

# THE ALEX JONES FAKE TRIAL

*by Miles Mathis*

*First published October 19, 2021*

On October 1, aces and eights, Chai, an Austin judge allegedly made a default judgment against Alex Jones in the lawsuit allegedly filed against him by parents of Sandy Hook victims. On October 18, aces and eights, Alex Jones published a reply on his own site. That is where I heard of it yesterday. In case you don't know, a default judgment is a finding for the plaintiff without going to trial. It is normally reserved for cases in which the defendant fails to reply or show up to court. That wasn't the case here, since Jones did show up.

Jones has claimed this was a show trial, but it isn't. It is a *fake* trial, which is different. A show trial would be a real trial used for media, propaganda, or political purposes. But that isn't what this is. This trial, like the similar trial against Jim Fetzer, is a phony CIA trial, run on paper to scare people like me from speaking out. But since I ignored the Fetzer fake, they have decided to try again, hitting me closer to home. They know I am from Austin and am now reading Infowars, since I have said so (and since of course they are tracking me online).

How do I know this is fake? Well, if you search on it, the first site that comes up on Google or Bing, even above msn.com, is [FirstAmendmentWatch.org](http://FirstAmendmentWatch.org). You get the first clue very fast, since they misspell “judgment” in the title of the article. So this is Langley on the first sniff. Do you really think a bunch of top attorneys and writers at a First Amendment website would spell judgment as “judgement”? Get real! This is a fake CIA site.

This website is supposed to be a production of the Arthur L. Carter Journalism Institute at New York University. But these PhDs in journalism and law don't know how to spell judgment? Really?

We are told the judge was forced to this default judgment because Jones didn't respond to discovery requests. So this story is for the legally illiterate, as usual. In a defamation suit, there is no discovery on the defendant. The plaintiff either has evidence against him or it doesn't. Jones posts all his stuff on the internet, and the plaintiffs would have seen it there, so they should have saved it. Short of that, there is a little thing called the Wayback Machine, which saves this stuff automatically. It is not up to Jones to provide the evidence against him, or incriminate himself. It is up to the plaintiff's attorneys to show the evidence and prove it is libelous. Jones' only required action in the suit is to respond, arguing it is free speech, opinion, and other protected speech, and therefore isn't libelous. If anyone would be requesting discovery, it would be Jones, who has the legal right to know what the plaintiff thinks he has against him, so that he can prepare his defense. Yes, discovery is normally a thing *defense requests from the plaintiff*, not the reverse. Requests for discovery would come from Jones, not against him.

Do you assholes really think I don't know that?

In this same article, we are told the judge had already sanctioned Jones by making him pay the plaintiffs' legal fees up front, in the amount of \$122,000. But that is legally impossible, since legal fees aren't awarded until *after* a judgment. There is no such thing as a pre-judgment sanction of this sort. If the jury had found against Jones in a real trial, then they could have awarded the plaintiffs legal fees and court costs along with the libel award, but no one can award legal fees *before* the trial. Nothing

could be more absurd, and it is beyond belief anyone would dare to print such garbage. Only the CIA treats its audience with such contempt, so we know who we are dealing with.

This phony website even prepared a [“teacher's guide on Alex Jones and defamation”](#) just for me. There, they assure me that the First Amendment doesn't really exist and that no one is allowed to have an opinion on anything. According to their long legal analysis, if you don't buy every lie you are told in the media, you have thereby libeled the writers at the CIA, who demand you do so. Even though the government and CIA have been caught lying literally millions of times, you are defaming the CIA by not gleefully swallowing every new lie they come up with, no matter how transparent or asinine.

By that argument, NASA could sue people for defamation who don't believe in the Moon landing. SpaceX could sue half the country for not believing that rockets can land backward. Joe Biden could sue more than half the country for not thinking he is in charge, since it hurts his widdle reputation. And Keanu Reeves could sue 90% of the world for saying he can't act.

This just proves once again that Jones is an agent, playing opposition control, since he is obviously in on this gag. He is now saying he was wrong about Sandy Hook, though he hasn't bothered to tell us what exactly he was wrong about, or what convinced him to change his mind. Where exactly is my analysis of Sandy Hook wrong? Nothing on that, of course. These people will never argue facts or nod in the slightest way to reason or logic.

I could just as easily sue the mainstream for libeling *me*, for reading my papers and not believing me as an authority. My papers make much more sense than theirs. In fact, in a fair legal system, one not slanted toward the government to vertical, and one where the CIA was not exempt from prosecution, the CIA could be sued by me and everyone else in a class action for gross civil rights violations, include libel, interference with trade, gaslighting, illegally working domestically against their own citizens, psychological torture, and literally hundreds of other actionable offenses, many of which they admit they are doing.

Since I can't do that, I do the next best thing. I sit here and tell the truth, which clearly hurts them more than anything else. The truth is their kryptonite.

---

---

And in other news, two days after my previous paper on Kitty Genovese came out, the mainstream released a new fake news story about a guy raping a woman on a Philly train, and no one doing anything about it but filming it on their phones. The story hit the press on 10/18, aces and eights, indicating a fake. The assault allegedly lasted eight minutes and bail was set at. . . are you ready? . . . \$180,000. Since this was a story about sex, we had to get the usual childish Langley jokes. It happened at 69<sup>th</sup> street station. The guy's name is Fiston Ngoy. Or, Fisting a goy. Reminds me of the old joke name Holden McGroin. Intelius and Instantcheckmate have no listing for Ngoy, though he has supposedly been previously put into many government records, including police and immigration. Two days after the story came out, Tucker Carlson ran a segment on it, though it had to have known it was a fake. He sold it as real, and even mentioned it as a analog of the Kitty Genovese story. Strange. When was the last time you heard mainstream news talking about Kitty Genovese? More indication Tucker's writers are reading me closely.

