

Report #3

Canadian Law Study Group

Ian Bell

website: <https://www.virusfraud.org/>

email: info@virusfraud.org

April, 2025

Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	4
2 Video and text reports.....	6
2.1 Video section times.....	6
3 Why Amanda and her group?.....	8
4 Overview.....	10
5 Part 1 - Ignoring the fundamentals of this global war.....	13
5.1 Step 1 – The three critical criteria.....	13
5.2 Step 2 – NRRM.....	14
5.3 Step 3 – OSMR.....	14
6 Part 2 – What is Amanda’s contribution in this global war?.....	16
6.1 Objective?.....	16
6.2 R v Ridding.....	16
6.3 Substack.....	17
6.4 The woman in the red dress.....	19
6.4.1 Chinese or gibberish?.....	19
6.5 More complicating law!.....	22
6.6 A LEGO Action.....	26
6.7 Telegram.....	28
6.8 Is the BNA Act 1867 a legitimate constitution?.....	30
6.9 Eleven questions.....	32
6.10 Might is right!.....	33
6.11 Amanda is a one-trick pony.....	35
7 Conclusion.....	37
8 Amanda has been notified of this report.....	39
9 Appendix A.....	40
9.1 2025-02-18.....	40
9.1.1 Context.....	40
9.1.2 Amanda.....	40
9.1.3 Ian.....	40
9.1.4 Amanda.....	41
9.1.5 Ian.....	41
9.1.6 Amanda.....	42
9.1.7 Ian.....	42
9.1.8 Amanda.....	42
9.1.9 Ian.....	43
9.2 2025-02-28.....	44
9.2.1 Context.....	44
9.2.2 Amanda.....	44
9.2.3 Ian.....	44
9.2.4 Rebecca.....	45
9.2.5 Ian.....	45
9.2.6 Rebecca.....	46

9.2.7 Ian.....	47
9.2.8 Rebecca.....	47
9.2.9 Amanda.....	47
9.2.10 Ian.....	48
9.2.11 Amanda.....	48
9.2.12 Ian.....	48
9.2.13 Ian.....	49
9.2.14 Amanda.....	49
9.2.15 Amanda.....	49
9.2.16 Ian.....	50
9.2.17 Amanda.....	50
9.3 2025-03-02.....	52
9.3.1 Context.....	52
9.3.2 Ian.....	52
9.3.3 Amanda.....	53
9.3.4 Amanda.....	53
9.3.5 Ian.....	54
9.3.6 Rebecca.....	54
9.3.7 Ian.....	55
9.3.8 Rebecca.....	55
9.3.9 Ian.....	55
9.3.10 Rebecca.....	55
9.3.11 Ian.....	55
9.3.12 Amanda.....	56
9.3.13 Ian.....	57
9.3.14 Amanda.....	57
9.3.15 Ian.....	58
9.3.16 Amanda.....	58
9.3.17 Ian.....	59
9.3.18 Gregory.....	60
9.3.19 Yolo Bear.....	60
9.3.20 Amanda.....	60
10 Appendix B.....	61
10.1 Amanda’s response.....	62
11 Appendix C.....	65
11.1 2025-04-11.....	65

1 Introduction

- This is report #3 that takes a close look at another of our toothless chihuahuas here in Canada. This report is about Amanda Ridding and her “*Canadian Law Study Group*”(CLSG).¹
- Toothless chihuahuas is a descriptor I began using in January of 2024 to mock and ridicule our fake freedom fighters here in Canada.² Why you ask? Let me explain...yet again...
- The cabal is waging 5th generation warfare against us, the little people.
 - This is World War III!
 - Our world is in upheaval and the march towards One World Government under the depraved and evil ideology of Technocracy and Transhumanism is a juggernaut that rolls on unabated.
 - We, the little people, have been overwhelmed on all fronts, with what is referred to as “*Onmiwar*”.³
 - As I have mentioned before ⁴, figuratively speaking, our toothless chihuahuas recognize we are all getting raped and butt-fucked, every day, by the cabal.
 - Our toothless chihuahuas understand that we face a real existential threat where literally our lives, the lives of our children and the lives of our grandchildren are at stake.
 - Our toothless chihuahuas fully understand that if we don’t win this global war then we literally have no future.
 - The cabal’s depopulation agenda will kill off most of us and enslave the few of us that remain.
 - Here’s the point, our toothless chihuahuas accept all of this as fact.
 - There is only one way we win this global war; we must eliminate the cabal and it’s global network.
 - There is only one way we eliminate the cabal. We must unite our rank-and-file ⁵ across Canada and across the world, and fight as one with a common vision and direction.
 - If we don’t unite and eliminate the cabal then we lose this global war.

(1) The website for the Canadian Law Study Group is <https://www.canadianlawstudygroup.com/>

(2) [There are no freedom fighters in Canada!](#)

(3) ["Covid-19," Psychological Operations, and the War for Technocracy, Volume 1](#)

(4) [Toothless chihuahuas make for poor leaders](#)

(5) [We must engage our rank-and-file!](#)

- What makes our toothless chihuahuas so pathetic is that they refuse to take effective and decisive action to counter our existential threat.
- You see, our toothless chihuahuas have prioritized their petty turf wars, egos and echo chambers over winning this global war.
- Our toothless chihuahuas have proven themselves to be incompetent and impotent in fighting this global war.
- In my reports, I am calling out our toothless chihuahuas for the fake freedom fighters they have proven themselves to be.
- There are two parts to this report.
 - Part 1 of this report shows that Amanda ignores the fundamentals of what we must do to fight this global war.
 - Part 2 of this report looks at what is supposedly Amanda's contribution to our fight in this global war.

2 Video and text reports

- This report on Amanda and her group is available as a video and as a PDF document, that is, the document you are reading now. Both video and document are accessible from the [“Reports” page on my website](#).
- You will note that all paragraphs in this document are bulleted. That is because this document was used as a script to create the video report and it is easier to follow a script that is comprised of short and clearly delineated talking points.

2.1 Video section times

- This written report complements the video.
 - The table of contents in the document corresponds to the different sections in the video.
 - The time at which each section of this document occurs in the video can be found in the following table.
 - For example, section 2 of this document is titled “*Video and text reports*”. In the video, this section starts at time 00:02:51 that is, at the 2 minute and 51 second mark.
 - Similarly, section 2.1 of this document is titled “*Video section times*”. In the video, this section starts at time 00:03:23, that is, at the 3 minute and 23 second mark.

Table 1: Table of contents and their corresponding time in the video version of this report

Section Title	Time in Video (HMS)
1 Introduction	00:00:08
2 Video and text reports	00:02:51
2.1 Video section times	00:03:23
3 Why Amanda and her group?	00:04:05
4 Overview	00:06:50
5 Part 1 - Ignoring the fundamentals of this global war	00:11:10
5.1 Step 1 – The three critical criteria	00:12:13
5.2 Step 2 – NRRM	00:13:28

Report – Canadian Law Study Group

5.3 Step 3 – OSMR	00:13:45
6 Part 2 – What is Amanda’s contribution in this global war?	00:14:50
6.1 Objective?	00:14:57
6.2 R v Ridding	00:16:10
6.3 Substack	00:17:45
6.4 The woman in the red dress	00:20:26
6.4.1 Chinese or gibberish?	00:20:40
6.5 More complicating law!	00:26:31
6.6 A LEGO Action	00:34:12
6.7 Telegram	00:38:49
6.8 Is the BNA Act 1867 a legitimate constitution?	00:41:53
6.9 Eleven questions	00:46:28
6.10 Might is right!	00:47:38
6.11 Amanda is a one-trick pony	00:52:06
7 Conclusion	00:54:00

3 Why Amanda and her group?

- I originally has no intention of, or interest in, reviewing what Amanda and her group do. But let me explain why that changed.
- I first learned of Amanda in December of 2024 when Rebecca Shepherd at Stand4Thee promoted an upcoming meeting in January of 2025 where Amanda would be talking about her own work.
 - I attended that meeting but left halfway through because I literally could not understand the words Amanda was speaking. ⁶
 - Until late February, I paid little attention to Amanda other than to quickly scan through her Telegram group ⁷ on a daily basis.
- On February 18, I published my report about Rebecca and Stand4Thee on my website. ⁸
 - In addition, I posted a link to my report in Amanda’s Telegram group.
 - Amanda immediately deleted my post, subsequently asked if she was next on my list ⁹ and I told her no, she was not. ¹⁰.
 - To repeat, I simply had no interest in Amanda.
- But then, on February 28, Amanda posted something in her Telegram group that caught my attention and curiosity. ¹¹
 - Amanda stated “*The British North America Act is Canada's Constitution.*” ¹²
 - The BNA Act is at the core of and is foundation all of what Amanda and Rebecca are doing in law.
 - If what Amanda and Rebecca claim about the BNA Act is wrong then that completely undermines and discredits everything they are doing in law.
 - In section 3.4 of my report on Rebecca and Stand4Thee, I showed that Rebecca was bluffing when she said that the BNA Act 1867 is a legitimate constitution.
 - What is conspicuously and suspiciously lacking from both Amanda’s and Rebecca’s websites is proof that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution.

(6) Just before I left the Zoom meeting, Rebecca explained to me in the Zoom chat that Amanda has a speech impediment.

(7) <https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup>

(8) The [REPORTS web page on my website](#) has links to the video and written version of my report on Stand4Thee.

(9) section 9.1.4, 3rd sentence/paragraph

(10) see section 9.1.5, point #2

(11) see section 9.2

(12) see section 9.2.2

- Now Rebecca, not Amanda, argues even if the BNA Act is an illegitimate constitution then that doesn't matter because, to paraphrase her, might-is-right.
- Given there appears to be some collaboration between Amanda and Rebecca, I assumed Amanda also had no proof.
- For this reason, I indirectly asked Amanda for her proof that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution.¹³
- As expected, Amanda deflected and avoided my question. I will talk about this in more section 6.8 of this report.
- And with that, I was fairly certain Amanda was also bluffing and really had no clue if the BNA Act 1867 is a legitimate constitution.
- That in turn tweaked my curiosity to know what else Amanda was bluffing about.
- And with that, Amanda became the subject matter of my next report.

(13) see section 9.2.3

4 Overview

- Our legal system in Canada has been subverted and corrupted by the cabal.
 - Our three branches of government (i.e. the legislative, executive and judicial branches) do not operate independently but are instead colluding with each other.¹⁴
 - Our legal system practices what is termed “*law-fare*”, where the law is a political tool that is weaponized against the people.
- In the “*freedom movement*” here in Canada, we have different pseudo-legal groups that are trying to study and understand law, and how to restore justice to our legal system.
- With few exceptions, the leaders and members of these groups are laypersons self-taught in law and have no formal legal training.
- Each group has it’s own understanding and interpretation of law.
 - Each group claims only it’s understanding and interpretation of law is correct.
 - Not surprisingly, each group works alone, by itself.
- This report is about Amanda Ridding and her Canadian Law Study Group (CLSG).
 - Amanda and her group are one and the same.
 - If Amanda leaves then her group dies.
 - So this report will refer only to Amanda.
- Amanda has been studying our legal system and law for at least 7 to 8 years¹⁵, with the past three years being focused on what she describes as “*constitutional discoveries*”¹⁶
 - Amanda thinks highly of herself as an authority in law, describing herself as a “*trail blazer*”¹⁷, that she is better than a lawyer¹⁸, and that her work is a sacrifice for and a gift to Canada.¹⁹
 - Amanda states, “*Law in of itself isn't complicated; it's people who complicate it.*”²⁰

(14) [Demonstrably Justified w/ Leighton Grey & Bruce Pardy](#) (see time 01:25:07)

(15) Amanda’s case [R v Ridding, Ridding & Salamander](#) is dated February 5, 2019. Amanda therefore started studying law one to two years before 2019. In turn, that means Amanda has been studying law for at least 7-8 years.

(16) Amanda wrote in her Substack article [To Divide and Conquer](#), “*While my interest in excising this government overreach began long ago, I did not begin my constitutional discoveries until about June 2022.*”

(17) [Amanda wrote](#) in her Telegram group, “*Not to be boastful, but people need to understand 1 thing about me; I am not a follower, I am a trail blazer.*”

(18) [Amanda wrote](#) in her Telegram group, “*I am definitely not a lawyer. I am better than a lawyer.*”

(19) [Action! Order to Federal Cabinet Ministers to Resign](#)

(20) [I Need Your Help – We Are in a Word War](#), see 1st paragraph

- As this report will show, the irony is that Amanda is a good example of someone who makes law complicated.
- As I have demonstrated in my report on the pseudo-legal group Stand4Thee, I don't need to know much about law to provide a fair and accurate review and assessment of what our pseudo-legal groups claim they are doing to contribute to our fight in this global war.
- Let's talk about Amanda.
 - First, most of what Amanda does is to try helping people, on a one-to-one basis, challenge and contest petty offenses/infractions such as traffic, parking and covid related tickets/penalties.
 - These people are only interested in protecting their own butts. Whether they succeed or fail, they leave Amanda's group once their case is closed.
 - So whatever it is that Amanda does with these people is irrelevant because it does not contribute to our fight in this global war.
 - Second, Amanda promotes her own action initiatives that supposedly do contribute to our fight in this global war.
 - To succeed, her action initiatives require our participation in large scale numbers.
 - This is where Amanda falls flat on her face.
 - This report will demonstrate:
 - a) Close to 100% of us will not understand what Amanda says about law.
 - b) Amanda's initiatives are LEGO Actions that provide the illusion of action without having to actually engage in action.
 - Third, seeing is believing.
 - If Amanda is an authority in law then her prowess in law will be reflected in the number and types of her legal successes/wins.
 - From what I have gleaned in Amanda's Telegram group, her only successes seem to be for petty offences ²¹ and the "guy who didn't pay my husband the \$10,000 he owed" ²².
 - Conspicuously, Amanda claims wins without providing details about those wins.

(21) As an example, [Amanda claims her work](#) is responsible for getting "more than 100 tickets withdrawn". She offers no proof to support her claim. But even if it is true then, in this global war, these are minor and insignificant wins. Amanda works alone and clearly failed to translate even these few wins into an actionable, united network.

(22) <https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/29012>

- Conspicuously, Amanda does not report her failures and the failures of others who followed her advice.
- When it comes to big wins, Amanda doesn't have any, she batting zero (0) and predictably fails for the obvious reason she has no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle.
- Fourth, Amanda ignores the fundamentals of what we must do to win this global war, thereby showing us she has no clue of how to fight this war.
- Let's get into the details.

5 Part 1 - Ignoring the fundamentals of this global war

- Part 1 of this report shows Amanda ignores the fundamentals of what we must do to fight and win this global war.
- I have defined a three step process²³ that I use to assess and evaluate all our groups that claim to be fighting this global tyranny of Technocracy and Transhumanism.
- These three steps are about the fundamentals that are at the core of everything we must do in fighting this global war.
- These are things that every person, who claims to be fighting this tyranny, must explicitly understand, commit to and act on!
- A detailed explanation showing how my three step process is applied can be found in my first two reports on *AwakeCanada*²⁴ and *Stand4Thee*²⁵.
- Similar details apply to Amanda and her group but there is little value in repeating those details again in this report.
- In this report, it will suffice to provide a quick summary review of this three step process as applied to Amanda.

5.1 Step 1 – The three critical criteria

- In this first step, Amanda is assessed on whether or not she passes three critical criteria.
- The 1st critical criteria requires that Amanda identify the enemy we must defeat to win this global war.
 - Amanda doesn't even think about this so she automatically fails to pass the 1st critical criteria.
- The 2nd critical criteria asks the question, what is Amanda doing to unite us, to unite the millions of our rank-and-file across Canada?
 - With one exception, Amanda isn't doing anything to unite us.
 - The one exception comes from Amanda's Substack article "*We MUST Unite to Win!*".²⁶
 - But that is the toothless chihuahua's version of unity; Amanda only wants us to unite under her banner, where she is top chihuahua and yaps orders she expects the rest of us to follow.

(23) [How to identify a toothless chihuahua](#)

(24) [Report – Awake Canada](#), see Part 2 of this report

(25) [Report – Stand4Thee](#)Stand4Thee, see Part 2 of this report

(26) [I Need Your Help – We Are in a Word War](#)

- That is not what real unity is about. ²⁷
- So Amanda fails to pass the 2nd critical criteria.
- The 3rd critical criteria is about identifying the leadership we need to win this war.
 - Amanda completely ignores the issue of leadership and so she automatically fails the 3rd critical criteria.
- To summarize, Amanda fails to pass all three critical criteria.

5.2 Step 2 – NRRM

- The 2nd step in assessing Amanda and her group is to look at her numbers, resources, reach and muscle (NRRM). ²⁸
- A mere glance at Amanda is all it takes to recognize she lacks all of four things.
- So Amanda fails to pass the 2nd step.

5.3 Step 3 – OSMR

- The 3rd step assesses Amanda from the perspective of objectives, strategies, metrics and results (OSMR). ²⁹
- Amanda’s website has a “*Campaign*” a main menu item that lists 5 items:
 1. *Canada Stands 2024 – Operation take back*
 2. *Federal cabinet ministers*
 3. *Immunization school pupils act*
 4. *Notice to chief justices*
 5. *12/20/24 Open letter to LAO (the Legislative Assembly of Ontario)*
- These are Amanda’s action initiatives.
- As I will explain in part 2 of this report, these action initiatives are LEGO Actions that predictably will fail and which Amanda knows will fail.
 1. They do not define objectives and strategies.

(27) In [this blog post](#), I explain that, “*Unity is not about recruiting our rank-and-file to fight under one particular leader’s banner but rather is about fighting together with a common vision and direction regardless of which banner our rank-and-file fight under.*”

(28) [How to identify a toothless chihuahua](#)

(29) [How to identify a toothless chihuahua](#)

2. They do not define metrics that can be used to track their progress.
 3. They do not define expected results and will not address the final results.
- To summarize, Amanda fails all three steps and completely ignores the fundamentals of how to fight and win this global war for us.

6 Part 2 – What is Amanda’s contribution in this global war?

6.1 Objective?

- So what is Amanda’s primary objective in what she is doing?
- We get the following from the **About** web page on her website:

*Concerned Canadians asking questions and seeking answers to those questions on how it is that Our government, Our public servants, have managed to become so authoritarian that Our very Human Rights are now in jeopardy.*³⁰

- This is a vague and meaningless blurb that tells us nothing about Amanda’s primary objective.
- Let’s look elsewhere.
- The title of Amanda’s first Substack article is “*About the Author*”. The subtitle of this article is “*My driving purpose is to disseminate the knowledge that Canada has a Constitution*”.³¹
 - Huh? Amanda appears to be saying her main purpose is simply to tell us that Canada has a constitution.
 - That is obviously not her main purpose.
 - This subtitle is a meaningless blurb that tells us nothing about Amanda’s primary objective.
- So what exactly is Amanda’s primary objective?
- The answer is we don’t know and Amanda doesn’t tell us.

6.2 R v Ridding

- Amanda studies our legal system and laws. She has been doing that for at least 7 to 8 years. So the question is, what has she learned and what does she know?
- Amanda’s website references her court case R v Ridding, Ridding & Salamander.³²
- In 2019, here is what Justice A.L.McLeod had to say about Amanda. It was not good:

(30)<https://www.canadianlawstudygroup.com/about>

(31) [About the Author](#)

(32) [R v Ridding, Ridding & Salamander](#)

1. Point 7 states, “**The vast bulk of the grounds and arguments** (provided by Amanda) **are not founded in law and predominantly nonsensical.**” (my emphasis)
 2. Point 12 (2) (a) states, “*The accused parties were self-represented. Although they filled voluminous materials, it is readily apparent that they* (i.e. Amanda and her husband) **were unsophisticated in matters of law.**” (my emphasis)
 3. Point 25 states, “*As the case law holds, the bulk of participants in the provincial offences court proceedings...are unsophisticated and unfamiliar with court proceedings. In these instances, a more detailed inquiry and offering of assistance is required than that which was undertaken by the presiding justice of the peace. This is especially so, when as was the case herein, the applicants* (i.e. Amanda and her husband) **were clearly unsophisticated participants.**” (my emphasis)
- The question is, is Amanda as “unsophisticated” in law today, in 2025, as she was in 2019?
 - What I have found and will illustrate is that Amanda complicates law and cannot explain it in a way we can understand.
 - I know Amanda works alone; she has no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle.
 - I also know Amanda ignores the fundamentals of what we must do to win this global war.
 - So the answer is it doesn’t matter whether Amanda is or is not “unsophisticated” in law today.
 - Whatever she is doing does not contribute to our fight in this global war and that is all we need to know about Amanda.

6.3 Substack

- I began preparing for this report by reading Amanda’s Substack articles ³³ in chronological order starting with her first article “*About the Author...*” ³⁴
- Let me begin by quoting from this article. Amanda wrote:

It has not been enough for me to accept what I am being told by most people. You want to tell me something, odds are I won't accept. You want to prove something to me, explain it and show me. Why? So I may see with my own eyes and hear with my own ears.

- The problem for us is that Amanda does not practice what she preaches.

(33) <https://amandaridding.substack.com/>

(34) <https://amandaridding.substack.com/p/about-the-author>

- The problem is Amanda expects us to do what she will not do herself. Amanda expects us to accept her claims/statements without requiring she prove them to us.
- A good example is Amanda’s 13th Substack article, “*The Woman in the Red Dress*”.
- After reading that article, I posted a comment explaining one of the significant problems is Amanda provides no references to support her claims/statements.³⁵
- This led to a short exchange I had with Amanda in her Telegram group.³⁶
 - What made me laugh is that Amanda played the victim card and lamely said my comment was an attack meant to “*discredit*” her.
 - But here is the thing. Authoritative supporting references are a standard and absolute requirement in all professional fields, not just in law.
 - So this is very simple. If Amanda, especially as a layperson, wants to be respected as someone knowledgeable and/or an expert in law then she must support her claims/statements with authoritative references.³⁷
 - Without supporting references, it is understood that Amanda is merely expressing her opinion, an opinion we should rightfully question and challenge and, more importantly, is only her unsubstantiated opinion.
 - Unwittingly, Amanda acknowledged she is only expressing her opinion. For example, she wrote:
 1. “*You do understand that Substack is a place for writers to share **one’s thoughts and opinions**, right?*” (my emphasis)³⁸
 2. “*It’s an article, not a legal argument, which will have much of my **opinion**. Pointing out the obvious, **an article with my opinion**, to criticize and say, this is **an article with my opinion**, is not constructive, it’s nonsensical.*” (my emphasis)³⁹
 - It is Amanda who is being nonsensical here.
 - What Amanda fails to realize is her credibility in law requires that even her opinions MUST include supporting references.

(35) To read my comment, see section 9.3.1.

(36) To read our full exchange, see section 9.3.

(37) Amanda imagines herself to be a teacher in law, one that is an authority and expert. For example, [in a March 3 Telegram post to Joel Viau](#), Amanda ends the post by writing, “*As a result, you see a Picasso and not a Rembrandt. My desire is for you to see a Rembrandt.*”. Here, Amanda implies she is an expert in law. This is something that Amanda conveys in more than a few of her Telegram posts; she is the authority and her members must listen to her.

(38) See section 9.3.4.

(39) See section 9.3.14.

- I will use the article “*The Woman in the Red Dress*” to illustrate a few of the problems with Amanda’s opinions and her articles.

6.4 The woman in the red dress ⁴⁰

- This article is poorly written and might as well have been written in Chinese.
- The article will baffle and confuse close to 100% of all people in Canada, that includes me.
- This is Amanda’s problem, not ours.

6.4.1 Chinese or gibberish?

- This article starts with the following:

Q: What does, the Strawman and the Woman in the Red Dress appear to have in common?

A: They both appear to be programs written to distract you.

- Huh? Here are some simple and basic questions:
 1. What is the “*Strawman*”? It doesn’t appear Amanda is referring to the straw man character in the story Wizard of Oz.
 2. What is the significance of a red dress? ⁴¹
 3. What does Amanda mean by “*programs written to distract you*”? How does “*program*” apply to straw man and red dress?
- In the section “*The Strawman is a Fiction*” Amanda wrote the following:

Looking at the Strawman again, what is the source for this comparison? The Wizard of Oz.

Is the Wizard of Oz a book of factual text or a fictitious story intending to entertain? A fictitious story.

(40) Substack article “[The Woman in the Red Dress](#)”

(41) For me, reading this article was a real struggle. For example, I kept asking myself what was the significance of a red dress. It was only after weeks of struggling with this article that I realized the picture comes from a scene in [the movie “The Matrix”](#). However, at that point, I was not going to waste any more of my time trying understand what Amanda had to say. For Amanda to not explain/reference the picture is a basic and inexcusable writing mistake.

Being pulled from a fictitious story written with the intention to entertain, does it not stand to reason that the comparisons being drawn between the Strawman from the Wizard of Oz and your corporate persona is nothing more than a parable?

- Huh? More questions:
 4. Again, what is the “Strawman” in the leading paragraph? It’s obviously not the character from the Wizard of Oz.
 5. What is a “corporate persona”?
 6. What are “the comparisons” Amanda is referring to?
 7. A comparison in itself is not the definition of a parable. So what is it Amanda is actually trying to say?

- Amanda continues with the following:

Everyone who insists the Strawman is a fiction and follows this statement by insisting this fiction is also real, maybe should be seen as jumping to nonsensical conclusions with sloppy syllogism founded on a parable pulled from the fictitious story, the Wizard of Oz

- Huh? Another question:
 8. I don’t understand a word of this. Again, what is the “Strawman”? Who insists the “Strawman is fiction”? What does Amanda mean by “the Strawman is a fiction”?
- In the section “Fictions don’t exist” Amanda wrote:

If the Strawman is a fiction, then by definition of fiction, it shouldn’t exist. Therefore, why do you need to correct your status?

- Huh? Another question:
 9. I don’t understand a word of this. What does Amanda mean by “correct your status”? What “status” is Amanda referring to?
- Jump down to the section “Canada is not a myth”. Amanda wrote:

... apparently precedes any instruments in law which may create and establish the corporation of CANADA found on the NYSE

- Huh? More questions:
 - 10. What is the significance of capitalizing “CANADA”?
 - 11. Why does Amanda refer to Canada as a corporation?
 - 12. What does she mean by Canada is found on the NYSE, which I assume is the acronym for the “*New York Stock Exchange*”?
- In the section titled “*The State of Nature*”, there are two references about John Locke.⁴²
 - In the section title “*Canada is not a myth*”, there are four references to the Constitution Act.
 - This indicates Amanda has some understanding about the purpose and use of references.⁴³
 - Another question.
 - 13. Why is most of this article lacking references? Yes, Amanda argues she is only expressing her opinions. But isn’t a much more plausible explanation for the lack of references that Amanda doesn’t have any supporting references? Without references to clarify what Amanda is talking about, we are left in the dark about what she is trying to say. And without references, Amanda is only offering her unsubstantiated opinion.
- I have many, many more questions about this article that need answers if I am to even begin to understand what Amanda is trying to say.
- What I do understand with 100% certainty is that close to 100% of all people in Canada will literally have no idea of what Amanda is trying to say.
- That’s a big problem for Amanda because she wants us to participate in her action initiatives, in large scale numbers, which is the only way her initiatives can succeed.⁴⁴
 - The question is, why should we participate if we can’t understand what Amanda is trying to say?

(42) The first reference is “[Two Treatises of Government](#)” and the second reference is “[short synopsis of John Locke’s political theory](#)”

(43) Amanda should, but does not, specifically tell us which part (e.g. chapters, pages) of her references she is using to support her statements. Instead, she leaves that to our imagination to figure out.

(44) As expressed in the article “[Action! Order to Federal Cabinet Ministers to Resign](#)”, Amanda thinks of her work in law as her sacrifice for and gift to Canada. Yes, this is pretentious. But it does tell us that Amanda wrote her articles for the many and not the few.

- To summarize,
 - Amanda fails to define and/or explain key ideas and concepts.
 - Amanda appears to be using pseudo-legal concepts and arguments that most of us know nothing about and aren't even aware of.
 - Amanda fails to provide supporting references that are so critical to making this article understandable for us.
 - These are very basic writing errors that make the entire article cryptic and convoluted.
- To be polite, the article might as well have been written in Chinese. To be a little less polite, most people will think what Amanda wrote is gibberish.
- This is an excellent example of sloppy writing skills and a poorly written article.
- This is a reoccurring problem in most of Amanda's articles.
- Amanda is an example of someone who makes law so complicated as to not be understandable. This article illustrates that point.
- Now for the real question.
 - Will any of this hold up in a court of law?
 - The answer is we won't even think about that question, let alone ask it, because we can't even get past what Amanda is trying to say.

6.5 More complicating law!

- Let's look at another of Amanda's poorly written articles that also might as well have been written in Chinese: "*To Divide and Conquer, Getting to the root of 'the person'*".⁴⁵
- Amanda starts off with:

If you will allow at this point, I would like to return you to one the basics of the English language and re-introduce you to the "person" to help nip some of this 'Legalese in the bud'..

- Great, Amanda is going to teach us something about the word "*person*" as applied in law.
- Amanda wrote:

(45) [To divide and conquer](#)

Which “person” you put first is the person who shall most likely come first. If you believe Canada is a “corporation” I ask you, which person did you just put first?

If you admit you believe CANADA is nothing more than a corporation you just put the “corporation” first, and you would be putting this administration first and look at which person is winning...that’s right, the “corporation” called “the Government of Canada”.

- Huh? Here are a few simple and basic questions:
 1. The words “person” and “you” are singular, not plural. So how can something singular be put before itself?
 2. Why does Amanda refer to Canada as a corporation?
 3. What do “Canada” and “corporation” have to do with “person” and “putting a person first”?
 4. What is the difference between “Canada” and “CANADA”?
 5. How is a “corporation” an “administration”?
 6. Amanda appears to be saying an “administration” is also a “person”. If so then why?
 7. What does Amanda mean by “the Government of Canada” is a “corporation”?

- Amanda wrote:

In law, Canada is a person, as is Ontario and every other province thereof.

Canada is NOT the same person as Ontario. Nor is Canada the same person as CANADA.

- Huh? More questions:
 8. Where in law does it say “Canada” and the provinces are “a person”? What authoritative references does Amanda have to support her statement?
 9. Again, what is the difference between “Canada” and “CANADA”? Why are each a different “person”? What authoritative references support this statement?
- Amanda wrote:

If it will help, try thinking of Canada and Ontario as people. Think of Canada as all Canadians and think of Ontario as all Ontarians.

○ Huh? More questions:

10. All “Ontarians” are also “Canadians”, right? So how then can we think “Ontario is NOT the same person as Canada”?

11. For a layperson like myself, everything up to this point appears to unsubstantiated nonsense. So why should we “try thinking” this way?

• Amanda wrote:

Now, “the Government of Canada” (or CANADA) as yet another person, but not just any person. This person, “the Government of Canada” (or CANADA) is headed by none other than His Majesty, King Charles III of the House of Windsor.

○ Huh? More questions:

12. Why is it that only the “Government of Canada” constitutes Canada, with no regard for the provinces and people in Canada?

13. Whoa, FULL STOP!

- Is Amanda saying Canada is not a sovereign country but instead is only a subject of the UK?
- If so then that is a completely different and significantly higher priority subject for review and discussion that first needs to be addressed before any further consideration of whatever this article is about.

14. Why is “the Government of Canada” a person? According to Amanda, is the “Government of Canada” person different from the “Canada” person and the “CANADA” person? If so, why? Where are her supporting references?

• Amanda wrote:

This chart above should help to visualize each subject in its natural hierarchy. Note that everything secondary to Canada the Nation is on equal footing to each other.

○ Huh? Another question:

15. Where are the supporting references that prove Amanda’s diagram is a correct representation of “*each subject in its natural hierarchy*”?

- Amanda wrote:

If you refuse to see the Nation of Canada First and foremost, you will lose this Word War against His Majesty’s corporation.

- Huh? Another question:
 - 16. At this point, it seems like Amanda is spouting absolute nonsense. Why should we believe anything Amanda has written, especially since she hasn’t proven a single word of it is true?
- I am only a third of way through this article.
 - Amanda has not proved anything she says is factual and true.
 - All Amanda appears to do is express her interpretation of law, or more correctly, nothing more than her unsubstantiated opinion.
 - Amanda seems to be saying that “*person*” in law is plural and somehow refers to multiple things. To me that is as cryptic as the Christian belief that the father, son and the holy ghost are one and the same, and yet are completely different.
 - Amanda has not simplified our understanding of “*person*” in law. She has complicated it.
 - Amanda writes to impress, not to teach. That is not a complement.
 - For me, there was no point reading any more of the article. It’s nonsense.
- As before:
 - Amanda fails to define and/or explain key concepts.
 - Amanda uses pseudo-legal concepts and arguments she knows very few people are even aware of.
 - Amanda fails to provide supporting references that are so critical to making this article even remotely understandable.
- Again, what I do understand with 100% certainty is that close to 100% of all people in Canada will not understand anything Amanda has to say about law in this article and in any of her other articles.

- This is a huge problem for Amanda because she want to be recognized as an expert in law, as a leader and she wants to lead us.
- Amanda has listed multiple action initiatives (i.e. “*campaigns*”) on her website.
- She needs our participation for those action initiatives to succeed, not just a few of us but hundreds of thousands at a minimum.
- The question is, why should we trust Amanda as a leader if we can’t even understand what she is trying to say? The answer is we won’t.

6.6 A LEGO Action ⁴⁶

- Let’s take a look at a 3rd article that is titled, “*Action! Order to Federal Cabinet Ministers to Resign*”. ⁴⁷
- The title indicates this article is about an “*action*”, the action is to issue a command as in “*to order*”, and the command is for “*federal cabinet ministers to resign*”.
- Amanda needs our participation and help.
 - Amanda has written notices and she wants us to send these notices to ministers she has identified.
 - Apparently all we have to do is fill in a few blanks and voila, we just send the notices off.
 - Easy-peasy, right? Wrong!
- First, this article suffers from the same problem as Amanda’s other articles.
 - We don’t know what, if anything, Amanda’s claims/states is true or false.
 - Amanda has certainly not established her credibility as an authority or expert in law.
 - For all we know, Amanda’s notices will simply be laughed at by the ministers and immediately shredded.
- Second, if we send Amanda’s notice without knowing what in it is true or false then that means we are simply parrots and we will not be taken seriously.
 - The truth is, we don’t know what is true or false in Amanda’s notice and, predictably, we will not be taken seriously.
- Three, this is a LEGO Action, something all our toothless chihuahuas engage in.

(46) LEGO Actions are a term I coined and described in my article [“The message does not change!”](#) and in my [video report on Stand4Thee](#) (see time 01:03:58).

(47) [Action! Order to Federal Cabinet Ministers to Resign](#)

- LEGO actions provide the illusion of action without actually having to engage in action.
- For example, what is Amanda’s objective?
 - The answer is Amanda leaves it to our imagination to figure that out.
 - The fact Amanda has no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle means she has no expectation that any minister will resign.
 - That in turn means getting ministers to resign is not Amanda’s real objective.
 - So again, what is Amanda’s objective? We don’t know and she doesn’t tell us.
- As another example of a LEGO Action, what is Amanda’s strategy?
 - Her primary strategy ⁴⁸ appears to be an email campaign.
 - Email campaigns that are the primary strategy ALWAYS fail.
 - This again means Amanda has no expectation that any minister will resign.
- As another example of a LEGO Action, what metrics has Amanda defined to track the progress of this action?
 - The answer is Amanda hasn’t defined any metrics.
 - That means Amanda never had any intention of tracking the progress of this action.
 - This too means Amanda has no expectation that any minister will resign.
- As another example of a LEGO Action, what expected results has Amanda provided?
 - The answer is none. For all we know, Amanda initiative is a bluff and she is not telling us it is a bluff.
 - This too means Amanda has no expectation that any minister will resign.
- As another example of a LEGO Action, when this action is over and done with then Amanda needs to report the results, that is, whether she succeeded or failed in reaching her claimed objective, which is to have ministers resign.
 - It is 100% predictable that no minister will resign.
 - When will Amanda report this action failed? The answer is she won’t.

(48) Here is an example of the difference between a primary and a secondary action. If our government in Canada was sued for its heavy handed overreach in the covid mandates and the cases are being argued in the courtroom then protests outside the courthouse would be a secondary action in support of the primary action happening in the courtroom.

- To summarize this third problem with Amanda’s initiative, she has a poorly defined objective, strategy, metric and expect result plus will not discuss why this initiative predictably failed.
- Four, we know Amanda has no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle.
 - No numbers means this action initiative can be safely ignored by all ministers.
 - The fact Amanda has no numbers means she knows this action initiative was dead in the water right from the very start.
- In summary, this action initiative is a deceptive tactic Amanda is using to fraudulently inflate her credentials as an activist, without her having to actually plan, organize, manage and track her initiative to it’s final conclusion.
- Amanda arrogantly concludes this article with, *“This is my gift to Canada. Now it’s in your hands. I leave it with you to decide what to do next.”*
- I personally got a good laugh reading the nonsense in this article and in the notice Amanda wanted us to send to ministers.
- This is a LEGO Action and it is real joke.
- We are facing a real global existential threat and this is the best Amanda has to offer us.
- You have to wonder, who is Amanda lying to, us or herself?

6.7 Telegram

- Amanda spends a good part of each day on the Telegram social media platform.
- Her Telegram group is [Canadian Law Study Group](#) and this is where Amanda claims to do her *“best to teach”*.⁴⁹
- As illustrated in the next figure, when I exported the chat history, there were 26,312 posts in Amanda’s Telegram group. Today, that number will be much higher.

(49) See section 9.3.20



Figure 1: Exporting the chat history shows there were a total posts 26,312 posts in Amanda's Telegram group.

- There is no structure or organization to any of the information in Amanda's Telegram group. That is true of all Telegram groups..
- All posts are displayed in chronological order.
- Telegram's search capabilities are very limited and that makes trying to find anything in Amanda's Telegram group a tedious and time consuming process.
- Telegram was not designed to be a learning/resource tool and few people will waste their time trying to use Amanda's Telegram group as a learning/resource tool.
- I know because the little information I have gleaned from Amanda's Telegram group has been a tedious, time consuming, hit-and-miss process.
- Whatever Amanda has said in her Telegram group is now lost in the murky mist of time.
- The only way Amanda's Telegram group might be meaningfully used is to follow it daily.
- With a few exceptions, those that do follow daily will only do so until they have gotten Amanda's advice on how they should contest their offense/infraction. Once they have that advice then it's goodbye Amanda.

- There are only a little over 700 followers in Amanda’s Telegram group and it appears less than a dozen are active members.
- Remember, “*followers*” are not the same as “*active members*”.
- The number of followers is a meaningless number and that is because followers cannot be organized and mobilized into action. Followers do not contribute anything to a group.
- For example, how many of Amanda’s 700 followers have engaged in the action initiatives listed on Amanda’s website?
 - The answer is Amanda doesn’t tell us.
 - But this is what metrics are all about in OSMR (i.e. **O**bjectives, **S**trategies, **M**etrics and **R**esults).
 - Metrics are about tracking the progress of Amanda’s action initiative to see if she is on target to successfully reach, or fail to reach, the objectives of her action initiative.
 - The fact Amanda does not report metrics strongly suggests few if any of her followers paid any attention to Amanda’s initiative.
- There only appear to be about dozen active members in Amanda’s Telegram group. What we can take from that is very few people want to work with Amanda.

6.8 Is the BNA Act 1867 a legitimate constitution?

- I have been quickly scanning the posts in Amanda’s Telegram group on a daily basis since early January, 2025.
- On February 28, I saw that Amanda had posted a one line statement in her Telegram group that “*the British North America Act is Canada's Constitution*”.
 - The question of whether this is true or not is something I addressed in my report on Rebecca Shepherd and her group Stand4Thee.
 - I demonstrated Rebecca cannot support her claim that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution.
 - Naturally, I wanted to know if Amanda could support her claim about the BNA Act.
 - So I indirectly asked Amanda to do just that.
 - Amanda didn’t and the most likely reason is she can’t.
- The short exchange I had with Amanda is included in section 9.2 of this report.
- I started my exchange with Amanda by saying R. Roger Smith was a constitutional expert.

- As a constitutional expert, Smith’s two books that I cited are authoritative references.
- Smith’s two short books, “*Ho Canada*” (120 pages) and “*Inside Canada*” (49 pages) argue that Canada is not a sovereign country and does not have a legitimate constitution.
- Are these the only authoritative references on Canada’s constitution? Most certainly not.
- But Amanda has been made aware of these authoritative references and it is expected that she reads them and either accepts or refutes their content.
- Both books can be downloaded from Doug Force’s website “*The Myth Is Canada*”.⁵⁰ A good review of the information is covered in the video “*Canada the Illusion*”.⁵¹
- Smith argues the BNA Act 1867 is not a constitution but is only a statute of the UK parliament.
- Smith states Canada ceased to be a Dominion of the UK with the passing of the Statute of Westminster 1931 and, since that time, Canada has only been a “*geographical expression, not a political entity*”.
- To be clear, Smith states the provinces are fully independent and sovereign while Canada as a country (i.e. a political entity) has ceased to exist since 1931.
- The point is that Smith refutes everything Amanda has to say about the BNA Act 1867 being Canada’s constitution.
- This is a big problem for Amanda because all of her work is based on the BNA Act 1867.
- But Amanda refuses to even read Smith’s books, let alone attempt to refute his arguments.⁵²
- It beggars belief that Amanda casually dismisses two highly authoritative references that have enormous negative implications for what she is doing in law.
- Again, Smith was a constitutional expert while Amanda is only a layperson with apparently no understanding of constitutional history.
- If Amanda can’t refute Smith’s work – as is very likely – then Amanda’s interpretation of and approach to law is wrong.
- By intentionally ignoring Smith’s work, Amanda can pretend she doesn’t know about his work and arguments.

(50) <https://www.themythiscanada.com/r-r-smith/>

(51) [Canada The Illusion](#)

(52) See sections 9.2.9, 9.2.14 and 9.2.17 of this report.

- Now pay attention to what Amanda wrote on Substack: ⁵³

“The key point is to be willing to admit when you are in the wrong ... how most people will not admit when he or she is in the wrong ... most will deflect first with excuses instead of admitting being in the wrong ...”

- That’s quite funny. Why? It is because Amanda is the pot calling the kettle black. She does exactly what she says other people do; Amanda “*deflects first with excuses instead of admitting being in the wrong*”.
- The word that comes to my mind is “*hypocrite*”. Amanda is being a hypocrite, expecting from us what she in turn will not do.
- The key point here is that Amanda is probably wrong and she knows it.
- She therefore hides in her Telegram echo chamber, with the feeble excuse Smiths short books are too much for her to read, knowing she will not permit anyone to seriously challenge her.
- That’s the real benefit of an echo chamber. ⁵⁴
- That reflects very, Very, VERY poorly on Amanda.

6.9 Eleven questions

- Let’s take a quick look at another example of where Amanda deflects so she does not have to risk the real probability of acknowledging that she is wrong.
- The 11 questions from the home page of “*The Myth is Canada*” were posted in Amanda’s Telegram group in August of 2023.
- These questions and Amanda’s response are shown in section 10 of this report.
- In short, Amanda used another lame excuse that she was just too busy to respond to 11 questions, questions that just by chance, happen to be at the core of all her work.
- The most probable reason Amanda deflects from answering these questions is because she can’t. She can’t refute them.
- Amanda simply cannot afford to acknowledge the BNA Act is an illegitimate constitution because that would undermine all her work and prove she is wrong.

(53) [Challenging the Jurisdiction of the Ontario Court of Justice in a Part I Offence](#)

(54) Smith’s book are short with “*Ho Canada*” having only 120 pages and “*Inside Canada*” having only 50 pages. As Amanda explains (see section 9.2.17 of this report), that is too much for her to read because it will slow down her own work. This is a lame excuse. Amanda can read thousands of pages of bills and acts but she can’t find time to read 170 pages written by Smith.

- So again Amanda hides, and gets away with hiding, in her Telegram group echo chamber where she does not permit anyone to seriously challenge her.

6.10 Might is right!

- Our legal system has been subverted and corrupted in Canada. It practices law-fare where the law is a political tool that is weaponized against us, the little people.
- The Coutt's Case ⁵⁵ and the case of Detective Helen Grus ⁵⁶ are text book cases of law-fare.
- As Donald Best and so many others have noted, we don't have rule-**OF**-law in Canada, where the law is applied equally to all people. ⁵⁷
- Instead, what we have is rule-**BY**-law, where the law is a political tool to suppress and control us little people.
- Might-is-right, where the strongest wins, is the rule-by-law in Canada and the rule-by-law across the world.
- In December of 2024, only four months ago, Amanda wrote:

It's not that elected representatives can't be held to account, it's that we first need to learn how the law is being broken. We then need to prove how the law is being broken, and present that argument to our elected representatives. ⁵⁸

- This shows how profoundly out of touch Amanda is with reality.
- First, the cabal and it's global network are above the law.
 - That includes the cabal's network here in Canada. It will not be held accountable and we don't have the power or clout to hold it accountable because we are not united.
 - Mark Carney and Justine Trudeau are part of the cabal's global network and we can't hold these two accountable.
 - Amanda still hasn't figured that out yet.
 - More to the point, nothing Amanda does with her pseudo-legal law changes any of the cabal's agendas in Canada.

(55) [Debunking CBC Part 2 w/ Betty Carbert & Marco Van Huigenbos](#)

(56) [Turmoil in Detective Grus Trial as Prosecutor Leaves Ottawa Police](#)

(57) [Deprived Justice](#) talks about law-fare in Canada.

(58) [Names: They possess meaning and power](#)

- Second, the National Citizens Inquiry has repeatedly proven that all our elected representatives, at all levels of government across Canada, are intentionally ignoring us, the little people.
 - So regardless of what Amanda does with her action initiatives, it is predictable that she too will be ignored by our elected representatives.
 - For Amanda to think she is magically going to accomplish what none of our other groups can do, is just abject stupidity on Amanda part.
- Third, from 1935 to 1949, Walter. F. Kuhl was the member of parliament for Jasper-Edson in Alberta.⁵⁹
 - As reported on Doug Force’s website “*The Myth is Canada*”:

On a number of occasions, evidenced with all the historic legal documents in hand, Walter brought to other politician’s attention, the fact that Canada was never actually – lawfully – confederated into a sovereign state.

- Here was one of our elected representatives doing exactly what Amanda proposes, directly informing our elected representatives that there was a big problem with Canada’s sovereignty and constitution.
 - Walter had reach, but no numbers, resources or muscle.
 - Hey Amanda, guess what happened? The answer is Walter was effectively ignored.
 - Amanda doesn’t have even the one thing Walter had which was “*reach*”.
 - The question is, how does Amanda expect to get her message to our elected representatives when even Walter could not? Predictably, the answer is she can’t.
- Fourth, to repeat, the fact is Amanda has no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle.
 - What that means is Amanda has no way to enforce her interpretation of law on our elected representatives.
 - For example, Amanda simply doesn’t have the resources to sue even low ranking elected officials and that means all levels of our elected officials can safely ignore Amanda.
 - They will laugh at Amanda.
 - Fifth, Amanda’s action initiatives can only succeed if large scale numbers of us, in the millions, engage in her action initiatives.

(59) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Walter_Frederick_Kuhl

- But as I have demonstrated, the big problem for Amanda is most of us will not understand what she is saying about law and that we will conclude most of what she says is pseudo-legal gibberish.
- We will not listen to, or be lead by, people like Amanda who spout what sounds to us like utter nonsense.
- Sixth, our governments have adopted the principle of might-is-right and Amanda has demonstrated she has no idea of how to even begin to effectively counter might-is-right.

6.11 Amanda is a one-trick pony

- What is Amanda doing to challenge and counter 15 minute cites? The answer is nothing.
- What is Amanda doing to challenge and counter the global push to make make bugs and synthetic lab grown meat our primary source of food? The answer is nothing.
- What is Amanda doing to challenge and counter the bogus climate change narrative. The answer is nothing.
- What is Amanda doing to challenge and counter the law-fare in our legal system in Canada. The answer is nothing
- There are many such questions for which the answer is always the same; Amanda is doing nothing.
- The cabal has inundated us with a tsunami of problems.
 - The only way we can manage this tsunami of problems is if the billions of our rank-and-file⁶⁰ across the world work together as one, where each of us has to focus on only a single problem.
 - To fight and win this global war we need many people with many different skill sets but all working as one.
- Like all our toothless chihuahuas, Amanda is crippled by the fact she works alone and the fact that she is is a one-trick pony, with the only tool in her toolbox being her pseudo-legal law.
- Being alone, there is nothing Amanda can do to even begin to address the tsunami of problems we face.
- This is where we see just how incompetent and impotent Amanda is.
- To manage this tsunami of problems, we must unite across Canada and across the world.

(60) [We must engage our rank and file](#)

- But the only unity Amanda wants is unity under her banner, where she is top chihuahua and yaps incessantly about what she wants the rest of us to do for her.
- That is the wet dream of all our toothless chihuahuas, to be top dog and for us only to unite under their own banner and no other banner.
- That isn't going to happen for any of our toothless chihuahuas, including Amanda.

7 Conclusion

- Amanda is a legend in her own mind.
- She foolishly thinks of herself as a trail blazer, that she is better than a lawyer and that her work is a sacrifice and gift for Canada.
- In 2024, Amanda wrote, “*When the Canadian Civics 101 series completes, I will be dropping a bombshell which should shake the foundation of the current status quo within Canada*”.^{61, 62}
- My, my, my, what arrogance!
- Oopsie, has anyone in Amanda’s echo chamber dared say that her bombshell was a dud, just as silent and ignored as everything else Amanda does?
- I don’t need to know anything about law to conclude Amanda and her group are doing nothing, absolutely nothing, that contributes to our fight in this global war.
- And let there be no misunderstanding, Amanda imagines herself to be doing just that, contributing to our global fight.
- Amanda has spent at least 7 to 8 years studying law and, after all that time, all she has under her belt is a relatively few puny wins for petty infractions.
- Amanda’s few action initiatives are all hare-brained LEGO Actions that predictably have already failed or predictably will fail.
- Amanda has prioritized her petty legal turf war, ego and echo chamber over our unity, the only thing that will win this global war for us.
- Amanda is not a team player.
- Amanda sucks as teacher and as a leader.
- Amanda needs us. We don’t need her.
- Our big problem is there are hundreds, if not thousands, of Amandas across Canada.
 - Collectively, they siphon off considerable donations, resources and people that we desperately need to fight this global war.
 - They keep us heavily fragmented and disorganized.
 - They undermine and subvert our fight in this global war.

(61) [Power – It Is Mine/Ours for the Taking](#).

(62) The “*Canadian Civic 101*” series of articles is complete. We know that because Amanda has commenced her “*Canada Stands 2024*” action which she said occurs AFTER the “*Canadian Civic 101*” series.

- This must stop and we must stop it.
- We must stop donating our money and time to these fake freedom fighters, for they are indeed frauds.
- War is unforgiving and it does not reward failure. Amanda and her Canadian Law Study Group have failed us.
- The best thing for us would be if Amanda's group simply disappeared.
- So let's laugh at, mock and ridicule Amanda and her group for the toothless chihuahuas they have proven themselves to be.

8 Amanda has been notified of this report

- Amanda was notified of this report by email on April 11, 2025.
- Links to the written version and the video version of this report were sent to Amanda’s email address ‘canadianlawstudygroup@pm.me’
- A copy of my email to Amanda can be found in section 11.1, Appendix C, of the written version of this report.
- If Amanda or members of her group CLSG respond to this report then those responses will be added to Appendix C.

9 Appendix A

This appendix includes three exchanges I have had with Amanda in her Telegram group. ⁶³

9.1 2025-02-18

9.1.1 Context

- In February, I posted a link to my report on Rebecca and her group Stand4thee in Amanda's Telegram group. And that started the my exchange with Amanda. Note that Amanda deleted my original post which included a link to my video report on Rebecca and Stand4thee.
- In this exchange, Amanda asked if she was next on my list (of reports). I said no, she was not on my list. At that time, I did not have any interest in Amanda or her group.

9.1.2 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31520>

Really @ian000bell.

This is how you invest your time and energy?

Am I next on your list of "toothless chihuahuas" to be maligned?

If you have not noticed, I do not use this platform to call out other group leaders, therefore, I ask that you respect this platform for its intended purpose.

Each of us helping each other come to understand Canada's laws so we may stand on them!

9.1.3 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31523>

We are in a global war. War is unforgiving. It does not reward failure.

(63)<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup>

I have defined 3 critical criteria which are about the fundamentals of what we must be doing to fight this war. We are not doing it. No one is even thinking about them.

I have explained in quite a bit of detail why we are losing this war, are losing it badly and have probably already lost it. No one focuses on any of that.

Instead, everyone literally focuses on the descriptor "toothless chihuahua". That is all they focus on, the descriptor alone. Why is that? I've also answered that question in my blogs.

9.1.4 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31526>

You yourself admit you know little about law in your video.

Rather than spend your time and energy on learning the law to help us win this war, you rather invest it in tearing others down.

That I don't get...

With that said, you failed to respond to my question and my request.

My question, am I next on your target list?

My request, can you not bring your maligning of others onto this platform?

9.1.5 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31532>

1) My criticism of Stand4Thee is a) about the fundamentals of this war and b) how to organize and implement an action/initiative. That does not require I know much about the law.

2) No, you are not on my list. I've only recently learned about you and know little about what you are doing. In contrast, I have been following and monitoring Stand4Thee for 4 years.

3) *I am a toothless chihuahua. I'm not offended by the descriptor because I recognize the truth in it. All our groups literally refuse to even acknowledge my talking points. It's been a year since I first introduced the descriptor "toothless chihuahua". No one has yet challenged, countered or refuted any of my talking points.*

4) *It appears you are only focused on "the law". That will never win this war for us. I've explained why in my video and blog posts.*

5) *It appears my post has been deleted without any discussion of my talking points. That is par for the course with our "freedom fighters".*

9.1.6 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31533>

Your video was deleted because it goes against the purpose of this platform.

When I deem content inappropriate, I don't open it for debate as to whether or not it should be deleted, it is my prerogative.

Also, we do not agree about the law.

It is through the manipulation of law that has got us into the mess Canada is in today.

You do know @ian000bell that I worked directly with Stand4Thee during the Trucker Convoy before I began this group, right?

9.1.7 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31535>

May I ask what the point is you are trying to make?

9.1.8 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31536>

I see the tide turning. It's just starting, so it is hard to see for most, but I see it.

We will win this war, and we will win it through the application of Constitutional Law.

More and more leaders, not all of whom I see eye to eye with necessarily, are starting to ckme to see what I see.

You may see toothless chihuahuas, but I see opportunities of our various platforms unifying on this one common thread.

Using the rule of law to neuter our governments.

Beyond that, I encourage individualism, because this is a free country.

That said, this platform has been formed for the purpose of exploring law, and helping each other with actual legal problems. It is not for individuals to promote vlogs with no fruitful purpose.

9.1.9 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31542>

This will be my last post in this exchange.

You don't have the numbers, resources, reach or muscle to win this war "through the application of constitutional law".

My blog is about the fundamentals of how to fight this war and the only course of action that can win this war for us.

My observations since 2020 are that "No fruitful purpose" is what those do who are solely focused on what they think is "the law". I have just demonstrated that in my report on Stand4Thee.

You've made it clear your telegram group is not the place for this discussion. If you wish to further this exchange then you can send me a direct message.

I have no more to say here.

9.2 2025-02-28

9.2.1 Context

- Amanda began the exchange by posting a statement that the BNA Act is Canada’s constitution.
- Rebecca Shepherd at Stand4Thee makes the same claim and, as I have demonstrated, she cannot support.⁶⁴
- I was curious to see if Amanda had any evidence to support this claim. As it turns out, she doesn’t.

9.2.2 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31792>

Amanda:

Yes. The British North America Act is Canada's Constitution.

9.2.3 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31794>

Ian:

Russel Rogers Smith was a Canadian constitutional expert. In his two books "[Ho Canada](#)" (120 pages) and "[Inside Canada](#)" (49 pages), Smith argues the BNA Act is not Canada's constitution. Would you share your understanding of why you believe Smith is wrong?

Note:

- I point out that Smith was a constitutional expert and he contradicts Amanda’s opinion; Smith states the BNA Act is not Canada’s constitution.
- What I am asking is for Amanda to provide she considers is the proof that the BNA Act 1867 is a legitimate constitution.

(64) See the [REPORTS web page](#) on my website.

9.2.4 Rebecca

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31794>

Rebecca:

Even if Smith is right, it doesn't matter.

For almost 200 years our entire system has operated on the constitution. Laws, court rulings, procedures, the BNA ACT IS the Constitution.

Why would you be in this group if you fundamentally disagree with the actions of this group.

Notes:

- Rebecca responds to a question I asked Amanda but Rebecca provides no evidence or proof that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution.

9.2.5 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31795>

Ian:

Yes, I have already noted you support the principle of might-is-right in [my review of Stand4Thee](#). Ironically, that principle is the antithesis of rule-of-law, something your group also purports to support. This is an obvious contradiction. I look forward to understanding how you resolve it when you send me your response to my review. Would you be able to give me a ballpark idea of when I can expect your response?

You have blocked and banned me from your Telegram group for simply asking you common sense and reasonable questions. That is certainly one means of ensuring you are free to say anything you want without being questioned. Some might call that censorship or prioritising a petty turf war and echo chamber over facts and truth. If you un-block me from your Telegram group then we can have this exchange in your S4T group instead of here. To repeat, I have only ever asked you common sense and reasonable questions. What do you have to fear from that? After all, you have repeatedly stated you and S4T are all about the truth.

Correct me if I am wrong. My impression is you believe groups should only be composed of "yes" people, those that offer unconditional acceptance and agreement with whatever the group leaders say or talk about. Having followed you for 4 years, I can say that is certainly true of [Stand4Thee](#). You have a wee tendency to ban anyone who counters, questions or challenges what you have to say. So what do you say? Will you unblock me in your Telegram group?

I don't know much about Amanda. I have not followed her for 4 years like I have followed you. She made a statement that the BNA Act is Canada's constitution. I have openly stated I am a layperson and, like yourself, certainly no constitutional expert. I have read both of Smith's books and find his arguments to be strong and compelling. Smith states the BNA Act is not a constitution, it is simply a statute of the UK Parliament. I have demonstrated you cannot counter Smith's arguments. Here, Amanda has just said the BNA Act is Canada's constitution. Amanda's focus is exclusively about doing things according to the law. As such, I simply asked for Amanda's understanding about the process of law underlying the BNA Act.

9.2.6 Rebecca

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31796>

Rebecca:

Actually, that's you doing the "might is right" Ian.

You have been harassing me and the members of the group from the start. Why, prey tel, do I have to tolerate your shit? You are not my boss, you are nothing to me.

I dn't give one single F what you say about me. Frankly, I am not concerned of anyone's opinion of me.*

You call me toothless, it's you who is toothless. Why? Because of your bad behaviour towards others - NO ONE WANTS TO WORK WITH YOU.

As for the purpose of this group, your statement just shows you aren't vested in the work that Amanda is doing.

You clearly are obsessed and should get some help.

9.2.7 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31797>

Ian:

You are now resorting to an ad hominem attack. Amanda's Telegram group is not the place for that. If you wish to continue this exchange then send me a direct message.

9.2.8 Rebecca

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31798>

Rebecca:

I am done wasting finger strength on you and am not engaging further.

9.2.9 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31799>

Amanda:

No. I am not going to spend my time refuting this document as there is no good reason for me to spend my time doing your homework.

Let me ask you this Ian. What do you think the purpose of the Constitution is?

Notes:

- This is a post from Amanda. I made the mistake of thinking it was from Rebecca.
- Amanda says she will not spend her time doing my homework.
 - What she means by this is she is telling me I have to go through the over 25,000 posts in her Telegram group.
 - The problem is that Telegram's search capabilities are very limited and Amanda knows this.
 - My suspicion at this point is that Amanda is bluffing, she knows she has no proof that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution.

- Amanda acknowledges ⁶⁵ that she has not read either of Smith's books.

9.2.10 Ian

Ian:

You've just used an ad hominem attack to make false statements against and about me. You've just said you are not engaging with me any further. Now it appears you are re-engaging me and asking me a question.

I've asked you many questions and you have yet to respond to any of them. Why are you asking me to do what you won't do?

Notes:

- Again, I made the mistake of assuming Amanda's response was from Rebecca.
- I immediately apologize for making this mistake in my next post.

9.2.11 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31802>

Amanda:

Um, look again. You are speaking with Amanda.

I have not attacked you.

9.2.12 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31803>

Ian:

My apologies Amanda. You are right. That is my mistake here.

(65) Sections 9.2.14 and 9.2.17 of this report confirm that Amanda has not read either of Smith's books.

9.2.13 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31804>

Ian:

Are you asking what the purpose of the BNA Act is or what the purpose of any constitution is?

9.2.14 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31805>

Amanda:

That said, I am at a point @ian000bell that I won't necessarily engage, one on one, with these types of large documents simply because I lack the time and strength to do so, just to appease another's curiosity.

When I respond, there is usually a good reason behind the response and some type of fruit to benefit from.

No, I don't necessarily mean money by that last statement either.

9.2.15 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31806>

You saw I spelled Constitution as a proper noun, correct?

- The obvious answer is no, I did not take note of the fact she had spelled “*Constitution*” with a capital “*C*”. Amanda is fully aware I missed this technicality and is aware few people would have noticed.
- But do you see the deception here?
 - On the one hand, Amanda points out the technicality that I missed the capital “*C*”.

- On the other, I have pointed out the “*technicality*” that a recognized Canadian constitutional expert has stated the BNA Act is not a legitimate constitution, it is not Canada’s constitution.
- Conspicuously, Amanda deflects and ignored the “*technicality*” I pointed out but she expects me to recognize the “*technicality*” she points out.

9.2.16 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31807>

Hello Amanda,

This is not a trite matter of curiosity. The question goes right to the core of whether Canada is a sovereign country and has a legitimate constitution that was ratified, according to rule-of-law, by the Canadian people.

I will accept this as your response to my question.

Thank you,

Ian

Note:

- Amanda has deflected from providing her proof to support her claim that the BNA is a legitimate constitution.
- If Amanda had any evidence then she would have cited the books, articles and/or documentation to support her claim.
- Amanda can’t provide a single supporting reference.

9.2.17 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/31808>

Caution.

Choosing not to answer, because no good reason has been provided to compel a response is not to be construed as any kind of admission nor acceptance.

That said, you asked a vague general question, which I declined to answer, provided reason for not answering and followed up with my own question.

From there, you gave some type of nonsensical response alluding to a potential understanding between us two, to which I declare I do not understand you @ian000bell .

If you are incapable of engaging in a direct conversation, and only seek to bog me down with large documents to refute while declining to engage in a simple back and forth chat which may help suss out some of the answers you seek, I begin to question your motive.

You now have me on my guard with you, and I am less likely to engage as willingly, because I don't understand you.

For now, you're welcome to stay, but I do ask that you respect the purpose of this group, and not step outside those boundaries.

Notes:

- The purpose of this entire exchange was for Amanda to provide her proof that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution of Canada. In this last post, Amanda deflected again.
- Amanda's response is, for the most part, spurious argumentation.
 - For example, Amanda makes the straw-man argument about “*a potential understanding between us two*” when there was no such thing. My decision (i.e. “*I will accept this as your response to my question*”) was a unilateral action, regardless of what Amanda thought at that point.
 - As a 2nd example, Amanda suggests I am “*incapable of engaging in a direct conversation*”. My question was explicit, specific and very direct. I was asking Amanda to provide the proof to support her claim that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution. Amanda does not provide a specific and direct answer. Instead, she deflects and evades.
 - As a 3rd example, Amanda wrote, “*...only seek to bog me down with large documents to refute while declining to engage in a simple back and forth*”. This is nonsense. Both references are short books (i.e. 120 and 52 pages respectively). Both books are authoritative references, from a recognized constitutional authority, and they refute

Amanda’s opinion that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution. To say I am trying to bog her down is another straw man argument that let’s her deflect from and evade having to support her opinion about the BNA Act.

- At this point, it is reasonable to assume Amanda is bluffing and has no proof that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution. In saying the BNA Act is Canada’s constitution, all Amanda is doing is expressing her unformed and unsubstantiated opinion.

9.3 2025-03-02

9.3.1 Context

- Amanda and I had an exchange in her Telegram group that started as a result of a comment I posted to her Substack article “*The Woman in the Red Dress*”.⁶⁶

9.3.2 Ian

<https://amandaridding.substack.com/p/the-woman-in-the-red-dress/comment/97454165>

- This is what I posted in the comment section to Amanda’s Substack article.

The crux of the problem with this entire post is it offers no references, let alone authoratative references, to support any of the claims/statements made in it. Without references, all that can be said is this entire post is an opinion-piece, a questionable one at that.

Subject matter of this nature MUST be extensively referenced by the writer so readers can validate the statement/claims/information for themselves.

Imagine reading this post, as the normal person, who has never come across terms such "corporate persona". Conspicuously, an internet search of "corporate persona" yields zero (0) hits. The normal person who is unaware of the pseudo-legal arguments that our pseudo-legal groups/people engage in will read this post as gibberish.

I have just begun making my way through all of Amanda's posts, starting with her first post, "About the author". I've read the first 13 posts. So far, I have not come across a single reference, let alone an authoratative reference, to support any of Amanda's claims/statements. That's a big red flag.

(66) <https://amandaridding.substack.com/p/the-woman-in-the-red-dress>

It is the responsibility of the writer making a statement/claim to support that statement/claim. It is not the reader's responsibility to go off on a wild goose chase looking for references to disprove/refute that statement/claim.

9.3.3 Amanda

<https://amandaridding.substack.com/p/the-woman-in-the-red-dress/comment/97454165>

- This is Amanda's response to me in the comment section to her Substack article.

This is not a legal argument but an article designed to make the reader think and or contemplate what he or she knows, or thinks they know.

Who pays you to try and discredit people? That's what I would like to know...

9.3.4 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32102>

@ian000bell really?

Trying to use a Substack article by claiming "lack of citation" to discredit me?

Who do you work for?

You do understand that Substack is a place for writers to share one's thoughts and opinions, right?

Mr. Ian Bell has decided to turn his attention to try and discredit me by attacking one of my Substack articles for lack of citation.

*What does it say about me and my stand when some unknown guy shows up, out of the blue, and after being part of this group for months, begins to attack me on my Substack, which is my **private thoughts** I chose to publish for the public to read?*

Couldn't discredit me in here @ian000bell so you turned your attention to my Substack?

Seriously, who do you work for?

9.3.5 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32107>

You posted on substack and that is where I responded. Would you prefer to have that exchange here? I'm willing to have this exchange here if you do not ban me for simply questioning what you do. If you are inclined to ban me then let's have this exchange in my Telegram group where you cannot shut the exchange down.

You want to know more about me? Here is my website (<https://www.virusfraud.org/>). Here is my "Winning this war (<https://www.virusfraud.org/winning-this-war/>)" unity proposal. My unity proposal has been sent out to about 240 of our prominent "freedom groups" across Canada and read by at least 1,000 of our prominent "freedom fighters" in Canada. There is not been a single person that has challenged or refuted any of my talking points. In addition, here are my three steps (<https://www.virusfraud.org/how-to-identify-a-toothless-chihuahua/>) for assessing our "freedom groups".

The first step in assessing our groups is about defining our primary objective in this global war, about defining out primary strategy to reach our primary objective and about the leadership we must have to win this global war.

The second step addresses the issue of large scale numbers we must have, the ability to organize and mobilize millions of our rank-and-file (<https://www.virusfraud.org/we-must-engage-our-rank-and-file/>) in Canada and billions across the world. Without large scale numbers, we have no resources, no reach and no muscle.

The third step highlights the fact all our groups have poorly defined objectives, strategies, metrics and results.

Once you have reviewed my work then I will engage you.

9.3.6 Rebecca

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32108>

There is a reason why no one will work with you.

9.3.7 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32109>

I thought you were finished talking with me. You have no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle. These are facts. No one is working with you.

9.3.8 Rebecca

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32110>

What do you have? Nada.

9.3.9 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32111>

Chuckle! Tell us something everyone of us doesn't already know. Yup, I too am a toothless chihuahua. I've given you ample material to work with in my review of Stand4Thee. All you have to do is prove me wrong.

I'm not here to make friends and be liked. I'm here to fight and win a war.

9.3.10 Rebecca

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32112>

I don't have to anything. You are nothing to me.

9.3.11 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32113>

We are in a global war of Technocracy and Transhumanism. You do not dispute this. Tell us, in your own words, here and now:

- 1) *What do you think should be our primary objective in this global war?*
- 2) *What do you think our primary strategy should be for winning this global war?*
- 3) *What is the leadership you think we must have to win this global war?*

9.3.12 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32115>

I think you miss the point.

You attacked me on my Substack, without just cause, and on that I am calling you out.

I'm not looking to know everything about you, just who all is paying you.

If you reviewed today's chat at all, you would already know that presenting something to another, even if it is wrong, does not necessitate, or compell, any one to respond.

If you want to win people's attention to your platform and ideas, I suggest you stop attacking the very people whose attention you want to gain.

I especially suggest that if you are going to challenge me, you do not take things stated and present them out of context.

Most people who know me know I have no issue being corrected if I make a mistake.

Those same people also know I will quickly acknowledge my error and stand corrected.

Am I open to constructive criticism? yes.

Am I open to unconstructive criticism? no.

So far you have been highly critical of people, with statements being pulled out of context, and anything offered within the confines of you group to be unfruitful.

I see no good reason to read your platform, because you have given me none.

Actually, Reb does have people working with her.

At present, not only does she have people working with her, she is in process of updating her knowledge base and her website to reflect same.

9.3.13 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32121>

*A review of what I posted on your substack can be read here
(<https://amandaridding.substack.com/p/the-woman-in-the-red-dress>).*

I did not attack you and there is nothing in what I wrote that can be construed as anything other than a constructive comment. I explained what the main problem was with your post; you cite no references to support your claims/statements and that therefore makes them just your opinion. For example, I wrote, "Subject matter of this nature MUST be extensively referenced by the writer so readers can validate the statement/claims/information for themselves".

For laypersons such as myself who do not have a good understanding of our legal system and laws, references are necessary and expected as a) the writer demonstrates what they say is more than an opinion and b) readers can validate the writer's statements. Expecting references cannot be construed in any way as an attack.

In your very first post (<https://amandaridding.substack.com/p/about-the-author>), you wrote: "It has not been enough for me to accept what I am being told by most people. You want to tell me something, odds are I won't accept. You want to prove something to me, explain it and show me. Why? So I may see with my own eyes and hear with my own ears."

I ask for and expect to see references so that "I may see with my own eyes and hear with my own ears".

9.3.14 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32122>

You point out the obvious for no fruitful purpose.

It's an article, not a legal argument, which will have much of my opinion.

Pointing out the obvious, an article with my opinion, to criticize and say, this is an article with my opinion, is not constructive, it's nonsensical.

Also to claim I don't support my work because you don't understand the descriptive noun "corporate persona" because you couldn't find that term when you googled it, is you pulling a descriptive noun out of context.

Also, the relevant points referencing a specific rule of law I do believe have largely been provided, although I cannot confirm if all the links work and were caught.

You come across as a frustrated person wanting attention, but the attention you're gaining is not to your platform, and it's not winning you any allies.

Who pays you Ian?

9.3.15 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32123>

Unity is not my platform and idea. You too talk about trying to unite people with your own action initiatives. Yet it is very evident you too have no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle.

You hide behind statements such as, "I see no good reason to read your platform, because you have given me none." This is an excuse, not a reason. Like all our "freedom groups" in Canada you have no interest in looking beyond what you are doing. How do you expect to appeal to people when they do as you do?

9.3.16 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32124>

You obviously do not comprehend why this is, do you? Why my platform remains small that is.

As for me looking at your platform, I stand firm on my statement you have given me bo good reason to look.

It is not an excuse, it is my position.

I find you rude, abrasive, and question your integrity.

You're asking me to invest my time and my energy into something you've produced.

Why should I?

Because you have done everything in your power to repel me and nothing to attract me, I take the position I see no good reason to invest my time and energy into reviewing your work, because I see no benefit resulting from it.

Helping @PhaseIII should result in another lawful win.

Helping MICHAEL GODDARD should result in another lawful win.

Helping @remymartins should result in another lawful win.

Investing in you...nothing.

9.3.17 Ian

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32125>

Correct me if I am wrong, the purpose of your articles is to a teach and educate. Teaching is a hard learned skill with the goal of finding a way to successfully impart knowledge. If your intention is only to share your opinion then state that less someone take it as a truth.

You asked who is paying me. I gave you information about me.

In the short time I have been following you, what I have observed is that you are very, very defensive and are quick to direct the blame at other people.

You are not the first to try and make this about me. Here is the point. You have no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle. This is fact. What will it take before you and all our other "freedom fighters" acknowledge the obvious?

I am retired. I have a doctorate in Psychology from the University of Ottawa and a post-doc at Toronto Western Hospital. For my career, I had a small tech company where I designed, implemented and sold biomedical software.

Finally, I have respected your policy in your group here. I did not start this exchange but I did respond to posts that were addressed to me.

9.3.18 Gregory

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32126>

Listen get the fuck off the page I come here to read stories about law not your perspective of whats taught here

9.3.19 Yolo Bear

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32127>

This is performative. If you had honourable intentions you would be having all these discussions privately.

9.3.20 Amanda

<https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/32128>

It is my blog Ian.

Telegram is where I do my best to teach.

You may not like my style, many don't, but I am learning.

Do I push people into thinking twice? I hope so.

Can I be less abrasive, I am working on it.

10 Appendix B

- This appendix includes the 11 questions that were, until recently, listed on the homepage of the “*The Myth Is Canada*”.
- Doug Force, the person behind this website, recently passed away. So for now, the 11 questions have been replaced by video informing us of Doug’s passing.
- The 11 questions listed below are from Doug’s homepage and were posted in Amanda’s Telegram group on August 30, 2023.⁶⁷
 1. *Where are the Articles of Confederation, if Canada had confederated in 1867 and is a sovereign nation?*
 2. *Why was Canada known as the “Dominion of Canada” a British colony until 1938, if Canada had confederated in 1867 and is a sovereign nation?*
 3. *Why in 1867 was the BNA act created to be Letters Patent for a Governor General to the Dominion of Canada if Canada had confederated and is a sovereign nation?*
 4. *Why in 1893, would the British Parliament deem it necessary to repeal certain sections of the BNA act, with the “Statute Law Revisions act” if Canada confederated in 1867 and is a sovereign nation?*
 5. *Why in 1931 would the British parliament create the “Statute of Westminster” to nullify the Dominion of Canada, if Canada confederated in 1867 and is a sovereign nation?*
 6. *Why in 1946 did a foreign Monarch, King George VI appoint a representative for the UK, a Governor General and then command the Parliament of Canada to create Letters Patent and command the PM at that time to sign on his behalf those Letters Patent in 1947 for his Governor General, if Canada confederated in 1867 and is a Sovereign Nation?*
 7. *Why did PM Trudeau in 1982 have the government create the “Canada Bill” and then take that Bill to a foreign Monarch and have her parliament pass that Bill as the “Canada act, 1982” if Canada confederated 115 years earlier and is a sovereign nation?*
 8. *Why do Prime Ministers and other officials when sworn into office here in Canada, swear their allegiance to a foreign monarch, Queen Elizabeth, and not to the people of Canada if Canada confederated in 1867 and is a sovereign nation?*
 9. *If Canada is a sovereign nation, why does the Government of Canada in their Interpretations act define Canada as the internal waters and territorial seas if Canada confederated in 1867?*

(67) <https://t.me/canadianlawstudygroup/9954>

10. *Why was it necessary in 1990 to sue a member of the federal parliament, J. Littlechild MP, to force him to do his duty to his constituents and have the courts rule against his constituents, if Canada had confederated in 1867 and is a sovereign Nation?*
11. *Why in the “Constitution act, 1867” of Canada is there no clause that allows for land for the Government of Canada to become a sovereign nation if Canada Confederated in 1867 and is a sovereign nation?*

10.1 Amanda’s response

- Here is the response Amanda posted in her Telegram group to the 11 questions.

Canada the Nation wasn't registered as a Corporation in 1867.

Canada is still a Dominion. Further, with the law of nature in mind, think of the relationship between parent and child. You don't cut all ties as a baby, you do it slowly, as the child grows and learns. It's worth noting, the Commonwealth countries with codified Constitutions are the ones being hardest manipulated, first because they kept us in ignorance of Our Constitution then poisoned others with misinformation about Our Constitution.

What letters patent? Do confuse the BNA with Rupert's Landing. They are not one in the same and only the lands were admitted in 1868, not the Hudson's Bay Company.

The Crown is not a foreign Monarch. The Crown Acts and operates in right of Canada.

Prime Ministers have no standing in law for starters. Secondly, they should swear allegiance to the Crown, but don't, which is part of the issue, but not at the top of the list. While ambiguous, the Crown, as the protector of the Constitution having sworn to protect and preserve the laws and customs of Canada, in essence represents the Constitution. Swearing an oath to the Crown includes Swearing an oath to the Constitution.

Define or include internal waters and territorial seas.

I don't know the Littlechild case, but without reviewing, I would think the Charter is the reason as it allows judicial activism to run rampant and unchecked.

As for anything unanswered, I have not answered in part because to do so would be so lengthy in detail, taking too much time. I don't have time to spare with my focus being on people with real issues going before the court.

I have had lots of these conversations, feel free to review my platforms to review these past debates.

- Amanda is given 11 direct question. It is expected she provide direct answers. She doesn't do this but instead deflects and evades.
- Amanda wrote, "*Canada is still a Dominion*".
 - This means Canada is not a sovereign nation but is only a subject of and tied to the UK.
- Amanda wrote, "*It's worth noting, the Commonwealth countries with codified Constitutions are...poisoned others with misinformation about Our Constitution*".
 - What does this have to do with the 11 questions? The answer is nothing.
- Amanda wrote, "*Do confuse the BNA with Rupert's Landing...not the Hudson's Bay Company*".
 - What does this have to do with the 11 questions? The answer is it nothing. The BNA Act was passed in 1867 while the Rupert Land Act was passed in 1868.
- Amanda wrote, "*The Crown is not a foreign Monarch. The Crown Acts and operates in right of Canada.*".
 - I do know the Interpretations Act defines the Crown as "*the Sovereign of the United Kingdom, Canada and Her or His other Realms and Territories, and Head of the Commonwealth*".⁶⁸
 - In other words, the Crown is the foreign British monarch which is currently Charles III and he is definitely foreign.
 - As a petty point, I don't understand what Amanda means by "*The Crown Acts and operates in right of Canada*" and why she capitalizes "Acts" which is a verb.
- Amanda wrote, "*Prime Ministers have no standing in law for starters...Swearing an oath to the Crown includes Swearing an oath to the Constitution.*".
 - What does this have to do with the 11 questions? The answer is nothing.
- Amanda wrote, "*As for anything unanswered, ...I don't have time to spare...going before the court.*".
 - Amanda evades and avoids answering the 11 questions using the lame excuse that she doesn't have time.

(68) [Interpretations Act](#), see definition for "*Her Majesty, His Majesty, the Queen, the King or the Crown*"

- From the little information I have gleaned from Amanda's Telegram group, it does not appear she has ever answered these 11 questions.
- It beggars belief the Amanda casually dismisses key questions that critically reflect on everything she has to say about the BNA Act 1867.
- The big question is why does Amanda deflect from answering them? The probable answer is because she can't refute them.
- Amanda knows that answers to these 11 questions undermine everything she says about the BNA Act 1867 so she pretends to have more pressing matters to deal with.

11 Appendix C

- The purpose of this section is to show any and all responses that Amanda and/or member of her Canadian Law Study Group have to this report.
- This report was sent to the email address canadianlawstudygroup@pm.me April 11, 2025.

11.1 2025-04-11, 11:20 – email from Ian to Amanda

Hello Amanda,

I have just published my report about you and your Canadian Law Study Group on the [REPORT page](#) of my website. Here is the link for the [written version of my report](#). Here is the link to the [video version of my report](#).

If you choose to respond to my report then note that all communications will be public and posted in Appendix C of the written version of my report.

I have removed myself from your Telegram group and am no longer a member of it. Should you or any members of your group choose to respond to my report then send it by email to 'ianbell@virusfraud.org'.

Ian Bell

www.virusfraud.org

11.2 2025-04-11, 11:34 – email Amanda to Ian

Please provide me with your real name and address of service where you may be served personally in person.

Should I chose to respond it will be with a Defamatory Libel claim for damages for slandering my name, Amanda Ridding.

Regards.

Amanda Ridding

DISCLAIMER: All information shared is not to be construed as legal advice; any thing shared is being shared for information purposes only.

Any one sharing information from Canadian Law Study Group recommends you validate all information with a qualified legal professional.

11.3 2025-04-11, 11:49 – email from Ian to Amanda

Hello Amanda,

My name is Ian Bell. You know I'm in Montreal. You haven't even taken the time to review the written version of my report or watch the video version of my report. Why don't you do that first before deciding to sue me for libel.

Ian

11.4 2025-04-11, 12:20 – email Amanda to Ian

I did not know you are from Montreal.

I do not know if damages have yet been incurred from your slander.

However, should I discover damages being incurred, I really don't want to waste time serving you, by waiting for you to maybe provide me with your address of service.

In reality, I think most people ignore you, so I am not certain damages have been incurred, but on chance I am wrong on that presumption, I would like to be prepared to act against you, as you have acted against me.

Therefore, I respectfully demand you provide me with your address of service now.

Furthermore, and to make it clear and known early, I claim Ontario as jurisdiction to lay any potential claim I may find need to lay against you on grounds it is in Ontario I am professionally known and potentially impacted by your libelous slander.

In addition to claiming Ontario as jurisdiction for any potential future claim, I am further claiming my time to pursue known damages by your hand, from your slanderous act against me, at a rate of \$500 per hour spent in pursuit of justice against you.

In addition to claiming Ontario as jurisdiction and my time spent in pursuit of justice at a rate of \$500 per hour. I further claim all other expenses and costs incurred in any potential proceeding I may need to commence against you, for damages caused by your hand with your slanderous acts made against me in you twisted, misapplied logic and reasoning.

Further, and in addition to claiming Ontario as jurisdiction, my time at a rate of \$500 per hour spent in pursuit of damages, along with all other costs and expenses, I also claim punitive damages to be calculated at a rate of ten-fold against the sum total assessed for my damages, time, expenses and costs.

Finally, upon judgement against you, with my verified claim being presented, should I deem damages have been incurred by your slander, I claim the right to charge interest at a rate of 2% per month or

26.82% per annum, for any payment of damages so endorsed by a court which remains outstanding after 30 days post judgement.

You have been duly notified.

Regards.

Amanda Ridding

11.5 2025-04-11, 12:57 - email from Ian to Amanda

Hello Amanda,

Instead of shooting first and asking questions later, why don't you first ask questions and then consider shooting later.

I have been hammering away about the huge problems in our freedom community: the lack of unity, the lack of discipline, the lack of organization, the lack of infrastructure/structure, the lack of leadership, the lack of channels of communication and the lack of so many other things that have severely handicapped our fight in this global war. All our groups accept as fact we are in a global war and all our groups accept as fact we face a tsunami of problems that cabal has overwhelmed us with in this global war. So instead of trying to pound me into the pavement with a legal suit against me, how about acknowledging the huge problems we face and help me start building the unity we so desperately need to fight and win this global war?

On the other hand, if your pride and ego demand you pound me into the pavement, then do what you must do. You will only be supporting and proving my talking points right. BTW, you can't get blood from rock. I live off a small pension and below the poverty line. I have little and if taking what little I have makes you feel better then knock yourself out.

Chuckle! You are correct, I have been and continue to be ignored, for reasons of turf wars, egos and echo chambers I have been talking about for several years now.

Ian

11.6 2025-04-11, 13:18 – email Amanda to Ian

Not going to waste my time on you Ian, unless I see damages arising from your slanderous actions.

The fact that you refuse to provide me with your address of service speaks volumes.

If I respond, it will be under a proper challenge registered with a court of inherent jurisdiction, but only if I see damages arising from your slanderous actions.

Like I said before, I presume most people ignore you, because they see through you, and don't see the value in what you have spent so much time manipulating.

Regards,

Amanda Ridding

DISCLAIMER: All information shared is not to be construed as legal advice; any thing shared is being shared for information purposes only.

Any one sharing information from Canadian Law Study Group recommends you validate all information with a qualified legal professional.

Sent from Proton Mail Android