

**My defense is that I was acting out and speaking out of despair caused by a personal crisis involving extremely painful migraines, emf sensitivity and a series of repeated break-ins into my home.**

I believe that I am a targeted individual. I am one of thousands of Americans from all walks of life who claim to be victims of a secret program that harasses people, breaks into their homes, and uses emf along with bio, neuro, or nano-technologies to poison and torture their targets. Rather than kill the target, the goal is to get the target to have a breakdown that discredits them and causes them to lose their livelihood.

Our culture has been inoculated against the 'tin foil hat' stereotype. We are encouraged not just to doubt but to ridicule people who claim to be victims of anything cybernetic or bizarre. (I'm also personally working against the stereotypes of the 'mad scientist' and 'nutty professor'). This bias against victims makes covert technological harassment easy to get away with.

I first noticed that I could 'feel' wifi and cell phones in 2005—a sensitivity to emf. At the same time I developed asthma and chronic shortness-of-breath that I felt was related to exposure to emf. I later found that eating apricot pits helped and the chronic shortness-of-breath subsided in 2008, although it still flairs up. I began having minor headaches in 2010, which I also believe to be a symptom of progressively worsening emf sensitivity brought on by constant exposure. I first noticed the break-ins into my home in late 2018.

But the break-ins and emf sensitivity would have been of no consequence if not for the painful migraines which eventually became the most damaging of my problems. They slowly started getting worse after I started at Ferris in 2014, but medication helped me deal with it. The migraines eventually destroyed my marriage and my wife left me in July 2019. Just before I got tenure in Fall 2019, they reached a pinnacle of intensity. They took on a new character and came on abruptly like I'd been shot in the head with something and I would get an adrenaline rush similar to the experience of braking a bone. In June 2019, after one of the first really bad episodes, I checked myself into the emergency room and got a CT scan that was clear, (see attached documents). I didn't decide to start acting like a prima donna because I now had tenure—coincidentally, I was suddenly in great pain. The migraines would last for several days and even migraine medication didn't work.

My concerns about my targeting and my emf sensitivity and migraine pain first came to the attention of the Ferris administration on November 8, 2019, when I called the Mecosta County Sheriff to report break-ins into my home. Because I was on campus when I made the call, a Ferris police officer was dispatched to interview me in my office.

When the officer arrived, I told him that there was physical evidence of the break-ins that I could describe but he wasn't too interested in that. His line of inquiry quickly moved to questions of 'why' I thought people were breaking into my home. I have a trusting nature so I decided to share my beliefs about my targeting with him. Looking back, I should have only talked to the police officer about the home invasions.

My doctors had recently ordered an MRI to see if there was anything visibly wrong with my brain that could explain the migraines, (see attached documents). The only thing they found were 'several tiny T2 flair hyper-intensities that can be associated with migraines or age.' The overall diagnosis was that my brain was normal, but I was still worried about some of the features in the

MRI scan that looked like they could be abnormalities. I showed one of the MRI images to the police officer and I did say to him, 'What, do I have a microchip in my brain or something?' It's hard to explain nanotechnology to people, and I knew that it was unlikely that the artifact in the MRI scan I showed him was a microchip. I needed something visible to point to, but I wasn't trying to play games with him. I wasn't convinced it was a microchip—I believed it could also have been a natural blockage or accumulation of plaque, but I didn't get a chance to convey that to him. I had fallen into the 'tin foil hat' stereotype and allowed myself to be portrayed as crazy by anyone who was unsympathetic. His police report was titled, 'Mental Health Incident,' (see attached documents).

Once the Ferris administration got wind of this, rather than helping me, it felt like they punished me and tried to fire me. An email from the president of our faculty union, Charles Bacon, described their treatment of me at that point as 'harassment,' (see attached documents). Human Resources demanded that I get a letter from a doctor declaring me 'fit for duty,' or I would not be allowed to teach the next semester. I had a good relationship with my doctor, from whom I'd been getting treatment for my migraines and with whom I'd been discussing my emf sensitivity as well as the break-ins. He allayed my fears with a second x-ray that proved to my satisfaction that the weird square in the middle of my brain was just an imaging artifact due to low resolution. My doctor read the police report and the letter from HR and then wrote me a letter declaring me non-delusional (see attached documents).

As a result of the police report incident and talking to Charles Bacon, I learned that there was another professor at Ferris, whom I won't name, who was also being persecuted by the administration. It also involved the campus police as well as harassment and allegations by some custodial staff. These parallel incidents in Fall 2019 exposed a conspiracy against the faculty and I suspect are partly why our dean, Kristi Haik, was forced to leave Ferris shortly after. I'm not saying it was her fault—maybe she was just the fall-guy.

After being declared sane, the behavior of the Ferris administration should have changed. If I was sane, or even if I wasn't, they should have showed some sympathy for what I was going through or at least the police should have taken my report of break-ins seriously. Calling the police only made things worse. The break-ins at home continued, the migraines and emf sensitivity continued to cause me intense pain, and in the wake of this I started to feel harassed on campus. A stack of ungraded quizzes went missing from my office during Spring 2020 (I'd never lost a stack of grading in my life until then), and there was a possible sabotage incident in the observatory in late July 2020. I reported the observatory incident to my department head, Dave Frank, by email, but there was no response. I also cc'd Charles Bacon in that email, (see attached documents).

This is where my tweets come into the story. Beginning in Fall 2019, as a result of my frustration at not being able to stop what was happening to me and since I couldn't express myself at work, I started to fall into despair. I decided to express my despair on twitter. Despair is a dangerous emotion and it will eventually cause you to be self-destructive. And that's what happened to me. Instead of being physically violent and harmful, I decided to become verbally violent and harmful, but only on twitter. I know that many of the things I tweeted were horrible, and I don't truly feel that way in my heart. But out of spite for myself and what my world had turned into, I decided to say all the things that are some of the worst things you could say. My attitude was 'f\* it, f\* everybody and everything.' That's what chronic head trauma will do to you.

Despite the despair and isolation, I was still struggling to defend myself and stop the break-ins. I did what I could to improve my home security. I installed security cameras outside my house and I changed my locks. But that didn't stop the break-ins. I realized that there were gaps in the camera coverage and other simple flaws in my security set-up that could easily be overcome by a determined or expert burglar. I changed my locks again. In the end the thing that finally stopped the break-ins, in mid-May 2020, was when I fully nailed all of my windows shut. A fresh breeze was a luxury I couldn't afford.

But while the break-ins and intense migraines continued, so did the tweeting. In the middle of all this the Covid-19 pandemic began. The lock-down forced us to switch to remote-learning in mid-February 2020 and I successfully finished teaching that semester online. In a way this curse on the world was a blessing for me. For the first time since wifi and cell-phones became ubiquitous in 2005, I was away from emf and could control my environment. I used wired internet at home and only turned on my flip-phone if I had to make a call.

By mid-June 2020, after being away from the emf on campus and stopping the break-ins, I noticed that the intensity of my migraines began to diminish, although they didn't stop altogether. I started to recover from the despair somewhat. My tweet record started to improve (but there were still a few red zingers after that) and I tried to go back through my account and delete the really bad ones I could find. I should have just deleted the whole account in June but I didn't want to lose touch with some of the people I'd met who also claimed to be targeted individuals.

As my situation was improving, things for people in the rest of the world were getting bad due to the pandemic and the social strife it brought. In August 2020, I was moved by my conscience to speak out against the tyranny that I felt the pandemic brought, not on just twitter, but in real-life meetings. Unlike my tweets, my comments in those meetings were civil. That provoked the wrath of the administration against me once again.

It's been said that 'the Internet is forever,' and anything you've said or done on it in the past could eventually come back to haunt you. My recent twitter history made me an easy target for an administration that had already shown itself to be unsupportive. They've tried to weave a contrived fiction that the discovery and publication of my tweets was purely the spontaneous work of students at the student newspaper, The Torch. But the timeline of events I've described and more that I'll describe shows it might not have been.

In early August 2020 I let my department head, Dave Frank, know that I refuse to wear a mask on campus this coming Fall. A few days later, I got an email from HR asking about my 'mask concerns.' I didn't want to talk to them because I feel that they're not my boss. I wanted to talk to our new Provost, Bobby Fleischmann. Charles Bacon agreed and arranged for a Zoom meeting between myself, Charles, Bobby Fleischmann and MEA lawyer Brandy Vanderbrook. Before the meeting, I realized I needed to compromise—If I showed up on campus not wearing a mask I'd probably get arrested and surely fired. So in that Zoom meeting, which I believe was August 5, I offered the compromise of teaching Fall 2020 semester fully online and Fleischmann said that would be fine. Then I went a step further and told him 'Forcing people to wear masks is immoral.' Some people in the meeting groaned a little at that, but the meeting resolved successfully and it was agreed I could just teach online.

As August rolled on, I began to prepare to go back to school and teach online. It came time for the back-to-school college-wide zoom meeting on August 23. In that meeting, the plan for dealing with the pandemic was the main topic of discussion. Some of the faculty and administrators talked about the BLM/Antifa protests in a positive light. Since those were the topics of discussion and opinions were being shared, I felt it was relevant and within my rights to express my opinion. I did so in a chat sidebar, where I typed something like, 'The pandemic and riots are a leftist stunt to overthrow the U.S.' I also held up a sign in my Zoom window saying 'the U.S. death numbers are exaggerated.' This led the acting Dean, Trinity Williams, to write me a letter of warning/reprimand, stating that 'Your comments undermining the gravity of the Covid-19 pandemic were unacceptable,' (see attached documents).

The letter wasn't finalized until mid-September, because Charles and I objected to the initial wording which we felt was misleading. After those comments in the late August college meeting, I felt I had done all I could to stand up for what I thought was right and I was done speaking out about the pandemic. The semester got underway, and my two classes got off to a fine start. I never spoke out about the pandemic to my students, only to my colleagues and superiors. I believe my comments in those August Zoom meetings with faculty and administrators are what precipitated the article in the Torch.

On September 26, I got an email from Cora Hall at the Torch. Her initial angle was that she wanted to interview a few professors about how the pandemic was affecting their work and classes. I initially said 'sure,' but then I sensed trouble and cancelled. Then on September 28, she emailed me again saying "I have heard that you have a different viewpoint than a lot of our professors, so I wanted to speak with you specifically." Again, I told her no. Another couple weeks went by and just a day or two before her article appeared on November 16, 2020, she emailed me again asking to interview me, mentioning that 'You've got some interesting theories that you've written on twitter...' At that point it was clear what she was up to.

I usually keep my twitter account in a locked, private mode, especially when the semester is underway, and I've never knowingly allowed Ferris students who identify as such to follow me. It was my little hole to shout in and purge my despair with my fellow TIs (targeted individuals) and I felt no need to involve students. As I said, it was despair that led me to do this, and I knew I might get in trouble but I needed to cry out. Yes, you can say twitter is public and tweets are public statements, but non-famous people like me (only 350 followers at the time) don't really have the ability to make public statements—unless they get republished later on. By that same logic you could say shouting something out loud in a crowded pub is making a public statement—but it's off-duty behavior that wouldn't interfere with work unless somebody there heard it and told it to a reporter who republished later on in a newspaper. The danger of twitter and all social media is that it has created a new way to find blame with private individuals and stomp out the little guys you don't like—cancel culture. Nobody on campus (that I knew of) and only a limited group in the larger world knew about my tweets.

There was a period of almost three weeks between when Cora Hall first emailed me on September 26 and when her first article about me appeared in the Torch on November 16—plenty of time for the faculty and administrators who oversee the newspaper to learn about what she was working on. (Is it University policy to allow students to write hit pieces against faculty, staff or administrators?) Furthermore it's implied in her emails that she had heard about my comments in the faculty meeting of August 23 since in that September 28th email she said 'I have heard that you have a different viewpoint than a lot of our professors...' There were only

faculty and administrators present in that meeting, so it's possible that between August 23 and September 26, someone from the faculty or administration told either her or other students about my comments in the meeting. There were also some screenshots of tweets that I deleted in June that appeared in her article. This implies that somebody closely connected to the University knew about my tweets in June and was building a portfolio to use against me.

I would like to ask Cora Hall or Garrett Stack, the faculty advisor who oversees the Torch, if there were faculty or administrators who passed information to the Torch. What would be their motivation for doing so, other than to hurt me? If my comments on twitter were an act of discrimination, as the charges against me state, Title IX regulations would require any faculty, staff or administrators who were aware of my discriminatory comments to notify the Title IX office, not pass information to students to write a hit piece. If that happened I would say *that* was misconduct. In a court of law my attorneys would be able to cross-examine my accusers and ask them if any faculty, staff or administrators knew about my tweets before the Torch article was published.

But exactly how it came about that Cora Hall decided to write the article or get the information doesn't matter to the outside world. Legally speaking, the University (or its board of trustees) owns the Torch, so the University is the entity legally responsible for what is published by the Torch, not the students. Therefore, according to the law, it was the University that republished my tweets and made them widely known, not the students. And that's why this situation is contrived. If the University believed that my tweets were potentially damaging to its reputation, then it shouldn't have made them more widely known. They could have just privately asked me to delete my twitter account and I would have. This shows that the Ferris administration used students as a weapon or shield in their attempt to take down a faculty member. They already harassed and tried to fire me a year before, revealing prior motive. They were just waiting for the right time to strike. The open season and 'purge' against conservatives and 'conspiracy theorists' in the wake of the recent election outcome would be the perfect time.

Now as I've said I did this tweeting out of the despair caused by physical pain, the break-ins into my home, and the fact that I was almost fired in Fall 2019 for trying to get some help from the police. Say you're an objective third party, like a judge in a court of law, and you're only willing to consider facts that can be proven. The only thing I can prove is that I've been suffering physical pain from the migraines, based on my medical history, and that the University became aware of that fact in Fall 2019. My beliefs that I'm the victim of cybernetic torture and that my home was being invaded might or might not be facts and I can't prove them here. Although it is a fact that the University became aware of those beliefs and rebuked me for sharing them at that time. It's also a fact that the tweets that the University finds objectionable began in November 2019, just around the same time I called the police, and their frequency began to subside in June 2020, but did not stop altogether. It's also a fact that the University's case against me is entirely based on my tweets, not on anything I said or did on campus.

Even though I was declared sane to the extent that I was not a threat to myself or others, internal memos between my doctors show that they did suspect I could be delusional (see attached documents). But the intense migraines alone are evidence of a disability. Thus, from the standpoint of the law it could be argued that the migraine pain and possible delusions constitute a disability. Since I had no way to speak about my disability at work, I was exercising my free speech rights on twitter as a result of my disability. Therefore the things I said on twitter were not expressed in order to discriminate against people of different races or social categories

but were uttered as a result of my disability. This is one of many reasons why freedom of speech exists. If somebody suddenly starts acting weird and saying weird things, it's reasonable to first take a closer look at that person's circumstances. Misunderstandings with those around me exacerbated the effects of my disability. This led to speech I tried to confine to an off-duty setting and which is protected by the first amendment.