

10/15/2018

### **Newest Abusers & Abuses (Stop 007)**

<https://youtu.be/Eb93IRVanDI>

Linked to this page about me: <https://stop007.org/home/black-list/erika-meyer/>

1:35:50

Says that she is "strongly of the opinion" I am "an agent"

She points out first that my name, Erika Meyer, is Germanic (she coughs when she says this - which is a form of what I call "code" and she calls "cartel signaling") therefore, she speculates, I may be a German agent, possibly working in the US.

My response: I would think that if I were a German agent and trying to hide it, I would have changed my name to something more Anglo-sounding. My name "Erika Meyer" was given to me at birth, and I've never changed it. Katherine, however does seem to have changed her name, as her birth name, as well as birth date, is blocked out of some of the documents she's posted online. There is nothing wrong with changing your name – however, it's interesting to me that her birth name is hidden, and the name she presents with appears to be anglicized (Horton is an English surname).

My surname, Meyer, originates from Switzerland – which is where Katherine says she lives. My working theory right now is that Katherine is strongly linked with me, so it's possible that some of those links are through Switzerland. I will admit that it is odd, even to me, that my first name is so German-sounding, since I don't have a strong German heritage. My understanding is that my first name was chosen by my mother, and is linked to her history, which I believe is in turn linked to post World War II era mind control programs. I am not here to claim there are no weird intelligence links in my background, only that I have been unaware of them most of my life, and I have no conscious or consensual ties to any non-US government. If anyone wants to do a deep dive into these bizarre German links in my background, that's ok with me, as long as it's honest and not fictionalized or defamatory. I find it interesting because I think it sheds light on mind control programs that are still really being kept secret, including what I feel is, or was, a pattern of promoting affinity for Germanic culture and even Nazism in some mind control subjects.

On her web page about me, Katherine provides on her page a list of 13 bullet points, each of which she claims are incidences of "defamation" on my part. In each and every case these are actually instances of me discovering contradictions in presentation which I felt were in fact evidence of duplicity and hidden agendas. Rather than simply letting this go (because there are real costs to someone who is fooled by people about something this serious) - I challenged these individuals with my opinions, and their basis, usually directly and in public.

Katherine is correct in saying that I believed that Katherine herself was genuine for much longer than I believed that others (Ramola, for example) were genuine. And yes, once the light began to dawn on me about Katherine, the house of cards fell pretty quickly. Because both my parents are academics with PhDs, I have a good idea how academics think, and because my father is a scientist, and because I started out wanting to follow in his footsteps, I have a good idea of how scientists operate. What I thought I saw with Katherine was her name being attached to a lot of sketchy people and ideas, that, as a scientist, she would not want to associated (Richard Lighthouse is one of these, but there were others before him). I also saw

that Richard Lighthouse (who's credentials are also almost certainly falsified) was publishing a lot of nonsense, that as a scientist, she clearly would not want to be associated with. At some point, it came down to sheer logic - Lighthouse said something that was clearly wrong - could be easily shown to be wrong - and Katherine argued on his behalf to the point of being ridiculous. That's the moment I knew she wasn't a scientist. (This was the drone vs. satellite discussion.) At the same time, Katherine's demeanor had changed quite a bit since I first encountered her, and I could tell she was engaged in some type of long-term strategy which at that point appeared to involve following and engaging with a bunch of shill accounts on twitter, and reposting the most ridiculous things (things like "Michelle Obama is secretly a man"). Up until this point I'd granted her leeway as far as tone went, since she was supposedly being tortured and manipulated so much, which is not to say that some of what she's said is not over the top - it is - but that's never been my main issue with her. It's the falsifications which, it's increasingly obvious, are part of a bigger agenda. Also, I'm beginning to see signs that Katherine is working with a system of covert communication behind the communications, similar but not at all the same as the "cartel signaling" she speaks about.

So it was back in April that I figured out that Katherine had falsified her credentials. I wrote everyone I could think of at Oxford who could have confirmed a PhD in Physics, including the professor who's name is on the letter of recommendation on her website. No one at Oxford has responded to any of my emails.

Meanwhile, Katherine increasingly makes a lot of statements with seeming authority, as if they are self evident, for example, she writes, "At this point, Erika Meyer revealed that her public lying was for the targeted purpose of defaming Dr. Horton and sabotaging the disclosure on criminal False Flag operations conducted by the European Intelligence Agencies. In the US, only the CIA would be involved in such an operation and would provide personnel in the US for such a psyop and attempted sabotage of public disclosure." Specifically, she says "In the US, only the CIA would be involved in such an operation..." as if she has absolute knowledge about this, never mind whether these "criminal False Flag operations" are real or not. First, Wikipedia lists 17 different intelligence agencies linked with the United States. So "only the CIA" seems like a stretch. Second, an example of what Katherine calls a "criminal False Flag operation" in the US is the Sandy Hook shooting. She treats Sandy Hook as if it's self-evident that it is a "False Flag" and then states that it simply has to be the CIA behind it, and this is what Horton calls "logic." It's actually a non sequitur which begs the question (the CIA is behind this because only the CIA would be behind this).

Besides calling logical fallacies "logic," I think that what Katherine is doing here is gaslighting, because her core claim about events like Sandy Hook is that they are staged theatrical performances. My argument is that what Katherine is doing is exactly what she calls a "false flag." She is presenting a false persona and much more importantly, false credentials, in order to elicit certain behaviors from certain people – behaviors that may put them in harm's way, or prevent them from responding properly to signs that something is terribly wrong (increasing frequency of mass-casualty events is a sign something is terribly wrong). Again, behind all this, there seems to be another type of communication going on for those "in the know." And though I'm not certain, I *suspect* that within this covert communication, Katherine is actually advocating for some of the behavior she claims to be trying to prevent.

Regarding her overt communications, I personally see what Katherine is doing as not just disinformation, but fraud. It is fraud because believing and promoting disinformation is potentially harmful to someone who might have a real problem, for example, with harassment via microwave weapons. That person might repeat false information, blame the wrong people, or take the wrong course of action – and this is by design. Worse, Horton says she is trying to work through the court system, appearing both as an "expert witness" and as a plaintiff, though the only case I know of where she's appeared as an expert witness is the

case of Frederic Larcoche who, it seems obvious to me, is also disinfo. So the court is then mucked up with what amounts to a ridiculous theatre performance, increasing the chances that someone who really needs to seek redress for a real problem will not be taken seriously. There is all kinds of damage that could be done if Katherine is either appearing in court with her falsified Oxford PhD as an expert witness; or as a demonstrably dishonest plaintiff. In addition to this, on her "counseling" page, Horton appears to be offering legal advice for a fee, despite the fact that she is not actually a lawyer.

I could go through and defend myself to each of Horton's 13 defamation claims against me individually, but essentially what she is calling "defamation" was me asking questions and making assertions in a process of discovering that someone was dishonest. First I'd discover that one person was dishonest, and then another, then another, and so on, and now, six months later, it's clear to me that there is no massive "targeted individual program" and that something else entirely is going on here. It's possible, given everything else I now know, that the entire "targeted individual" phenomenon is a performance being given specifically to cover very big crimes being committed against a very few people, and/or an extrajudicial policing and/or punitive retaliation system around "The Game." This is something I'm still working to understand - what exactly is going on here - but I think it is all a continuation of mind control programs and the associated social engineering and other "experimentation." What I do know is that every self-identified "targeted individual" that I've spoken to long enough has turned out to be fundamentally deceptive, and generally speaking, their stories break down quickly when you try to get them to relate specifics, or even, often, when you ask them to correct obviously false information. What this suggests to me is that there is a MASSIVE disinformation system at work here. Meanwhile, I know of several people who are being targeted and are in danger who either do not know or will not admit that this type of thing is going on. Everyone to whom I am close fits into this category. Another thing I know is that some of the scariest parts of this are linked to medical implants, and that in some cases, these implants may be linked to science departments in universities like Berkeley and possibly Oxford.

For example, if a person says that "the perps" are saying such-and-such - I might ask them how "the perps" communicate, and they usually can't really tell me. They might say they get V2K - if I ask them to describe the V2K, how it sounds, etc, so far, in every case, they can't really tell me. There is this constant push away from specific fact-based information back to vague, generalized statements. To me, this is a sure sign they are lying, and part of the reason I know this is because I have experienced different kinds of communication that might be called V2K and I could easily describe what I experienced. My original intent was not to play "gotcha" but to understand others' experiences and compare them to my own. What I discovered was a very consistent pattern of deception, and/or simply shutting down the conversation (blocking me, etc) once the person knew they would get likely caught in this pattern of deception.

If I had to guess what was going on, I would guess that it's a multi-pronged disinformation scheme being carried out within the framework of "The Game." For the target (me, mostly) the message they wish to convey seems to be 1. you are not unique (there are "thousands" or "millions" of "targeted individuals") 2. there is no hope (no one will help "targeted individuals") 3. there is an evil psychopathic cabal that only wants to oppress and harm 4. the best remedy for all of this is to prepare a court case and take the intelligence agencies to court 5. another good idea is to ceaselessly attack intelligence agency accounts, etc, via social media like Twitter. In other words, misguided and counterproductive behavior is actively demonstrated and encouraged, and falsehoods seem to be supported by nonsensical arguments labeled as "logic" and "science." Meanwhile, with regards to Horton, before her Twitter account was suspended, she seemed to be gathering around her a sort of internet army of what appear to be shill accounts, with an emphasis on accounts linked to the "MAGA" hashtag, and presenting herself in a leadership role. I identify

these "hashtag MAGA" accounts as shills due to the similarities between them - they appear to exist entirely to amplify certain fringe ideas with endless tweets about the same stuff, each one of them chock full of hashtags and @ signs, etc, etc, etc. There are patterns to the behaviors in these accounts as well.

**The thing about this is that aside from this being what has to be a pretty in-depth disinformation campaign, this page about me, by Katherine, is itself defamatory. The reason what I have written is *not* defamatory is because I have *only* made claims that I believe, and can support. The reason that Katherine is being defamatory, is because I *know* she is not telling the truth about her opinion of me.** She's deliberately spreading false claims, and her attempts to "support" these claims are very weak. I *know* Katherine doesn't *actually* believe I'm a German agent working in the US, as she states. Her "evidence" to support this claim is 1. my name sounds German 2. I used some emoticons in 2 or 3 of my personal emails to her – emoticons like a peace sign, a wink, and a rabbit – to which she ascribed covert meanings I did not intend, and I truly believe she knows I did not intend. 3. In one of these emails I joked that "My intelligence is very good." This was an email where, when I still believed that Horton herself was genuine, I warned her about Ramola, based on a dream I'd had. Anyone who has paid any attention at all to YouTube account should understand that the whole premise behind it is that I am receiving "very good" intelligence through dream-based telepathy.

01:38:46

Regarding comment about me "pretending" to use Katherine's help, one thing that disinformation agents do, and a reason why a person can be fooled for so long by a disinformation campaign like this, is that truth and fiction are mixed together. This seems to have a few purposes - one is to disguise lies with truth and vice versa - the other is that once the lies are discovered, the truths around the lies may also be discarded due to the known untrustworthiness of the source. Also, when an innocent person like myself is fooled by a disinformation agent, that person's credibility ends up being smeared by association. In my case, I wrote an affidavit in March 2017 with the specific idea that it would be helpful primarily to Katherine, and secondarily to myself. This, by the way, is a detail she left out when she describes my first contacts with her – the fact that I was reaching out to help her. In the introduction to the affidavit I ended up writing, (prior to the words "swear or affirm") I stated that:

In early December 2016 I discovered some videos posted to YouTube by a high-energy physicist named Dr. Katherine Horton. Dr. Horton, a German citizen, makes a statement under oath, here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o1rLEAjACz8> (Dr. Katherine Horton - Stop 007 : Stop 007 - Who I am, posted to YouTube Dec 7, 2016)

Over the past several months, Dr. Horton has posted video after video describing painful attacks by directed energy weapons, occurring mostly in Switzerland. In Dr. Horton's case, they seem to mostly be microwave weapons. I have had similar experiences, but I think the weapons being used on me are electrical, EMF, and/or ultrasonic (used in combination with suggestion, conditioning, and other medical/psychological techniques). After watching Dr. Horton document her suffering for the past three months, and seeing that she has been unable to receive help, and not being able to receive help for attacks I have experienced, I decided I should document my experience with directed energy weapon attacks. Because of what has happened to me, I believe Dr. Horton. I want to see her protected from further harm and I want the perpetrators of the crimes against her held accountable. My hope is that this affidavit helps confirm her experiences, and that someone will take the necessary steps to see that the abuse against Dr. Katherine Horton, myself, and others is stopped.

Reading back on this, I feel very embarrassed that I believed that Horton was a “high-energy physicist” who was telling the truth about her experiences simply because she gave testimony on YouTube “under oath.” Because she seemed intelligent, and because at the time she was the first seemingly credible person I'd seen discussing microwave weapons in what appeared to be a rational way, and because her reported attacks seemed in some ways to mirror my own, it simply didn't occur to me that this was fraud.

I want to point out here that something else seems to have been going on at this time, specifically with regards to Google/YouTube. Horton's videos, which had been up for a few months, appeared simultaneously with another video called “Diary of a Person of Interest” by New Zealander Susie Dawson. In both cases, the videos were fairly new, the speakers seemed to be articulate and intelligent, and both of them reported being “targeted” in different ways. I now suspect that both of these videos appeared on my timeline as a form of “bait,” possibly targeted specifically for me, possibly for other purposes as well. Horton's angle seemed to be to seem scientific and academic, while Dawson presents herself as an activist and journalist. I don't know enough about Dawson's background to understand whether or not she falsified credentials or experiences, but the bit that I've looked into suggests that she, too, may not be exactly what or who she portrays. In other words, there are a lot of confusing holes in her story. In any case, Dawson soon de-emphasized the idea that she was a “targeted individual” whereas Horton became sort of a leader of “targeted individuals” and began to advocate some very crackpot “theories,” unscientific “science,” and other troubling behavior, not the least of which is the idea of “throwing (pro se) court cases” at the judiciary.

In my case, after finding out that this “Targeted Individual” phenomenon was a disinformation scheme, the logical next thing for me would be to believe that no one is suffering the types of attacks that TIs complain about, even though I know that's not true, because it has happened to me, and is in fact the whole reason I became interested in TI stories at all. It made sense to me also, because it was also clear that I was not the first person to experience this. What I saw around me appeared to be a system that had been in use for some time. I still think this is true, but that whatever system it is doesn't operate the way people say it does. And I still to this day don't know what to believe or not believe about the attacks Horton says have been done to her, specifically, mostly because I know she is implanted and therefore subject to this type of attack, but also because some of her photographic evidence (of bruising, mostly) suggests she has in fact experienced some kind of directed energy attack.

In any case, Katherine was probably more helpful to me than she expected to be in a few different ways, and this may be a source of irritation to her. I don't know how Katherine knew about doing this frequency tracing to find implants, but it turns out that it's one of the few ways to show empirical evidence of the crime, and therefore, it was very helpful to learn about it, especially in an environment where I'm accused of saying things without factual basis.

It is fascinating to hear Katherine on the video, as well as in writing, say again and again that I present arguments “with no evidence.” Along with this, she seems to be showing parts of tweet threads where I come to conclusions (rather than presenting evidence which I've presumably done earlier in the associated threads). Along with this, she repeatedly uses the word “defamation.” My understanding of the word “defamation” is that (in the US, anyway) it is a legal tort which means a person has knowingly published falsehoods about another person. An genuine opinion is not defamation, an evidence-based opinion (which mine were and are) is not defamation, and telling the truth is definitely not defamation. Therefore, my writings are NOT defamatory - but Katherine's writings about me ARE defamatory. Her writings are defamatory because she is KNOWINGLY lying about me.

The reason I say that Katherine is KNOWINGLY lying because based on patterns as well as dreams, I know that Katherine knows far more about my background than she's ever let on. Katherine certainly knew who I was long before I knew who she was, and in fact I am pretty certain that I am the entire reason Katherine ever showed up online at all. (More on this later.)

01:40:43

"I was contacted by her very innocuously on the 22nd of March 2017 for the first time..."

To be clear, I see I wrote what appears to be a 14-tweet tweet thread from me to her on March 19. I don't know what the thread says because her account's been suspended. But what I *think* was going on, based on the email I sent afterward, and based on the kinds of videos that Katherine was posting, and what I was experiencing, is that I was offering to HELP her with a sworn statement talking about what I was experiencing at that time, which was, in fact, a relentless ongoing assault with directed energy weapons. Specifically, I think that I was experiencing a lot of microwave attacks, some of which were very similar – even at times exactly the same, as what Katherine was reporting happening to her. I did believe at the time that she was an Oxford-educated physicist being tortured in her own home. Now I'm not sure what was going on with her. It's possible that she suggested or asked that we write affidavits. I do remember that I wrote that particular affidavit with her in mind. In other words, I knew I couldn't do much about what was happening to me, but I thought she might be able to use my affidavit to help her situation. I was reaching out to help her, not to get help from her. I thought she was a real scientist, and I thought she was helping spread awareness by posting videos.

While I was composing this affidavit for Katherine, the incident happened where my next door neighbor and his friend were murdered in a parking lot in the Evergreen district of Vancouver, Washington, and on the same night, my daughter's uncle Timmy was murdered in Crivelli's parking lot in Klamath. This was actually the night of March 19 and morning of March 20 – after I'd sent the tweet thread (presumably) and before I sent the email.

In any case, my email account confirms that, yes, I sent Katherine an email on March 22, 2017. She doesn't include this email or any of the context. Generally speaking, I consider our emails to be personal emails. I don't think what kind of emoticon I used in any given email has any bearing on whether or not she's falsified credentials, which has been my primary claim. Bringing up the emoticons in my emails seems like a misdirection technique.

Regarding my use of the word "Heidekraut" - I guess I thought it was a funny play on my name; Heidekraut and Erika are two names for the same plant (known in English as Heather). I was aware of the connection to the word "heath" (*Heidekraut* is literally "heath herb"). I didn't know that in German, the word "Heide" meant not just "heath" but "heathen" (or "pagan" according to Google), and all that stuff that Katherine says about the rabbit representing a handler may or may not be true, I don't know, but I do know that she does a lot of misdirection when she talks about so-called "cartel signaling" which, to be clear, is not at all what I intended to do. Katherine knows full well that part of The Game is to keep me ignorant of what kind of coded meanings are being lobbed around, and one good way to keep me ignorant is misdirection. I think the bit with the rabbit is, on her part, another instance of gaslighting in which the handler and/or wanna-be-handler (Katherine, in this case) projects his/her intent on the target (me, in this case). Another interesting thing about her "rabbit" lecture is that during this time period, Katherine was

still doing Techno Crime Fighters with Paul Marko who frequently talked about getting into “rabbit holes” as if it were a positive or desirable experience. I don't recall Katherine ever challenging or calling attention to that concept.

There were many emails exchanged between me and Katherine between 2017 and 2019. Out of all of them, these are probably the only emoticons I used. In case people really are concerned about them, I want to make it clear that I only meant the peace sign to be a peace sign, and I meant the rabbit to be cute and funny.

1:43:40

Katherine says authoritatively that “both victims and Intel agents are implanted.” How does she know this? Is it possible she's giving herself away?

One of the reasons I began to understand the concept of “targeted individuals” didn't make sense was because of the way self-described “TI's” would seem to divide allegedly involved people into highly polarized categories of “perps” and “victims.” What I've begun to understand is that the landscape is something different than this. I do think it's safe to assume that all involved parties are likely implanted and at the very least, being tracked by intelligence agencies. The other thing that is becoming clear is that there is a type of war games scenario that is going on, as part of “The Game.” The style of “fighting” is covert and heavily features deception, misdirection, psychological tricks (including things like mirroring, projection, and gaslighting), and social manipulations – even long term social engineering.

1:44:01

I want to be clear that I watched nearly every episode of the Techno Crime Fighters series while it was running. It was in fact while the series was running that I began to have questions about some of the discussions, but at that point I was still giving everyone the benefit of the doubt. For example, I know that I left comments about my concerns that UN Agenda 21 was being falsely portrayed as a “genocide agenda” when there was absolutely no evidence being provided to support such a claim. I was also very concerned about Paul Marko's claims that the Sandy Hook shooting didn't actually happen, and I couldn't understand why other members of the team didn't call that claim into question. In particular, it confused me that one PhD would make such a claim (Paul Marko was always presented as “Dr. Paul Marko”) , and another PhD (Katherine Horton, allegedly) would simply let it go by as if it were self-evident. Over time, Katherine herself began to make similar claims with regards to “false flags” and Agenda 21. At this point, I was just confused.

1:44:01

Even though I watched Techno Crime Fighters while it was running, I never thought it was anything but what it appeared to be: five individuals who had gotten together in order to understand and address an unusual crime. I still am not sure exactly what it was, but I do know it was operating in the context of The Game. Techno Crime Fighters forum consisted of a group who called themselves “the joint investigation team.” This team included Paul Marko, Katherine Horton, Ramola D, Karen Stewart, and a woman called Millicent Black. Three of these five individuals claimed to have PhDs. After researching all of them, I now believe that not a single one of them had actually earned a PhD.

Generally speaking, I don't think anyone in that group was exactly who they claimed to be. I do think that they all had some kind of ties to Intel, but again, I think it was in the context of "The Game." Of this group, Katherine was the only one living outside the United States. There are a few different things that are possible. One possibility is that the death of Paul Marko was a factor in deciding to break up the group. Another possibility is that one or more members of the group (or, depending on the situation, maybe even an American handler connected to the group) began to suspect that Katherine had another agenda which they felt they needed to derail. I really don't know. One thing that is worth noticing is that Katherine continued to attach herself to Ramola somewhat, and to Karen especially, even after the break up occurred. Katherine has said that Karen helped her with the affidavits even after the break up, so that's another big question mark for me. Karen appears to be linked to the NSA. Were there American intel agencies making use of Katherine's research – specifically, the responses to her call for affidavits?

1:44:40

"My intelligence is good. ;)"

I had told Katherine about a dream I had about Ramola about two months before the Techno Crime Fighters break up. Katherine for her part is well aware that various types of frequency-based telepathy exists. She refers to it as "synthetic telepathy" but telepathy just means communication of thoughts or ideas by means other than the "known senses," so I'm not sure the word "synthetic" is necessary. In fact, this is the whole premise of me reading my dreams on YouTube. That was the reference. It was a joke about "intelligence" being received through dreams.

Katherine, by the way, never indicated at this time that she had issues with my emoticons (though it now looks like every single emoticon was problematic for her) or anything I was saying to her. Generally speaking, for Katherine, at least as she presents herself online, every single intelligence agent is a psychotic evil doer, which, all things considered, could be seen as additional support for the idea that she herself is linked to intelligence (it's misdirection). Also, maybe even more importantly, Katherine cannot like the fact that solid information can be conveyed to me in this way, because she herself is duplicitous and telepathy is disruptive to her agenda.

1:45:45

I stand by my claim about Millicent Black.

1:46:30

I'm not sure what Katherine is calling "smearing." From my perspective, I was engaging in a discovery process, and what I discovered was a tremendous amount of deception. To make her case against me, Katherine has linked to selected screenshots from longer tweet threads, without linking to the threads themselves. This "campaign" as she calls it, appears to consist of twelve threads over a period of four months. I think it would be a good idea to question why, with everything else she's put into this, she didn't bother to provide links to the entire threads so that the tweets could be seen in context.

1:48:29



I still believe that the Paul Marko in the obituary is the same Paul Marko from Techno Crime Fighters, and that the obituary features an older, deliberately obscured image due to the fact that, I think, Marko was an intelligence agent of some sort. In addition, I do not believe he possessed a PhD. As far as who died where, there is no evidence provided to say where Paul Marko died for certain, simply two conflicting stories.

An alternative possibility is that two different men named Paul Marko just “happened” to die within days of each other. If this is the case, then it's evidence that Pinecone Utopia Paul Marko was part of a “twin” assassination.

Regardless of what the actual truth is, I want to be clear that I am *not* saying any of these things to “smear” Paul Marko. Katherine pretends to work from the assumption that all intelligence agents are the scum of the earth. This is not my position and never was. For me to say that any given individual around me hasn't been fully honest is hardly a smear, considering my position. In most cases, it's simply a reveal. However, it's worth noting that when the lack of honesty puts me or others in harm's way, the stakes around all of this become much higher.

R.I.P. Paul Marko and the other Paul Marko.

1:50:00

I just want to be very clear that the final-straw reveal about Katherine Horton came when she defended Richard Lighthouse's ridiculous confusion of satellites and drones with fake science. Not whatever she's claiming here.

The documents on Katherine's site are either nonexistent or falsified. She provides no proof of her PhD (transcript, document scan, graduation dates – nothing like this) and refuses to do so when asked. She provides no curriculum vitae and refuses to do so when asked.


When asked to show evidence of her credentials, the page that Katherine points to is this one: <https://stop007.org/home/qualifications-work/> Click on “Undergraduate in physics, Master of Physics (1st class)Hertford College, University of Oxford, 2000-2004.” and you reach front page of Oxford university website. Click on “Doctorate in Particle Physics, DPhil (PhD) Hertford College, University of Oxford, 2004-2008.” and you reach the front page of the Hertford College website. The same is true of most of the links on this page. They simply go to the website of any given organization. That's not “evidence.”

There is what appears to be a certification letter from St. John's College signed by Mrs. Joy Axtell. This is the most authentic looking document in the list, but I'm not sure what it shows, exactly. And since it appears to be a form letter, I couldn't really expect that Mrs. Axtell would remember Katherine, or be able to confirm her PhD.

After that, there is some type of letter that is supposed to be from CERN but could easily be a falsification, and there is a CERN expenses receipt which seems random, or else there is some coded communication going on here. Both documents contain references to finances. And then there's the supposed reference letter from Professor Elston to a potential employer in the “Asset Management” field. According to this letter, after completing a Doctorate in Particle Physics, Katherine explored other fields including “medical physics and engineering” (giving lectures in the field – but where and when?) and “developing collaborations with academics both within and outside of Oxford,” she “started to explore ideas in the business and finance world.” The letter does mention Katherine receiving a PhD in Particle Physics, but it's hardly proof, especially since this is

essentially the ONLY piece of evidence she has provided. The job which she got from this letter of recommendation appears to be “Head of Digital Marketing.” Again, she doesn't provide a CV or resume, she doesn't have a list of lectures or publications, she doesn't show her degree or a transcript or even give a graduation date.

I wrote to Professor Elston for clarification and received one auto reply, then nothing.



I then wrote to two administrative offices (one email bounced, the other went through) and copied Oxford physics Outreach Manager Sian Tedaldi. No one responded.

The one person who could really confirm or deny – at the very least, whether he wrote this letter, is Professor Elston. He does not answer my emails. However, there do seem to be some examples of his writing online, and judging by them, I think it's pretty safe to say Professor Elston didn't write this letter.

This is more Professor Elston's style: “My present research interests are mainly in the field of novel liquid crystal materials and applications, within which I undertake both theoretical and experimental work. The theoretical work has three main strands: (i) the applications of liquid crystal continuum theory to novel liquid crystal phases; (ii) the interactions between order and elasticity in liquid crystalline systems; (iii) advanced optics of liquid crystal displays. Experimental work undertaken includes the study of alignment and switching processes in novel liquid crystal phases, and also the applications of liquid crystalline materials in both display technology and surface sensing systems.” (<https://www.photonics.ox.ac.uk/steve-elston>). While I initially believed that Oxford and Elston were somehow involved with Katherine's fabrications, I now have my doubts. If they are involved, they seem to have done it in such a way as to be able to deny it if necessary, though obviously the preferred tactic so far has been to pretend not to notice or care.

I think that all things considered, there is a high likelihood that the reason Oxford doesn't consider someone like Katherine Horton to be a serious enough problem to address is that Horton's role is mostly to fool me personally. In addition to this, it's possible that some powerful and influential people are behind, or profiting from what Katherine is doing. This would explain why Oxford and so many other colleges simply

prefer to pretend none of this is important.

Part of how I discovered that the targeted individual phenomenon is mostly or entirely falsified, in a similar manner, it seems, to how Horton's background is falsified, is because once I began to be able to discredit claims of so-called scientific experts within the so-called TI community – first Robert Duncan, then Richard Lighthouse, then Katherine Horton – all of these other so-called TI's didn't seem to think it mattered, acting as if I was just expressing a random unsupported opinion, or worse. Self-identified “targeted individuals” continued to refer to Duncan and Horton as “doctors,” for example, and to amplify their posts, etc. It was as if finding and understanding the truth was completely irrelevant to the agenda at hand, and this is how it still is with these so-called “targeted individuals.” I am *very* concerned that this is a disinformation campaign which is being used along with various types of falsified records to cover up serious crimes and to discredit sufferers with real, serious, evidence-based complaints (like me).

1:51:43

“My PhD is beyond a shadow of a doubt.”

Simply saying something with an authoritative tone doesn't make it true. Why doesn't Katherine show her credentials the same way every other academic shows their credentials – with a curriculum vitae, or something like it? For example which classes did she teach, and where, and when? Which physics or engineering lectures did she give, and where, and when? What she calls a “curriculum vitae” is nothing like a curriculum vitae which is an academic resume and often includes publications, lectures, classes taught, etc.

Also, why don't any Oxford physics faculty respond to emails regarding Katherine's PhD?

1:52:34

Regarding my statement “guilty until proven otherwise.” We are not in court, and this is not a court case. This is about facts, truth, and science. I believe that I have presented compelling evidence that all three of these individuals have falsified their credentials. Therefore, it is up to them to prove me wrong. That's what I'm saying. An alternate, perhaps less inflammatory phrasing would be to say the ball is in their court. I deliberately used strong language because I feel that these falsifications are significant and consequential. Keep in mind also that at this time I still believed that most “targeted individuals” were generally truthful. Now I think that I am the primary target of all of this nonsense.