



P O Box 5042
George East, 6539
Cell: (071) 170 1954

29 August 2012

Editor: John Yemma
Managing Editor: Marshall Ingwerson
The Christian Science Monitor
210 Massachusetts Avenue, Boston MA 02115

Dear Mr. Yemma / Ingwerson / Ms. Criscione,

RE: Valeria Criscione: No clear winners in trial of Anders Behring Breivik¹.

For Your Information: Censored by Norwegian Media:

[1] Norway's Press Complaints Commission authorizes Norwegian Media to deceive the public, if the target of the deception consents to it. [PFU: Lara Johnstone vs. News with Views in Norway²]

[2] The 'Rule of Law' in Norway: Pending Norway v. Breivik Judicial Ethics and Attorney Ethics Complaints

[3] Inaccuracy of Mr. Breivik's 'conviction': Breivik's Conviction has been appealed to Supreme Court by means of application for review.

[D] Possible Inaccuracy of Mr. Breivik's Motivation: Islamification of Europe Problem Solving, or Bullshit the Public Self Promotion Parasite Leeching?

[A] Norway's Press Complaints Commission authorizes Norwegian Media to deceive the public, if the target of the deception consents to it. [PFU: Lara Johnstone vs. News with Views in Norway³]

In an article published in News with Views in July 2012, Editor Nina Berglund reported that Mr. Breivik had 'been found guilty a long time ago'. I complained to the PFU (Press Complaints Commission), that Ms. Berglund was publishing erroneous information. Only a court of law could make a finding of guilt, not a journalist, editor, the accused or their lawyer, and every accused deserves their right to presumption of innocence.⁴

¹ <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Global-News/2012/0828/No-clear-winners-in-trial-of-Anders-Behring-Breivik>

² <http://ecofeminist-v-breivik.weebly.com/press-comp-comm-pfu.html>

³ <http://ecofeminist-v-breivik.weebly.com/press-comp-comm-pfu.html>

⁴ <http://ecofeminist-v-breivik.weebly.com/press-comp-comm-pfu.html>

The PFU refused to accept my complaint, in the absence of written consent from Mr. Breivik; who refused his consent.

I then filed an appeal to the PFU that “Special circumstances of journalistic/editorial ethics warrant that the complaint be treated without Breivik’s consent. Factual legal findings of guilt, cannot be made by an accused, their lawyer, or any journalist, or editor; only an impartial court of law; and any reporter/editor who reports an accused to have been found guilty -irrespective if the accused pled guilty or not - is MISSTATING LEGAL FACTS.”

On 28 August the PFU denied my representation that special circumstances of journalistic ethics and public interest support against trial by media, warranted that the complaint be processed without Mr. Breivik’s consent. The PFU have so far refused to provide written reasons for their refusal of my appeal.

[B] The ‘Rule of Law’ in Norway: Norway v. Breivik Judicial Ethics and Attorney Ethics Complaints Pending:

There are currently three complaints⁵ pending with the Secretariat for the Supervisory Committee for Judges against Judge’s Nina Opsahl, Wenche Arntzen and Tore Schei.

There are also 170 pending Bar Association Ethics complaints⁶ (4: Defence Attorneys, 166: Victims Families Attorneys).

[C] Inaccuracy of Mr. Breivik’s ‘conviction’: Breivik’s Conviction has been appealed by means of review.

On 27 August 2012 an application was filed with the Norwegian Supreme Court for Review of the Oslo District Court: Breivik Judgement, to set aside (A) the Necessity ruling, and (B) the conviction; to conclude Objective and Subjective Necessity Test Evidentiary Enquiry. The finding of guilt, in the absence of full Objective and Subjective Necessity Test Conclusions renders the Guilt Finding Inadequate.

Specically the Application requests the following orders:

[A.1] Set Aside the Judgements ‘Necessity (Nødrett) Ruling’

[A.2] Set Aside Defendant’s Conviction (Finding of Guilt) and Remit to Oslo District Court for hearing of Further Evidence to conclude Objective and Subjective Necessity Test Evidentiary Enquiry.

[A.3] If Defendant refuses to cooperate with Further Evidence proceedings; an order to change his plea to ‘guilty’; and/or ‘Non-Precedent’ Setting Declaratory Order

[A.4] If Failure of Justice Irregularity Does not Influence Conviction and/or Sentence Verdict; a ‘Non-Precedent Setting’ Declaratory Order

[B] Set Aside the Judgements Failure to disclose the pending Judicial Ethics violation complaint against Rettens Leder: Wenche Elizabeth Arntzen, filed on 06 June 2012 to the Secretariat for the Supervisory Committee for Judges⁷, as a violation of Aarhus Convention Article 3.(3)(4)(5) principles, and general ECHR public accountability Transparency (Lithgow & others v United Kingdom) principles

⁵ <http://ecofeminist-v-breivik.weebly.com/secr-supv-comm-judges.html>

⁶ <http://ecofeminist-v-breivik.weebly.com/bar-association1.html>

⁷ <http://ecofeminist-v-breivik.weebly.com/secr-supv-comm-judges.html>

[D] Possible Inaccuracy of Mr. Breivik's Motivation: Islamification of Europe Problem Solving, or Bullshit the Public Self Promotion Parasite Leeching?

Mr. Breivik's decision to refuse to appeal his conviction, particularly in light of the gross irregularities that occurred during his trial, by the Prosecution avoiding an enquiry of his evidence by means of the required objective and subjective test that is required in cases of an accused pleading to necessity; indicate a possibility that the obvious motivation may not be his true motivation.

Mr. Breivik appears to be the only political activist in the history of civil disobedience activism who has plead to necessity, who appears to have no interest in demanding that his evidence be examined in accordance to the required objective and subjective tests; and who refuses to appeal the denial of the prosecution to conduct these tests.

If Mr. Breivik sincerely believed that his 22 July terrorism actions were motivated by necessity, then such sincerity would wish to have his evidence examined in accordance to the rules of evidence, to determine the quality and quantity of its authenticity or lack thereof.

White Nationalism's Pied Piper: He's worse than Insane; he's a fraud?

Excerpt from Radical Honoursty Letter to Mr. Breivik⁸:

Request Clarification: What were your instructions to your attorney's regarding 'Guilt/Innocence: Necessity'

Mr. Lippestad stated in court proceedings that your claim of innocence and necessity was purely a formality: i.e. my interpretation: you did not subjectively believe your claims of necessity; its all just propaganda bullshit.

Your testimony, on the other hand, repeatedly focussed on your claim of necessity as the source for your innocence.

So, I am confused: If you sincerely believe your claims of innocence and necessity:

At the very least: Why have you not instructed Mr. Lippestad to retract his statements that contradict yours?

If he refuses: Why have you not publicly stated your lawyers refusal to follow your instructions and placed the dispute transparently before the court, as a matter of court record?

Or, is Lippestad telling the truth; and you really don't subjectively believe in your necessity claim towards innocence, you are simply engaging in a bullshit the public relations propaganda [campaign]?

Respectfully Submitted



Lara Johnstone

Radical Honoursty EcoFeminist

<http://ecofeminist-v-breivik.weebly.com>

Habeus Mentem: Right 2 Legal Sanity

<http://www.facebook.com/Habeus.Mentem>

⁸ <http://ecofeminist-v-breivik.weebly.com/rh-13-aug-2012.html>