



Fw: Resolving the problems CONFIDENTIAL

From: **Christopher Story FRSA** (cstory@worldreports.org)
 Sent: Wed 3/12/08 10:56 PM
 To: Ambassador Leo E Wanta (diplomat_switzerland@msn.com)
 Cc: MICHAEL COTTRELL (pii-mcc@msn.com)

----- Original Message -----

From: Christopher Story FRSA
To: ThomasEsq_232@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2008 8:28 PM
Subject: Resolving the problems CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Mr Henry

As you know my task and responsibility is to correctly inform our subscribers about the international financial situation, and to furnish them with intelligence that may not be available in the so-called 'mainstream' media.

I have become aware of the fact that harmonious relations between my friend Ambassador Wanta and Michael C. Cottrell appear to have broken down. I find myself awkwardly caught in the middle of this, but nevertheless I must report accurately to our subscribers now and in the future.

This morning, the Ambassador asked me to call you, and I tried to do this without success. I am therefore placing my queries and points before you by this means. Since the Ambassador asked me to call you, as you can verify with him, the purpose must be so that you can respond to my necessary arms-length questions. I would be grateful if you would do so, as soon as you can.

First, the Ambassador informed me last week that a Chartered Bank Trust (as I believe I heard him state) was being established to operate either in lieu of or in parallel with AmeriTrust Groupe, Inc.. **Could you confirm that this entity will operate a corporate securities account?** The reason I ask this question is that the Ambassador had all his funds stolen from bank accounts. A corporate securities account provides far better security to ensure that the funds are not compromised or stolen. Since this fact is indisputable, I imagine that you will agree that it would be unwise, hazardous and even irresponsible to use a straight bank account.

I am aware that the Ambassador may not agree with this, but as Editor of *International Currency Review*, this is what I believe to be true.

I also know that the funds are required to be delivered and executed under the US Treasury Direct arrangements procured in 2005 and 2007, and that this arrangement stands and cannot be altered. I further assume that any instruction given concerning the disposition of the funds by the Ambassador *from Wisconsin* would entail a grievous response from the Wisconsin State Department of Revenue, so that no instructions can be given by Mr Wanta from there without such obvious adverse consequences.

Secondly, given this background I need to know (for the reason stated at the outset) why changing the arrangements at the last moment enhances the situation in any way? This cannot possibly be the case.

An objective reporter would be liable to draw the opposite conclusion, especially given the close collaboration between the two parties that has prevailed at least until the turn of the year - that, on the contrary, changing the arrangements places everything in glaring jeopardy.

Specifically, the objective observer would be inclined to conclude that the underlying purpose 'of others' here may be duplicitous, and may include *inter alia* the following objectives:

(a) To fold up The Wanta Plan, contrary to the wishes of the Group of Seven countries and HM The Queen.

(b) To create the impression to the Ambassador that he is to be in free receipt of his funds, when the

<http://by127w.bay127.mail.live.com/mail/PrintShell.aspx?type=message&cpids=fcd67439...> 3/13/2008

underlying intention is to relieve him of them.

(c) To frame him as previously, to have him in court and sent to prison, or to dispose of him after his money has been stolen.

(d) To frame or otherwise compromise Mr Cottrell himself.

One reason I believe this is likely is that I have not received an answer to my enquiry, repeated below.

If I did not explain myself adequately, what I wanted to know is what steps have been taken to clear the Ambassador's name as a felon?

We know that he ought not to be labelled a felon, but the record states otherwise. We know all the background and history of this matter, specifically as I personally have deconstructed the Wisconsin State Department of Revenue tax fabrications fraud, and am in a position to continue publicising this fraud in the Ambassador's interest until the matter is resolved. This has been the case ever since I first investigated the oppressive State tax fabrications against him, and their unlawful consequences, 16 months ago.

So my question is: as you are his lawyer, WHY am I still under the impression, given your lack of response, that you have not yet procured that his status as a felon has been overturned? I asked Mr Goodwin if he would deal with this, also to no effect; and I have placed Judge Martin of the Dane County Circuit Court on notice under the Misprision of Felony Statute concerning the grotesque miscarriages of justice affecting the Ambassador; and STILL the situation remains UNRESOLVED.

YOU are his lawyer, and surely it is up to YOU to make sure that these injustices are reversed. Do you concur with these statements and my interpretation of the position?

Why am I harping on about this? Because it stands to reason that if Mr Wanta remains registered as a felon, documents signed by him could be treated as nul and void or inapplicable. It is for THIS reason that, irrespective of what you, Michael C. Cottrell or the Ambassador himself may assume, and irrespective of the Ambassador's own powerful and authoritative position, I personally, on the basis of the data to hand, believe that Ambassador Wanta is being set up, as before, and that the intention may be to relieve him of his funds and to dispose of him once and for all.

In this connection, it is to be noted that his diplomatic status provided him with ZERO protection in 1993. Why, then, is it assumed that this would no longer be the case? It has been demonstrated before the whole world that so far as the US Federal and one US State Government are concerned, **diplomatic status has no meaning and offers no protection.**

Prudence and common sense would therefore dictate that this situation remains unchanged

I understand that our Head of State was also concerned about the possibility that the Ambassador is being set up; and I am saying this from my own sources, not from information given to me by the Ambassador.

Further, it is manifestly in the interests of people who wish the Ambassador ill (which category DOES NOT include me, Mr Cottrell or HMQ, obviously) that discord should have been sown at this late stage (over the past few months) between the Ambassador and Mr Cottrell.

Given my extremely delicate and unsought-after personal and professional position in this matter, I am now aware of the positions of both parties, in general terms. I have repeatedly stated that the supposed breach is based upon a series of misunderstandings which may have been fomented by malevolent parties with nefarious agendas, including the 'Never-Pay' agenda.

In this connection I detect the following misconceptions:

1. *That Michael C. Cottrell 'has another agenda'.* Although I was introduced to MC by the Ambassador, my contact with Mr Wanta was cut off for several months from last November and has only recently been restored. Earlier I did get to know Mr Cottrell quite well. I do agree that he does 'blow up' on occasion, but I also perceive that this represents a perfectly natural response to the double-dealing, deception, lies, bait and switch and all the other Black Arts perpetrated upon him and everyone else, in his case for many more years than I have had anything to do with these matters. I can state to you as a FACT that the ONLY 'agenda' Mr Cottrell has is to try to

do what he can to save the United States from the clutches of the criminal operatives and other scamsters who have all but brought the United States and the world, by design, to its knees. He believes in the re-establishment of the Rule of Law, a sentiment with which I assume you naturally concur, seeing that you practice within it.

2. *That Mr Cottrell wishes to control everything himself.* This in my perception is not true. The reason he has insisted all along on a corporate securities account is that his expertise and experience leads him to conclude that it is a much safer receptacle for funds in the United States, than a bank account. Over 25 years ago, a US bank stole \$7,000 from ME, so I have to agree with him.

3. *That Mr Cottrell's stance on the corporate securities account is a stratagem to ensure that he has a bigger role, can control the situation, or whatever.* My independent and arms'-length conclusion on this point is that this is NOT TRUE. It is complete rubbish.

As I understand them, Mr Cottrell's motivation in possibly disagreeing with certain stances adopted of late by the Ambassador are as follows:

(a) He believes that the Ambassador will not be protected from the consequences listed above under any alternative arrangements, and that the underlying objective of NSA *et al* is to fold The Wanta Plan and to acquire control of the funds, leaving Wanta stranded as before, after their own payments have been received. Manifestly, these payments will need to be made from the corporate securities account.

(b) He believes that the Ambassador is now in greater danger than ever before and that swapping arrangements at this late stage indicates that 'others' have an unfriendly agenda. It is my experience that these people ALWAYS accuse the target of intending what THEY have in mind. I therefore have to say, and have tried to point this out to the Ambassador, that I agree with his assessment. It would be quite dishonest of me to pretend otherwise.

(c) Mr Cottrell himself fears that any altered arrangements will leave **HIM** vulnerable to extremely disagreeable consequences. Only this morning, an attempt was made by someone connected with Mr Cheney to inveigle him into a transaction involving a fraudulent corporation, the account of which is held by HSBC in Jersey: and he told me that it was clear that the purpose of this phone call was to entrap him, frame him, so that he could be 'removed' that way.

(d) The fears expressed to me by Mr Cottrell concerning the fate intended for both parties were clearly enunciated in my report dated 3rd March; and although this caused shock in certain quarters, I cannot retract what I said because I believe that what I wrote was accurate in those respects.

(e) It may even be intended that the breach between the two parties can be used as a pretext for not paying, as happened today when, to the extreme anger of trustees and of the 160+ countries whose signed documents were confirmed at The Hague yesterday, Presidents 41 and 43 intervened to stop the settlements (as reported to me this afternoon by two separate reliable sources).

It is also a FACT that the ONLY factor which has procured any movement whatsoever towards settlement has been the publicity which Wantagate has engendered. Certain parties had been labouring in the wilderness for 15-20 years to 'get things done' without success, before I came on the scene. Our 99 Wantagate reports have been the engine driving the movement towards settlement. Everyone knows that this is true.

My interim conclusions on all of the above are predicated on the fact that, as I understand it, the Ambassador's irregular status as a felon has NOT YET BEEN RECTIFIED and that THIS FAILURE TO CORRECT THE GROSS MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE leaves the ground fertile for the Ambassador to be 'dealt with' at a time that those with their 'agenda' so choose. This is quite obvious. In this connection, his diplomatic status is in my perception completely irrelevant.

I write as a friend and Number One admirer of the Ambassador and as someone who has published more than one million one hundred thousand words to try to help him, because I realised what a special person he is and understood what he had achieved. Within the 1.1 million words referenced above, I include the article dated 3rd March 2008 which, *contrary to the views of some*, was written in order to try to ensure that the worst case scenario described above does not eventuate. This has been taken the wrong way. I did not intend harm, I intended to help.

The suggestion that Mr Cottrell 'whined' to me is not accurate: he called me this morning, but his intentions are

<http://by127w.bay127.mail.live.com/mail/PrintShell.aspx?type=message&cpids=fcd67439...> 3/13/2008

E3-3

honourable, as are mine.

The Ambassador has been left in a very difficult position but the differences have, in my view, been fomented deliberately 'by others'; and the best course for both parties, for the United States and for the whole world, would be for these differences to be 'set aside' **immediately**. Surely there would be plenty of time later to change any arrangements, if necessary, in an amicable manner, when both parties have been able to discuss the issues face to face bilaterally, and most obviously, with NO input whatsoever from myself. **As Mr Wanta's lawyer, I would have thought that it would have been appropriate, indeed if I may say so, your responsibility, to ensure such an outcome.**

The fact that Morgan Stanley have rejected the payment four times does not change anything. They HAVE to comply with the Treasury Direct instruction and making other arrangements cannot change this.

At the same time, I must stress that since my position in this matter is what it is, I do need accurate guidance so that in forthcoming posted articles and printed publications, I do not inadvertently mislead our readers, of which there are a very large number. Therefore, would you please let me have the written answers and reassurances to this Chinese puzzle that I need, to enable me to do my job properly.

This is also the right moment for me to state that Mrs Linda Fanton assisted us at great risk to herself at an earlier stage, as you know. I am concerned at what has happened to her, as is the Ambassador. She should be rewarded for what she did *pro bono publico*. Since she is an American citizen, the risks she took were arguably greater than those I have taken, although since I am coming up to my 15th death threat, maybe this statement is an exaggeration. Nevertheless, her role should be recognised, which was what I told her I would try to ensure.

The enemies of the Ambassador are very good at sowing confusion and discord. They have done a good (bad) job in recent weeks and months, and I am disgusted. As a friend of the Ambassador in the awkward position I find myself in, I have taken a further risk and am trying to ensure that the unnecessary and counterproductive breach is healed. This needs to be done NOW. I am doing this to try to help resolve matters.

You may say that it is none of my business, but the Ambassador himself asked me to call you this morning.

If positions have got heated, this needs to be ascribed to the intolerable strains everyone has been placed under due to the frauds, double-crossings, lies, trickery and base behaviour of those responsible for this situation, and **should NOT be attributed to the parties concerned.**

Since I first started visiting the United States regularly in 1977, I learned a big lesson in human behaviour: how to 'let it go'. As I wrote to you in 2003, I try to adhere to Christian principles, and that is the primary motivation for this email.

I look forward to your response, so that I can have the proper guidance in order to be able to report accurately, which is what is expected of me.

Manifestly, if I receive no such guidance, I will have no choice but to conclude that my deductions (not Mr Cottrell's, but my own) are accurate.

Christopher Story FRSA

----- Original Message -----

From: Christopher Story FRSA
To: ThomasEsq_232@hotmail.com
Cc: Ambassador Leo E Wanta ; MICHAEL COTTRELL ; Ambassador Leo E Wanta
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2008 7:41 PM
Subject: RECTIFICATION OF THE WISCONSIN SCANDAL

Thomas E Henry
1125 South 79th Street