

[return to updates](#)

The Alleged Sandy Hook Tragedy



by Miles Mathis

First published January 6, 2013

[Added much later: To get you started, we will skip ahead a few years, to look at an official [FBI report of murders in Connecticut, 2012](#). Go to the line for Newtown, CT, and see the box for “murders”. The number listed? **Zero**. Strange, since the Sandy Hook murders allegedly occurred on December 14, 2012. Did the FBI list them in 2013 by accident? Nope. I checked.

(194) Inbox | milesmathis@pro... x FBI — Table 8 - Connecticut x +

ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s./2012/crime-in-the-u.s.-2012/tables/8tabledatadecpdf/table-8-state-cuts/table_8_offenses_known_to_law_enforcer

Madison	18,288	2	0	0	1	1	116	25	89	2	1
Manchester	58,444	111	1	12	46	52	1,797	288	1,417	92	7
Meriden	60,934	222	5	25	76	116	1,812	421	1,223	168	9
Middlebury	7,583	4	0	2	1	1	70	20	45	5	0
Middletown	47,878	72	1	1	25	45	900	156	661	83	3
Milford	52,817	46	0	2	33	11	1,586	150	1,371	65	4
Monroe	19,728	3	0	1	1	1	159	41	115	3	0
Naugatuck	31,896	30	0	7	11	12	632	92	498	42	2
New Britain	73,458	317	3	5	179	130	2,917	775	1,749	393	0
New Canaan	19,992	6	1	0	2	3	130	14	114	2	0
New Haven	129,934	1,870	17	55	844	954	6,516	1,451	4,351	714	15
Newington	30,668	28	1	8	14	5	784	99	636	49	4
New London	27,643	366	3	10	45	308	764	183	515	66	10
New Milford	28,047	21	0	9	1	11	363	4	335	24	1
Newtown	27,904	7	0	5	0	2	185	32	151	2	1
North Branford	14,422	5	1	1	1	2	201	34	160	7	0
North Haven	24,119	12	0	0	11	1	578	63	478	37	0
Norwalk	86,693	272	3	9	68	192	1,713	250	1,352	111	4
Norwich	40,517	99	1	18	35	45	963	274	639	50	15
Old Saybrook	10,293	9	0	0	0	9	162	7	152	3	0
Orange	13,971	7	0	2	5	0	376	33	332	11	4
Plainfield	15,410	14	0	3	5	6	121	36	72	13	1

The most famous murders in the history of Connecticut, and the FBI just forgot about them?]

Since the government and the media aren't giving you any good or consistent information about this alleged tragedy, I suggest you look at some of the information they *aren't* giving you. So far the reported “facts” about Sandy Hook have changed in spectacular fashion. First the shooter was said to be Ryan Lanza, but then that was changed to Adam Lanza, his younger brother. First a man was said to be murdered at the Lanza home, then it was said to be a woman, Adam's mother Nancy Lanza. First Nancy Lanza was said to be a teacher at Sandy Hook, then a substitute teacher; but now we know she was neither. She was actually [an employee at Morgan Stanley](#)—and before that at Citigroup. First the principal at Sandy Hook gave a statement to the press, describing all the shots being fired. Then it was reported the principal was killed. How did she give a statement to the press after being killed? First the assault rifle was found in the trunk of the car, but later it was reported that this rifle was the main murder weapon. How did Lanza return the rifle to his car trunk after shooting himself? First the car was said to be that of Adam Lanza, but then someone ran the license plate and it turns out [it is registered](#) to a Christopher Rodia, a known drug dealer.

But these anomalies, though curious, aren't even close to the most curious things we now know. To start with the best first, did you know [Adam Lanza's father Peter was the vice president](#) and tax director of GE Financial Services? On October 18, 2012—less than two months before the Sandy Hook tragedy—[Bloomberg reported](#) that GE bankers had been given prison terms in a bid-rigging scheme involving municipal bonds. These convictions were part of a larger case that includes Bank of America, JPMorgan Chase, UBS, and Wells Fargo. This case is a variation of the LIBOR scandal which started in London, and is tied to it. UBS (Union Bank of Switzerland), for instance, is involved in both scandals. Morgan Stanley, where Peter Lanza's ex-wife worked, [has also been caught up in the LIBOR scandal](#). If you don't know what the LIBOR scandal is, I suggest you read up on it. It is being called the biggest scandal ever in the banking industry, and major banks have already been fined billions. It is far from over.

Also curious is the link to the alleged Aurora tragedy, also called the Batman shooting. The alleged shooter in that alleged tragedy is James Holmes, and his father is Robert Holmes, [senior lead scientist at FICO](#). He is one of several scientists who patented a predictive model system used to detect telecommunications fraud. Telecommunications fraud was used extensively in the LIBOR scandal.

Some researchers have claimed that both highly placed fathers were scheduled to testify in LIBOR hearings, but I found no hard evidence of that. Debunkers are using this lack of evidence to dismiss the LIBOR connection, but even without subpoenas or testimony schedules (which would not be public anyway), it is a big red flag to find these alleged mass murderers coming out of such families. It is known in the black agencies that the best way to attack a man is through his family, so when we see highly placed individuals suffering unaccountable tragedies via their families, we should at least ask the question—are we seeing the tragedy we are being sold by the media or are we seeing a different tragedy?

I remind you that [the BBC reported in June of 2000](#) that Pan Am's in-house investigation of the Lockerbie tragedy (Pan Am flight 103, over Scotland, 1988) determined that neither Libya nor Iran nor any other terrorists were involved. Pan Am's investigators determined that it was the CIA offing its own rogue agents. So these tragedies are rarely what they seem. They are almost never what we are told they are. This applies to just about any one you could mention from the past fifty years, and if you study them, you will find that out for yourself.

At this point in time, it is difficult to say what really happened at Sandy Hook, but as with other scripted tragedies, it is becoming easier and easier to say what *didn't* happen. The story you are being sold in the mainstream media didn't happen. The best indication of that is [this video](#) now making the rounds on the internet, which shows Robbie Parker, one of the alleged fathers of one of the alleged victims, giving a press conference. I suggest you watch it closely, especially noting that before he starts he says, “Just read from the card? OK!”

The alleged funeral of Emilie Parker was in Ogden, Utah. [An intelius search on Robert Parker](#) of Ogden, UT and Sandy Hook, CT, aka Robbie, related to Alissa, gives us a man 59 years old. Does the man in that video look 59? No, he looks about 30. Apparently this crisis actor borrowed the identity of a 59 year old man.

Also curious is that his allegedly deceased daughter Emilie Parker was photographed in Obama's lap *after* she was killed, wearing the same red dress she is shown wearing in obit pics. [see pics below] Debunkers are claiming this is her sister, who was nearly the same age, but the part in the hair strongly indicates it isn't the sister. It is Emilie herself. As a portrait painter, I confirm that this looks much more like Emily than her sister. The part in the hair is indeed the best evidence, since we even see the wispy hair right at the start of the part, which goes the opposite way of the part. It is highly unlikely that the parents would choose to not only dress the other sister in Emilie's red dress, but also change her part to match her dead sister. It is nearly infinitely unlikely that the other sister's hair, if newly parted in that place, would also create the signature wispy underpart of her dead sister.

If that is her sister. The probability appears to be that these people are all actors, which means they aren't even guaranteed to be related. Like families in apparel catalogs, they are just people who look good together. Which means the little girl's name probably isn't Emilie Parker. So why did they choose the name Emilie Parker? Well, if these people are actors, they probably know a lot about movies and other actors. Maybe they are giving us a clue. If you search on Emily Parker, you find a 2004 made-for-TV movie starring Anne Heche as Emily Parker. The title of the movie: *The Dead Will*

Tell. The dead appear to be telling us a lot here, without even being dead.



Are all little blonde girls the same?

Here's a face recognition test, for those of you are good at this sort of thing (and those who aren't). We are told this next pic is the Parker family Christmas card from last year (2011).





Which one doesn't belong?

The answer is B. A and C may be the same girl. B is absolutely not the same girl. Not even close. I paint the portraits of little blonde girls for a living, so I can read faces. I have to, in order to reproduce them exactly. Yes, we have very different lighting situations, but the little girl in the middle doesn't even have the same shaped head. Look at the top of her head, from the hairline up. Then look at the other two pics. They have much higher crowns, making it appear they have more hair on top. You will say, "Well, maybe her hair was dirty that day and it was stuck to her head." But that can't explain it because photo A and photo B were supposed to be taken on the same day, at the same shoot. She is wearing the same pink blouse and is in the same forest background. That is supposed to be the same person on the same day. So she can't have dirty hair in one and clean fluffed hair in the other. Pic A looks like she has twice as much hair as Pic B.

The mouths and eyes aren't the same, either. Let's study the eyebrows. Pic A has high arched eyebrows. Pic B is blown out so we can't see the eyebrows very well. So let's blow out pic A to match it.



I've actually blown it out far past the other, as we can see from the hair. In pic A the hair is now bright white. But we still see her eyebrows. Pic B simply doesn't have those eyebrows. If you look close, you can see just the hint of eyebrows in pic B, but they aren't arched like that.

The chin is also different. The girl in pic B has a less prominent chin. Her smile is different as well. She brings her lower lip up when she smiles and the girl in pic A does not.

For more faked photos of Emilie, you may go to [this very good analysis on youtube](#). The graphic designer explains how Emilie is pasted into a photo there.



Here's a picture of Robbie Parker at his daughter's funeral. Really broken up, isn't he?

I also recommend you watch the [interview with the alleged chief medical examiner](#). It is exceedingly strange. Few people have watched this and not become suspicious. [Here's a transcript](#), where you can study the wording closely. Notice he says the parents didn't get to see their own children, not even to identify them. They were given photos. Strange and unprecedented. You will say we have no other evidence of that, and that the medical examiner was misunderstood, or that he misunderstood. No, [Huffington Post confirms it](#). Although *HuffPost* has been debunking any mention of strange goings-on at Sandy Hook, in an interview with Gilles Rousseau, their own reporters confirm that parents are not being allowed to see their dead children. According to [CBC news in Canada](#), Lauren Rousseau was cremated *before* her funeral. Normally people are cremated *after* the funeral, and many churches strongly recommend this. There are various reasons one might want to cremate before a funeral, one of them being to permanently hide the body, or lack of a body. Obviously, in that case there is no question of open casket or closed. It is a closed urn, and nobody walks by to look inside.

Notice that here, as elsewhere, it is not people like me making up theories from nothing, or from dangling threads. The mainstream is reporting these things themselves, and we are just putting it in front of you and circling it. That is not conspiracy theory, it is reportage. It isn't a conspiracy theory that Gilles Rousseau "wasn't allowed" to see his daughter's body. It is a fact reported in the mainstream. That is why I provide these links. CBC is not a conspiracy site. It is the Canadian Broadcasting Company, the biggest news source in Canada, sort of like CBS here.

Mr. Rousseau was told that "he wouldn't be allowed" to see his daughter's body, because her face was shot off. The report claims that many victims were shot in the face multiple times, and that because this precluded any possibility of identification by the parents, they weren't being allowed to see the bodies. Is that even close to believable? People can be identified from other things than their faces, and besides parents have a legal right to see *and take possession of* their dead children. Otherwise all we have here is a mass government kidnapping. I hope to see some lawsuits on this.

We also learn from similar interviews that the local first responders didn't see the dead or wounded, either. They were directed to a nearby fire station, which was made into a staging area. And then, “the call came over the radio to release all of these ambulances from surrounding towns and [just hold the Newtown ambulances](#) at the scene.” So, the local people weren't allowed to see anything. They were told there were no survivors that needed medical attention. They saw no bodies.

For more video evidence of poor acting, I send you [to the interviews](#) with other alleged parents and neighbors of other alleged victims, including [Nick Phelps](#), [Kaitlin Roig](#), [Chris and Lynn McDonnell](#), the parents of Jessica Rekos, and [Gene Rosen](#). Why are these people smiling? Can't any of these people cry? When they pretend to cry, why are there no tears? Where is the moisture? Why aren't their eyes red? Why does it all look so fake? Why do all their comments appear to be scripted? Do you really believe Gene Rosen took six stray kids into his house for 30 minutes during the tragedy? If so, you may ask, “Why does he have all those stuffed animals?” You may also ask why and how [he got caught rehearsing his lines on camera](#). [Update: some theorists are linking Gene Rosen to a Jeffrey Rosenberg. This link is mistaken. The two guys look somewhat similar, but the theorists need to study face recognition more closely before they jump to such conclusions. The differences are very clear.]

We may ask why [Obama's remarks were also scripted](#). Does he ever say anything that he isn't reading from Teleprompters or notecards? Does he have any ideas or emotions that are his own? Even he pretends to cry, but does it poorly. He wipes a tear that isn't there with an odd flick, and magically manages to have no break in his voice like the rest of us would have in such a situation (were it real). I begin to wonder: are these things live or does he get several takes?

Also poorly coached were the children, who when asked about gunshots and loud noises, never mentioned shots. [They said they only heard banging on the door](#).

Then there is [Cathy Gaubert](#), a woman who discovered that her daughter's pictures had been “borrowed” off of Flickr and posted as a victim of Sandy Hook. How many other victims have also been borrowed off the internet?

Add to that the interview of [Kaitlyn Roig with Diane Sawyer](#). What no one has noticed—not even the other Truthers exposing this—is that Sawyer tells us Roig rushed 15 students “into a tiny bathroom”. We then cut to the interview, where Roig herself tells us she “pushed a bookshelf in front of the door”. Do you see a problem? **There are no bookshelves in school bathrooms.**

Another waving red flag is the now scrubbed facebook “in memoriam” page for Victoria Soto, one of the teachers allegedly killed. Observant researchers noticed that this page had been started four days before the tragedy. How did they know that Soto would be killed four days in advance? Debunkers are already saying that it is just a coincidence: Soto's family just happened to start a facebook page four days before the tragedy, then switched it to an in memoriam page four days later. Do you believe that? If it is true, why did facebook scrub the original page and replace it with a cleansed page as soon as it was discovered by researchers? That's right, they replaced it with a new page, one that didn't have the old timestamp on it.

And yet another facebook page got caught rushing. [Pass the Hat](#) production company began a fundraiser for the Sandy Hook victims at 10:35AM on 12/14, only one hour after the first police reports began coming in. There is a timestamped post on that date proving it. Since medical personnel weren't scrambled until 10:00, there couldn't have been any report of deaths until 10:15, at the earliest. Are we to believe that *Pass the Hat* confirmed the tragedy in just 20 minutes—ahead of the pace of the

Associated Press, FoxNews, The New York Times, and CNN—while at the same time building a facebook page? Is it even possible to create a facebook page that fast?

[United Way of Newtown](#) also got caught posting early. Three days early. The Google search on that URL is dated December 11. The tragedy was December 14. If they have scrubbed that date since I wrote this, Mike Adams has it cached [on his site](#).

But the earliest posting came from a [Vimeo video](#) posted more than a month too early. A Sandy Hook tribute video was found with a posting date of November 10. Go to minute 2:00 after you take that link.

Other anomalies include the fact that Adam Lanza's hard drive was wiped. We are being told by debunkers that he did it himself, to bury evidence. Ask yourself how logical that argument is. According to the mainstream's own story, Lanza killed himself after murdering the others. What did he care about evidence? Was he worried about a conviction? Was he worried they might tie him to the murders? Come on! Someone else wiped his computer, to hide other evidence.

Another anomaly: Sandy Hook had CCTV cameras and a buzz-in front door that required someone inside to press a button. Are we to believe they buzzed in a guy wearing a mask, a bulletproof vest (or now “utility vest”), and carrying at least three guns? Why no video from the front door, like we had of the Columbine shooters in the cafeteria? As with all the hundreds of cameras at the Pentagon during 911, this film was lost or confiscated.

And who are these guys?



Why are the police being led by a guy in tennis shoes, flare pants, a hoodie and an AR-15 in pic 2? Everyone else has a badge or armpatch, and no one else has a weapon drawn. And they all are looking at him apprehensively, walking at least a step behind. Don't you find that odd? Is he ATF, like the bearded guy in pic 1? I can just read ATF on his flak jacket. Don't the ATF guys dress for work anymore? What's with the bluejeans and tennis shoes? But no, on a closer look, guy 2 isn't ATF. He has yellow letters on his vest, maybe ICE. But why would ICE be there? ICE is now under DHS, so maybe that was the jacket available. This would confirm the last picture below. It also confirms the

fact that local authorities have been trumped by the feds, at least since the time of Waco, 1993. Ask yourself this: why do ATF or ICE or DHS need to be there *at all*? If the story is true, we have one shooter, who killed himself within minutes of a short spree. You don't think the Newtown police department can handle that? One, they go in; two, they find the guy dead. You don't need a bunch of paramilitary running around with military weapons at that point. Why do these guys have weapons drawn out in the middle of the street? Bystanders are strolling calmly down the street, so the event is clearly over. Where are these guys going? Were they mistakenly informed of a siege?

You will say they are patrolling the area, in case there are more shooters. But that makes no sense. Either they are patrolling the area for shooters or they aren't. If they *aren't*, they don't need to be walking down the middle of the street with military weapons. If they *are*, then they don't need dad and son strolling nonchalantly along with them, while camera crews film it. Normally when you are seriously patrolling a public area for shooters, you clear it first. You don't just walk past dad and son on a stroll, with a film crew in front of you.

To see the mainstream response to the story unwinding, I encourage you to read this article called [“Newtown Conspiracy Theories Debunked,”](#) at *the Atlantic*. As usual, I recommend you read both sides and decide for yourself. As with the so-called debunking of the 911 theories, what we get here is just a list of the theories and then the assurance that they are wrong. Notice there is no counter-argumentation here or presentation of evidence. Not even a clarification or an explanation of anomalies. Apparently this author thinks all she need do is title the article “Debunked,” and it will do the job of debunking. The word “debunk” is so powerful, in and of itself, that all an author need do is chant it. I clicked on the article hoping to hear the other side of the story, but I got nothing.

[*Update, January 19, 2013.* We now have debunking from CNN, TIME, Yahoo, HuffPost, Salon, and just about every other mainstream source. But none of these pieces does any real debunking. None explain any of the anomalies, or even try to. They simply attack those asking questions and try to spin the already spun information. Again, I *encourage* you to read them, since all the debunkers simply end up shooting themselves in the foot, giving more credibility and attention to the anomalies. Other than that, the only purpose these debunking pieces serve is to highlight and circle which sources are being written by the government. If you are smart, you will simply catalog every magazine or TV program that is debunking, filing them away as compromised. The CIA trains journalists to write these articles, and you are seeing the articles they write: it is that simple.]

But let us return to Nancy Lanza, who, we are told, is the first person her son killed. It turns out “she spent her last months alive criss-crossing the globe in a desperate search for a new home as she knew that ‘time was running out’”. That is a quote from her sister-in-law, speaking to [the MailOnline](#). She had traveled to nine cities in three foreign countries, fleeing from. . . what? The MailOnline implies it was fear of her own son, but the article itself contradicts that. It tells us she was devoted to Adam and had no plans to leave him when she left. So what was she so scared of?

The mainstream media is now telling us she was a Doomsday Prepper, stockpiling weapons for the endtimes, but how many rich ladies living in mansions, with multi-millionaire ex-husbands, and working for Morgan Stanley do you know that are Doomsday Preppers? Doomsday Preppers normally come from Montana or someplace like that, not from a mansion in Newtown, Connecticut. Curiously, TIME admitted it could find no registration for any of those weapons for Nancy Lanza. Although [HuffPost and many other papers](#) stated those weapons were registered to her, [an AP article](#) (now memoryholed) admits that TIME found no registration for any of the guns. It would appear that this stockpiling of weapons charge was made up from nothing, to create a backlash against Preppers, the

NRA, and the 2nd Amendment. Which of course is precisely what has happened. It would appear that this tragedy, like so many others, is doing double duty. This was both a setup against the Lanzas, as well as one more in a long line of excuses to ram through new gun laws. Unfortunately, that doesn't appear to be working. The only people who want more gun laws are the people being paid to read from scripts and Teleprompters. Real people are buying guns at a faster pace than ever before. December was the biggest month in the entire history of gun and ammo sales. Rather than learning from Sandy Hook a lesson about gun control, real citizens appear to be learning a lesson in not trusting their own government. When a government stages poorly conceived tragedies every other month, that is a proper lesson to learn, I would say.

And when that same government [is purchasing billions of rounds of hollow-point ammunition](#), which cannot be used either for foreign wars or for target practice, those citizens have even more reason to distrust it. And when that government is known to be illegally spying on them, releasing drones domestically, making illegal searches and seizures, tasing indiscriminately, torturing, renditioning, and murdering American citizens, I would say those citizens would be fools to trust it at all.

continued below

Participant Preparation

Participants need a basic knowledge of exercise design and HSEEP terminology. Therefore, participants are **required** to complete Independent Study (IS)-120.A, An Introduction to Exercises, before attending the HSEEP Training Course. The IS course takes approximately 3 to 5 hours to complete. To complete this requirement, follow these steps:

Go to training.fema.gov/EMWeb/IS/IS120A.asp and select "Interactive Web-based Course".
After completing the modules, select "Take Final Exam".
Obtain proof of completion of the course.

Additionally, the HSEEP Training Course will briefly cover other DHS initiatives. As such, it is **recommended** that participants complete the following IS courses:

IS-130, Exercise Evaluation and Improvement Planning
IS-139, Exercise Design
IS-700, NIMS, An Introduction
IS-800.B, National Response Framework, An Introduction

The course will be held at the Sandy Hook Fire Department, address below.

Location: 18 Riverside Road, Sandy Hook CT
This event is 37 miles from you (06106).

8 AM - 5 PM

Contact: Tom Romano
Email: thomas_romano@ct.gov
Phone: 860 256 0844

19 of 30 seats still available

Last day to register: 9/17/2010

Sorry, you may not register for this event.

Check out this Department of Homeland Security [training course sheet](#). Notice the location. That is the address of the Fire Station across the street from the school, which was a staging area during the tragedy. Looks like DHS has been there since late 2010, planning this "exercise."

Sorry, you may not register for this event.

[There are now [three follow-up articles](#) to this one available.]

For an excellent video presentation of this evidence—and some additional evidence—you may visit this [youtube video](#) which has already gotten over 12 million hits. It is referenced in some of the debunking pieces, which is

ironic. These debunkers do not manage to debunk even one of these anomalies, but they provide a link to the evidence for the anomalies.