**Stupid Frigging Fool**

The tragicomedy of an American lawyer and Russian mafia prostitute

A middle-aged American lawyer while managing a Moscow detective agency, Kroll Associates, falls for a young, pretty, six-foot, vat-dyed blonde hair, wolf-eyed Russian girl who uses black magic, narcotics and feminine duplicity to play him for a ticket to America's sex market in the Big Apple—New York City. Married to this bane and living in New York, he finally becomes suspicious of her; a little slow for an attorney sporting an MBA with honors from Columbia University's Business School. He starts investigating using F.S.B., Ministry of Interior and G.R.U. agents and other sleuthing techniques that take him through a Minotaur labyrinth of the international Russian Mafia's sex industry in Moscow, Krasnodar, Cyprus, Mexico City and New York. Along the way, members of the Chechen Special Islamic Regiment, or Baraev clan, and various Russian mobsters step out of the shadows to threaten him, his informants and witnesses. The Baraev clan subsequently led the taking of 700 hostages at the Dubrovka Theater in 2002.

Digging through the Russian netherworld revealed not only the truth about the attorney's wife but also the lunacy of modern-day Russian society, and seeking justice through the politically-correct American judicial system and incompetent U.S. Federal agencies exposed the widespread discrimination against men in modern-day feminarchy America.

## Executive Summary

The true story Stupid Frigging Fool starts as a romance between a middle-aged American man and younger Russian girl but ends up exposing the inner workings of the Russian mafia's international sex industry in America, Russia, Cyprus and Mexico; reveals the failure of American law enforcement and the judicial system to prosecute alien criminals and their gangster allies who corrupt the U.S. system; and unveils the institutionalized discrimination against men in America.

The story's antagonist is the Russian mafia moll Alina (a.k.a. Angelina) Alexandrovna Shipilina (a.k.a. Chipilina). Angelina, her stage name, grew up in Grozny, Chechnya, moved to Krasnodar, Russia, near the Black Sea, worked as a prostitute, procurer and model for Krasnodar's top modeling agency, which doubles as a call girl operation, and for a prostitution ring in Moscow. She used drugs, duplicity and black magic to trick a middle-aged American lawyer, me, into marrying her so that I would bring her to the U.S. where she could make big bucks as a striper, call girl, pimp, money launderer and drug smuggler for the Russian mafia.

Angelina practices the black arts, worships the anti-Christ and has engaged in prostitution since a teenager in Grozny where she made money—her one and only love—as a teenage mistress for Chechen warlord Ruslan Labazanov. After graduating from the Krasnodar Academy of Physical Culture, Angelina commuted periodically to Moscow for prostitution, stripping and modeling with the Phodes Studio agency, which is part of a powerful Moscow organized crime krisha. Phodes Studio's customers include American businessmen, New Russians and Mafiosi—a distinction without a difference. One American medical doctor from southern California used Phodes' prostitutes to produce pornography videos in Moscow that he imported into the U.S.

Angelina starred in one masturbation video for the doctor of which the promotional clips are included in the appendix to this story. The doctor subsequently switched to using Red Star "models" for his sex videos. Phodes Studio, runs prostitutes to southern California, Mexico, Venezuela and Greece, its web site was at http://www.phodes.net.

In 1999, the Krasnodar model agency, called the Tatyanna Vasilyeva House of Fashion, sent Angelina, at her request, to Limassol, Cyprus where she sold sex in the brothel/strip club "Zygos," http://www.zygosclub.com. Zygos is owned by two Russian mobsters from Krasnodar and managed by two Cypriot brothers. The Russian wife of one of the brothers recruits girls from Russia and the Philippines for Cypriot brothels. Customers for Zygos and another brothel/strip club, "Tramps," www.cytramps.com, owned and managed by the same people, come from the Middle East, Europe and Asia.

The Tatyanna Vasilyeva House of Fashion not only provides willing girls for sexual entertainment to overseas brothels but also to Krasnodar's Albatross Club of "gangsters and bandits" who run the city of over a million people. The CEO of the House of Fashion, Anastasia Vasilyeva, immigrated to Wisconsin with her Russian organized crime husband Nicolay Vasilyev to set up its operations in the U.S. Anastasia continues to run the House of Fashion in Krasnodar, which includes a school for grooming prepubescent girls for Russian model-hood and prostitution. In Wisconsin, the two hide behind the cover of poverty, collecting welfare benefits and allegedly working at low-paying jobs.

After Angelina's lucrative stint in Cyprus, she had Phodes Studio send her to Mexico City to earn tens of thousands of dollars prostituting and selling lap dances at "The Men's Club," a franchise of the American strip clubs under the same name in Houston, Dallas and North Carolina. Mexican organized crime owns the upscale Men's Club in Mexico City, which caters to Americans, Canadians, Europeans and wealthy South Americans.

Mexican Immigration eventually arrested Angelina and deported her back to Russia where she began dating the American lawyer and business consultant, Roy Den Hollander, a former writer and political producer for Metromedia TV News and WABC-TV News in New York City. I met the 23 year-old Angelina in Moscow when I was managing and upgrading the Russian operations for the private detective firm Kroll Associates. Angelina used feminine duplicity, tricks, black magic and narcotics secretly fed me in order to marry me for a green card to America. After the wedding, I discovered Angelina's diary and had just enough of it translated to learn of her adultery. This included a trip to Italy for an assignation with a Mexican narco-trafficker just two and a half months after we had been married. Angelina begged forgiveness, promised fidelity and I, like a stupid frigging fool, forgave her.

I took Angelina to New York City with hopes of helping her pursue a career in modeling, acting, dancing and singing. Instead, over my objections, she started working at the strip joint Flash Dancers on Broadway in Times Square. There she made around $15,000 a month in cash—tax-free. (The combined income in 2000 for all the girls on the night shift at Flash Dancers—not a few of whom were illegal Russian aliens—ran around $13 million. Since they didn't pay taxes, other Americans' tax-dollars subsidized them.)

Immediately after starting work at Flash Dancers, I accidentally discovered that Angelina was calling "customers" on my land-line telephone to make "appointments." I launched an investigation, had the rest of her diary translated and finally realized my new wife was nothing more than a hardcore, money-grubbing prostitute who cared about nobody. I kicked her two timing, four flushing carcass out of my apartment and demanded an annulment or a divorce.

An annulment or divorce coming so soon after the marriage, seven months, would likely lead to Angelina's deportation. U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service might charge her with fraudulently marrying me to gain a green card or working as a Russian mob prostitute. A law firm connected with the Russian mafia came to her aid. Angelina's lawyers told me to lie to Immigration in order to assure that Angelina stayed in America. I refused, so her lawyers and other Russian mob associates resorted to coercion, intimidation and a temporary order of protection obtained by Angelina's perjury to force me into doing their bidding. I did not comply and filed an annulment/divorce lawsuit. I began searching in Krasnodar, Russia for additional evidence in order to win an annulment or a divorce based on adultery.

An annulment or divorce trial would expose the Russian mafia's operations of funneling Russian prostitutes into the New York City sex market and large sums of cash out of the country into overseas bank accounts, usually in Cyprus. In order to prevent a trial, the Russian mafia, Angelina and her New York lawyers began threatening me and intimidating my Krasnodar witnesses into keeping their mouths shut. At the time, I did not know the Russian and Chechen mafias were standing in the shadows behind Angelina.

The city prosecutor in Krasnodar indicted Angelina's mother for criminal activities in arranging for the silencing of my witnesses. However, a $10,000 bribe from Angelina to Russian Ministry of Interior officials and threats by Chechen mobsters against the witnesses and the children of my Krasnodar attorney closed the case before trial. In America, my divorce attorney sold me down the river by lying to me about what transpired in a meeting with the lesbian feminist judge hearing the case and Angelina's attorney. I was prevented from attending that meeting by the judge. As a result, a trial never occurred. I filed a complaint against the crooked lawyer, but the Attorney Disciplinary Committee did their usual nothing.

I turned to the INS at the American Embassy in Moscow for some justice—deporting Angelina back to Russia where she deserved to spend the rest of her life. I provided the Embassy with evidence of Angelina's perjury in obtaining her marriage visa to America. Angelina denied, under oath, on her visa application that she worked as a prostitute in Russia, Cyprus and Mexico. Such perjury is a deportable offense. I also obtained affidavits from three individuals attesting to Angelina's trade of hoing for money in Krasnodar before she applied for her visa. INS started deportation proceedings. I then started receiving threats to stop providing information to INS and to refrain from trying to reopen the criminal proceedings against Angelina's mother in Krasnodar. I went to NYC police—they laughed at me. I went to the FBI, which identified the man making the threats, but the FBI agents refused to tell me who he was. They cited "privacy concerns." They did, however, warn me not to open my door to any strangers and to watch out whenever I left my apartment.

Russian military intelligence agents, however, were not as deleterious as the FBI. Military intelligence discovered that Angelina, while living in Chechnya, served as a teenage mistress to the warlord Ruslan Labazanov, a former bodyguard to Chechen President Dudaev. She and her mother continued to maintain close connections with the Chechen Special Islamic Regiment. The Regiment, or mafia clan, was initially run by Arbi Baraev who beheaded four British telecommunication workers in 1998 in return for $20 million from Usama Bin Laden. In 2002, the Regiment was commanded by Movsar Baraev who led the takeover of the Moscow Dubrovka Theater in which over 700 hostages were held and ended with the deaths of 170 hostages.

Angelina and her mother used the Baraev clan in 2001 and 2002 for intimidating people in Russia to stop assisting me in gathering evidence for the annulment and divorce case while it was still alive and to change their testimonies in the criminal proceeding against Angelina's mother. Angelina and her mother continued to have profitable dealings with the Baraev clan and other Chechen criminals in Krasnodar. With their help, the mother ran a private business out of the gymnasium of the Krasnodar Academy of Physical Culture, where she worked as an instructor.

I notified the U.S. Internal Revenue Service of Angelina's tax evasion, also a deportable offense. Provided evidence in her handwriting of her intent to evade taxes and other evidence on her failure to pay taxes on over $140,000 yearly. The IRS did nothing. The total amount of money on which she evaded taxes was over one million dollars by 2006. I had also alerted U.S. Customs as to when she would be smuggle tens of thousands of dollars on Aeroflot flights from JFK to Moscow, again a deportable offense, but Customs did nothing. The New York City Commissioners for Elections did, however, refer to the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York and the Queens District Attorney Angelina's lying under oath that she was a U.S. citizen when she registered to vote, a Federal and State felony and another deportable offense. The U.S. Attorney and Queens D.A. did nothing.

After discovering the Russian mafia's involvement behind the fraudulent marriage, the subversion of the legal process, the threats and intimidations, I brought a civil Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York (CV-03-2717). Among the defendants were Angelina, her Russian and Chechen mafia associates, including the Baraev clan, and other Russian mob members and associates, such as Flash Dancers Topless Club, Cybertech Internet Escort Service, and Angelina's immigration lawyers.

The RICO case was dismissed in the District Court and the dismissal upheld in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (CV-04-6700) where then Judge Sotomayor was the head of the panel of three judges. RICO cases do not fair well in Federal Courts where there's a dismissal rate of 65% compared to other actions that have a 10% dismissal rate. Many judges believe they have a right to change the RICO statute that Congress passed. Another reason for the dismissal was that the judicial system in America discriminates against men. Switch the sexes of me and Angelina and the courts would have done their duties. I finally petitioned the U.S. Supreme Court (CV-05-10635) to hear an appeal, but it was denied.

The suit had charged:

- Pimps, prostitutes, pushers, pornographers and assorted criminals from the former Soviet Union have joined with underworld characters in Western markets since the early 1990s to create a global web of smuggling, protection, extortion, counterfeiting, tampering with witnesses, revenge, evasion of taxes and other illegal activities.
- Russian organized crime groups and Chechen Islamic Mafiosi, working in cooperation with each other and foreign gangsters, infiltrate lucrative, hard currency markets, such as the U.S., by taking advantage of ineffective and un-enforced immigration laws as well as bribable officials to illegally gain entry for the organization's managers and human assets, in particular Russian prostitutes.
- The civil RICO suit focused on two of the core businesses of the alliance among American, Russian and Chechen gangsters—white slavery and pornography. It also addressed the attendant crimes that keep prostitution and pornography profitable, such as immigration fraud, bribery, drugs, money laundering, tax evasion, coercion, intimidation, perjury, official misconduct and more.
- One of the Russian mafia's schemes is duping American men into marrying mafia prostitutes so that the girls can obtain legal U.S. residency and citizenship to carry out and expand the organization's activities in the U.S.
- Another Russian mafia scheme is to trick American men into sponsoring mafia prostitutes for travel visas in which once the hookers enter the U.S. they disappear into the underground economy of sex-for-dollars.
- The Russian mafia runs prostitutes, pornography and in some cases drugs out of Russia into the U.S., or first to Cyprus and than the U.S., or by a third route though Mexico to the U.S.
- Profit driven immigration lawyers, aided by the Violence Against Women's Act, subvert the U.S. Constitution in order to bring into America Russian mafia prostitutes or keep them here once they enter illegally.
- Russian, American and Chechen gangsters, including those connected with the Arbi and Movsar Baraev Chechen Islamic clan, protect Russian mob operations from exposure and legal proceedings through threats, intimidation and coercion.
- Prostitutes and pornography are sold in America through an affiliation of lap-dancing clubs controlled by or associated with organized crime and marketed over the Internet by the likes of Cybertech Internet Strip Club Network.
- Drugs are secretly administered to wealthy and influential club customers as a way of assuring return business.
- The suit was for damages caused to my business and property in the amount of approximately $1,000,000.

After its dismissal, I then brought a number of men's rights cases in federal and state courts—or as the media described them "anti-feminist" cases, or as I described them "anti-Feminazi" cases. The cases were called "Ladies Nights"; "Immigration Fraud Act, a.k.a. the Violence Against Women's Act, or State Violence Against Men Act"; "Women's Studies I and II, or "Witches' Studies"; and "Book Burners of Australia"

Not once, not even close to once, did the federal or state courts reach the fundamental question in each case: Is it fair under the U.S. Constitution to give females preferential treatment at the expense of the rights of men? The cases were not about enforcing more rights for men, but

defending the rights they allegedly had in the face of an onslaught by the totalitarian belief system—Feminism/PC.

As Howard Zinn said, "To exalt as an absolute is the mark of totalitarianism, and it is possible to have an atmosphere of totalitarianism in a society that has many of the attributes of democracy." Believing that certain political and personal beliefs are the only "correct" ones sounds absolute to me.

Every court used one of the many tactics that bureaucrats endowed with governmental power use, or more accurately abuse, in order to further their personal beliefs or demonstrate sequacious allegiance to those they fear. Every case was thrown out of court at the very first instance with complete disregard for what the blindfolded lady in the courthouse was supposed to represent.

***Ladies Nights***

The Ladies Nights' case challenged the charging of males more for admission than females by public accommodation nightclubs. The federal courts said that was okay under the U.S. Constitution because the government was not involved.

When private businesses like nightclubs, which are opened to the public, discriminate, it violates the Constitution only if (1) the state or federal government is involved to a large extent in the business's operations so that it is really the government controlling the business—this is called state action, or (2) the private parties have been delegated some of the government's traditional powers; that is, they carry out a public or state function.

*State Action*

The federal courts ignored that New York State does not just issue a license to sell alcohol, but extensively controls the people involved and all the activities of a public nightclub or bar. The State rules over the level of lighting inside, the panorama within, advertising, citizenship of the employees, moral character of the customers (no tramps, pimps or pushers), interior floor plan, number and positioning of tables and chairs (ever wonder why every club has those little tables), exterior blueprint, block-lot diagram, landlord, type of building, history of the building's prior use, finances, manager, owners, owners' spouses, the people with whom the owners associate, reputation of the owners, waitress outfits (no dressing like furry little animals with cotton tails), who gets admitted (no falling-down drunks, minors, or terrorists), noise level outside a club, parking and traffic congestion near the club, and all other circumstances relevant to the "public interest" that "may adversely affect the health, safety and repose" of citizens. ABC Law § 64(6-a); SLA Rules, 9 N.Y.C.R.R. Pt 48; SLA Handbook Retail Licensees, p. 5.

The State also controls "the industry's structure … [and] the industry's behavior by prescribing and proscribing specific dimensions of business conduct," Moreland Commission on the ABC Law, No. 4, p. 6, which logically includes admission policies.

Despite the State's extensive involvement with nightclubs, the Ladies Nights' courts declared the State was only involved when an alcoholic drink was handed over to a customer, not when the customer entered the nightclub to reach the bar to buy that drink.

The federal courts found it necessary to ignore the reality of State control over the entire operation of public nightclubs in order to avoid overruling a 1969-70 case that found state action when a bar discriminated against two females. *Seidenberg v. McSorleys' Old Ale House, Inc.*, 317 F. Supp. 593 (1970)(Mansfield, J. granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment); *Seidenberg v. McSorleys' Old Ale House, Inc.*, 308 F. Supp. 1253 (1969)(Tenney, J. denied defendant's motion for a Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal).

The Ladies Nights' courts invented a factual distinction to preserve the 1969-70 case by claiming the two females were refused alcoholic drinks and that involved state action; whereas, charging men more to enter a club did not. The files of the 1969-70 case, however, do not refer to any refusal to serve alcoholic drinks. The bar may have refused to serve the girls soda, lunch, boiled eggs, or pickles—the Ladies Nights' judges did not know. So they simply assumed the fact to reach the decision required by the judiciary's anti-male ideology because now men were being discriminated against by bars instead of females.

The judges even ignored the U.S. Supreme Court's statement that the McSorleys' decisions meant that "federal and state courts uniformly have declared the unconstitutionality of gender lines that restrain the activities of customers of state-regulated liquor establishments…." *Craig v. Boren*, 429 U.S. 190, 208 (1976). Entering a nightclub is an activity of the club's customers, and for men, it is "restrain[ed]" by having to pay more than females.

*Public Function*

As for the nightclubs being delegated state power to carry out a public function, the federal courts simply ignored history:

> A long history of regulation, control, price fixing, place of time and sale setting, and outright extinction lies behind the liquor business in this country since Colonial times, and it is too late today to suggest that the rights of those who choose to engage in it are on a constitutional or legal parity with the rights of people who trade in bicycles, or cosmetics, or furniture.

*Seagram & Sons, Inc. v. Hostetter*, 16 N.Y.2d 47, 61, 262 N.Y.S.2d. 75, 201 N.E.2d 701 (1965), overruled in part on different grounds, *Healy v. Beer Inst.*, 491 U.S. 324, 342, (1989). The states and only the states, except for Prohibition, have always controlled any activity concerning alcohol. "[T]he regulation of the liquor traffic is one of the oldest and most untrammeled of [state] legislative powers." *Goesaert v. Cleary*, 335 U.S. 464, 465 (1948), overruled on different grounds, *Craig v. Boren*, 429 U.S. 190, 210 n. 23 (1976). Public function exists when there is a history of exclusive government activity. *Flagg Bros. v. Brooks*, 436 U.S. 149, 158-59 (1978).

New York State always had absolute power to prohibit totally the sale of alcohol; broad power to control the times, places and circumstances under which alcohol is sold by nightclubs; and even

to arrogate to the State the entire business of distributing and selling alcohol to its citizens. *Seagram & Sons, Inc. v. Hostetter*, 16 N.Y.2d 47, 61, 262 N.Y.S.2d. 75, 201 N.E.2d 701 (1965), overruled in part on different grounds, *Healy v. Beer Inst.*, 491 U.S. 324, 342 (1989).

"[W]hen private individuals or groups are endowed by the state with powers or functions governmental in nature; they become agencies or instrumentalities of the state and subject to its constitutional limitations." *Evans v. Newton*, 382 U.S. 296, 299 (1966). New York State chose to delegate some of its exclusive functions to nightclubs for operating premises where persons could purchase and consume alcohol. Nightclubs, therefore, exercise a public function for which they are entirely dependent upon State decisions to operate successfully. *See Flagg Bros. v. Brooks*, 436 U.S. 149, 158-59 (1978).

The State could have decided to set up and operate nightclubs and bars itself while forbidding anyone else from doing so. In that situation, the discrimination of charging males more for admission would clearly constitute state action or public function and be unconstitutional. There's no legal or logical reason that because the State chose to delegate its public function to corporations operating under the State's extensive control, that involvement by the State somehow disappears and the same conduct becomes constitutional, unless it discriminates against girls. *See Horvath v. Westport Library Ass'n*, 362 F.3d 147, 151 (2d Cir. 2004).

Under the courts' rulings, nightclubs and bars can now charge the male sex hundreds or thousands of dollars for admission, thereby effectively keeping men out of a nightclub, while allowing females in for free, and it would be constitutional.

***Immigration Fraud Act, a.k.a. the Violence Against Women's Act or State Violence Against Men Act***

This case challenged the constitutionality of a secrecy law created by the Violence Against Women's Act ("VAWA") that allows the Department of Homeland Security's immigration division to use proceedings kept secret from an American to make findings of fact that the American committed "battery," "extreme cruelty," or an "overall pattern of violence" against his alien spouse or lover, whether here legally or illegally. Remember, the American is found to have done these things without being able to appear or submitted evidence on his behalf at the proceeding. Homeland Security makes its decision by hearing only one side—the alien's side.

This secret, "Star Chamber" type proceeding violates the procedural due process requirements of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution. Also, because the secret proceedings are used against a disproportionate number of American men—around 85%, it violates equal protection in the application of the law. Laws might not have specifically discriminatory classifications written in words, but they may be applied in a way so as to create such classifications and that's unconstitutional. *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 373-74 (1886).

The federal courts quickly dismissed the action for lack of injury based on the following Kafkian logic: Since the fact-findings about what an American did to his alien spouse or lover and the result of the release of those fact-findings to certain private Feminist organizations and various

law enforcement agencies are kept secret from the American, any allegation of harm by him is "speculative" because he doesn't know what actually occurred or how it impacted his life, such as the denial of a job or an undercover investigation by the police. The plaintiffs, including me, could not find out what the federal government did behind closed doors concerning us because we were locked out; therefore, we could not say what we were found to have done or how those fact-findings were used against us by releasing the findings to various third parties. The courts ruled our allegations speculative even though it was the federal government's secrecy law that we were challenging, which allowed the courts to rule our allegations speculative. It's called Catch 22.

Once again, the federal courts' subservience to society's preoccupation with punishing males for any perceived or imagined slight to females—whether the females are citizens, aliens, prostitutes, or terrorists—caused the courts to ignore the wisdom of one of the better Supreme Court Justices: "'[Secrecy] provides a cloak for the malevolent, the misinformed, the meddlesome, and the corrupt to play the role of informer undetected and uncorrected.' Appearances in the dark are apt to look different in the light of day." *Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 172 (1951)(Frankfurter J., concurring)(internal quote *U.S. ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537, 551 (1950)(Jackson, Black, Frankfurter, dissenting)).

***Women's Studies I and II, a.k.a. Witches' Studies***

The first round of this case, Women's Studies I, or Witches' Studies I, largely relied on Equal Protection and Title IX to claim that federal and state support for Women's Studies programs were unconstitutional because there were no Men's Studies programs for the minority of students—men.

In 2008, there were over forty Women's Studies programs in New York State's higher education system. Females made up 58% of all college students, received over 55% of the Bachelor degrees, over 63% of the Master's degrees, and over a majority of the Doctoral degrees, and yet there were no Men's Studies programs. N.Y. State Department of Education, ORIS.

The federal courts again dismissed, at their first chance, by ruling that any harm caused the minority—males—by the lack of a college's Men's Studies program was "speculative." The federal courts, however, did not say the same about the lack of a female sports team when a college only had a male team, but that's because males, even as a minority, don't count in the federal courts.

Women's Studies I also claimed that Feminism was a religion and that New York State and the Federal Government's use of taxpayer dollars to feminize New York's higher educational system violated the first clause of the First Amendment: "Congress [or state] shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion . . . ." To bounce this issue out of court, District Judge Kaplan simply made a finding of fact without any evidence that "Feminism is no more a religion than physics . . . ." Now that may be so, although I doubt it, but in this day and age we are beyond accepting proclamations of what is true by the powerful just because they are powerful.

The Second Circuit Court of Appeals took a different tack on the religion issue by resorting to the hyper-technical pleading standards of the early 19th century. Because I did not write in the complaint that "I am a taxpayer," the Second Circuit ruled I did not have standing to bring the Establishment Clause challenge. Based on the absence of those four words in a 36-page complaint, the Second Circuit threw the case into the street.

The Court did not bother to consider the obvious fact that I was a taxpayer. After all, I was admitted to practice before the Court of Appeals and the complaint stated I was a resident of New York. What adult, who is not an illegal, living and working in this country does not have taxpayer status? The Second Circuit also did not bother using its power of "judicial notice" to determine whether I was a taxpayer even though the Federal Defendants conceded that I was. Further, the Second Circuit did not bother remanding the case to the district court for a hearing on whether I was a taxpayer, which the Second Circuit had the power to do and I requested.

So why were the courts so determined to prevent even the appearance of rendering justice on the issue of whether Feminism is a religion aided by government? Because to do so, would mean a modern-day excommunication from the Feminist Establishment—a barrage of personal invectives from Feminist ideologues, criticism from the mainstream media, and ostracism from the politically correct elite. The courts of the Second Circuit once again confirmed that when it comes to the rights of men, a case will never make it to trial, unless it is to eliminate those rights.

In round two, Women's Studies II, the complaint specifically stated—four times—that I was a taxpayer and specifically cited all the relevant statutes. Naturally, the federal district court threw the case out, anyway.

To do so, the court phonied the facts about what happened in Women's Studies I, so it could get rid of the case based on collateral estoppel. Under collateral estoppel, if issues were fully litigated, actually decided, and necessary or essential to the decision in a prior case, then those issues cannot be raised again between the same parties (remember this for later) in a subsequent case. The district court in Women's Studies II ruled that collateral estoppel prevented me from alleging that I had standing under the Establishment Clause to bring the case because that standing had been previously decided against me in Women's Studies I.

There are two different ways for a plaintiff to satisfy standing under the Establishment Clause: (1) having taxpayer status and (2) incurring a non-economic injury. Non-economic injury meant I found "offensive"—an understatement—the defendants' inculcation of Feminism into higher education. In my case, it was at Columbia University and its Institute for Research on Women and Gender that runs Columbia's Women's Studies program which propagates Feminism throughout the University and the Columbia community of which I was an alumnus.

Whether I was a taxpayer or had non-economic standing were never touched upon in the district court in Women's Studies I. The Court of Appeals did find fault during oral argument for my not including the four magic words, "I am a taxpayer," in the complaint and said as much in its decision. The Court of Appeals, however, never mentioned non-economic standing during oral argument or in its decision. So the most favorably politically-correct or Feminist spin that could

be put on the court proceedings in Women's Studies I concerning non-economic standing was uncertainty, and that is not good enough for collateral estoppel.

Had the law, instead of ideology, been followed in Women's Studies II, it would have resulted in a victory for men. To prevent that, the lady judge in the district court simply ignored the facts and ruled that "[b]oth the District Court and the Second Circuit necessarily decided the issue of Plaintiffs [Establishment Clause] standing in [Women's Studies I] …. The issue of Plaintiff's standing to litigate his Establishment Clause and related claims regarding the University's Women's Studies program was decided against him in [Women's Studies I]." Judge Swain's Order at 5. "Plaintiff's . . . objections, that collateral estoppel does not apply because . . . non-economic standing [was] not previously litigated [are] without merit." Judge Swain's Order at 4. The district court knew the answer it wanted, so it simply falsified the facts to reach that conclusion.

All was not yet lost in Women's Studies II, or so I thought. A key requirement of collateral estoppel is that it can only apply when the parties are the same, so I made a post-judgment motion to amend the complaint by adding two new male plaintiffs who came forward after the district court's decision and had the guts to fight for their rights. The district court could not possibly apply collateral estoppel against them because they were not involved in Women's Studies I. Naturally, the court found another way to enforce its Feminist ideology.

The lady judge ruled that her court lacked the authority to allow the post-judgment amendment of the complaint to cure standing. Strange, that in the earlier case, Women's Studies I, Court of Appeals Judge Chester J. Straub, during oral argument, admonished me for not trying to amend the complaint post-judgment in that case, which had also been dismissed for my lack of standing.

Does a district court have the authority to allow a post-judgment amendment of a complaint that was dismissed for lack of standing? Under federal procedure—yes. But under Feminist procedure, it all depends on whether it will aid that court in ridding itself of bothersome men fighting for their rights violated by the government's preferential treatment of females.

Useless as the effort was, I appealed Women's Studies II to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. The three judge panel simply parroted the district court by saying that the issues of non-economic and taxpayer standing had been "fully litigated and decided" in Women's Studies I, and that the complaint could not be amended because the two "new plaintiffs are not new evidence," even though the two would testify as to new facts, which sounded like new evidence to me, and, of course, legally it was.

But the kicker to the Court of Appeals' decision was their blatant abuse of power by threatening me with Rule 11 sanctions that forever banned me from representing the two new plaintiffs, or anyone else for that matter, in any case raising the issue of whether Feminism is a religion. That's no different than a Jim Crow court in the 1800s threatening the attorney for the New Orleans Comité des Citoyens with fines, license suspension or disbarment for bringing another *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896), suit with a different plaintiff on the same issue—separate but equal. And no different than at the end of every year sanctioning the American Civil Liberties Union for bringing another action with new plaintiffs against Christmas displays.

So I asked the U.S. Supreme Court to not only reverse the Second Circuit's decision (Petition for Writ of Certiorari), but to tell it to rescind its threat of sanctions and to stop acting like a King John of England by relying on their divine right of life long tenure to rule in accordance with their personal beliefs: "In the men's rights cases, the Second Circuit has acted beyond its authority by deciding in accordance with the current popular ideology Feminism, even though it is the imperative duty of the courts to support the Constitution. '[The] constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges as a fundamental law.' Alexander Hamilton, Federalist Paper No. 78. Supplanting it with the tenets of Feminism is an act beyond a court's authority and its duty to obey the rule of law—not the rule of the 'politically correct.'" (Petition for a Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition).

The Supreme Court, rarely a profile in courage, said beat it. The lower court decisions will stand because Justice Black was wrong when he once wrote, "Our Constitution was not written in the sands to be washed away by each wave of new judges blown in by each successive political wind. Rather, our Constitution was fashioned to perpetuate liberty and justice. . . ." *Turner v. United States*, 396 U.S. 398, 426 (1970)(Black, J., dissenting).

***Book Burners of Australia***

A number of professors and I put together the world's first Men's Studies graduate program that would be taught via the Internet at the University of South Australia. On the eve of being offered to the University students, two yellow, female-dog-in-heat reporters jumped on their electronic broomsticks and scared the administrators of the University into canceling six of the eight courses, including the one with the section I was going to teach. They guillotined the teaching of the courses by lying that their content expressed "radical" and "extreme" male views by men's rights extremists who hate females. Neither reporter ever read any of the courses' summaries, nor interviewed me before they prominently denigrated my section and me to over seven million of their readers.

The bacchanalian-like frenzy of these two PC-Feminist, zealot reporters (they believe there are two sides to every story: the Feminist side and the politically correct side) was reminiscent of the 1933 Nazi book burnings at German universities. Back then, Joseph Goebbels said, "The era of extreme Jewish intellectualism is now at an end." The two reporters, Tory "the Torch" Shepherd for the Rupert Murdoch owned newspaper The Advertiser Messenger Sunday Mail in Adelaide, Australia, and a reporter from the Sydney Morning Herald, owned by another multi-billion dollar global corporation—Fairfax Media Publications, could now say the same about any intellectualism in Australia that wasn't pro-Feminist.

The two sanctimonious, PC reporters didn't go into the University and take knowledge, ideas, and facts in the form of books and throw them on a bonfire. Instead they used the modern-day torch of the electronic media to incinerate views they personally disagreed with. The end result was the same—censorship of ideas by way of verbally mutilating the ideas and those who don't conform to current, trendy ideology even though in my case it was history—legal history. My section concerned the discrimination of both sexes by the law since the Industrial Revolution. Education in Australia was limited to history that was approved by a couple of not very bright female tabloid-reporters.

These two sanctimonious PC-Feminists justified their actions because they believed in their exceptionalism and their sense of being the chosen ones. That they have the right to decide the destinies of men because it is only PC-Feminists who can be right—just like a bossy wife or girlfriend.

So I sued in the New York State trail court the two reporters and their papers for publishing "injurious falsehoods" about my course section and "interfering with a prospective economic advantage"—my being paid for teaching the course section. I also sued Tory for libeling my professional reputation as a lawyer.

The case started out before a fair minded male judge who simply ignored the Murdoch female lawyer's whining about anti-feminism and ruled on a procedural matter favorable to me. The case was then transferred to another judge; he was also a fair minded male judge before whom I had previously appeared. But then the case was transferred again, this time to what the defendants wanted—a male-hating, female, feminist judge who actually lost a key set of my papers. These transfers were all done behind the scenes where I could not oppose them. The case was doomed.

Murdoch's lawyer sealed her advantage before the feminist judge by hacking into my icloud and stealing an attorney work product document along with everything else. Attorney work products are confidential so that an attorney can write down anything that comes to mind concerning a case. You can imagine how a lying feminist would spin such information for an anti-male judge.

After the Australian reporters and newspaper companies won the case, I sued Murdoch's female lawyer in federal court for hacking into my icloud. (Check the Southern District of N.Y. for the result in 1:16-cv-09800-VSB *Roy Den Hollander v. Katherine Bolger et al.*).

***Draft registration***

Then I remembered a quote, rightly or wrongly attributed to Albert Einstein, "The definition of insanity is doing something over and over again and expecting a different result."

So my last equal rights case was for women's rights. Women are not required to register for the draft, but men are. Women can fight in combat like men, so they should be required to register. The case was right on the law and right in accordance with the avowed Feminism/PC ideology. But for the female federal judge, I was the wrong attorney. She was Hispanic, clearly hated white men who fought for their rights, and even though my client was a woman, the judge intentionally delayed and delayed the case.

It took four years to get passed the motion to dismiss stage—unheard of for this type of case. The judge wanted to keep the case and its attorney, me, from winning a victory for equal rights in the U.S. Supreme Court. The judge is one of those Venezuelan socialists who hates Trump supporters, hates those who expect that judges should be competent and, as the Magna Carte says, render speedy justice.

She couldn't rule against our position or she'd be labeled a reactionary idiot and never move beyond the N.J. District Court. So, she just delayed and delayed until the case became moot or something happened—which it did. Mother Nature gave me terminal cancer, so the case was turned over to an excellent law firm. Let's see that Obama appointed bigot delay the case now.

***Conclusion***

Through all these cases, the deciding judges have been consistent in abusing their power to further their personal interests by using any means, such as phony facts, non-existent laws and Orwellian logic, to do the opposite of what they are supposed to do. They have forgotten that "in times of repression, when interests with powerful spokes[persons] generate symbolic pogroms against nonconformists, the federal judiciary . . . has special responsibilities to prevent an erosion of the individual's constitutional rights." *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 58 (1971)(Douglas, J., dissenting). "In a government like ours, entirely popular, care should be taken in every part of the system, not only to do right, but to satisfy the community that right is done." *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 172 n. 19 (1951)(Frankfurter, J., concurring)(quoting 5 The Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster, 163).

The federal judges in the Men's Rights cases failed to realize that efforts to enforce unanimity of belief in any dogma claiming itself the sole possessor of the truth are doomed to fail. As U.S. Supreme Court Justice Jackson so aptly wrote in 1943, during another time of intolerance and hatred directed by the majority at those in the minority:

> Nationalism is a relatively recent phenomenon but at other times and places the ends have been racial or territorial security, support of a dynasty or regime, and particular plans for saving souls. As first and moderate methods to attain unity have failed, those bent on its accomplishments must resort to an ever-increasing severity. As governmental pressure toward unity becomes greater, so strife becomes more bitter as to whose unity it shall be. . . . Ultimate futility of such attempts to compel coherence is the lesson of every such effort from the Roman drive to stamp out Christianity as a disturber of its pagan unity, the Inquisition, as a means to religious and dynastic unity, the Siberian exiles as a means to Russian unity, down to efforts of totalitarian [regimes]. Those who begin coercive elimination of dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard.

*West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 640-41 (1943).

In America, it is Feminism and political correctionalism that are succeeding in stamping their brand of thought, speech, and action on the nation at the expense of liberty.