

From: Nancy Willard <nwillard@csriu.org>
Date: Tue, 13 Feb 2007 10:32:21 -0700
To: [redacted]
Subject: The Amero case, NY Times

Hi all,

I do hope you will read this entire message and the attachment. I also suspect that the key players, Mr. Smith, Mr. Lounsbury, and Mr. Hartz, are likely not reading all of their hate mail about this case. And I believe that it is most important that they read this message. If someone please call this message to their attention, I would appreciate it.

You should understand my background. I am a former education and lawyer. I have been working on issues of effective management of school Internet systems for over a decade. I am not a technical expert, I am a policy and practices expert. I have a recently published book on cyberbullying that addressed Internet use management. I have a regular column in Education World. I recently presented to the National School Board Association Leadership Council on cyberbullying and effective Internet use management. And in about a month, my book for parents on Internet safety will be published. I have the credentials and authority to speak out on this situation.

The purpose of this email is to lay out my recommendations to you on how to get your state out of the major trouble it has gotten itself into. I spoke with a NY Times reporter yesterday and have submitted the attached commentary to the NY Times. In these efforts, I am striving to set the situation so that you can make the right decisions that will allow you to "save face" and do the right thing -- and bring quick closure to this case.

Please understand two things:

1. A grave error has been made. Julie Amero is totally innocent. She was not searching for pornography. The computer in the classroom was infected with several spyware programs that were causing the pornographic images to appear. From all that I have read, she was doing the best job under the circumstances to deal with the situation. And you want to send a totally innocent woman, who reportedly has a young child, to prison.

2. Computer security experts and other concerned individuals from throughout this country are coming together and formulating a massive national awareness effort to force your state to recognize this grave mistake. As I am associated with them, I can tell you that their strength appears to be growing hourly, they are fully investigating all details, and the campaign they are about to launch will be devastating -- to the individuals involved, to the reputation of your entire state education system, the city of Norwich, and likely to the economy of your state. (You likely want to see your high tech industry grow and it is unlikely to do so if the high tech community perceives you to be at the Neanderthal-stage of understanding of new technologies.)

As I said in my attached commentary, this is a tragedy of errors.

Error 1. The school district's technical system was inadequate to prevent the computer from being infected from spyware and limiting the pop-up ads. This is not just a filter problem. The entire security was inadequate -- firewall, spyware and virus protection, and a browser that blocks pop-up ads should have been in place.

There are many school districts that have inadequate Internet use management. But I know of no other school district that has chosen to sacrifice a blameless 40 year old substitute teacher, with a young child, due to its inadequacy. Mr. Hartz, I actually hold you in the lowest regard of all of the individuals in this case. Not because you failed to have adequate security in place. But because you are unwilling to publicly accept responsibility for the inadequate security and you are apparently willing to

allow an innocent woman go to prison. Will you stand up as a man or be scum of the earth?

(Believe me, this is the least worse comment I could make based on my current understanding of the situation. And I have serious questions about the behavior of other school district officials. Very soon all of the parents whose children attend your schools will know that you had inadequate computer security, but rather than accept responsibility for this, you were willing to allow a woman with young child go to prison. How low can you get?)

Error 2. Mr. Lounsbury, you are quite likely a very good police officer. But in this case, you were asked to do a job that you simply do not have the expertise to do. You are not a computer security expert and you were using a research product that was incapable of revealing the concerns. I do not believe that you lied, attempted to deceive anyone, or committed perjury. I think you were doing the best job you were capable of doing and testified honestly, unfortunately erroneously. The problem is that your best just was not good enough, and now a young woman is suffering. So I ask you: Are you willing to come forward and take responsibility for your mistaken analysis (and it really was just a mistake) so that a young woman no longer is in legal jeopardy?

Error 3. Actually, error 3 was made by a person who is not included on this email list. The defense attorney in this case made significant errors. The most significant errors were that he utterly failed to have the computer evaluated in a timely manner to determine what actually was the cause of the problem and he sought to present evidence at trial that had not been properly provided in advance to the prosecutor. If he had evaluated the computer by an expert in a very timely manner and shared these findings with the prosecutor, I believe this case never would have gone to trial. (For the record, just after law school I was a law clerk for a trial court judge.) I strongly believe that this attorney committed malpractice. However, I have also been informed that he is suffering from MS and this disease has reached the level where he is likely medically incompetent.

Error 4 -- which is actually not an error, but more of a dilemma. Mr. Smith, you were faced with a situation at trial where the defense attorney sought to enter evidence that had not been provided to you in advance. Your objection was actually proper -- although others will not describe this as being so. The picture that will be painted of you at a national level is that you are more interested in preserving your victory than ensuring that justice is served. I have already been told by a reporter in your state that this is your attitude.

Here, I believe, is your dilemma: You did win. You got your conviction. But now, after obtaining this conviction, you are being presented with clear evidence that an error was made. And you know darned well that Julie received totally inadequate legal assistance and this is the reason for your victory. (Remember, I spent lots of time in the courtroom and I know that attorneys know when the other attorney is blowing it.) Yeah, you know that eventually the legal system will sort this out. But what will Julie (and your state) go through to get to the point of an appropriate resolution?

So basically, Mr. Smith, I believe the "ball is in your court." (Actually, I am a soccer mom, not a tennis player do let me change this). I think the "shot is yours." Do you simply follow the typical legal path of sentencing and appeal? Or do you do what is right, now?

What I think is right (and I checked with my good friend who is a trial court judge in our state) is to file a motion to vacate the conviction.

I want to point out that the very convenient fact in this case is the fact that the defense attorney is suffering from MS. Because much of the fault then can be placed upon the effects of this disease. He also was probably trying to do his best, but his best just was not good enough because of this disease.

I want to go back to what your state, state justice system, state educational system, local school district, and local community is going to face if Mr. Smith does not make the decision to do what is right. You are trying to send an innocent woman with a young child to jail because no one involved understands some really basic computer security issues. Just in case you do not "get it," this casts a very negative image of all of you.

This story now has "legs" and is beginning to get national coverage - which will continue and grow. Computer security experts will soon be launching an information "attack" that will simply destroy the reputations of Mr. Smith, Mr. Lounsbury, and Mr. Hartz. The individuals involved have the knowledge and expertise to do so.

If prompt action is not taken to file this motion to vacate the conviction, I will also be joining this effort. It has actually been recommendation to these individuals to back off for a period of time to try some efforts that will allow you to make the right choices. But at most, I think you have a couple of days.

Mr. Smith, I truly hope that you make the right choice.

Nancy

--

Nancy Willard, M.S., J.D.
Center for Safe and Responsible Internet Use
<http://csriu.org>
<http://cyberbully.org>
nwillard@csriu.org

Cyberbullying and Cyberthreats: Responding to the Challenge of Online Social Aggression, Threats, and Distress. New edition, published by Research Press.

Cyber-Safe Kids, Cyber-Savvy Teens: Helping Young People Learn to Use the Internet Safely and Responsibly. Jossey-Bass (March 16, 2007)

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

From: "Nancy Willard" <nwillard@csriu.org>
To: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2007 2:38 PM
Subject: Correction -- she miscarried

I have a correction to make. It was reported that Julie was pregnant. I assumed she now had a young child. But apparently she had a miscarriage.

Severe stress will cause a miscarriage -- and even more damaging aspect of this case!!! Believe me, this fact will get reported more widely.

Nancy

From: "Crime Prevention" [redacted]
Date: Tue, 13 Feb 2007 15:52:30 -0500
To: "Nancy Willard" <nwillard@csriu.org>
Subject: Re: Correction -- she miscarried

Hello,

I thank you for not showering me w/ any more words of hate. I've received plenty. I have alot to say about this case but have been told to shut up until sentencing is done. I have the evidence recovered from the computer and emails from those associated w/ the defense expert. This will serve to

prove that the facts which I intend to provide to anyone, who seeks the truth, are the facts. I can only provide the evidence when the opportunity arises. I can not speak of any other aspect of this case of which there is much to examine and or explore. I trust you will afford me the opportunity present the facts.

Thank you, Mark Lounsbury

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

From: "Nancy Willard" <nwillard@csriu.org>
To: "Crime Prevention" [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2007 4:28 PM
Subject: Re: Correction -- she miscarried

Hi Mark.

You will also likely be appreciative of the fact that I am also trying to encourage the computer security experts who are all over this case not to shower you with more words of hate. But I will tell you that many are prepared to do so and you are at high risk of significant additional personal and professional attack.

And now that I have discovered that Julie also lost the child she was carrying -- a child she would have had at the same age I was when I had my oldest -- and getting a little less charitable. But I am trying to find the best way to get everyone out of this situation that has not yet gotten as bad as it will.

I am going to be direct and I think you can deal with this, which hopefully you will translate as respect. I do not think you are "at fault" or that you committed perjury at trial. But I do not think that you have the expertise to do the computer security investigation competently. I may be wrong. But none of the other computer security experts working on this case think that you do either. (Believe me, there are many things that I also could not do effectively 0- this being one of them.)

The folks now working on this case include many top computer security people in the US -- who just, btw, got the transcript which they will be sharing and picking apart in scrupulous detail.

As I recently explained to these folks, the people I see who are at primary fault are:

Hartz. Hartz was not doing his job properly - clearly. The management of the district's Internet system was woefully inadequate. Now, this is my area of expertise -- maybe not all of the technical stuff, but I know when a school district system is being run effectively or not. It is my perspective that the management of many district Internet use systems is inadequate -- this is what I told all of the folks at my recent presentation at the NSBA. But this system really was not being run effectively -- even worse than most. Part of the problem in small districts is that the districts cannot pay for competent computer systems staff and frequently some district

administrator
assumes the responsibility.

But in my opinion, Hartz is a true scum-bag of the lowest degree - I am saving you from my more "flowerly" language. Hartz has failed to take personal responsibility for his dereliction of duty --filter not operating effectively, no firewall, no spyware blocking, no system to prevent pop-up ads and reportedly a common practice in the district of kids doing what they want to online. Hartz has allowed an innocent woman to take a horrible rap for his failure. This I consider to be unconscionable.

Julie's attorney. Julie's attorney committed malpractice, clearly. He did not have the computer evaluated promptly by an expert. He should have immediately done this < back in 2004. I am quite sure that you made this available to him. Had he arranged to have the computer properly evaluated and presented the findings to you and Smith, I would lay odds, Smith would have simply dismissed the case.

At trial, Smith was well within his right to move to exclude Herb's testimony. It is Julie's attorney who failed to provide this testimony to Smith in advance, as he is required to do! But this is legal malpractice < plain and simple. It is my understanding that the attorney is in later stages MS. So his medical condition likely played a role in his malpractice.

The problem is that the longer this goes on, the longer it is going to hurt everyone. And that includes you. I am supposing you did not plan to get your 15 minutes of national fame in this manner. Your testimony will be torn apart -- shredded. And this will profoundly damage your professional reputation.

Would you be at all willing to communicate with some of these computer security experts? I would be quite pleased to help set this up. You do not have to "say anything" just listen. I think they can help you understand how and where your analysis mistakenly failed.

Really, truly, the best thing for everyone involved is to convince Smith to file a motion to vacate the conviction. Your entire state is going to be severely damaged otherwise.

All of the evidence should have been presented at trial - so you should not have any "secret evidence" that is not out on the table. And none of the evidence supports the conclusion that Julie was intentionally looking at porn. Excuse me, this was a 38 year old pregnant female.

I think you were just "over your head." I think you were trying to do the best job possible. I just think you made a mistake. And if you will talk with the security folks, I think they can help you understand how this mistake was made. Can I help set this up?

Nancy

From: "Crime Prevention" [redacted]
Date: Thu, 15 Feb 2007 12:29:14 -0500
To: "Nancy Willard" <nwillard@csriu.org>
Subject: Re: Correction -- she miscarried

Hi Nancy,

I took yesterday off to try and regroup as I've learned there will more Nationally televised witch burnings scheduled over the next few weeks. As a witch, I have been preparing my final statement. I've pretty much given up all hope that I will be able to present any of the data prior to my execution. All that I've read regarding this case is based on opinions and prejudices. The statement of the expert (fuel for the fire) to Network Performance Daily is in opposition to my interpretation of the data to which he alludes, data of which I am in possession.

I have been contacted by two, very educated, experienced computer network security and forensic examination professionals: Tim A and Michael H. I spoke at length with Michael about the software I used and of my interpretations of source code. We spoke about pop ups in particular and about methods related to their implementation. I learned nothing new from Michael and I'm hoping he will let everyone know I am competent and not the stupid moron I am being portrayed as.

I have offered them the data and the tool used to extract the data so that they may independently formulate an accurate picture of what had transpired on that fateful day in October. I am confident that their conclusions will exonerate me so that my charred remains will receive a proper burial.

As for the specialists currently investigating this matter, one wouldn't happen to be the president of a computer software company located in Florida? If so, I have been in communication with one such individual and do have the communication, in the form of emails, which I believe I am at liberty to share and which I believe would shed light on the situation from the specialist standpoint. I can forward the emails to you. Their content is very insightful.

I would be happy to speak w/ any of the specialists who are currently on the case or who wish to gauge my knowledge in the field. Again, this is to ensure I receive a proper burial. I will be on vacation the week of Feb.18th but may be contacted via email: [\[redacted\]](#). I thank you for your courtesy.

Mark Lounsbury

From: <nwillard@peak.org>
To: "Crime Prevention" [[redacted](#)]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2007 1:49 PM
Subject: Re: Correction -- she miscarried

Hi Mark,

I really do understand that you are in a really difficult position here. For the record, you owe me one. ;-) Because I think I have had some success in convincing the people I am communicating with that you were quite likely asked to do a job that you simply have not had sufficient training to do -- and being a police officer in a small community this is understandable. And I believe they are less inclined to crucify you -- as they clearly were before.

I am actually very likely old enough to be your mother (I am 54 ;-)). So I am going to take some liberties and talk to you as such. Hope you don't mind. I see you in a really tough spot. And I truly believe that in order to get yourself out of this spot, you are going to have to rethink the situation and change your mind and strategy.

First of all, I think there are some things that really stink about this

school and its administration. And those issues will likely come out. Oh, might as well ask you. Is there any way you can send me the police report for this incident? . Quell school violence

May 2, 2004 .. 1106 words .. ID: nor2004050322384474

Assault at Kelly Middle School raises alarm Last week's revelation that a 13-year-old girl was assaulted by another girl at Kelly Middle School - knocked down, kicked in the head and treated at a local hospital - raises some uncomfortable questions. Foremost, are students at Kelly Middle School safe? If not, what can be done to make them so? t Whether Kelly is safe or not, Principal Scott Fain has provided data that appears to put it at a relative disadvantage to

Let me get you thinking about something. The report I have heard is that Julie was the teacher who came to this girl's aid -- when no other teachers or staff were inclined to do so. I am assuming that an assault that led to a child being in a coma resulted in a police investigation. I would like to know the outcome of this.

I am clearly not a computer security expert. But I am an expert in the field of school Internet use management from the policies and practices perspective and an expert on human behavior when using technology. In one month and one day ;-) I will have a major important book released for parents on Internet safe and responsible use.

You should also know that I have read the full police report on Julie's incident. I am preparing a statement about my interpretation of this report. Here it is in brief: Rather than support the perspective that the actions reported lead to the conclusion that Julie was intentionally surfing for porn, I believe this report demonstrates the opposite. School technology directors know that staff access, or attempts to access, pornography are a real concern. In virtually all cases, the staff member is male and such access is attempted either after school hours or at a time when no students are present in the room -- behind closed doors. Given the ability of students to detect that a teacher was accessing porn, a staff member would have to be a "stupid moron" (hope you don't mind I borrowed a phrase) to try to surf for porn while students are present -- because a student will see and that person will tell others. And that is exactly what happened in this case.

The clear impression I received from reviewing this report was that Julie was trying in vain to get rid of the inappropriate images, without alerting the students that something was wrong. She appeared to be very successful in this endeavor. Although apparently 60 students could have seen this material, only 10 or so reported that they actually had (I have to check, I think this is actually 9). It appears that most of these students were alerted by another student that something weird was going on and they decided to try to go and look at the computer -- very typical student behavior. On every occasion, Julie took a strong action to prevent them from seeing what was on the screen.

So rather than taking actions that could "impair the morals of a minor" (I will not mention the student who described an image of a girl giving a guy a head likely already had some impaired morals), every indicator was that Julie was striving to the best of her ability to deal with a situation she was unprepared to handle and was very focused on protecting the children in that classroom.

So this is essentially the "expert testimony" that I will provide.

Now, here is another issue you are going to have to deal with. A statement has been obtained from ComputerCop that clearly establishes that their product cannot distinguish between URLs visited as a result of malicious software and URLs visited by direct user action.

And the experts will have proof positive that there was spyware on that computer and the spyware was causing the porn to appear.

So Mark, basically your "goose is cooked." You were wrong. And the folks who know lots more about this kind of stuff than you do are preparing to hand you the head of that goose on a platter. Publicly. To the national press. (Oh, and they have found out about some other investigations about you in your community.)

So here is where the "motherly advice" kicks in. What do you do when you tried your best (and I do think this) and you find out you were wrong? I read guidance on this in some book that I can't remember the title of. Basically, the guidance was the longer you try to defend your actions, the worse it will get. The best strategy is to admit to the error and focus on the good intentions that were present when the error was made and a commitment to future actions to remedy the situation.

You gotta know when to hold 'em and know when to fold 'em. Mark, it is time to fold 'em. If you do not, one person you will do significant damage to is yourself.

So here is my recommendation on what to say:

"As a police officer I am sworn to uphold the law. With this comes a duty to do what is right. In this case, with the knowledge, skills, and tools I had, I tried to do what was right. Many are now pointing out that my knowledge, skills, and tools were not sufficient and that I was wrong. I have not had the opportunity to fully evaluate these reports and at this point I am not sure that I have the expertise to do so. I am a police officer, not a computer security expert. I also am not an attorney, so I am not sure how this issue can appropriately be addressed at this point in time. All I can say is that I tried to do my job to the best of my ability. And if it is demonstrated that I was wrong, then I will be the first to admit this. Because the bottom line is that we need to do what is right."

Mark, I can virtually promise you that if you make the above statement you will not be crucified, you will actually be applauded. It is so rare in our society today that anyone will publicly say "I might have been wrong." You will be one of the few who is strong enough to stand up and do this.

And if you follow the path of trying to say you were right, when people with far more expertise than you will be able to clearly demonstrate that you were wrong, you will destroy yourself. I really do not want to see that happen.

Please think about this. If you want to call and talk, my cell is [redacted].

However, I am also a mom -- yeah an "old mom" ;-)-- with 3 kids and Saturday will be crazy. One basketball game, 2 indoor soccer games (I am the coach of one team), and one important Tai Kwon Do demonstration in which my son will have a starring role. I do take the "mom-business" seriously. You will also see this when you read my book.

Nancy

From: "Mark Lounsbury" <[redacted]>
Date: Thu, 15 Feb 2007 23:43:21 +0100
To: nwillard@peak.org
Subject: Fw: Correction -- she miscarried

Hi,

Wow, Let me start by saying I am 45 years old, a father of three girls (all of whom are in the Norwich Public School system), and someone who accepts responsibility for my actions. I am also someone who does not judge (let the first person w/o sin cast the first stone) but, I do have an opinion on everything. The difference between me and most of my fellow humans is that I do not share my opinion freely. I'm an observer of the human condition and I accept the things which I can not change. I am a Christian by birth and a Jew, a Muslim, a Hindu, and a Buddhist by choice. We all have something to give. The problem lies in the human race's fear to explore its innate ability to see and accept the truth, to open its collective eyes and to embrace the truth.

To blame others for our shortcomings and to seek an excuse to do so lessens us all. Yet, it is what we do, take the easy out. My child is fat. It's the school system's failure. My child's test scores are dismal. It's the school system's fault. It's not my responsibility. Funny, my girls are all in the same classrooms as the children who struggle with obesity and failure but, they are healthy and score well above goal on the Federally mandated tests: same class, same teacher, same social environment. No, I do not demand anything from them. I support them to be free thinkers, to make their own choices, and to be responsible.

You mentioned that I have been implicated as an involved participant in the actions of another. You didn't say "Hey Mark, this information has surfaced and I would like to inquire. Again, there will be tabloid headlines but, guess what. I had absolutely nothing to do with the actions of James Daigle. I was one of the three who were thrown out with the bath water. Gee, you talk about injustice. Here's where I failed to recognize something I had the power to change. If you want to know the truth all you have to do is ask. I have a copy of my deposition. I'll send one to you. Do me a favor, call the complainant and ask them what was my part in James Daigle's actions. I guess I should ask for forgiveness. No, I'll let GOD judge me. If I have to serve another sentence on earth as a worm, I'll accept that. What I won't accept ever again is being blamed for someone else's mistakes.

If you wish, I will make myself available for your interrogation, by phone or in person. I have nothing to hide from anyone. Again, I thank you for your charity. I also thank you for your suggested course of action, though I will never bow to another human ever again.

Mark

From: "Nancy Willard" <nwillard@csriu.org>
To: "Mark Lounsbury" <[\[redacted\]](#)>
Subject: Continuing conversation
Date: Thu, 15 Feb 2007 15:07:04 -0800

So ok, that lets me off the hook for being your mother. ;-)

I did not provide you with that information to say that I agreed with it. You just need to know that there is a link out there that has your name on it: <http://www.wtnh.com/Global/story.asp?S=594152>
"Norwich police detective has admitted to drinking beer while driving a minor around the city on a sting targeting alcohol sales to underage drinkers."

And the folks working on this issue have found the link with your name on it and, unfortunately for you, drinking beer while driving a minor could also likely be considered "impairing the morals of a minor." So it is likely that at some point this incident/link will be made public.

What I was trying to do in my message is to convince you that you are digging yourself into a hole that you might never get out of. Please explore

your innate ability to see and accept the truth:

You were wrong. The access to the porn sites was caused by the spyware.

The ComputerCop is incapable of revealing the difference between intentional access and spyware-induced access. The company is now on record saying so.

All of the statements from the students indicate that Julie made every effort to block their viewing of this material. There were approximately 60 students in those classes and only a handful saw anything and they were the sneaky ones who were trying all sort of tricks to be able to get a peak.

These computer experts are going through your testimony with a fine-toothed comb and are going to skewer you royally.

And, most importantly, an innocent woman who was doing all she could do has been convicted.

And if her conviction is right, then every parent and teacher in this country is at high risk of arrest because of the creeps who are putting this garbage online always seem to have the ability to stay one step ahead of the folks who are trying to make sure that kids do not see it.

And you have the power to correct this situation.

But do you have the courage to admit you were wrong?

I am not suggesting bowing. I am suggesting standing tall. Do your girls ever make a mistake? What do you tell them? Probably to admit the truth and accept responsibility.

Nancy

From: "Mark Lounsbury" <[redacted]>
Date: Sun, 18 Feb 2007 00:18:32 +0100
To: "Nancy Willard" <nwillard@csriu.org>
Subject: Re: Continuing conversation

Hey Nancy,

You believe what you want to believe. Be ignorant like the rest of the herd. Facts are USUALLY and, in this case, ARE different from what is written. The FACT that you would put that in my face made me realize you are a member of the herd. One who follows. I'm not suppose to talk about the case and have alluded to you numerous points of FACT, but you IGNORE the facts which I freely offer you. FACT#1: I have nothing to confess. FACT#2: I am NOT WRONG (my statements are based on the facts, facts which no one wants to see), FACT#3: I did NOT drive a MINOR around while intoxicated. Fact#4: The FACTS are available, free of charge, to ANYONE who wants them. FACT#5: No one has requested the FACTS. Fact#6: The EXPERT in this case, the person who all are basing their opinions, is going to HELL. FACT#7: YOU ARE AFRAID OF THE TRUTH. You've made a decision and are INCAPABLE of opening your eyes to the truth. FACT#8: Because of you and people like you a) my goose is cooked (stick a fork in me) and b) a stupid woman with NO, I repeat NO, moral values is being portrayed as a VICTIM. In 18 years I have seen children suffer. I have seen children die. I have seen DEATH, LOSS, and the unimaginable. I have seen the WORST of what HUMANS are capable. WELL, So I thought until I personally experienced the IGNORANCE of Humankind. I am sick!

Early on in my career I was lost. I didn't know what to do about people's inhumanity to people. Then I came home from work one morning and turned on the TV. One of those bible thumping shows was on and I watched it. I took one thing away from the preachings, KEEP THE FAITH. YOU and the rest of the herd have NOT done so. YOU have LOST the FAITH. You choose to accept the lies, the evil: FEEL THE POWER OF EVIL! You have decided to violate the COMMANDMENTS. For what I ask. I don't have that answer

because I have the Faith. I do not judge. I seek the TRUTH, be it in my personal life or for humankind.

I DARE you to look me in the face, to SEE what GOD sees: the FACTS. I dare you to continue to JUDGE ME! I ask GOD to show YOU the TRUTH, to have JULIE AMERO CONFESS the TRUTH. I Know that will never happen but, maybe I'm wrong? Feel free to share this with the world. I invite the ignorant to test my FAITH.

Mark Lounsbury

From: Nancy Willard <nwillard@csriu.org>
Date: Sat, 17 Feb 2007 15:53:39 -0700
To: Mark Lounsbury <[redacted]>
Subject: Re: Continuing conversation

OK, I hereby request the facts.

Nancy

From: "Nancy Willard" <nwillard@csriu.org>
To: "Mark Lounsbury" <[redacted]>
Subject: Reports on my site
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2007 20:41:20 -0800

Hi Mark,

I hope you got a bit of a break and are feeling less stress. There are two reports on my web site at <http://csriu.org> that I think you might want to read. One is my report on the case. The other is my guidance to school districts on how to prevent such a tragic situation from occurring in their schools.

I am sorry to say that I do believe that you presented entirely inaccurate information at the trial. The porn sites in the log were there because the students accessed a site that was a "porn trap." Julie did not access these sites intentionally.

Actually, based on my understanding of the process by which the sites appeared in the log and having worked with this age group, I rather suspect this might have been an intentional set-up on the part of the students. It is my understanding that the computer went to AOL (Julie checking email), Obitz (since no other Obitz links and since Obitz is frequently a pop-up ad, I assume popup), then directly to the hair-styles site. No Google search for "hair styles" and these were boys (looking for hair styles?). One problem school tech folks tell me they have is teen boys getting into the computer lab, accessing a porn site and then letting the screen-save go on so the next person who moves the mouse get an eyeful. There were also 3 students in the first class who were quite a tight trio and apparently very interested in what was on that computer. I am a former teacher of these kinds of kids and I sort of "smell some rats." Of course, this is pure speculation and at this point likely impossible to investigate.

But back to your situation. You do need to understand that it will be very necessary to publicly point out the inaccuracy in your testimony. The prosecutor relied heavily on this point in his argument. So, naturally, since this information is in error, your testimony will be publicly challenged. And when it comes to the accuracy of the statement, you will not win because the statement is simply not accurate.

Basically, it appears that one or a combination of the following is the case: A) You intentionally committed perjury. B) You are not really an expert, C) You were relying on a product to do what you thought it could do,

but it really couldn't do, and/or D) You really were not looking into the question of whether this was intentional or accidental because the assumption was all along that this was intentional

I actually think that both you and Officer Belair were not fully informed and this may have impacted your investigation. I see no evidence in Belair's investigation report that the principal, Fain, told him that Julie had asked for help on the day of the event or that she had told his assistant principal and him about the problem of popups that she could not get to go away. This is what Fain testified to at trial. Interesting information to withhold from Belair. People who are intentionally accessing porn generally do not tell people what is happening and ask for help, do they? The tech director also conveniently failed to tell Belair that the content filter license had lapsed.

My reading of the investigation report leads me to believe that Belair was proceeding under the assumption that Julie's access was intentional and his job was to find the victims. You may well have believed that the access was intentional and your job was to find the sites that she visited. You may well have never even thought it was your job to try to figure out whether the access was intentional or accidental.

And the ComputerCop people, who are trying to get their new company off the ground, may well have oversold the capabilities of their product. So you could have actually believed that only sites that were intentionally accessed by the user would show up on your report. I frequently have to deal with the entrepreneurial techie types and I know that they frequently engage in lots of hype.

You have noted the basis for some of your spiritual beliefs. In every one of these spiritual doctrines there is the concept of a "golden rule." Put yourself into a position similar to Julie. If someone had made an inaccurate statement, that the person may truly have thought was accurate at the time but is later found to be inaccurate, and because of this inaccurate statement you were now in serious trouble, what would you want the person who made the statement to do?

Nancy

From: "Mark Lounsbury" <[redacted]>
Date: Thu, 12 Apr 2007 15:51:12 +0100
To: "Nancy Willard" <nwillard@csriu.org>
Subject: Re: Reports on my site

Hi Nancy,

Believe what you will. If you don't want open your eyes to the truth that's your choice. I just want to make one thing perfectly clear. In my capacity as a public servant I have no opinion in this or any matter. What I present is JUST THE FACTS. I don't make suppositions or contort the truth. With that said, I hope you find the strength to face the facts and to take responsibility for your words and actions, someday.

Regards, Mark

From: Nancy Willard <nwillard@csriu.org>
Date: Sat, 14 Apr 2007 22:53:28 -0700
To: Mark Lounsbury <[redacted]>
Subject: Re: Reports on my site

Mark,

You did not present FACTS at trial. You are either totally stupid and naïve cop who should have never been given the keys to a \$300,000 Internet safety van or you committed perjury.

I hope you find the strength to face the facts and to take responsibility for your words and actions, someday. I do believe that in the end you will be held accountable.

Nancy

From: "Mark Lounsbury" <[redacted]>
Date: Tue, 24 Apr 2007 18:23:18 +0100
To: "Nancy Willard" <nwillard@csriu.org>
Subject: Re: Reports on the Light

Hi Nancy,

Wow, I don't even get a trial. It's going to take alot of work to convince you to open your eyes. Have you been to www.femalesexual.com? It's not a porn site but it does have links to many such sites. They have a nice disclaimer which you should read. Warning: it'll force your eyes open just a bit, letting in a glimmer of the light of truth. If you can do it, get back to me. I have much more to share but, it's only for those who seek the truth.

It's never too late to admit your mistakes.

Mark

From: Nancy Willard <nwillard@csriu.org>
Date: Tue, 24 Apr 2007 11:39:47 -0700
To: Mark Lounsbury <[redacted]>
Subject: Re: Reports on the Light

Mark.

I totally agree that these sites are horrendous. But there are too many people, kids as well as adults, who have been falsely accused of trying to get to these sites, when they have simply made a mistake or have fallen into a "porn trap."

Your error was in your statement that it was necessary to physically click on these sites for them to appear in the log. It is not. The students who went to the hair styles site triggered a porn trap and Julie did not know how to force quit the browser to get out of this porn trap. She did her level best, based on her knowledge and her instructions, to prevent the students from seeing any of this material.

And she was very successful. The only students who saw anything, were clearly trying to look and only described seeing what was erotica -- except for 2 who both also stated that they were "little pictures" and that they were too far away for Julie to notice they were looking -- and one described the image he saw in terms that leave no doubt that he had had some prior exposure.

Yes, these sites are horrendous.

Yes, we should do everything we can to ensure that kids are not exposed.

But, no, we do not accomplish this by sending innocent people who merely fell into porn traps to prison.

Your testimony was wrong -- and anyone who is truly an expert, which you clearly are not, will tell you it was wrong. So you need to admit your mistake and fix it.

Nancy

From: "Mark Lounsbury" <[redacted]>
Date: Thu, 26 Apr 2007 00:28:08 +0100
To: "Nancy Willard" <nwillard@csriu.org>
Subject: Re: Reports on the Kids

Nancy,

I've noticed you spend your energy for the children: CyberBullying prevention, etc. So, I'm gonna share SOME things with you. About the \$300,000.00 RV. Back in the day I was very involved w/ US Rep. Rob Simmons, spreading the word on Child Cyber Predators; educating parents and children (FOR FREE) about the dangers; etc. Because of my dedication to children and ALL the work I did, I was offered DOJ funding for a CyberCrimes Unit, paid for w/ money attached to the, then, Federal CyberCrimes Bill. I filed a request for \$45,000.00 to be used to train and support a two person unit (you want me to email you the original request? I will.) When MY request was read by Appropriations in DC, they were so impressed with MY dedication to the safety of children that MY request was inflated to \$500,000.00. They trusted that I would use the \$\$ wisely. Well, the Bill passed to Law. DOJ sorted through the requests (by the way, only 100 agencies in the entire USA were included to share in the funding) and my department was granted \$300,000.00. I was very excited. I was going to get four officers trained and paid with overtime to SAVE CHILDREN FROM SCUMBAGS! OOPS!, Though he fought me tooth and nail during the entire process, my boss decided to buy an RV with the money given to ME. He spent all of it. There was none left for the children. Go figure. It's the story of my life and my struggle against ego driven ignorance. Do you accept YOUR Karma? The good news is that I do not quit. I continue to work with any and every LE agency in this country. I'm currently working with the FBI, trying to co-host a NW3C (National White Collar Crime Center) training program needed to provide free training for officers needed to catch child predators http://nw3c.com/ocr/courses_desc.cfm?cn=BOTS.

Do you really believe that the school system, the court system, the police, the children, and I conspired to put some poor substitute teacher in jail? Do you know about two statements, made by the children, in which each says a certain person was "scrolling down a page of pornographic images"? Do you know about the child who stated that a certain person was "watching a movie with naked men and women on the computer"? Do you know that there was a FIREWALL in place? Do you know that I have the firewall logs? Do you know that the evidence recovered by ComputerCop Pro is confirmed by the firewall logs? Do you know what a relative link is and how htm tags work (do you want to see the blue relative link turn red = font tag)? Do you know that the proof of a web page lies in the source code (.htm, .pl, .js, .gif, .jpg)? Do you know that Active X controls can be written in many languages, to include C++, AND only function in a Windows environment? Do you know that Herbert Horner is a liar, a being with NO moral values? Do you know that I can prove that FACT Empirically?

Lastly Nancy, Do you want to open your eyes to the truth? Do you want to know the truth? If your not afraid of the truth all you have to do is ask for it.

Mark

From: Nancy Willard <nwillard@csriu.org>
Date: Thu, 26 Apr 2007 12:32:46 -0700
To: Mark Lounsbury <[redacted]>
Subject: Re: Reports on the Kids

Mark,

Having been around this field for quite a while I do know that there is absolutely no relationship between quality and the receipt of pork barrel funding in relation to Internet safety concerns.

Your proposal was unnecessary overkill and inappropriately focused. The majority of incidents of sexual predation occur between victims and predators who are linked in

some manner in their local community. I do believe that these relationships are the primary source of the new horrendous child porn images.

I have seen presentations by Law Enforcement agencies addressing these concerns and they present inaccurate facts and inflame fears. I would prefer that LE folks would at the very least present information grounded in the research.

Computer Cop has indicated that its product cannot do what you testified it could do. All evidence indicates that the computer fell into a porn trap. It is not necessary to intentionally click on a link to have it appear in the log. Even I know that.

Julie was doing the best she could based on her understanding and specific instructions. Very few teens say anything, those who did were trying to look.

34% of young people between the ages of 10 and 187 have accidentally accessed porn. Are you going to throw all of the parents, teachers, librarians, who prevented this from occurring into prison?

These were 12 and 13 year old boys (one girl but she did not testify). Are you telling me they had never seen this stuff? Are you telling me this experience "impaired their morals?" If so, what percentage of men in Connecticut have equally impaired morals, yourself included?

Nancy