

Expanded version of frequently asked questions:

1. What happened at Concordia University?

I came to Canada in December of 1979 from the USSR. I started working for T.S. Sankar, who was at that time Chair of Mechanical Engineering Department, at initial salary of \$7,000 a year. I wrote more than 60 scientific articles plus 2 books during 12 years. In about 30 of them, I have included T.S.Sankar as co-author, though he did not understand a word in any of them. In 1986, I have stopped including him as a co--author and he tried to have me fired.

I complained everywhere: to the Rector, Board of Governors, Minister of Education, Member of Parliament (Feinstone), etc., to no avail. I started a lawsuit in 1992, and it has become clear to me that Judges are corrupt and have no respect for the law.

On August 19, 1992, I was served court documents accusing me of contempt of court (I made a posting, where I called Chief Justice Chief InJustice). The same evening I got a call from Dr. Hogben, who was at that time President of our Association. He was paid to protect me from administration, instead, he was "in bed" with them. He told me that he knew about the accusation, that I would be put in jail and that "anything can happen in jail". I understood it as a death threat.

The court hearing was scheduled on August 25, 1992, and this is why shooting took place on August 24. I did not plan to kill anyone, I took the guns with me Just to threaten the gangsters to leave me alone. When I pointed my gun at Hogben, he blurted out that this is exactly what they wanted me to do and that now they would be able to put me in jail for good. After that I started shooting.

Summary: Concordia big crooks (Kenniff, Sheinin, Swamy, Sankar, etc.) used little ones to provoke me, and they succeeded. Why would Hogben do his dirty part? Two reasons: one, his wife, just with a Master degree, was allowed to lecture at Concordia (usually, only people with Ph.D. can lecture); second, a psychiatrist (Dr. Steiner), who he trusted, convinced him that there was no way I can kill him. He was wrong.

2. If you did not plan to kill anyone, why did have your guns loaded?

Two reasons. One, the idea was to scare the gang, so that they leave me alone. In a revolver, it is readily visible that it is empty. It is stupid to point a gun at another person, where it is obvious that the gun is not loaded. I wanted to be taken seriously. Second, the gang members knew very well that I purchased a gun. They pretended to be scared of me and hired bodyguards. I would not be surprised if Hogben had a gun of his own. If he saw my revolver not loaded, he could have pulled his own gun and killed me with impunity. I could not allow such an opportunity.

3. You were convicted of premeditated murder. The Jury obviously did not believe your claim that you did not plan the killing.

Corrupt judge Martin did not allow me to testify, jury has never heard my story. Jury pool was tampered with. I saw court clerk taking cards with Jury names from the top, instead of mixing them up first.

Hogben offered me about \$200,000 shut-up money, which I did not accept. If I planned to kill him, I would have taken the money first. Last, but not least, had I planned the killing, different people would have been killed.

4. How could you kill 4 innocent people in cold blood?

Not a single innocent person was harmed: the people I killed were members of the gang, which threatened my life. About "cold blood": you were not there, and neither were reporters, who used this cliché. It was a very traumatic experience for me, who never killed even a fish, but I am very proud that I had the courage to do it.

The problem is that people, asking this question are obviously not using their brains. I suggest the following questions to be asked:

- a) Do you believe I was insane? If you agree that I was not, then ask the next question
- b) Do you think my dream was to die in jail? If the answer is an obvious NO, then ask the next question
- c) Why would I kill persons, who did no harm to me, and go to jail for the rest of my life? Again, the answer is obvious: I would not harm a person, who did no harm to me. Clearly, these people did so much harm to me, that killing them was more important, than the threat of dying in jail. Ask the last question
- d) What was it? The only thing, which justifies a killing is a death threat, and this is what it was.

5. Why did not you go to police if you felt your life to be in danger?

It is well known, that when a battered wife comes to police complaining, they tell her to come after she get killed. In my case, I had to complain on the Chief Justice of Quebec Gold, who was at that time also the Concordia Chancellor. There was no way they would do anything against Chief Justice. In addition, the phrase "anything can happen" is a very veiled threat to go to police with.

6. You can not claim self-defense, since the people you killed did not point a gun at you.

When someone points a gun at you, it is generally too late to pull your own gun. If a gang member makes a veiled death threat, it makes no sense to wait till he arranges your murder. The legal definition of self-defense does not require someone actually pointing a gun at you. There was a case, where a battered wife was acquitted, when she killed her husband who made a death threat, though she shot him in the back and at the moment of shooting he was unarmed. Just recently, a girl in US stabbed her father to death, because he was abusing her mother. The father did not point a gun at any of them, their life was not in immediate danger. The grand jury refused to indict her.

7. You did not give you victims a chance to defend themselves; you killed unarmed people.

These people belonged to a gang, which threatened my life. I did nothing wrong to them. They have chosen to behave the way they did and they got the consequences. They might have had a gun of their own, since they claimed to be afraid of me and hired bodyguards. They did it not because I threatened them, but because they knew that they had already almost killed me (heart attack in 1991), so it was natural of them to presume that I could strike back.

It was not a sporting competition or a duel; these people threatened my life and they paid with theirs.

8. You took justice in your own hands; what kind of society would we have if everybody did the same?

When a human being feels protected by law, he does not need to take Justice in his own hands. This is why the laws exist. On the other hand, when the top administrators like Rector, Minister, MP, Chief Justice have no respect for the law, a human, whose life is threatened, has no choice but to take justice in his own hands. If everybody did what I have done, we would have had a society which DOES respect the laws.

9. You are a coward who killed 4 innocent people.

About "innocent", see question 4. A coward would have tried to hire someone to kill. Another type of coward would kill in the darkness of night and then run away to avoid criminal responsibility. What I did was as brave as it could go. It takes a lot of courage and guts to kill in a broad daylight in full view of everybody. I have never punched anyone in my entire life, I have never thought to be capable of killing, so I am very proud of myself that in the critical moment I had what it takes. During my trial, one guard told me tete-a-tete, that I did what he dreamt of doing all his life, but never had the courage. I am pretty sure he is not the only one, who felt that way.

10. You are a paranoid idiot, who imagined his life in danger and killed 4 innocent people.

About "innocent", see question 4. Even if one is paranoid, this does not mean that nobody is following him. I must admit, that I had at the beginning some doubt whether my life was in danger. Being in jail several years convinced me that I was right. There were a number of murders during this time, and in each case guards were either initiators or deliberately closing their eyes. It is incredibly easy to kill anyone in jail. It is much more difficult to kill me, because majority of prisoners have great respect for me. The second important obstruction: to kill me in jail would mean that I was right in my claim that I could be killed in jail.

11. You are just trying to justify an insane act; several respectable psychiatrists testified at your trial that you had problems and one even said that you were not fit to stand trial.

I was never insane, I knew perfectly well what I was doing and I knew why I was shooting each individual. There was not a single innocent person harmed. I did not hear voices and did not imagine devils.

Indeed, two of the top psychiatrists testified that I had a number of "disorders". None though diagnosed any paranoia. I can not call them "respectable", because they were committing perjury: I refused to talk to each of them, they could not possibly have diagnosed anything just by looking at me.

It was true that psychiatrist Morissette testified that I was unfit to stand trial, but it was I, who called him to testify. I wanted to show to the jury just how dishonest and dishonorable he was. He was never asked to examine me; he was invited by my lawyer to give me information about Pinel, and this was the only thing we discussed.

In order to be unfit to stand trial, a person should be so insane, as not to understand what he is charged with, not to understand, who is the Judge and who are the Jury, etc. Clearly, I understood all that. Nevertheless, he testified under oath that I was unfit to stand trial.

Psychiatry here is at the service of government exactly as it was back in the USSR. I could not find a single psychiatrist, who would agree to testify that I was sane. My lawyer brought one from Ontario, he (Davidson) on arrival, prior to "Hello", announced that just by looking at me, it was clear to him that I was unfit to stand trial. Can a psychiatrist sink lower than that?

12. Why did not you find another job, if you were so miserable at Concordia?

I did my best: I sent over 1000 applications to practically every university in the US, as well as other continents (Australia, New Zealand, etc.), to no avail. Despite my credentials and publications, I discovered, that it is not what you know, but who you know is important. In addition, I have no doubt, that Concordia crooks had me blacklisted as a troublemaker.

13. Why did not you just leave: being unemployed is still better than to die in jail.

First, I did not plan to kill anyone, so I never considered those alternatives. I had a wife and 2 small children, I could not just leave. After the accusations of contempt of court, leaving would not change anything: the contempt of court accusation would still be there, as well as the death threat associated with it. These were the reasons for shooting, not the stolen articles.

14. Are you sorry?

I feel sorrow for the families of individuals I killed, but I am not sorry; I am at peace with myself. My life was threatened and I had the right to defend myself. Eleven years of jail convinced me beyond a reasonable doubt. One should not take Justice in his hands in the country, which respects the laws. On the contrary, in a lawless country, one is justified in defending himself, with deadly force, if necessary. Here are few examples, which convinced me, that Canada has no respect for the law.

Judge Martin stopped my defense, did not allow me to question numerous witnesses and to testify myself. This is a major breach of criminal procedure. Court of Appeal decided that it was OK, Supreme Court refused to hear me.

In 1998, I had a heart attack. I felt it coming, but jail doctor refused to bring me to the hospital. Crooked Quebec doctors refused to do angioplasty saying that it was too dangerous. The film of angioplasty was sent to the top US doctors, and all of them responded that the angioplasty was possible, and all were ready to do it. We also found a doctor in British Columbia, who also agreed to do angioplasty.

For almost 4 years, jailers refused to bring me to British Columbia for an angioplasty. Murderous Quebec doctors helped murderous jailers by providing "Professional opinions", that all I needed were pills. I wrote numerous legal proceedings as well as professional complaints against the doctors and nurses. They were all denied. Corrupt judges of Federal and Superior courts declared me vexatious pleader. Jailers finally brought me to the brink of death, and this is where murderous doctors finally blinked. They admitted that my life was in danger; I was transferred to British Columbia, angioplasty was done in January of 2002 and this is why I am still alive.

In the meantime, Attorney General of Canada has filed a request to declare me vexatious and to forbid me to file any professional complaints against doctors, nurses and lawyers (what lawyers have to do with it, I do not know). One would presume, that since all my complaints and legal proceedings demanded transfer to British Columbia for an angioplasty and the facts showed that I was right in my demands, so Attorney General has no case. It is not so for corrupt Judge Durand. On June 10, 2003, he signed an order declaring all my complaints vexatious and forbidding me to file any professional complaints with relevant Committees on Discipline against doctors, nurses and lawyers. There was no hearing, which by itself is a breach of procedure.

I filed application in the Court of Appeal. Chief Justice Robert refused even to open file, writing that I was declared vexatious and that I did not make a case. This is against the law: even if I have no case, he still is obliged to register my application and formally dismiss it. I asked him, which section of the law allows him not to register my application. He never responded, because he knew his action was illegal. He did it just to demonstrate to me, that he can disregard the law, and there is nothing I can do about it. Can a legal system sink lower than that?

I need medical care again, and again I am being denied it by Quebec murderous doctors. Now I can not even complain. In a lawless country one has no choice, but to defend himself, with deadly force if necessary.

15. You are a convicted murderer, why should we believe a single word of yours?

I see no logic in this statement: a law-abiding citizen can be a liar, and a criminal can be a truthful person. In my case, just Use common sense. Some things can be verified in the court record. For example, one can check whether there was an accusation of contempt of court, whether the hearing was scheduled on August 25, 1992, and this is why the shooting took place on August 24, etc.

The Gazette wrote that I was a false scientist about to be unmasked, and this is why I killed 4 innocent people. Use your brain: how killing of innocent people might save a crook from being exposed? La Presse wrote that I killed 4 people to attract attention to my fight with Concordia. Does this make sense? I claim that my life was threatened. Clearly, it was not a dream of my life to die in jail, so if I disregarded jail, it means that something more serious than jail was involved, namely, threat to my life.

16. What can be done to prevent repetitions of Concordia?

What is surprising, except for one case, nobody is asking this question, though I think, this is the Most important question. Why? Just look at the sample of July news:

July 2, 2003

"A factory employee in Jefferson City, Missouri, has killed 3 other employees and later killed himself. Media pretends not to know the reasons."

July 6, 2003

"Three boys from New Jersey were arrested. They were allegedly plotting to kill several people at their school (how could they do it: there is no school in July). The media does its best to conceal their reasons. It was though mentioned that the guys had facial deformities and were picked on and mistreated at their school for many years."

July 8, 2003

"Doug Williams in Meridian, Mississippi, killed 5 people and wounded 8 in Lockheed-Marietta plant, then he killed himself. Initially media claimed that motives were unknown. Now they are saying that he was racist, because four of the five killed are black."

Carnage continues unabated, because people Just refuse to learn the lesson, since this procedure implies admission of errors. It is Bo much easier to explain each shooting by perpetrators insanity. Just present the guy a raving lunatic and everybody is happy - guy exploded out of blue, nobody could have possible foreseen it and nothing could be done to prevent it. This is Just not so.

Yet another idiotic trick: blame everything on availability of firearms. I call this idiotic, because it is obviously wrong: no matter, how you tighten the laws, I still would be eligible to buy guns. Even if there were no guns on the whole planet, I would have taken a hammer and smashed their heads. In the old USSR, nobody had guns, including police, nevertheless, the number of murders there was greater than in Canada. People in Rwanda managed to kill about million of humans, without any firearms. On the other hand, in Switzerland, every family is obliged to have a gun, and they have one of the lowest rates of murders. Why? Because they do not need to kill each other.

The only way to eliminate murder is to extinguish the need of one person to kill another. In the case similar to mine, this means to stop abusing and mistreating people, because abused people have tendency to strike back, and often with deadly force. No law, including introduction of death penalty, would change it: when an abused person strikes back, he concentrates only on the need to kill his abusers, what will come after that is

irrelevant.

This is what usually happens. A person is abused, he complains to the superior of his abuser. This superior pretends to investigate the complaint, but in reality, he does his best to cover-up the abuse. He responds to complainant some nonsense. When the complainant writes back saying that his arguments were not addressed, he gets a response, that his complaint was thoroughly investigated and that the file is closed.

The abused person hires a lawyer, and this lawyer just pumps money from him, deliberately delays the adjudication and finally loses the case: he does not want to fight the rich and powerful. The abused person complains to the Minister, MP, etc., to no avail, and after several more pushes, he explodes. Each big crook in every organization has many little crooks, who are ready to do any dirty Job for him. These are the people who usually get killed, and for good reason: the abused person hates them more than the big crook, because they are harming him just to please the big crook, not because they have any personal problem with the abused person.

Some secretaries behave according to the principle: my boss is always right, and even when he is wrong, he is right to be wrong. If you are a secretary and your boss is seriously abusing someone, this kind of behavior might cost you your life. If you are actively participating in the abuse (lying that your boss is not there, putting the abused person on hold deliberately for a long time, being rude, etc.) the abused person will hate you more than your boss, and you are the one who will get killed when this person explodes.

So, if you want to stop the carnage, prevent the abuse. If the abuse already happen, rectify it, before it is too late. Justice for all should mean Just that. Declare zero tolerance to bullying, not to victim's threats. A threat is a warning, suppression of threats would lead to only one thing: the victim will strike without warning.

17. Questions, nobody asks: would anyone be killed if Hogben did not threaten my life? Why would Hogben do it? He had no personal interest in the matter, so somebody told him to do it. Who was that somebody? Former Chief Justice Gold, who was then Concordia Chancellor. Now you understand, why nobody in the media asks these questions.