *quantum*-acknowledging gold hue is present when Raina and Shark have a discussion. The scene is just after a court motion Wayne made to be his own lawyer at his trial.

Raina: Calison defending himself. Sounds like good news to me.

[**number 4 – 58** on hallway wall]

Shark: Which is why I drive a Mercedes and you take the bus. Judges and juries root for the underdog. Every time I pounded this guy in court I look like a bully and he looks like a victim.

Raina: He’s a serial killer [gold lighting].

Shark: He’s also smart, manipulative and he has zero conscience. The difference is I don’t have **five** bodies buried under my deck.

The first parallel drawn here is the fact that the Canadian lawyer had not choice but to act on his own behalf during the Federal Court litigation. He tried many times to get a lawyer to help and not once did anybody agree to take his case on. And for the government that was “good news”.
There is also a second Kidmanesque reference. Judges and juries certainly would root for someone like the Canadian lawyer who’s been ‘under the influence of a dog’ for twenty years.

Part of this chapter’s title is taken from this portion of the script. How Grazer et al. describe Wayne is exactly how one describes those who run Canada. They are “smart, manipulative and [they have] zero conscience”. And as stated in a subsequent scene, the smarter they are the freakier they are. Thus for being intelligent and clever evil-worshiping career murderers, torturers, enslavers, thieves, frauds, treasonists, stalkers, saboteurs and sexual perverts, the Canadian gets his quantum.

During a late night at the office scene, the D.A. comes to see Shark after he interrogated Wayne’s brother – under whose patio were Wayne’s victims:

D.A.: I heard you got Tommy Calison to roll over on his brother.

Shark: It helps us with the murders but evidentiarily Wayne tortured him for years when they were kids. By the time [yellow vertical blinds] Tommy’s done testifying, he’s gonna make Wayne look like a model citizen [Erin then Execution M.].

D.A.: You know this guy’s got a 184 IQ.

Shark: The smarter they are the freakier they are.

D.A.: He’s also done tons of legal research over the past few months.

Shark: Ah, he may be nuts, but he’s not stupid. He’s got a B.A. from USF, a Masters [aggressive quasi-Clooney M.] from Irvine – eve spent a little time in Mensa [Erin M.].

D.A.: So you’ve done your research.

Shark: Know thy enemy.

The insertion of the yellow blinds was meant to keep the Presidential quantum theme persistent throughout the show. This time it’s timed to the message, sarcastically put in the script, that now that the Canadian lawyer has finished entering evidence into the diplomatic evidence record, he’s made the case that leading members of Canada’s elite and those involved or complicit in crimes against humanity will face the death penalty.

The Canadian lawyer is complimented for his academic abilities. Geo-gestures are timed to the issue of having a Masters Degree and being a member of Mensa:
Mensa International is the largest, oldest, and best-known high-IQ society in the world. The organization restricts its membership to people with high testable IQs. Specifically, potential members must score within the top 2% (98th percentile) of any approved standardized intelligence test.

Source: wikipedia.com

Mensa provides a forum for intellectual exchange among members. Its activities include the exchange of ideas by lectures, discussions, journals, special-interest groups, and local, regional, national, and international gatherings; the investigations of members’ opinions and attitudes; and assistance to researchers … in projects dealing with intelligence or Mensa.

Source: mensa.org

Tommy taking the stand at his brother’s trial affords opportunities for coalition partners to make more statements and deliver more messages to the East-West Corridor of Diplomacy:

Shark: Did you two have a happy childhood?
Tommy: Not really.
Shark: Why is that?
Tommy: Well, our dad, he didn’t treat us very good.
Shark: Now your father died when you were ten and your brother was 12.

[gallery: Clooney M.].
Tommy: Yea.
Shark: After your dad died [*], did your brother begin to abuse you physically? Did your brother abuse you?
Tommy: No. No. Wayne and I got along fine. [*]
Shark: In your statement you described chronic mental and physical abuse. Was that a lie?
Tommy: Yea. I just told you what I thought you wanted to hear.
Shark: Permission to treat the witness as hostile.
Judge: Granted.

The geo-gesture was again embedded to take advantage of another chance to indicate that the death penalty is on the table and will be available when the 'Iron Fist' of accountability is implemented.

A second threat of capital punishment was cleverly inserted at the first asterisk. There were several camera angles of Tommy in the witness box, but none revealing what was behind him. When the camera filmed from the angle shot for this line in the script, he was observed sitting in front of an America flag involving the colors red, white and yellow. Being visible at here and not before or after was thus interpreted to link the colors of Chinada with the issue of the death penalty and culpability for membership in the China-Canada alliance. Its second inclusion was timed to Tommy saying he and his brother got along fine – which is what the relationship between China and Canada has been for some thirty-five years.

The questioning went on about him being tortured by his brother. At the end of the interrogation, the judge asks “Do you have any further questions for this witness” at which time one of those now coalition-formulaed jury box scenes is inserted that contains geo-content. This time it’s a coalition-identifying three jury members in a row attired in coalition colors: the closest in two layers of red, the second in yellow and the third in two layers of green. The translation for what was said and these colors was there are no longer any questions needed to be answered to establish that China is responsible to the Canadian lawyer for the quantum assessed for his pain, suffering and economic losses.

Shark responds to the judge’s inquiry with a “no”, at which time her name plaque becomes visible: “Jane Briar”. ‘Jane, as stated above, is the name of Mike’s 1990s girlfriend.

Wayne cross-examines his brother:

Wayne: When Mr. Stark was asking us about growing up together, it got me thinking [*]. Do you remember Lydia Franklin?

Shark: Relevance Judge?

Judge: Mr. Calison, you question must pertain directly to the issue at hand.

[...]


Tommy: I don’t want to talk about that Wayne.

Wayne: She lived next door to us for 12 years.
Tommy: You said that she liked me Wayne.

[close-up of Madeleine and Lydia]

After hearing and seeing the names of “Janet”, “Wayne” and “Jane”, hearing “Lydia” in this context – and one twice red flagged with the colors of Chinada and once with a coalition identifier – acknowledged the Canadian lawyer’s emancipation and quantum again, for the name “Lydia” is that of the street soldier who covertly stalked, swarmed, surrounded and manipulated his sister in the 1990s for several years.

This wasn’t the first time that not only a street soldier was identified in coalition content, but this particular one was. On his birthday, he saw an episode which was documented in the Fiefdom treatise as follows:

Logan: He’s steering us away from there. Now I’m really curious. [...]

Lydia’s (4) a voodoo healer.

[...]

* The choice of names for the suspect who eventually is charged with the double homicide, “Lydia”, is interesting. In a Fiefdom context, that is the exact name of a street soldier who stalked, swarmed and through social engineering befriended the Canadian lawyer’s sister for several years in the mid-1990s. If so, this would be another in a series of references embedded in geo-content proving just how much the coalition has done its homework about his personal life and that of his family. It demonstrates just how important is has been for the coalition to show that its members took every reasonable step to learn everything there is to know about this family so that the author of the most serious allegations made in the Fiefdom treatise both on the domestic and geo-political level isn’t hiding any dark past, isn’t somehow connected to the elite and, given a complete review of his background, has an unassailable credibility.

‘Lydia’ was also the name given to one of the scientists in the ‘SNL’ Bear-Shark comedy sketch on October 21, 2006: ‘Saturday Night Live’: High Profiling and Condemning China’s Twenty Years of Article 7 Experimentation and Enslavement in the Last Democratic Fiefdom. And on December 1st, Letterman et al. embedded it in a ‘fun fact’: Letterman et al.: How Their Uber-Genius Ripped into the Freaks, Morons and Perverts Running and Supporting the Last Democratic Fiefdom.

To the Canadian lawyer, “Lydia Franklin” is an exact parallel with the name David E. Kelley et al. chose for one of their characters: “Lincoln Meyers”. This was a means in September 2006 to link and contrast the historically memorable with the historically evil. In that case it was linking the slave emancipating American president with the squash-playing senior lawyer in the Canadian’s life, Chris Meyer – an Honorary South African Consulate General – who in spite of his title conspired with Canada’s elite: The Episode Proving David E. Kelley Had Evolved from Extraordinary Maximum Super Talent to Uber-Genius: Institutionalized Perjury,
Reinstituting the Death Penalty in Canada and Judges are Legitimate Targets for Coalition Justice.

The link was made in Dick Wolf’s ‘Law & Order’: High Profiling the ‘Consent’ Requirement of Article 7:

It occurred to the Canadian after the chapter was authored that Aaron placed Chris’ name together with the name of the first president of the United States to link and contrast the history of freedom and an icon of that legacy with the history of Canada and a representative of trans-generational tyranny.

The same applies therefore to this new composite of evil and genius. Benjamin Franklin was:

...one of the most well-known Founding Fathers of the United States. He was a leading author, politician, printer, scientist, philosopher, publisher, inventor, civic activist, and diplomat. As a scientist he was a major figure in the history of physics for his discoveries and theories regarding electricity. As a political writer and activist he, more than anyone, invented the idea of an American nation, and as a diplomat during the American Revolution, he secured the French alliance that made independence possible.

Franklin was noted for his curiosity, his writings (popular, political and scientific), and his diversity of interests. His writings are proverbial for being wise and scintillating to this day. As a leader of the Enlightenment, he gained the recognition of scientists and intellectuals across Europe. An agent in London before the Revolution, and Minister to France during it, he more than anyone defined the new nation in the minds of Europe. His success in securing French military and financial aid was the turning point for American victory over Britain. He invented the lightning rod; he was an early proponent of colonial unity; historians hail him as the "First American." The city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania marked Franklin’s 300th birthday in January 2006 with a wide array of exhibitions, and events citing Franklin’s extraordinary accomplishments throughout his illustrious career.

The fact ‘Lydia’ is red flagged twice with the colors of Chinada and once with a coalition identifier signals that this secret tag-teaming and social engineering is evidence of the serious malfeasance the Canadian lawyer and his family suffered as a result of Chinese joint hegemony. It proves that many non-nepotistically wealth and power connected people are also treated this way by the ruling elite and the Beijing leadership’s representatives in Canada. It demonstrates just how imperative it is that the purge eliminates this evil dynamic from Canadian society.

What also struck the Canadian lawyer in this scene was how Grazer et al. again contribute to the isolation-deprivation issue. In past episodes on a few occasions,
the actress who plays Madeleine – an attractive woman – has been put forth as a potential love interest and was a conduit for the condemnation of being forced to go without love, romance, intimacy, relationships, sexuality and family creation opportunities for twenty years. This time her availability for post-emancipation companionship is forcefully presented. A close-up of her is timed to the remark “You said that she liked me...”; immediately followed by a clip with the colors of Chinada.

In the basement of Shark’s home is a mock courtroom – another venue that was exploited by the coalition. Shark’s in punishment certainty colors:

Raina: Isaac’s bringing [Janet] over but this is wrong.

Shark: You got any better suggestions? ‘Cause without Janet Butler’s testimony all our case is is a circumstantial house of cards.

Casey: The brother screwed us. Janet’s our only shot at a conviction.

Madeleine: Not if Calison destroys her on the stand.

Raina: Thank-you.

Shark: What, you’re going soft now. It’s like a pit-bull quoting Gandhi.

This last remark is quite interesting. It puts a Kidmanesque reference in the immediate proximity of what the Canadian lawyer’s been identified as like on the international stage.

Janet and Isaac enter. As the scene starts where Shark cross-examines her to prep her for trial, the camera starts with a close-up of the witness box and pans upward. When doing so, there are three white horizontal lines on the burgundy wood background which go to make a great coalition identifier and Canada colors scheme. Since it immediately precedes her testimony, what she says is already red flagged.

Shark: When you were lying bound and gagged like an animal in Wayne Calison’s house [Shark: quasi-Blair M.], did he speak to you?

[...]  

Janet: He apologized to me.

Shark: For what? [two quasi-Blair M.s]
Janet: I can’t. I’m sorry, I...

Shark: ...Yes Janet, yes you can. We’re almost done. [close-up of Madeleine]

Janet: Okay [Clooney M.] [sigh] [...] Please, please don’t make me do this.

Shark: You have to. Because if you don’t testify, Janet, Wayne Calison could go free and he needs to pay for what he did to you and I need to stop him from doing it to anybody else.

It was argued early in the *Fiefdom* treatise that the country’s elite chattelized the Canadian lawyer and treated him no better than an animal. And later that description was accepted as factually accurate and in early 2006 the ‘monkey’ analogy was introduced into the coalition lexicon.

Again there’s a close-up of Madeleine – timed to “we’re almost done”, interpreted as evidence collection and intelligence gathering so when the coalition moves it can be as effective as possible to achieve the objectives.

Shark is scripted to be provoked by Wayne during a plea bargain conference. He goaded him by taunting him with the threat that he’d harm his daughter. During the private chambers motion to have Shark removed for misconduct, the D.A. shows up in a black and light grey horizontally striped scarf to argue why her A.D.A. shouldn’t be removed.

Judge: Under the circumstances [Wayne: aggressive quasi-Clooney M.] a mistral seems warranted with a new trial to commence immediately.

This was the first time a coalition partner made the technical point that the Canadian lawyer’s federal lawsuit be declared a mistrial given the malicious judicial bias operating behind the scenes. In its place was an international tribunal that acted as an independent arbiter of fact and law and found in the Canadian lawyer’s favor – not only for the original US$ 5 billion damages stemming from the economic interference torts and turning him into a lab monkey for twenty years and torture, enslavement and isolation-deprivation, but also for punitive and compensatory damages and interest assessed in the summer of 2006 and accumulating daily to reach hundreds of trillions of dollars pursuant to the *quantum* increase schedule.

*Anti-Chinada Coalition Generates International Signpost Regarding the Canadian Lawyer’s Compensatory and Punitive Damages*

When the trial resumed and Shark fulfilled his representation to the judge that he’d explain the scratches on Wayne’s face to the jury, he sucker punched him with a tape recording of the provocation. Wayne objected vehemently; but the judge
refused to suppress the tape. Shark taunts him back with “It’s called the adversarial system for a reason – you’ll learn this stuff in law school”. A clip of Madeleine is again inserted – being a coalition-identifying third time. Her executing a quasi-Clooney M. signals that whether a domestic court or the international court, the process is the same. When confronted with the *Fiefdom* indictment charges Canada’s elite and Beijing had the opportunity to respond through diplomatic channels. They chose not to and according to the adversarial process not registering a defense or challenging the evidence – rather in fact adding more to the diplomatic evidence record – proved strategically fatal. They were found guilty of all charges and are now subject to the various options of punishment documented in the *Fiefdom* treatise.

When the tape is played, Shark undermines Wayne’s credibility and makes his case against him by saying “For a guy to [testified he] abhors violence, you’re kinda scary”. Grazer et al. geo-politicize that remark by editing in a clip of five jurors and then Wayne in front of an American flag. Translation: Since Canada’s elite chooses to threaten the world, the Canadian lawyer’s quantum is going to come from their assets to neutralize them.

The next plot twist is Janet Butler taking her own life after Wayne called her and took advantage of her emotional vulnerabilities. Without Wayne having the opportunity to cross-examine her, the judge was asked to dismiss the murder charges:

Judge: There is no compelling evidence Mr. Carlison caused Miss Butler’s death.

Shark: [aggressive Clooney M.]

Again Grazer et al. used the diplomatic lexicon to warn the malfeasant that they are now subject to the death penalty for having been proven to have committed the most serious of crimes.

With the evidence against Wayne no longer in the court record, the question was whether there was enough circumstantial evidence to warrant a conviction:

Judge: Will the jury please rise. [Newman M.] Has the jury reached a decision?

Forewoman: We have Your Honor. [gallery: aggressive quasi-Clooney M.] In the matter of the County of Los Angeles and Wayne Robert Calison, five counts of murder and one count of attempted murder, we find the defendant not guilty.

Wayne: [to Shark] No hard feelings.

[gallery: aggressive quasi-Clooney M.]
The script included a Newman and quasi-Clooney M. to red flag that the coalition has reached a verdict on the *Fiefdom* indictment: guilty on all counts. The last one timed to “no hard feelings” was meant to be sarcastic and indicate feelings of the coalition membership. Because the convicted were joyously petulant, aggressively arrogant and constantly belligerent, their sentiments are ‘good riddance’ and ‘you deserve the punishment you face’.

Shark is scripted having dinner with his daughter in the last scene. He executes a very protracted quasi-Clooney M. timed to “I had him; I let him get away”. That was authored to affirm that the coalition is not going to let Canada’s elite and Beijing get away with what they’ve done and be allowed to threaten subsequent generations.

---

‘Shark’: High Profiling Twenty Torturous Years of Sexual Isolation and Deprivation in the Last Democratic Fiefdom

[February 1, ’07]

There was only one profoundly coalition-relevant scene during the February 1, 2007 episode of CBS’ ‘Shark’. And it was jam-packed with lexicon embeds to send another message to Canada’s elite and the Beijing leadership that coalition members are shocked, horrified and angered that the Canadian lawyer was socially isolated and intentionally deprived to advance the *Article 7* Pandora’s Box R&D regime; that they used a total lack of sex as part of the surreptitious assassination without culpability initiative and generate propaganda and continuing amounts of schadenfreude.

Starting in or around late June 2006 and especially after the commencement of the ‘final notice’ phase in late June 2006, the issue of socially engineering the Canadian lawyer into a state of perpetual sexual loneliness to advance the interests and objectives of the China-Canada alliance and the trans-generationally corrupt was placed front-and-center on the international stage by coalition partners. Over and over, coalition partners authored content to convey to him their empathy for twenty years of being covertly manipulated into forced abstinence, maneuvered into and out of street soldier acquaintances with attractive women for the sole purpose of getting him excited and using the hypnotic backdoor to obtain information on his fantasies to make the engineering of his surroundings all that more torturous.

A lot has been documented in the *Fiefdom* treatise and entered into the diplomatic evidence record on this issue. What was done to him for experimentation, propaganda and schadenfreude objectives need not be repeated, except to highlight the two examples of sexuality manipulation that not only shocked and horrified the international community but opened a window of understanding and appreciation just how powerful stealth cogitation technologies became after pushing the hypnosis envelop for two decades. One way of humiliating him was repeatedly surrounding him with attractive street soldier women night after night, year after year at the Roxy nightclub and other Dogville venues of that nature and then
sending him home alone – to be closely monitored as he satisfied his urges for romantic companionship. Then unknown to him, his fantasies were accessed, the information recorded, transmitted to these women who played him up even more – all with the objective of eventually making him feel totally vulnerable in the realization that his mind was being accessed and his surroundings totally engineered; a kind of trap of traps out of which there was no escape and no hope of a normal life – ever.

The other was the ‘elevator incident’ in which Dogville torture technicians implanted a ‘drop your pants’ thought process that made him appear he was ‘caught’ in a most morally compromising position and then spin it into a sexual perversion amongst downtown street soldier hospitality staff and patrons.

Combined, these two hideous situations were supposed to both lead to his suicide and prove to Beijing Canada’s Article 7 technicians had developed an ultimate weapon of mental destruction. Instead, however, they were the ones who were caught and now they face the death penalty, life imprisonment and an existence from their perspective not worth living.

Thus what the coalition did starting in mid-2006 to empathize with his experiences, hold those responsible to account and communicate on many an occasion its members intend that his post-emancipation life be one to be envied can only be a triple twist of fate worth recording in the history books.

It is in that torturous context in which there was no way out except political asylum or an early death the latest episode of ‘Shark’ is to be appreciated. Grazer et al. pack one scene with a multitude of sexuality-flagged moments designed to high profile these atrocities, again condemn the culpable and liable to remind them why they’re going to face the punishment they are and do so on the first anniversary of U.S. troops shooting at Canada’s diplomats.

The main plot of the episode involved the murder of a billionaire. The question during this geo-politically important trial scene was whether the son (Dylan), allegedly caught by his father sketching a portrait of a school teacher-mentor (Ellie) in the nude at home, got enraged and shot him or whether she as his protector from an abusive father killed him. Based on the evidence first available, the D.A. chose to charge Ellie. But the genius of Grazer et al. had two plot twists coming.

**Shark:** Dylan, you said you had a sexual relationship with Ellie Davis, is that correct?

**Dylan:** Yes.

[Court security: aggressive quasi-Clooney M.; Ellie at defense table Clooney M.]

**Shark:** And when did this sexual relationship with the defendant start?
Dylan: Ellie asked me to draw her portrait.

Shark: Without her clothes.

[Ellie: Erin M.]

Dylan: Yes.

Shark: Go on.

[jury: quasi-Cl.M.]

Dylan: It made me uncomfortable [jury: quasi-Cl.M.] but she was my advisor and [jury: five and one Chinese] I like her a lot so I went along with it.

Shark: Did it stop there?

Dylan: No. During the session she came up to where I was working.

Shark: And, what did she do?

Dylan: She kissed me. [Shark: Maria M.] and then she started to take off my clothes.

Shark: And you had sex.

Dylan: Yes.

Shark: Did you relationship continue?

[Ellie: Cl.M.]

Dylan: We got together whenever we could. [jury: three] Her office, my car. She’s come over to the house when my dad was out of town. [jury: three]

Shark: Thank-you Dylan. Nothing further. [palm wipe]

Defense: You sketched my client nude, is that correct [Dayna M.]?

Dylan: Yes.

Defense: And you had sex with her repeatedly, right?

Dylan: That’s right.
Defense: So then let me ask you a simple question. What does Ellie Davis look like naked?

Shark: Objection. Vague and irrelevant.

Defense: All goes to credibility – this alleged sexual relationship is key to the prosecution’s case.

Judge: I will allow it. But counselor let’s try to keep it PG13.

Defense: What did Ellie look like without her clothes on?

Dylan: Er, I’m not sure what you want me to say.

Defense: Was there something distinctive about her body? A scar or a birthmark?

Dylan: Um, I um, I can’t really remember. It was dark usually when we did it.

Defense: Oh, you draw in the dark?

Shark: Oh Your Honor, may we have a recess please?

Judge: Denied. The witness will answer.

Dylan: Look, I don’t remember anything specific.

Defense: I’d like these [photos] marked defense exhibit 22 and defense exhibit 23 – pictures of my client partially disrobed – her lower right hip visible. Do you see this [large rose] tattoo?

Dylan: Yes.

Defense: You claimed to have drawn my client’s nude body [*] and you have made love to her repeatedly; and yet you haven’t seen her tattoo until this moment? So Dylan, either you are the least observant adolescent male on this planet or you’ve been lying through your teeth.

It is totally clear what the purpose of the geo-gestures and jury inserts, one with a Chinese woman in the middle, were designed for – to high profile the social isolation engineering – sexual deprivation of the Canadian lawyer. The asterisk is where Grazer et al. edited in a clip of a close-up of a member of the jury aggressively scratching the palm of his hand – what in modern culture is the gesture symbolizing self sexual gratification.
The coalition couldn’t have put the case for the Canadian’s twenty years of isolation and deprivation any more graphically and condemnation for this atrocity any stronger, except by putting the guilty in a room and bashing their brains in. The denunciation is so loud and unrelenting because his sufferings and loss were directly related to being a lab monkey, ongoing propaganda victory and continual schadenfreude generator for Beijing and Canada’s elite. Had he been entrepreneurially and professionally successfully, as was his future in the late ‘80s and ‘90s, he never would have been so cruelly manipulated and spend so much of his adult life seeking sexual gratification alone. So while his torturers, enslavers, experimenters and economic, social and sexual deprivers were getting the best out of life, he was living in a nightmarish hellhole of Kafkaian proportions.

This episode being aired on February 1, 2007 was no coincidence. As with so much of what coalition partners have done during 2006, it was strategically planned for months in advance. In fact, a review of all geo-activity during the last couple weeks of January reveals an incredible amount of advanced organized diplomatic-related products that were delivery-perfect. Like with so much of his life, he took a major bullet – and one for his coalition family members. And he can’t wait to see that bullet – real ones – head in the other direction.

‘Shark’: Svengali, A Plethora of Death Penalty Messages, Reaffirming Making Up for Lost Romance Time And Making the Canadian Lawyer’s International Status Even More Profound

[February 8, ‘07]

The February 8, 2007 episode of ‘Shark’ was a platform to deliver all the messages identified in the chapter title. What ought to worry Canada’s incorrigible is how many times Grazer et al. tailored the script and choreography to send capital punishment signals to them. Considering how serious the geo-political conflict is being taken by coalition partners, only the stupid would ignore them.

Being brainless intentionally, insulting people like President Bush and Bill Gates and scratching noses or hand-to-head gestures on the streets of Dogville never stopped a bullet, bomb or other means of getting rid of an enemy. But they sure helped the coalition conclude that Canada’s political and economic elite had to be purged. Had there been an inkling of mature, responsible attention paid to the geo-political conflict and coalition concerns, there might be an argument – a slim argument – that justified they be allowed to stay in power. But over the last three and a half years and especially since early 2006, the elite has demonstrated it have no interests in complying with demands to capitulate, stand down crimes and cruelty and stop helping China – a country its members think world leaders are going to allowed to mature to superpower status with all its systemic and foreign policy faults. Like Canada’s rulers, the Beijing leadership still thinks that the vulnerabilities and weaknesses it found in democracy and capitalism are going to pave their way to ruling the world. In their unbridled enthusiasm, they haven’t taken official notice that the tide is turning against them.
The more resistance to change shown by the unapologetically petulant, arrogantly belligerent and enthusiastically insolent the more coalition members ratcheted up the ‘you’re gonna die’ initiatives. Such was the case at the end of January and into February 2007. Still not taking heed of the international relations advice given them, they were advised that Canada’s Prime Minister and involved or complicit judges would be assassinated. That didn’t faze them a bit. So Grazer et al. released another ‘Shark’ episode – one filled with ‘you’re gonna die’ messages peppered throughout. The evidence hook that justified the death penalty signals came from the scripting of one word – one historically powerful name: “Svengali”:

‘Svengali’: Proving How the Coalition is so United that Members are Conducting and Broadcasting Historical Research to Demoralize the Last Democratic Fiefdom

A tell-tale sign just how unified the coalition is emerged recently on NBC’s ‘The Late Show with David Letterman’. It is highly inferable that family members have conducted historical research and then broadcasted it to the Canadian lawyer to supplement the Fiefdom treatise. How brilliant is that?

It was a thoroughly revealing circumstance the Canadian lawyer found himself in on Wednesday, April 12, 2006. He had already been the primary recipient of hundreds of manufactured events for coalition purposes and had been fed concepts such as ‘coercive diplomacy’ (by CBS) to help characterize situations; but he hadn’t yet experienced a time that he recalls actually receiving historical research meant to both pound the hell out of the Liberals and Chinese and to supplement his own work compiling content for the Fiefdom treatise.

That need to have all content relevant to the Fiefdom was met by his coalition partners at NBC. He had never heard of the term ‘svengali’ before and conducted a Google search to find out what it meant. He was not just surprised but pleasantly shocked just how relevant on so many levels it was to describing what kind of hell he had been going through for all those years.

Excerpts from the research assignment remind the malfeasant why they are to be executed as it relates to violations of Article 7 that both stretch into decades and are institutionalized and have military purposes:

Scientific researchers regarded their subjects as means to an end, as useful objects whom they manipulated like laboratory rats to prove, or disprove, their competing hypotheses. [...]When novelists write about unethical hypnosis, they deal with issues of dominance versus submission, the predator’s technical expertise versus the subject’s ignorance, and betrayal versus trustworthiness. [...] Hoffman said that hypnotism:
...can be either good or evil. The evil magnetizer is a kind of moral vampire who destroys his subject...Therefore, the magnetic relationship can be either good (friendly, fatherly), or evil (demoniacal). (quoted in Ellenberger, p. 160)

‘Svengali’ is the name of a fictional hypnotist in George du Maurier's 1894 novel, Trilby. A sensation in its day, the novel created a stereotype of the abusive hypnotist that persists to this day. The word "Svengali" has entered the language meaning a person who, with evil intent, tries to persuade another to do what is desired. It is frequently used for any kind of coach who seems to exercise an extreme degree of domination over a performer (especially if they are female or believe they can only perform in the presence of their coach).

The moral of this geo-political story is if you want to employ hypnosis for evil, prepared to be executed.

The episode’s plot balanced death with extraordinary life – pumping the Canadian lawyer with messages that his post-emancipation experiences are going to more than make up what he lost.

The plot of this episode revolved around the murder of a young super-celebrity. She left a nightclub that had been surrounded by paparazzi, retained a decoy to walk out the front while she slipped out the back and into her awaiting Mercedes. As she drove up a Hollywood Hills road, she was rear-ended off a cliff to her death. The question for prosecutors was who dunit.

As per usual, coalition content was embedded in the first scene. In this instance it was wardrobing the decoy and the celebrity in the colors of punishment certainty. The corroboration the colors were coalition related came when the celebrity’s boyfriend at the back entrance executed an aggressive Clooney M. while the camera did a close-up.

A quick glance of her Mercedes license plate was available at the club and a close-up in-your-face visual was even more evident just as the car was being bumped over the cliff. Therefore the "4RN0435" included a 3, 5 and 8. This would be the first threat of execution in the episode – directed at China’s military and intelligence agents in Canada.

Shark gets out of his car at the crime scene and executes a Stewart M.. A coalition identifier is added to this part of the script:

Raina: My nine-year-old niece is hysterical. She can recite all of Taylor May’s movies.

[TV crew truck: big station ID letters 3 KKJH]
To put more of a Fiefdom face on the episode Grazer et al. high profile the use of the Canadian lawyer’s use of the phrase “high profile” – a verb added in chapters where coalition partners underscore an issue that’s important to them in coalition content. The camera is directed to film through an office window in which set decorators have sign painted the title “High Profile Crimes Unit”. This title is observed by the audience hears during the following line of the script: “...then her tape recording just before her death “God I [sign] feel so free”. It was Taylor talking on her cell phone as she’s driving. Inserting the sign right there was a signal that the coalition is ‘high profiling’ everything that went wrong in Canada and that an end result is the Canadian lawyer’s freedom from twenty years of lab monkey and schadenfreude-generation hell.

Corroboration that is what was intended came in the next line and in the color of justice that was worn by Madeline:

Shark: Very likely the last words of Taylor Mays. Left on her 19-year-old sister’s voicemail at 3:35 a.m.

Grazer et al. go on to kick the freaks, morons, perverts and racists in the teeth again:

Raina: When do these people sleep?

Shark: During the day. They’re vampires [Madeline: justice color again]

The courtroom becomes a forum where a plethora of capital punishment message are sent. It seems like the scenes were masterfully constructed to insert as many ‘you’re gonna die’ signals as possible. Shark:

Mary Babish [the decased’s father] made himself the single most important person in Taylor Mays’ life. An intimate relationship that ultimately would lead to Marty [clip: three jurors]. But Marty Babish forgot one thing: young girls grow up. Taylor Mays – tired of being exploited by this sleazy Svengali – decided to [pink on gallery member] end the relationship. The night she died she fired him [close-up of pink gallery member; male: Execution M.] Taylor thought she had declared her freedom. [clip: three people: guard, defendant and defense counsel]. But what she had really done was to give Marty Babish – now facing financial ruin – motive to kill her in cold blood. [clip: five jurors]. The People will prove that Marty Babish [jury member: quasi-Cl.M.] in the saddest of ironies stalked Taylor Mays in a $65,000 Lexus that she had bought for him as a birthday gift; finally running her off the road in a brutal act of vehicular homicide. [gallery member: Erin M. and three jurors]. Can you [the jury] change the horrific events of this tragedy? No. But you can write a just conclusion. Find Marty Babish guilty of murder in the first degree. [close up of defendant in Canadian punishment certainty colors]
There are a quantum ratifying five death penalty signals; one condemnation for being late 20th and early 21st century Svengalis; one condemnation that leads to being “fired” (the purge dynamic); a signal that the coalition will make sure Canada embraces freedom; one stalking reference; and one reference to the Fiefdom treatise (“write a just conclusion”).

Defense: [gallery: African-American extra executes Erin M.] You know, like so many young performers, Taylor May lived life in the fast lane – money, fame and all the things that come along with them. [three actors; Shark & two gallery members] [The victim’s sister will] testify that [Marty Babish] was asleep at home when Taylor’s car veered off the embankment that night. [three jurors with 1 African-American]

Noticeably there were two coalition embeds that included African-American extras. This related to the evidence of institutionalized racism discovered by the Canadian lawyer just before Christmas 2006. Given what script lines accompany this insert, the coalition is telling the Canadian lawyer that part of his post-emancipation lifestyle is to reward him for revealing this despicable element of the Canadian paradigm of governance and by implication Chinese foreign policy on how it will organize the affairs of state of those countries which come within its orbit of control or influence. And there is at the end of this excerpt one more ‘you’re gonna die’ reference – timed to the second inclusion of an African-American extra to state on the record that the racism discovered attracts the death penalty too.

Clearly, not only have Canada’s elite and the Beijing leadership angered the world population of Jewish people because of institutionalized human experimentation, now they’ve got African-Americans and Africans living in other places in the world livid at this institutionalized bigotry and what China-Canada had planned for humanity should they have achieved global hegemony.

Shark’s team found a former employee and teenager lover of the accused who came forward to paint his reputation as a womanizing cheat who ripped off aspiring actresses. She sat in the witness box and the American flag behind her was folded to reveal the colors of Chinada. In that context she describes some of the character traits of Canada’s rulers and Chinese partners:

Witness: I think he’s a sick, lying psychopath [three actors: accused, counsel and gallery member] who derives pleasure from seducing young women and then destroying their lives.

Shark: Like you and Taylor Mays?

Witness: Yes. [Newman M.]
The episode then turns to Shark’s home life. His daughter was threatened by a serial murder a couple shows ago and so she now has a full-time bodyguard. She’s just gotten off the phone with her father.

Julia: Something came up. My dad has to work through dinner.

Bodyguard: Did he say what he wants me to do?

Julia: [quasi-Cl.M.] Hang out with me I guess.

This would be the first of two scenes where Grazer et al. plant the message that the Canadian lawyer’s going to have multiple opportunities to make up for lost romance time. In previous episodes the character playing Madeline was scripted to be the bearer of this great news. This time it’s Shark’s daughter. The second scene in which post-emancipation adventures involving intimacy becomes much more sexually explicit.

When the trial resumes, a justice-attired Shark cross-examines the victim’s accountant. The American flag is also behind the witness and is folded to reveal the colors of China and a death penalty message is embedded:

Shark: So let me get this straight. When you and Marty Babish treated her money as if it were your own, I guess the plan was if she hadn’t died it would have been. [clip: three jurors].

Back at the office Madeline is looking as gorgeous and sophisticated as ever in her body-tight punishment certainty white top and black skirt. “Our luck may be changing”, she says as her wardrobe comes into view. Clearly, the Canadian lawyer’s is.

Taylor’s boyfriend took the stand:

Defense: You told [her sister Christie] that after [Taylor] was discharged from this [rehab] facility she wrote you a letter.

Witness: Yes.


Shark: Your Honor, there is no relevance here.

Defense: I need some latitude here Your Honor.

Judge: Make it fast Mr. Hokum.

Shark: Thank-you.
Defense: [Erin M.] What was that big lie that she admitted to, Ronny?

The use of an African-American to this time execute a coalition-identifying triple Clooney M. was clearly something that couldn’t be underestimated. The big lie is that Canada had portrayed itself as a multi-cultural society – one where everyone had equal opportunity to achieve the ‘Canadian dream’. But, as the Fiefdom treatise has proven, that is a “terrible lie”. It is part of the façade manufacture that the ruling elite has been so successful at for so many generations and which the Chinese participated in to perpetuate it to protect their exclusivity and monopolization ‘entitlements’.

Letters that Taylor wrote to her boyfriend became material evidence in the trial. When Taylor’s sister took the stand, she at first refused to admit she received them. The relevance was in the fact that defense counsel tried to persuade the judge that the boyfriend was the murderer, being a spurned lover. However, the letters proved the two were very much in love. Her sister was compelled to admit she’d received them when Shark tracked down a tree-elevated paparazzi who had photos of her taking possession of them just like the boyfriend testified.

Christie was the name given to Taylor’s sister. There is a ‘Christie’ in the Canadian lawyer’s past. She was a street soldier socially engineered into his late 1990s path. Extra attractive, she played him like a Stradivarius violin in an attempt to make him fall in love with her – just like the elite tried to do with Lesa Cipriano as part of the surreptitious assassination campaign. The details of her nefarious involvement were recorded in the Amended Statement of Claim at para. 235 et seq.

Christie reads Taylor’s letter into the court record:

Christie: “I know you won’t be able to forgive all my lies. And I’m too ashamed to ask you to. I’ve brought misery to everyone I’ve ever met. I’ll never forget you Ronny. The one person [boyfriend: Clooney M.] who ever loved me for who I am, Love Taylor”

Christie goes on to testify that her sister didn’t want to do her up-coming movie and her dad, the accused, got angry because of the lost revenue that decision entailed. He then chased after her and later admitted to getting into ‘an accident’. She claimed she thought she could take Taylor’s place: “I was more talented than Taylor anyways”, she stated. “…That I could be an even bigger star”. When the defendant executed a quasi-Clooney M. to this last remark, Grazer et al. were geopoliticizing it to affirm the Canadian lawyer’s international status would increase more that it was in February 2007. Corroboration of that interpretation came right after that clip, when producers edited eight paparazzi shots of Shark, Madeline and Christie leaving the courtroom.

To end the episode, Shark comes home after a long and successful day at ‘the office’. Julia is choreographed to hold a pen in her mouth for a total of exactly 38 seconds and there are a coalition-identifying three close-up shots of her sucking
this writing instrument. When added to her being surrounded by two sets of textbooks that are red, black and white – Canadian punishment certainty – there is no doubt there was a sexual implication to her sucking on that pen.

More is added to strengthen this inference of sexuality. The news she was watching as she did her homework involved a post-trial interview of Christie, who’d been cast in the movie in place of her dead sister. The interviewer said “You have some good news on the subject. Is it something you wanna share with our audience?”. At “share” and with the pen firmly in her mouth, Julia is directed to raise both her eyebrows. So after Svengali and eight death penalty messages the post-emancipation romance signal was much appreciated.

‘Shark’: The Ubiquity of Condemnation Yields to the Ubiquity of the Death Penalty, Holding Canada’s Judges Accountable for Serial Depraved Indifference Murder, Institutionalized Racism, the Relevance of a Black Cadillac STS, an “Eye for an Eye” and “You Wanted a War – You Got One”

[February 15, ’07]

A regular stream of coalition initiatives has been generated since early 2006 that revolved around condemnation, high profiling the various items in the Fiefdom indictment and frequently invoking coercive diplomacy. Then in late January 2007 there was a noticeable shift towards more aggressively asserting capital punishment. The February 15, 2007 episode of CBS’ ‘Shark’ added to that new pattern.

‘Powerfully moving’, ‘unavoidably forceful’ and ‘thoroughly convincing’ capture the essence of the geo-political plot in the latest episode of ‘Shark’. Where the general public saw a judge being held accountable for a murder for hire plot against his wife because she was going to ‘out’ him for being gay and then executing the hit man he hired, the audience in the East-West Corridor witnessed Grazer et al. having demonstrated they’ve geniusly mastered the use of the lexicon to deliver a plethora of critical messages to Canada’s elite. In and amongst embeds that high profiled various aspects of the Canadian lawyer’s circumstances and the dynamics between coalition partners and their two nemeses emerged three main themes. One was that Canada’s judges have been found guilty of involvement and complicity in crimes against humanity, Chinese joint hegemony, Pandora’s Box R&D (including Article 7), the China-Canada alliance, trans-generational corruption and illegality and unforgivably serious ethical turpitude. The sentence: death.

One of several pinnacle moments for the malfeasant in terms of the Canadian lawyer’s circumstances – one that encapsulates his financial ruin, professional disempowerment, enslavement, lab monkey status, isolation and deprivation, drug entrapment, and attempted humiliation; and on the flip side, a decade of enormous propaganda victories, extreme schadenfreude generation and Article 7 advancement – is identifying with specificity the vehicle he drove when living in the Dogville Penthouse: Amended Statement of Claim para. 222.
And the third main theme goes to the heart of the geo-political conflict. It will be recalled that President Bush formally declared war on May 5, 2006 while being interviewed on CNBC by the esteemed Professor Kudlow. This episode was an affirmation of that official state of military hostilities – one made while the actor who uttered the remark “You Wanted a War – You Got One” stood in front of a set of elevators.

Grazer et al. clearly knew exactly how to employ the diplomatic lexicon to embed a multitude of communiqués throughout the show. With a honed skill and a never dry well spring of creativity, virtually every scene was tailored in one way or another to insert something of relevance to advancing coalition interests and objectives. What became evident quite quickly was the television program was going to be a conduit to repeatedly threaten capital punishment for those, especially judges, who clearly behaved over a lengthy period of time in a manner that attracted that penalty and chose defiance instead of capitulation, arrogant belligerence instead of humble negotiation and petulant insolence over respectful diplomacy.

Like all geo-content in the evening drama genre since September 2006, ‘Shark’ embedded coalition content in the very first scene and to the last.

The murder was committed on the top floor of a parking lot at Los Angeles airport. A woman pulls up in her car, sees a man walking towards her and waits until he’s observed entering the elevator, gets out when she feels safe and then is killed. Grazer et al. then insert a clip of a plane taking off and chose what was likely a United jet so that the red fuselage underbelly could be color-schemed with the white take-off lights and the black sky to create the Canadian punishment certainty color scheme.

When Shark shows up at the crime scene he’s welcomed by Raina and no time is wasted before the first geo-gesture is scripted to create the first death penalty communiqué.

Shark: I’m at LAX, yet I’m not heading to Las Vegas.

Raina: White female, mid-thirties, stabbed at the car [Clooney M.]. Apparent robbery gone bad.

The husband shows up distraught and Shark recognizes him as a judge who he’s been before many times and doesn’t like. Notwithstanding, he tries to put mutual feelings aside. Grazer et al. embed the second death penalty communiqué:

Shark: I’m sorry for your loss. [Isaac: quasi-Clooney, quasi-Execution M.]

Judge: Save the ‘sorry’. Just find the animal who killed my wife.
Isaac: [Russell M.] I take it you two know each other?

Shark: He’s [like evangelist Pat Robertson]. He’s not shy using the Bench as a pulpit. He’s held me in contempt 7 times. He’s tried to have me disbarred twice.

Raina: And I supposed you were an innocent victim.

Shark: [quasi-Cl.M.] Well, I was that. I circulated a petition demanding an impeachment from the Bench.

With the number of contempt citations and disbarment attempts at the sole discretion of the producers, it was easy to see the quantum ratifier inserted; and this was corroborated by what was in the next scripted line and Shark’s aggressive geo-gesture. The Canadian lawyer was “an innocent victim”.

The gesture was also relevant to what followed it. As far as the Canadian lawyer’s been concerned, judges like Federal Court Chief Justice Lutfy, Lemieux J., the three panel federal appeals court of Sharlow, Decary and Noel JJ. and Brenner CJ on the British Columbia Supreme Court and Cooke J. on the Alberta Court of Queen’s Bench ought to be forced off the Bench – at minimum – for their complicity in what’s been proven.

In the first two lines of the office conference room discussion about this new case one of the main essences of Canada’s paradigm of governance is highlighted. The economy monopolization, wealth plunder and depraved indifference murder dynamics were concisely and brilliantly captured in the phrase “robbery-homicide”.

Shark: What have we got [Stewart M.]?

Raina: Robbery homicide.

As per usual, when a spouse is married, the survivor is a suspect. So Shark pays the judge a visit in Private Chambers. The dialogue was scripted to embed issues important to coalition partners:

Judge: Has there been a development in the case?

Shark: Ah, not yet [double Paula M.] but I was hopin’ to ask you some questions.

Judge: Well, before I do I want to apologize for my behavior this morning. I was distraught and I’m sorry.
Shark: No apology necessary Sir. [Judge: double-handed SNL M.] Do you know of anyone who might have held a grudge against you or your wife?

Judge: Karen dedicated her life to helping children. Everyone loved her. You’ve been to my courtroom. I believe those who are unable to live by society’s rules must be punished.

Shark: I guess that’s why they say ‘justice is blind’.

Judge: That file contains every threat against me since I became [a] judge. Phone calls to my home and office, letters – mostly from convicted defendants [Cl.M.]

There are three ‘apology’ references – a coalition identifier – and a geo-gesture. Embedded, as in other coalition content, is confirmation that Canada’s elite have no remorse for what they’ve done – in fact they’re proud of all their accomplishments – and have no intention whatsoever of seeking forgiveness for their crimes and improprieties. This is important in a criminal law context because a failure on both counts goes to sentencing mitigation.

The geo-gesture was also added to highlight the issue of having a grudge. There is no doubt in any coalition partner’s mind that the Canadian lawyer and some thirty million Canadians have one against the ruling elite and Beijing. And it’s not a stretch to argue that all Americans have one too since they’re flipping the bill for everything that has to be done to protect the United States from China’s aggressive espionage and now the Pandora’s Box and the global hegemony foreign policy.

To make it as abundantly clear as possible, Grazer et al. on behalf of the entire coalition inserted a Clooney M. to “convicted defendants” to underscore the fact that members of the elite have already been found guilty and their fates determined.

Another moment of geo-political genius is witnessed during the next scene. In the office Raina is working on two mobile corkboards that has evidence and photos pinned to them. Shark walks in, sees what she’s doing and is scripted to comment half jokingly “dueling crime boards”. Isaac’s quasi-Clooney M. and punishment certainty colors, Shark’s triple justice attire combination and Madeleine’s quantum ratifying five-bobble necklace turn that description into a brilliant metaphor for China and Canada.

On the front steps of City Hall the D.A. and Shark have a conversation and Grazer et al. employ a coalition embed technique observed a few times in 2006. It will be recalled in a couple instances yellow school busses and lexiconic colored cars were choreographed to whiz behind the actors timed to relevant remarks.
D.A.: [school bus] You’re charging Judge Bennett?

Shark: Where’d you hear that?

D.A.: CNN.

Shark: Oh.

D.A.: [black, then red, then red car] Someone leaked that Judge Bennett’s a suspect in his wife’s murder. [two extras, one wearing justice, behind them] My money’s on you. [extra 1 reaches out and touches extra 2]

Shark: Now why would I do that?

D.A.: Oh, I don’t know? ’Cause you hate the man with every fiber of your being? [...] Bennett’s a very popular guy.

Shark: Yea, right. People don’t like Bennett. They fear him. [extra walks through totaling three actors]

D.A.: Same difference. He knows everyone in this city. He will bring the wrath of God down on you. [Canadian flag colored car]

Shark: Well, if he killed his wife I’m willing to bet God will be on my side.

D.A.: Bennett is a judge Sebastian. You can’t afford to get this wrong.

Shark: You know, the last time I looked my office door said ’High Profile Crime Unit’. I don’t have the luxury of getting anything wrong Jes – which is where my God-like perfection comes in handy.

[...]

D.A.: [three actors one angle] So I assume you’ve got this covered. [and three actors other angle]

Shark: Yea.

After an implicit threat of serious consequences, the next one is direct and to the point. It’s embedded in a hallway scene where Shark discusses the case with Casey:
Shark: Who died?

Casey: Judge Linstrom won’t hear our request for a search warrant.

[...]

Shark: What kind of car does Bennett drive?

Casey: Black Cadillac STS.

As stated in the chapter title and at the beginning, this is where Grazer et al. embed the kind of car the Canadian lawyer used when he was turned into a servant-butler for Dogville street soldiers at a time when he should have been a senior lawyer with only a couple-three more years left practicing before Canadian law allowed him to apply for a position on the Bench. A black STS was the car he drove his ‘master’ landlord and his friends around in the capacity of chauffer to bars and nightclubs for a year and a half. It was the car he did errands in for his landlord’s in-part Chinese agent resettlement real estate business. It was transportation for groceries and liquor to keep the party palace stocked for the reams of street soldiers that celebrated their good fortune and who gloated over the fact they had their own slave to tend to their needs. And it was the car used at all hours of the morning when the wanna-be king of the penthouse castle wanted his telephone dating date picked up and driven home to satisfy his craving for sex.

The federal lawsuit Statement of Claim pled his enslavement and attempts at humiliation:

During this residence in the penthouse, the Defendant engineered an embarrassing, humiliating and degrading home environment. Immediately, the Plaintiff was given the designation of “butler” and was required to sleep in the master bedroom walk in closet. He was often belittled by Twarog et al.. He was given menial tasks in front of “et al.” that included shining Twarog’s shoes and pressing his shirt and pants before going out nightclubbing. The Plaintiff was also ordered to play the role of gopher to fetch items desired ad hoc sometimes at 4 or 5 o’clock a.m. and to destinations at various distant locations outside Vancouver.

The Plaintiff’s other duties included stocking the penthouse with the close to $1,000.00 a month of food, alcohol and supplies. And, although there was a paid cleaning service that came in once a week, it was his responsibility for general daily cleaning. Since the penthouse was hosting after-nightclub-closing parties every single night for the first 3 months of his tenancy, cleaning became a laborious, tedious, thankless and humiliating job. Twarog even farmed the Plaintiff out to his penthouse floor neighbors for cleaning,
and which was intended to and did cause embarrassment and humiliation.

[...]

During his residence at the penthouse, the Plaintiff witnessed Twarog et al. consume enormous amounts of alcohol and appear to consume regular amounts of illegal substances over the year and a half of his tenancy, including ecstasy and cocaine. The general and routine social calendar revolved around being regular patrons at the Big Bamboo and other nightclubs in Vancouver. Experiencing Twarog et al.’s apparent lifestyle, including Twarog’s **new Cadillac STS**, special VIP privileges at all the nightclubs they attended, large liquor tabs paid by credit card, purchasing drugs in the nightclubs and in the so-called security of the penthouse, Twarog et al. making advances, seeking and obtaining sexual gratification regularly from different single relatively attractive women, carrying on week and month long relationships, lead to the Plaintiff’s life going by year after year with nothing of substance happening personally, professionally or in terms of his proprietorship.

After the judge is arrested for the murder of his wife, Shark and his boss have a hallway conversation that terminates at the geo-politically symbolic elevator and where another element of the chapter title comes from.

D.A.: You arrested him in the middle of a trial?

Shark: Can’t imagine how long I’ve dreamed of doing that.

D.A.: Gotta admit it’s crossed my mind a few times. [*five actors]*

Shark: Take the best sex you’ve ever had; add in a royal flush.

D.A.: Still you humiliated the man.

Shark: Guys like Bennett think they’re untouchable, so I reached out and touched him.

D.A.: Yea and in the process alienated every judge in this building.

[...]

Stark: Screw ’em if they can’t take a joke. [*stop at elevators]*

D.A.: The point is: **you wanted a war; you got one.**

Shark: Good.
The “untouchable” remark is strikingly similar to how the *Fiefdom* treatise describes the attitude of Canada’s elite: “invincible, insulated and immune”. And they will continue to feel that way until they observe themselves surrounded by military personnel who slap the handcuffs on them, feel the scorching knife sensation and excruciating pain of the bullet piercing their skin or get news their assets have been seized.

What is most profound in this portion of the script is not the reaffirmation of the declaration of war, since all parties in the East-West Corridor knew that already. It’s the emotional sentiment reflected in the remark. There’s an undeniable element of not just impending military action, but enthusiastic confidence that the result is a foregone conclusion.

And who’s to doubt that, since the U.S. has such a gargantuan assault capability – on the ground, in the air and technologically – that it’s laughable the Canadians think they can resist even a minor intervention. They’ll know the war is in the aggressive phase when police and military communication systems no longer work and the entire street soldier infrastructure becomes useless for surveillance or stalking-surrounding dynamics. Operational blindness, instant disorganization and immense vulnerability will be followed by a complete breakdown in military discipline. Group panic and disorder will set in since everyone connected to the elite – from the high command to the lowly street operative – will realize the day has arrived that they’re going to face their already determined fate.

And then there’s Law 42: Strike the Sheppard and the sheep will scatter: *Uber-Genius Aaron Sorkin: Execute the Morons*. Word of the assassination of key members of the trans-generational elite and Chinese will generate mass hysteria since nobody will know who’s next, will fear for their lives and that of their family and friends and go into hiding.

The adage “you can run but you can’t hide” will be relevant at that stage of ‘Iron Fist’ accountability.

This excerpt from the script also includes one of the Canadian lawyer’s sentiments. He’s longed to see justice delivered to those who were supposed to dispense it and protect people like him from the malfeasant. It’s widely known he is adamant all of them deserve what’s comin’ their way.

The next scene where a judge seeks to squash the search warrant of the Cadillac STS and a motion for bail is made. This is another precious moment worth remembering. After the search is deemed valid, the issue of release from incarceration is decided:

Judge: As to the matter of bail?
Shark: We’re talking about murder one.
Defense: My client is a highly respected jurist and poses little risk of flight.

Shark: Judge Bennett personally denied bail in dozens of cases [Bennett J. aggressive protracted Stewart M.] just like this. Are we not equal under the law?

After bail is set, there’s a little professional jousting between prosecutor and defense counsel that includes a remark the Canadian lawyer’s used in the East-West Corridor several times to describe what the U.S.-led coalition is going to do to its Chinada adversary:

Defense: I’m gonna squash you like a bug.

The judge then approaches Shark to give him a piece of his mind. The terminology cannot be interpreted other than within a medieval fiefdom context: “When you go after the king, you better kill the king”. Clearly, that’s precisely what the coalition has in mind to bring a swift end to the last democratic fiefdom.

The Stewart M. executed by the judge relates both to the issue of bail for those charged under international law and the rule of law principle that everyone is equal under the law. In the former case, no doubt the coalition court will deny it for all who are implicated in the Fiefdom indictment. In the latter, Canada looked like and was therefore supposed to adhere to the principle of equality. But the evidence clearly indicates there are two codes of conduct operating in the country: one for some thirty million citizens and one for the nepotistic-patronage or joint hegemony connected – regulations that reward serious infractions of both international and Canadian domestic law, not punishes it. This is intolerable to the international community and is high on its members’ priority list to rectify.

The very next scene adds to that interpretation by starting with an extra walking past the elevators. Raina and Casey are walking down the hall conversing about the case:

Raina: No eye witness. [back & white tiled floor] No murder weapon. No motive.

She goes on to articulate other problems with the case against the judge, but this first part is where the ‘elevator incident’ reference is still relevant, as are the punishment certainty colors. Thus, Grazer et al. are confirming that in the case of the International Community vs. Chinada, the coalition has all three: eye witnesses – the Canadian lawyer and U.S. intelligence agencies, the murder weapon – Pandora’s Box and stealth cognition technologies, economy monopolization and wealth plundering technologies, techniques, strategies and tactics; and motive – perpetuation of trans-generational corruption and pursuing authoritarian imperialism.
An isolation-deprivation moment is scripted when Raina is addressing A.D.A.s in the office. Madeline walks up from behind as she states “Fun never stops”. This time the cute A.D.A. is wearing cleavage-revealing attire.

A major twist is then introduced and the motive for killing the wife becomes clear. The judge was seeking a nomination to the federal appeals court and had a good chance of an appointment since his reputation was based on traditional family values and a ‘law and order’ agenda. Madeline and Casey attend a bar where the judge’s financials reveal he regularly used an ATM to withdraw money. When it was discovered the venue was a gay bar, the judge’s image as a family man evaporated and suddenly he had a motive to exterminate the one person who could have ruined his upward mobility dynamics. A visit to the victim’s divorce lawyer earlier on turned up no leads because of solicitor-client privilege. But now her seeing the divorce attorney allowed for the inference she was going to leave him because of his sexual proclivities. When the two A.D.A.s inform Shark of this evidence, he’s in both mild shock and ecstatic. He rhetorically asks “How do you spell ’motive?’”.

Grazer et al. geo-politicize the moment with some clever cast additions and choreography. They position a coalition-identifying three extras directly behind Shark, Madeline and Casey and instruct two of them to shake hands timed to Shark’s rhetorical question. The implication was the script was being used to convey a ‘done deal’ confirmation frame of mind on the domestic and geo-political motive issue.

The scene involving the D.A. being told was just as precious. These emotional ‘whoa-boy’ reactions must have occurred every time a new coalition member agreed to join the coalition. The “you gotta be kidding me” sentiment would have been repeated over and over when CIA, military intelligence or an existing coalition recruiting member advised a prospective coalition partner what the evidence was that proved what was itemized in the Fiefdom indictment. There is now a library full of damning wiretaps that parallel the culpability-proving remarks made by Enron employees just before the collapse: Instances of Unabashed Corruption Caught in the Act: How Canada’s Elite Paralleled Enron Traders to Reveal Corroborative Evidence of the Paradigm of Governance.

The tables are turned on the D.A. and Shark during a plea conference. In the former’s office with the judge and counsel present she states (as the judge executes a Blair M.) “We’re not here to make threats – we’re here to make a deal”. In the geo-political context the time to negotiate a plea bargain expired months ago and throughout the diplomacy process Canada’s malfeasant chose to hedge their bets there wouldn’t be a military intervention.

The new twist was the claim that the murder weapon was found and had fingerprints on it of a man known to have threatened the judge repeatedly. That exculpatory evidence was then the thrust of the next scene where a press conference was held. There were a coalition-identifying three instances of three during it. The judge was arguing his innocence, but the embeds were conveying the view that Canada’s politicians, elite and Chinese were guilty. Madeline, Raina
and Shark (three) are watching the press conference on the television set in the office. There are three people at the podium – the judge, counsel and his P.R. man, Harris. And the P.R. man holds up a mug shot of the accused killer with three photos of him on it.

An isolation-deprivation embed was added right after this triple picture – a close-up of Madeline appearing most stunning.

The next plot twist was the judge using his media exposure to short circuit Shark’s decision to use the gay motive card to convict him. Much to their surprise, he ‘outed’ himself on TV. This not only sent the A.D.A.s reeling with disbelief, but caused them to find a way to mitigate this second loss to their strategy – first the murder weapon and now the gay motive. But in walks Shark with new evidence. He’s got proof that the judge wrote a glowing letter of recommendation for the accused killer’s cousin’s early parole – so the killing was the payback for this favor. Shark directs the audience’s attention to the “dueling crime boards”, on which is some writing that includes the number twenty and two coalition identifiers: “C 11 20”. The ‘payback’ theme therefore took on a geo-political context.

During the interrogation of the cousin, Grazer et al. let their script be a conduit for the coalition to threaten surprise arrests that lead to the guilty being swallowed up by the justice system for a long time. The cousin executes a quasi-Clooney M. when asks Raina how “a guy like [the murderer] disappears”.

The next scene was so powerful, it instantly made the Canadian lawyer hoot and howl with elation. Coalition partners are now fully committed to depriving Canada’s elite and Beijing of Alberta’s oil wealth. They have fully accepted the Fiefdom argument what tens of trillions of dollars will be put towards.

The scene’s context began earlier when the judge’s Cadillac STS was impounded and searched. Forensics found oil in the trunk, but at that time there was no explanation for it. Now that closer attention was being paid to every detail, the traces of oil developed significance. Madeline and an office investigator walk into Shark’s office beaming.

- Madeline: The only active oil field in greater LA: [Shark: quasi-Blair M.; close-up of Madeline] – ‘Stalker Hill’.

- Shark: Well, gold stars all around. Get an SID team right away. I get the feeling we’re about to strike it rich.

Grazer et al. acknowledge the Canadian lawyer’s future financial status twice: “strike it rich” and the quantum identifier. There now can be no doubt that the coalition feels thoroughly justified in repatriating stolen Canadian wealth to cash him up because from his hard work the United States and civilization are going to be saved from what those tens of trillions of dollars of oil wealth were going to be put to.
The very next scene adds to both the reward dynamic and the isolation-deprivation compensation issue by starting with Shark’s daughter opening the front door to invite her former bodyguard in for dinner. She’s looking very cute and her date is attired in punishment certainty colors. When she beelines for the kitchen to finish preparing what the audience saw was an impressive meal laid out on the counter, he walks over to see what she’s done and is amazed. He may have been interpreted by most as commenting on her efforts when he said “This looks amazing”, but any married man knows that the way the scene was laid out there was a discernable hint of the sexual encounter many spouses have engaged in in the kitchen when the man is thoroughly appreciative and the woman is looking stunning and showing how accommodating she wants to be to please her soul mate.

The police search on ‘Stalker Hill’ produced the body of the killer, ‘Painya’. The name sounded like a clever way to disguise geo-political implications from the audience; namely, to convey the pain and suffering Canada’s petulant, insolent and belligerent malfeasant are going to feel: pain (for) ya.

Shark brings the news to the judge in his Private Chambers and Grazer et al. embed a Shania identifier to link the Canadian lawyer’s suffering and his tormentors’ fate:

Shark: We found Painya. Shot in the chest up on Stalker Hill.

Judge: Well I can’t say I’m sorry to hear it [quasi-Colbert M.]

Shark: We’re running ballistics but we both know the bullet came from your gun. [Judge: Colbert M.] Still time to settle – avoid the death penalty.

Judge: That’s the difference between us Stark. I believe in the system.

Shark: Fine. Throw yourself on the mercy of the court.

Judge: You know I’ve never been a big proponent of mercy. Besides, I’m very confident in the end the truth will come out.

Shark: The truth will set you free, right? Don’t bet on it.

The producers are one hundred percent accurate that when there’s news of the successful execution of Canada’s enthusiastically evil no coalition members will be sorry one bit for their fate. And as the second geo-gesture red flags, everyone who worshiped at the altar of the devil will know where the bullets came from when they feel the sharp burning sensation of it piercing their skin.
The last line is a very powerful statement for the Canadian lawyer, for having discovered the truth of his predicament has ignited a process that will set him completely free of the twenty years of hell he experienced.

When the trial starts there were no coalition red flags during Shark’s opening. But there were several during defense counsel’s. This is where Grazer et al. helped coalition members embed a harsh condemnation for institutionalized racism and linked it to serious consequences. Defense counsel was wardrobed in punishment certainty and *quantum* and Shark in double justice.

**Def.:** Mr. Painya was a violent criminal. And his death was a direct result of the dangerous life he chose to lead.

[clip: jury, *three* Caucasians, one African-American in punishment certainty colors]

And as far as the murder of Karen Bennett, my client had absolutely nothing to do with it. Judge Andrew Bennett [clip: jury, two African-Am; two Caucasian with one quasi-Erin M.] is a fine public servant and he is a grieving husband. And he is a victim.

Raina cross-examines a detective on the case:

**Raina:** Detective, did you supervise ballistics on the bullet that killed Karen Bennett? [quasi-Blair M.]

**Detective:** Yes – one *38* caliber slug to the chest.

The judge takes the stand in his own defense:

**Judge:** [clip: *three* actors] I tried reasoning with him. I’d been threatened many times [clip: gallery member arm jerk]

**Defense:** What happened next?

[intro punishment certainty colored binder on judge’s desk with *three*]

**Judge:** I waited outside Painya’s house [binder “*3 S*”] and when he arrived I confronted him.

[judge’s testifies with hearsay what Painya said about killing his wife]

**Defense:** In know how difficult this is. Please tell us what happened next. [binder]
Judge: I told Painya that I was calling the police. I was going to make sure that he spent the rest of his life in jail. [...] [I thought he was going to kill me.] That’s when I shot him.

[clip: jury, two African-Americans; two Caucasians; one Af-Am Erin M; one Caucasian quasi-Cl.M.]

I know I should have gone to the police. But this man – he had already taken so much from me. [Shark: quasi-Erin M., then quasi-Cl.M.] He destroyed my life.

This scene demonstrates how coalition members are always looking for new ways to embed geo-political relevant content both so the public doesn’t get saturated with the lexicon and creates an opportunity for somebody discovering the secret lexiconic language and so coalition partners are constantly entertained with seeing uber-creativity. This time something as inconspicuous as a binder on the judge’s desk is turned into a powerful symbol representing how the coalition is going to deliver the ‘Iron Fist’ of accountability to Canada’s unapologetically unrepentant.

Its use conveyed the message that the coalition’s military forces will be confronting those now convicted of what’s itemized in the Fiefdom indictment.

There was a liberal use of geo-gestures and African-American extras in this scene. Reminiscent of the use of Chinese extras in this program and others to underscore a Beijing joint hegemony and China-Canada alliance connection, the use of these extras was designed to convey the point that institutionalized racism as part of Beijing’s global hegemony objective attracts capital punishment and life sentences.

Judge: [clip: three actors] I tried reasoning with him. I’d been threatened many times [clip: gallery member arm jerk]

There was no need to ponder what Grazer et al. meant when timing the judge’s remark “I tried to reason with him” to a clip importing the coalition. Coalition partners have used diplomacy for a long time with no results. And one to the clip of the gallery member jerking her arm timed to “I’d been threatened many times” is cleverly linking the attention-grabbing tactics of street soldiers who would then intimidate him with gestured death threats. Nor was there need to wonder why Shark was choreographed to execute a double geo-gesture to “he had already taken so much from me” and “he destroyed my life”.

With the judge copping to the murder of his so-called wife’s killer, Shark’s case was tanking. During a recess there was a hallway huddle amongst the prosecutors. As they’re discussing strategy, the judge’s P.R. man. Harris, is giving a press conference. As had been scripted before, a Chinese extra in the role of a reporter is planted in the press crowd. She’s standing to his immediate right and he’s attired in punishment certainty and quantum.
Again being exceptionally clever, Grazer et al. edited in one short sentence uttered by Harris as Shark and his team are considering their next move, knowing its import would be caught during transcription and added to the *Fiefdom* treatise.

Shark: A guy as good as Harris – nothing gets past him. [clip: Chinese extra: close-up] [...] Need something fixed, call a fixer.

Harris: ...Just to please me...

Shark: Okay, we’re due back in an hour.

The composition for geo-political purposes was again brilliant. The first clip was inserted to “nothing gets past him” – a reference to how the Canadian lawyer’s sharp perceptions and academic skills discovered what the *Fiefdom* treatise documents involving the Chinese both in Canada and globally.

The clip was also relevant to “need something fixed, call a fixer”. That’s meant to identify how the Canadian sought the assistance of the international community to ‘fix’ his country by militarily fumigating it to be rid of its two predatory parasites. Arguably, his trip to the United States seeking political asylum was more than just an escape. It was a call to coalition partners to actively intervene in the affairs of his country to spark democratic reform.

When Harris is later confronted with his complicity – he planted the murder weapon – he’s plea bargained to turn on his client. When he’s asked by Shark in the witness box to “describe for the jury this murder for hire plot”, a clip of three jurors is inserted: one Caucasian and two African-Americans, including the one wardrobed in Canadian punishment certainty attire. The implication was that those in Canada who were responsible for institutionalized racism with a military – hegemony connection were going to face ‘Iron Fist’ punishment.

After being convicted, Shark goes to visit the judge in his prison cell. Grazer et al. don’t miss the opportunity to embed coalition content in this powerful scene. It was indicative and symbolic of the situation Canada’s judges find themselves in. Like the fictional jurist, members of Canada’s judiciary are on the fast track to execution, life imprisonment and asset forfeiture, depending on the level of culpability. Thus it was totally appropriate for the two stenciled numbers, 125 and 5, to appear on the jail walls; as was the use of yellow lighting to underscore that while these nepotistic-patronage appointed corruption protectors and hegemony perpetuators weren’t going to order his damages be paid by the state, the coalition was going to see to it.

Shark: [125...] Does the Supreme Court have a policy on convicted murderers? [five] What were you thinking? [...]

[…]

Shark: [...]

Harris: ...Just to please me...

Shark: Okay, we’re due back in an hour.

The composition for geo-political purposes was again brilliant. The first clip was inserted to “nothing gets past him” – a reference to how the Canadian lawyer’s sharp perceptions and academic skills discovered what the *Fiefdom* treatise documents involving the Chinese both in Canada and globally.

The clip was also relevant to “need something fixed, call a fixer”. That’s meant to identify how the Canadian sought the assistance of the international community to ‘fix’ his country by militarily fumigating it to be rid of its two predatory parasites. Arguably, his trip to the United States seeking political asylum was more than just an escape. It was a call to coalition partners to actively intervene in the affairs of his country to spark democratic reform.

When Harris is later confronted with his complicity – he planted the murder weapon – he’s plea bargained to turn on his client. When he’s asked by Shark in the witness box to “describe for the jury this murder for hire plot”, a clip of three jurors is inserted: one Caucasian and two African-Americans, including the one wardrobed in Canadian punishment certainty attire. The implication was that those in Canada who were responsible for institutionalized racism with a military – hegemony connection were going to face ‘Iron Fist’ punishment.

After being convicted, Shark goes to visit the judge in his prison cell. Grazer et al. don’t miss the opportunity to embed coalition content in this powerful scene. It was indicative and symbolic of the situation Canada’s judges find themselves in. Like the fictional jurist, members of Canada’s judiciary are on the fast track to execution, life imprisonment and asset forfeiture, depending on the level of culpability. Thus it was totally appropriate for the two stenciled numbers, 125 and 5, to appear on the jail walls; as was the use of yellow lighting to underscore that while these nepotistic-patronage appointed corruption protectors and hegemony perpetuators weren’t going to order his damages be paid by the state, the coalition was going to see to it.

Shark: [125...] Does the Supreme Court have a policy on convicted murderers? [five] What were you thinking? [...]

[…]

Shark: [...]

Harris: ...Just to please me...

Shark: Okay, we’re due back in an hour.
Judge: Do you think this has been easy? I have been trapped for years, unable to live my life.

‘Shark’: Thousands of Canada’s Senior Lawyers Are Going to be Disbarred and Face ‘Iron Fist’ Accountability

[February 22, ‘07]

It wasn’t until about three-quarters through the February 22, 2007 episode of CBS’ ‘Shark’ that the diplomatic bomb detonated. And when it did, thousands of Canada’s most senior lawyers lay dead and dying in the trenches of the last democratic fiefdom.

All the other officials and decision-makers in Canada’s publicly-perceived mature, rational and independent accountability mechanisms were identified for ‘Iron Fist’ justice in coalition content. Judges, the police and the media were all targeted at one time or another – some repeatedly – for violating their oaths of office or the public trust and allowing Canada to remain a trans-generationally corrupt, economy monopolized, wealth plundered, schadenfreude-ravaged, sexual perversion and Chinese paradise. Nearing the end of February 2007 it became the lawyers’ turn to feel the wrath of the international community. After filling the script with a plethora of non-stop geo-activity, in one quick scene the geo-political plot was revealed.

By the time Grazer et al. flipped the death penalty switch on thousands of involved and complicit members of Canada’s Bar, the elite had experienced what in other circumstances of similar magnitude is called “overwhelming force”. Scene after scene, they were bombarded with their malfeasance and more unequivocal signals they are going to suffer exactly what the coalition partnership has been arguing for -> execution, imprisonment and impoverishment.

It only need be said briefly that lawyers have a special place in democratic societies. They are endowed with a unique privilege which if violated leads to tyranny. Not only are judges chosen from their ranks and many of them become parliamentarians, cabinet ministers, senior bureaucrats and Crown corporation directors, but also in private practice they serve the most critical function of being able to evaluate when the state oversteps its lawful bounds.

They are educated, knowledgeable, intuitive and with their skills capable of commencing litigation to seek relief, damages and obtain orders of the court preventing further abuses of power. When they become maliciously biased; when they serve only the state and its parochial domestic and foreign policies; when they betray their solemn oath to protect the individual from vicious, brutal, cruel, sadistic, perverted and racist conduct and use their education, knowledge and skills to make the state even more vicious, brutal, cruel, sadistic, perverted and racist, then they are to be held to full account for their actions – with aggravating circumstances playing a fundamental role in sentencing. Therefore not only are
they subject to disbarment and their firms to complete asset forfeiture, but lengthy imprisonment and the death penalty.

Lawyers also become members of law societies, law professors and sit on law school admission boards. Therefore, they become gatekeepers for entry into LL.B., LL.M. and doctorate of laws programs and upward mobility into the judiciary. They become Benchers – those charged with disciplining lawyers and who have the power to make or destroy careers. They also are ideal candidates for the hundreds of different boards, commissions and tribunals that evaluate everything from labor disputes to foreign accreditation. Lawyers therefore are in the modern era what priests were in medieval times.

The duties, obligations and responsibilities of lawyers have already been articulated twice in the *Fiefdom* treatise. The chapter ‘Shark’: Eight Gun Shots Heard ‘Round the World from the November 28, 2006 episode reproduces the relevant sections of the Canadian Bar Association’s *Code of Profession Conduct*. Some of them are:

Chapter XIII says: “The lawyer should ... try to improve the administration of justice”: and in particular it states:

The lawyer, by training, opportunity and experience is in a position to observe the workings and discover the strengths and weaknesses of laws, legal institutions and public authorities. The lawyer should, therefore, lead in seeking improvements in the legal system, but any criticisms and proposals should be *bona fide* and reasoned.

And in Chapter XV: “The lawyer should assist in maintaining the integrity of the profession”.

Duties, obligations and responsibilities were also discussed in *The Role of the 21st Century Political Philosopher and Lawyer Protecting Democracy from the Likes of Those Perpetuating the Last Democratic Fiefdom* and which identified what the Canadian as both a political philosopher and lawyer was obligated to accomplish by virtue of those two trainings. The United Nations *Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power* and the sections involving the obligations of lawyers was quoted from extensively. Here are some of the provisions which have been violated by Canada’s Bar:

Whereas the Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power recommends measures to be taken at the international and national levels to improve *access to justice and fair treatment, restitution, compensation and assistance for victims of crime,*

Whereas adequate protection of the human rights and fundamental freedoms to which all persons are entitled, be they economic, social and cultural, or civil and political, requires that *all persons have effective access to legal services provided by an independent legal profession,*
Whereas professional associations of lawyers have a vital role to play in upholding professional standards and ethics, protecting their members from persecution and improper restrictions and infringements,

[...]

Duties and responsibilities

12. Lawyers shall at all times maintain the honour and dignity of their profession as essential agents of the administration of justice.

[...]

14. Lawyers, in protecting the rights of their clients and in promoting the cause of justice, shall seek to uphold human rights and fundamental freedoms recognized by national and international law and shall at all times act freely and diligently in accordance with the law and recognized standards and ethics of the legal profession.

[...]

Guarantees for the functioning of lawyers

16. Governments shall ensure that lawyers (a) are able to perform all of their professional functions without intimidation, hindrance, harassment or improper interference; (b) are able to travel and to consult with their clients freely both within their own country and abroad; and (c) shall not suffer, or be threatened with, prosecution or administrative, economic or other sanctions for any action taken in accordance with recognized professional duties, standards and ethics.

17. Where the security of lawyers is threatened as a result of discharging their functions, they shall be adequately safeguarded by the authorities.

[...]

24. Lawyers shall be entitled to form and join self-governing professional associations to represent their interests, promote their continuing education and training and protect their professional integrity. The executive body of the professional associations shall be elected by its members and shall exercise its functions without external interference.

What the Alberta and British Columbia law societies did to the Canadian lawyer were pled in the Federal Court Statement of Claim and more evidence and argument to prove they advanced the Article 7 regime, protected trans-generational nepotism, generated propaganda victories for the Chinese and strengthened the China-Canada alliance were presented in 'East of the Rock and West of the Hard Place’ in the Last Democratic Fiefdom and How the Law Societies
of Alberta and British Columbia Conspired With China and the Last Democratic Fiefdom.

It is in the foregoing context that the November and February episodes of ‘Shark’ are to be appreciated.

As with all coalition content of ‘Shark’s genre, the opening scene contains coalition content. There is a quick retrospective to remind the audience that during the end of the last episode Julia gets arrested for suspicion of drunk driving. Thus when the first new scene begins with Shark being woken up by three telephone rings, the audience thinks it’s her calling from jail. But it turns out it’s a call about a murder that creates the circumstances out of which Canada’s lawyers are identified as subject to the coalition’s ‘Iron Fist’.

Julia calls Isaac to help her instead of her father. He shows up and a female police officer states “You can take her home, but I can’t make her DUI go away”. The combination of the red sign and yellow colored desk to create the official colors of China were Grazer et al.’s way of saying there’s no way the Fiefdom indictment is going to go away. The malfeasant going to be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, so Canada’s elite better get used to it and prepare for the worst.

Shark is not called by a fellow prosecutor or the police to indicate he has to attend a crime scene, which is the formulaed process at the beginning of episodes. This time there’s a twist right at the start. His friend of thirty years and the Godfather of her child is in trouble and needs him to attend at a hotel penthouse right after a big party was held to celebrate a multi-million dollar corporate merger. The problem is he’s got a dead employee, which will cost him the deal if the press gets news of it and he needs his childhood friend to fix things.

Naturally Shark’s first predisposition is to protect the integrity of the District Attorney’s Office and his standing as a member of the Bar. But his friend gets to him and convinces him to help despite knowing he’s becoming an accessory after the fact and could be obstructing justice. The scene has lexiconic embeds. When the friend says I’ve got a problem there are red and yellow flowers in the background and a victim in black & white – in other words, Canada’s elite has conspired with the Beijing leadership and is going to get punished for it. There is also green lighting behind them, which is Grazer et al.’s way of inserting the Canadian lawyer’s quantum.

When Shark tells his friend to leave the scene and get himself an alibi and lawyer and he’s asked about the body, he says housekeeping will discover it. Only later, he’s asked to attend a crime scene in some field on the outskirts of Los Angeles to discover the body under the tarp is the victim. Madeline is already there and advises her research has discovered the woman’s father is an East coast mob enforcer. She’s also in punishment certainty colors – a rather sophisticated bit of fashion involving a white sweater not with a zipper or buttons but a black tie at the waist. As these colors come into view she states:
Madeline: Do you think he’s gonna want revenge?

Shark: Nah, he died. Of course five bullets to the brain will do that to ya.

Grazer et al. create a very powerful and convincing coalition initiative here designed to double up on the coercive diplomacy and double up on the punishment. They attribute the death penalty sentence to coalition partners seeking retribution for what happened to the Canadian lawyer and demand that a failure to compensate him for what used to be a US$5 billion damage award goes to the issue of sentencing. Had they paid out this compensation back in 2004 it is likely the sentence would be mitigated by that circumstance. But instead, the guilty persisted in thumping their collective nose at the judges, jury and executioners. Right after that the next bombshell explodes. After the coalition had identified most of the street soldiers who were used to socially engineer the Canadian lawyer into his Article 7 torture, isolation and deprivation chamber of hell, they add one more; and an important one since the woman in question embedded herself as far into his life as was possible. The woman identifying herself as Heather Bosnian became his ‘girlfriend’ in October 1996 and tried to entrap him into cocaine use. To intensify the isolation she abandoned him during Christmas and New Years, picked a fight with him to ruin Valentine’s Day and gave him the boot two weeks shy of his April birthday.

Shark pulls the tarp off and is told the victim’s name is “Heather Spalding”. There was a parallel to draw in Grazer et al. using a street soldier’s name for the deceased woman at the center of the plot. They identified another female street soldier and used her name for the victim in the November 16, 2006 episode documented in ‘Shark’: High Profiling the Corruption-Protecting Mobilization of Bar Maids, Bartenders and Bouncers in the Last Democratic Fiefdom. “Erica” was a Dogville Roxy nightclub employee who contributed to the isolation-deprivation dynamic.

After observing the punishment certainty colors on the victim again Shark is placed in his car making a call the hotel where the party was held. As he’s stating “Good morning, I’d like to have a late checkout on the penthouse please and a ‘do not disturb’ on it until then”, Isaac pulls up beside him and executes a Clooney and quasi-Clooney M..

The first scene in the office begins with the cork evidence boards on wheels. This time they weren’t cork but some kind of laminate that could be written on with felt pen. The white surface became ideal to create Canadian colors on. And that’s what Grazer et al. did right off the bat. “Time of Death” and “3 – 3:30” were the first notations the audience saw and which for coalition purposes were easy to interpret as identifying the coalition as the ‘Iron Fist’ executioner.

When an employee of the company is called in for an office interview, he’s scripted to claim the deceased was hitting on a client and states “We have strict rule about that sort of thing...”. Although there were no formally recognized coalition red
flags, it was possible to view the edited-in close-up of Raina, an African-American, as a protest against institutionalized racism.

Then there was a close-up of Madeline timed to the second half of the sentence: “...but B’s the kind of guy that takes ‘no’ for an answer”. Since it was odd to hear not a name but “B”, the person being identified was the Canadian lawyer (first initial) and describing his easy-going, respectful and caring attitude.

What followed that had coalition relevance were several lexiconic numbers; like #16 in the garage sign when Julia went to pick up her impounded car; #1199 and 90019 on the tow truck. The accused was said to not have valeted his car at the hotel until 4:12 a.m. and who left at 5:47 (= 16).

Shark’s professional ethics got the best of him and he called a conference of his associates at his place to bring them into the information loop about his improprieties. As he confesses, Madeline is standing there in another wardrobe consisting of punishment certainty. When he leaves the room, Raina, Casey and Madeline discuss how not turning Shark in makes them professionally liable and criminally culpable. They ultimately resolve to support him.

Back in the office, Grazer et al. choreograph a really interesting sequence. First Raina walks in wearing black, then Isaac walks in wearing red and Madeline trots in in white – Canadian punishment certainty. Shark’s confronted with a united staff: “You don’t have to do this”, Isaac argues. “You’re right” says Madeline, “So appreciate it and let’s win”.

Such, however, is not the case in the geo-political circumstances. China and Canada have put the U.S. and its allies in the unenviable position of having to assertively deal with the Pandora’s Box threat since its aim is to undermine American military and economic superiority and spreading democracy throughout the world – a foreign policy that has national security as its impetus.

A twist is scripted when Shark receives a DVD with photos of him at the penthouse crime scene after the employee who created it was arrested for the murder. He tries to use this as leverage to get the charge dropped. Turns out Shark’s friend was embezzling millions of dollars from the company at the time the merger was being negotiated and the victim stumbled on the criminality and was going to expose him. The audience gets to see him hovering over the body and the set is mostly black and white, the deceased’s wardrobe is black and white and there is a red time stamp which creates another powerful coercive diplomacy moment. When the time stamp hits 4:30:55 (quantum ratifier X2 and China identifier) the video screen goes black and in red letters Shark sees “If I go down, you go down”.

Confronted with being exposed, Shark has no choice but to confess his professional sins to his superior. The District Attorney is obviously not pleased. Attired in justice, he executes a Newman M. to “I guess now would be the appropriate time to throw my ass out the building” – which was meant to be a parallel with the fate of Canada’s elite: being forced into early retirement through ‘Iron Fist’ dynamics.
D.A.: [in pink] If I fired you would Stafford still release these photos?

Shark: Probably.

D.A.: [Newman M.] You know, I knew you’d bury this office and me along with it.

The color of condemnation and the geo-gesture combined made it easy to see what the D.A.’s remark was referring to geo-politically. “Bury” is meant literally. Trial prep is conducted in Shark’s basement mock courtroom. His friend is in the witness box practicing his testimony. Madeline is sitting in the judge’s chair attired in a white top and red necklace – Canada colors representing the trier of fact against the country’s trans-generationally corrupt and foreign partners. Then when she steps down off the Bench she’s observed in black pants and her color scheme shifts to Canadian punishment certainty.

Casey: Pretty convincing witness.

Raina: And we still go out with a win.

Madeline: Ryan Stafford is going down.

All three statements are geo-politically correct. The Canadian lawyer was a convincing witness both because of his own professional and academic credibility and because his evidence was corroborated by U.S. intelligence sources. Second, the coalition is going to be victorious; and, three, the Canada-China regime “is going down”.

Shark then advises them that the employee guilty of the embezzlement and with the ideal motive, Ryan Stafford, isn’t the culpable party. The courier who delivered the incriminating DVD identified Shark’s friend. The next scene is thus a confrontation between the two. His friend is attired in Canadian punishment certainty and Shark’s wearing justice.

Friend: How’d you figure [out that I killed her]?

Shark: Courier service ID’d your photo.

Friend: You weren’t supposed to keep digging.

Shark: Actually, I was digging out. [quantum color] It’s a natural reaction when someone’s trying to bury ya.

[...]
If you confess Chris, I’ll take the death penalty off the table.

Friend: [Newman M.] It’s tempting but I think I’ll pass.

The same applies to the Canadian lawyer. He was compelled by the circumstances China and the Canadian federal, two provincial and two municipal governments and the invisibly wealthy put him to dig his way out of the hell hole they dug for him. He had to file and prosecute a federal lawsuit. He tried to file an attempted provincial lawsuit. He made submissions to parliamentarians and Senators, sought political asylum and now has spent many thousands of hours authoring the Fiefdom treatise.

The insertion of the Newman geo-gesture was interesting. Those who confess to their crimes will avoid the ‘Iron Fist’ death penalty. As is the usual case with these plea bargains, the party must provide full disclosure of everything they did and everything they know – which includes revealing the names and conduct of others.

Shark (in red and purple) and the D.A. (in black and white to create Canadian punishment certainty and justice) have a hallway discussion.

D.A.: Stafford go for the deal?

Shark: Turned me down cold.

D.A.: He has no ideal [Shark’s friend] is settin’ in up.

D.A.: Nope. [red & white sign] And I can’t tell him. But I can make one thing right [eight actors; one in red & white; Shark pulls out an envelope from his suit jacket] This is cash for all the grief you caused me?

Shark: This is my resignation [Cl.M.]. I’ve become a liability to this office Jess.

Before the resignation becomes effective Shark finishes his trial. He puts his friend in the witness box, gets him to commit perjury and then forces him to tell the truth about what happened after the party. The beginning of the scene is geo-politicized to create another instance of coercive diplomacy: “And when I arrived [Raina: protracted Execution M.] the victim was dead at that time, correct?”.

When the judge grasps the evidence of Shark’s malfeasance he states “I hereby suspend your right to practice law pending an internal investigation of your actions”. Right after he says that Grazer et al. script a courtroom exterior scene where gallery members pile out followed by Shark and his associates. The first extra out was wearing Canadian punishment certainty colors followed by an African-American in yellow to create a Chinada punishment certainty color scheme – inserting the institutionalized racism worry. After then came Madeline, Raina and
Casey, who executed a quasi-Clooney M.; and then an extra in the background who gestures a tanking motion. The courtroom scene, the judge’s remarks, the color schemes, an African-American extra, Casey’s geo-gesture and the extra’s hand-diving motion combined made it absolutely clear what the coalition wanted Grazer et al. to convey to Canada’s senior lawyers: you’re guilty of involvement and complicity in what’s itemized in the Fiefdom indictment and you’re going to face the ‘Iron Fist’ accountability mechanism. So expect disbarment, asset seizure, imprisonment and for the most culpable capital punishment.

Shark’s first line in the hallway is a sarcastic but appropriate commentary on what Canada’s lawyers did: “I’ve always wanted to commit suicide in open court”.

Shark is saved by a fast-thinking D.A. Both appear before the judge in Private Chambers at her request where she advises him that a covert federal Treasury Department investigation of the embezzlement has been ongoing and Shark was a participant. The judge confesses to having been a prosecutor and knew of these kinds of situations and absolves Shark of all responsibility.

As the two walk towards the elevators he states “You like me; you really like me”. With the ‘elevator incident’ implicit in the scene, his remarks were parallel to what the coalition thinks of him being so helpful in identifying the China-Canada threat and sticking with the authoritarianism deconstruction process.

The episode ended with the formulaed home scene. Earlier Isaac let it slip Julia got arrested for the DUI and Shark struggles with confronting his daughter about her transgression. But the producers decided to play out the non-communication between the two and geo-politicize it viz. the coalition and their nemeses. He says to her

If [the murderer] had just leveled with me, I [Julia: quasi-Cl.M.] could’ve helped him. But he didn’t have the guts to admit he screwed up.

The same goes for Canada’s ruling elite. Had they come clean with their involvement in and complicitous behavior with China in international law violations in 2003 or 2004, punishment would have been substantially mitigated. However, they hedged their bets they would remain insulated and immune and persisted aggressively with more egregious conduct. And when they go down, so will thousands of senior lawyers who believed they could participate in the carnage, monopolization and plunder and got excited at the prospect of them or their children sharing global hegemony with the Chinese. But it isn’t going to turn out that way. They’re going to face execution, imprisonment and impoverishment. There’s an aggravated circumstances scenario here, since they violated the public trust. And lawyers in positions of public duty, like politicians, Crown corporation executives and on tribunals face the same increased exposure to severe punishment.
Now Canada’s politicians, judges, police, lawyers and media – all accountability mechanisms – are on the road to a really painful future. They had a chance to mitigate and decided to roll the dice – and lost big time.