

# Mystery Bolen Theater!

By David N. Brown

Since the initial outcry over DDI's lawsuit against Stephen Barrett, reports have been few and far between, and dominated by hype from Tim Bolen. To counter his influence, I have been doing my own "reporting" with his false claims, failed predictions and outright threats as the central "story". But, I have not been able to fully do justice to Bolen, without descending below any semblance of journalism. To fill in the gap, I have written the following: The complete text of three of Bolen's posts, accompanied "MST3K" style with articulate but irreverent original commentary. Enjoy!

## Federal Summons Issued For NCAHF...

Opinion by Consumer Advocate [Tim Bolen](#)

Wednesday, August 18th, 2010

We have to keep our eye on the Doctor's Data v Barrett, et al, Federal case. Something new is always happening, or at least brewing. Here is the latest Pacer record:

*"SUMMONS Issued as to Defendant The National Council Against Health Fraud, Inc. (vcf, ) (Entered: 08/11/2010)"*

I don't have a copy of the document, because it simply isn't filed in the record, but I imagine it reads very similar to the last one filed against Quackwatch, Inc...

In the service filed formally against Quackwatch, Inc. it clearly states that:

***YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED*** and required to serve upon PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY

*Augustine, Kern, and Levens, Ltd, 218 North Jefferson St., Suite 102, Chicago, IL 60661*

*an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 21 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, **judgment by default** will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You must also file your answer with the Clerk of this Court within a reasonable period of time after this service.*

## So, what will happen here?

OK - the NCAHF will have 21 days to respond... Will they do that? Not in any of our lifetimes... Why? Because, and I am not joking here, the last time they did a fund

raiser, their current president, bobbie baratz (Robert S. Baratz MD, DDS, PhD), offered a photo of me, Tim Bolen, as an incentive for a contribution. Um???"

Hmm... First, Bolen said there would be a default judgment against Barrett because Barrett had not replied through an attorney within 21 days. Then he admitted Barrett was given a longer period of time to respond. Then he claimed that there would be a default judgment against NCAHF had because NCAHF had not replied through an attorney. Now he admits that a court summoned NCAHF to appear, but persists in claiming that there will be a default judgment, now simply because NCAHF supposedly does not have money to pay for the proceedings.

The last time I paid any attention to the NCAHF was when I tried to buy a \$112,000 Court judgment against them, but a group of Homeopathic manufacturers would not sell it to me.

Bolen was telling a different story at Respectful Insolence on July 4: "Doctor's Data is probably going to buy the \$112,000 plus interest Court Judgment against the NCAHF who owes six homeopathic manufacturers for attorneys fees. That would give Doctor's Data immediate access to Barrett's financial records without having to wait for Discovery in this new case. Then they could start the process of seizing any money they find including contributions for his legal fund. Judgments last forever and are unstoppable." By doing so, he strongly implied that no one should make further donations to the defense fund. It would now appear that he did so despite knowing that such a sale was very unlikely to occur, thus effectively lying to undermine Barrett's defense.

At the time baratz bragged that the NCAHF was run out an address in Massachusetts that turned out to be the address of his baratz's hair removal salon. I had found out that the NCAHF, at that time, had not done their corporate record keeping and I would have been able to pierce their NCAHF corporate veil and gone after the money, plus collection costs, from the individual Board Members.

Would I have done that? (smile here)...

This is quite a bizarre statement. It appears that seven years ago, Bolen [said](#): "The NCAHF is operating out of a cardboard box in the back room of Bobbie Baratz's Braintree, MA hair removal salon, and has so little money, that Baratz begged members for cash, offering a picture of me (Tim Bolen) as an incentive for contribution." Of course, he offered no evidence whatsoever. When he spoke of Baratz's "salon", he might have been speaking of the Braintree South Shore Health Center, where Baratz has worked. One might benignly suppose Bolen meant the line about NCAHF being run out of a "salon" as a joke. Perhaps he later forgot it was a joke. Also note that Bolen admits that he tried to buy a debt solely to harass and take money from people he disagrees with. Also note that, while Bolen dwells on his yarn about the NCAHF being run out of a salon, the listed address of *his* "business" is a safe deposit box.

So, let's see. Will bobbie baratz, Wallace Sampson, William Jarvis, and Stephen Barrett cough up the money personally to Defend the NCAHF? Of course not.

So, likely, this Defendant will go to "*Judgment by Default*" also. And the Plaintiff, Doctor's Data, can then go to the Judge and say "*we want their property right now Judge...*"

Bolen seems fixated on the idea of a default judgment, and more generally the idea that "quackbusters" are, despite "Big Pharma" largesse, too poor to afford even the costs of replying to the initial service. Reality check: If the judge were going to rule against NCAHF simply for failure to hire the right person to fill out the right paperwork, *he would not have summoned them to appear in court*. I can understand Bolen's disappointment; I was expecting to see the case dismissed by the end of last month. But it's time to face reality and move on.

So, what property is there? Well, there could be a lot, if the NCAHF Board members forgot to complete their corporate paperwork again - for Doctor's Data could go after the whole twenty million from the individual NCAHF Board Members - just like I was going to do with the \$112,000 judgment.

Bolen keeps talking about this judgment. But he still has not shown any evidence that it ever existed. I have a brainstorm: If the case doesn't get thrown out or dropped before entering discovery, Barrett should subpoena Bolen, and grill Bolen about the supposed \$112,000 figure the same way Aetna did about the "New York advertising agency" he said was running Quackwatch. Then, he can either a) be thrown in jail for perjury for repeating the \$112,000 figure, b) thrown in jail for contempt of court for not saying where he heard of the \$112,000 figure; c) thrown in jail for obstruction of justice when he admits he has no idea how much money is or ever was specified in the judgment but used it to threaten Barrett's legal fund; or d) on the off-chance the \$112,000 figure is true, thrown in jail for releasing the contents of confidential legal documents.

Or, they could just grab the emailing list for the Consumer Health Digest, where, I am sure, you will find the names of some of the sleaziest people on the planet, including some who could be added on to the case as Defendants.

As in his RI comments, Bolen gives a surprising account of how a collection process would work. Normally, documents have no monetary value. And it would appear that courts do not normally allow a successful plaintiff to grab property left and right. The normal course of action would appear to be a court-ordered auction, in which typically the property is sold by a professional third party to members of the public. In any event, exactly how would DDI's lawyers justify trying to subpoena Consumer Health Digest's mailing list *after dropping the digest as a defendant*? Also note that Bolen continues to assert that people could be added as defendants merely for supporting Barrett.

The NCAHF has until September 1st, 2010 to answer... Two weeks from now.

Stay tuned.

Tim Bolen - Consumer Advocate



## Barrett Lawyers Up - Sort Of...

Opinion by Consumer Advocate [Tim Bolen](#)

Saturday, August 21st, 2010

I admit this move by [Stephen Barrett](#) took me by surprise. I actually thought this lawyer Barrett hired, to defend him in the Doctor's Data v Stephen Barrett, et al case, Michael K. Botts, was dead.

Bolen appears to have a problem with keeping track of whether people are alive or dead. He has been previously [mocked](#) for claiming that Susan Getzendanner was dead. The name Michael K. Botts would appear hard to miss. An attorney of that name is listed #175 of 1,538 Alexandria, VA attorneys in visibility by [martindale.com](#). Other listings for that name record other addresses, most notably Kansas City, MO and Washington, DC, which appear at [skeptifiles.org](#) and Quackwatch respectively. It is entirely mysterious how Bolen could have gotten the impression that the person referred to was dead. Indeed, in the course of writing this piece, I inquired to Bolen whether he was sure that he was referring to only *one* Michael K. Botts. His reply: "Go home to mommy, little boy. Maybe mommy can teach you research. Michael K. Botts has changed addresses several times." Remarkably, Bolen does appear to be right. On the other hand, given his professed ignorance that Botts was even alive, I have every reason to discount his sudden assertion that he knows about the attorney's whereabouts over time. It would appear most likely that he got this one by simple luck, and if he had been unlucky, things could have gone very badly. After all, insulting a lawyer is generally a bad idea, and insulting two or more lawyers would be considerably more so.

More, the last case Botts handled for the quackbusters ([Herbert](#) (sic) v American Quackery (sic) Association - 1987) ended so badly for them I would have thought Botts would be the LAST CHOICE they'd ever use.

Bolen has misspelled: The actual name of the case is Victor Herbert vs. American *Quack* Association. As an added bonus, the article he links to, besides being by himself (strike 1!), describes a completely different case, *makes no mention of Botts*, and has no citations of or substantiations from court documents (see below). The last detailed account I can find is the [October 1989 NCAHF newsletter](#), which reported optimistically, "Despite delaying tactics by the defense, the Herbert vs the American Quack Association, et al, is moving forward." Michael Botts, Esq, of Kansas City, MO, is listed as a contact for Herbert's legal fund. According to [Barrett](#), "The group quietly stopped operating in 1989." So, Bolen has given the wrong name of the defendant, and linked to the wrong case. Why should we trust his account of the outcome?

But here he is...

I actually had a difficult time digging up current information on Botts. It's like he lives on the fringes of life. The closest thing I could find, attaching Botts to the real legal world,

was on a lawyer referral website showing he was with an attorney firm in Alexandria, VA listing him as "*Of Counsel*."

Then I found the usual listing for quacksters (sic), of course, as a health or political advisor for the American Council on Science and Health (ACSH.org). But, anyone can get on that page. You don't even have to be alive.

It looks to me that the ACSH doesn't keep their lists well updated, and a perusal of those lists will find that a good many of their so-called "health and political advisors" really are dead.

So Bolen says, but he gives no examples. And it has already been noted he has a hard time keeping track of such things.

Then too, I found the original legal reference for Botts on one of those lawyer reference sites, but when I went to the listed law firm's actual up-to-date website, he was not listed as one of the lawyers in any category. When I looked up the definition of "*Of Counsel*," I found that it sort of means "*we sort of know this guy,,,but he doesn't actually work here.*"

Curiouser and curiouser. According to [Wikipedia](#), "Of counsel is often the [title](#) of an [attorney](#) who is employed by a [law firm](#) or an organization, but is not an [associate](#) or a [partner](#)." Surprisingly, Botts' name is absent from a current [listing](#) of the firm Bolen appears to have in mind. On the other hand, his status as "of counsel" is reported on a number of professional sites, including [martindale.com](#), [lawyers.com](#) and a cached page for pview.[findlaw.com](#). A reasonable, peace-loving possum would conclude from this that Botts *did* work for the firm at one time, but left relatively recently. But the Bolenator tries to suggest (in his usual semi-coherent fashion) that he *never* worked there, that the firm *says* he never worked there, and that multiple sites that *do* say he worked there are wrong. Thus, he tops himself in foolhardy defamation: In defaming one lawyer, he also defames an entire law firm, and by extension defames at least three sites *run by and for legal professionals*.

So, who in the world is Michael K. Botts? Strangely, in his application to appear on [Stephen Barrett's](#) behalf in the Northern Illinois Federal Court, Botts claims to have appeared there earlier (February 10th, 2010), in a case called "*Fifth Market v CME Group*." Naturally I looked that up and - guess what - there is no no (sic) such case listed.

Let's see what happens when I google for Botts plus CME... [Found it](#).

Hmmm?

Indeed.

**Now, it is going to get interesting...**

Michael K. Botts was the attorney who so thoroughly embarrassed the late [Victor Herbert](#) in the famous "*Herbert v American Quackery (sic) Association*" case. Botts was

Herbert's attorney, and Herbert was so completely and thoroughly horse-whipped in that case I am surprised he didn't drop out of public life, entirely.

[Herbert](#) and Botts, it appears, decided one day in late 1987 to shut down the alternative medicine movement (It's OK to laugh here). So they sued everyone they could think of all at once in a Federal court in Northern Iowa.. (sic) Over a ten year period they suffered one humiliation after another with the Federal Court, at one point, awarding Frank Weiwel (sic) ([www.peopleagainstcancer.org](http://www.peopleagainstcancer.org)) HALF of Herbert's assets.

Yup - that's what I said "*HALF of Herbert's assets.*"

Of course Herbert was a [quackbuster](#). Which means that he had the personal substance of a flea fart, and HALF of his net worth was three thousand dollars.

The link given here is the same non sequitur cited when he introduced the American Quack Association case. Again, it is accompanied by bad spelling, as the name is actually Wiewel, which, if derived from German, should probably be pronounced "Wee-well" (insert 5<sup>th</sup>-grade bully giggling.) In that article, Bolen describes a 1993 incident in which Herbert got into a physical altercation with Wiewel over the latter's use of a tape recorder. Bolen alleges that this resulted first in an assault charge against Herbert, then in a suit by Herbert against Wiewel. Allegedly, the alleged suit over the allegedly physical alleged altercation allegedly ended with an alleged judge allegedly ordering Herbert to pay an alleged \$3,000 dollars for Wiewel's alleged fees, which Herbert allegedly alleged was half of only \$6,000 allegedly in his possession. The closest thing to substantiation for Bolen's story is a similar allegation made by [Matthew D.M. Lee](#), without any citations of court sources, with notable discrepancies in details (including the absence of Wiewel's name, NO mention of a lawsuit, and the year being given as 1987), and still no mention of Botts. Of course, we do not have the slightest reason to accept Bolen's account as true or even based on a true event. (My best guess is that something like the incident occurred at some point, and was settled completely out of court.) But if it were true, what does it have to do with Michael K. Botts? Or the American Quack Association? Or even the year 1987?

One of the things I have always noticed about the attorneys the [quackbusters](#) seem to use is a common lack of understanding of some basic legal principles - like, for instance: Jurisdiction, timely filings. basic legal understandings. Either they don't know these things - or they intentionally ignore them.

For instance, I was in shock when I first took on famous author/health humanitarian Hulda Regehr Clark PhD as a client, after she had been falsely arrested and hauled back to Indiana under the fake claim that she had been "*practicing medicine without a license,*" during the research period for her best-selling book "*The Cure for HIV/Aids*" six years before. I soon traced her problems back to the [quackbuster](#) operation, and in my usual soft-spoken approach with the quackbuster sleaze brigades (sarcasm intended), I lit off the B-52s and went and found where they lived.

Just for clarification, he is talking about the same Hulda Clark who sold "zappers" hundreds of dollars? Who charged cancer patients tens of thousands to stay in "clinics" housed in substandard hotels and tent-city enclosures in Mexico? Who charged \$80 to have teeth pulled?

Who chose to associate with a “Medical Escrow Society” that sold people life insurance to pay for her methods? Who, despite claiming to have the “cure for all cancers”, died of cancer?

But, my "shock" was not over what was being done to Clark, for there are hundreds of cutting-edge health professionals who have had this sort of treatment. My "shock" was in the fact that my opposition was so POOR, and that they were maintaining an assault with sheer bullshit - no bullets, no real bombs, just a lot of noise.

Soon, a lawsuit appeared against Clark, filed in San Francisco, by Stephen Barrett's personal attorney, at the time, Christopher Grell. The case was a joke, so poorly assembled that the Judge in the case began to hack away at Grell's case with what are called OSC hearings (Orders to Show Cause) - eighteen of them, as I recall. In short, Grell sued a bunch of people; Clark, and people who knew her, in a San Francisco Superior Court. About eighty percent of those people lived outside the jurisdiction of that court - so they were dismissed from the suit.

So, I thought this guy Grell was abysmally stupid - for that wasn't the only thing wrong with his case. Of course, as we all know, the case got dismissed and was terribly humiliating for Barrett and the boys.

But then there's Michael K. Botts. Frankly, he was before my time in the movement, as was Victor Herbert. I missed out then. Botts, it appears was the quackbuster guru for "wrong jurisdiction" filings, for in the "*Herbert v American Quackery Association*" case the Court Dismissed 22 of the 25 Defendants for "Jurisdiction" issues early in the case. Two others were thrown out by the Judge (mistrial) because the Plaintiff did not make a case against them - and the Judge ordered those Defendant's attorney fees to be paid. And the last Defendant simply waited the case out - and it all went away.

Curiouser and curiouser... Where are the records of these rulings? Surely, Bolen could provide them, if they exist. Most curious of all is his claim that the case “all went away”. From Barrett’s account, it was the AQA that “went away”.

[Victor Herbert](#) was shown to be the screaming piss ant he really was.

Sounds like the skunk calling the ferret smelly...

**So, it's time for a little humor - at their expense, of course...**

Of course I watch to see what the quackbusters are up to. It is amazingly easy to follow their activities. In a sense, they are like misbehaving children and cannot help but telegraph their intentions. Also, it is a good way to determine whether or not they have any people with brains in their midst - anybody truly dangerous.

A good place to observe wanna-be quackbuster's behavior is at Orac's blog. Although [Orac the Nipple Ripper](#) himself, David Gorski MD, writes in a whiney, limp-wristed, girly-boy, framework, you'll still find some gems in his comments section. Gorski, I believe,

really is the one hand-picked (so far) to replace failing Stephen Barrett. So, it is a good place to divine the Farm Team's thinking.

So, over in Orac's blog this guy appears, calling himself "Igor" (I kid you not) and claims to be an attorney. He then starts to tell everyone how easy it is going to be to win this case, blah, blah, blah... His strategy, he claims, is to immediately file a Motion to Dismiss, before an answer is made to the case, and he talks about how successful he knows these "pre-answer" Motions are.

Curious... While there is a commenter with the handle "Igor", and he did agree with me that a motion to dismiss would be an effective strategy. He mentioned being involved in litigation where such motions were successful, but did not specifically claim to be an attorney. So, it would appear most likely that Bolen is using Igor as a proxy to further defame me. It happens that this comes after I roasted him for his column defaming me, and sending a strongly worded complaint to Trueman Tuck and three others who reposted it. Could it be that the Bolenator has been frightened by a starving possum?

Well, on that part he is right. Those "pre-answer" Motions are very successful - especially when used against quackbusters. In California, for instance, the most common "pre-answer" Motion is an "Anti-SLAPP Motion," and Stephen Barrett was made familiar with that legal move the hard way - for he, and his fellow Plaintiffs, in the Barrett v Clark case ended up coughing up, or are in the process of coughing up, over \$500,000 of legal fees to the Defendant Ilena Rosenthal's attorneys.

This time, Bolen's claims are easily checked, and he is wrong. According to a document made available by Rosenthal, a court judgment awarded her \$434,000. That's a lot, but it doesn't even *round up* to \$500,000. What's very curious is that Bolen has published the \$434,000 figure. The status of the debt is murky: [Terry Polevoy](#), named for \$311,000, reports that a court stopped her from attempting to collect in 2008, and that she already assigned any money collected to her lawyers.

More, the NCAHF, another Defendant in this Doctor's Data v Barrett et al case, also knows how bad that kind of Motion can be - for they still owe, as per Court Judgment, \$112,000 in legal fees to a group of Homeopathic manufacturers.

But let's get to the humor part.

### **Barrett has an Attorney named "Igor?"**

What is an Igor? Well, according to [Wikipedia](#) (snort):

*"Igor (or sometimes Ygor) is the traditional [stock character](#) or cliché [hunch-backed assistant or butler](#) to many types of villain, such as [Count Dracula](#) or a [mad scientist](#), familiar from many [horror movies](#) and horror movie [parodies](#), the [Frankenstein](#) series and [Van Helsing](#)<sup>[1]</sup> films in particular."*

*"Ygor", played by [Bela Lugosi](#); this character, however, is neither a hunchback nor a lab assistant, but an insane broken-necked blacksmith who reanimates the Monster as an instrument of vengeance against the townspeople who attempted to hang him for graverobbing."*

How fitting is this?

Now Barrett decides to make fun of people named Igor, and I take greater offense on their behalf than my own. The name Igor has belonged to some very important men. My personal favorite is [Igor Sikorsky](#), the inventor of the first successful helicopters. He cuts a virtually heroic profile in aviation history: a survivor of the fall of Tsarist Russia; an immigrant who started his own successful company in the USA; a researcher who persisted at what seemed like an impossible task, and a leader who challenged his team with his most famous words, "According to the laws of aerodynamics, the bumblebee can't fly either." But, Bolen would rather make jokes about a fictional character.

I swear, it is beginning to look like Barrett's Defense is being organized by the scriptwriters for Saturday Night Live...

Stay tuned.

Tim Bolen - Consumer Advocate

## Has Stephen Barrett's "Puppet Master" Appeared?

Opinion by Consumer Advocate [Tim Bolen](#)

Wednesday, August 25th, 2010

I think the arrival of [Michael K. Botts, Esq.](#) as Stephen Barrett's attorney in the [Doctor's Data v Barrett](#), Federal lawsuit is significant.

It is a flat-out desperation move. Simply, [Stephen Barrett](#) could not afford to hire a law firm to Defend. So someone is providing an attorney of their choice - not someone Barrett would pick - Michael K. Botts, who is not a litigator but an intellectual property and patent attorney.

So, let's see if we have this straight: Bolen says that Botts is unqualified and unsuccessful, but at the same time says that Barrett could not possibly afford him. So which will it be? Then there's the bit about Botts not being a "litigator" because he is "an intellectual property and patent attorney". Right. Because no one has ever sued or been sued for copyright or patent infringement. I guess I can stop my imaginative efforts to get away with selling my "fan fics". Then when I get sued, I can sue Bolen for giving me bad advice.

Why would someone pick Botts when he is not a litigator? Because Botts is, himself, a [quackbuster](#). He is close to being an insider, and he is, clearly, a zealot. You will find his name interspersed through [quackbuster](#) documents going back as far as 1986. For instance, below is a reference to the so-called

### **The Scientific Review of Alternative Medicine and Aberrant Medical Practices**

**Publisher:** Paul Kurtz

**Editor in Chief:** Wallace I. Sampson, MD, FACP, Clinical Professor of Medicine, Stanford University

**Managing Editor:** Meghann French

**Science Editor:** Saul Green, PhD

**Associate Editors:** Barry Beyerstein, PhD, Timothy Gorski, MD, Steven Novella, MD

**Senior Editor:** Michael K. Botts, Esq.

Pay close attention to the fact that, in typical [quackbuster](#) attention to detail (sarcasm intended), two of the people currently listed are DEAD (Barry Beyerstein and Saul Green), and have been dead for quite a while. However, I'd bet their current work is just about as good now as when they were alive.

Finally, examples. And the first question worth asking is, SO WHAT??? The source cited is a journal. Journal staff are known to die. Somewhat to my surprise, I found that the two people named are, in fact, dead. Where did I find that information? In [the table of contents of SRAM](#).

### **So, why does Barrett have to use an attorney who has limited litigation experience?**

My guess is that (1) [Stephen Barrett](#) could not get his homeowner's insurance policy to pay for a second Defense (he was previously sued in Pennsylvania), (2) He could not raise serious money from his so-called support network, (3) He has been abandoned by the old [quackbuster](#) soldiers, (4) He could not get any advocacy group, like Public Citizen, to come to his aid.

I'm guessing he fell back on his Puppet Master with a simple device - *"if they get me they will get YOU..."*

So, suddenly, [Stephen Barrett](#) has a questionable attorney he can't really afford, a guy who is a known zealot. It makes sense if you look, once again, at the inset above.

There is a name that ALWAYS plays an important role in Barrett, and other [quackbuster](#) and [skeptic \(pseudo-skeptic\)](#) activities. Who? [Paul Kurtz](#), the owner of Prometheus Press, the Skeptical Enquirer Magazine, the originator of [CSICOP](#), and the publisher of too-many-to-name-here anti-AltMed publications - and, of course, a whole host of sexual deviance publications including, according to an article I'll show you below, a big bunch of pro-pedophile stuff.

[Paul Kurtz](#) - I think he is the Money Man, the guy who, in my opinion, when, and if, he tells Barrett to jump, Barrett responds with *"How high Sir?"* as he leaps into the air. I think Kurtz is the guy who is writing the checks to Michael K. Botts, Esq. We know for sure that Kurtz is the guy who publishes Barrett's crappy books, providing Barrett, and other quackpots, with an income, and who makes money publishing Barrett's crappy books.

[Paul Kurtz](#) - Barrett, and the entire US "skeptic" community's "Puppet Master..."

So, Bolen gives more names, but what about them is supposed to be impressive? Paul Kurtz, it turns out, is a professor of philosophy, dubbed "father of secular humanism". Other names I have run across before. Prometheus Books is a small to mid-sized publisher, which in my opinion and experience does not have very high editorial standards. (They first came to my attention for publishing the works of GA Wells, whom I would classify as "denialist".) Skeptical Inquirer is a publication with US circulation of 50,000. And CSICOP is best known for investigating UFOs. So how exactly does this add up to a "puppet master" of the medical research/ business establishment? Indeed, why should the real and imagined powers of "Big Pharma" bother with this lot, when they already sponsor colleges, hospitals and prime time television?

### **So, What does this mean?**

So, what do I think will happen now? Instead of a "legal" Defense, they're going to use a two part strategy:

(1) Delay, delay, delay - for the last thing the [quackbusters](#) want is to have Barrett (a) examined by a Psychiatrist, (b) forced into a two or three day video taped Deposition. (c) or to have the NCAHF board members Deposed, (d) or to have [Paul Kurtz](#), [Terry Polevoy](#), [Orac the Nipple Ripper](#), Steve Novella, [William London](#), or [Paul Lee](#) Deposed.

Any of the above would create a disaster for them.

It is striking that Bolen persists in threatening people with being dragged into the suit merely for reporting critically about it. This time he makes a plausible threat. Attorneys certainly *could* try to depose hostile bloggers, the same way Clifford Shoemaker tried to subpoena Kathleen Seidel, and such efforts *could* create significant inconvenience. But who would be taking the real risk? It seems unlikely that an attorney would try to subpoena all of us, and to judge from the Seidel example, probably not one would have to appear. Any cost to us would be measured in the time and postage it would take to quash them like a roach being hit with a hammer. (Incidentally, ever heard that a roach's head can stay alive after being severed? It's true.) The cost to DDI's attorneys, on the other hand, could be sanctions or even worse. Why would they risk damage to their careers just to harass us?

(2) They will instigate a "screaming" Defense, similar to the tactic [Victor Herbert](#) used to use. Botts, I'd guess, is a zealot who will scream out, in writing, the [quackbuster](#) message in Barrett's Official Response.

Why? Once the Response message is on file then the **public relations campaign** to destroy Doctor's Data Laboratory, and the Doctors that have used their services, will begin in earnest. Barrett, and his Puppet Master, will call on all of their resources, all at once, in an effort to win.

But, will this work?

Nope. They've tried this before, and each time it has backfired.

As usual, Bolen gives no evidence or examples. But it does sound a lot like how he and his clients handled the 2001 "racketeering" suit against Barrett.

This time, I'd bet, it will backfire even more.

### **What is their Public Relations tactic going to be?**

This is easy. Once Botts files something, anything, the so-called support network (insert the word "co-conspirators" here) will write comments on their blogs, based on what Botts writes in those Court Documents, about the case. Since they are all linked together in a Search Engine Optimization (SEO) move (insert the term "civil conspiracy" here), they will be using their

existing structure to dominate the internet search engines and Wikipedia, with their destructive, defamatory, version of the lawsuit.

Really? What exactly would we do to make the lawsuit look more “destructive” and “defamatory” than it is? Why does he think we would wait for an attorney’s cue? What does he think I have *been* doing the last month? And what’s this about us being “linked together”? I’m just a starving possum.

Then they will send out Press Releases referring to the comments from alleged "scientific groups" (co-conspirators) that can supposedly be found on the first pages of search engines like Google. Then, once some 85 IQ reporter writes a story, then they can refer other reporters to that story, blah, blah, blah.

And that is *so totally not* what Bolen is doing for DDI.

Simple? Yes. And, it is what they are doing right now - so it would seem that it should work, for they think, the North American Health Freedom Movement is too dumb to counter it.

It might have worked three years ago. Now, all it is going to get is that the blog owners and writers involved will simply be added on to the lawsuit in a "*Second Amended Complaint*."

My guess is that Doctor's Data's law firm, [Augustine, Kern, and Levens](#), is quietly sitting their like a cat outside of a mouse hole. A pleasant, playful lunch will be along in a minute.

This is as good a time as any to note something I find amusing. While senior lia- I mean lawyers Augustine and Levens started this legal fumaroles with threatening letters in which they refused to tell Barrett what they wanted him to retract, DDI’s representatives at trial are Levens and one Jaya Venkataramari. The story this brings to mind is something like: A leading white guy and his second in command decide to do something stupid and dangerous. Then, on second thought, the lead guy sends his second to do it, and he takes some poor black (or in this case brownish) bastard to do most of the work. But Bolen presumes they are as confident as he is.

It will be a shock, I think, for individual members of the quackpot Farm Team (the bloggers, and the commenters on those blogs) to realize that after that guy that showed up at their place of work this morning, with the Court Summons, they now have 21 days, themselves, to lawyer up (mortgaging the house, selling the car, pawning the dog's jewelry), individually, and Respond.

Right. Like DDI can afford to serve a hundred new defendants. Like we can’t file motions to dismiss for free. Like a judge wouldn’t be suspicious of revising a complaint simply to sue people who criticize them for suing in the first place.

After the first one gets served there will be panic in the quackpot ranks.

## So, What's this "Puppet Master" Stuff?

It's been right here in front of us all this time. There is someone running Barrett. Someone who prefers not to be seen for obvious reasons. Let us start with some simple, sensible, assumptions:

(1) [Stephen Barrett](#) does NOT run those websites. He couldn't hold a full-time job during most of his professional career. He couldn't even pass the test to become a Psychiatrist. For a long period of time he had a guy named Paul Lee, PT from Denmark, editing the sites. Lee has disappeared from sight. So who actually runs those websites?

(2) Barrett is not running the [quackbuster](#) operation. He is not that bright, and that will show up quickly when we see the two days of video-taped Deposition he will be forced into, posted on the internet.. Barrett has deep-seated psychological problems. They'll show up in a Court ordered Psychiatric examination. Barrett is a front-man.

Curious. Apart from Bolen, even Barrett's enemies do not appear interested in questioning his sanity. On the other hand, Bolen has attracted nouns and adjectives like "pathological liar", "nutcase", "Tim O'Ranter", "rabidly insane", "obsessional and delusional", and "spammy kook". So, if the case goes on long enough for Tim to be dragged into court, why don't we make him get a psychological examine?

(3) There are two parts to the internet component of the quackwatch, etc., operation: (a) the actual misinformation articles, but more importantly (b) The SEO component which floats the scum to the top of the septic tank. Barrett has no training in SEO. It is being done by a professional. Professionals get paid a lot of money. So, who's paying?

I had two separate analysis done, by SEO experts, of how [Stephen Barrett](#), and the [pseudoskeptics](#) float to the top of the search engines. It is not by accident. It is planned and executed. How they do it makes them co-conspirators. Co-conspiracy is actionable.

This lawsuit, [Doctor's Data v Barrett](#), is just starting to get interesting.

Now this certainly is "interesting". Frequently, I have been leading google search lists. So, do I have help from an SEO? No, I don't have anything but a \$100 laptop, a free blog, and a "gig" with examiner.com. Yet, it is certainly true, I do seem to be leading Bolen. But before Bolen threatens me with being sued for beating him in "google wars", he really ought to consider the following, non-exclusive hypotheses:

1. You are the only one posting in DDI's favor, compared to scores posting against it.
2. You associate with people accused of fraud.
3. You say things you can't prove.
4. You report things that are not true.

5. You predict things that do not happen.
6. You give the impression that you are dishonest, insane or both.
7. You have no credibility.
8. You get your allies sued.
9. You write like a fifth grader who is also a bully.
10. No one cares what you have to say, except for the people whom you defame.

Stay tuned.

To reality? Not if you're reading "Bolen Report".