



The Crown of Thorns.

FDS

The following is written by Fabooka De Stait and is self explanatory

For Steph Cockshaft of The Daily Mail and The State:

THE CROWN OF THORNS

So, tell me, just by whose standards is the world going to accept the context of "Deeply Unpleasant Conspiracy Theorist?"

Is Christopher Spivey a theorist who has studied a deeply unpleasant conspiracy, or is he someone the establishment would like to class as deeply unpleasant for daring to venture a lot deeper than most into the behind the scenes workings of our national propaganda machine?

Whatever way you try to look at the very ambiguous points raised, it also seems that the state and the media it controls have tried their very best to dissuade the general public from having any intention or right to question very disturbing and far-fetched events such as 9/11 and 7/7.

Unbelievably, it appears that those who rule may actually be attempting to steer public opinion into not accepting any of the alternative and very valid theories surrounding these

instances for fear of being branded as someone like Chris Spivey – a man who they have done their best to destroy by way of character assassination and not following their own obligatory procedures or contemplating evidence that may more than dispute their pre-conceived ideas and offerings, that they would like everyone else to imbibe after having swallowed without question.

It is nothing to be ashamed of to be very wary of the official versions of 9/11 and 7/7. Indeed, neither is it anything to be wary of to be speculative of someone supposedly being shot with an AK 47 over 30 times in Tunisia and not having a mark on them. This would be especially pertinent, given there are a number of areas of concern relating to Israeli interest in the country and a possible very substantial oil find, under the sea bed that may be worthy of international attention.

Is it by the standards of a corrupt and murderous government, that has been proven to be full of paedophiles, fraudsters and warmongers who never seem to quite find themselves in the dock, due to their deeply entrenched positions within the upper echelons of our rancid society that we are meant to accept the soiling of Chris Spivey's reputation?

If so, are we then going to allow this wholly biased and vindictive defamation to be presented by the equally libellous and corrupt Rothermere family and their politically corrupt media machine, so as we can all willingly accept falsehood as fact?

The libellous allegations made in the national press during and after Chris's trial were simply either misreported facts taken out of context or worse still, a pack of made up lies.

So, please let us not highlight misleading statements so as to demonize somebody who did a very thorough and analytical investigation of the circumstances surrounding the staged event: and it was a staged event, in that it was pre-planned

by whoever was involved. Whether the public face of the two Mikes is responsible for the act or not, they were still partly responsible for actually creating the circumstances for it to take place.

Thus, it can be seen that Mr. Spivey made claims based on thorough analysis and observations that went far more in depth than the shallow brief that was presented to the general public by the media and those who control them.

Sound bites flounced to the public by the likes of the Daily Mail should quite simply be taken with a pinch of salt. Make no mistake about it, Chris Spivey did not initiate a campaign of harassment against ANYONE the day after this alleged attack.

The reality is that the topic was up and open for debate on the very popular web site of Mr. Spivey, just like it was for many other groups within the Alternative Media, other online communities and even the somewhat ignorant general public through their main information sources.

So, this in itself is a complete lie and an obvious besmirching of a man based upon an agenda that is out to do him no good in any way shape or form. Hundreds of thousands of people became aware from a multitude of sources that there were indeed many inconsistencies surrounding the official story.

It is not our fault that the 'official story' had more holes in it than a large lump of Swiss Cheese, so let us not try and taint the issue with aspects that are actually irrelevant to the prosecution's stated case.

Tony Abell, the C.P.S. employee, responsible for a scathing attack may have indeed felt the actions of people discussing or not agreeing with an official narrative were deeply unpleasant and menacing. He would do, wouldn't he, as his livelihood depends on securing the views of the warped state

in controlling the disposition of the population by way of cajoling, and if that is not possible, by way of subterfuge and coercion.

Let us all be in no doubt that the website <http://www.chrispivey.org>, although very popular was in fact a closed environment in that it had to be sought out if you wished to view the contents held therein. So, just because a group of like-minded individuals happen to discuss some very unpleasant and criminal acts in a forthright and grown-up manner in such a place – it does not constitute their actions being classed as harassment of anybody in any circumstances whatsoever.

Further to this, it should be quite apparent that Mr. Spivey did nothing underhanded at all, in analyzing supposed residences of those who claimed harassment; in that he used information that had previously been printed and orally transmitted by the national press itself.

Even with a number of site visits totalling around 10,000 per day (verified) a mention of an address on Chris's site would reduce any alleged fear to a miniscule amount as opposed to having your address stated and presented in photographs via multiple national newspapers and television channels.

So, it can be appreciated that such an insinuation is completely laughable from whatever aspect you try to view it as there would be a far higher likelihood of a lunatic who reads the national press doing something just for the hell of it and without any reason to an address such as that which was shown, even possibly just for the case of gaining sick notoriety.

After all, who could claim to be devastated by their publicly known address being used to illustrate information based articles 'online' if on the other hand they were perfectly happy for the same details to be all over the country for

everyone to see via the medium of television?

In reality the only reason for being so selective would be that Chris's articles did not support the agenda being promoted which needed to be accepted as fact by the nation in order to be successful.

Yes, if Chris Spivey is guilty of anything, it is of expressing his opinion and putting it up for appraisal on his own website and nothing more. Where in the world would such an act be classified as a crime, except in what is or is rapidly becoming a Post Orwellian state?

Our very same government and judges wish to decry many nations for doing similar things to people who express views that are not in line with the state approved doctrine. A similar example would be trying to condemn Putin's Russia for imprisoning the likes of Pussy Riot for a couple of years when their very own courts sentenced a man to a similar period for simply putting his artistic slant on a less than flattering picture of The Queen. Thus it can be easily seen that there is far more to the concerted effort to malign Chris Spivey than meets the eye.

Furthermore, nobody should fall for very pernicious and yet weak suggestions that Chris Spivey personally had anything to do with mock-up news headlines that were presented as if they were from The Sun Newspaper, as he simply did no such thing.

The offending mock-up was posted on Chris spivey's Facebook page, run by admins whom saw no reason to remove it in the interest of balance since the spoof page gave people the opportunity to view some other assessments of the incident. It was not Chris Spivey at all, who was responsible for the initial presentation of this material.

Again, in the very poor journalistic efforts displayed by those incompetents at The Daily Mail; we see very out of context comments from Mr. Spivey so as to allude to him as

uncaring or insensitive, when nothing could be further from the truth. And whether the system likes it or not, which they most certainly do not at this time – people do have a right to free speech.

There is no point the Mail decrying free speech, when they are allowed to distort information and get away with it with impunity, like they and their affiliates always have done. There was nothing 'Bizarre' about the genuine researching and analysis taking place on <http://www.chrispivey.org> in respect to the incident in question, nor was it the case for numerous other websites by way of doing the same, even if they were somewhat less effective and convincing.

Is it criminal for a researcher or investigative journalist to approach somebody involved in an incident or a family member of someone involved to seek clarification on issues so as they do not say something out of turn or very incorrect now, is it?

Neither did that communication which was polite and respectful in content and only sent with the best of intentions become a problem until over a year later, when it was picked up on by the police four days after Chris Spivey had been arrested. From that point forth, it somehow became construed as being a malicious communication. No doubt in order to give padding and a boost to the extremely dubious case which lacked, and still does, ANY real, credible evidence.

After all, many news establishments do such things and they go a lot further and carry out far more sinister actions in order to secure their information – as we all know. Yes, from hacking peoples' phones, to infiltrating communities and even to stalking dead girl's family members, those at the helm of your so called, glorious 'Free Press' have done it all. In addition to this, they are very seldom interested in doing such things with the aim of uncovering the truth as opposed to enhancing the bank balance of themselves and their very dubious employees.

So let's not judge too harshly in this case, nor accept the rhetoric of the easily corrupted and easily misled, in that they like to have their job of misleading being as comfortable for them as possible so as they can easily mislead the populace.

Let it be explained to all concerned that yet again, any attempt to erode Chris Spivey or his reputation is rather easy to refute. Especially the report that Chris stated that the alleged victim was a rapist; which was in fact only used by way of referencing a page that had been promoted to specifically call the alleged victim, in the first place.

Revelations and allegations relating to Facebook activity are also presented in a disturbing manner so as to further tarnish him. Indeed, friends of those who alleged harassment, after they had made their complaints that sought to prevent Mr. Spivey from contacting them, continued to besiege his website and his Facebook page – so much so, that I myself had to inform one of those who made a collaborating witness statement that by way of doing what he was doing and Chris Spivey not being allowed to talk to him, he was only disproving the basis for his allegation by way of showing himself to anyone and everyone as the vicious and malicious fool he was, as he gloated. Thus, he was not too bothered about what was said or interacting due to his own actions. That is very obvious and should not be dismissed under any circumstances.

As well we all know, on one of Chris's previous court appearances he had such a significant amount of support that it did seem to worry those who were in charge of the biased proceedings and in the latest debacle only around half a dozen were actually allowed in to view the show trial, which was based upon easy to disprove statements.

Why does District Judge Woollard have to quiz anybody over their beliefs on other issues, if he is supposed to be so intent on finding facts that he very comfortably dismisses in

order to save his own position and that of the corrupt state that pays him his £135,000 salary? Fair enough, he may have wanted to gain a grounding, but if he failed to accept fact, and prevented a fair trial to begin with, why would he be interested for any reason other than to affirm in his own mind that these beliefs held by Mr. Spivey and many others are something to be quashed by those who work for the system and are part of it?

He was found guilty of being offensive was he? By people whose business is dealing in murder abroad and the institutionalized killing off of their own old age pensioners, as they also steal 10,000 children per year from families in order to supply their insidious conveyor belt of those who are to be abused? Wow!!! Well that would certainly worry me, and so it is best I get my priorities in order, don't you think?

To be fair, I am of the opinion that Jenny Hopkins, Chief Crown Prosecutor for CPS East of England could not convince me of the clarity of drinking water. People are allowed their free speech and we shall fight for it all the way – well, at least those like myself shall do so, as I can't really speak on behalf of the numerous traitors and weaklings who pretend they are part of what is supposed to be the online or bona fide, Alternative Media in this country.

Their actions seem to be of very shrinking violets when faced with the full weight of oppression from those they are meant to be challenging in the first place. So why half of them even pretend to bother, when such important and disturbing state abuses are left unchecked is quite simply beyond my comprehension.

If Mr. Spivey is to be classed as criminal for uncovering advertisements for false charities, illegal activities and links to right-wing organizations then so is everyone who commented and addressed those issues. However, let us not forget that the real problem is that such activities were

allowed to be covered up and in order to preclude Mr. Spivey from obtaining the right to question his false accusers and their state assistants in person – and what a surprise that is to us all. So, I will go with that he was well within the boundaries of his right to free speech if you do not mind – whichever way you try to paint it.

Upsetting assertions surrounding the act would not be as big a worry to me if my family member had been murdered, let me tell you all that for nothing. And, to be honest, this actually sounds much like another very interesting case that is heavily promoted by the state, which is that of the very strange McCann family, in that nobody appears to have the right or the sense to question them in a workmanlike fashion – least of all the police, who are apparently doing their best to avoid the obvious to a greater extent than I have ever witnessed.

In summation, the fact is that it is crystal clear for all but the most myopic to see that Chris Spivey has had to be seen to be made an example of. There are no misunderstandings with regards to this, in that he and his family are the ones who have been harassed via the machinations of big society and big brother as well as being physically and mentally abused by its very knowledge-lacking minions. All has been done, so as to achieve an underlying aim that is very Cultural Marxist in nature and dispersed throughout the land via Common Purpose infiltration of the judicial system and all of those who seek to uphold it in all of its failings and false morality.

That ultimate aim is to seek the reduction in ability or knowledge of those who are to be controlled. That is it: nothing more and nothing less, as all other options are on the table for those in power once that objective has been achieved, and they will therefore stop at nothing to secure it.

People like the supposed VICTIM, his family, their friends and associates are of no concern to those at the reins of power.

Many of us know this, and are aware that such people do not care, as long as they feel they are being praised or supported by those who would like us to believe that their very clear ideas for us all have to be seen to emanate from the assumption that weak and manipulated authority somehow constitutes the truth, innate goodness and all of its very elusive benefits.

Well, you won't be fooling me, or preventing me from stating it anywhere, anytime, or in any place, no matter how hard you try to bend millions of tiny minds. I mean, for argument's sake, what is going to happen when I have twenty friends around for a get-together and we end up a little loud in my house as we then start to discuss such things with the same take on them? Is the smart T.V. going to record all that data and send it back to Thought Police H.Q. so as we can expect a visit from the public order enforcers and those who think we need some mind altering, so as to appear normal?

Whatever you do, don't laugh, as all who are silent will be deemed responsible for the furthering of the journey along this path. You wait and see!!!

You're welcome....Fabooka De Stait