

# Report #2 – Stand4Thee

Ian Bell

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

email: [info@virusfraud.org](mailto:info@virusfraud.org)

February, 2025

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction.....	5
2 Video and Text reports.....	7
2.1 Video section times.....	7
3 Part I – The Truth.....	10
3.1 Mission statement.....	12
3.1.1 Objective #1.....	12
3.1.2 Objective #2.....	13
3.2 Self-representation.....	14
3.3 Law-fare.....	16
3.4 Sovereignty and constitution.....	19
3.4.1 The Myth Is Canada.....	20
3.4.2 No proof!.....	22
3.4.2.1 Is Canada a sovereign nation?.....	23
3.4.2.2 Magna Carta.....	26
3.4.2.3 Who is the government?.....	29
3.4.2.4 Amanda Ridding.....	31
3.5 Rebecca works alone.....	32
4 Part 2 – A three step assessment.....	36
4.1 Step 1 – The three critical criteria.....	36
4.1.1 Critical criteria #1.....	36
4.1.2 Critical criteria #2.....	37
4.1.3 Critical criteria #3.....	38
4.1.4 Summary – the three critical criteria.....	38
4.2 Step 2 – NRRM.....	38
4.3 Step 3 – OSMR.....	39
4.3.1 LEGO action.....	41
4.3.2 LEGO action initiatives.....	41
4.3.3 Trudeau for treason.....	42

4.3.3.1 Objective..... 42

4.3.3.2 Strategy..... 42

    4.3.3.2.1 Strategy to bring back our lawful right to a grand jury..... 42

    4.3.3.2.2 Strategy for holding Trudeau and others to account..... 43

4.3.3.3 Metric..... 44

4.3.3.4 Result..... 44

4.3.3.5 Summary..... 44

4.3.4 Block digital ID..... 45

4.3.5 15-minute city..... 46

4.3.6 Kill bill C-293..... 47

4.3.7 Notice of liability and parent info + action..... 50

5 Conclusion..... 51

6 Rebecca has been notified of this report..... 53

7 Appendix A..... 54

    7.1 Rebecca’s opening post..... 54

    7.2 Ian..... 57

    7.3 Rebecca..... 57

    7.4 Ian..... 57

    7.5 Rebecca..... 58

    7.6 Ian..... 58

    7.7 Nathalie..... 58

    7.8 Jessica Clare..... 59

    7.9 Rebecca..... 59

    7.10 Jessica Clare..... 61

    7.11 Ian..... 61

    7.12 Rebecca..... 61

    7.13 O Lam..... 62

    7.14 Raoul..... 62

    7.15 Ian..... 63

    7.16 Rebecca..... 63

7.17 Ian..... 64

7.18 Rebecca,..... 65

7.19 Ian..... 65

7.20 Rebecca..... 66

7.21 Ian..... 66

7.22 Rebecca..... 66

7.23 Ian..... 67

8 Appendix B..... 68

9 Appendix C..... 70

9.1 2025-02-18 – email from Ian to Rebecca..... 70

9.2 2025-02-28 – My exchange with Rebecca and Amanda Ridding..... 70

9.2.1 Context..... 70

9.2.2 Amanda..... 71

9.2.3 Ian..... 71

9.2.4 Rebecca..... 71

9.2.5 Ian..... 72

9.2.6 Rebecca..... 73

9.2.7 Ian..... 73

9.2.8 Rebecca..... 73

9.2.9 Amanda..... 74

9.2.10 Ian..... 74

9.2.11 Amanda..... 75

9.2.12 Ian..... 75

9.2.13 Ian..... 75

9.2.14 Amanda..... 75

9.2.15 Amanda..... 76

9.2.16 Ian..... 76

9.2.17 Amanda..... 77

# 1 INTRODUCTION

- This is the second in a series of my reports that take a close look at our toothless chihuahuas here in Canada. This second report is about the group Stand4Thee (S4T).<sup>1</sup>
- Toothless chihuahuas is a descriptor I began using in January of 2024 to mock and ridicule our fake freedom fighters here in Canada.<sup>2</sup> Why you ask? Let me explain.
- World War III is raging, right now, as I prepare this report.
  - An estimated 17 million people were killed by September, 2023. Today, that number has likely climbed to between 25 to 30 million people and will continue to climb.
  - Just as many or more have been injured, many with lifelong severe and debilitating injuries.
  - It is only our side, the little people, that is being killed and injured.
  - WW III is not fought with guns and bullets.
  - The cabal is waging 5<sup>th</sup> generation warfare against us, the little people. This is a class war.
  - 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 have been overwhelmed on all fronts, with what is referred to as “*Onmiwar*”.<sup>3</sup>
  - There is only one way we win this war. We must eliminate the cabal and it’s global network.
  - It will take billions of us little people, united and working together with a common vision and direction, to defeat and eliminate the cabal.
  - Unfortunately, our toothless chihuahuas have proven themselves to be incompetent and impotent in fighting this global war.
  - Our toothless chihuahuas refuse to commit to the only course of action that can win this war for us – unity with our large scale numbers.
  - All I am doing in my reports is calling out our toothless chihuahuas like S4T for the fake freedom fighters they have proven themselves to be.
- There are two parts to this report on S4T.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://stand4thee.com/>

<sup>2</sup> [There are no freedom fighters in Canada!](#)

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

- Rebecca claims S4T is all about the truth. Part 1 looks at the truth behind S4T’s mission statement, self-representation, what S4T has to say about Canada’s sovereignty and constitution, and the reason S4T works alone.
- Part 2 applies my three step process to show S4T fails to understand the fundamentals about this global war of Technocracy and Transhumanism. <sup>4</sup>
- Before continuing, there are two points I would like to make:
  1. I want to make clear, at the start of this report, that I know little about our legal system and our laws. What little I know comes from having followed and monitored S4T for 4 years, since 2021.
  2. In November of last year, Rebecca banned me from her Telegram group. She banned me for calling her bluff about one of her action initiatives, for explaining why her initiative would fail. The details can be found in *Appendix A*. It serves as a fitting example of all that is wrong with S4T.

---

<sup>4</sup> [How to identify a toothless chihuahua.](#)

## 2 VIDEO AND TEXT REPORTS

- This report on Stand4Thee 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

- The document 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 00:03:12 that is, at the 3 minute and 12 second mark.
    - Similarly, section 2.1 of this document is titled “**Video section times**”. In the video, this section starts at time 00:03:38, that is, at the 3 minute and 38 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	00:00:09
2 Video and Text reports	00:03:12
2.1 Video section times	00:03:38
3 Part I – The Truth	00:04:46
3.1 Mission statement	00:06:48
3.1.1 Objective #1	00:07:15
3.1.2 Objective #2	00:09:38

3.2 Self-representation	00:11:00
3.3 Law-fare	00:16:19
3.4 Sovereignty and constitution	00:22:30
3.4.1 The Myth Is Canada	00:23:54
3.4.2 No proof!	00:29:24
3.4.2.1 Is Canada a sovereign nation?	00:29:42
3.4.2.2 Magna Carta	00:35:01
3.4.2.3 Who is the government?	00:39:35
3.4.2.4 Amanda Ridding	00:44:55
3.5 Rebecca works alone	00:46:26
4 Part 2 – A three step assessment	00:52:38
4.1 Step 1 – The three critical criteria	00:53:21
4.1.1 Critical criteria #1	00:53:33
4.1.2 Critical criteria #2	00:56:05
4.1.3 Critical criteria #3	00:57:08
4.1.4 Summary – the three critical criteria	00:57:58
4.2 Step 2 – NRRM	00:58:38
4.3 Step 3 – OSMR	01:00:16
4.3.1 LEGO action	01:03:58
4.3.2 LEGO action initiatives	01:05:28
4.3.3 Trudeau for treason	01:05:50



4.3.3.2 Strategy	01:06:48
4.3.3.2.1 Strategy to bring back our lawful right to a grand jury	01:07:10
4.3.3.2.2 Strategy for holding Trudeau and others to account	01:09:23
4.3.3.3 Metric	01:10:57
4.3.3.4 Result	01:11:26
4.3.3.5 Summary	01:12:12
4.3.4 Block digital ID	01:13:09
4.3.5 15-minute city	01:15:07
4.3.6 Kill bill C-293	01:18:03
4.3.7 Notice of liability and parent info + action	01:22:20
5 Conclusion	01:22:56

### 3 PART I – THE TRUTH

- Let's get into part 1 of this report.
- First, a bit of S4T trivia.
  - S4T was created in late 2020 as a collaborative effort between Jane Scharf and Rebecca Shepherd.
  - Jane was a driving force behind S4T and was a mentor to Rebecca.
  - In late 2023, Jane disappeared from S4T and we still don't know why. For a group that regularly boasts it is all about the truth, this is one truth it has kept secret.
  - Today, Rebecca Shepherd and S4T are one and the same. If Rebecca leaves then S4T dies.
- Rebecca likes to say S4T is all about *"the truth"*.
  - 2024-12-27 - [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom Dec 27th - What's the Future of Stand4THEE?](#)

- 00:05:06 - *"And we are learning the truth... And the truth is really what sets us free."*
- 00:06:16 - *"Because the truth comes out. It always comes out. It slips out. It comes out for sensationalism. It comes out. You know, it's like in every lie, there's the truth, right? In every lie, there's the truth."*
- 00:15:05 – *"The Real Deal - The truth will set you free"*
- 00:24:35 - *"They're afraid of us learning the truth and of us empowering ourselves with the truth"*
- 00:27:30 - *"educating ourselves on the truth"*

- 2024-11-22 - [Bill 24: Hijacking AB Bill of Rights - Rebecca Sheppard](#)

- 00:21:22 – *“Now I feel compelled to show you guys this because the truth is important...”*

- 2024-10-05 - [Stand4THEE Interview with Cullen McDonald & Canuck Law](#)

- 01:39:37 - *“...we are all about the truth”*
- 01:45:03 – *“I’m going to speak for everybody here. We always want the truth, the good, bad and the ugly. Because if we don't see the truth then we don't know how to fix things.”*

- 2023-07-28 - [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom July 28 2023 - Magna Carta](#)

- 00:47:10 - *“If there is one thing that is important in all of this, is the truth. And even if the truth hurts, we must hear it!”*

- Let’s take a look at an example of what Rebecca calls the truth.

*A lot of them support us. I think I would say 60 to 70 percent of them support us I'm just pulling that number out of my ass But I would say the majority support us...<sup>5</sup>*

- In this last clip, Rebecca is talking about the level of support S4T has among the police force.
- There are many of them across Canada. But which police force is Rebecca talking about? The answer is we don’t know and Rebecca doesn’t tell us.
- Like so many things, the truth is Rebecca has no data and no idea of what support she has from the police.
- Her claim is based on nothing more than a few anecdotal observations.
- In other words, Rebecca is simply expressing her opinion, an unsubstantiated opinion.

---

<sup>5</sup> [https://rumble.com/v63g9y2-stand4thee-friday-night-zoom-dec-27th-whats-the-future-of-stand4thee.html?e9s=src\\_v1\\_upp](https://rumble.com/v63g9y2-stand4thee-friday-night-zoom-dec-27th-whats-the-future-of-stand4thee.html?e9s=src_v1_upp), see time 01:42:09

- This is a reoccurring pattern at S4T where, using Rebecca own words, she pulls things out of her butt and calls it the truth.

## 3.1 Mission statement

- What is it that S4T claims is it's primary purpose or objective?
- From the “Mandate” web page, this group has two objectives:
  1. To ensure our government and courts operate based on the principles of common law inherited from the English system and,
  2. To maintain common law in Canada by educating people in common law.

### 3.1.1 OBJECTIVE #1

- The first and primary objective stated in the S4T mission statement is:

*It has been our intention since the beginning to ensure that the government and court regard their obligation to operate based on the principles of common law we inherited from the English system.*

- If you asked people today what they understand is common law then most of them will give you the deer-in-the-head-lights look.
- What exactly is it that Rebecca understands is or constitutes “common law”?
  - We don't know and Rebecca doesn't tell us.
  - Conspicuously, I can't find anything on the website that explains what common law is.
  - Rebecca currently has about 250 videos on her Rumble channel. I have not found one that explains what common law is.
  - I've heard Rebecca briefly talk about trial-by-jury and about some of the processes involved in trial-by-jury. I've also read Rebecca's Grand Jury Overview.<sup>6</sup> However, Rebecca's understanding of common law appears to be as basic and lacking as is her understanding about Magna Carta, something I talk about in section 3.4.2.2.

---

<sup>6</sup> [Grand Jury Overview](#)

- There is a long history to common law but you will not get that history or understanding from Rebecca.
- If you are someone like me who knew nothing about “*common law*” then Rebecca will have you making the mistake of assuming “*common law*” is simply “*case law*”.
- What little I now know about common law doesn't come from Rebecca but rather from the few sources I've since read such as “*Democracy Defined: The Manifesto*” by Kenn D'Oudney and “*Seven Absolute Rights: Recovering the Historical Foundations of Canada's Rule of Law*” by Ryan Alford.
- Now set that aside for now. Let's assume for the sake of argument that Rebecca fully understands what common law is. Let's get back to her objective which is to ensure our government and courts use common law.
- What is Rebecca primary strategy to achieve her primary objective? The answer is we don't know and Rebecca doesn't tell us.
  - It is reasonable to assume Rebecca hasn't even defined one.
- Rebecca and S4T are constantly complaining about the lower “*bastard*” courts not accepting case law and the Bill of Rights.
  - But what part of that, or anything that S4T does, “*ensures our government and courts operate based on the principles of common law?*”
  - The answer nothing.
  - The fact is there is nothing S4T can do to ensure our government and courts operate based on common law. Rebecca and her members know this is the truth.
- In short, S4T has completely ignores it's primary objective.

### 3.1.2 OBJECTIVE #2

- The second objective stated in the S4T mission statement is:

*To maintain common law in Canada by educating people in common law.*

- First, as already mentioned, it appears Rebecca and most of her members only have a very basic, introductory understanding of what common law is.
  - As such, whatever education they offer on common law a case of the blind leading the blind.

- Second, S4T has no numbers. As I will later discuss in section 4.2, I estimate Rebecca only has about a dozen active members, again, none of which are qualified to teach common law.
- Third, over about the past 18 months, Rebecca has been jumping from issue to issue to issue.
  - She is struggling to make S4T meaningful and relevant.
  - She is just trying to keep S4T alive.
  - The last thing on her mind is trying to educate people in common law.
- Again, S4T completely ignores it's second objective.
- But even if Rebecca was not ignoring her first and second objectives, they are unrealistic goals that S4T cannot ever hope to achieve them, if only for the obvious reason it has no numbers and never will have any numbers.

## 3.2 Self-representation

- Self-representation is S4T's big claim to fame.
  - S4T members says this is empowering.
  - Don't hire a lawyer, represent yourself!
- Craps is a dice game, a gambling game, where players bet on the outcomes of the roll of a pair of dice.<sup>7</sup>
  - Self-representation is also a gamble with odds of winning not much better than those in the game of Craps.
  - My sense is for each person who might have benefited from self-representation, there are dozens more for whom self-representation failed.
  - But we will never know for certain because, in general, Rebecca doesn't track her progress or report her failures.
  - This is one truth S4T wants to obscure and keep hidden.
- However, Rebecca and her members have become their own critics. They provide ample reasons why self-representation is like a crap shoot. Let's take a look at some of them:
  - 1) The learning curve is very steep and difficult.
    - If you are lucky enough to receive guidance from the very few people with any self-representation experience then you are still looking at a minimum of many months of intensive learning and preparation.

---

<sup>7</sup> [Craps by Wikipedia](#)

- S4T hasn't built a support network. You are essentially alone and on your own.
- Most people will not have the mental fortitude, abilities and/or resources to do this well or at all.

2) A good part of the learning curve is to understand and recognize when courts violate their own rules or process of law.

- For example, you have the right to face your accuser. In the case of covid tickets, the PHAC officer is "*your accuser*".<sup>8</sup>
- If the PHAC officer doesn't show up for your court appearance then this is sufficient grounds for the charges against you to be dropped.
- However, if you fail to inform the court that the PHAC officer isn't present then the court will not automatically drop the charges and the crown prosecutor will proceed in its case against you.
- This is a clear violation of your basic rights, something the court is fully aware of and should – but will not intervene – to enforce/protect.
- You are on your own.

3) Your case can drag on for several years as happened to Kelly Hale, Cullen McDonald, Kimberly Woolman and many others.

- Jamie Gale has been representing herself in court for just over a year and her case is still ongoing.
- Randy Hillier's case has dragged on for several years, is also ongoing, with what can only be described as malicious prosecution by the crown.
- These aren't the exceptions.
- Self-representation takes a big toll on you and your family.

4) Your chances of beating charges and tickets in the lower "*bastard*" courts is very low.

- These are "*statute courts*" which don't recognize the Bill of Rights and case law, both of which are central to what S4T preaches and teaches.
- The "*bastard*" courts don't have "*inherent jurisdiction*" like the superior courts.
- Don't expect to win in the lower courts.
- You will have to appeal and try to move your case into a superior court, another factor that drags your case on.

5) Expect to face law-fare.

---

<sup>8</sup> PHAC – Public Health Agency of Canada

- When you go to court don't expect you will only be up against the crown prosecutors. Expect the judge, the administrators, the crown prosecutors and the courts will often be working to find you guilty.
- Don't expect their goal is to determine the truth, to separate right from wrong, and assume you are innocent until proven guilty. As members of S4T can attest to, and this includes Rebecca and Kimberly, you are guilty until proven innocent.
- Donald Best, Bruce Pardy and others with extensive experience with our legal system are very frank and to the point; our legal system no longer abides by the rule of law.
- Sure there are good judges and good people in our legal system. But there are many, many bad and/or corrupted judges and people and you don't get to choose which ones you go up against.
- If you cannot generate sufficient public interest and public attendance in your court appearances then your probability of winning in any court is low, regardless of how strong your legal arguments are.

6) Self-representation is an extremely stressful and exhausting experience with every step forward being a fight against a legal system that has been captured by foreign driven agendas.

7) Don't expect to be able to hold our legal system accountable for the law-fare it wages against you. S4Ts track record in holding these people accountable is zero.

8) Your chances of winning with self-representation are low. Your chances of winning by hiring a lawyer to represent you are even lower. Yes, you read that right.

- Lawyers are trained to use the Charter of Rights (COR), which is so deeply and fundamentally flawed that using the COR as a defense almost guarantees you will be found guilty of the covid charges.
  - Heed the old adage, *"An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure"*.
  - The message I take away from S4T is stay out of and avoid our courts and legal system at all costs.
  - Self-representation should only be used as a last resort measure.
- The novelty and luster of self-representation has been lost and we now understand just how little the return-on-investment self-representation provides.
  - The real and many problems with self-representation point to a much deeper and systemic problem with our legal system, problems which raise the question what is the law?

### **3.3 Law-fare**

- There are three branches of government: 1) legislative 2) executive and 3) judicial.



- The legislative branch makes laws, the executive branch carries out the laws and the judicial branch evaluates the laws.<sup>9</sup>
- The idea is that each branch is supposedly separate thereby providing “*checks and balances*” against each other.
- Bruce Pardy explains,

*This separation of power isn't working right now because all three branches, especially in this country (i.e. Canada), seem to all more or less be on the same page. They are not checks and balances. They're colluding. The legislature is delegating its own powers to the executive branch. The courts are deferring to the executive branch. When there's a question about whether or not the executive agency had the power to do what it wants to do, the courts defer to it.<sup>10</sup>*

- We now have in Canada a legal system but not a justice system; it is legal but not lawful.
  - Rebecca and her members understand what that means.
  - Our legal system practices what is termed “*law-fare*”, where the law is a political tool that is weaponized against the people.
  - The *Coutt's Case*<sup>11</sup> and the case of Detective Helen Grus<sup>12</sup> 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.
  - Instead, what we have is rule-**BY**-law, where the law is a political tool to suppress and control the people.
- So what is the law?
  - The law is whatever the courts say it is!
  - And what the courts say the law is can change from one week to the next, from one case to another case, depending on what political and foreign driven agendas dictate.
- Would you like more examples? Sure you would!
  - Closer to home, Stand4Thee has reported in some detail on the cases of Byron Carr and Cullen McDonald.

---

<sup>9</sup> [The 3 Branches of Government and Their Functions](#)

<sup>10</sup> [Demonstrably Justified w/ Leighton Grey & Bruce Pardy](#) (see time 01:25:07)

<sup>11</sup> [Debunking CBC Part 2 w/ Betty Carbert & Marco Van Huigenbos](#)

<sup>12</sup> [Turmoil in Detective Grus Trial as Prosecutor Leaves Ottawa Police](#)

- Rebecca has been very clear, stating at different times, that her strong opinion is the only reason these men weren't found guilty was because of the relatively larger public turnout at their trials.
- For example, Rebecca said “*I truly believe that if Colin McDonald went in that room alone, it would have been a different situation. It would have been a different story.*”<sup>13</sup>
- What she is implicitly saying is it didn't matter these men were innocent, telling the truth and had strong legal defenses; they would have been found guilty had the public not turned up in sufficient numbers.
- Chris Weisdorf, who worked closely with Cullen, stated:

*If you read the decision, the decision was complete disconnected from reality. It's legal gaslighting.*<sup>14</sup>

- In addition, Chris stated:

*This is very much political. It's not based upon the truth or the facts or the law or any of those things. It's about literally getting right in there like in a hockey game and taking as many shots as in as possible, doing it properly, legally, and, and scoring. And that's it. That's what it comes down to. That's what it should not be like. They should respect the rule of law and respect the art of the arguments. At the end of the day, it does come down to putting pressure in terms of, you know, silent pressure, just showing up.*<sup>15</sup>

- In one of Rebecca's Friday night Zoom meetings, Alex from Canuck Law<sup>16</sup> commented about she was seeing our legal system:

*Obviously the bigger cases get a lot more attention, but yeah, the only successes I've encountered really so far, just really the little stuff. I hear about like people getting their tickets dropped or thrown out. I've encountered some like postings of people getting their EI (i.e. employment insurance) overturned because they were fired for no injection. **So I've seen some successes at the low level. I haven't encountered a single major case anywhere that's won.** (my emphasis)<sup>17</sup>*

---

<sup>13</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom Oct 11 - Cullen's Win!](#) see time 00:52:18

<sup>14</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom Oct 11 - Cullen's Win!](#), see time 00:06:16

<sup>15</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom Oct 11 - Cullen's Win!](#), see time 00:29:25

<sup>16</sup> <https://canucklaw.ca/>

<sup>17</sup> [Stand4THEE Interview with Cullen McDonald & Canuck Law](#) see time 01:40:09

- For those of you that are paying attention, you will note this last statement is indirectly aimed at Rebecca and S4T; the only successes are “*really just the little stuff*”, at the “*low level*”.
- But even public pressure is no guarantee for countering law-fare, something S4T learned first hand in the case of the expropriation of Tommy Craft’s property and destruction of his home.<sup>18</sup>
- Law-fare concedes and tosses us a few bones.
  - It is a few of these few bones that S4T exaggerates and counts as big wins, the Byron and Cullen cases included.
- The question is, what is it that Rebecca has S4T doing to challenge, counter and defeat law-fare? After all, the law is Rebecca’s focus of interest. The answer is nothing.
- Rebecca does talk about some of the problems in our legal system but that’s all it is; talk, talk and more talk.
- Rebecca states we have solid, sound constitutional and legal frameworks in place and that all we have to do is to restore them to proper functioning.
  - If that is indeed true then Rebecca has yet to demonstrate she has any idea of how we go about restoring them, especially ones that based on and use the principles of English common law.
- On the other hand, there is good reason to say that Rebecca is even wrong here, that we don't have solid, sound constitutional and legal frameworks.

### **3.4 Sovereignty and constitution**

- Rebecca regularly makes two points: 1) Canada is sovereign and 2) Canada has a constitution.
- Why is this important?
- Canada’s sovereignty and constitution are at the core of what S4T is all about, supposedly Rebecca’s “*area of expertise*” or at least things she should have a reasonably good understanding about.
- Rebecca argues if we renounce the BNA Act 1867 (a.k.a Constitution Act 1867) as Canada’s constitution, if we create a new constitution for Canada, and if we break our ties to the British monarchy then we forfeit our claim and right to use English common law.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom Nov 29 - Back to battle another day!](#) see time 00:05:00 to 00:28:00

<sup>19</sup> This is a false and straw-man argument. We could still choose to use English common law even if we create a new constitution for Canada and Canada break its ties to the British monarchy.

- But what if Canada has never been a sovereign country and the Constitution Act is not a legitimate constitution? That would mean everything Rebecca and S4T have been saying is in error and wrong.
- The truth is that Rebecca has no proof that Canada is a sovereign country and that Canada has a legitimate constitution.
- Instead, these two points are simply opinions that have become sacred cows S4T members mustn't challenge or question. To do so is heresy and can get heretics and non-believers excommunicated from the Order of Saint Rebecca.
- Let's get into the details because S4T is all about the truth, right!

### 3.4.1 THE MYTH IS CANADA

- Doug Force is the person behind the website The Myth Is Canada <sup>20</sup>.
  - Doug says Canada doesn't have a constitution and Canada is NOT a sovereign country.
  - On the surface, Doug and Rebecca appear to be saying opposite things, obviously one of them is wrong and the obvious question is which one is it?
- I've known about Doug's website for a few years but ignored it until recently, when Jason Lavigne had Doug on his show. <sup>21</sup>
  - Jason has become a source of information I trust and so I decided to spend some time on Doug's website.
  - For starters, I was intrigued by the 11 questions on Doug's home page.
  - Having followed and monitored S4T since 2021, these questions seemed to me to be to at the center of everything S4T is about.
- There are two key references I took from Doug's website.
  - The first is the book "*Ho Canada*" by R. Rogers Smith <sup>22</sup> and the second is "*Inside Canada*" also by R. Rogers Smith <sup>23</sup>.
  - Smith was a recognized Canadian constitutional expert. He argues that the BNA Act 1867 isn't a real constitution, it is only a statute of the UK parliament that was drafted by Lord Thring, the UK Parliament Secretary to the UK Treasury. <sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.themythiscanada.com/>

<sup>21</sup> [Peaceful Dethronement w/ Wayne Peters & Doug Force](#)

<sup>22</sup> [https://www.themythiscanada.com/pdfs/RRSmith/Ho\\_Canada-1965.pdf](https://www.themythiscanada.com/pdfs/RRSmith/Ho_Canada-1965.pdf)

<sup>23</sup> [https://www.themythiscanada.com/pdfs/RRSmith/Inside\\_Canada-1939.pdf](https://www.themythiscanada.com/pdfs/RRSmith/Inside_Canada-1939.pdf)

<sup>24</sup> "[Ho Canada](#)" by R. Rogers Smith, page 21

- Smith argues Canada is only geographical entity, but not a political entity. In other words, Canada isn't a sovereign country and doesn't have it's own constitution.
- These books by Smith hit home with many details and facts, all of which challenge, counter and refute Jane and Rebecca's belief that Canada is sovereign and has a real constitution. I found Smith's books to be a compelling read.
- Rebecca knows about Doug's website. So what does she have to say about it's contents?
  - As far as I am aware, the only thing I've heard from Rebecca is an evasive retort where she says, "*The Myth of Canada is also a myth*".<sup>25</sup>
  - The problem for Rebecca is Doug's references appear to be authoritative whereas she doesn't cite any references.
  - As such, what I take away from Rebecca's retort is she cannot refute the information on Doug's website.
  - She therefore evades and deflects with a terse, one line bluff (i.e. she fakes) that she knows better.
- It's not just Doug's website. Rebecca is fully aware there are different groups which challenge and refute the claim that Canada has a real constitution and is a sovereign country.
  - How does Rebecca prove them wrong? The answer is she doesn't and/or can't.
  - How does Rebecca prove her claim that Canada is sovereign and has a constitution? The answer is she doesn't and/or cannot. She cites no references. All she offers is her unsupported, unsubstantiated opinion.
- There is no shame in Rebecca acknowledging when she doesn't know something. But Rebecca shames herself when she pretends to know when she doesn't, as is almost certainly the case here with The Myth is Canada.
- Now consider that Rebecca says the final version of the Canadian Charter of Rights was very different from the original drafts. She states:

*...I was going back and looking at the documentation at like the special joint committee on the Constitution 1980, 1981. And if you read the information in there, they all knew it was shit. Everybody knew it was shit. But if you go back further, I think it was seven years. I feel like it was seven years. The original plan for the charter was completely different than what we got... there was an original outline of a charter and it was very, very different than the final version. And it actually, you know, it could have just been smoke and*

---

<sup>25</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom Nov 1 - Bills, Bills, Bills](#), see time 00:48:07. Rebecca reads a comment posted in the Zoom chat section. We don't know what the comment was but Rebecca's response to it was to say, "*The Myth of Canada is also a myth*".

*mirrors, but it sounded like something that could have been good. And then as it went through its iteration, it just became this piece of shit that it is.* <sup>26</sup>

- Roger Smith describes similar problems with the BNA Act 1867, where the final version of the BNA Act was quite different from the draft versions. If Rebecca recognizes some handy-panky went on between the drafts and final version of the Charter of Rights then presumably she should be open to Smith’s reporting that comparable hanky-panky occurred between the drafts and final version of the BNA Act 1867, right?
  - What does Rebecca have to say about this? The answer is she doesn't.
  - Rebecca is silent, as if she has never heard about Roger Smith and his books, something I know for certain isn't true.
  - The question is why? That’s a red flag for me.
- I have no qualifications to say whether Rogers Smith or any other constitutional expert is right or wrong.
  - But when I hear lay persons like Doug and Rebecca making opposite and contradictory claims then I expect them to be able to substantiate, to provide the data, that supports their claims.
  - I found Doug’s references to be very informative and compelling.
  - Rebecca has no references, she doesn't and/or cannot support her claims.
  - Remember, this is supposedly Rebecca’s area of expertise, or at least something she should be reasonably well informed about.
  - So Rebecca’s bluff about Doug’s website is, for me, an example where she is pulling stuff from her butt and calling it the truth.

### 3.4.2 NO PROOF!

- When Jane and Rebecca say Canada is sovereign and has a constitution, the truth is they are expressing nothing more than their unsupported opinions. Neither of them has provided any references or data that supports their opinions.
- If there is any proof that Canada is sovereign and has a real constitution then you won’t find that proof at S4T.
- I will illustrate this with four examples.

### 3.4.2.1 Is Canada a sovereign nation?

- The first example which illustrates Jane and Rebecca only express their opinions about sovereignty and constitution comes from the Friday night Zoom meeting on June 30, 2023.
- The description of this meeting reads as follows:

*The burning question...is Canada a sovereign nation? There's a lot of chatter on this hot topic. So I dive into the goings on of current and previous administrations – can they sign over our sovereignty to a foreign entity?*

- This meeting runs for just over two hours.
- The subject of sovereignty and constitution is only superficially touched on in a short 20 minute segment.<sup>27</sup>
- Here is an example of what Jane had to say:

*They want us to believe that our constitution has no teeth. It has huge teeth. And it's a constitution that stems from a series of events in British history that we call common law history, starting with the Magna Carta. Magna Carta was the beginning of a democracy where the people are in control, not the state. That hasn't changed. And our constitution is firmly and clearly based on that heritage on that common law heritage. And at no time have they ever changed that process. We still have the same process. And this notion that we don't have a constitution because of 1931 West Minister, that's that's bull crap. Because it said in there, we have the authority to establish an independent constitution and be an independent member of the Commonwealth all that. But we never did that. But it doesn't say if you don't do that, you have no constitution and you have no government blah, blah, blah. And in 1982, same thing. It said that we can make our own amendments going forward. And we can bring in a charter of rights and freedoms. Britain allowed it Britain passed a proclamation that this was allowed, but we never did it. So we have the same constitution that we had the British North American Act. And it's a solid and as well developed as it ever was, there's nothing that's ever been passed that takes anything away from the substance.<sup>28</sup>*

- Having since read a bit about Canada's constitutional history, I now realize just how weak Jane's arguments are.

---

<sup>27</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom June 30 2023](#), see time (00:10:00 to 00:30:00)

<sup>28</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom June 30 2023](#), see time 00:13:14

- Let's use the Statute of Westminster 1931 to illustrate.
  - Jane understands the Statute of Westminster 1931 has been interpreted in different ways.
  - She understands it marks a highly significant point in time for those who have an interpretation that challenges and contradicts her own interpretation.
  - For example, Doug Force at The Myth Is Canada challenges and contradicts Jane's interpretation. Doug's information, material and references are very compelling.
  - If Jane and Rebecca expect to maintain any credibility on this subject matter then they necessarily must provide comparatively strong and persuasive counter arguments and authoritative references.
  - It is simply insufficient for Jane and Rebecca to claim their interpretation is right, others are wrong, end of argument. And yet, that is effectively what Jane and Rebecca do.
  - Roger Smith wrote entire books to support his arguments. Jane and Rebecca offer nothing more than a few vocal blurbs.
- **Jane argued the following:**

*And this notion that we don't have a constitution because of 1931 Westminster, that's that's bull crap. Because it said in there, we have the authority to establish an independent constitution and be an independent member of the Commonwealth all that. But we never did that. But it doesn't say if you don't do that, you have no constitution and you have no government blah, blah, blah.<sup>29</sup>*

- How can you not laugh and be amused? Jane's argument consists of 3 points:
  1. "that's bull crap"
  2. "But we never did. But it doesn't say if you don't do that, you have no constitution and you have no government."
  3. "blah, blah, blah"
- Points 1 and 3 are self explanatory; Jane has no counter argument and is bluffing that she knows better.
- With regards to point 2, this is a logical fallacy.
  - The Statute of Westminster doesn't specify, one way or the other, what happens if the provinces didn't create a new constitution.

---

<sup>29</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom June 30 2023](#), see time 00:14:00



- Without additional information such as historical context – and Jane doesn't provide us with additional information – we cannot draw any conclusions about Canada's government, sovereignty and constitution after the passing of the Statute of Westminster.
- For laypersons like myself who don't know constitutional history – and Jane and Rebecca are also laypersons with a questionable understanding of constitutional history - the direct opposite of Jane's interpretation is equally plausible; Canada has an illegitimate government, it isn't a sovereign country and it has no constitution.
- Jane doesn't provide any references to support her interpretation. So at best, all Jane does is express her opinion, clearly an unsupported and unsubstantiated opinion.
- What about Rebecca?
  - She appears to be as little an authority on Canada's sovereignty and constitution as Jane. Consider this blurb:

*"...is that when people tell us, we're not sovereign, you're not sovereign, the politicians are controlling, we've signed off to, we've sold our rights to the WHO and the World Economic Forum and all these different groups, they are dis-empowering you by making you believe that you don't have any rights in Canada. And that is bullshit. It's the same thing as saying the courts are corrupt. And you know what? That's an easy cop out, isn't it? Because then you cannot do anything. So you might as well just sit back and do nothing. There's no point in fighting."*<sup>30</sup>

- As with Jane, how can you not laugh and be amused?
- Who exactly are the "people" and "they" that Rebecca is referring to? Who is saying "we've signed off to, we sold our rights"?:
  - I've listened to many of S4T meetings, from start to finish.
  - Aside from possibly Maggie Hope Braun, I have no idea who all these people are that Rebecca is referring to.
  - The good thing about anonymous bogymen is they can say anything Rebecca wants them to say.<sup>31</sup>
  - Anyways, Rebecca triumphantly brings this first straw-man argument to a close with the insightful and brilliant conclusion "That is bullshit".

---

<sup>30</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom June 30 2023](#), see time 00:18:40

<sup>31</sup> I've challenged Rebecca 5-6 times in her Telegram group. I was always civil and reasonable. She doesn't like being challenged and she ignored me. The last time I challenged her, Rebecca removed me from her Telegram group. In Appendix A" I provide details of that exchange. Rebecca had proposed a particular action/initiative and she deleted me from her group because I asked what her objective, strategy and metric were for this action.

- Having successfully demolished this straw-man, Rebecca proceeds to tackle another one. She says, *“It’s the same thing as saying the courts are corrupt... So you might as well just sit back and do nothing”*.
- It is again left to our imagination to speculate who Rebecca might be referring to, what the bogeymen actually said, and to understand the only conclusion the bogeymen could come to was to sit back and do nothing. Seriously, this is so conveniently vague.
- Boom, second straw-man demolished!
- Wow Rebecca, you rock straw-men!
- Those of you who have your thinking caps on will recognize Rebecca offers nothing that proves Canada is sovereign and has a real constitution, which of course, was supposed to be the main purpose of this meeting.
- I have more to say, but won’t, because that would be flogging a dead horse.
- If you think I am cherry picking my talking points then listen for yourself to the full 20 minute exchange between Jane and Rebecca.
- I go where the data leads.
  - Neither Jane or Rebecca lead with any data/references.
  - As such, I take whatever Jane and Rebecca have to say about Canada’s sovereignty and constitution with grain of salt.
- Ryan Alford wrote the book *“Seven Absolute Rights - Recovering the Historical Foundations of Canada’s Rule of Law”*.
  - In his book, he derides the limited understanding that people like Jane and Rebecca have about constitutional history, using Magna Carta as an example of that limited understanding.

### 3.4.2.2 Magna Carta

- The second example which illustrates Jane and Rebecca only express their opinions about sovereignty and constitution comes from the S4T Friday night Zoom meeting on July 28, 2023.
- The description of this meeting reads as follows:

*The wonderful Magna Carta is the main talking point for tonight. The background, it’s current relevancy and some of the highlights of the “Great Charter”*

- The meeting was eventful for me because it led me to reading two books:

1. *“Democracy Defined: The Manifesto”* by Kenn D’Oudney and,
  2. *“Seven Absolute Rights: Recovering the Historical Foundations of Canada’s Rule of Law”* by Ryan Alford.
- If what these books have to say is correct then most of what Jane and Rebecca preach, teach and practice, isn't common law. Maybe that’s why Rebecca never refers to them.
  - But that isn't what this section is about. This section looks at something Jane said as it relates to Canada’s sovereignty and constitution.
  - Late in this meeting, a person named Laura mentioned two versions of Magna Carta, the original 1215 version and the later 1297 version.<sup>32</sup> That led to the following exchange between Jane and Rebecca:<sup>33</sup>

- Jane: *That might be a bunch of bullshit though because the very context of the original one doesn't leave any room to overturn it or change it or repeal it or anything because it's not it wasn't passed through parliament so it cannot be unpassed through there.*
- Rebecca: *Yeah yeah it's like the same thing of saying that, and going back to Maggie, that because some corrupt politicians signed some corrupt document with a foreign entity that means that we don't have any sovereignty and that we are now bound by these international agreements. No we're not.*
- Jane: *i got sucked into the de facto argument about the Westminster statute that uh the UK gave Canada the authority to make its own constitution and be an independent member of the commonwealth. And we didn't do it so the theory was well then we don't have any constitution. Which wasn't true because that statute didn't say you have to do this immediately because in the meantime you have no constitution. And it's been i think it was 30 times we looked up since 1931 till now, UK made amendments so how can they make amendments to the constitution if that West Minister 1931 statute um like completely obliterated the constitution? So i got sucked into that whole everything's de facto.*

- Before I get to the point of this example, you will note Jane states the UK parliament amended the BNA Act 1867 at least 30 times since 1931 and then in the next breath refers to the BNA Act as our (i.e. Canada’s) constitution.

---

<sup>32</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom July 28 2023 - Magna Carta](#) see time 01:23:00

<sup>33</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom July 28 2023 - Magna Carta](#) see time 01:23:43 to 01:25:16

- You don't need to be a constitutional expert to ask the question, if Canada is sovereign and has its own constitution then how can a foreign country amend Canada's constitution?
- Again I am no constitutional expert but the reasonable and logical answer is that this means Canada is not sovereign and does not have its own constitution.
- As far as I am aware, Jane has never explained this inconsistency and contradiction.
- Shortly after, a person named Cathleen referenced the book “*Seven Absolute Rights*” by Ryan Alford.<sup>34</sup>
  - At that time, Jane, Rebecca and I didn't have the book but all of us were interested in getting it.
- Having since read the book, Alford makes it very clear that Jane is wrong, that the 1215 version of Magna Carta isn't the one and only authentic, legitimate version. In fact, Alford emphasizes the 1297 version of Magna Carta.
- Alford cites “*The Queen v. Lindsay*” case in Canada and what he has to say about this case has a direct bearing on Jane and Rebecca. David Lindsay, the person in this case, is self taught in law and promotes self-representation in court.<sup>35</sup> Alford wrote:

*His (i.e. David's) argument was predicated on section 40 of Magna Carta which he translated as: 'To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right of justice.' ... The judgment that decided his case concluded that Magna Carta was not an instrument of constitutional significance in Canada. This is undoubtedly correct: if all the provisions of a thirteenth-century instrument were held to be legally binding in the present day, then patently absurd results would follow...<sup>36</sup>*

- Alford doesn't hold a favorable opinion of people like Jane, Rebecca and David in regards to their understanding of Magna Carta:

*Canadians' loss of familiarity with the medieval history of Magna Carta – other than its broadest strokes – is lamentable. Unfortunately, if the only people arguing about the meaning of Magna Carta in courts (as opposed to in academic literature) are self-*

---

<sup>34</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom July 28 2023 - Magna Carta](#) see time 01:29:13

<sup>35</sup> I've listened to David Lindsay speak in Action4Canada online meetings. After being promoted by Action4Canada, I bought David's book “*The Common Law Education and Rights Initiative*” and attended his workshop. They were a complete waste of my time and money. My opinion is, what Action4Canada and David recommended amounted to legal mine field that was guaranteed to blow up anyone foolish enough to enter into it.

<sup>36</sup> See the section “The scope of the principles protected by pre-confederation statutes requires attention” in chapter 2 of “*Seven Absolute Rights*” by Ryan Alford.

*represented litigants who (as discussed in chapter two) believe that it specifically prohibits charging fees for court transcripts, it is inevitable that jurists will begin to view it with suspicion. Through neglect and abuse, then, this instrument has become familiar to most working judges in Canada as a hobbyhorse ridden only by the eccentric and the vexatious.*

*Yet it may be precisely because its protections were so well embedded in our constitutional order, such that any violation would be practically unthinkable, that it has become possible for an instrument of this magnitude to degenerate in the popular imagination to this state.<sup>37</sup>*

- I have little understanding of Canada’s constitutional history other than the few books I have read.
- But what Jane and Rebecca have to say about Canada’s sovereignty and constitution raises many, many questions and answers none.
- Conspicuously, the S4T website is devoid of any information, material or content that addresses the inconsistencies and contradictions in Jane’s and Rebecca’s opinion about Canada’s sovereignty and constitution.

### 3.4.2.3 Who is the government?

- The third example which illustrates Rebecca only expresses her opinion about sovereignty and constitution comes from the Friday night Zoom meeting on August 2, 2024.
- In this meeting, someone put a comment in the chat section that Rebecca read out loud.<sup>38</sup>
- The comment quoted the first three of the 11 questions listed on the home page of Doug Force’s website, the Myth is Canada:

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?*

---

<sup>37</sup> See the last two paragraphs in the first section of chapter 3 of “Seven Absolute Rights” by Ryan Alford.

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?*

- Let me remind you again that Canada’s sovereignty and constitution are things that Rebecca should be reasonably well informed about.
- Rebecca read the three questions and her response is embarrassingly contradictory and incoherent. Here is what she said:

*But hold on a second. You're not, have you read the Constitution because it doesn't say, nowhere in there does it say that we are independent of the crown. So I think you're mixed. There's, there's, I think there's a concept that we are a sovereign nation. We, okay, let me frame this up. We are a sovereign nation, but we, there's still a connection to the crown. That's obvious. That is obvious. And I don't actually disagree with that for the reasons that I've stated. And because without the, without having the, well, the crown actually isn't the boss is technically. Well, yeah, no, the crown is still the boss, but the crown hasn't really been interfering in Canadian law in some time.<sup>39</sup>*

- Watch the clip again and note how Rebecca squirms like a worm on a hook; she tries, but fails, to lie her way out of this predicament.
- What and where are Rebecca’s supposed reasons that Canada still has a connection to the crown? We don’t know and Rebecca doesn’t tell us.
- In one breath, Rebecca states Canada is a sovereign country. In the next breath she contradicts herself by saying the crown is still the boss (i.e. Canada’s boss), where the “boss” refers to England.
- Which is it Rebecca? Is Canada a sovereign country or a subject of the UK?.
- But here is the more important point. Rebecca cannot refute the first three questions. She’s out of ammunition and resorts to firing blanks.
- Rebecca conveniently let’s herself get distracted by a second comment someone posts in the Zoom chat.
  - We don’t know what the actual comment is but Rebecca’s response to it is relatively long so I add it separately in Appendix B.

- She all but agrees Doug Force is right and she is wrong. Here are the incriminating points of what she said:

*...so even if, even if all of this is true that we never confederated blah, blah, blah, here's the thing. We have since 1867, been operating even in this like fake bullshit land we're still on which is the fake thing that they put on top of the foundation is that they, if the foundation was so crap, then they wouldn't have had to hide it or hijack it. ...*

*...When something, and this is part of the issues that we have to tackle that happen with COVID is where, even if something is atypical, unlawful or maybe against procedure, **if it happens and it remains unchallenged, it becomes the norm** (my emphasis)...*

- Rebecca is saying that even if Doug Force is correct - that the BNA Act 1867 was never a Canadian constitution, that the Canadian government is illegitimate – none of that matters.
- Rebecca is arguing it doesn't matter what is right or wrong but only what is; all that matters is what you can get away with and that becomes “*the norm*”.
- So if the powers-that-be got away with an illegitimate constitution and illegitimate governments, then too bad, suck it up!
- Let's be very, very clear here. What Rebecca is saying is might-is-right and fuck the law!
- Let me summarize all of this for you.
  - Rebecca doesn't have a clue of how to prove that Canada is sovereign and has a legitimate constitution.
  - If Canada is really sovereign and has a legitimate constitution then there must be, and will be, a long paper trail that provides the proof.
  - Where is that proof Rebecca? The answer is she doesn't know.
  - This leads to the fourth and final example which puts the nail in the coffin that, when it comes to proving Canada is sovereign and has a legitimate constitution, Rebecca is shooting blanks.

#### 3.4.2.4 Amanda Ridding

- The fourth and final example which illustrates Rebecca only expresses her opinion about sovereignty and constitution comes from the Zoom meeting on January 4, 2025 where Amanda Ridding was talking about her own work.
- The start of the meeting was delayed because of technical problems.

- To fill some time, Rebecca decided to improvise and offered this nugget of gold that explains in her own words why Canada is a sovereign country.

*“Anyone who's saying that Canada is a myth, I oppose that. And there's a lot of reasons for that. And I would say the biggest reason for that is that when we believe that Canada doesn't exist, when you believe that Canada as a country has never existed, it makes it very easy for us to not fight for it.”*

- I really laughed when I heard this nonsense.
- Rebecca has had four years, since 2021, to prepare a statement, that includes irrefutable and conclusive data/references, as to why Canada is sovereign and has a legitimate constitution.
- After four years, all Rebecca has to offer is this mind numbing blurb that we must BELIEVE Canada exists otherwise we won't want to fight for it.
- Rebecca is bluffing. She doesn't have “a lot of reasons”. She has only one reason, which she tells us here, and that one reason is nothing more than an uninformed and unsubstantiated opinion.
- It looks like S4T is built on a house of cards that is teetering towards collapse.

### 3.5 Rebecca works alone

- Part 1 of this report examines a number of truths about S4T. This report will look at one more truth before moving on to Part 2.
- Rebecca has been very clear about why she works alone:

*I don't know any other groups that are pushing the bill <sup>40</sup>, who reject the charter <sup>41</sup>, who will take the time to dissect the BNA Act <sup>42</sup>, who are interested in restoring true government. If you find me that group guys, I will work with them 100%” <sup>43</sup>*

- All our toothless chihuahuas face a common enemy.
  - That common enemy is a colossus that owns and/or controls our entire world.

---

<sup>40</sup> [Canadian Bill of Rights](#)

<sup>41</sup> [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#)

<sup>42</sup> BNA Act 1867 was renamed the [Constitution Act 1867](#)

<sup>43</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom Dec 27th - What's the Future of Stand4THEE?](#), see time 01:45:49



- Our toothless chihuahuas refuse to unite to defeat that colossus and have a million excuses why they refuse to unite.
- Let's take a look at Rebecca's excuse.
  - Rebecca's says there are 4 criteria that must be met if she is to work with other groups:
    1. a group must "*push*" the Bill of Rights
    2. a group must "*reject*" the Charter of Rights
    3. a group must "*dissect*" the BNA Act 1867
    4. a group must be "*interested in restoring true government*".
- Let's start excuse 4.
  - What exactly does Rebecca mean by "*true government*"?
  - The answer is we don't know and Rebecca doesn't tell us. She leaves it to our imagination to speculate what she means.
  - If you've followed S4T for any length of time then you understand "*true government*" is simply what Rebecca says it is.
    - It is her opinion and nothing more than her opinion.
    - We know this because she never cites authoritative references, or for that matter, any references.
- What if Rebecca is completely wrong about what she thinks is "*true government*"?
  - Why should we believe what Rebecca says when all she has to offer is her unsubstantiated opinion?
  - Let's again compare Rebecca with Doug Force.
    - Doug states that the Canadian government has been illegitimate since 1931 with the passing of the Statute of Westminster.
    - Doug is implicitly saying Rebecca is wrong and doesn't know what she is talking about.
    - Who is right, Rebecca or Doug?
    - I am not a constitutional expert. But if I was asked for my opinion then I lean heavily towards what Doug is saying.
    - I have more than a few reasons why I favor Doug but the most prominent is that his references and arguments are very compelling.
    - In contrast, Rebecca provides no references and, as I have already demonstrated, her arguments are feeble and flimsy. Rebecca stands on very weak and shaky ground.

- It is in this context that we begin to understand “*true government*” is just an excuse Rebecca uses to protect her petty turf war.
- Let’s go right to the crux of the problem that plagues Rebecca and S4T.
  - Regarding excuse 1, Rebecca has tunnel vision when it comes to the Bill of Rights (BOR).
    - The question is, how can the BOR be used to defeat and eliminate the cabal and it’s global network? The answer it can’t.
    - The cabal is above our laws. The truth is that Rebecca and her members know this.
    - So it doesn't matter what Rebecca has to say about the BOR because it doesn't impact the cabal’s agendas in any way.
  - Regarding excuse 3, Rebecca also has tunnel vision when it comes to the BNA Act 1867.
    - What I just said about excuse 1 also applies to excuse 3. The cabal is above the law.
    - There is nothing Rebecca can do with the BNA Act that contributes to eliminating the cabal and it’s global network.
  - Regarding excuse 2, it is irrelevant what Rebecca thinks about the Charter of Rights (COR), again for the simple reason the cabal is also above the law.
- Today, I estimate Rebecca only has about a dozen active members working on her initiatives.
  - The highest number of viewers I have observed in S4T weekly Friday night meetings was about 200 and that was in 2023.
  - Today, S4T weekly meetings are down to 70 ± 10 viewers.
  - Now consider the S4T’s National Telegram group. If I recall correctly, when Rebecca banned me from this group last year, the number of members in that group has been constant at about 1,500 people.
  - In most Telegram groups, I have roughly estimated that only about 1% of group members are active. Accordingly, 1% of 1,500 people is 15 and that is well within my ball park figure of “about a dozen active members” in S4T today.
  - The official S4T Telegram channel has remained unchanged at a bit under 1,800 members. Accordingly, 1% of 1,800 people is about 18 people, again well within my ball park figure of “about a dozen active members” in S4T today.
  - But let’s be generous and, today, assume all 70 + 10 viewers in the Friday night Zoom meetings are active members. That would still leave S4T today with only 80 active people, and that is from across all of Canada.
  - Technically, Rebecca is not alone. But practically speaking, she is very, Very, VERY much alone.

- Now we come to the real truth about Rebecca and S4T, a truth that comes right from the horses mouth. As reported in section 7.9 of the written version of this report, this is what Rebecca has to say about her group:

*Through my own experience, I see that \*most\* of us who are working to create change are just regular people with little to no activism background. **Most of us have very little influence in all of this and lack the resources to cast a wide net** (my emphasis). However, we are do what we can. <sup>44</sup>*

- Rebecca acknowledges what I have been saying all along; S4T has no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle. S4T also has no results despite four years of effort.
  - Rebecca is not fighting to win this global war. Rebecca is not fighting for Canada.
  - All Rebecca and her few members are doing is playing freedom fighter like a child plays house with her dolls.
- That brings part 1 of this report to a close and moves us into part 2. Part 2 shows that S4T cannot even get right the fundamentals of how to fight and win this global war of Technocracy and Transhumanism.

---

<sup>44</sup> See section 7.9

## 4 PART 2 – A THREE STEP ASSESSMENT

- I have defined a three step process <sup>45</sup> that I use to assess and evaluate all our groups that claim to be fighting this global tyranny of T&T that the cabal is waging against us little people.
- These three steps are about the fundamentals that are at the core of everything we should be doing 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!
- In part 2, I assess Rebecca and S4T using my three step process.
- For me, this is where S4T begins to provide real entertainment.
- I am constantly laughing at the absurdity that S4T keeps churning out.

### 4.1 Step 1 – The three critical criteria

- Let's start with step 1 which uses three criteria to assess a person or group.
- I will walk you through each of these three criteria.

#### 4.1.1 CRITICAL CRITERIA #1

*To win this war we must eliminate the cabal and it's global network. If we do not or cannot eliminate the cabal then we lose this war.*

- The question underlying this criteria is very straightforward; who is the enemy we must defeat to win this war?
- So Rebecca, who is it you think is the enemy that we must defeat to win this war?
  - There are three parts to this first criteria. Rebecca must:
    - a) identify our enemy that,
    - b) we must defeat and eliminate in order to,
    - c) win this war.
  - It isn't sufficient to meet only one or two parts, all three parts must be met to pass this first criteria.
- The **first part** of this criteria is about explicitly identifying our enemy.
  - Rebecca has about 250 videos on her Rumble channel.

- Who is it Rebecca says is our enemy?
- This is something that should be made clear in all of Rebecca's videos.
  - Do you hear Rebecca regularly talking about Blackrock, Vanguard and State Street. The answer is no.
  - Do you hear Rebecca regularly about talking the Vatican State, London State and Washington DC State. The answer is no.
  - Do you hear Rebecca talking Rothschild, Gates, Soros, Musk and Trump and all the other trillionaires and billionaires. The answer is no.
- Who is it Rebecca says is the enemy we must defeat and eliminate to win the war of T&T? The answer is Rebecca doesn't know. The problem for us is that Rebecca doesn't even think about this question.
- The **second part** of this first criteria is about being explicit in stating we must defeat and eliminate our enemy.
  - Rebecca doesn't do this any of her 250 Rumble videos.
  - She simply doesn't talk about defeating and eliminating our enemy.
- The **third part** is about being explicit that our primary objective is to win this global war.
  - Rebecca doesn't do this, in any of her 250 Rumble videos, she never talks about winning this global war.
- All three parts must be passed to meet this first critical criteria. Rebecca fails to pass each of them.

#### 4.1.2 CRITICAL CRITERIA #2

*There is only one way we can eliminate the cabal. We must unite with our large scale numbers to fight as one with a common vision and direction. We must organize and mobilize millions of our rank-and-file in Canada and billions of our rank-and-file across the world. If we do not unite then we lose this war.*

- What are Rebecca and S4T doing to unite our rank-and-file in Canada? The answer is nothing.
- Rebecca doesn't work to unite us, she doesn't promote unity, Rebecca doesn't want unity.
- This second criteria is about defining a primary strategy for winning this global war of T&T.
- Since Rebecca is not interested in uniting us, the question is, what is Rebecca's primary strategy for winning the war? The answer is Rebecca doesn't have one. The answer is Rebecca hasn't even thought about a primary strategy.

- Rebecca fails to pass the second critical criteria.

### 4.1.3 CRITICAL CRITERIA #3

*There is only one way to unite us, to organize and mobilize the millions of our rank-and-file in Canada, and the billions of our rank-and-file across the world. We must adopt a top down, hierarchical leadership structure. If we do not adopt a top down, hierarchical leadership structure to organize and mobilize billions of our rank-and-file across the world then we lose this war.*

- This criteria is about the leadership we need to win this global war.
- The question is what does Rebecca have to say about a top down leadership structure? The is she doesn't say.
- What leadership is it that Rebecca says we need to win this global war? Again, the answer is she doesn't say and the answer is she doesn't know.
- Rebecca says nothing about leadership at all, what leadership we must or should have to win this war.
- Rebecca fails to pass the third critical criteria.

### 4.1.4 SUMMARY – THE THREE CRITICAL CRITERIA

- As you can appreciate, my three critical criteria address the fundamentals about this global war of T&T.
- The first criteria is about our primary objective in this war, the second criteria is about our primary strategy and the third criteria is about leadership.
- The big problem with Rebecca and S4T is they have not even considered any of these three critical criteria.
- So how can Rebecca and S4T claim to be fighting for Canada when it hasn't a clue about who to fight, how to fight and who lead us so we win this global war?
- S4T is a case of the blind leading the blind.

## 4.2 Step 2 – NRRM

- Now let's move onto step 2 which looks at Rebecca from the perspective of numbers, resources, reach and muscle (NRRM).
- NRRM

- **Numbers** is about being able to organize and mobilize millions of people across Canada and billions of people across the world.
- **Resources** is about the money and physical things needed to effect real change.
- **Reach** is about being able to communicate with decision makers to effect real change.
- **Muscle** is about being able to influence decision makers so as to effect the real change we want.
- As I explained in section 3.5, S4T has no numbers and I estimate Rebecca only has about a dozen active members across all of Canada. But if others wish to be more generous and argue the 60 to 80 people in the S4T Friday night meeting are active members then that is still a pitiful few people from across all of Canada.
- And even then Rebecca has not been able to organize and mobilize them to work as one in the S4T action initiatives. As I explain in the next section, all of Rebecca's action initiatives are LEGO actions, actions that provide the illusion of action without actually having to engage in action.
- Regardless of how you look at S4T, Rebecca literally has no numbers. What that automatically translates to S4T has no resources, no reach and no muscle.
- In terms of this global war of T&T, whatever Rebecca might think she and her group are doing, it is meaningless and pointless for the simple reason S4T has no numbers and works alone.

### 4.3 Step 3 – OSMR

- Now let's move on to step 3 and look at Rebecca from the perspective of objectives, strategies, metrics and results (OSMR).
  - **Objective** defines what it is we are trying to accomplish, what our end goal is. If we are at a point A and want to get to a point B then our objective is reach point B.
  - **Strategy** defines the method, approach or what we do to try to reach our objective.
    - If we are at a point A and want to get to a point B then what are each of the steps we propose for getting from A to B?
    - Assume there are 5 different steps we must perform to get from A to B and each step must successfully be performed before we can proceed to the next step: A, step 1, step 2, step 3, step 4, step 5, B.
    - Together, the 5 steps represent our strategy for getting from point A to point B.
  - **Metric** defines what we will measure, the data we monitor and/or record, that will be used to assess whether our strategy is succeeding or failing to reach our objective.

- Metrics are what we use to track the progress of an initiative.
- If we want to get from point A to point B and there are 5 sequential steps we have proposed to get us to from A to B then we track our progress by knowing which step we are at and whether or not we have successfully completed each step.
- **Result** consists of two parts.
  - First, when an initiative is initially conceived, we must estimate it's chances of success.
    - This part answers the question what is a reasonable estimate that the objective (i.e. expected results) will be achieved. Think of this as a risk analysis.
    - If the initiative is considered to be too risky then cancel the initiative while it is still on the drawing board.
    - If there are 5 steps for getting us from point A to point B but the chances of successfully performing one or more of the 5 steps is very low then we are probably not going to get to point B.
    - In that case we then need to define a different strategy (i.e. a different set of steps), one that increases our chances of getting to point B.
  - The second part of results is, when the initiative is over and done with, what is the final result?
    - This part determines if we achieved our objective.
    - If we failed to achieve our objective then why and where we did we fail?
    - If our objective was to get from point A to point B then the end result is either we successfully reached point B or we failed to reach point B.
    - If we failed to reach point B then why did we fail, which steps between A and B did we fail to successfully perform?
- Now I expect most, if not all of you, will snidely remark that you already understand what objectives, strategies, metrics and results are and that I just wasted your time telling you what you already know.
- If that is true then great, you will now know what to look for when I say Rebecca has poorly defined them, that is, if she defines them at all.
- And what that automatically translates to is Rebecca's initiatives predictably fail.
- Let's look at each of Rebecca's "*Action Initiatives*".



### 4.3.1 LEGO ACTION

- LEGO is an educational toy for children.<sup>46</sup> It consists of different color plastic bricks/blocks that lock together, allowing children to design and build their own creations.
  - Children intuitively understand that if they dump a box of LEGO pieces on the floor then the pieces will not automatically self-assemble into the object they want.
  - Children learn they must have discipline and organization before they can successfully build their own creations.
- People are like LEGO pieces.
  - With discipline and organization, they can work together to accomplish things that cannot be done when they work alone.
  - Just as LEGO pieces cannot be dumped on a floor and expected to automatically self-assemble, so to can people not be dumped together and expected to automatically produce a final result.
- For both LEGO pieces and people, discipline and organization must be applied in order to achieve a final objective.
- What is a LEGO action?
  - A LEGO action is where you dump a group of people together and expect them to magically reach an objective without applying any discipline or organization to the group.
  - A LEGO action is the equivalent of dumping a box of LEGO pieces on the floor and expecting/hoping the pieces to magically self-assemble; it just doesn't happen.
- A LEGO action is the toothless chihuahua's way of appearing to be action oriented without actually having to engage in action.
  - All our toothless chihuahuas engage in LEGO actions.

### 4.3.2 LEGO ACTION INITIATIVES

- S4T lists 6 different actions under the “*Action Initiatives*” menu item. Each of them is a LEGO action.
- The last menu item on the website is “*Grand Jury*”. It too is another LEGO action.
- Let's take a look at each of these “*action initiatives*”.

---

<sup>46</sup> <https://kids.kiddle.co/Lego>

### 4.3.3 TRUDEAU FOR TREASON

- The Grand Jury menu item is about Rebecca’s Trudeau For Treason action initiative.
- Let’s look at this initiative from the perspective of objectives, strategies, metrics and results.

#### 4.3.3.1 **Objective**

- The stated objectives of this initiative is as follows:

*We are bringing back our lawful right to a Grand Jury for the purpose of holding the Liberal executive branch, and all Members of Parliament involved, accountable for breaking the law.*<sup>47</sup>

- There are two objectives here:
  1. to “bring back our lawful right to a Grand Jury”
  2. to hold Trudeau and others “accountable for breaking the law”
- The second objective is contingent upon successfully achieving the first objective. If S4T cannot bring back the grand jury then it cannot hold Trudeau and others accountable.
- Let’s ignore that S4T simply doesn't the numbers, resources, reach or muscle to pull any of this off.

#### 4.3.3.2 **Strategy**

- Let’s assume we can take both objectives at face value.
- If Rebecca has defined these as her two objectives then that must mean she has already defined her strategy for achieving each objective. After all, what good is an objective if you don’t know what strategy you will be using to achieve it, right?

##### 4.3.3.2.1 **Strategy to bring back our lawful right to a grand jury**

- So what is Rebecca’s strategy here for the first objective, which is to bring back the Grand Jury?
- What are the different steps we must perform to get a grand jury up and running, one that can actually lead to holding Trudeau accountable? The answer is we don't know and Rebecca’s doesn't tell us.
- First of all there’s a bit of a problem with the way the objective is phrased. What exactly does “bringing back” mean? S4T leaves that for us to speculate.

---

<sup>47</sup> <https://img1.wsimg.com/blobby/go/3b866b4e-4468-4e36-a472-a203e07245ad/Grand%20Jury%20Update%20April%2027%202024.pdf>

- I don't know anything about a grand jury other than what I have read in S4T documentation.
- What I guess “*bringing back*” means is that our governments and legal system have obscured and hidden knowledge of a grand jury from the public, that a grand jury nevertheless remains a legal instrument in law and that S4T wants to restore public awareness and functionality of the grand jury to our legal system.
- Rebecca’s objective is to get from point A to point B and her strategy corresponds to the different steps she wants us to take to get from A to B.
  - Point A corresponds to where we are right now, where the idea of a grand jury has been obscured and hidden from the public.
  - Point B corresponds to restoring the grand jury to public awareness and to a making it fully functioning instrument in our legal system.
- There will be many steps between point A and B.
  - What I expect is for Rebecca to define and share the general steps (i.e. the primary or high level strategy) for getting from A to B.
  - If Rebecca cannot describe or explain these general level steps (i.e. it’s primary strategy) then that means she doesn't know what it is doing.
  - Remember, S4T cannot succeed on it’s own. It needs all of us in the rank-and-file working together and that requires we fully understand what the primary strategy is for getting from point A to point B.
- So what then is Rebecca’s primary strategy here? For example, what are the steps to getting our government and courts to restore something they want left obscured and hidden?
- The answer is we don't know and Rebecca doesn't tell us.
- At this point today in February, 2025, it is reasonable to assume Rebecca doesn't have a primary strategy, or for that matter, any strategy at all.

#### **4.3.3.2.2      *Strategy for holding Trudeau and others to account***

- Rebecca may not have defined a strategy for her first objective, but what about her second objective?
- What do we find here?
- A grand jury represents just the first, preliminary step, in trying to hold anyone to account.
  - Even in the highly improbable event S4T actually manages to assemble and conduct a grand jury, that is a long, long way from actually holding Trudeau and others accountable.

- For example, anyone going after Trudeau and others will face almost insurmountable resistance from foreign entities such as the WHO and WEF but also all levels of government as well as our legal and law enforcement systems.
- Rebecca’s primary strategy must therefore account for this resistance right up front and from the start.
- What is Rebecca’s primary strategy to counter this high level resistance? The answer is we don’t know and Rebecca’s doesn’t tell us. It is reasonable to assume S4T hasn’t defined a primary strategy.
- If Rebecca was serious about holding Trudeau to account then why has she ignored this huge elephant in the room? That’s a rhetorical question.
- There is no evidence to suggest Rebecca and S4T have a viable strategy for holding anyone to account, let alone Trudeau and other high level officials.

#### 4.3.3.3 **Metric**

- What metrics have been defined, to measure and track the progress or lack of progress in working toward both of these two objectives?
- The answer is we don’t know and S4T hasn’t told us.
- It is reasonable to assume S4T hasn't defined any metrics. In other words, Rebecca has no intention of tracking the progress of this initiative.

#### 4.3.3.4 **Result**

- There are two parts to results, expected results defined at the beginning of a project and final results that are assessed at the end of a project.
- Part 1 Expected results:
  - Rebecca doesn't provide or discuss expected results. It is obvious why; she never expected to be able to hold Trudeau to account.
- Part 2 Final results:
  - The last update was in April of 2024.
  - If I am correct, this initiative is dead in the water, it’s over and finished.
  - Can we expect S4T to discuss this failed initiative and why it failed? The answer is no.
  - There will be no grand jury and no one will be held to account.

#### 4.3.3.5 **Summary**

- Rebecca has intentionally defined two unrealistic objectives that she knows she can never hope to achieve.

- Rebecca hasn't defined any strategy, let alone a viable strategy, for achieving either of her two objectives.
- Rebecca hasn't defined any metrics which means she never had any intention of tracking the progress of this action initiative.
- For obvious reasons, Rebecca didn't discuss or provide expected results at the outset of this action initiative.
- In terms of final results, Rebecca will never acknowledge or discuss it's failure to hold anyone to account.
- The Trudeau For Treason initiative is a LEGO action, poorly organized and poorly implemented.
- The unavoidable conclusion is that accountability was never Rebecca's real objective.
- If you are asking what Rebecca's real objective was then you are asking the right question and on the right trail.

#### 4.3.4 BLOCK DIGITAL ID

- If this initiative doesn't make you laugh then it's because you don't know anything about S4T.
- Here is your cue that this initiative shouldn't be taken seriously and amounts to a bad joke:

*...a response is expected, and **if one is not received within the 14 day period that legal action will be taken** (my emphasis).*

- This is a bluff, it's a legal bluff. S4T's track record on holding anyone accountable through legal action is zero (0).
- Everything about this initiative tells us it's a LEGO action:
  1. All forms provided have been created by S4T. What weight will they hold in a court of law? The answer is we don't know and Rebecca doesn't tell us.
  2. How do we know which entities are sharing our private information? The answer is we don't know and Rebecca can't tell us.
  3. How can we tell if companies continue to share our private information after having received S4T's form(s)? The answer is we don't know and Rebecca can't tell us.
  4. What exactly is the legal action we are suppose to take if we don't get a response or the response we get is unacceptable? The answer is we don't know and Rebecca doesn't tell us.

- If Rebecca suggests using small claims court, think twice. S4T tried that it and it turned out to be a hare-brained idea.
- 5. What metrics has Rebecca defined to track the progress of this initiative? The answer is we don't know and Rebecca doesn't tell us.
- 6. Does any of this work? The answer is we don't know and Rebecca doesn't tell us.
- 7. This initiative is another example of Rebecca pulling stuff from her butt and calling it the truth.

### 4.3.5 15-MINUTE CITY

- First of all, if you want a better understanding of what 15-minute cities are and a better understanding of how you might better be able to counter them then go to Maggie Hope Braun's website KICKLEI.<sup>48</sup>
  - Relatively speaking, Maggie is better organized and structured. Rebecca isn't.
  - Just be aware that Maggie is also a toothless chihuahua.
- You would think Maggie and Rebecca would be natural allies that share a common enemy.
  - Wrong. If you want to see a cat fight, put Rebecca in the same room as Maggie.
- Rebecca's web page for this 15-minute city action initiative contains so little information.<sup>49</sup>
- What is the objective of this initiative? We don't know and Rebecca doesn't tell us.
  - Seriously, what is it that Rebecca wants to accomplish? She leaves that to our imagination.
  - Whatever it is that is on Rebecca's mind, it certainly isn't about organizing and mobilizing large numbers of people to stop the implementation of 15-minute cities.
- What is Rebecca's proposed strategy? The answer is she doesn't have one.
  - The webpage uses the buzzword "*community pod*", which will be meaningless to most people. The link that supposedly explain what pods are is dead.
  - Rebecca provides blurbs about 1) "*creating a community association*", 2) "*build a stakeholder group*" and 3) "*take legal action*". Other than that, Rebecca leaves it to your imagination to figure out the rest.
  - The web page lists 11 questions that you can ask your mayor/councillor. But what is the purpose of these questions and what is their context? If you don't already know then Rebecca doesn't tell you. In that case all you are is a parrot parroting questions that you

---

<sup>48</sup> <https://www.kiclei.ca/>

<sup>49</sup> <https://stand4thee.com/15-minute-city>

don't understand. On the other hand, if you do already understand then Rebecca won't be telling you anything new.

- As with all of Rebecca's initiatives, she doesn't define metrics and results. Rebecca doesn't track the progress of her 15-minute city action initiative.
- The Notice of Liability (NOL) is a joke.
  - The uninitiated and uninformed have no idea of just how much work is involved in taking legal action if the NOL is ignored and few people will be motivated enough to commit themselves to that steep learning curve.
  - To be clear, the NOL is a legal bluff.
  - This is Rebecca's dirty little secret that she incidentally just forgot to tell you.
- This action initiative is a LEGO action, poorly organized and poorly implemented.
  - It is website filler, meant to give the appearance there is more to the website than there really is.

#### 4.3.6 KILL BILL C-293

- As I prepare this report on S4T, Bill C-293 hasn't yet been passed.
- If I recall correctly, Rebecca claims to be a project manager.
  - As such, she understands the success of a project requires that it's objectives, strategies, metrics and expected results (e.g. risk analysis) must all be clearly defined.
  - In addition, one of the big responsibilities of a project manager is to track the progress of a project to see whether or not it is on target to reach it's objective.
- If taken at face value, the primary objective of this initiative appears to be that Rebecca wants to defeat and kill C-293.
- It isn't but let's assume this is the case.
- As an exercise, stop this video and review the information Rebecca provides about this kill-the-bill action initiative. Try to find for yourself what and where Rebecca defines her objectives, strategies, metrics and results for this initiative.
- There isn't much information about this action initiative on the S4T website but let's see what we find.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup><https://stand4thee.com/kill-bill-c-293>

- *We must take action to KILL this Bill before it's too late! We have put together several actions you can take NOW to stop this bill from becoming law!*
- *Actions you can take now!*
  1. *Join us in our working sessions as we produce legal strategies to stop the bill. Meeting times are posted under "events"*
  2. *Email the senate and tell them to KILL the Bill;*
  3. *Email the Bill sponsor, Nathaniel Erskine-Smith to tell him to rescind this Bill;*
  4. *Download the social posts and share them on your channels;*
  5. *Talk to your friends and family to help educate them.*

- Step 1 tells us to check the "Events" web page.
  - Except there is nothing on that web page about this action.
- Let's look at Step 2 and 3.
  - Email campaigns are only effective if they are a secondary action in support of a primary action.
  - If email campaigns are THE primary action then they always fail. They simply don't work.
  - What is the primary strategy/action in this initiative? The answer is an email campaign.
- What about metrics for all 5 steps? Metrics are critical to tracking the progress of a project.
  - What metrics has Rebecca defined? The answer is none.
  - How does Rebecca track S4T members to see who does and doesn't follow her instructions? The answer is she doesn't.



- So how can Rebecca track the progress of this initiative? The answer is she can't.
- Why doesn't Rebecca track the progress of this initiative? The answer is Rebecca doesn't want this initiative to be tracked.
- She is fully aware it is a LEGO action, guaranteed to fail, and she doesn't want us keeping tabs on her failure.
- Where are the expected results for each of these 5 step/strategies? The answer is Rebecca has ignored them too for the reason I just explained; she doesn't want us keeping tabs on her failure.
- Bill C-293 will effect all Canadians and there are other groups working to kill this bill.
  - So how many groups is S4T working with? The answer is we don't know and Rebecca doesn't tell us.
  - It is reasonable to assume the answer is none.
- As you can see, there is no discipline and no organization behind Rebecca's "*Kill the bill*" initiative.
  - S4T members do what they want, when they want, how they want and...if they want.
  - This entire initiative is a LEGO action where somehow the few S4T members and pieces are expected to magically self-assemble to produce the final result which is to defeat and kill bill C-293.
  - But that just not going to happen!
  - This S4T initiative is nothing more than a feel-good action that predictably will accomplish nothing.
- In terms of numbers, S4T simply doesn't have the people to make a meaningful contribution to defeating Bill C-293.
- Whatever happens with this bill, S4T won't play any role or part in it.
- I have a lot more to say about this initiative, but you get the point.
  - It was poorly conceived and poorly implemented.
  - It is a LEGO action.
- Look to the last line on the web page about this initiative:

- *Let's NOT be victims! Let's work together to be VICTORS!*

- Rebecca works alone and the only thing S4T's action can do is fail.
- Here is another example of Rebecca pulling stuff from her butt and calling it the truth.

#### 4.3.7 NOTICE OF LIABILITY AND PARENT INFO + ACTION

- These remaining two action initiatives are the same as the other four actions, they are LEGO actions.
- Their objectives, strategies, metrics and/or results are poorly defined, if at all.
- Both are poorly conceived, organized and crippled actions.
- Nothing from them contributes to winning this global war of T&T.
- Rebecca and her members boast they are all about action. What they don't tell you is it is meaningless action that inevitably fails.

## 5 CONCLUSION

- Rebecca claims to be about the truth, even if the truth hurts.
- Here is the truth:
  - S4T has failed both of it's primary objectives which are about using common law.
  - S4T cannot identify the enemy we must defeat and eliminate to win this global war.
  - S4T works alone. It refuses to commit to the only course of action that can win this global war for us; unity with our large scale numbers.
  - S4T has no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle.
  - S4T has poorly defined objectives, strategies, metrics and results.
  - S4T grossly exaggerates the few minor wins it's had with self-representation.
  - Whatever it is that Rebecca and S4T imagine they are doing, they have little in the way of results.
  - S4T calls all this empowering. This is delusional.
- What is it that Rebecca and S4T are doing that contributes to fighting this global war of Technocracy and Transhumanism? The answer nothing.
- It is a shameless ego that makes Rebecca and S4T imagine that, working alone, they can contribute to stopping this juggernaut.
- S4T is like a solitary ant challenging a pack of ravenous hyenas.
  - The only reason the ant isn't crushed is because the pack doesn't see the ant.
  - There is nothing, absolutely nothing, the ant does that threatens the pack. Everything and anything the ant does is pointless because the ant is alone.
- S4T has lost it purpose and any relevance it might have had.
- Rebecca herself is lost and doesn't know what to do with S4T.
- S4T is just another toothless chihuahuas trying to get it's yap, yap, yap heard above the yap, yap, yap of all our other toothless chihuahuas.
- S4T is pissing on and away our freedom.
- If Rebecca and S4T ever decide to get serious about fighting this global war then there is only one thing that they must do.
  - Rebecca and S4T must talk, breath and preach our unity.

- Rebecca and S4T must become team players and focus their entire efforts on uniting the millions of our rank-and-file across Canada and the billions across the world.
- It will be a cold day in hell before Rebecca and S4T do this.

## **6 REBECCA HAS BEEN NOTIFIED OF THIS REPORT**

- Links to both the video and text version of this report have been sent to the email address [stand4thee@gmail.com](mailto:stand4thee@gmail.com).
- If Rebecca or members of S4T respond to this report then those responses will be added to Appendix C.

## 7 APPENDIX A

On November 6 of 2024, Rebecca posted in the S4T National Telegram group her Alberta Bill 24 initiative. I had an exchange with Rebecca and a few of her members in this Telegram group about this initiative. I explained this initiative was poorly planned and wouldn't produce any results. As a result of this exchange, Rebecca banned me from her Telegram group. This appendix shows all posts in that exchange.

There is a background context for this exchange. I had already challenged Rebecca 4 to 5 different times in the past in her Telegram group about things she posted. In each case, I was very civil and respectful. In each case, Rebecca ignored me and didn't respond.

I recorded this exchange knowing I would be writing this report. I wanted evidence to show I was challenging Rebecca. In this instance, Rebecca did respond but she deceptively deflected and ignored my challenge.

In this new Bill 24 initiative, Rebecca was asking her members to do three things (see section 7.1). I posted a response that explained why this initiative would fail (see section 7.2). Rebecca responded to me (see section 7.3). Our exchange continued from there.

I challenged Rebecca to explain what her objectives, strategies, metrics and expected results (OSMR) were for this Bill 24 initiative. Having followed and monitored Rebecca for 4 years, I was reasonably certain Rebecca hadn't defined any of them. Rebecca was bluffing and I called her bluff.

As you can confirm for yourself, Rebecca and her members avoided and deflected from answering my questions about OSMR. I have added a few notes after some of the responses in this exchange.

My last post in this exchange can be read in section 7.23. For calling her bluff, Rebecca banned me from her group. I wear this as a badge of honor and have since been vindicated; Rebecca has nothing to show for this initiative.

This is an example of Rebecca prioritizing her petty turf war, ego and echo chamber over the only course of action that can win this global of Technocracy and Transhumanism for us, unity with our large scale numbers.

Note I provide separate Telegram links to each post in our exchange. Those links no longer work and were automatically deleted when Rebecca banned me from her group. I made a copy of this exchange before Rebecca banned me.

### 7.1 Rebecca's opening post

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92570>

*!!Update on the Alberta Bill of Rights Amendment, Bill 24!!*

*<https://rumble.com/v5ly2c9-urgent-update-on-the-amendments-to-the-alberta-bill-of-rights.html>*

*Smith spoke on Bill 24, the BOR Amendments, at the second reading in the Legislature on Oct 29th. She made this statement during debate:*

*"Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Bill of Rights was first introduced in 1972. It was a full decade before the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and it was introduced on the heels of the 1960 Diefenbaker Bill of Rights. But since that time, despite society evolving, the Bill of Rights has not changed that much, and if the Bill of Rights doesn't reflect the lessons learned and the changes needed today, then it loses its power and Albertans are at risk of having their rights overlooked and overruled.*

*We think this is unacceptable, and that's why I'm so pleased that the Minister of Justice has tabled amendments that will protect Albertans' personal autonomy, their property, and their expression. Mr. Speaker, these amendments stem from recommendations in part from the Public Health Emergencies Governance Review Panel, that we created to review the legislation and governance practices of government during the COVID-19 pandemic. These amendments relate to those recommendations to better protect Albertans' rights and to better align the act with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and with natural law."*

*Read the debate here:*

*[https://docs.assembly.ab.ca/LADDAR\\_files/docs/hansards/han/legislature\\_31/session\\_1/20241029\\_1330\\_01\\_han.pdf#page=16](https://docs.assembly.ab.ca/LADDAR_files/docs/hansards/han/legislature_31/session_1/20241029_1330_01_han.pdf#page=16)*

*And for those pointing the fingers at the bill sponsor, Mickey Amery, he was appointed by Smith. Put the pieces together and don't forget about the party whip. If you don't follow the party, you will be disciplined or kicked out of the party.*

*This past Sat, Nov 2nd, a group of cowboys, called the black hats, presented amendments to the Alberta BOR to the UCP members who PAID to vote on the amendments at the AGM by a show of hands.*

*The amendments are very good, maybe too good. However, the Bill has already passed into the second reading by a UCP majority Gov.*

*don't be tricked! Bill 24 is in the Alberta Legislature and is expected to go into the THIRD reading this Thurs, Nov 7th. This is a fact, link to the status below.*

*The DANGER of this Bill is that it that it is "CHARTIFYING" the Alberta Bill of Rights and adding in a "section 1 clause":*

*"Reasonable Limits Clause: Establishes that rights and freedoms are subject to reasonable limits prescribed by law, demonstrably justified in a free and democratic Alberta."*

*Alberta is the ONLY province that has it's own Bill, that has NO limit clause. If they are succesful this Bill will become another tool to facilitate communism - and this is not an inflammatory statement. If the government can "justify" limiting your rights, they will find a reason to limit them.*

*FOLKS WE NEED TO TAKE ACTION NOW! Below are some quick actions you can take NOW to help get the word out as awareness is the first step:*

*1. SHARE the information!*

*2. Call MPP Amery and Danielle Smith's office and DEMAND this Bill be rescinded:*

*Amery's contact:*

*Phone 403.248.4487*

*Legislature Phone 403.248.4487 · Email [Calgary.Cross@assembly.ab.ca](mailto:Calgary.Cross@assembly.ab.ca)*

*Smith's contact:*

*780-427-2251 or email [premier@gov.ab.ca](mailto:premier@gov.ab.ca).*

*3. Send in the letter to Smith telling her to KILL this bill:*

*<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1qID6x-L58nepNXLcvgVUxTaP5KhgAvdh?usp=sharing>*

*DONT MAKE EXCUSES! JUST TAKE ACTION! 🙏👊👊*

*Links:*

*- status of the bill: <https://www.assembly.ab.ca/assembly-business/bills/bill?billinfoid=12046&from=bills>*



- Link to the text of the Bill:

[https://docs.assembly.ab.ca/LADDAR\\_files/docs/bills/bill/legislature\\_31/session\\_1/20230530\\_bill-024.pdf](https://docs.assembly.ab.ca/LADDAR_files/docs/bills/bill/legislature_31/session_1/20230530_bill-024.pdf)

- Link to the ORIGINAL Alberta Bill of Rights:

<https://www.canlii.org/en/ab/laws/stat/rsa-2000-c-a-14/latest/rsa-2000-c-a-14.html>

#wegotthis

## 7.2 Ian

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92584>

*Another "feel good" post that gives the appearance of action without actually having to engage in action. This is the equivalent of dropping a box of Lego pieces on the floor and expecting the pieces to spontaneously create the object you want. It doesn't happen. The Lego pieces don't self-assemble any more than telling members to share information and call elected officials produces the results you claim to want.*

## 7.3 Rebecca

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92585>

*With all due respect Ian, your attitude is why no one wants to work with you.*

*And what, prey tell, are you doing Ian?*

## 7.4 Ian

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92587>

*How about focusing on my point instead of making this an issue about me? What is your objective, what is your strategy, what are your metrics and when will the results of "your action" be reviewed?*

## 7.5 Rebecca

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92589>

*Why are you here if you don't like what we are doing?*

*Why not just start your own group and then you can do what you think is best.*

*I don't appreciate your constant badgering and negative comments. I don't think I am lone in this.*

Notes:

- I have never “badgered” Rebecca and Rebecca knows this is true.
- Instead of responding to my accurate assessment for why her initiative will fail, Rebecca deflects by referring to my assessment as a “negative comment”.

## 7.6 Ian

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92590>

*If you aren't prepared to discuss your objective, your strategy for reaching your objective, your metrics for assessing your strategy and when will the results of "your action" be reviewed then there is no point furthering this exchange.*

## 7.7 Nathalie

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92600>

*How about focusing on your own actions, quit the talking and leave this group alone as you are seemingly wasting your precious time with us bunch of ignorant idiots! Stupidity is it not to keep doing the same thing, and expecting different results? It is obvious we aren't good enough for you, Mister, so why must you keep persisting with your rants! I've had enough of*

*your negative patronising and pessimistic attitude. Nothing constructive ever comes out of any of your posts, I'm through with the likes of you!*

Notes:

- I have explained and provide offered a very constructive assessment of why this initiative from Rebecca will fail. Nathalie doesn't want to acknowledge this obvious truth.

## 7.8 Jessica Clare

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92608>

*Apparently he failed in his own attempts and is now focused solely on bringing everyone else down. From his own website:*

*"We don't have freedom fighters in Canada. What we have are undisciplined, heavily fragmented, completely disorganized, short-sighted, self-centered and self-serving people who masquerade as freedom fighters. They refuse to commit themselves to our unity. That means everything they do is pointless and meaningless. This makes them fake freedom fighters.*

*My current objective is to show why our so called freedom fighters here in Canada have lost this war for us, why they were never really fighting it despite what they have imagined. Over the past four years, our fake freedom fighters have repeatedly demonstrated their incompetence and impotence in fighting this war. I intentionally mock and ridicule our fake freedom fighters for the pathetic joke they are."*

Notes:

- Jessica's response is priceless. She quotes directly from my website where I clearly explain what it is that constitutes a fake freedom fighter. Notice Jessica conveniently ignores my explanation. She also conveniently avoids taking up the challenge to prove me wrong.

## 7.9 Rebecca

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92609>

*What does a fire fighter do? Fight fires. What does a crime fighter do? Fights crime So what does a freedom fighter do????? Hahahahaha Am I the only one that laughs at this? heheheh*

*I want to share a few thoughts here...*

*Through my own experience, I see that \*most\* of us who are working to create change are just regular people with little to no activism background. Most of us have very little influence in all of this and lack the resources to cast a wide net. However, we are do what we can to help and that is based on many factors; education of law, awareness, intuition and principles.*

*For me, I see many groups taking action and unfortunately a lot of them don't don't align with the direction Stand4THEE is taking. This isn't a job where we get paid so there is zero incentive to compromise values, principles and objectives for the sole purpose of working with others. Frankly, at every attempt to work with other groups in the end it didn't work out and in some cases it was bad experience.*

*If another group is doing something that is aligned with Stand4THEE purpose and goals, I would gladly work with them - \*IF\* they want to work with us! It's a two-way street and I am fully aware of various opinions about Stand4THEE.*

*If others want to attack, belittle, whatever, that's on them. It's not going to stop the work of Stand4THEE, nor anyone else and in reality, it just looks poorly on them.*

*I wish Ian well and hope that he can see that communication and presentation is everything. What you put out, is what you get back.*

Notes:

- Rebecca wrote, “Through my own experience, I see that \*most\* of us who are working to create change are just regular people with little to no activism background. Most of us have very little influence in all of this and lack the resources to cast a wide net. However, we are do what we can to help...” Here Rebecca acknowledges and agrees with what I have been saying; S4T has no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle.
- Rebecca want me to change my “communication and presentation”. In other words, Rebecca will continue to ignore my message if I don’t learn to cuddle up and stroke her ego. My response is I’m not here to make friends and be liked. I’m here to fight and win a war. Rebecca needs to take the same attitude and approach.

## 7.10 Jessica Clare

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92611>

*Rebecca, you've made a difference in so many people's lives. By sharing your own journey and by your encouragement, you've helped awaken the latent power of others.*

*From very early on, I knew that what was going to be most effective in this battle—for myself, at least—was an internal shift, a fundamental correction in mindset. Only from an empowered perspective can true empowered action take place. This is what @ian000bell doesn't understand. Steps toward lasting and meaningful change aren't always measurable through a set of arbitrary metrics. True transformation comes only from within and is inherently immeasurable.*

Notes:

- We are not having a philosophical and esoteric discussion about some abstract idea. We are talking about the concrete steps Rebecca want us to take in regards to Bill 24. These steps **MUST** be measured using metrics that Rebecca **was supposed to have clearly defined when she first conceived of this initiative**. If Rebecca has any intention of tracking the progress of her initiative then metrics must be defined! It is nonsense to suggest otherwise.

## 7.11 Ian

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92614>

*So then, what is the objective, strategy, metrics and expected result for the proposed "action on Bill 24"? Or are members only interested in shooting the messenger instead of the message?*

*BTW, Rebecca knows "freedom fighter" is how the majority of our groups define/describe themselves.*

## 7.12 Rebecca

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92617>

*No one likes to be dumped on. Try changing your delivery of the message.*

*I don't use the term "Freedom fighter", not concerned about what others do. To me it sounds silly.*

Notes:

- Rebecca deflects, again.

## **7.13 O Lam**

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92620>

*I am now 100% convinced that mr bell is a professional provovocateur and I'd like to propose a members tally of who agrees.*

*Mr bell seems to follow, every single hallmark of division, seemingly endless capacities lacking demonstrable evidence, a consistent writing pattern(AI), no links ever.*

*I'm calling out mr bell as an infiltrator and agent of all those we know to be working against us and therefore, against we the people.*

Notes:

- A bit of context will be helpful here. O Lam has already tried several times to get Rebecca to remove me from Rebecca's Telegram group.
- O Lam never responds to my reasonable and valid talking points.
- O Lam deflects and does not want to weigh in on the big problem with Rebecca's initiative which is that Rebecca has not defined her objective, strategy, metrics and results.

## **7.14 Raoul**

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92622>

*If that is the case why isn't the provocateur banned from this channel ?*

## 7.15 Ian

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92623>

*I didn't dump on your original post. What I did was to be honest and direct in pointing out the main reason it will not succeed. I understand that approach will not make me popular.*

*I have been making this point along with other very important points for several years, with particular emphasis since January of this year. I speak about ALL of our groups, not just S4T. Rather tellingly, after all this time, no one has challenged or refuted any of my points. Instead, as illustrated in this exchange, the response is to attempt to discredit me personally, to deflect and distract from having to deal with the real issues I raise.*

*I was very clear and direct in my question about objective, strategy, metric and expected result regarding your "action" for Bill 24. Chuckle, where is the heresy in this question that is "so negative" and justifies banning me from this group? Note that my question has been ignored by all comments here. Why is that? Having followed you for several years and knowing you to be a reasonable person, I think it is fair to say we both know the answer.*

## 7.16 Rebecca

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92739>

*Hey Ian,*

*Since you directed this to me, I'll answer.*

*First, I am working full time, 40 hrs per week, sometimes more per week. I am NOT complaining as it has been close to 2 years since I have worked last. However, my job is very intense and is tiring.*

*Then on top of my job, I stay on top of the social posts, send out emails, do research and am also working on a case with a woman with BRAIN lesions is battling the town order to install a smart meter OR shut off her water. There are MANY side projects like this one that you might not be aware of. AND I host Zooms, take calls, answer emails... blah, blah, blah.*

*Then I need to find time for my husband, and friends. They are usually the last on the list. And trust me, it's not appreciated by my husband who is often left waiting for me or just gives up waiting.*

*I don't disagree with your points nor your idea of setting goals/targets. Thing is, instead of DUMPING on me - when have you ever offered support instead of criticizing me? This is why I get irritated by your comments. I don't get paid to do this and I give A LOT of my time, and heart, into Stand4THEE. I also don't have a "how to defeat the globalist" handbook.*

*So, in saying all of this, throwing it back to you. And the question is, are you here to help or just criticize?*

*@ian000bell*

Notes:

- Rebecca acknowledges everything I have been saying but tries to turn it around by falsely claiming all I do is “dump on her”. I address this in my next response to Rebecca.

## 7.17 Ian

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92745>

*Hello Rebecca,*

*I am here to HELP.*

*1) I was very clear about why your Bill 24 initiative will not succeed. No one, including you, addressed that point. Not only have all of you not addressed my point, but even when I repeatedly brought it to your attentions, all of you intentionally ignored it.*

*2) I have asked you and members what the objective, strategy, metric and expected result is with your Bill 24 action. No one, including you, addressed this point either. Like point 1, all of you intentionally ignored it.*

*3) Until recently, I have been very clear it very clear why we are losing this global war (see this (<https://rumble.com/v54vc4r-we-are-losing-this-global-war-of-technocracy-and-transhumanism.html>) and this (<https://rumble.com/v57yky5-we-are-losing-this-war-in-lay-terms-podcast.html>)). At this point, I can say with almost 100% certainty, we have already*



*lost this global war. I have been hammering away on this point for several years, especially since January of this year. No one has responded or addressed what I have been saying. Everyone has literally turned a blind eye away from the many reasons why I say everything we are doing is pointless and meaningless.*

*4) What I do is framed as criticism so as to deflect and distract attention away from my talking points. If I was wrong then it is reasonable to say I would have been tarred and feathered several years ago when I first started speaking out.*

## **7.18 Rebecca,**

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92746>

*Guess I am just a toothless Chihuahua with no reach and have accomplished nothing.*

*THIS IS WHY NO ONE WILL WORK WITH YOU*

### Notes:

- What does Rebecca have to say about each of my 4 points she is responding to? The answer is she avoids answering them and tries to deflect with what is essentially an Ad Hominem attack.
- For the record, no one wants to work with Rebecca. All Rebecca now has is 70 ± 10 people in the weekly S4T Friday night meetings and I estimate only about a dozen active members who work on her initiatives.

## **7.19 Ian**

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92747>

*You have just demonstrated what I said. You choose to ignore my talking points. You are shooting the messenger instead of the message. I have made my point and have nothing more to add.*

## 7.20 Rebecca

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92748>

*Because NO ONE likes to be treated like a "dog" Ian. This is a fact.*

*YOU chose to alienate yourself with your message. So why don't YOU take responsibility for YOU.*

Note:

- Rebecca again deflects by saying, *"Because NO ONE likes to be treated like a 'dog' Ian."*
- I refer to Rebecca and S4T as *"toothless chihuahuas"*. Both words *"toothless"* and *"chihuahua"* refers to the fact Rebecca has no numbers, no resources, no reach and no muscle.
- The word *"chihuahua"* implies how puny, insignificant and non-threatening her group S4T is. I could have used *"rat"*, *"ant"*, *"bird"*, or any other tiny creature in place of *"chihuahua"* to emphasize puny, insignificant and non-threatening.
- Rebecca fully understand I am saying she and S4T are puny, insignificant and non-threatening.
- Rebecca fully understands I am not calling her and S4T dogs.
- Rebecca focused on *"dog"* in an attempt deflect readers attention away from the fact she is fully aware of; that Rebecca and S4T are puny, insignificant and non-threatening.
- Rebecca brags she and S4T are all about the truth, even if the truth hurts. This example illustrates Rebecca is not interesting in hearing the obvious truth, especially a truth that cuts deep and hurts.

## 7.21 Ian

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92750>

*This is your Bill 24 action, not mine. My original post stands and it is has nothing to do with me.*

## 7.22 Rebecca

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92752>

*So you are being extra productive in all of this.*

*Your idea of uniting is putting others down. Seems legit.*

## **7.23     Ian**

<https://t.me/c/1242011694/92754>

*What is the objective of your Bill 24 action? Is your objective to defeat the bill? If so, then please explain what your strategy is to defeat it? What are your metrics to determine if your strategy succeeds or fails? Based on what you know, what results do you reasonably expect to achieve? For example, how many people do you have working on this action? What resources have you allocated for this action? What "reach" do you have for accessing senate members and what "muscle" do you have to influence a decision you want?*

*This and more is what I have been trying to open a discussion on in our freedom/dissident movement. For reasons I have clearly explained, no one wants to open this discussion, including you and S4T.*

*This and more is what you are conveniently ignoring. Why is that?*

## 8 APPENDIX B

This appendix quotes Rebecca from the S4T August 2, 2024 Friday night Zoom meeting.<sup>51</sup> This part of the meeting starts at time 00:45:15 and ends about time 00:50:41.

The context for Rebecca's says is as follows. A first person posted a comment in the Zoom chat and quoted the three first questions from the home page of Doug Force's website "*The Myth Is Canada*". Rebecca's response, which I mention in section 4.6.2.3 of this report, was incoherent and contradictory.

Next, Rebecca distracts herself with a different comment posted by a second person. We don't know exactly what that second comment was but, starting at time 00:46:25, Rebecca mumbles part of it.

*...supersede the charter and constitution...bill of rights part one is hereby...our rights supersede the charter... Canadian bill of rights is hereby recognized...*

Rebecca's response to this second comment was a follows:

*[Rebecca]: Well, the charter is a piece of crap. Yes. Canadian bill of rights is hereby recognize. Yep. Yeah. So the crown is the head of state. The governor general is acting by proxy, the representative of the head of state, which is the crown.*

*[Amanda]: He has power of attorney.*

*Rebecca: Yeah, exactly. And that stated right in the constitution. And I'm going to say it again. Sorry. Go ahead, Amanda.*

*[Amanda]: ??? section 10 ???*

*[Rebecca]: Yup, yup. And I'm going to say it again. I don't at this point see an issue with this because the alternative is we have nothing. And every time I hear people saying exit the system, all I can hear is build back better. Build back better. And until we have some semblance of accountability, because slapping on a new system to this shit's not going to solve anything either. It's like voting. You could vote in whomever you want, but it's not going to solve the issue. And you can disagree with me. I'm sharing my perspective on this and what I've seen and understanding. And what it always leads me back to. If the Constitution meant nothing, let's understand that even if,*

---

<sup>51</sup> [Stand4THEE Friday Night Zoom Aug 2nd - Who is the Government?](#)

*[Rebecca responding to another comment]: we have not tried everything, are you kidding me? We're in a global domination here. This is a this is a battle here. This is this is a war and there. Sorry. This is a war and there are battles along the way. Okay.*

*[Rebecca responding to another comment]: Yes. Yes. Yes. That's correct. So so if T. So what was I just going to say? I totally forgot. Oh, right. The Constitution.*

*[Rebecca (see time 00:48:22)]: So even if, even if all of this is true that we never confederated blah, blah, blah, here's the thing. We have since 1867, been operating even in this like fake bullshit land, we're still on which is the fake thing that they put on top of the foundation, is that they, if the foundation was so crap, then they wouldn't have had to hide it or hijack it. It wouldn't matter. And the constitution is woven into every facet of of the house, of the legislature and of the judicial system. It is part of Canada. So whether and this is this is what people need to grasp is that. When something, and this is part of the issues that we have to tackle that happen with COVID is where, even if something is atypical, unlawful or maybe against procedure, if it happens and it remains unchallenged, it becomes the norm. And so this is this is what's what we are striving to do now is to correct that so that we can go back to what it should be, which is the foundation. Instead of operating under a government that's not even a government, MPs aren't government, prime ministers not government, parties aren't government. We have to change our mindset so that when we understand that, then we can understand how to correct it.*

*[Rebecca responding to another comment]: Like grand jury being swept under the rug exactly. Exactly. So this is the first step and I'm going to continue and and you know, I hope that Amanda, you're you're you're another time you can come and join us. I know I did ask you last minute, but you know, this is so important for Canadians to understand because don't we want the truth. Don't we want to see what is there and not listen to these people like pretending to help us and I'm going to make a little dig at the conservatives because I'm over this bullshit.*

## 9 APPENDIX C

- The purpose of this section is to show any and all responses that Rebecca and/or her members have to this report.
- This report was sent to the email address [stand4thee@gmail.com](mailto:stand4thee@gmail.com) on February 18.
- I had a brief exchange with Rebecca in Amanda Ridding’s Telegram group on February 28 (see section 9.2). It is reasonable to conclude from this exchange that Rebecca has no intention of responding my assessment and report on S4T. **Rebecca cannot challenge, counter or refute any part of my report.**

### 9.1 2025-02-18 – email from Ian to Rebecca

Hello Rebecca,

Here is the [video link](#) and the [document link](#) to my report on and assessment of you and your group Stand4Thee. If you choose to respond then please be aware I treat all communications as public and will them made available in Appendix C of written document.

Ian Bell

[www.virusfraud.org](http://www.virusfraud.org)

### 9.2 2025-02-28 – My exchange with Rebecca and Amanda Ridding

#### 9.2.1 CONTEXT

- Amanda Ridding has a Telegram social media group called [Canadian Law Study Group \(#BePartoftheChange\)](#).
- Amanda initiated this exchange between the three of us (i.e. myself, Rebecca and Amanda) by posting a statement that the BNA Act is Canada’s constitution.
- Of relevance to this report on Stand4Thee, two posts by Rebecca (see sections 9.2.6 and 9.2.8) indicate Rebecca herself will not be responding to this report of mine.
- Posts by Amanda are included to provide context. Other than that, Amanda’s posts are of no relevance to this report of mine on Stand4Thee.

## 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 that, as a constitutional expert, Smith arguments 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 is a legitimate constitution.

## 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.

## 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 ball park 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:

- I mistakenly assumed this post was from Rebecca when it is actually from Amanda.
- Amanda says she will not spend her time doing my homework. I have read both of Smith's books. Amanda acknowledges (see section 9.2.14) that she has not read either book.
- If I understand correctly, by "*doing your homework*" Amanda is saying I must do my research on the work she is doing and determine for myself whether or not she answer my question and provides the proof that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution.
- Given my work with our other pseudo-legal groups, including Stand4Thee, I recognize the pattern of deflection and deception that Amanda employs here. My suspicion at this point is that Amanda is bluffing, she knows she has no proof that the BNA Act is a legitimate constitution but she needs to save face with her followers.

## 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:

- 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.*

### 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 picked picked up on it.
- But do you see the deception here? On the one hand, Amanda points out a spelling technicality I missed with her knowing full well I missed it. 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, our entire exchange is based on this highly pertinent “*technicality*”. Amanda intentionally deflects and ignores it.

## 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, so far, deflected from providing the proof to support her claim that the BNA is a legitimate constitution.
- In this post, I make it clear that our exchange is focused on Amanda providing her proof that Canada has a legitimate constitution.
- By stating “*I will accept this as your response to my question*” I have made it clear that she has not provided the proof to support her claim.

## 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 deflected and evaded.
  - As a 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 stating the BNA Act is Canada's constitution, it is reasonable to conclude all Amanda is doing is expressing her uniformed and unsupported opinion.