

A reporter by the name of Matthew Willett, of *The Union Recorder*, May 7, 1998 A.D. wrote an article entitled, "*Sills Files Suit To Close Club Without Support Of County Commissioners.*" The sheriff said himself "this is a public safety issue. This is a law enforcement issue, and while I would have liked to have had The Commissioners' support in protecting the public and enforcing their own ordinance, I did not get it," so he didn't get the support of the county's attorney or commissioners and if it's such a safety issue, then why did he come out here and padlock Rameses Social Club? In that way, there is no means of correcting the issue. This is also a contradiction. His actions are continuously contradicting to his words.

The Sheriff went out there, and stated "*I said personally on T.V. that I personally don't have any problem with these people other than the club.*" If public's safety is his only concern, then why has it taken so long for the sheriff to come up with his proposal to close down the "The Strip"? As of November 1998, the sheriff proposed a plan to the eatonton city council to close down the strip again. In **November 5, 1998, Vol. 130, No. 45** Edition Of *The Eatonton Messenger* reported that Sheriff Sills asked the council to "*immediately close down night clubs operating there...*". Needless to say, this proposal comes after we, the Concerned Citizens of Eatonton pointed out the fact that these dens of iniquity are allowed to exist, while the Nuwaubian's club is closed which is drug and alcohol free.

If people's safety is what is motivating him to overreact, then why has a notorious drug and alcohol infested place like "The Strip" has been allowed to remain open for such a long time? Rameses Social Club is drug and alcohol free without minor supposed violations, only open for six month, yet the doors are slammed shut and padlocked. Is this not a contradiction?

Why has it taken him such a long time to close down The Strip and it practically took him only minutes to close Rameses? **Ask Yourself Why?** He had much more cause to close those clubs down, not Rameses. Not to mention he stated that "*The Strip*" was going to be closed down back in the **August 13, 1998 A.D.** edition of *The Eatonton Messenger*. Busts and arrests on The Strip are still being made in a place that was supposed to be closed down. Isn't this also a contradiction?

**Listen, this is all about a precedence** meaning if they get over in this case with their misuse of authority, give themselves the right to drive up on your property without being called, and tell you what you can and can't do on your own property that you paid your hard earned money for. If you are a concerned citizen of Eatonton, you should want all this harassment, injustice, and violation of their rights, and yours for that matter to stop. Does

the constitution not grant Americans the freedom of speech (1st amendment), freedom of rights (5th amendment), and freedom of property (4th amendment)? Or is it just a bunch of words and that our freedoms are just a myth?

Does a sheriff have the right to come on your property without you calling, or without a warrant? Let's be honest, you know they are being harassed. Put yourself in their shoes in this situation, would you allow any person to trespass on your property, knowing it's wrong? In the constitution, does it say that only the sheriff can trespass on private property, or does it say no one can trespass on private property?

So this whole episode that the officials are putting the Nuwaubians through is just to merely set a precedence for the future. You may think that it doesn't concern you now, but if this is allowed to happen to one group of people, it will certainly happen to another. History is proof of that. So when they come out to your land and tell you can't build a barbecue pit in your own backyard or have a yard sale for you and your family to enjoy, you'll understand a little more.

It all starts with little petty incidences like these. And when they begin to dictate to you what you can and can't do, you are under Big Brother. Can't you see that they are trying to set rules and regulations where they themselves don't have to follow the law? Well, I am sorry because as citizens of the United States of America, under the Constitution of America who enjoys life, liberty and freedom, these officials as well as any others who are not abiding by the law, will be made to hold to the letter of the law and you are going to live by the law like everybody else. They have set the law aside to do what they want and hide under it to do their devilishment.

Listen, President Clinton was put on national television and was persecuted for perjury. Shouldn't this apply to any of the officials in office that do the same? If he lies, we can't trust him. However, if the president who is the highest elected official in America, is put on the stand and made responsible for his actions, then shouldn't any other elected official be made to do the same?

I for one, will fight on the side of the Nuwaubians because right is right and wrong is wrong. Once the law makers themselves become the law breakers, we as Americans are doomed, thus making the Constitution null and void. If you can't trust the officials who are elected and sworn in to uphold the law, who can you trust? (*The Dialogue That Appears In This Flyer Are Actual Quotes Taken From Video Footage And Newspapers.*)

**ORGANIZATION:**  
**Concerned Citizens Of Eatonton**

## First You Say They're Good, Then You Say They're Bad; Isn't This A Contradiction?

According to the *American Heritage Dictionary*, **Contradict** means "*to say or express the opposite of what was said before.*" They have found that officials of Eatonton, as well as the media, have contradicted themselves repeatedly concerning the Nuwaubians, Egypt of the west, and their Rev. Malachi Z. York. and they would like to make you aware of these contradictions. So that you can see the inconsistencies or the down right lies being used against this person and those people.

Doug Richards of the Atlanta television channel Fox 5, interviewed Sheriff **Howard Sills**. The sheriff stated, "*I have no information to indicate that they are dangerous.*" If he claims that they are not dangerous, why is it on April 20, 1998, the day the sheriff closed Rameses Social Club, he rushed out to Malachi York's private property with un-stamped papers and 17 squad cars, and even a K-9 unit, to try to intimidate everyone on the land, including the children? He brought all kinds of deputies and officers from different counties there for backup, just to change a few locks on 6 six doors of their social club which was done by a local locksmith. Was all of this force necessary? No! He overreacted, and his personal feelings and dislike of the organization for no apparent reason got involved.

Even Senator **Floyd Griffin** said in an article entitled, "*Griffin concerned about overreaction with Nuwaubians*" printed in *The Union Recorder*, **May 8, 1998**, "*I was concerned that these were some bad perceptions out there that could lead to some things they don't need to have in our county.*" This next concern was relating to Sheriff **Howard Sills**: "*...I was concerned about the Nuwaubians being treated fairly and equally and that's the way everyone in that county and in this country should be treated.*" So even his superior is telling him that he is going overboard. Can't you see what he's doing? The senator expressed his concerns about the Sheriff's hasty actions. With an obvious disrespect for his superior's opinion, he still continues on with this personal vendetta against this group. So now, as you can see, they are not just making this up, it's real.

But it doesn't end there. The plot thickens. The security guard that was standing at the pylon (entrance gate) that day said, that once they arrived, the sheriff stated, "*oh no*

*we are not going to do it this way.*" Meaning he wanted to enter the gate with an overuse of force. Then, the security guard said, *"I'll call the escort to escort you."* He insisted on, and said *"oh no, we are not going to do it your way. We are going to do it my way; I'm the sheriff."* So he flagged the car, and it seemed as if he was planning on running over the guard. Then, he went on to say, *"if you don't move out the way, then I'm going to arrest you."* Then the guard said, *"why?"* And the sheriff said *"because you won't move out the way."*

The sheriff was merely trying to throw his weight around to get past the guard. However, the escort was on his way up to the pylon to escort him and his deputies. They hastily sped pass, all the way to Rameses Social Club. Not to mention, there were children playing outside, and he could have run over them. The guard at the pylon said, *"Why all of this unnecessary force?"* The sheriff then answered, *"I thought it was necessary, and I'm the sheriff right now; whatever I say goes."*

He had all of those deputies from other counties under the impression that the Nuwaubians were a dangerous para-military group. Thus, he convinced them to waste an important day of crime prevention and go out there with him for backup, hoping for a confrontation that never happened. Meanwhile, how many crimes were going on at the same time while hours were wasted while standing there watching him put a sign on a door while these law enforcement agents could have been out fighting crime? How is it that Sheriff Sills can openly state before thousands of T.V. watchers *"they are not a dangerous group"* yet, he showed an unnecessary amount of force when he went out there just to padlock a door? What was the point? Did he lie when he said they are not dangerous to the public or was his actions a contradiction to his own statement? Victor Greig who has falsely been referred to as Malachi's groundskeeper was cited with violating 4 Putnam County Building Ordinances and was required to appear in the county magistrate court on **April 8, 1998**. The judge who resided over the case, **Sylvia S. Huskins** merely suggested that the electricity to the Rameses Social Club be turned off. As soon as the court was adjourned, the sheriff acting on the suggestion of the judge, the sheriff pulled up to the pylon. There are certain procedures that are required by law that have to be done before, you can come to someone's private property and turn off the electricity to a private social club or anything else for that matter.

For one, according to the **Official Codes Of Georgia Annotated, Section 9-11-58 (B)**, The oral judgment by a judge is not law until it is filed with the clerk. So any order, including an order to turn off, the electricity or even to padlock Rameses Social Club, must be stamped and filed with the clerk of that court to be legal. This was not done.

Secondly, the head operator of **Tri-County Electric Company in Gray, Georgia** named **Chuck Lynette** would be the only person able to give anyone authorization to turn off the electricity, not a stamped or unstamped court order, not the sheriff, or anyone else over the phone. If it was a court order, it would be shown to him, **Chuck Lynette**, and he would then stamp it, put it on file and authorize workmen to go out and terminate the electricity. These legal procedures were not filed because for one, **Chuck Lynette** was out on field on **April 20, 1998** and there was a fill-in who did not have the authority. This should invalidate or make void the sheriff's actions which means the sheriff illegally closed down Rameses Social Club. This Will Be Dealt With In Court. One of many mistakes made in anger and haste.

Victor Greig was told by the **Fire Safety Compliance Officer Lewis Brown** that as long as they fix the violations, Rameses Social Club can stay open but only to private members. Also in several articles they say the interior of the club contains a bar; implying that they sold alcohol over the counter in the club. However, most of these newspaper articles didn't bother to clarify to the public that, as stated in the hearing, the bar is just that, a bar, in front of a mirror, that reflects inactive electricity. There is no one standing behind the bar. There is no way you can sale alcohol from there and this was confirmed by **Lewis Brown** and is documented in the court transcripts on page 143 where he said *"I inquired as to if they served alcohol or not. And my--and they told me they did not. And I saw no evidence of it..."* **District Supervisor For The State Fire Marshal's Office John Yearwood** also confirmed Mr. Brown's statement in the court transcripts on page 154. Victor Greig's past lawyer **Ronny Jones** asked Mr. Yearwood *"Did you find any evidence that alcohol was served there?"* Mr. Yearwood said: *"No I didn't."* Most of these reporters claimed they sold alcohol just to support their mistake and fear of retribution because of out right lies to the public which is going to lead to litigation. So they must keep their lie going to cover up their initial mistake of stating they sold alcohol.

There is <sup>no</sup> alcohol being served so there is no real argument. So, why did the sheriff padlock all 6 doors of the club? How was it possible for them to correct the violations? In the meantime, there are damages happening to the Social Club the whole time the club is padlocked, sealed and no way to enter to correct the violations. Is this not a contradiction? Believe it or not, he would come out everyday to walk around the building like he had nothing else to do. It was even said that he had stakeouts from other lands hoping that the Nuwaubians would violate the law. And just recently on **November 10, 1998** Sheriff Sills and his **Detective Lee Wilson**, went to Rameses Social Club just to check the

locks on the doors that he padlocked. What was the purpose? Was this some kind of intimidation tactic because the club can not be used or even entered because it is padlocked? The entire incident was being videotaped by two residents of Tama-re and Detective Lee Wilson. All tapes are passed on to the office and lawyer for the upcoming case.

However, getting back to the point, because of the time factor, isn't it obvious that the sheriff appears to not be following the necessary procedures? **Citation number 01306**, was signed by Judge **Sylvia S. Huskins** as a suggestion to turn off the electricity. In the citation it states *"in addition to other remedies, the building inspector may require that public utility service be withheld therefrom until such time as the structure or premises are no longer in violation of these regulations."* The citation goes on to say *"I am suggesting to the sheriff and building inspector that this be done with regard to the Rameses Dance Club, the fountain and drum stage structures!"* Two of these structures, the drum stage and fountain have been rectified in Malachi's favor yet, the newspapers won't print that.

In the above quote, the citation states that *"...the building inspector may require that public utility service be withheld therefrom..."* Not the sheriff. Why is the sheriff doing the building inspector's job? It also states that *"...public utility service be withheld therefrom until such time as the structure or premises are no longer in violation of these regulations."* The only way the structures could no longer be in violation is to allow them to go in and fix the few minor problems. On **Wednesday, May 7, 1998 A.D.** the sheriff and 17 squad cars arrived to padlock the doors. So it appears that not enough time was given by the sheriff to make the necessary corrections.

But citation was not sealed by the clerk's office on that day. So again, it seems that the sheriff was operating on an illegal documents that didn't have the appropriate approval. That's a contradiction within itself because the sheriff was sworn into office to uphold the laws, but then turns around and appears to break the laws himself. Mr. Sills went out of the county, to Madison, Georgia, to hire an attorney named **Brenda Holbert Trammell, State Bar No. 360075**, to file an injunction to padlock Rameses because the Putnam County attorney and Putnam County Commissioners County did not agree or support his actions. He couldn't get them to go to court to shut down The Social Club. This is when he went out and did it himself. Then, **Superior Court Judge William A. Prior Jr.**, ordered Rameses Social Club padlocked. This injunction that Mr. Sills filed would demand the destruction of the club or the return to its permitted use. Do you see what is happening here? Exactly and it doesn't make any sense. Is this a misuse and abuse of power?