



FREE-SPEECH IS LEGAL...UNTIL IT'S NOT

Another Original And Exclusive Column From The Mind Of DINO COSTA

-October 21, 2019

I think it's important to note something that seemingly nobody is talking about – but they should be – because this is the latest crazy step in the process by which free-speech in America is under vigorous assault.

This is actually scary and frightening, not figuratively, but literally.

Just last week, a Wisconsin jury awarded the father of what is thought to be a victim of the Sandy Hook School shooting back in 2012, \$450,000, after an author penned a book on Sandy Hook titled “*Nobody Died At Sandy Hook.*”

It was ruled that James Fetzer, co-author of the book, had defamed Leonard Pozner, father of Noah, 6, who was the youngest victim of the December 2012 mass shooting,

as in the book, Fetzer claimed that Pozner had fabricated copies of his son's death certificate.

The author outlined his belief that the Newtown, Connecticut, mass shooting — which left 20 first-graders and six staff members dead — never happened and was instead an elaborate and criminal hoax staged by the federal government in an effort to pass stricter gun laws.

A Dane County jury deliberated for almost four hours before slapping Fetzer with the \$450,000 fine.

Fetzer called the amount “*absurd*” and said he would appeal the ruling.

Folks, this is crazy, and it may also be interpreted possibly as a precedent-setting situation where more people may be able to seek monetary damages against others for having an “*opinion*.”

I'm not a lawyer, nor do I pretend to be one, however, this doesn't smack of “*slander*” or “*defamation*” in any way to me.

What the author was doing was expressing his opinion – his belief – his own conjecture in terms of what may or what may not have happened at the Sandy Hook Elementary School that day.

No matter what you may believe, personally, about that day in question, even if you believe the official story to be accurate and factual, anyone with a little bit of brain matter in their head would have to concede that there are more than several odd, if not bizarre things, many inconsistencies that in the aftermath of that day that begs questions.

To me, this is a case of hurt feelings being rewarded more than anything else.

So – who else will cite hurt feelings and attempt to be awarded money as a result?

How about the National Rifle Organization for starters?

The San Francisco City Council referred to the NRA as a “*terrorist organization*.” Should the NRA file suit over this fabrication?

Is the Washington Post liable for defamation over their publication of blatant falsehoods concerning the Covington Kids episode?

Today, I found this little diddy Online as I was doing a bit of research and attempting to play devil's advocate with myself by coming up with a counter-argument.

See below:

New York Times Co. v. Sullivan

“A State cannot, under the First and Fourteenth Amendments, award damages to a public official for a defamatory falsehood relating to his official conduct unless he proves “actual malice” — that the statement was made with knowledge of its falsity or with reckless disregard of whether it was true or false. Pp. 265-292”

Link: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/376/254>

I think that it's very difficult to prove recklessness on the part of any conspiracy theorist – or malice even.

Many of these people do an exhaustive amount of research and independent investigating.

While some may believe that they get the result of any given situation wrong – I think it's almost impossible to prove recklessness over opinion or conjecture.

I would think that as a matter of law, the plaintiff can't actually *prove* defamation in this specific instance.

If the 1st amendment protects a multi-million dollar publication attempting to destroy the lives of a handful of high school kids over an out of context YouTube video – how then can a lesser standard apply to a guy publishing his theories about a school shooting?

This leads me to perhaps the most maligned person on the face of the earth right now.

With as many assumptions, if not outright lies and distortions, which are not only printed about the current sitting President – but also spoken loudly by thousands of people – many of them in the mainstream press – how many lawsuits should such people be facing from Donald Trump right now?

How about those who have claimed for years that Pearl Harbor was indeed a false flag?

The Holocaust?

The JFK assassination?

The Oklahoma City bombing?

What about *“Architects And Engineers For 911 Truth”*, among them some of the most credible and respected people in their professions who don't only doubt the official narrative of 911 – they actually call the entire thing pure bullshit. Should these people also face lawsuits?

Link: <https://www.ae911truth.org/>

You want to go ahead and call this author, James Fetzer, an opportunist? I'd have no issue with that, but to slap him with a \$450,000 fine for expressing his opinion in a book? Really?

Does the jury's ruling which seeks to punish what may be described as someone who is a truth-seeker, does this automatically validate the opposite opinion, that Sandy Hook *was not* a false flag?

I don't know, you tell me.

When a memorial website was set up to receive donations for "*victims of Sandy Hook*" which also included an SSL certificate that was issued days before the event took place (*as well as something mentioned in Fetzer's book*), should this not be only one of many discrepancies that should be investigated and explored to the fullest?

I never read Fetzer's book, however, I can deduce with a certain amount of positivity that Fetzer was more than willing to point out that not only should we feel abject horror when we realize that not only did children possibly die in such a horrific way – but it stands to reason that Fetzer probably argues that *in his opinion* they were killed by U.S. government operatives who then immediately covered up their crimes solely for the purpose of motivating emotional support for disarmament.

Fetzer probably argues *that in his opinion* – this wasn't a single madman hell-bent on killing a few innocent children – but that instead – this was the action of a rogue government bent on total domination of every single person in the nation.

Is he right?

I can't say, and neither can you, however, is it not his right to say or to feel as he wants to?

Again, if *Sullivan* applies, as I noted above, then wouldn't what happened that day at Sandy Hook be left open to the interpretation of the single individual making the claims – and would not any jury need to prove that recklessness and malice were beyond legitimate before awarding a person \$450,000 of someone else's money?

Just because you or I may find the findings or the publications of Fetzer objectionable – does this then mean we have the right to shut him down, bring a lawsuit against him, and then dock him \$450K?

"Well, the guy is crazy and he's a nutjob", you might say.

Okay, forget for a second what could be considered your own libelous accusations against Fetzer, is someone publishing what you might consider crazy and unhinged thoughts now criminal in this country?

If it is, then Trump would already own CNN, MSNBC, The New York Times, and a host of other media institutions.

In order for any jury to award the kind of dollars they did in this case, wouldn't they need to prove that the publisher either knew the statements he made were false – before recklessly disregarding the veracity of his statements and coming to the conclusion that he should reach deep into his pockets to pay an outrageous fine? This is quite a stretch as far as I'm concerned.

Yes, in my opinion (*if I'm still permitted to have one*) it was the jury who was reckless and not the book author Fetzer.

I don't know, perhaps Fetzer is assumed to be a "*right-wing conspiracy theorist*", and so the rules of engagement are probably different for him than if he had been a "*left-wing conspiracy theorist*" wherein that instance he probably would have been given a pass.

Think: "*Russia-Gate.*"

So, let's not only de-platform the author Fetzer (*while fining him almost a half-million dollars*), but while we're at it, let's also do the same to Google, Facebook, and Twitter, because after all, its only right to do so.

Then let's pull the plug on CNN, MSNBC, and the New York Times for pushing the Trump secret Russian agent "*conspiracy.*"

This ruling against this author James Fetzer is frightening in my opinion – and it's yet another step in the direction of silencing and neutering free-speech and the 1st amendment in America – and whether you agree with the book's author or not – this should be concerning to everyone.

So, what else are we not allowed to say or think?

So on one hand, let me get this right, someone is permitted to say that they believe the Sandy Hook shooting didn't happen as it was reported – yet on the other – if you do say what's LEGAL to say – no matter the legality of an expression one way or the other – then I guess that someone can always find a jury that will levy a fine against someone...for saying what is LEGAL to say?

Got all that?

And by the way – are we now writing in the laws as we go along?

For instance, who told anyone who has said or written that they don't believe in the Sandy Hook shooting – that it was now illegal to say such a thing...*before anyone said such a thing or expressed such an opinion?*

“Wait just a second! Did you just say that Sandy Hook was a hoax? You know, it IS legal to say something like that...I think. But give me a day to contact my lawyer so that I can see if it’s possible to sue your ass for saying what’s...legal for you to say or to write.”

If what this author claimed in his book and on his website is now considered illegal, just think of how many people on something like Twitter are subject to lawsuits and claims for some of the things they print.

Throw in Facebook as well.

America: *Land Of The Free?*

Bullshit, that went out the window a long time ago, folks.

So I conclude for now by asking you this question: *Do you believe that what happened at the Sandy Hook Elementary School back on December 14, 2012, was real – or was it a government action, a false flag intended to help usher in more restrictive gun-laws or even the eventual abolition of gun ownership in America eventually?*

Again, I haven’t read Fetzer’s book, but if I think about it, I’ll bet I could probably come up with a few questions that Fetzer has wondered about in the pages of his missive.

Did he ask people to inquire about where the blood was from such a devastating terrorist act that should have been so easy to see?

Did he ask about the lack of evidence concerning the fact that there didn’t appear to be any blood on the scene?

A total of 26 fatalities (*children and adults*) would produce at least – conservatively speaking – an estimated 20 gallons (*75 liters*) of blood, right?

Ahh, this is so stupid, so let’s not be stupid with one another.

Don’t be stupid enough to ask why to this very second – not a single child’s body was ever shown coming out of the school that day – not a single image is available anywhere showing any children being placed in ambulances heading to hospitals.

Don’t be stupid asking why not a single image or video is available showing the police, EMT’s, or anyone else rushing out of the school that day with dead or injured children in their arms.

Don’t be stupid and ask why so many triage units were set-up outside the school that never tended to anyone.

Don't be stupid and wonder why nobody allowed any Paramedics and the EMT'S inside the Sandy Hook School to treat the seriously injured or those children and school staff clinging to life.

Don't be stupid and ask how anyone could definitively claim that 18-children and six school staff members were legally dead within the first 8 minutes of the situation.

In the moments following the shooting and when the school was on lock-down, don't be stupid and ask where the other 500 children and 60 school staff members were from Sandy Hook Elementary School that day.

What's that? In the Columbine high-school shooting you remember seeing video and pictures of hundreds of kids and teachers streaming out of the building that day? So what. Don't be stupid. No two situations are ever the same.

Don't find yourself being put off by some of the strange reactions from so many of the parents who were interviewed following the tragedy.

Pay no mind to a parent by the name of Robbie Parker, who was seen laughing and smiling only seconds before he went live on the air to an interview – and then immediately shifted into a somber state almost as if he was playing a role.

Oh, and as a parent who lost a child due to gun violence, I'm sure that in such a situation as I actually found myself in, I'm sure I would have been in a jovial mood, laughing and smiling only 24-hours after learning the fate of my own boy. Sure I was.

By the way, I defy anyone to tell me that my own son didn't die the way that he did. Try me on for size and watch me find a sympathetic jury to snag your ass as Leanord Pozner did with this fruitcake book author, Fetzer.

Don't be stupid and dare question the bizarre and often rambling nature of the coroner on the scene that day.

If you haven't seen the video of the coroner I suggest you check it out – but please – don't be stupid and think anything is off-kilter.

Speaking of that video, the coroner, a guy by the name of Wayne Carver, actually said to the press; *"I hope the people of Newtown don't have it crash on their heads later."* Uh, come again, Wayne?

Don't be stupid and wonder why nobody thought to call any Life Star Helicopters knowing that children and school staff were seriously injured and clinging to life.

Question none of this (*as well as other questions which have been raised*) and simply believe what you've been told – by those who have told the story.

What does the news media do? They tell you what they've been told to report.

Why no questions – and why has skepticism been outlawed as per Sandy Hook?

It is common knowledge, police investigators will tell you, that the best way to catch a person in their lies is to simply keep asking questions; because if a person is lying they will eventually have to change their story to cover the lie.

However, if a person is telling the truth, you can keep asking them questions for months and years on end and their story will never change.

Don't you be nonsensical and question who or why someone ordered a huge traffic machine brought to the site of the shooting within minutes that read: "*CHECK-IN
HERE.*"

Who does that for a school shooting?

Was this real – or would a sign like that indicate a drill?

Strike the last question entirely because you're stupid for even thinking like this.

Don't question why YouTube has scrubbed clean virtually every single video that was ever produced by the thousands of skeptics who wanted answers to more than reasonable questions they had about Sandy Hook.

Do you have children? If someone told you that your child was in a school that was the subject of a horrendous shooting, would even King Kong himself be able to stop you from getting inside that school?

So then don't ask why there was never a picture or a video released showing desperate parents attempting to get into the school that day.

Back to Columbine?

What's that you say?

Really?

Pictures and videos around and outside of Columbine show hundreds of people moving in frantic and desperate ways – and when you watch the videos of Sandy Hook (*if you can find them anymore*) those outside the school building seem to be calm and kicked back as if awaiting orders from central command?

What's that?

Do I find that odd since so many little children were inside the school and were just slaughtered by some lone nut gunman that not one person outside the school seems to be acting urgently?

Not at all.

These people are paid and trained to be cool under pressure.

Speaking of the lone nut gunmen, a person nobody seemed to know or ever recall, a skinny kid, goes into an elementary school with no previous military training and he kills everyone he shoots – but he injures no one?

Don't be stupid, not every person needs a lot of time around a Bushmaster XM15-E2S rifle to be deadly proficient with it.

Look it, now you're really pissing me off, okay?

You're asking me if I'm aware that a known actor and Sandy Hook witness by the name of Gene Rosen kept changing his story about how he encountered the 6 kids who allegedly came to him?

How during different interviews he claimed that he found the kids just after feeding his cats in the loft of his home – or then claiming it was just after going to breakfast – and then in another story – just after coming home from breakfast?

That his testimony completely conflicts with many details in the official report?

Who were those 6 kids by the way and has anyone ever got any of their parents on record to talk about how they were simply dropped off in some neighborhood by a bus driver that day?

That there is also a video of Gene Rosen near the firehouse walking around slowly at a time he was allegedly comforting small kids on his lawn dropped off there by a bus driver...who was never identified?

Surely this bus driver has a story to tell, right?

That there's a video of Gene Rosen rehearsing his lines with the cameraman? You are really testing my patience, amigo. DON'T BE STUPID.

By the way, what bus driver would drop children off into the front lawn of a total stranger's house not knowing if that stranger was home and not being sure that such children would be safe and out of harm's way in a place where they probably had no idea of where they were?

A more than responsible bus driver, that's who.

Again, does anyone have that bus driver's name?

What's that? You're now asking me about Lieutenant Paul Vance from the Connecticut State Police?

Like why did Vance threaten to prosecute as a crime anyone who reported information that contradicted the official narrative?

You are stupid, aren't you?

This is normal procedure for any officer of the law, isn't it?

And why did Vance do this, why did he say that he would seek prosecution of anyone who challenged his take on what happened that day?

Because the official narrative is as official as things get.

It's officially official when an official narrative is explained and then spit out to the general public. Dummy.

And please, in this extremely litigious society we all live in, where everyone is sued for just about anything, don't be stupid or obtuse to inquire as to why in the aftermath of this hideous event, why nobody ever sued the estate of Nancy Lanza?

Again, get rid of the stupidity, okay?

What happened that day, unfortunately, tragically, happened, and it happened in all of the ways the authorities reported it – followed by all of the ways that the news media then told you the story they were told to tell you.

So please, I beg of you all, when someone asks you if you believe that Sandy Hook went down just the way that officials told the news media – who then did their jobs by telling all of you what happened – please – for your own safety, as well as it being a very good way to avoid potential litigation, simply respond in the affirmative, that you agree and understand that Sandy Hook *as well as everything else the media tells you* – is authentic and truthful – exactly as it's been explained to you by those whose job it is to tell you what has happened.

No further questions, please.

Thank you.

Aww, come on now, what's that, another question for me?

Okay, but make this the last one because I've got to get going.

Do I believe that Sandy Hook was real and as was reported all these years later?

Are you kidding me?

Of course, I do...they told me what I needed to know, and just like you...I'm more than satisfied with the results.

Have a good day.