



Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

Paul, this is Gordon, again... Something odd's happening...

Gww1210@aol.com <Gww1210@aol.com>

Tue, May 16, 2017 at 10:17 PM

To: plshelton@sbcglobal.net

Cc: Gww1210@aol.com, gww1210@gmail.com

Wow - you have taken quite a bit of time to respond to me in great detail, twice, just now; Thank you, Paul.

I will try and reply to each point in both of your emails in one response, -- and 'interleave' my replies below each of your responses, for clarity --

As email is usually done, I will put your more recent response on top, and I'll respond in bold-faced dark green for clarity. (So, that means you'll read it from the bottom up, like usual.) -- -- see below... [[will number my points to make it a bit easier.]]

In a message dated 5/16/2017 7:06:26 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time, plshelton@sbcglobal.net writes:

Gordon

You need to get past the "forgery". Richard is a liar. He gave what's her name a POA so he could make all these fraud claims. But in reality, he gave her POA and she had right to alter deed, even date, "forge" it or sign properly as attorney in fact. That is the judges point.

[[#10]] Wow, finally some thoughts or a counter-argument. Thank you, Paul!! While I think I'll respectfully dissent, know this solemn axiom: I don't get smarter by asking views or feedback from people who are 'yes' men/women - and only agree with me!.. Anyhow, I saw the record: While there *was* a POA, it obviously wasn't as powerful as you suggest -- otherwise, the title would have transferred on the May 2006 deed, and Younes kicked him out with a 5-day notice back then. Besides, the POA I see in my record <http://gordonwaynewatts.com/MortgageFraudCourtDocs/2007-CH-29738-LAW-DIV-Sept09-2015-Motion-Amicus-Exhibits-GordonWayneWatts.pdf> or <http://gordonwatts.com/MortgageFraudCourtDocs/2007-CH-29738-LAW-DIV-Sept09-2015-Motion-Amicus-Exhibits-GordonWayneWatts.pdf> see "Exhibit Watts-G," was good only until June 30, 2006, when it became irrevocable (and was revoked by the affidavit of forgery put in the recorder's office, remember?), meaning that the July 09, 2006 'signature' -- even if possibly with the POA, before then, wasn't possible afterward, as the POA had expired. (But good argument!)

Besides, "Exhibit Watts-F," was the same copy, but not notarised, meaning the notary stamp was illegally put on after-the-fact (unless someone had a photocopy machine at that Starbuck's that day, to scan a before & after - not likely). But, unless Rhone testified that she used the POA for that purpose (and she didn't, I don't think), it is clear that fraud occurred.

Note also, it was a 'limited' POA, for a real estate 'transaction,' to an outright quit claim deed transfer - big difference. A transaction is more than merely deeding over the property, and, again, no consideration is an issue, below...

The deed was a valid transfer instrument, in equity. She did what she did with his authority and the title co accepted it. End of story.

[[#11]] But the lack of consideration was a stumbling-block, as I point out: Stilk v. Myrick, 170 Eng. Rep. 1168, 1168 (1809) (L.R.C.P) (Ellenborough, L) (holding a renegotiated contract void due to lack of consideration). Daniggelis wasn't paid, which voids any 'transfer' on that grounds too.

Please keep in mind I am not a liar, and I have no reason to lie now.

[[#12]] I, by and large, believe you, Paul - but I still have doubts about Daniggelis' claim that you & your wife testified that she witnessed something he signed, when he says she never met him. And, the fact you have Exhibit-F in my attached brief, here not notarised, but Exhibit G was? How was that possible? Probably, someone notarised this after he signed it - again, not the worst crime (people do it all the time - and Daniggelis DID admit to signing it), but still a fib is a fib, and unnecessarily gives you a bad name if Daniggelis is correct here.

And I tried to help Richard. A waste of a lot of time. I feel stupid about it now. He lied to me and was hatching his plan to claim he was wronged. This is a man who inherited the building free and clear;

[[#13]] Actually, he says the he bought out his siblings' shares - and, I'm guessing, at a substantial cost. (I think he has no reason to lie about this, but I admit I don't know all the fact - and this point is really unimportant to the criminal aspects.)

sold the garage for profit; refinanced multiple times and never made a payment and used the cash out to do who knows what cause the place is a pit. He filed BK many times by himself. Like I say dumb like a fox. He was at the end of the line and the women beguiled him and "convinced" him to sell to an investor, live there 6 months and move. Richard agreed, but hatched his real plan to cry ignorance and nativity and fraud. It's worked. I helped him out and tried to get him to write his book; I spoke to him for hours about his life and plan.

[[#14]] He does talk *and talk and talk!..* (And, just between you & me, Richard agrees with me & thinks you are much more honest than Younes, and even told me how you said that you couldn't stand Younes any longer and had to stop being his law partner. Rich thinks and hopes that you will turn state's witness and help us win, which would be appropriate if, in fact, laws were broken.)

Even if Rich made stupid financial decisions & bit off more than he could chew, nonetheless, 2 wrongs make not a right, and, while I like the strength of your POA argument above, I think it's clear that Erika Rhone's scheme didn't work, since her POA expired, and was legally revoked. Even if a judge says otherwise, I still am not convinced. (Let's not forget the side-agreements that limited the POA for use of paying arrearages, etc. Since title didn't transfer on the May 2006 Warranty deed, this is proof of the side-contracts existence, which limited this transfer; otherwise, title would have not had to wait til the July 2006 warranty deed!

Besides, Paul, even ****if**** what you're saying is true about her use of the POA, she would have had to sign her OWN name, and invoke the POA, to make it legal. Otherwise, she was committing a forgery. I'll give you an example: Even IF I hired a security guard, and gave him permission to enter a property I (theoretically) owned, it would be illegal for him to impersonate ME and try to enter it. Rhone, if she was the one forging the signature, is still guilty of forgery. Just remember, a POA does NOT give any person license to break the law, and forgery is still criminally illegal - and has no statutes of limitations. Moreover, there were 'acts of furtherance' committed more recently (Younes' continued attempts to gain property via forged signature, and knowingly dealing in stolen property), which I think will (a) possibly convince the State's attorney supervisor to overrule Asst. State Atty. Thomas Simpson on this point, and (b) convince the IARDC to revoke Younes' law license.

Remember, Paul -- even if Younes "got away" with this due to statutes of limitations expiring, there was a local teacher in my area who, while unable to be "criminally" prosecuted for making a sexual joke to a student, will probably get fired as a teacher. A lawyer need not break a criminal law to be disbarred -- as you found out the hard way. Younes is, in my view, MUCH more guilty than you, and if the IARDC doesn't disbar him SOON!!, I will probably contact John Kass and friends and inform them that the IARDC admits (and/or knows) that criminal acts were committed that were "untouchable" due **solely** to SOL (Statutes of Limitation) issue - and that the IARDC is saying that you can commit a crime and still be an attorney in "Crook County," IL so long as the SOL expire! ... not. SOL also stands for sh-t out of luck, and that is the case, as Younes is obviously much more guilty than you, and will sooner-or-later face even harsher sanctions, if there is a God. -- .. -- .. There **is** a God.

He convinced me he would move out and go to his sisters. The place was simply mortgaged out. Check the records. He has you now working for free, all to keep squatting for free.

[[#15] Ah, "mortgaged out": a term meaning that he To borrow more than is necessary to secure the purchase or improvement of real estate. Yes, but no proof of payment exists, so even so, the 'contract' is not valid: *Stilk v. Myrick*, 170 Eng. Rep. 1168, 1168 (1809) (L.R.C.P) (Ellenborough, L) (holding a renegotiated contract void due to lack of consideration). Daniggelis wasn't paid, which voids any 'transfer' on that grounds too.

But, anyhow, Karen Shanner, formerly with Steward Title, allegedly testified that you & others broke a bunch of broker rules. AND, if you knew the title was transferred on a forged signature & didn't speak up, you were at fault. (But maybe you believed Rhone had POA permission, even tho I know that no POA authorises anyone to break a law, like forgery, etc.)

There is a better client for you. Richard simply is a scammer. He sucked all the equity from the place and his time is up.

[[#16]] OK, even he admits he spent a little bit of it for improvements, and such, but this is de minimus if crimes were committed. Rhone can't simply break a law because of a POA - that is absurd!

I wish you'd move on to someone who deserves your work.

You've convinced yourself Richard is honorable. But he is not.

[[#17]] Well, while Daniggelis is argumentive and talkative, I don't accept your legal analysis. (But am open to being wrong! Remember, I admitted to Judge Otto that I was wrong about teleconferences for people like me in Florida, and that it was only optional, not mandated!)

C'est la vie.

[[#18]] *Such is life: that's how things happen. I wish blessings upon you too, but if you are indeed guilty of lying about witnessing / notarizing that Exhibit-G in my PDF attachment, in this email, and/or wrong in your assessment that Rhone could commit a forgery & break the law, you should admit where you're wrong - but only IF you're wrong, and for nothing more. Defend yourself where you're innocent, which is true for the vast majority of the issues.*

Blessings

Paul

Sent from my iPhone

On May 16, 2017, at 3:18 AM, Gww1210@aol.com wrote:

Paul, this is Gordon, again...

In a message dated 5/16/2017 6:49:24 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time, plshelton@sbcglobal.net writes:

This is personal and confidential and I'm trusting that none of what I say here is used against me.

[[#1]] While I will admit that I think you and/or your wife may have lied about my friend, Richard Daniggelis (regarding her alleged witness of his signing something), I have absolutely no motive to betray your confidence or otherwise do you harm. (While I'm far from perfect, Paul, please remember that even when I was convinced you were the 'main' bad guy, I was trying to encourage you to hang in there - and also see what solution I could propose that would be fair to all -- AND, even now that I'm sure that Joseph Younes ****KNOWINGLY**** took title of a house, when he ****KNEW**** that the transfer was

done using a forged signature (I KNOW he knew, because I notified him, hello!?), and I'm convinced that he's FAAAR more criminally-guilty -- and quite evil to boot -- nonetheless, even regarding Younes, I don't wish to seek for him to be made homeless or even unemployed (tho some of that may eventually result anyway).

So, what I'm saying is this, Paul -- even tho I'm sadly VERY human & make mistakes, if I don't even wish revenge (but merely punishment) on Younes, I certainly don't want to kick *you* while you're down, in any way, if I can help it. (I'm guessing you were probably guilty of something small, but were punished far more than you should have been. I say that because I believe Daniggelis has no reason to make up a story and falsely accuse you & your wife of lying on the stand. So, I VERY much believe you & your wife lied about her witnessing his signature, and would like to hear your take on why Daniggelis said this -- and come clean, if his accusation is correct -- but, even if true, all agreed that Daniggelis signed the POA, and so lying about a notary witnessing it, while wrong & illegal, is a self-inflicted unforced error, and not at all as criminally-illegal or as morally-immoral as what Younes did, in taking a house while knowing it was done on a forged signature -- and then bragging to Daniggelis that he was "distanced" or "separated" from the actual crime.

Please come clean on this small point -- or else defend yourself in the best way you know how: not only am I curious, but moreover, this will come back to haunt you if you don't address it.

I did nothing wrong as to Richard, deep down Richard knows the truth. I lost time and money on Richard, trying to help him. He fooled me. The real culprit was the African American girl, can't remember her name,

[[#2]] I think it may be Erika Rhone?...

she had POA over Richard, and brought Richard to me. She is dumb like a fox and was very attractive too and used that to manipulated people. Richard was one of many she figured out away to make money upon. I saw closed deals with her where her company netted \$80-100k on flipping to a 700 credit "buyer". She'd buy a two flat in depressed black neighborhood for like \$80k do a quick rehab and "sell" it to someone for \$240k making that nice profit for rehab costs to her company.

I have to think on this, the Larocque issue. He was once my best friend and only supplied the money which is not illegal.

[[#3]] I spoke *briefly* by phone with Lou Brydges (by phone - after pestering him a lot via email & phone voice mail messages), and he says the same thing; While I know you don't like him, I'm glad both of you weighed in. Moreover, Robert J. More, the weirdo "vexatious litigant" character who was the infamous unpaying tenant of Daniggelis, is like an idiot savant on case law (but with no common sense), and when I asked him the same question, he said he saw no reason that it would be illegal for Younes to borrow money from LaRocque to do a closing. I think Mr. More's logic is sound, and, except for possible credit-worthiness issues (where some obscure law might require a person to prove their credit or financial mojo is good), I tend to agree. Thanks once again for clarifying what happened -- and what is legal here. After I asked him if he remember my Fla Supreme Court filings, Brydges did, however, say he was impressed with my 4-3 loss in the Fla Supreme court in re Terri Schiavo, the famous 'feeding tube' girl, and said, in his view, it was a win, since i came so close to winning against stacked long odds. I sort-or agree.

No reason to take his testimony at all. It was just another investment. He is quite rich so I just think he doesn't want to waste his time.

[[#4]] That sort of makes sense, and thx 4 offering your thoughts. But if Galic keeps seeking to depose him, and LaRocque keeps hiding, this smells, to me, like there's something there. (Why else would Galic pursue, and why else would LaRocque hide? Avoiding wasting time is not motive enough in light of the risk if his ass being arrested, charged, and either fined or locked up - not to mention possibly losing his FINRA credentials.) Something doesn't seem right here, Paul, but I can't put my finger on it, and neither can Daniggelis or More -- and Galic is not talking (Lawyer-client privilege, plus he wants to surprise LaRocque, so he's keeping silent & tight-lipped.)

In reality though, Richard really has no case.

[[#5]] Respectfully, I disagree: While Daniggelis (as a practical matter) may be in over his head in payments, etc., really, Paul, how could the transfer of title be legal in light of the fact that --a-- , it's an obvious photocopy (identical signature, plus whiteout), and --b-- Daniggelis didn't get paid either (no contract is valid without consideration e.g., payment). Plus, --c-- Daniggelis has no motive to just give up the house & land with hundreds of thousands of dollars of equity, which makes the transfer even more criminal, in light of the stolen equity. (And, --d-- sources tell me that there was usuary or otherwise illegal interest schemes, not to --e-- mention that Linda Green fraud issue.) -- really, Paul, how could any transfer of title be legal like that? If you're saying *this* is legal, then --f-- (since a-e add up) I'll just go and forge a signature and take whatever I want!.. Oh, really?... ... --NOT.

Certainly you can create one but I know the truth. Richard is dumb like a fox too.

[[#6]] Yes, and even Rich admits he over-extended himself in trying t buy or otherwise build 2 houses, but 2 wrongs make not a right, and nothing can legally justify what happened to Rich. ONLY if he did a quit claim or something (which he didn't do) would it even be *possible* to consider condoning or otherwise supporting such an (otherwise illegal) transfer.

She was just "dumber".

[[#7]] Well, if she did the forgery, then yes -- what comes around, goes around: "KARMA" is the eastern way of saying the Godly law of Sowing & reaping is true!... She'll get hers is she did the forgery -- or knew about it and was silent - or both.

He should eventually give up the house. He is still squatting, little birds tell me.

[[#8]] Well, the house has NO roof, and is being rained on -- but (spiritually-speaking, anyhow), yes, he's squatting.

Good luck but please leave me alone if possible.

[[#9]] Well, I believe you will eventually be summoned to testify -- I can't guarantee it (and have no power and no much more influence, here), but if (as I am guessing) you're only guilty of lying about the notary witnessing Daniggelis signing a POA, my guess is you should come clean, which would gain you credibility, and then it would (greatly, I'm guessing) lessen the probability of you getting charged with doing and/or covering up the forgery. What? Sent from an iPhone? That nutty Robert J. more character just bought me an Android cell phone, and I'm discovering just how hard it is to type in on such a small keypad -- I am amazed that ANYONE uses those things! And I only use it via WiFi (on my own modem or uptown with others' Wifi), as a 'plan' costs WAAAYY too much money. My own cell phone (863-409-2109) is a prepaid welfare phone -- since the economy is so bad that even us right-wing Conservatives are lining up for social programs. My home phone, 863-688-9880, is much more "normal," altho it doesn't text or anything.

But, anyhow, if you're (almost 100%) innocent, you have nothing to lose and much to gain by following my example of speaking up about wrongs. You want to do that as a 'national' or whatever, right? Why not do so where it can make a difference. Capt. James T. Kirk, in *Star Trek: Generations* (a movie) told Capt. Jean-Luc Picard that ONLY when he was in the captain's seat could he make a difference - I'm *old* (just turned 51!), and you're what? Even older? We won't be here forever, Paul - only while we're in the 'Captain's Chair' can we make a difference -- observe:

Star Trek: Generations (1994)



Quotes

Showing all 38 items

Kirk: Captain of the Enterprise, huh?

Picard: That's right.

Kirk: Close to retirement?

Picard: I'm not planning on it.

Kirk: Well let me tell you something. Don't! Don't let them promote you. Don't let them transfer you. Don't let them do *anything* that takes you off the bridge of that ship, because while you're there... you can make a difference.

Picard: Come back with me. Help me stop Soran. Help make a difference again!

Kirk: Who am I to argue with the captain of the Enterprise? What's the name of that planet? Veridian III?

Picard: That's right.

Kirk: I take it the odds are against us and the situation is grim?

Picard: You could say that.

Kirk: You know if Spock were here, he'd say I was an irrational, illogical human being for going on a mission like that.

[pause]

Kirk: Sounds like fun!

14 of 14 found this interesting | Share this

source: <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0111280/quotes>

Blessings brother

Paul

Sent from my iPhone

On Tuesday, May 16, 2017, at 3:18 AM, Gww1210@aol.com wrote:

Paul, this is Gordon, again... Something odd's happening, & I wanted to pick your brain, ok?

GMAC v Younes, Daniggelis, Shelton, et al, 2007-CH-29738 <https://w3.courtlink.lexisnexis.com/cookcounty/Finddocket.asp?DocketKey=CAAH0CH0CJHDI0CH> was transferred out of Chancery and into the Law Division, https://w3.courtlink.lexisnexis.com/cookcounty/FindDock.asp?NCase=&SearchType=2&Database=2&case_no=&PLtype=2&sname=daniggelis&CDate= and under the same case number to boot. In case you haven't noticed, Andjelko Galic, Daniggelis' attorney, keeps deposing John LaRocque, **and LaRocque keeps evading**

deposition. Obviously, he must feel he has something to hide. Judge Sanjay Tailor was threatening to dismiss the case if Galic couldn't get LaRocque into deposition - but a few things seem odd:

1) Why does Galic want to question him? To see who committed the obvious forgery, maybe? (The signatures on the two warranty deeds is IDENTICAL, as you well recall - and there's whiteout on the latter one, which was used to transfer title, after the 1st deal fell through, due to unpleasant side-agreements Daniggelis put in place.)

2) Why would LaRocque be afraid to testify? (Maybe Galic has some documentation to pin him down to testify on some point?..)

3) Judge Tailor is said to have suggested Galic not merely 'depose' LaRocque, but rather, issue a subpoena, something that (according to Daniggelis) he did not do. Why would he be afraid to issue a subpoena? (And, what's the difference in deposing him and issuing a subpoena, or maybe I'll ask Google that one!)

4) Lastly, Daniggelis thinks that maybe Joseph Younes, who eventually got title to the house (see my news item, below), was supposed to bring his own money to the closing, and didn't and that this broke some law. Could that be the reason Galic wants to depose LaRocque? My sources tell me that it's not illegal to go to a closing using someone else's money, and that it's merely borrowing it.

What are your thoughts on 1-4, here? Thanks!

Gordon Wayne Watts in Florida

begin- copy/paste of news item:

(Fri. 14 Apr. 2017; UPDATED Sat. 29 Apr. 2017, from Staff Reports; NEWS) **Courts** * *Chicago Courts refuse to stop illegal construction/demolition: "Mortgage Rescue Scam" victim's house almost destroyed* * **UPDATE:** As previously reported by *DNAinfo* ("*Rotted' Historic Building In Old Town Triangle Could Be Seized By City*," by Ted Cox, *DNAinfo*, March 30, 2017 **COMMENTS**; and: "*Rotted' Old Town Triangle House Owner Faces Daily \$1K Fine As Charges Fly*," by Ted Cox, *DNAinfo*, April 07, 2017 **COMMENTS**; and: "*Rotted' Old Town House Slated For Repairs As Fines Threatened Again*," by Ted Cox, *DNAinfo*, April 28, 2017 **COMMENTS**), the house which was featured in our previous **Tue. 01 Dec. 2015 story**, [linked here](#) was almost destroyed, even in spite of repeated warnings to The Court's **Chancery, Civil, and Law Divisions** This story is developing: keep posted for updates. *The Register's open-source docket*, is accessible [here](#) with most or all key filings. [[Perma-link to this story: click here](#)]

--end copy/paste of same.

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

In a message dated 4/18/2017 12:26:13 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time, Gww1210@aol.com writes:

Long time no see, Paul. Sadly, the only person that pays me for my hard work, here, is the Lord God, himself... (of course, through intermediaries, like family), but even my friends (who benefit) almost never repay or compensate me. I'm not even sure what an American National is, but I'm guessing it is like a Patriot, like when I used to have time to stand by the roadside (e.g., the Interstate Overpasses, which is where it got its name) with signs for the Overpasses for

America movement (which used to be called Overpasses for the Impeachment of Obama).

I personally know James Neighbors, the national founder for Overpasses, and Dallas Thurman, who is lieutenant; they're both on my Facebook. While they're generally conservative, they are also against corporate welfare and "Crony" capitalism, so it is more populist or libertarian in nature, I'd say. You know, it would help if you could volunteer some information about who executed the forgery. While there *might* be some short-term "legal pain," long-term, it would be the best investment. My guess is that you're *much* more honest than Younes, which is clear because he is unnecessarily rude (telling me to not call him back, when I called once a long time ago to apologize for not filing something informative & helpful sooner). But, no disrespect meant, when Daniggelis tells me you & your wife lied about a notary being present when he signed something (not sure why anyone would want to lie about that, as he freely admits that he signed it), I believe him, and I wonder why he would say that. He has said that you told him that Younes disgusted you or words to that effect, and that Younes was getting to be too evil "even for you" I thin were his exact (or similar) words. This suggests that Daniggelis thinks you're dishonest, but less than Younes.

I feel bad that there is the chance that you did something wrong (possibly Daniggelis was right about his claims you & your wife lied - I don't know, and must give both sides the benefit of the doubt, as a misunderstanding could have occurred, making both of you honest). But anyhow, no one I've ever spoken with (and no one I've ever "dealt with" – excepting the bad judge Otto character) disputed my assessment that the 2nd warranty deed was forged via a photocopy. Even Otto didn't outright dispute it, but rather made light of it in his ruling, suggesting that even if his court had jurisdiction on the merits (it was on appeal, then), that this new finding would not have made any difference. I'm calling bullshit on his claim, as it was pure B.S. His order, of course, is on my online docket, if you want to read it.

So, don't you think that it's pretty-much certain that the 2nd warranty deed used a photocopied signature of the 1st one? And, what should (or can) be done about that, now? What do you think about these tough questions? (Well, the 1st one wasn't tough: Easy for even a blind man to see it was forged, but the ramifications of the court system's refusal to fix it are a "tough" pill to swallow.) But anyhow, what you think of it? And, what are you doing now days?

Thanks,

Gordon W. Watts

In a message dated 4/17/2017 8:05:13 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, plshelton@sbcglobal.net writes:

Gordan:

Interesting...do you make a living filing this stuff? Just wondering..

Are you familiar with how to become an American national?

Thanks

Paul L. Shelton

On Monday, April 17, 2017 7:15 AM, "Gww1210@aol.com"
<Gww1210@aol.com> wrote:

Counsel,

I have filed an amicus curiae brief, with requisite motion. It is attached.

Let me remind everyone that there is a hearing in Room 1912, before Hon. Diane M. Shelley, Circuit Judge, Law Division, in this case, at 9:00am CST, today (Monday, 17 April 2017).

My brief has seven exhibits (up to Exhibit-G), but I am hesitant to include these in the email attachments (tho I may try after I electronically serve this brief), because the attachments are close to 20MB, and that might be a little large for some email servers.

You can pick up your copies of the exhibits here:

www.GordonWatts.com/MortgageFraudCourtDocs/DOCKET-MortgageFraudCase.html

or here:

www.GordonWayneWatts.com/MortgageFraudCourtDocs/DOCKET-MortgageFraudCase.html

The docket entry is dated "*04/17/2017," and is pretty close to the bottom of the page. Or, you could wait for the hard copies, which I am working on sending right now. Should you lose these links, above, my docket of selected items is still linked through the front-page news item in question, on *The Register*, my namesake blogs.

Best,

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

www.GordonWayneWatts.com / www.GordonWatts.com

BS, The Florida State University, Biological & Chemical Sciences;

Class of 2000, double major with honours

AS, United Electronics Institute, Class of 1988, Valedictorian

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

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

<http://GordonWayneWatts.com> / <http://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. Fomier, 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//

=



2007-C~2.PDF

948K