

Randy Chapel
November 14, 2015

David Berger, American Citizen Services & Crisis Management Barack Obama Loretta Lynch James Comey Arne Duncan Susan Allister	James Cole, Jr. Sally Yates Leslie Caldwell Herman Bounds Jr. Valerie Jarrett
--	---

Dear Mr. Berger:

What part of “*I have made no effort to contact you, Mr. Berger, for a reason*” is not understood?

On November 13, 2015, I received a letter mailed on May 28, addressed to “Joel Chapel” and returned on June 5 because no such PO Number. Joel Chapel doesn’t live in the US. He is an abducted child living in England. This is the first time Carol or myself have become aware of this letter. There are no emails, letters or any other communication by the Government regarding this letter in and around that time, advising either Carol or myself who requested the welfare check and extradition. In fact, no communication exists since the spring of 2015, except for the actions to seek FOIAs.

Within England a father has Parental Rights, if his name appears on the birth certificate or he was married to the child’s mother at the time of birth. According to the guidance by the UK Government, Susan “needs to keep [me] updated about [Joel’s] well-being and progress”¹ at a minimum. Susan has never done this and only when the U.S. forces the issue is anything known. Besides the two reports there is no other communication since November 2010. Susan and the Allisters have acted to deny everything and anything related to Joel.

According to the UK Government, fathers are also responsible for 1) disciplining the child; 2) choosing and providing for the child’s education; 3) agreeing to the child’s medical treatment; 4) naming the child and agreeing to any change of name; 5) looking after the child’s property; among other things. Susan Allister and her family have alienated Joel from me and others in the family, while instead forming a new, “preferred” replacement family with replacement “daddy” Richard Gareth McHugh. Susan and the Allisters have gotten away with all of this by leveraging the corruption and fraud by the American Government and the Religious in America. Friends and family in England are encouraging these acts, the new “preferred” relationship and writing anything to do with me out of Joel’s history. (just check out their facebook).

In the letter dated May 6, 2015, an unknown named “consular officer” with an unknown named “consular assistant” met at an unknown named primary school, with an unknown named deputy head teacher. There are no school or health records, in fact I have never seen or been consulted on any school or health issues or on anything - ever. While the teacher noted that Joel has a strong moral compass, there is not a single case whereby I as a parent, have had any opportunity to impact Joel or to assess this for myself. As noted in my October 29th letter:

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/parental-rights-responsibilities/what-is-parental-responsibility> It should be noted that I am unaware of any motion filed restricting my rights. As explained later, Susan “forum shopped” for the UK, which might provide her an edge to extract money or control of Joel. One of the most frequently heard complaints made by parents is that schools and doctors refuse to give them any information about their children, even though they have Parental Responsibility. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) issued its own Guidance on these matters (DfES/0092/2000) explaining that all 'natural parents', regardless of whether they had parental responsibility or not, are equally entitled to participate in their children's educational lives. The Access to Health Records Act 1990 requires 'the holder of a health record' - a doctor, dentist or other health professional - to provide access to health records in response to a request by the patient. Where the patient is over 16, s/he alone is entitled to access, but where the patient is a child under 16 an application can be made by any person with Parental Responsibility. The ruling seems clear, but many non-resident parents face difficulties in attempting to obtain any information about their children's education or health from schools and doctors. Susan’s acts are making for a confrontational situation.

“The loss [to a child of the relationship with a parent] cannot be undone. Childhood cannot be recaptured. Gone forever is that sense of history, intimacy, **lost input of values and morals**, self-awareness through knowing one's beginnings, love, contact with extended family, and much more. Virtually no child possesses the ability to protect him- or herself against such an undignified and total loss.”² (Bold mine)

The boy described in the letter appears to be a mixture of Richard and Susan – *Joel McHugh*. As once again I noted in my October 29th letter, “Joel will be an Allister, McHugh or whatever.” “Joel will never be my son.” and “Susan and the Allisters will never stop. Never. Their place in society, their pride, etc., whatever, they will never stop.” I didn't write these statements for filler, Mr. Berger.

The whole episode in early 2015 occurred because I was made aware of the blocking of “Joel Chapel” and www.joelchapel.com for searches performed on Google.³ As I noted on April 12, “The effort is to cover up what has happen, and to write me completely out of history - Joel's and everything else.” This is a case of perverting EU data protection laws to cover up what has gone on and continues. Joelchapel.com and joelchapel.co.uk were first created so that any searches by Joel or his friends, other parents, school, employer, girlfriend, etc would inform that Joel was in fact loved and missing. People with missing children are many times advised to do this, so that the child will learn sooner than later what has actually happened, gone on, who did this to them, why and so on.

Take the recent case of Julian Hernandez, who was missing for 13 years, without knowing that in fact he was taken and loved. His case has been noted around the world and when he learned the truth of what had happen he became unglued.

'How does he cope with going from somebody he thought he was to now somebody that's completely unknown to him?' said Lieutenant Johnny Evans.⁴

What do you think is going to happen when the press in America and England find out not only what has happen, but link this to Donald Allister who sits in the House of Lords or to the corruption and fraud the Obama Administration has acted for years to defend and to which Susan used as a means to force her divorce? To put it mildly, the shit is going to hit the fan – and people, including Richard, Donald, Janice, John, etc are going to be viewed as co-conspirators. The press is not going to note Susan as a **tremendous Mother**, like has been stated of Bobby Hernandez. Abduction and the willful acts to destroy the son-father, grandson-grandparent relationship is not about love or being a loving parent. When Joel finds out about this, the longer he is in the dark, the more damage will be caused. Like Julian, his entire frame of reference, his entire childhood, his entire worldview will come crashing down as one big lie.⁵

The court has already ruled on issues related to Joel. In *Friedrich v. Friedrich*, 78 F.3d 1060, 1068 (6th Cir.1996), the *Friedrich* court found that evidence that a child will suffer adjustment problems if returned to the country of habitual residence is not enough to establish a grave risk of psychological harm that would defeat the Convention's return remedy. The court's rationale is persuasive: the abducting parent should not be permitted to profit from the very situation he or she created by wrongfully removing or retaining the child in the first place.⁶ However, in the volume of previous documents, we have clearly

² Stanley S. Clawar & Brynne V. Rivlin, *Children Held Hostage: Dealing with programmed and brainwashed children*. ABA Section of Family Law, ISBN No. 0- 89707-628-1, p. 105.

³ In fact, other search engines do the block as well in the UK. This was a calculated act to ensure people do not know what is actually going on.

⁴ <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3308088/Attorney-Ohio-man-took-boy-mom-knew-hed-caught.html>

⁵ Children deprived of a parent may, as a result, suffer loss, guilt, confusion, fear, powerlessness, identity crisis, anger, withdrawal, anxiety, a retreat into a fantasy world, hopelessness, inadequacy, fears, phobias, depression, suicidal ideation, sleeping and eating disorders, academic problems, withdrawal from one or both parents, drug abuse, peer group problems, obsessive-compulsive behavior, motor tension (tics, fidgeting or restlessness), psychosomatic disorders, damaged sexual identity and other problems. By inculcating a message that children are not permitted to love both parents, alienating parents make children feel anxious each time they wish to express love to the target parent. “They might feel anxiety over the smallest gesture, such as making a Father's Day card in school but not being able to present it to the [other] parent” *Children Held Hostage* at p.113.

⁶ International Child Abduction Remedies Act, 42 U.S.C. § 11601(a)(1)(“The Congress makes the following findings: (1) The international abduction or wrongful retention of children is harmful to their well- being...”).

noted that at each step, the government dropped the ball and Susan was able to leverage this to her and the Allisters' advantage. (I need not go through all the examples here, but I do in the book. Given by the time the reader gets to that chapter, the sense of extreme moral turpitude by the Obama Administration and the Religious will be overwhelming. This is why one production company is interested in this book because you just can't make this stuff up in Hollywood).

Many abductions, like in this case, occur before a court has had the opportunity to enter a child-custody determination. Susan claimed she could never return to the U.S., and forced her divorce in England. This is somewhat the same as the Sean Goldman case, whereby Sean's mother refused to return to the United States and Hillary Clinton got involved. However in this case, Hillary Clinton ignored us. What Bruna and Susan did is referred to as "forum shopping" in an attempt to receive a favorable court ruling.⁷ Even if at this point Susan was to seek a child-custody determination, Susan's action to take, entice away, keep, withhold and conceal Joel (California Penal Code Section 277(k)) fails because "a custody order obtained after the taking, enticing away, keeping, withholding, or concealing of a child does not constitute a defense to a crime charged under this section." California Penal Code Section 278.5(c).

What Susan and the Allisters' have done is aggressive parental alienation and it will get worse over time. One of the "basic techniques" alienating parents use is to send the message, either overtly or subtly, that the target parent is insignificant or irrelevant to the child.⁸ This may be done by ignoring the target parent at social functions and elsewhere, or by denying or refusing to acknowledge his existence.⁹ By choosing to "never talk about the other parent," a subtle message is sent that the other parent is insignificant.¹⁰ Another insidious but powerful method of excluding the target is for the alienating parent to refuse to acknowledge any positive experiences the children have with him.¹¹ By not responding "to the excitement and joy" the children express about the other parent and acting indifferently to their excitement, the alienating parent effectively marginalizes the target. "This 'ho-hum' approach has the effect of numbing the children from sharing [their positive] experiences with the programming parent."¹² A parent may also subtly, yet powerfully, attack the target by attacking his family, career, living arrangements, travel, activities, associates or any other circumstance identified with him.¹³ This is well known for Susan, for example, the marriage was a "mistake" and her statements forcing the divorce. This passive-aggressive act, seeks to attack the target indirectly in this way also provides the alienating parent with "cover" to deny the attack.¹⁴ Further, situations in which contact between the non-custodial parent and the child is diminished enhance the viability of successful programming. If a child does not have much contact with one parent, he or she is not afforded the experiences needed to contradict the programme. . . . [Deprogramming] can best be done through increased experience and physical contact between the target and child.¹⁵ An alienating parent like Susan, may also exclude the target parent by failing to inform him of important events in the child's life:

Not informing the other parent of school dates, plays, conferences, ceremonies, awards, sporting events, and the like is a way of signifying to the children that the other parent lacks importance. . . .

Children are deeply affected by the presence or absence of parents at educational, social and religious functions. After a time, they develop the veneer of an "I don't care" attitude. After interviewing 200 children between the ages of four and eighteen years on this issue, it was noted that virtually every child desired both parents to be present at as many of these functions as possible. Children would say,

⁷ In spite of everything Susan claimed and demanded in her forced divorce action, the court granted her nothing.

⁸ Clawar & Rivlin, Id. at 15.

⁹ Id.

¹⁰ Id.

¹¹ Id. at 17.

¹² Id. at 17-18.

¹³ Id. at 18-19.

¹⁴ Id.

¹⁵ Id. at 24-25.

“Even if my dad can’t make it, my mother should have told him.” . . . Clearly, children are often aware that one parent does not participate in social functions due to the aggressive nature of the other parent. Children know this, even in cases where they say that the aggressive parent is positive and constructive in other ways.

In more extreme cases, the brainwashing parent actually obstructs the flow of information to the target parent by not supplying schools with his or her proper name and address. One of the most common problems in custody-conflicted families is that the mother places the stepfather on the educational records as the father of record. In a review of our cases, we found that mothers were five times more likely to participate in this behavior than fathers. Fathers did not appear to have the same social need to present the stepmother as the mother, whereas mothers had a very strong need to present stepfathers as “the” father. As part of this pattern, mothers seem less comfortable in attending social functions when the birth father is present. Fathers on the other hand, seem to have a greater sense of comfort in attending social functions when the birth mother *is* present.¹⁶

Denigration may be used by making moral judgments against the target parent’s values, lifestyle, choice of friends, career or financial or relational successes or failures in life.¹⁷ These criticisms are often:

insidious, occurring over a period of time with different degrees of intensity but always powerful. Like the wearing away of a stone constantly assaulted by waves, the child’s perception of the target parent changes from its original, more positive, view finally conforming to the programming parent’s opinions and sentiments.

In such cases, the effect is almost irreversible. These children are no longer able to accept both parents as equally good. . . . These beliefs become so ingrained that the parent who created them no longer has to promote the desired perceptions. They have been given life within the child’s own mind. So much so, that the parent may honestly report that he or she is not actively doing anything by word or deed to thwart the target parent’s relationship with the child.¹⁸

We are at this point because the United States of America is more concerned to cover up what it was involved in, cover for the Religious, while everyone has sought to paint me as the devil himself – to protect themselves; to protect their group/institution; to protect their employment; to protect their personal futures; etc., which I noted in my October 29th letter.¹⁹ Susan and the Allisters, for their personal advantage, forced the divorce and retained Joel doing and continuing all of this:

“The Respondent who is an American citizen has devoted a large proportion of his time and energies conducting protracted litigation in the USA throughout the duration of the marriage. The legal action was initially against a religious seminary he joined as a student in the 1990’s and was expanded to including other parties, culminating in a final judgment against him in May 2010. The Respondent’s obsessive absorption in this litigation and its morbid effect upon him has alienated the Respondent from the Petitioner and the parties’ young child. The Respondent has been hindered from progressing his career or obtaining gainful employment due to the demands of the court cases he has pursued. The Respondent has also run up very high debts in court costs since 2002. This has prevented the Petitioner from obtaining a visa for residency in the USA with their son Joel, which has had a

¹⁶ Id. at 21–22 (emphasis in original).

¹⁷ Id. at 24.

¹⁸ Id. at 24–25.

¹⁹ Point No. 5. Here I am basically making a note for RICO (18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968). An objective of Civil RICO is to turn victims into prosecutors, “private attorneys general”, dedicated to eliminating racketeering activity. See [Rotella v. Wood](#). The Obama Administration has obstructed justice and abused power because of its own intrinsic involvement in this case.

negative impact on the parties' relationship and the Respondent's relationship with Joel. The Respondent has not been to the U.K. and has therefore not seen either the Petitioner or Joel, since the beginning of May 2010."²⁰

This is why <https://www.facebook.com/Joel.T.Chapel>²¹ was created in the spring of 2015, in an attempt to directly combat what Susan and the Allisters have done and continue. This is why the letter of October 29th was written Mr. Berger. No one within my extended family or friendship group has any regard for the U.S. Government or the Obama Administration at this point, given what it has done over all these years. The point that the May 6 letter was never further communicated, no extradition action was made and no warrant to take physical custody of Joel has occurred speaks volumes. This is directly why the book is named what it is *Government Corruption and Educational Fraud: The Toxic Legacy of the Obama Administration*. This case is one clusterfuck²² after another and paid for with public money.

"The only people who don't want to disclose the truth are people with something to hide"
– President Obama, August 21, 2010

"Members of organized crime continue to exploit their victims the old-fashioned way - through violence, threats and intimidation. As law enforcement has so successfully done before, we will employ our own time-tested techniques to bring them to justice to account for their crimes."
– Loretta Lynch January 27, 2012

BP is receiving the punishment it deserves, *The steep penalty should inspire BP and its peers to take every measure necessary to ensure that nothing like this can ever happen again.*
– Loretta Lynch October 5, 2015

James Cole, Jr., Sally Yates & Leslie Caldwell: *United States of America ex rel. Mary Hendow and Julie Albertson v. University of Phoenix; Civil Action No. 2:03-cv-00457-GEB-DAD (E.D. Cal.)*²³ \$78.5 million settlement includes \$11 million as statutory attorneys' fees and costs. This would also be in line with the September 9, 2015 Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates, "the Yates Memorandum" and the Department's use of Deferred & Non-Prosecution Agreements.

No family should ever go through, what my family and I have over these years. Just because some

²⁰ I should point out that Susan's third reason to force a divorce was used by the Feds (Read James A. Scharf) and the Santa Cruz County Counsel in an effort to take away my 2nd amendment rights, while using doctored medical statements. – yea, I have those as well.

²¹ This facebook page has been set up to show photos of the family, gifts, to explain what has happen, etc. all to show that what Joel has been raised to believe is not true. Susan, the Allisters, Richard and his family and all their friends are well aware of this facebook page. The fact that all this continues speaks to the dichotomy of this case and the personalities involved.

²² While **clusterfuck** is sometimes used as an engineering term for a mess of electrical cables (I am an engineer), it is also used to describe a disastrously mishandled situation or undertaking, which clearly sums-up this case.

²³ Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in 2007 reinstated all claims after concluding that the whistleblowers' allegations of fraud, if proven true, could make the University of Phoenix liable to reimburse the Department of Education for hundreds of millions of dollars in student aid funds. The University denied the lawsuit's allegations, and in 2005 the trial judge dismissed the action on the ground that the *University's certifications of compliance with the Higher Education Act did not constitute false claims under the False Claims Act*. In 2007, the Ninth Circuit reversed that ruling.

The Higher Education Act ("HEA") mandates that an educational institution is ineligible to submit any requests for Title IV student loan and grant funds without first executing an agreement with the Secretary of Education, the Program Participation Agreement ("PPA") and as a requirement of that agreement, maintain the contractual requirements of said agreement. An institution's knowingly false promises to comply with the HEA in the mandatory PPAs are actionable under the False Claims Act where those false statements cause the Government to grant the institution's subsequent requests for Title IV student education funds.

In addition, 20 US Code § 1099b doesn't provide accreditors "authority" or "power" to do what ATS-Western Seminary claimed. In fact on December 2006, Deputy General Counsel Jeff Taylor stated on the record regarding the ABA scam, "*regulations do require published standards.*" The transcript went on to note: "*It's certainly reasonable that the Department and the law anticipates that schools will conduct themselves, will make sure that their behaviors are lawful. And certainly we would not want to approve an agency that has standards or requirements that would require an institution to violate the law or the Constitution...but I get the impression from this, that what it says is that to meet, to comply with the standard as this agency has written it would require or invite institutions to have to do things that would violate the law or the Constitution...would encourage or even require institutions to do things that were unlawful.*"

people wear robes or collars, doesn't mean they are not members of organized crime or use their position in society to exploit people. To date, I am unaware of any action to hold corrupted government employees, Western Seminary et al, ATS et al or NWCCU et al accountable, yet the damage they have caused will impact my family for the rest of our lives. In spite of all that Susan and the Allisters have done, the pain they have caused and continue to cause, they didn't deserve this either.

Everyone has made his or her choices Mr. Berger. I have made mine. We are way beyond your pay grade at this point as I previously noted in my October 29th letter.²⁴ This is a calculated paper trail, by interested parties seeking justice against corrupt people and institutions that have done everything possible to destroy anyone that gets in their way.

There is not much more time to fix the problems created and turn this all around before I go to press.

Randal.

²⁴ The governmental corruption and educational fraud will continue as long as *Duncan*, *Obama* and *Lynch* want it too.