

[return to updates](#)

# The Boston Marathon Bombing Trial



*by Miles Mathis*

*First published April 3, 2015*

The Boston Marathon trial is now being manufactured for your amusement in the media, so we will take a quick look at it, for more proof this is all theater. On the front page of most newspapers, we got this headline on March 5:

IT WAS HIM

That is telling us that the defendant, Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, is guilty as presumed. But notice who is saying that. It is Tsarnaev's own *defense* attorney, Judy Clarke, in her opening statement. Don't you find it a little odd that Tsarnaev's attorney is admitting he is guilty in her opening statement? Do you really think the legal system works that way? I will tell you a secret: all lawyers and law students know this trial is fake, and they know because they know that real trials don't work like this. Our legal system is an adversarial system, where the two attorneys argue *opposite* sides. In a criminal trial, the prosecuting attorney is hired to argue the side of the State and the defense attorney is hired to argue the side of the defendant. The defense attorney *must* argue for a not guilty finding, even if he or she knows the defendant is guilty. That is the process. If both attorneys are arguing for a guilty verdict, then the trial is pointless. You might as well have a summary finding by the judge. But it isn't done that way. In our system, the accused has a right to a trial and a right to an attorney. As part of that right, the accused has a right to have an attorney argue in his favor. If the defense attorney argues he is guilty, *his rights have just been violated*. In a real trial, as soon as Tsarnaev's attorney said, "it was him," the judge would have declared a mistrial, and the defense attorney would have been dismissed, fined, and possibly disbarred. Since none of that happened, we know this trial is fake. It is another Hollywood trial, like the Manson trial, the Hearst trial, the Chicago 8 trials, the Unabomber trial, and hundreds of other high-profile trials.

I will be told that the defense strategy was to admit the defendant's guilt but try to blame his brother Tamerlan\* as the mastermind. Again, that isn't how it is supposed to work in the criminal justice system of the US. Remember, Dzhokhar pleaded *not guilty*. Therefore, his attorney is expected to argue he is *not guilty*. What is the point of pleading not guilty if your attorney is going to admit you are guilty in her opening statement?

We see more ridiculous claims here:

Rebekah Gregory, who lost much of her left leg, posted her open letter to Tsarnaev on her Facebook page hours after giving her emotional testimony in federal court.

That is from *USA Today*. But they are just relying on your ignorance of the law, since that couldn't happen in a real trial. Notice that she is referencing things that supposedly went on during the trial: "You are a coward. A little boy who wouldn't even look me in the eyes." She is saying that Tsarnaev wouldn't look at her in the courtroom. That, too, should cause a mistrial, since those who give testimony during the trial aren't allowed to broadcast that testimony. Active participants in a trial are not allowed to repeat testimony to the press or to publicly broadcast trial proceedings, which is what Gregory is doing here. [Go here](#) to read the rules for yourself.

I also draw your attention to the name of Tsarnaev's attorney: Judy Clarke. Hmmm. They seem to be recycling names here. I would say they need a deeper hat of fake names. Is Judy Clarke related to Marcia Clark, [O. J. Simpson's fake attorney](#)? No, of course not, I will be told. They spell their last names differently.

Like Marcia Clark, Judy Clarke isn't doing much of a job as an alleged attorney. The prosecution argued for more than a month, while the defense rested after only two days. While the prosecution brought 92 witnesses to the stand, the defense only brought 4. Actually, the defense didn't bring *any*, since

The four witnesses included two digital forensics experts and two FBI investigators previously examined by the prosecution.

We are supposed to believe that Tsarnaev's entire defense consisted of re-questioning these 4 witnesses *for the prosecution*? Despite being given more than a year to mount a defense, this defense team couldn't come up with anything but to admit their client was guilty in opening statements? This despite the fact that independent researchers (like me) have come up with a mountain of evidence the entire event was faked, and posted that information freely on the internet? We are supposed to believe Tsarnaev's defense team doesn't have internet access, I guess. Judy Clarke's computer is on the fritz.

Tsarnaev's team didn't think to subpoena members of Craft International [who were photographed at the scene](#) wearing backpacks? The Craft is a private military organization, and its website admits it is "Registered with the Defense Security Service HUMINT and SIGINT infrastructure." That just means that, like Blackwater, Craft International is an arm of Military Intelligence. They claim to be private to avoid some laws that apply to Federal organizations, but they are really just another subset of Intelligence.

Tsarnaev's team also didn't think to follow the lead through the boys' uncle to Graham Fuller, vice-chair of the National Intelligence Council? Judy Clarke apparently didn't find it curious that Fuller's daughter was married to this uncle of the Tsarnaevs, and that they had lived in his house for more than

a year. Just a coincidence, right? Graham Fuller, vice-chair of the NIC, had no idea his in-laws were terrorists, right? And this same Graham Fuller, vice-chair of the National Intelligence Council, had no idea that Craft International—which works with Intelligence—was at the Boston Marathon event with his in-laws?

But since Intelligence manufactured the Boston Marathon event as well as this fake trial, we wouldn't really expect them to out themselves, would we?

Another thing the defense team forgot to tell the jury is that since Tsarnaev is a Chechen living in the US, the probability is around 100% that he is an asset of the US, not an enemy of the US or terrorist. Chechens have been at war *with Russia* for decades, but they are not in any sort of holy war with the US. On the contrary, Chechnya is *an ally*, and we funnel arms into Chechnya as part of our opposition to Russia. We have been using Chechnya as a pawn against Russia, since Chechnya is right on the border of the old Soviet Union (actually, it is currently inside “Russia”, having been retaken in the second Chechen War about a decade ago).

In telling the ridiculous story of this fake trial, the storytellers are relying on the towering ignorance of the American public, which not only knows squat about the legal system, but also knows less than squat about world geography or world politics. Only those with zero knowledge of recent world events would buy the story that these Chechen boys are terrorists. This also explains why Tsarnaev is said to have “a slight grin” on his face most of the time in the courtroom. He can't suppress his mirth at the absurdity of a Chechen being tried as an Islamic extremist terrorist, since—being a Chechen—he knows that Chechnya has been a US ally for decades.

Again, Tsarnaev's uncle is married to the daughter of a high-ranking US official, *an official in Intelligence*. Do you really imagine US Intelligence doesn't know who these Tsarnaevs are?

Not only that, but in trying to sell Tsarnaev as an Islamic fundamentalist, the storytellers are faking the entire history of Chechnya. There is a good chance the Tsarnaevs aren't Muslim at all. Places like Wikipedia tell you most Chechens are Muslims, but that isn't true, either. That area of the world is a mix, with Christians and Muslims in the same general area. Many other religions are represented in the area as well, with many Chechens being Jews or Khazars. Many Chechens are descended Vainakhs, whose religion was pagan. What they don't tell you is that paganism is still very strong in the area, with the Khazars also still practicing a similar form (Tengriism).

Remember, Georgia is to the south and west of Chechnya, and Stavropol to the north, both Christian strongholds. So to just assume the Tsarnaevs are Muslim since they are from Chechnya is absurd. They could belong to any of about ten religions, or none. Since they are working for US Intelligence, I would assume they are atheists. They probably don't care about religion at all. They care about the money they are making as actors.

Here's another problem:



Some people were appalled that *Rolling Stone* seemed to be glamorizing Tsarnaev by putting him on the cover looking like a rock star. But even these people asked the wrong question. Tsarnaev had long been in police custody by that time. We are told he has been in solitary confinement for most of the past two years. What is the first thing they do when you go to jail? *They cut your hair.* It's like the army: they don't allow you to look like a hippie. So as soon as these photos hit the magazines, everyone should have known it was a fake.



That is supposed to be Tsarnaev in the courtroom, drawn by the court artist. So he still has all that hair, or more of it. Do you really think he is allowed to have hair like that in jail? No, the hair is for effect. Is is part of his role.

But let's return to his alleged defense attorney Judy Clarke. Who is Judy Clarke? [In this 2013 article,](#)

*Huffington Post* told us:

**The names of her past clients – Susan Smith, Unabomber Theodore Kaczynski and most recently, Tucson shooter Jared Loughner – run like a list of the most reviled in American criminal history.**

Yes, and it also reads like a list of fake people. Since my first paper on the Boston Marathon bombing was first published, [I have written and published a long paper showing](#) that Ted Kaczynski was a CIA agent and actor and that his entire event was faked.

That also applies to Susan Smith. Remember, Smith is the one we are told killed her kids in 1994. She went on national TV claiming a black man kidnapped them, then nine days later confessed that she killed them by driving her car into the lake. All theater. Any time you see sensational 24-hour-a-day national coverage of an event like this, you can be pretty sure it is manufactured to play on your emotions. [They also borrowed her name: Susan Smith is a famous Playboy Playmate.]

And of course it also applies to Jared Loughner, who is said to have shot Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords in early 2011. More theater. It never happened. Giffords may have been injured somehow, but not in the way we are told. The shooting is said to have been caught on the Safeway store security camera, but the video has never been released. Neither has any other convincing evidence. We are told that shooter Loughner was subdued at the scene by Joseph Zamudio, who was armed and licensed. Although Loughner is said to have fired at least 31 times, Zamudio never drew his weapon. It was initially reported Giffords was killed, and the county Sheriff's office confirmed that to NPR. How could that happen? How could any agency confirm that someone was dead who was not? These "mix-ups" only happen in fake events like this, which have been taken over by Intelligence. Intelligence then releases conflicting reports *on purpose*, to muddle the event from the first word.



Remember how Giffords and her alleged husband Mark Kelly used the event to lobby Congress for gun control? Then how do you explain the 2010 photo above, [which Giffords herself has confirmed is real](#). Kelly also bought an AR15, *after* the event. Also ask yourself why pacifist Giffords is shooting at human targets? Most normal gun enthusiasts shoot at bullseyes, not at pictures of Hispanic kids. Weird, weird, and triple weird.

Here's the Wiki photo of Loughner:



That's faked. Why is there a black line around his head? No possible angle of lighting creates a line like that against a background like that. During the trial, Loughner was connected to conspiracy theorists, including 911 Truth and the movie *Zeitgeist*. This conveniently blackwashed all those who had questioned mainstream government stories, and acted to pre-blackwash anyone who might question the Giffords story. The psy-ops are never-ending.

Loughner's trial is filled with other anomalies, including being prosecuted in Federal court but not State court, federal judges then recusing themselves, shipping in a judge from San Diego, findings of schizophrenia but no plea of insanity, strange plea bargains, and so on. Also curious is the hiding of Loughner's father, whose job we are not told. Likewise strange is Loughner's application to the military, which we are told was refused. I doubt that, and assume his father was also military. Loughner looks to me like another military man doing his job—as an actor.

The death of Judge Roll is also a red flag here, since Roll had long been under protection by US Marshals after death threats in 2009. Despite the discovery of those making the threats, Roll declined to press charges. That is both very strange and very unlikely. We are told Roll just happened to be at the Safeway when Loughner shot Giffords, “being at the wrong place at the wrong time.” Right. You shouldn't believe that for a moment. If the whole event wasn't manufactured from the ground up, it is much more likely Roll was the intended target, and Giffords was linked to him after the fact in this concocted story. I haven't unwound the entire event yet, but Giffords may have been injured in a shooting accident at a gun range, as in the photo above. I suspect that is why it was later leaked and released—to give the clue. The ever-present storytellers rushed in to use her accident for profit, and it was decided to link her to the Judge Roll event already in progress. That event was probably created to fake his death, allowing him to retire and dodge his enemies at the same time. Giffords' name was

inserted into his event, and allowed to take it over. That way his fake death made the papers, as planned, but since he was said to be just a collateral victim, fewer people would find his death suspicious, or analyze it closely. It was the perfect cover.

The other victims were either made up out of thin air, as at Sandy Hook, or borrowed from natural deaths that occurred that week. That is my assumption about the old people said to have died. Three of the six victims in Tucson were over 76, which is statistically very unlikely. The little girl, Christina Taylor Green, is a mountain of red flags, including a birth date of September 11 and two famous relatives, one of them actress Sophia Bush and the other Philadelphia Phillies manager Dallas Green.

The screenshot shows a YouTube video player with a profile page for Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords. The profile information includes:

- Subscribers: 202
- Website: <http://www.giffords.house.gov>
- Current Office: Congress
- Hometown: Tucson, AZ
- Country: United States

The video content shows a list of videos with titles and descriptions:

- The First Amendment**: On the second day of the 112th Congress (January 6, 2011), Giffords read aloud on the House floor the First Amendment.
- Agent Murdered on U.S.-Mexico Border**: On December 14, 2010, Border Patrol agent Brian Terry was murdered in Rio Rico, AZ. His murder is a stark reminder that our borders are under attack.
- Re-enlistment Ceremony of U.S. Army Sergeant from Arizona**: On September 29, 2010, Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords attended the re-enlistment ceremony for Sergeant First Class Leonard Crichton.
- Dismantling Drug Cartels**: On September 23, 2010, Congresswoman Giffords sponsored the Ultralight Smuggling Prevention Act (H.R. 5307), legislation to help dismantle drug cartels.

A watermark for [www.PropheticSeer.com](http://www.PropheticSeer.com) is visible in the bottom right of the video frame, advertising a "Podcast LIVE nightly 6-9pm Talk, news, Views, Call-in".

Below the video player, the video title is "Tragedy In Tucson Exposed" and the channel is "truth777exposed's channel" with 32,184 subscribers. The video has 17,375 views.

You may also be interested to know that Giffords' had a youtube channel at the time of the event. She had many subscribers, but she was subscribed to only two other channels. [One of them was](#) Loughner's channel. See the screenshot above, where one of the subscriptions out is "Classitup". That is Jared Loughner's channel. How do you explain that? Once this was discovered by independent researchers, Giffords immediately unsubscribed to Loughner's channel.

[If you go to youtube, as usual I encourage you to dodge any videos by DallasGoldBug, who is a plant. His job is to create noise around many events, to be sure you don't unwind them. All his analysis is gloriously wrong on purpose.]

And finally, I encourage you to ask the question no one has asked: have you ever heard of a US Congressperson having a “meet the constituents” event at a grocery store? Have you ever gone to the supermarket and seen your national Congressperson having an event outside? I haven't. Of course Congresspeople do have semi-public events to be seen by their public, but not like this. Such events take place in controlled arenas, where people must buy tickets or go through security. They take place at the Chamber of Commerce or the Rotary Club or something, not in front of a supermarket. So the given story never made sense from the first word.

To begin to understand the event in Tucson, it helps to look at the other subscription out of Giffords' youtube channel. It is to Rep. Ike Skelton from Missouri. Skelton was the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee until 2011, and in 2007 Skelton [toured Ft. Huachuca in Arizona with Giffords](#). The connection is the Advanced Airlift Tactics Training Center, which is based in Missouri but which has its Western wing in Arizona. As you will see if you take the link (which is on Giffords' own youtube channel), one of the uses of this misnamed Center is **Intelligence**. Part of that Intelligence is using drones to collect data. Huachaca leads the country in drone technology and use.

Watching that video tells me someone in the Giffords camp is trying to give us a clue. As with everyone in Congress now, Giffords was mixed up with Military Intelligence. No doubt it was they who planned, controlled, and manufactured her event for their own purposes, and who are still controlling it. Curiously, Skelton lost his re-election bid in 2010. I say that is curious because knowing his seniority, it is unlikely his constituents would vote him out. A district loves to have someone in that position, or used to (back when it actually meant something). So apparently Intelligence wanted Skelton out of their hair for some reason. He may have threatened to actually do something, which is no longer a function of Congress.

Which brings us back to the picture of Giffords I led with, at the shooting range. The guy with her has a patch that says Tucson police, but he is in army fatigues and has US flag above the patch. That isn't police attire, it is military attire. Although Breitbart confirmed the authenticity of the photo, that doesn't mean that all parts of it are authentic, and I suspect the patch was altered. The peculiar shape of the patch (inverted triangle) indicates Airborne, which dovetails with our findings at Ft. Huachuca. She is not at a police academy range here, she is at a military range. So why would they take the trouble to hide that, by cutting that guy out of most published photos—as at Brietbart—or changing the words on the patch to indicate police? All indications are she was shot on base, either accidentally or on purpose, and the Tucson event was created to make cover for that. Since it is unlikely Giffords was capable of making much trouble for the military—she was one of their best cheerleaders, after all—I assume she took a stray bullet on the range. That is my best guess for now, given the evidence at hand. Loughner would then have been one of the soldiers on base assigned to take the fall for the shooting. Being part of Intelligence, he would see it as no more than his job. On-site Intelligence was then instructed to make up a story that could be used to promote other agendas, including gun control.

That would also explain why Loughner was bald at the time of his fake arrest. Young military guys like their hair either very short or gone.

So let us return to the Boston event and Tsarnaev's attorney Judy Clarke. Since Clarke was involved in all these previous fake events, it is just more proof that she, like her namesake Marcia Clark, is a MATRIX-attorney. She *plays* an attorney in the media, nothing more. She is likely an Intelligence asset like all the rest of these people.

In addition to this obviously fake trial, we find obviously fake letters to the editor planted in prominent newspapers. If you do a BING search on this Boston trial, one of the links that comes up on the first page is [this letter](#) to the New Jersey *Courier-Post* (a Gannett Company). It is claimed to be from a Cheryl Gilbert in Oaklyn, and she says that there is no need for a trial, since Tsarnaev is “200% guilty”. Rather, we should publicly execute him instead, as further entertainment. Let's see, that would be Oaklyn, NJ. According to a people search, there is only one Cheryl Gilbert in Oaklyn, NJ, and she is supposed to be “over 65.” I encourage you to contact her and ask her if she wrote this. I would bet she didn't. It has all the earmarks of a fake letter, written and posted from Langley.

Finally, I beg you to ask how we are supposed to pronounce the name Dzhokhar Tsarnaev. That's right, the correct pronunciation of that first name is “Joker.” Doesn't that tell you something? I mean, c'mon. The storytellers here are just spitting in your face.

While you are wiping that from your eye, try to dodge this gob:

While this fake trial is meant to cement in your mind the fake terrorist event which will justify the Federal government spending billions of your taxdollars fighting fake terrorism, and which will justify further gun control measures, and which will cause more anxiety which will cause you and everyone else to buy more drugs—further enriching the pharmaceutical companies—those aren't the only endgames here. Another is local: these Hollywood trials cost tens of millions of dollars to put on, even though they are just show trials. The fake trial in Denver of the Batman shooter has already cost taxpayers over ten million, and the Boston Marathon trial will generate similar revenue for all these government actors and agencies in Massachusetts. So basically they are manipulating your mind with huge fake events, and then sending you the bill for it. You are paying for your own brainwashing. You are being taxed for the privilege of being lied to all the live-long day.

Also remember this curious side-effect, which we discovered in my recent paper on O. J. Simpson: these fake trials can act as precedent for future trials, both real and fake. So if Intelligence wishes to insert anything into future lawbooks, it can do so via these fake trials. In a future trial, an attorney can cite the outcomes of these fake trials as precedent, allowing the government to completely undermine the law *in any way it likes*.

\*I will not show you the alleged autopsy photo of Tamerlan, which exists on the internet, but be advised it is fake. The head is too small. It is a paste-up using a cadaver, probably from a medical school.