



Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

@Christine Marinakis re your concerns-->previously->>Re: Record on Appeal in 1-18-0091: Quote requested

Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

Tue, Oct 16, 2018 at 6:17 PM

To: "CCC.Lawcalendarw" <ccc.lawcalendarw@cookcountyiil.gov>, "Gww1210@aol.com" <Gww1210@aol.com>, Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

Cc: "Diane Shelley (Judiciary)" <diane.shelley@cookcountyiil.gov>, "Timothy Evans (Judiciary)" <timothy.evans@cookcountyiil.gov>, "Patricia A. O'Brien (Circuit Court)" <paobrien@cookcountycourt.com>, "James Flannery (Judiciary)" <james.flannery@cookcountyiil.gov>

Bcc: gww12102002@yahoo.com, gordonwaynewatts@hotmail.com, gordonwaynewatts@aol.com

Chris, this is Gordon again.

My apologies for the brevity of my curt reply below, but I am being evicted, and I just lost my elderly father, and now my friend, Rich Daniggelis, the elderly victim in this case where I named your Judge as a defendant, is homeless because of a broken judicial system, and lost his house (and hundreds of thousands in documented equity) on admitted mortgage fraud, without being paid a dime.

I have been under a lot of stress/pressure- again - apologies. Now, all that I said below was true, but I left out key points to reply to your valid, and genuine, concerns regarding prohibited "ex parte" communications with, say, a judge overseeing a case, and I amend now:

As you know, 5 ILCS 430/5-50 defines ex parte communications as: "any written or oral communication by any person that imparts or requests material information or makes a material argument regarding potential action concerning regulatory, quasi-adjudicatory, investment, or licensing matters pending before or under consideration by the agency." HOWEVER, it goes on to say that: ""Ex parte communication" does not include the following:... (ii) statements regarding matters of procedure and practice, such as format, the number of copies required, the manner of filing, and the status of a matter;," which is the case, here. I am trying to follow the proper procedure on filing my Record on Appeal, because I know that the appeals court Justices have a hard job, and can not read minds, and (as yet) do not have access to the electronic record in the case, in the same manner as Circuit Judges in the Law division (but I am seeing if I can change that procedure, as I speak).

To clarify, no, I am not making any arguments to Judge Shelley via email about my case (tho a few hints were included in my comments in my request for the record). To begin with, you, not she, screens the email, as you are her clerk --and, as such, you are charged with preventing the judge from prohibited ex parte communications on the merits. Moreover, were I I to desire to make an argument before this judge, I would file a motion or other pleading -- such as I did in my 04/20/2018, which is on docket at 2007-CH-29738, GMAC v. Daniggelis, Watts, et. al., where even the docket attests I am a named defendant, and thus a party of record eligible for In Forma Pauperis grant, which

allows me my Record on Appeal gratis and for free. Lastly, as 5 ILCS 430/5-50 clearly says, some ex parte communications are allowed, such as setting hearing dates, procedural matter, like my record, and other exceptions, incl. but not limited to, say, orders of protection, which, of course, preclude the other side from hearing.

I know you meant well, and I don't fault your motives or intents, but, no, I am not making ex parte merit arguments to the judge, here, in my email: Again, had I wanted to do that, I would have filed a motion, such as my 04/20/2018 filing, which is **ON DOCKET at the above-referenced case, and linked here

https://courtlink.lexisnexis.com/cookcounty/FindDock.aspx?NCase=2007-CH-29738&SearchType=0&Database=2&case_no=&PLtype=1&sname=&CDate=

on which the judge did NOT rule on... even tho, within the body of my SHORT AND SUCCINCT 'notice' filing, I clearly move for a Rule 321 limitation of the record. Your judge CAN NOT claim the she didn't receive my motion, as it is clearly court-stamped. Here is another copy, or two, in case you've lost your copy:

** https://www.GordonWatts.com/MortgageFraudCourtDocs/Fri20Apr2018_MotionClarification_07CH29738_LawDiv_Watts.pdf

or

** https://www.gordonWAYNEwatts.com/MortgageFraudCourtDocs/Fri20Apr2018_MotionClarification_07CH29738_LawDiv_Watts.pdf

Lastly, when service a copy upon the court and clerk, it is customary to include the judge's chambers a copy of all my filings, motions, etc. Even Judge Otto, who issued the blatantly Unconstitutional ruling, giving elderly Daniggelis' to the local rich attorney, Joseph Younes, without any legal basis, never objected to my having served him copies of my filings, and, up to this point, neither have you.

In conclusion: Your concerns are noted, and again, I do not impute malicious motives on your part, but, as a matter of law, your concern is misplaced. Lastly, no matter how frustrated I am with Judge Shelley's blatant disregard for the title theft in this case, I am not trying to insult her (or the judiciary) in any way, and, for the record (this email thread is slated to be in my appendix to demonstrate to the appalls court prosecution on my part regarding procurement of the record on appeal), anyhow, for the record, I will attest and affirm that I vividly recall Daniggelis telling me in numerous phone conversations that Judge Shelley told Andjelko Galic, his attorney, that she would grant his nonsuit (voluntary dismissal) motion, docketed on Dec.07, 2017, that day, but that she couldn't guarantee that she'd be around to hear the case when/if he refiled it in the Law Division, which implies that she wanted to do her best to assure Galic that he would get a fair day in court, but warn him of her limitations regarding transferal out of the division, or random reassignment of the new case to another judge. I'm grateful & thankful that Judge Shelley made such reassuring & respectful comments to Atty. Galic, letting him know that she was doing her best. My recollections on her comments to Galic do not impact the merits of the case, and are, therefore, not prohibited ex parte communications, and, moreover, I'm angry at the court, in general, and Judge Shelley, in particular, for her comments to Daniggelis, telling her to ask me to butt out of

the case, my Intervention rights, notwithstanding, so I have no motives to enter into the record a positive comment about the judge, but my religious beliefs -- whatever they be -- compel me to be honest, respectful, and back up my intents with actions to help the other parties, and judges, to be able to do their jobs as easily as possible, even if I, myself, feel I am being treated unfairly.

With kind regards, I am, Sincerely,

Gordon Wayne Watts

On 10/16/18, gww1210 <gww1210@gmail.com> wrote:

> The judge •is• a party of record as she is a named defendant, Chris, in the
> Mandamus proceedings. Why else would she have an email address if not for
> moral due process?.. She should have thought of that before doing something
> to *become* a named defendant, incl., but limited to, not even ruling at
> *all* on my timely motions, much less ruling in my favour, fair & practical
> Due Process, hello? Please, overlook typos earlier, as I am using my
> smartphone. Gordon Wayne Watts
> Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android Device
> ----- Original message -----From: "CCC.Lawcalendarw"
> <ccc.lawcalendarw@cookcountyil.gov> Date: 10/16/18 1:58 PM (GMT-05:00) To:
> "From: gww1210" <gww1210@gmail.com>, Gww1210@aol.com, "From: gww1210"
> <gww1210@gmail.com> Cc: "Diane Shelley (Judiciary)"
> <diane.shelley@cookcountyil.gov>, "Timothy Evans (Judiciary)"
> <timothy.evans@cookcountyil.gov>, "Patricia A. O'Brien (Circuit Court)"
> <paobrien@cookcountycourt.com>, "James Flannery (Judiciary)"
> <james.flannery@cookcountyil.gov> Subject: Re: Record on Appeal in
> 1-18-0091: Quote requested

> Mr. Watts,

> Please do not have ex-parte communication with Judge Shelley. There are
> other parties of record.

> Best,

> Christine Marinakis

> Case Coordinator

> Hon. Diane M. Shelley

> 1912 Richard J. Daley Center

> Chicago, IL 60602

> (312) 603-5940

> From: gww1210 <gww1210@gmail.com>

> Sent: Monday, October 15, 2018 10:25 AM

> To: Patricia A. O'Brien (Circuit Court)

> Cc: Timothy Evans (Judiciary); James Flannery (Judiciary); Diane Shelley
> (Judiciary); Gww1210@aol.com; gww1210@gmail.com

> Subject: RE: Record on Appeal in 1-18-0091: Quote requested

>

>

>

> Thank you, Patricia, for your speedy reply, replying even during your
> time-off. Anyhow, since Illinois case law on Intervention is still current,
> and since i am (very, very) indigent, my rights to sue or defend are are
> being denied.

> While i understand your limitations here, i am not unmindful that you are
> ab attorney, and a very intelligent one at that, and, as such, you know that
> the appeals court is blatantly wrong in its claims of lack of, for example,
> jurisdiction to issue a Ruke

> 321 order limiting the record to a manageable size, or appeallate authority
> to uphold the John Hancock case cited below. Indeed, the elephant in the
> room is that the court had authority then to hear an appeal on Intervention,
> but not now? Oh, really? Things

> like that generate a bad name for the judicial branch. Anyhow, yes, since
> the docket alone is huge (takes several minutes to load on my slow
> connections), the file would be huge, i am guessing, several thousand
> dollars. If i had the money to pay for it, i

> might pay for a full record, but to ask me to make a down payment without
> kbowing full price not only violates my religious beliefs, as my Holy Book
> requires i "count the cost" before diving in (Luke 14:25-34 of the Holy
> Bible

> <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Luke+14%3A25-34&version=NIV>),

> but moreover, it is very unwise.

>

>

>

> If the court thinks that John Hancock is no longer valid case law, or that
> it has recently lost its Rule 321 appellate authority, who doesn't it issue
> a ruling receding from these holdings or otherwise strike R.321 as invalid
> or Unconstitutional?

>

>

>

> I •did• fill out the form you described, and filed it with you, albeit sans
> payment, because i am indigent, but i am willing to pay whay i can afford,
> maybe a few hundred dollars. Your court would be better off getting some
> money from me. If you don't

> believe i filed the required paperwork to request prep of the record, look
> at *my* docket, posted at these 2 mirrors, paying close attention to Exhibit
> B of my 1/22/2018 filing in this case, a fee waiver application. I did make
> a formal request to prepare

> the record, several times,...see also my 1/19/2018 docketing statement, and
> note exhibit B here also: Your court had the proper paperwork, and and want
> of prosecution was not my fault. Observe:

>

>

>

> <https://www.gordonwatts.com/MortgageFraudCourtDocs/DOCKET-MortgageFraudCase.html>

> or:

> <https://www.gordonwaynewatts.com/MortgageFraudCourtDocs/DOCKET-MortgageFraudCase.html>

>

>

>

> I can not blame you, Patricia, but neither am i to blame, and if i can't get
> a fair day in court, then bot only is this denying my due process, it also

> harms the reputation of the court, which i hope to avoid, as i am not
> spiteful or vengeful.
>
>
>
> In conclusion, if the courts reverse their heavyweight ruling, allowing me
> to proceed In Forma Pauperis, they will get a glass half full, as i am
> willing to pay something. If they force me to buy the whole record in this
> open & shut case, you will have
> to cobsider asking the clerk's office and/or the Chief Judge's office
> (whomever oversees this) to try out my suggestion of allowing litigants to
> access the same portal as the circuit judges, and use *that* as Common Law
> Record (on appeal), which might not
> only save my elderly friend's life, but certainly save your court millions
> of dollars in man-hours of labour, since your office would not need to
> prepare the Record on Appeal. Please inquire about both if my suggestions,
> and please follow-up with me on this.
> The current trajectory harms all parties immensely, and should be avoided
> at all costs. Thank you, in advance, for your inquiry in this regard.
>
>
>
> Regardless of Judge Flannery's ruling, wrongly denying my rights to sue or
> defend, I *did* fill out the formal request, and filed itwith the court, as
> you requested. It's your move.
>
>
>
> P S.: Since i almost won the Terri Schiavo case ALL BY MYSELF, doing better
> than Gov. Jeb Bush (he lost 7-0, and i lost 4-3 before the same panel of
> Fla. Supreme Court justices... Google me or review the court's docket...) i
> think i know a bit about law,
> more than most attorneys who did nowhere as well as me:
>
>
>
> <https://www.floridasupremecourt.org/clerk/dispositions/2005/2/03-2420reh.pdf>
>
>
>
> compare with here, where Bush did far worse than me:
>
>
>
> <https://www.floridasupremecourt.org/clerk/dispositions/2004/10/04-925reh.pdf>
>
>
>
> With Kind Regards, I am, Sincerely,
>
>
>
> Gordon W. Watts
>
>
>
>

> Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android Device

>
>
>
>
>
>

> ----- Original message -----

> From: "Patricia A. O'Brien (Circuit Court)" <paobrien@cookcountycourt.com>

> Date: 10/15/18 10:17 AM (GMT-05:00)

> To: Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

> Cc: "Timothy Evans (Judiciary)" <timothy.evans@cookcountyil.gov>, "James

> Flannery (Judiciary)" <james.flannery@cookcountyil.gov>, "Diane Shelley

> (Judiciary)" <diane.shelley@cookcountyil.gov>, Gww1210@aol.com,

> "Gww1210@gmail.com" <gww1210@gmail.com>

>

> Subject: RE: Record on Appeal in 1-18-0091: Quote requested

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

> Good Morning Gordon,

>

> As you know from our numerous prior discussions, the Civil Appeals Division

> does not prepare Records on Appeal unless the Request for Preparation of

> Record on Appeal form has been efiled and the statutory fee paid.

>
>

> Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 321, you may only limit the Record

> on Appeal by stipulation of the parties or by order of court. Also, as you

> know, my division is required to prepare Records in accordance with the

> Supreme

> Court Rules and Standards for Preparation of Electronic Records- you are

> not able to direct us otherwise.

>

> We do not provide estimates in advance of the Record being prepared because

> we have no means to calculate it until the images have been reviewed and

> prepared. However, as you are well aware, this case is eleven years old and

> was

> several boxes in size many years ago.

>

> The Record on Appeal in this case will not be prepared by this Wednesday

> because you never filed your Request form.

>
>

> Sent from

> Mail for Windows 10

>
>
>

> From: Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

>

> Sent: Monday, October 15, 2018 4:45:01 AM

>

> To: Patricia A. O'Brien (Circuit Court); civilappeals (Circuit Court)
>
> Cc: Timothy Evans (Judiciary); James Flannery (Judiciary); Diane Shelley
> (Judiciary); Gww1210@aol.com; Gww1210@gmail.com
>
> Subject: Record on Appeal in 1-18-0091: Quote requested
>
>
>
> CIVIL APPEALS DIVISION: Richard J. Daley Center, 50 West Washington
>
> St., Room 801
>
> Chicago, IL 60602 – (312) 603-5406, Hours: 8:30a.m.-4:30p.m., Mon-Fri,
>
> Excl. Holidays
>
> Attention: Deputy Chief, Patricia O'Brian, PAOBrien@CookCountyCourt.com
>
>
>
> Cc: Chief Judge and assigned judges on Circuit Court level
>
>
>
> Attorney O'Brien:
>
>
>
> As you are aware, the Appeals Court has granted numerous extensions of
>
> time in my appeal of 2007-CH-29783, where I have asserted Rights of
>
> Intervention. While I'm very displeased (and rightly confused) that
>
> the court has claimed it somehow or another lacks appellate
>
> jurisdiction to limit the record on appeal or address intervention --
>
> in spite of clear case law to the contrary (see e.g., 05/03/2018 order
>
> of 1st Appellate Court where it disclaims jurisdiction "to order the
>
> Cir. Ct. to allow Watts leave to intervene, grant a fee waiver, or to
>
> prepare the record on appeal & transmit to App. Ct. in this matter
>
> (1-18-0572)," an appeal of Judge Flannery's order regarding the sister
>
> case, 1-18-0091 -- Contra: City of Chicago v. John Hancock Mutual
>
> Life Ins. Co., 127 Ill.App.3d 140, 144 (1st Dist. 1984) -- which the
>
> 1st App.Ct. wrote on Intervention or, perhaps, Rule 321, which allows
>
> the Appellate Court to limit Contents of the Record on Appeal to only

>
> a few Sine Qua Non required filings, sufficient for This Court to
>
> easily & quickly review & decide the case)...
>
>
>
> ...nonetheless, The First Appellate Court has mercifully & graciously
>
> extended time twice (the 3/28/18 order extending time to June 12,
>
> 2018, and the 07/25/18 order extending time to October 17, 2018 to
>
> file the record on appeal).
>
>
>
> I am aware of the limits of your authority, and you can rest assured
>
> that I'm not asking you to prepare a Rule 321 "limited" record (which
>
> can only be allowed by the circuit or appellate courts), but as both
>
> courts, in their infinite wisdom, have decided to deny my request for
>
> a limited record (which I might be able to pay for), this limits me to
>
> an "all or nothing" approach at my appeal... and let me remind you,
>
> Patricia, that a lot is riding on my appeal. Since Daniggelis'
>
> attorney has been want in prosecution of his appeal, it is dead, and
>
> mine is the only live case, and, if I lose, not only my "interests" in
>
> intervention are denied their day in court, but my elderly friend
>
> remains homeless, which, at his age, no doubt, jeopardizes his health
>
> and life.
>
>
>
> Therefore, I wish to get my fair day in court. To that end, while I
>
> know you can't do much else, I will ask you to do what you can do, and
>
> that is this: Please give me a quote, that is, an estimate, on the
>
> preparation of the record on appeal, which, by the way, is due this
>
> Wednesday, 17 October 2018, unless the court grants me another
>
> extension of time.
>
>
>

> We just got evicted, and right before that, some nutcase drilled a
>
> half-inch drill into my gas tank, and I had to drop several thousand
>
> dollars into security cameras, motion lights, etc., and, being
>
> unemployed (we're being evicted, leaving me no time to work), those
>
> hardships took the monies I might have spent on a "full" record on
>
> appeal. Thus, I repeat my request: I request an estimate of the full
>
> record on appeal (or some method wherein I might purchase a partial
>
> record, which I might be able to afford).
>
>
>
> Alternatively, I propose that the record be posted electronically,
>
> without alteration (which would alleviate your clerks of the many
>
> hours of preparation), in other words, when I file a motion before,
>
> for example one of the judges in this Law Division case, the judges
>
> can read the full record electronically ****without**** your civil appeals
>
> division having to prepare ****anything****. If you did this for me, this
>
> would ((#1)) save me loads of monies ((#2)) possibly save elderly
>
> Daniggelis' life, as he was made homeless ((#3)) save your clerks
>
> hours of needless preparation and ((#4)) set precedent to save Cook
>
> County Circuit Court untold millions of dollars, since allowing
>
> citizens the same portal interface as judges would work: It worked for
>
> judges, and would work for litigants.
>
>
>
> Anyhow, the appeals court is probably wondering if I am slack in my
>
> desire to prosecute this case, but my email to you, and any response
>
> you might give, are slated to be put in my appendix in my upcoming
>
> Motion to Extend Time, so that I may show that I am not want for
>
> prosecution, as Mr. Daniggelis' attorney was. Thank you, in advance,
>
> for giving me a reasonable, moral, and fair quote to prepare the
>
> record in a timely manner, in this case which has dragged on for too

>
> many decades, in the which no one has shown cause why Daniggelis'
>
> house could be snatched from him, on admitted fraud (see my pleading
>
> where I quote Judge Otto) without him having been paid a dime.
>
>
>
> P.S.: No matter how frustrated I am with the 3 levels of court (which
>
> includes your Supreme Court's treatment of my recent motion in file
>
> #:123481), I must show proper ****and complete**** respect for the courts,
>
> particularly the appellate court, which has twice extended time to
>
> file the record, and to that end, I am making a special effort to
>
> grant the appeals court's request to get the record, and transmit it
>
> to them--in order to meet the court half-way, and do my part to make
>
> their jobs (they are people too, you know), as easy as is reasonably
>
> possible. And, if there is anything I can do to make **your** job
>
> easier, I will, but I am maxed out on several levels, but to recap:
>
> Record on Appeal in 1-18-0091: Quote requested, and electronic
>
> miracles welcome, as described above.
>
>
>
> --
>
> *Gordon Wayne Watts, editor-in-chief, The Register*
>
> *
> www.GordonWayneWatts.com* <<http://www.gordonwaynewatts.com/>>* / **
>
> www.GordonWatts.com* <<http://www.gordonwatts.com/>>
>
> ***A**LWAYS FAITHFUL - To God***
>
> *BS, The Florida State University, Biological & Chemical Sciences
>
> AS, United Electronics Institute*
>
> *821 Alicia Road, Lakeland, FL 33801-2113
>
> Home: (863) 688-9880 ****Work: (863) 686-3411 Voice&FAX: (863)**
>
> 687-6141****Cell: (863)409-2109**
>
> See also:

> **http://Gordon_Watts.Tripod.com/consumer.html**<http://gordon_watts.tripod.com/consumer.html>

>

> *Gww1210@aol.com ; Gww12102002@Yahoo.com *

>

> *Truth is the strongest, most stable force in the Universe*

>

> *Truth doesn't change because you disbelieve it**

>

> TRUTH doesn't bend to the will of tyrants

>

> **www.GordonWayneWatts.com** <<http://www.gordonwaynewatts.com/>>* / **

>

> www.GordonWatts.com* <<http://www.gordonwatts.com/>>*

>

> Get Truth.*

>

> **"First, they [Nazis] came for the Jews. I was silent. I was not a Jew.**

>

> Then they came for the Communists. I was silent. I was not a Communist.

>

> Then they came for the trade unionists. I was silent. I was not a trade

>

> unionist. Then they came for me. There was no one left to speak for me."

>

> (Martin Niemöller, given credit for a quotation in The Harper Religious and

>

> Inspirational Quotation Companion, ed. Margaret Pepper (New York: Harper

>

> &Row, 1989), 429 -as cited on page 44, note 17, of Religious Cleansing in

>

> the American Republic, by Keith A. Fornier, Copyright 1993, by Liberty,

>

> Life, and Family Publications.*

>

> *Some versions have Mr. Niemöller saying: "Then they came for the

>

> Catholics, and I didn't speak up, because I was a Protestant"; other

>

> versions have him saying that they came for Socialists, Industrialists,

>

> schools, the press, and/or the Church; however, it's certain he DID say

>

> SOMETHING like this. Actually, they may not have come for the Jews first,

>

> as it's more likely they came for the prisoners, mentally handicapped, &

>

> other so-called "inferiors" first -as historians tell us -so they could get

>

> "practiced up"; however, they did come for them -due to the silence of

>

> their neighbors -and due in part to their own silence. So: **"Speak up now**

>

> or forever hold your peace!"-GWW

>

>

>

>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

—
Gordon Wayne Watts, editor-in-chief, The Register

* www.GordonWayneWatts.com* <<http://www.gordonwaynewatts.com/>>* / **
www.GordonWatts.com* <<http://www.gordonwatts.com/>>

*A**LWAYS FAITHFUL - To God*

*BS, The Florida State University, Biological & Chemical Sciences
AS, United Electronics Institute*

*821 Alicia Road, Lakeland, FL 33801-2113

Home: (863) 688-9880 **Work: (863) 686-3411 Voice&FAX: (863)
687-6141**Cell: (863)409-2109

See also: **http://Gordon_Watts.Tripod.com/consumer.html* <http://gordon_watts.tripod.com/consumer.html>

*Gww1210@aol.com ; Gww12102002@Yahoo.com *

Truth is the strongest, most stable force in the Universe

*Truth doesn't change because you disbelieve it**

TRUTH doesn't bend to the will of tyrants

**www.GordonWayneWatts.com* <<http://www.gordonwaynewatts.com/>>* / **
www.GordonWatts.com* <<http://www.gordonwatts.com/>>*

Get Truth.*

**"First, they [Nazis] came for the Jews. I was silent. I was not a Jew.
Then they came for the Communists. I was silent. I was not a Communist.
Then they came for the trade unionists. I was silent. I was not a trade
unionist. Then they came for me. There was no one left to speak for me."
(Martin Niemöller, given credit for a quotation in The Harper Religious and
Inspirational Quotation Companion, ed. Margaret Pepper (New York: Harper
&Row, 1989), 429 -as cited on page 44, note 17, of Religious Cleansing in
the American Republic, by Keith A. Fornier, Copyright 1993, by Liberty,
Life, and Family Publications.*

*Some versions have Mr. Niemöller saying: "Then they came for the
Catholics, and I didn't speak up, because I was a Protestant"; other
versions have him saying that they came for Socialists, Industrialists,
schools, the press, and/or the Church; however, it's certain he DID say
SOMETHING like this. Actually, they may not have come for the Jews first,
as it's more likely they came for the prisoners, mentally handicapped, &
other so-called "inferiors" first -as historians tell us -so they could get
"practiced up"; however, they did come for them -due to the silence of
their neighbors -and due in part to their own silence. So: "Speak up now
or forever hold your peace!"-GWW