

[return to updates](#)

SANDY HOOK CONSPIRACY THEORIES DEBUNKED?

No.



by Miles Mathis

After writing [my first paper on this subject](#) about two weeks ago, I have been ignoring the various debunking responses from the government-controlled mainstream media. I considered them all too weak to even merit a response. But now that even [infowars is claiming](#) that some of the points have been debunked, and Glenn Beck is planning to repeat the debunking, I feel forced to respond.

The government always hires people to run this gambit: they publish some ridiculously weak response as a debunking, it utterly fails to debunk anything, but then simply because it got published by top outlets they claim the theory has been debunked. Go study just about any tragedy or big news story of the past 50 years, and you will see the same progression. [Specifically, you can study *Popular Mechanics'* pathetic efforts to debunk 911 Truth by this method.] But I have news for them, publishing an article with the title *Debunked* does not automatically mean the theory has been debunked. You actually have to make a strong argument. Blowing smoke for a couple of pages isn't a debunking, it is just more propaganda, and most people who read these things can see that. The debunking of 911 didn't work, because the debunking was exponentially weaker than the data it was trying to debunk. Most people now recognize that fact. We are seeing the same thing here with Sandy Hook.

To prove this, I will go point for point through the debunking of [Salon writer Alex Seitz-Wald](#), showing it is no more than 3rd-string debating tricks and cold cabbage. He starts by calling his paper "Your comprehensive answer to every Sandy Hook conspiracy theory." It is subtitled "Every conspiratorial allegation about the tragic Newtown shootings, answered." So it should concern you that he is starting off with a bold lie. His paper is only about 3 pages long, so how could it possibly address every point or be comprehensive? Not only is he *not* comprehensive as a whole, but each question he does address is only given a sound-bite answer. Most answers are only two sentences long, and some are only one sentence long. But although his title is obviously and demonstrably false, he says it anyway. Why? As a mind game. That is the way these people were taught to write, in Langley, Virginia, or somewhere. They don't have any real counter-arguments, so they have to come up with something. They want you to think that all questions have been answered, so they try to hypnotize you from the first word into thinking they have been. "See my watch swinging? You are getting sleepy. . . sleepy. . .all questions

have been answered.”

Probably the worst sound-bite answer he gives is one of his first. He addresses the fact that a little girl who looks exactly like Emilie Parker, and who is wearing her dress, is seen in Obama's lap after she was supposedly murdered. He assures us it is her sister, but provides no evidence of that. Those who say it is Emilie include an argument for why they think it is her, but Seitz-Wald doesn't feel the need to make a counter-argument. Because he is a writer for *Salon*, all he has to give is his assurance: he is that important. But it turns out the evidence is a great deal more extensive than just that one photo, although of course Seitz-Wald doesn't go there. I admit that one photo, *by itself*, is inconclusive, but that doesn't debunk it. Yes, it is within the realm of possibilities that Emilie's parents are not only using a hand-me-down dress, but that they also began parting the younger sister's hair like Emilie—and that her hair, newly parted there, just happened to create *exactly* the same signature wispies that Emilie's hair created. Its creepy, but not strictly impossible. However, it also remains possible that is Emilie. Nothing has been debunked. To decide this, we should logically proceed to corroborating evidence, to look for proof or disproof. That is the scientific method, after all. When we do that, the evidence that things don't add up becomes very strong. The evidence that there is a cover-up becomes certain. It turns out that most of the photos provided of the Parker family show clear signs of tampering of one sort or another. In the one I analyze in my first paper, we have a substitute for Emilie. And after I provided that analysis, a graphic designer on youtube found evidence of tampering [on another photo](#). [Update: [many other artifacts have been found](#) in that second photo by a fleet of professionals, so the window for debunking is definitely over.] In that one, you can see that Emilie has been pasted on the end of the photo. That can neither be debunked nor explained, which is why Seitz-Wald ignores it completely. If Emilie was killed as we are told, why are they pasting her picture into these Parker family photos? Seitz-Wald implies we need to give him a motive along with proof of pasting, but that is upside-down. Once the pasting is proved, it is then up to *him* to tell us the motive for pasting it together. If these photos aren't being photoshopped in order to scam us, why are they being photoshopped? Was Robbie Parker taking applications for new daughters, perhaps? Was he pasting together photos to see how his new family might look?



Here's the photo they are using to prove the girl is Madeline, not Emilie. Her part is still on the wrong side, but, as I said, it could go either way. The more I look at these Parker pictures, the more I think we may have a *third* girl represented, who is not one of the two older sisters. So although the close-ups don't resolve the problem, this photo does raise new questions. Notice that the hem of the dress is ripped out. We know this is an old dress, since Emilie was supposed to have been wearing it two years ago, "when she was the same size as Madeline." But the Parkers are not poor. Sandy Hook is an affluent school in an affluent neighborhood, with affluent children enrolled. Robbie Parker is a physician assistant, we are told, which is basically a doctor. They can prescribe medicine and do most things physicians can. In an area like Connecticut, a physician assistant should make something between \$80-100,000 a year, or even more. And this is a meeting with the President. And yet we see "Madeline" in a ratty old hand-me-down dress with the hem ripped out? These girls don't look like the daughters of a doctor, they look like the daughters of a traveling circus performer, who dresses them from a costume trunk.

But we have even more corroborating evidence that all is not right with the Emilie story. She isn't in the class pictures. Her alleged father is Robbie Parker**, who is the most histrionic actor ever. This guy doesn't even know when a camera is on, apparently. And he seems to have borrowed the identity of a Robbie Parker in Utah who is 59. To even begin to debunk Emilie Parker, Seitz-Wald needs to answer all the high points of this interconnecting evidence, and he doesn't even get started.

[Update, February 5: After this paper got linked on Rense.com (through no help from me, I didn't submit it), I got an email from a doctor of pharmacy and practicing pharmacist in Connecticut, who told me anyone who wants to prescribe medicine in the state must have an NPI number. This would include a physician assistant, of course. He said he had checked the state database, and the only Robert Parker he found in the whole state was a dentist. Robbie Parker cannot be a very effective physician assistant if he cannot legally prescribe medicine in the state in which he practices.]

Which brings us to Seitz-Wald's first answer, concerning the way people grieve. He is trying to answer the question why all these people interviewed are smiling and laughing, and why when they try to cry it looks fake: no tears, no redness, no normal signs of being human. His answer: "People mourn in different ways." Sure they do, Mr. Seitz-Wald, but none of them grieve by turning into really cheesy actors *a la* Robbie Parker. No amount of quotes from *Scientific American* is going to convince people that Robbie Parker is really a grieving father. He got caught and the best thing you debunkers could do is admit that.

The same goes for Gene Rosen, whose reputation is now beyond any restoration. He got caught telling several different stories, with so many contradictions they can never be spun into sense. He saw a casualty list before it was released. He got caught crying without any tears or redness. He got caught with a living room full of stuffed toys. [He got caught rehearsing his lines on camera.](#) Repeating his lies will not make that go away. We can tell you are spinning just by the way you write, Mr. Seitz-Wald: you say that some are claiming that "Rosen's accounts are suspiciously too consistent." Right, most people who think there is a conspiracy do so because they think Rosen is being too consistent. Is that what you are saying, Mr. Seitz-Wald? That is what we call a strawman with no straw.

Concerning the guns, Seitz-Wald just repeats the mainstream talking points, apparently not realizing that the mainstream has contradicted itself here on multiple occasions. But he doesn't feel the need to address any of the contradictions. Why was NBC told there were 4 handguns if there were two? Why were we told the Bushmaster was left in the trunk, then told it wasn't? It wasn't conspiracy theorists creating these contradictions, it was reporters. Reporters don't just make up information, they get it

from officials. Why didn't the officials know about the gun count? Can policemen in Connecticut not count to four? Can they not tell the difference between a rifle that has been shot and one that hasn't? My assumption is that there were so many Department of Homeland Security sub-agencies there—ICE, ATF, FBI, CIA—that they couldn't get their story straight. Some told the local police one thing and some told them another. In order to make people think the feds were not running the show, the local police then told the reporters. Given the facts, that is the logical conclusion for anyone to draw from the circus, and if that isn't the case, then Seitz-Wald needs to show us how the anomalies happened in a different way. Until he does that, I will continue to believe the most probable explanation.

The only point Seitz-Wald gets right is the third one, concerning women who look alike from Sandy Hook, Aurora, and Florida. I have studied those arguments and they don't fly. The women actually *don't* look alike, but the theorist claims they do. My assumption is these theorists are planted, for the purpose of muddying the waters. Whenever the government gets in a jam and it looks like people aren't buying one of their psy-ops, they hire people to infiltrate the movement and plant bad information. They have been doing this since the Kennedy assassination. Documents have even been declassified, and the CIA and FBI admit they were doing things like this in previous decades (see COINTELPRO and CHAOS). So we must assume they are still doing it. The bad information that is planted serves a dual purpose: it muddies the waters, and it gives debunkers easy targets to knock over, as here. But you should ask yourself why Seitz-Wald is including this point while ignoring much more important ones. None of the big sites—like infowars or naturalnews—that are promoting Sandy Hook theories are republishing this theory. So why does Seitz-Wald list it as one of the top 11 questions? Why is his only illustration (under title) on this question? Why doesn't Seitz-Wald address the chief medical examiner's very strange remarks? Why doesn't he address parents not being allowed to see their dead children? Why doesn't he address the lack of video from the school's security system? Why doesn't he address the judges' sealing of court documents? Why doesn't he address the problem of the school nurse Sally Cox telling a reporter that Nancy Lanza was a kindergarten teacher at Sandy Hook, when she wasn't? Why doesn't he address ATF and ICE agents walking around with assault weapons on public streets that haven't been cleared? Why doesn't he address the mystery of Ryan Lanza? Why doesn't he address the simultaneous [FEMA drill](#) for this event, just a few miles down the road? Why doesn't he address the DHS drills run out of that fire station for the past two years? Why doesn't he mention the Google map anomalies, including [a military base](#) about 2000 feet from the school*, and [map blackouts on Dickenson Drive](#)?



Why doesn't he debunk this photo, in which they have both signs wrong.



They got the name of the street wrong. It is spelled Dickenson. Even spelled right it is fake, since there is no sign on that corner at all. And the Sandy Hook School sign, although on that corner, isn't there with that background: [they have pasted it into another photo](#). That house isn't there, those poles aren't there, etc.

Why doesn't Seitz-Wald comment on this:



According to the Social Security Death Index (SSDI) records, Adam Lanza died on December 13. The Sandy Hook shootings were December 14.

Of course we would expect Seitz-Wald to deal with this just as he dealt with timestamp problems at Google and Facebook: he would tell us those timestamps are often wrong. Yes, maybe they are wrong occasionally, but do you have any proof they are wrong *here*? A general debunking is no debunking at all. A debunking has to be specific. The fact is, timestamps are right about 99.9% of the time, and we have corroborating evidence (such as interior posts that also predate the tragedy) that these are right. What evidence can he provide they aren't right, beyond his golden word for it? Why do not one, not two, not three, but [at least six timestamps](#) appear to wrong with these Sandy Hook memorials and announcements? Isn't that percentage way beyond any percentage that could be explained by statistics? I think most people would assume those timestamps pre-dating the tragedy are a sign of foreknowledge, and in fact that is what they *are* assuming. Therefore a real debunker is put in the position of having to argue we aren't seeing that here. But Seitz-Wald doesn't appear compelled to make any arguments, here or elsewhere. He just assures us they are honest errors, caused by computer malfunctions or something.

Other debunkers claim there is something wrong with Google's timestamps, but this isn't a problem of Google. Researchers have shown timestamps before December 14 on Facebook, Vimeo, Twitter, and other outlets. If the timestamps are universally wrong, why use them?

Remember, there is a mountain of evidence of foreknowledge of 911. The only way you wouldn't know that is if you have never studied the event. So why can't there be foreknowledge here at Sandy Hook? When we see precisely the same sort of smoke here, *of course* we are going to smell fire. Didn't they try to stall us on 911 Truth with the same sort of misdirection? Didn't they lose that one in an embarrassing fashion? Yes and yes.

We see the same lame tactic in answering the problem with the school principal. Seitz-Wald tells us that the *Newtown Bee* ran a retraction and apology: it *wasn't* the school principal Dawn Hochsprung who said those things, since she was dead. OK, but a retraction and apology aren't the same as an explanation. A debunking would include an explanation, would it not? If the person interviewed and quoted was not the principal, who was she? Normally when you misidentify someone in a newspaper article, the apology and retraction includes a correct identification. Since the *Newtown Bee's* retraction doesn't include a correct identification, it only adds to the mystery. [We are told](#) that the newspaper "quoted a woman who identified herself to our reporter as the principal of the school." If she wasn't the principal, who was she? A CIA agent posing as the principal, perhaps? Neither the *Newtown Bee's* retraction nor Seitz-Wald's regurgitation have anything to say against that assumption, so nothing has been debunked.

What about the car? Seitz-Wald tells us that even the conspiracy theorists are admitting that is debunked, but only one guy on youtube is admitting that, and he appears to be spinning a tale. Everyone else is continuing to find new information, as you see at [this newer link](#). To prevent this kind of investigation, a judge has actually [placed a gag order](#) on the cars, sealing all information for at least 90 days. And you wonder why a majority of people think they are hiding something? When judges seal all evidence, I guess people are going to think evidence is being hidden.

What about other people arrested at the scene? Seitz-Wald tells us one of them was Chris Manfredonia, giving us a link to an *LATimes* story that goes like this:

Chris Manfredonia, whose 6-year-old daughter attends the school, was heading there Friday morning to help make gingerbread houses with first-graders when he heard popping sounds and smelled sulfur. He ran around the school trying to reach his daughter and was briefly handcuffed by police. He later found his child, who had

been locked in a small room with a teacher.

Yes, but Seitz-Wald is trying to explain a guy who was chased through the woods for many minutes. We have seen the helicopter footage. He didn't just "run around the school." He fled police and had to be surrounded by them in the woods. He had on camo pants and a black jacket. Does Chris always wear camo pants to make gingerbread houses? Does he always run through the woods like a madman when he smells sulfur and sees police driving up? Do you really think the police are just going to release this guy within minutes to re-unite with his daughter, even though he led them on a big chase through the woods during a mass shooting? They aren't going to hold him for a few days while they investigate his story? They're just going to take his word for it? If you believe that, you are just the reader for Mr. Seitz-Wald.

What about the evacuation? How did they evacuate over 600 school children with no school buses, and all the streets blocked? The chopper footage shows no buses in the vicinity, and no vehicular traffic was allowed onto the school drive. In addition, the main street was blocked by emergency vehicles. Are we supposed to believe all the children just ran out the front door with Chris Manfredonia and into the woods and streets of Sandy Hook, eventually just happening to run into their parents? Since most of them lived many miles away, that by itself would be a miracle of Biblical proportions.

What about the LIBOR connection? Seitz-Wald quotes Ben Swann, who admitted there was no evidence to support it. But there is also no evidence to refute it. A lack of evidence either way does not mean the point has been debunked. It means the question is still open. Both the fathers of Lanza and Holmes *may be* connected to LIBOR. Just because they aren't on current lists of current witnesses in public testimony does not mean they are not persons of interest. The State Department, the FBI, the SEC, or all three may be questioning them right now, for all we know. Then Seitz-Wald swerves viciously from misdirection to outright lies: he says, "neither man is in much of a position to deliver an explosive testimony on the scandal anyway." That is demonstrably false. Do you think the vice-president and tax director of GE financial services is not in a position to know of high-level fraud? If you think not, you must know absolutely nothing about the entire issue, which is what Seitz-Wald is banking on. I would say that the lie of Seitz-Wald here is weak evidence *for* the LIBOR connection. Such a lie is usually the sign of a cover, and if there were nothing to cover there would be no reason to lie.

[Update, January 28. The LIBOR connection has now been found for Peter Lanza. [In a Reuters article from October, 2012, by Basil Katz](#), it is admitted that three men from GE Capital based in Fairfield, *Connecticut*, were convicted of conspiracy to commit wire fraud in order to defraud the US Government. Since this concerns bid rigging for municipal bonds, its link to LIBOR is not obvious at a glance. LIBOR is more commonly thought to concern rigging of interbank rates. But the link certainly exists, since UBS AG [Union Bank Switzerland] and JPMorgan Chase executives have also been convicted in the same scheme as GE. Both banks are major players in the LIBOR scandal, and are under ongoing investigation by Congress and the Justice Department. Furthermore, these banks and others are being sued in the US for corollary fraud involving mortgage rate manipulation, and, yes, muni bond fraud. You can also read about this scandal [from Matt Taibbi at Rolling Stone](#), from June 21, 2012 (the fake Aurora shooting was one month later, July 20, and it was also used to overshadow coverage of the banking scandals, among other things.) And on April 25, 2013, Taibbi published [another piece at Rolling Stone](#) on these banking scandals. Amazingly, he starts the piece off with this sentence:

Conspiracy theorists of the world, believers in the hidden hands of the Rothschilds and the Masons and the

Illuminati, we skeptics owe you an apology. You were right.

At Wikipedia, [it is admitted that LIBOR manipulation](#) may have cost municipalities ten billion in losses from interest rate swaps. These interest rate swaps are *directly* linked to the LIBOR rate rigging. Also notice that the executives at GE were convicted of *wire fraud*. That pulls back in James Holmes' father, from the Batman tragedy. Holmes' father is a top national expert in wire fraud. But it gets even bigger. In October—the same time as the article by Basil Katz—it was reported that both the House and Senate are investigating Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner's and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke's links to LIBOR. So we see that in the two months leading up to Sandy Hook, the entire banking system of the US found itself in a scandal bigger than any since. . .well, ever. The news of this scandal still hasn't broken in the mainstream, and we may imagine that one of the uses of Sandy Hook was to keep the banking scandal out of the papers. This means we have caught Seitz-Wald in yet another lie. The LIBOR connection has not been debunked, it has only been buried. Since CNN's Anderson Cooper has used Seitz-Wald as a talking head in its own debunking of the Sandy Hook event, we have also caught CNN and Cooper in another bold lie.]

As if that were not bad enough, Seitz-Wald stoops even further in his closing, quoting police spokesperson Lt. Paul Vance as saying he was disgusted by the conspiracy theories: “It’s offensive to the families who lost their babies.” As Seitz-Wald began with a psychological trick, he has to finish with one. If you question anything the government spokespeople tell you, you are sick and offensive. If you expect news stories to make sense and be consistent, you are sick and offensive. If you expect investigations to be open and transparent, you are sick and offensive. If you expect the photos they show you to be genuine and not pasted together, you are sick and offensive. If you expect the government to stick to its fundamental document—the Constitution—you are sick and offensive. This applies to Lt. Paul Vance specifically, since he is the guy who told us we would be prosecuted for questioning the mainstream story. Sorry Lieutenant, I think you need to re-read the Constitution—you remember, that document you swore an oath to uphold—which contains a clause about free speech. Doing research on an open investigation and asking pertinent questions is free speech. Asking officials questions is free speech. Demanding that published and promoted stories make some sort of sense is free speech. Interestingly, what is NOT free speech is threatening free citizens with phony prosecution for asking questions. That could fall under harassment, assault, or civil rights violations.

In closing, let's look again at Seitz-Wald's opening, where he says, “It's best not to engage conspiracy theorists on their own turf.” How is an open dialog “our turf”? He has just as much right to be here as we do, we just wish he would say something to the point. There is no turf. But perhaps he means it's best for spinners not to engage truth-tellers. That's true. The spinners always lose, since they can't help getting caught up in their own webs.

I think what Seitz-Wald means is something like what Anderson Cooper meant when he led his own debunking with the slur that no one would know anything about the conspiracy if CNN weren't taking the time to show how foolish it is. Just a general nonsense slur, one that is false on the face of it. Obviously, if the Sandy Hook conspiracy weren't getting a lot of attention, CNN and all these other places wouldn't *need* to debunk it. You hardly need to debunk things no one has heard and no one is talking about, do you? That is just giving the opposition airtime, isn't it? Wouldn't that be counterproductive, assuming no one has heard of this stuff?

Amazingly, we see the mainstream preferring to spin out the story as long as they can, even if that means reporting on the conspiracy theories. Better to report on conspiracy theories than to leave Sandy Hook behind and begin reporting on the gigantic new banking scandal, which dwarfs even the banking

scandals of the past five years. If the mainstream media can keep us off-balance with a continuous stream of manufactured tragedies, it may never have to report on any real news again. Who wants to hear about municipal bond rigging when they can watch scripted mass murders?

As the final turn of the screw, I want to suggest that perhaps this Sandy Hook event isn't just a smaller version of the 911 tragedy. It may not even be what the conspiracy theorists think it is. We have seen lots of signs before this of warring between unseen factions in the government, what with the posting of Obama's birth certificate on whitehouse.gov, the arrest of Strauss-Kahn, the fake shootings in Arizona, the fake shootings in Aurora, and so on. The government mobsters have split, and we see wars now between the billionaires. We must assume, for instance, that it was not Obama or his staff that posted the birth certificate, since it is so obviously fake. Someone else posted it, hoping to give a clue to someone outside. The same can be said for Aurora, where—among other agendas—it appears someone was trying to embarrass or pressure Philip Anschutz, the owner of Regal theaters, who put AEG up for sale soon afterwards. Bigger fish may be frying here than anyone has yet discovered. It is possible that with Sandy Hook, this tragedy was flubbed *on purpose*, and then dumped in the lap of the mainstream media and the current officials. Even as the media tries to salvage it, embedded spoilers are continuing to undermine the story at every turn. It appears that some on the inside—perhaps inside the CIA or military itself—are pushing for this Sandy Hook story to completely implode. If they really wished to debunk this thing, surely they could hire a better writer than Seitz-Wald. This guy is still writing with triple question marks, like he is in junior high. He does nothing but shoot himself in the foot here. The earlier debunking article [at the Atlantic](#), by Dashiell Bennett, did the same thing, leading with a link to a very well-done video at youtube with 8 million hits, and then doing nothing much to debunk it. These debunking articles and shows are just making the conspiracy snowball, and I have to think they intend that. We have heard that nothing happens by accident, and I still believe that.

Perhaps the most curious thing of all is that I see deeply buried signs of hope here. Someone somewhere is feeding the conspiracy theorists easy information, so the gun ban agenda isn't the only agenda moving forward. One faction is using the tragedy for that, as they always do. It has never worked and it isn't working now. But another faction is using the tragedy to undermine itself, and we should continue to study the signs to see what faction that is, and what end they have in mind. It may possibly be some improvement over the current state of things. I have said before that we seem to have the military cartel warring against the banking cartel, and the banks appear to be losing. But the military is also split, and we can't yet see who will come out on top. The sign of hope is that with all these warring factions among the elite, they don't have the time or the resources to fire up the concentration camps or start a war against the people. They have their hands full with China, Russia, and the fallout from their own factional battles. Right now, everything is falling apart. Everyone in power seems to be losing and no one seems to be winning. We see power splintering, which is always a sign of hope in any country trying to salvage freedom. I begin to doubt that all the ammunition purchases have been made to use against the citizenry. It is more likely that we will see the government fighting itself, with the DHS having to fight for its survival against the army/national guard, or something like that. We may see a civil war that the rank and file take little or no part in.

[A follow-up to this paper is now available.](#)

*You know that “woods” that we see the police chasing someone through? That woods leads to the highway, and once you go under the highway, you are in the backyard of the National Guard. Curious no one has thought that worth mentioning.

**I copied this from a discussion at [ATS](#), for anyone who is interested:

Ok, he says he's a Physician Assistant. He said he moved a lot because he was a PA. There should be a record of him as a PA on the web—PA's are expected to participate in community activities, breast cancer 5k runs, that sort of thing... and get their name in the paper about it usually associated with a clinic or hospital. This would be on the web. His real name appears to be Robert K. Parker. He'd be seen on the web, professionally, as R. K. Parker, PA or Robert Parker, PA, most likely. Using Google and searching for Robert K. Parker, PA, prior to 12/14/12, I see this:

[[link to www.healthgrades.com](http://www.healthgrades.com)] [[link to www.healthgrades.com](http://www.healthgrades.com)] [[link to www.healthgrades.com](http://www.healthgrades.com)] [[link to www.healthgrades.com](http://www.healthgrades.com)] [[link to www.ehealthscores.com](http://www.ehealthscores.com)]
Specialty in Albuquerque, NM was General Medicine (PA)

[[link to www.labdraw.com](http://www.labdraw.com)] [[link to www.danburyhospital.org](http://www.danburyhospital.org)]
Perinatal/Neonatal speciality in Danbury, CT.

[[link to beta.healthgrades.com](http://beta.healthgrades.com) (secure)] [[link to www.elicense.ct.gov](http://www.elicense.ct.gov) (secure)]
ROBERT K PARKER PA-C, Physician Assistants & Advanced Practice Nursing Providers Physician Assistant, Provider NPI: 1295043263, Provider Information: ROBERT K PARKER PA-C, Not Sole Proprietor, Practice Location: 1100 CENTRAL AVE SE ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87106-4930 US, Tel: 505-563-6392 Fax: -, Business Mailing Address: 967 HUDSON ST OGDEN, UT 84404-4558 US, Tel: 801-814-7322 Fax: -, NPI Information: NPI: 1295043263, Entity Type: Individual

[[link to www.e-physician.info](http://www.e-physician.info)]

Now, there's the above info and then THERE'S NOTHING ELSE FOR A FOOTPRINT FOR THIS ROBERT K. PARKER, PA. He's got no publicity, no participations in anything, nothing at all... the guy is a GHOST on the web other than the repeated sites indicating he has a license and was working as a PA in Albuquerque, NM before he went to Danbury, CT.

[[link to www.npivalidator.com](http://www.npivalidator.com)] His practice was 635 miles from his home address? [[link to maps.google.com](http://maps.google.com)] House in Ogden, UT: [[link to maps.google.com](http://maps.google.com)] 1295043263 - ROBERT K PARKER PA-C, Mailing Address: 967 HUDSON ST OGDEN UT 84404-4558, Phone: 801-814-7322; Practice Location Address: 1100 CENTRAL AVE SE, ALBUQUERQUE, NM, 87106-4930 Practice Phone: 505-563-6392

So... there's virtually no professional footprint of Robert K. Parker, PA doing anything of a civic nature. NOTHING. I challenge you to find anything. The guy was driving, apparently, from his home in Ogden, UT to Albuquerque, NM where his practice was before they moved to CT. That was a 650 mile drive... in the Rocky Mountains?

Let's see if he's got a footprint as a Mormon on the web: Apparently the wife: Alissa C Parker, 967 Hudson St., Ogden, UT 84404-4558 Maiden Name: Alissa Cottle, Age: 31, Associated: Michael A Cottle, Robert K Parker, Albert G Saunders, Douglas G Cottle, Betty S Cottle, Brooke Cottle, Brady Cottle, Jill Cottle, April Cottle

Odd... *none* of the Parker children are mentioned here... but who are these others?

Albert G. Saunders: Age: 105 years old, Ogden, UT 84404, (801) 392-XXXX, Associates: Berniele L Saunders, Bernice L Saunders, Berniece Saunders, Robert Saunders, Cottle Saunders, Danae Saunders,
Michael A Cottle: 31 years old, Associates: April Cottle, Douglas Cottle, Brady Cottle

Michael appears to be Alissa's brother. April, Douglas, Brady... nieces, nephews.

Douglas G. Cottle, Age: 62, Ogden, UT, Associates: Betty Cottle, Ryan Cottle, Michael Cottle, Strangely, Alissa is not showing as related to Douglas G. Cottle—and should, I think.

Brady Cottle, Age: 64, Ogden, UT, Roy, UT, Associates: April Cottle, Brooke Cottle, Jill Cottle, Michael Cottle

Regarding Robbie Parker: Places Lived: New Fairfield, CT, Ogden, UT, Hillsboro, OR, Rio Rancho, NM

"Robert Knowlden Parker was born in 1982. Robert currently lives in New Fairfield, Connecticut. Before that, Robert

lived in Ogden, UT in 2006. Before that, Robert lived in Hillsboro, OR in 2009."

[link to www.mylife.com]

Robert Knowlden Parker, Ogden, UT, Sandy, UT, Associates: Alissa Parker, Trella Parker
Alissa Cottle Parker, Age: 31, Ogden, UT, Associates: Robert Knowlden Parker

[link to www.peoplefinders.com]

OK, I am creeped out: How many Robert Parkers live in Ogden, UTAH? [link to www.intelius.com] Can you say 9 of them? Yet, our particular "Robby Parker" is a web ghost... nothing that he's done, said, or shared online.... AFAIK. There's his PA info and you can deduce he must be a Mormon living in Ogden. UT and Roy, UT.

This says, "James Lucas Parker, Brother of Robert Knowlden Parker (Emilie's Dad) Lived in Tuscon AZ"
James Lucas Parker, Mesa, AZ, Relatives: Libby Parker, Robert Parker

Ah... a brother *and* a sister... [link to web.publicrecords.com] And, when you try to find anything about them.... vapor...Something is not right here...

Robert Knowlden Parker... Ogden UT and Roy UT... Cue the Twilight Zone music folks...A Physician's Assistance who has no community footprint anywhere; no patient ratings anywhere; nothing... who lived in UT in Mormon-zone Ogden and had a practice 650 miles away... did he drive to-from on the weekends? what?... his brother sister are vapor, AFAIK.