

Trump Indictments are Theater



by Miles Mathis

First published August 3, 2023

How do I know? The easiest way is this:

Obama-Nominated Judge In Trump Case Is 'Toughest Punisher' Of J6 Rioters

That's a headline today from Zerohedge. DC federal judge Tanya Chutkan is the judge in this one, and this is what we are told about her:

"Chutkan has handed out tougher sentences than the [Justice Department] was seeking in seven cases, matched its requests in four others and sent all 11 riot defendants who have come before her behind bars," AP wrote of her last year.

"In the four cases in which prosecutors did not seek jail time, Chutkan gave terms ranging from 14 days to 45 days."

Except for one little problem. That is all a lie. There are no J6 rioters and no one is in jail or ever was. They are all military/intel actors, many of them from Air Force. I have already covered this in [my long J6 paper](#), so we know this is all being staged. All those long terms in solitary confinement you keep hearing about are more Langley baloney. This is being scripted by the usual vaccine-damaged bozos in subbasement 9 at Langley, who haven't got a law degree among them. But they figure you don't either, so what the hey. Neatness has never counted at Langley, because they know they won't be fact-checked. They own the mainstream media and know their audience can barely read, much less pull apart a story based on logic or known facts or, least of all, the law. But I have reminded those who can that these hearings, trials, and sentences never make any sense.

We are told Chutkan has already presided over 30 J6 trials in less than two years. Pretty amazing speed she has, especially since she is simultaneously juggling these fake Trump trials.

So we know already without further research that this Judge Chutkan is yet another Hollywood judge sitting above a dummy court. This is all being run just for the papers. Let's see what anomalies we can

find in this one article at ZH. Well, let's see, we get one in the opening paragraph, where they admit Chutkan came out the law firm that included Hunter Biden. She was the attorney for Theranos. So huge red flags already. We are told she was confirmed by the Senate with a perfect vote, with no Republicans voting against her. So why was her cloture vote 54-40? Apparently 40 senators were unhappy enough with her testimony to vote against cloture, but not one of them voted against her? Makes no sense.

You know what also makes no sense? The charges. In the latest round of fakery, Trump is being charged with knowingly making false statements about an election, referring to his claims the election was stolen. So let me get this straight: questioning an election is now illegal? A candidate now has to concede defeat gracefully or he will be charged with felonies? Then what was the whole point of a concession speech, or concession? If it is a legal requirement that candidates bow to the initial results, then Congress needs to pass a law saying so, and we need to get rid of concession speeches, recounts, and lawsuits. But as of now, neither Congress nor anyone else has passed such a law. A candidate is allowed to question his own ballots, to call for recounts, to sue, and to refuse to concede. He would have to be, since it falls under the heading of FREE SPEECH! If you believe you have been cheated, you are allowed to say so. No one has to believe you, just as you don't have to believe the results. It is part of living in a FREE COUNTRY! Belief and thought cannot be coerced, not by the media, the government, or anyone else. This is a "thought police" case if ever there was one, and any real judge would throw it out of court with prejudice, as an assault upon the Constitution. She would bring the prosecutors up for malfeasance. Except that these aren't real prosecutors. Like the judge they are just actors in this mad play.

Here's another red flag: Chutkan's husband is given a Peter Krauthamer, also a judge in DC. Wikipedia has a short page on him, but **the big computers have never heard of him**. He doesn't come up at Intelius or Instantcheckmate. Never heard of him. So he is either a ghost or they are giving us the wrong name. Same thing we found with Ketanji Brown Jackson, whom the computers have never heard of. Tanya's mother Noelle is supposed to be a DC lawyer as well, still practicing at age 83. Sounds fishy. Her mother is listed as graduating from law school in 1988. She would have been 48 then. Instantcheckmate lists her, but with no maiden name and no link to her birth family, which is also strange. She has three middle initials: E, A, and T. The E is for Emily. We are told Tanya comes from Jamaica, but there is nothing about that on her page or her parents'. The family appears to be from Georgia. Also Kingston, Wisconsin, and Kingston, GA, but *not* Kingston, Jamaica. So you see the joke. Her father is named **Winston Barrington Chutkan**, another red flag. Even the name Chutkan is a red flag, since [her father has also gone by Chautkin](#) and that appears to be a variation of Chaitkin, which is Jewish. Think Anton Chaitkin, one of Larouche's lieutenants. We could have predicted that coming in. The Barringtons are big in Jamaica, see for example reggae star Barrington Ainsworth **Levy**. I don't have to tell you what his surname indicates. But his given name [links us to the Viscounts Barrington](#), who have ties to Jamaica. They are closely related to the Stuarts. The Barringtons were bankers, generals, and admirals during the settlement of Jamaica, and were also big slavers. So you see how it goes. See for example William Barrington, Chancellor of the Exchequer and Secretary of War during the American War of Independence. The Barringtons also settled in Canada, which could be why we see the Duchesneaus in the Chutkan lists at Intelius: this black lady judge also has close French Canadian relatives. I would assume her father is only half black, but since we aren't given a maiden name for her mother, we don't know about her. Tanya is also related to an Imran Chutkan, which is a suspicious first name, not being Jamaican or American. It is Pakistani, think Imran Khan. Imran Chutkan is 41, listed only in Miami. So what is our link to Pakistan here? A search on that pulls up something strange: [Tanya Chutkan presided over a case involving Imran Awan in 2017](#). Awan has two birthyears at Wiki, so something is up. He is both 42 and 43. And he is Pakistani.

In July 2017, Awan was arrested on federal bank fraud charges. During an 18-month investigation into alleged misconduct involving congressional computer equipment,[2] he was subject to conspiracy theories involving espionage.

I guess you saw the aces and eights there, the sign of a fake? Chutkan sentenced him to time served and released him. So all the money spent on that 18-month federal investigation was wasted, eh? More of your taxdollars at work. Awan was information director for Robert Ira Wexler, Jewish of course, US Representative for Florida. Wexler is the one caught by FOXNews faking his residency in Florida. As a resident of Maryland, he shouldn't have been able to run from Florida, but it was all swept under the rug. Congress didn't care and let him slide, since most of them are doing something similar. At any rate, this strange name match begs the question: is Imran Awan related to or the same as Imran Chutkan? Remember, we just saw that Imran Chutkan is about the same age and is listed from Florida, same as Wexler. And if we search on Imran Awan at Instantcheckmate, we find he also has Miami on his list. In fact, Awan is listed twice, being both 42 and 50, with the same locations, aka Muhammad. Strange, because Wiki lists him as Shahid Imran Awan, not Muhammad. So someone is lying, or everyone.

So what is this Trump indictment really about? Other than hogging the headlines from real events, it is about getting you to police yourself, without any need for real police or real courts:

As of Friday, more than 50 people have been sentenced for federal crimes related to the insurrection. In at least 28 of those cases, prosecutors factored a defendant's social media posts into their requests for stricter sentences, according to an Associated Press review of court records.

That's what we find at the [Chicago Tribune](#) in Dec. 2021, reporting on these same cases. They not only want you to think you will be prosecuted for protesting election fraud, they want you to think what you say online can be used against you as evidence. It isn't true, since that would never happen in a real court. But it doesn't matter, because just reporting this will scare a lot of people off social media and the internet. It will silence a lot of people like me and my readers. Or that is the hope. It won't silence me because I know it is all a bluff. I know the Constitution is still in effect, so I can think and say what I wish almost without limit. I don't have to believe anything, least of all these court cases which aren't believable in the least.

We are supposed to believe these judges came down harder on the defendants because they said something like this on social media: *Haha, I am going to be at the Capitol because I have a right to be at the Capitol. I have a right to protest. I have a right to question this election. I have a right to support Trump if I want to.* Except for one thing. **All that is true.** They did have that right. So if this were real, the only one acting illegally would be the judge. A judge is forbidden from raising sentences in a punitive and arbitrary manner, punishing defendants who have done nothing wrong. Bragging about your Constitutional rights is not illegal.

But this reminds us all this is impossible in a further way: these people should have all had a right to **trial by jury**. The jury should have been sentencing them, not the judge. In real trials, it would be impossible for the judge to be doing what we are told Chutkan did. Judges can't just increase sentences on their own authority, above what the prosecution has requested and what the jury has decided,

because they don't like what someone wrote on Facebook. It is beyond absurd and every real lawyer would know that. Reading these stories, you are expected to believe that if you aren't penitent enough and don't say you are sorry with the right amount of tears, kissing the judges hems as you do it, the judge can keep raising your sentence until you say uncle. But that isn't how it works. You don't have to be penitent at all, especially when you have pled not guilty—which all these people should have done. Other than standing when she walks in, you aren't required to bow to the judge at all. You can think and say what you wish, in the courtroom and out of it. The judge and jury are allowed to punish you to the extent of the law, but they are not allowed to make up sentences or add time based on your demeanor in court, or even less on Facebook or Twitter. That would require a separate finding of contempt, and that would apply only to your actions in court.

That is what I mean when I say I can tell all these cases are staged. Until recently, court cases never proceeded like this. Real ones still don't, because there are rules in court as well as out of it. Judges have to obey a long list of procedural rules, and so do attorneys and juries. It isn't just a free-for-all, though the whacky writers at Langley want you to think it is.

And here's a related story at [Gateway Pundit](#) today:

J6 Political Prisoner Zachary Rehl Faces 10 to 12 Years In Prison For Walking In US Capitol For A Few Minutes, Stripped Of Honorable Military Service

Well, what do you know, he happens to be Marine! Also mentioned in that article, his comrade Stf Sgt. Joe Biggs, also military, with two purple hearts. These guys are not only allegedly being stripped of “service”, whatever that means, they are being stripped of military benefits. We are told Rehl has already been in jail for 2.5 years without charges, most of it in a solitary in a 6 x 8 foot cell. Impossible on many levels. Cells that small are illegal, and keeping someone in solitary for that long would be considered torture, under all international laws and agreements. You see what they are doing, though: these stories are aimed right at current and retired military, to scare and bluff them into compliance. They will read these stories and think they are at risk of the same thing, if they so much as post something on Facebook or Twitter. It keeps them quiet. But veterans cannot be stripped of benefits for protesting or speaking out, on the streets or online. If they were, their Constitutional rights would have been violated, and they could sue for millions.

Which reminds us that there is another way we know this is all fake. If these J6 prisoners had really been kept in tiny cells in solitary for years, civil rights attorneys from all over the world would be lining up to sue the government for torture. Literally billions would be up for grabs in slam dunk cases. The International Red Cross and Amnesty International would be all over it. Congress would be all over it. But we don't see any of that. Why? Because everyone on the inside, from Congress to Amnesty International to civil rights attorneys, knows this is fake. All of the media is now being run out of Langley and the Pentagon, in partnership with Hollywood, and it is a vast fiction. Hollywood doesn't have to worry about strikes or implosions, since most actors can transfer over to Langley, working in news theater. The only ones who can't are the big stars you would recognize.

So, just as we have seen with Alex Jones and others, this Trump indictment is all being staged. It isn't even a kangaroo court or a show trial, because those are both real. They may be crooked, but they are otherwise real. These trials with Jones and Trump aren't real. Like all the televised CourtTV trials back to O. J. Simpson, and many other trials back at least to Manson, these new trials are completely staged by Intelligence, and aren't real at all. It is all actors playing parts. The outcomes are

meaningless, as we saw with Jones: when he is going to be liquidated and put into receivership, so that he can pay the trillion-dollar judgment against him? You have to laugh, this is all so stupid. It is sad to think that anyone buys it for a minute.

And in a tack-on, we see that the film *Oppenheimer* is the biggest propaganda push in a while. People are lining up to see this Hollywood fiction, underwritten by the Defense Department—meaning you paid to make this film with your taxes. I hope it was worth it. Considering that you paid to make it, they should have let you in for free, and sold it as a public service announcement or something. Not really fair to make you pay twice for your own propagandizing. You can generally get all the lies you want for free.

But I guess the old films from Trinity weren't really passing muster anymore. [Any fool could see they were faked.](#) So they needed to rewrite the story and refilm the explosions, to make them look more real for modern audiences. How did they do that? Did they actually set off nukes for the film? No, of course not. This is conventional explosions made to look like nuclear explosions. Just like the first time around at Trinity. That too was a Hollywood production, with the films edited and produced by Lookout Mountain Film Studio in Los Angeles. And they admit that, in part.

I will have more to say after watching the film, which I see as my duty. But you can forgive me if I refuse to pay to see it. I will have to wait until it hits the internet, which won't be long.