

Peter J. Mancus
Attorney at Law
Victorian Square
876 Gravenstein Ave. So., Suite 3
Sebastopol, CA 95472
Tel: (707) 829-9050/824-1884
pmancus@comcast.net

August 17, 2009

Chief Executive Officer
Board of Directors
The Fighter Collection
Imperial War Museum
Duxford Airfield
Duxford
Cambridgeshire
CB22 4QR
England

Chief Executive Officer
Board of Directors
Imperial War Museum
Duxford Airfield
Duxford
Cambridgeshire
CB22 4QR
England

**RE: 1. OBJECTIONS AND COMPLAINTS ABOUT DUXFORD'S 2009 FLYING
LEGENDS AIRSHOW
2. DEMAND FOR REDRESS OF INJURIES
3. MERITORIOUS CONSTRUCTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS**

"The person whose rights are being determined should not be placed in a position of being required to object and thereby spur hostility or not object and thereby suffer waiver."

– Hackethal v. California Medical Assn.(1982) 138 Cal.App.3d 435, 444

Dear Chief Executive Officers and Members of the Boards of Directors for The Fighter Collection and for the Imperial War Museum Duxford:

1. INTRODUCTION

You need to confront, with a non-defensive attitude, the truth, the merit, and the wisdom of what I communicate, below. This is because you can benefit from the constructive, truthful, insightful, feedback of an intelligent critic who harbors good will toward you who also has professional legal training and relevant experience. I am such a critic.

I hope that my criticism and recommendations spur meaningful reforms, for the good of all, which includes *you*, airshow fans, photographers, and me.

2. SUMMARY

I attended your Duxford Flying Legends 2009 airshow on July 11-12, 2009. Certain parts of the non-flying aspects of that airshow, based on unimpeachable facts, made those parts the worst airshow that I have attended from 1960 to date, and I have attended hundreds of them. Some of your agents for the Duxford Flying Legends 2009 airshow performed egregiously. They usurped power. They violated my rights. They manifested a dereliction of duty. Via their dereliction, they morphed that venue into a bully's playground. As such, the wisdom of Edgar Allen Poe is applicable: "You do not get a man's most effective criticism until you provoke him. Severe truth is expressed with bitterness."

Your "Visitor Services" and "Public Safety" agents failed to enforce your excellent rules, to my detriment and to the detriment of many, which has emboldened the bullies, the troublemakers, and the liars. Your agents' failure to enforce your rules ruined my enjoyment of that airshow, for the second year in a row. When I complained to your agents about their failure to enforce your rules they took the easy way out: Instead of disciplining those who violated your rules, they ejected me without good cause, and, to exacerbate matters, I was banned for life from future Duxford airshows. That ejection and that ban are an injustice. You owe me an apology for what your agents did, and you should rescind the lifetime ban.

As a result of what your agents did, immature people who do not know all of the facts have threatened me with physical violence, citing, as part of their justification, what your agents did.

Via this communication, I am telling you my side of this dispute.

Below, I state facts, my analysis of those facts, issues that require resolution, recommendations, and a proposed amicable resolution of this dispute.

3. MATERIAL FACTS

July 2008:

I attended one day of the Flying Legends Air Show 2008. People standing on ladders made it impossible to photograph airplanes when these people were between me and low flying airplanes or taxiing airplanes. Many people at the crowd line stood on ladders.

May to June, 2009:

From late May 2009 to late June 2009 I attended a French warbird airshow as media, the entire Paris Airshow as media, and a French Air Force airshow, all without incident.

I saw at these airshows what appears to be a trend: More persons are using ladders, to gain an advantage, and the ladders seem to be getting bigger, up to 6-8 feet tall.

July 2009:

When at the RAF Waddington airshow, I asked a RAF police officer to please tell a man who stood on a ladder at the crowd line--who also leaned forward, on his ladder, to stay off his ladder because he needlessly obstructed the view. The police officer told the man to stop using his ladder. That man was outraged that I asked a police officer to tell him to stay off his ladder. I asked the police officer to speak to that man because I have never had a photographer standing on a ladder agree to stay off it no matter how politely they were asked to stop using their ladder.

At RAF Waddington, airshow fans persisted with starting BBQ's between the flight line and the runway, even after the announcer told them they were forbidden.

11 July 2009:

I bought an admission ticket for and attended the Flying Legends Air Show 2009 at Duxford on Saturday. At the admission gate one of your agents gave me a copy of your two-sided, folded, Duxford, Flying Legends Brochure dated 11 & 12 July, 2009. This brochure contained these rules:

Do not obstruct the view of others. Stepladders are not allowed, except for accredited media, who must report to the Media Marquee. [Exact quote. Bold highlight is per Duxford's brochure.]

The existence of these rules established (1) every airshow fans' *right* to enjoy the benefit of these rules, namely, an entitlement to an unobstructed view of the airshow; (2) an obligation on the part of all airshow fans to not obstruct the view of others; and (3) a duty on the part of your agents to enforce these rules for the benefit of all airshow fans.

Despite these rules, Duxford's officials let many people bring in a large number of stepladders and stand on them. I never saw the ban against stepladders enforced. Large number of people stood on ladders during the flying display with impunity.

When your agents failed to enforce your rules your rules become a farce, their dereliction of duty was a prescription for meltdown and lawlessness, and the Duxford airshow venue became a bully's playground.

When your agents failed to enforce your rules, a large number of airshow fans invented their ad hoc rules, crowded in on others who were there first, and obstructed their views, with impunity, because your agents did not enforce your rules.

On July 11, 2009, at approximately 8:30 a.m., I erected my tripod, with a large lens on it, on the top of a flat area close to the armored vehicle pit, above and behind the viewing area below, about as far back as I could be, away from others as much as I could be. I put my camera case under my tripod within the space of its legs, with cameras on top of that case. At that time at that area, there was plenty of open space around me because it was not crowded.

I stayed there from 8:30 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. when the flying display started.

I controlled my food intake so I would not have to use a restroom because I did not want to have to leave and forfeit my spot.

On July 11, 2009, at around 1:00 p.m., a large Caucasian man with two Nikon cameras with fairly large Nikon lenses attached, appeared and sat down in a vacant chair behind me on my left.

This man progressively moved closer to the front. When peak flying started, this man suddenly stepped directly in front of where my large lens had been pointing, in plain view, and he positioned himself in a place which made it impossible for me to take my pictures at the left end of my cone of view.

I told this man, "Step back." He did not. He continued to take pictures that I intended to take. His presence made it impossible for me to take the pictures he was taking that I otherwise could have and would have taken.

I told him again, "Step back." He ignored me. I told him again, "Step back."

This man leaned over and said I did not tell him "Please."

I told him he knew what he was doing [blocking my view], and I did not have to tell him, "Please."

I insisted that he refrain from blocking my view. What I insisted upon is 100% consistent with *your* rules.

This man told me he was there first. I told him he was rude and a liar.

This man leaned toward me and in a low voice said, "If you do not yield to me I will make your day uncomfortable." or "I will make your day uncomfortable." I construed that statement as a threat of physical bodily harm. That interpretation is reasonable.

At that time, the area around me was a dense pack of humanity. This is because the crowd moved in just before peak flying started. I did not see any good open space where I could relocate to get away from this man and still take good pictures.

This man continued to block my left cone of view, making it impossible for me to photograph airplanes during the beginning of their take off rolls and large parts of landings and taxing. This man was a Duxford rule violator. He violated *your* rule: "**Do not obstruct the view of others.**" This man violated my entitlement to an unobstructed view.

Since this man refused to move two feet to his left, which would have solved the problem he created for me, I often took my camera off my tripod and stood next to him, so he would not block my view. I hated doing that because I knew that by doing that I would, at times, probably block the view of a wonderful British man who I was traveling with who befriended me; however, I was there to produce—to come back with excellent images, not to be frustrated and blocked by anyone.

I also hated taking my lens off of my tripod for another reason: I wanted to use slow shutter speeds to blur props.

While standing next to this man, on my left, who told me he would make my day uncomfortable, I felt this man's hip make contact with mine. He pushed me toward the end of the flat area I stood on, toward the slope in front of us. I construed his behavior as the beginning of his threat to make my day "uncomfortable".

To keep from being pushed off the flat area, to keep from falling onto others--hurting them and/or myself, and to protect my camera gear which I held, and to send this man the message that I would not be intimidated, I pushed my hip back against his, for a few seconds. I stopped pushing back when I saw that I stood on enough of a flat surface, and he stopped pushing back against me.

This man then apologized. I told him his apology was not accepted because he knew what he did, and he needed to step back, which he did not do.

I looked around for an official to complain to about this man. I did not see an official. I anticipated that this man would try to push me out of the way again and/or use escalated force against me. To deter this man from being an aggressor against me, I yelled at him about six times, "Do not touch me." I wanted him and people around me to know that I did not want him to make further physical contact with me. I did not want to fight this man who was bigger, younger, and probably stronger.

I did not leave my vantage point and go look for an official because I wanted to photograph airplanes, peak flying was going on, I did not want to surrender my spot to anyone, I did not know where the officials were, and I had a lot of heavy, expensive, camera gear.

From 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., the entire flying display, I was unable to photograph low level flying airplanes at the right end of my cone of view because many people stood on banned stepladders. Also, I could not photograph taxiing aircraft in front of me because many people stood on banned stepladders.

On the evening of July 11, 2009, I discussed my experiences with this man at Duxford with the lady who ran the B&B where I had lodging. I wanted her advice. She told me that in her judgment it was good that I stood my ground with this man, and that "he had met his match". I agreed.

12 July 2009:

Per your Duxford, Flying Legends Brochure dated 11 & 12 July, 2009, these rules--*your* official written rules--were still in place, for 12 July 2009:

Do not obstruct the view of others. Stepladders are not allowed, except for accredited media, who must report to the Media Marquee. [Exact quote. Bold highlight is per Duxford's brochure.]

But, these rules were never enforced. As in July 2008, on 11-12 July, 2009, hundreds of people stood on stepladders, obstructing the view of thousands, with impunity.

On 12 July 2009, from 8:15 a.m. to around 9:10 a.m., I took pictures of static airplanes. I also talked to a "Steve" who wore a yellow-green "Visitor Services" vest. I asked him if "Visitor Services" meant *crowd control*. He said, "Yes, you could say that." I told this Steve about my

problems with the man who threatened me on Saturday, about my frustration with people standing on stepladders, about the absence of officials to complain to during the flying display. “Steve” told me he was also an American, from Las Vegas, he agreed with me, he thought stepladders and wind breaks should be banned. “Steve” said he would patrol that area more during the flying display and report my views to his superiors.

On July 12, 2009, at approximately 9:20 a.m., I erected my tripod, with a large lens on it, at approximately the same area before, near the armored vehicle pit area, when that area was not crowded. I stayed there until the flying started at 2:00 p.m. I limited my food intake so I would not have to use a restroom.

As soon as I got to that area I told my friends about my conversation with “Steve”. We were happy that “Steve” assured me that the stepladder ban would be enforced. As I told my friends what “Steve” told me I saw him talking to people below us about their stepladders, but he accepted their explanation, e.g., they were using their ladders to save their space! But they were already there! Those people lied to Steve. When the flying started, those people stood on their ladders.

On July 12, 2009, at approximately 1:50 p.m., a different man appeared and stood in front of me to my left, blocking about 10% of my left cone of view, exactly where my tripod mounted lens was pointing. That 10% was critical because it included a large part of an airplane’s take-off or landing roll, which is a large, important, dynamic part of an airshow.

While holding Duxford’s official brochure in my hand, and pointing the rules out to him about “Do not obstruct the view of others.”, I asked this man to please move two feet to his left.

I stress: A) I was there first; B) this man arrived just before the peak flying started; C) this man crowded in on me; D) *your* rules forbid anyone to obstruct another’s view; and E) this man could have avoided obstructing my view if he had repositioned himself *two feet* to his left, which he could have done.

This man said, “Excuse me.”, looked around, shrugged his shoulders, made a face and did not move.

I told him, “No. I do not excuse you. Why did I stand here for hours—just so you could show up at the last minute and block my view? Move!”

He did not move. There was no official in sight to ask for help.

This was the second man in two consecutive days who arrived near me soon before the flying started, crowded in on me, obstructed my view, refused to move only two feet to stop blocking my view, who violated *your* rules.

I lost what would have been many superb images due to this man blocking off about 10% of my left cone of view.

To cope with this man blocking my view, I took my camera off my tripod, moved forward, and stood next to him, even though I knew that my new position would probably obstruct my British travel companion friend’s view. I loathed doing that, but I traveled 7,000 miles one way to be productive.

On this day, as on the day before, and as on one day in 2008, when the flying display started, and for its duration, many people stood on their stepladders, obstructing the view, making it impossible to photograph airplanes for a significant part of the flying display. I tolerated that in 2008, the day before, and until about 3:00 p.m. on 12 July 2009.

Contrary to what “Steve” promised me, he and no other officials were in sight. No official enforced Duxford’s rules—not the rule against stepladders, not the rule against obstructing views.

On July 11 and July 12, 2009, men who showed up at the last minute obstructed about 5-10% of my cone of view on my left, people on ladders obstructed about 5-10% of my cone of view on my right, and people on ladders at the crowd line obstructed about 35% of my cone of view in front of me when airplanes taxied by. That amounted to approximately 45-55% obstruction.

On July 12, at around 3:00 p.m., with the realization that one third of the flying display was over, and it looked like no official would enforce the rules, it appeared to me that I would never get good pictures from my right side if I did not become proactive and assert my legitimate interests. During a brief lull in the flying, I told people on my right who stood on ladders they violated the rules and to get down. A few complied. I pointed to the ones who did not get down. I firmly told them to get down. They all got down. I then picked up a modest size ladder with no one on it, pushed it in front of me and dropped it to collapse it, to emphasize they should not get back on their ladders. That ladder did not make contact with anyone. I resumed taking pictures. After a few minutes, those people resumed standing on their ladders.

On July 12, at around 3:10 p.m., a dark hair, short hair cut, thin, female official wearing a yellow-green vest, approached me and asked if there was a problem. I told her yes. I asked her if she knew the rules in Duxford’s brochure. She said, “No.” When she told me “No.”, I suspected she was poorly trained, and she would prove to be difficult.

I showed her the brochure, pointed out the rules and read them to her. I told her the problem was one man on my left—pointing to him, blocked my view, and people on my right, pointing to them, were “standing on their damn ladders”.

This official looked at people who were standing on ladders. She had to have seen many people on ladders; however, instead of taking action to discipline them, this official berated me for using the word *damn*. She repeatedly told me I could stay there and take pictures only if I did not use that word, and I was calm. She kept asking me if I understood. After I told her I understood she persisted with trying to get me to say “Yes”, repeatedly.

I told her she was engaged in “misdirection”, that the issue was not my use of *damn*; instead, the issue was people were violating Duxford’s rules, to my detriment, and I was also exasperated by the lack of rule enforcement.

I also told this lady she should do her job and stop lecturing me about her personal taste.

This official told me to stop telling her how to do her job.

I got down on one knee, knelt before this official, put my hands together, as if to pray, looked up at her and repeatedly said, “Yes, Mother Superior”., to mock her, to get her to leave alone, and to enforce the rules.

I had answered this official’s question, and I had told her everything she needed to know. Inexplicably, she persisted with lecturing me, and she did not move on to enforce the rules.

I decided this official was an incompetent minion, I could not fix her stupidity, and she was not going to do her job. I wanted her to leave me alone and get out of my face so I could resume photographing premium flying, not argue with her.

I told this lady that when I got home I would write Duxford’s senior management a letter. She said that would be a good idea.

Around that time a British photographer friend of the British friend I was traveling with told this official that people on stepladders are a problem and Duxford should enforce a total ban against stepladders as does The Shuttleworth Collection at Old Warden.

Around that time, a photographer came over and told this official that I kicked a ladder out from under his friend while his friend stood on it and injured his friend! Knowing that that accusation was an egregious lie, I yelled at that man, "You are a damn liar." That man said nothing in response. He scurried off like a cockroach does when a light is turned on. No one came forth to support that man's accusation.

This official did *nothing* to get people to get off their ladders.

I resumed taking pictures.

This official chastised me some more. I again told her to enforce the rules, to leave me alone, and I came 7,000 miles to photograph airplanes, not to argue with her.

She told me, "Oh, you're the one. I've heard about you."

I told her I did not know what she heard, but I was confident I was not the only one who had come 7,000 miles to photograph this airshow.

Finally, this official left. I resumed photographing airplanes. I never saw or heard this official enforce any rule.

Around 3:20 p.m. a nice official by the name "Tim" said, "You asked me to get a supervisor so I brought you one." Tim had come with the female official. When she proved to be useless, I asked Tim to bring a supervisor.

I talked to a short male in a yellow-green vest who told me he was a supervisor. This supervisor had a demeanor which was far superior to the female official. This supervisor asked me what was the problem. I told him what I told the female official.

This supervisor also told me he did not know the rules in Duxford's brochure! I showed him the rules and urged him to enforce them. I told him he was the *third* official I had talked to about the rules and the problem [Steve, the female official, and him], all he had to do was enforce the rules, and I could not add any more.

When I discussed the female official with this supervisor he, to his credit, told me she should not have interacted with me as she did.

This supervisor talked to the man who blocked my view. The supervisor then left and he left "Steve" behind—the same official I talked to earlier. This "Steve" talked to the man who had blocked my view. Steve and this man seemed to be friendly. The man who had been blocking my view moved to his left, to make room for Steve. Steve, however, who is substantially taller than that man, then stood where that man had been standing, which made "Steve" more of an obstruction than the other man.

I did not complain to "Steve" about *him* blocking my view because A) that fact should have been obvious to him, B) the Brit I was traveling with told me to stop complaining because it was not worth it, C) I did not want to alienate my British friend with whom I was traveling, D) I had written off the officials as useless, and E) I had resigned myself to being forced to write Duxford's senior management a complaint letter, because the on-the-scene officials were useless.

At that time I thought it was odd indeed that "Steve" blocked my view and did not enforce the ban against stepladders.

I continued photographing as much as I could, minding my own business.

I had come to the conclusion that this airshow was run by indecisive, poorly trained, illogical, stupid, people; “crowd control” was grossly mismanaged; trying to get help from your officials was a waste of energy; and it was pointless for me to try to do their job.

Around 3:45 p.m., the supervisor who contacted me earlier approached me with 3-4 officials and a constable. The supervisor told me I was ejected. He did not say why. He did not cite me to any rule or law that gave him actual authority to eject me.

The constable said nothing to me. I said nothing to the constable.

I told the supervisor, “Brilliant. You have excellent rules which you refuse to enforce. You let people violate your rules. You punish only the person who complain. Brilliant. No wonder England is going down the tubes.”

I packed up my camera gear. I told my British friend to remain for the last hour of the airshow because there was no need for him to be punished too. My friend insisted on leaving with me because he was the driver, and he was considerate of me.

For a substantial period of time leading up to, and including, when this supervisor told me I was ejected, I had been and was calm. I photographed, calmly.

Even when your officials engaged in their ad hoc rule making, they invented and enforced inconsistent ad hoc rules, to my detriment, but they never enforced your official written rules. *That [their behavior] is patently pathetic. That is insufferable. That is indefensible.*

Official “Tim” escorted me away. While I peacefully walked away with Tim, around 3:50 p.m. World War One fighters, which are among my favorites, started to fly when the atmospheric were great. I asked Tim if he would give me ten minutes to photograph them. Tim said that would be okay after he walked me beyond an orange sign, per his instructions.

Once behind the orange sign I started to get my camera out, but the same constable told me I had to leave and, “It is not negotiable.” This constable did not arrest me. He did not tell me why “it” was “not negotiable”. He did not cite me to any rule or law that supported what he told me. I said nothing to the constable. I did not offer the constable any resistance. I packed up my camera gear and walked with him toward my friend’s car.

At my friend’s car an older female official told me I was banned for life from all future Duxford airshows. I said nothing. She never told me why I was banned. She never cited me to any rule or law that empowered her to issue that ban.

Even though I paid for an admission ticket that legally gave me a right of access to Duxford for the entire airshow, and I was ejected before the airshow was over, no one offered me a refund of my ticket.

I discussed this with the same B&B lady the next morning before we checked out of her B&B. She told me she thought it was wrong that Duxford’s officials did not enforce their rules, I should not have been ejected, I should not have been banned, and I owed it to myself and to all photographers to complain about how Duxford’s officials failed to do their duty. I agree.

When I told this B&B lady about the World War One fighters, my love for them, and the constable would not give me ten minutes to photograph them, I burst into tears. I cried before a female stranger. For about five minutes, despite my best efforts, I could not articulate words.

15-21 July, 2009:

I attended the entire RIAT airshow as a MACH 3 member, without incident.

At RIAT, I discussed, candidly, what happened to me at Duxford with British photographer friends. They told me: A) Duxford's officials took the easy way out—they ejected one person [me] instead of coping with hundreds on ladders; B) the “ladder issue” is a growing problem; C) ladders must be banned; D) ejecting me and banning me was “overkill”; E) Duxford's officials are not as good as they use to be; and F) when the flying started, the crowd forced its way into the media photographers' pit and Duxford's officials did nothing to control the crowd even when media photographers complained to them about the crowd.

At RIAT, I witnessed snarly encounters among photographers jockeying for position.

At RIAT, photographers told me that RIAT's officials enforced RIAT's ban against stepladders.

At RIAT, I saw people pointing cameras toward me. I assumed they were photographing the www.cloud9photography.us URL on my 600 mm lens shade for their reference.

At the end of the RIAT airshow, a British friend who I had stayed with for five weeks in France told me he received a link to a forum badmouthing me for getting into trouble at Duxford and that I “needed to clear my name.” I told him I did nothing wrong, and I did not need to clear my name.

I asked my British friend what would he do if a younger, bigger, stronger man told him, “If you do not yield to me I will make your day uncomfortable.” He thought about my question, as if he was stumped. He said he would move on and look for another place to take pictures.

That is his choice. I respect him for his choice, but I disagree. Bullies count on being able to intimidate others to get their way. To yield to bullies emboldens them.

This British friend, a professional person who has been to Duxford many times, opined that your crowd control officials are worthless; therefore, airshow fans are best advised to avoid getting them involved in any dispute, and it was prudent of me to resign myself to writing you folks an informative, constructive, letter.

22 July, 2009 to date:

For additional **important** information, please see two attachments:

- (1) EXHIBIT “A”: Relevant information culled from British Internet aviation forums. This information underscores problems.
- (2) EXHIBIT “B”: A letter of support for me sent to you by an airshow fan and my concluding commentary with friendly advice for you that you should heed.

4. RULES, RIGHTS, AND REASONABLE EXPECTATIONS

Your official rules were the basis for my reasonable set of expectations, namely, my *right* to have an unobstructed view, my right to not be frustrated by people standing on ladders, and my

legitimate expectation that *your* agents would enforce *your* rules for my benefit and for everyone else's benefit, too.

I reject the idea that it is okay for a Duxford airshow crowd to show up late and to crowd in on anyone who was set up first and obstruct their view. I also reject the idea that if a person who was there first objects to the crowd crowding in on him or her, it is okay for the crowd, and its members, to violate *your* rules and obstruct the individual's view because the crowd outnumbers the persons who were there first. The crowd has no rights. Individuals have rights.

Per your rules, an individual who early stakes out a place with an unobstructed view and holds his spot at that place has an on-going right to enjoy an unobstructed view, even against a late arriving crowd that crowds in. My view is correct; otherwise, your rule, "**Do not obstruct the view of others.**", is worthless.

5. LEGAL ISSUES

I do not know the specifics of controlling British law; however, I suspect that I have spotted issues that are probably in my favor, some of which are discussed below.

To the extent these issues are non-meritorious per British law, I apologize.

Contract Issues:

I believe the odds are high that Duxford's officials, per British law, breached a contract that I had with them. My reasoning follows.

When I paid for my admission ticket, I paid for a legally enforceable right to be on Duxford's grounds from the time the gates opened until they closed, subject to me not committing a crime and not violating a then existing, communicated rule.

I did not commit a crime. I was not arrested.

There was no rule that barred me from complaining about rule violators to your agents, that barred me from complaining to your agents about their failure to enforce Duxford's rules, that barred me from telling people on ladders to stay off of their ladders, that barred me from telling people who obstructed my view to stop doing so, that barred me from acting reasonably when I was threatened and was being pushed off of a flat area onto a slope. But, after I reasonably asserted my right to an unobstructed view and my right to complain to your officials, your officials, without legal good cause, ejected me before the airshow was over.

I doubt if Duxford's officials, per these facts, can eject me and keep my money, with impunity. I never agreed that Duxford's officials had unilateral power to eject me without good cause and keep my money, too.

Duxford's printed rules are part of my contract with Duxford—part of the reasonable set of conditions and expectations that arose from *your* rules.

The contract that arose when I bought my admission ticket placed enforceable, legal limits, on Duxford's officials. Those limits deny Duxford's officials the arbitrary power to eject me and/or to ban me. Duxford's officials are not an English king. An English king could ban disfavored persons to Scotland and/or rule arbitrarily with no accountability, but Duxford's officials cannot.

Discrimination Issues:

I believe the odds are high that Duxford's officials, per British law, probably unlawfully discriminated against me. This is because they sided with rule violators, bullies, and trouble makers, which is an egregious, perverse result.

At a minimum, the unimpeachable facts are: Duxford's "Visitor Services" officials behaved inconsistently with Duxford's rules, refused to enforce Duxford's rules, manifested a dereliction of duty, engaged in ad hoc rule making, did not enforce the rules evenhandedly, singled me out for punishment, and sided with rule violators.

Deception and Fraud Issues:

I believe the odds are high that Duxford's officials, per British law, probably unlawfully manifested fraud. This is because they, by including certain rules in their official brochure which was handed out to airshow fans, created the reasonable expectation that those rules would be enforced, but *your* agents did not enforce those rules.

Your agents took in a large sum of money via admission fees, and, on a non-meritorious basis, ejected and banned me before the airshow was over, without refunding my admission fee. Your agents' conduct smacks of deception. Deception is a form of fraud. You and your agents created one set of reasonable expectations but acted contrary to them. That incongruity smacks of fraud. Fraud vitiates everything it touches. Everything your agents did against me is impaired by *your* rules, the reasonable set of expectations *your* rules created, my admission ticket contract that I bought and had a legal right to enjoy for the entire airshow.

Corruption Issues:

I believe the odds are high that Duxford's officials, per British law, probably have an exposure to a possible meritorious corruption charge. This is because I doubt if British law allows your agents to eject me without legal good cause and keep my admission fee. *That* is not a proper way to manage an airshow. *That* smacks of corruption.

Public Safety Issues:

I believe the odds are high that Duxford's officials, per British law, probably have an exposure to public safety issues. This is because your Visitor Services officials 1) did not enforce *your* rules against bullies and rude people, 2) their failure to enforce those rules caused a meltdown of the rules, which promoted lawlessness because they did not stand up to the bullies, which made your venue a bullies' playground, 3) they allowed hundreds of people to bring in stepladders, and erect stepladders, which, with or without anyone on them, can fall and hurt or kill someone, 4) they allowed windbreaks which, when uplifted by a gust of wind, can hurt someone, 5) they allowed too many people to cram into too small of an area when it was reasonably foreseeable that their will be angry disputes arising from obstructed views and too many fans crowded into a dense pack of humanity, 6) during much of the flying display, *your*

agents where AWOL—nowhere in sight, which is suggestive of a callous indifference to rule enforcement and public safety, 7) it appeared that you had too few officials to control the crowd, and 8) it appeared that your crowd control officials were undertrained, improperly supervised, and not well led.

Damage to Reputation Issues:

One of your agents, without legal good cause, in a public place, in the presence of others, told me I was ejected. I was then, in the presence of your agents and a constable, before a crowd, escorted off of your premises. Another one of your agents, without legal good cause, in a public place, in the presence of others, told me a lifetime ban was imposed against me. Per these facts, I believe the odds are high that Duxford's officials, per British law, probably have an exposure to liability for damaging my reputation and for setting into motion a series of libelous remarks made about me by others on the Internet.

6. ANALYSIS OF AND OPINIONS ABOUT DUXFORD'S OFFICIALS

A *fact* is a thing done or something that has an actual existence, e.g., a communicated threat, a violation of a rule, an usurpation of power.

Facts are stubborn critters. They can be undiscovered, ignored, twisted, suppressed, and/or misunderstood, but they persist. When objectively appreciated for what they are, *facts* are important to reasonably constituted people. *Facts*, when respected and objectively confronted, confine reasonably constituted persons' opinions, judgment, and decisions.

The material *facts* support me, not Duxford's officials and not anyone who is engaged in Mancus-bashing.

Duxford's rules in Duxford's brochure said:

Do not obstruct the view of others. Stepladders are not allowed, except for accredited media, who must report to the Media Marquee. [Exact quote. Bold highlight is per Duxford's brochure.]

"Not" is a negative. "Do not obstruct" is a categorical, absolute, affirmative, negative command, that admits of no wiggle room, no exception—none.

"Stepladders are not allowed except for media . . ." is a categorical, absolute, affirmative, negative command, that admits of no wiggle room and no exception but one—media.

As popular as Duxford is, common sense dictates that not everyone on stepladders was "media".

I complained to *three* Duxford officials about the stepladders—Steve, the female official, and the male official, to no avail. *Three* should have been enough.

Duxford's officials should have enforced their rules before I complained, so I would not have had to complain. After I complained, they were on notice.

If Duxford's officials had intercepted stepladders at all entry points and barred non-media from bringing in stepladders, hundreds of people would not have been able to stand on stepladders.

If Duxford's officials had enforced *your* rules, I would not have complained, and Duxford's officials would not have any pretense to eject me and/or to ban me.

Nothing in the rules states that I could not complain about rule violators and/or about Duxford's officials' failure to enforce Duxford's rules or that such complaints are grounds for ejection and/or a life time ban.

Duxford's officials were nowhere in sight during the flying display before I was driven to do what I could to enforce Duxford's rules—for my benefit and for the benefit of others.

The law generally requires people to mitigate their damages. Thus, I had a right and a duty to become assertive, to tell others who were violating the rules to stop.

My yelling "Do not touch me." at the man who pushed me was prudent. He had previously communicated what I perceived to be a threat, and, when I manifested I was not intimidated, he pushed me with his hip when no official was in sight.

Duxford's officials condoned, tolerated, and promoted lawlessness. They promoted a lack of civility in the sense that, to the extent they did not enforce Duxford's rules, they allowed certain unruly, rude, airshow fans to do what they wanted because the officials never stopped them. The bullies were allowed to be bullies. No official supported me when I complained about rule violators.

I, on the other hand, stood up for the rules—*your* rules.

It is absurd that Duxford's officials would single me out and only me for punishment.

This is a classic case of "The nail that pops up [me] gets hammered down."

The mere fact that Duxford's officials ejected me, with a constable as an escort, and banned me for life, does not prove that what they did was lawful. I challenge the legality of what they did.

Duxford's "Visitor Services" officials did nothing positive, constructive, or correct, consistent with *your* official written rules.

Since Duxford's officials did not know their own rules and refused to enforce them when shown the rules, where does one go from there?

Since Duxford's officials tolerated rule violators and banned me, what message did Duxford's officials send to rule violators? To anyone who agrees with me?

It is patently pathetic when Duxford's officials are so poorly trained that even they did not know of Duxford's rules until I showed them to them and urged them to enforce them.

Service means: help; benefit; contribution to the welfare of others.

Duxford's "Visitor Services" officials never provided me with any useful *service*. They were worse than useless. They were out of sight during the flying display for a large chunk of time, they were dysfunctional, they let people bring in stepladders, they never told anyone to get off of a step ladder, they were indecisive, and, when they finally made a decision, they made two egregious ones: they ejected me and they banned me.

Since Duxford's "Visitor Services" officials performed miserably, the burden fell upon me to try to keep rule violators from ruining my enjoyment of the airshow. No paying airshow fan should have to function as a rule enforcer because officials are guilty of dereliction of duty.

This was the second year in a row that I was frustrated by people standing on ladders. There are finite limits to patience and tolerance.

Duxford's "Visitor Services" officials' conduct and decision making is the beginning of meltdown. They have, in effect, written a prescription for disaster.

What Duxford's "Visitor Services" officials did is establish a dangerous, egregious, precedent that has already emboldened immature rule violators.

Duxford's "Visitor Services" officials rendered services so ineptly they made the non-flying part of that airshow the worse I have attended from around 1960 to date.

Duxford's officials took official punitive action against me in front of a crowd, without good cause. That action, in excess of their lawful authority, has led to numerous libelous remarks made on the Internet about me. It was Duxford's officials' actions and egregious decisions that has caused me this international damage to my reputation. Your agents' actions and decisions set these events into motion.

You, apparently, turned incompetent, poorly trained, mislead, poorly supervised, officials loose on paying customers to provide services, which were not provided consistent with *your* rules. That is your fault, not mine.

Your agents snared me into *their* nonsense, *their* ineptitude, *their* decisions.

Your agents have taken giant steps into turning Duxford's airshows into a playground for certain immature airshow fans who are rude, who are bullies, who are liars, who are rule violators, who have tested your agents and your rules and, so far, have gotten away with their rule violations.

What I experienced at your airshow suggests that unwritten cultural rules and ad hoc rule making trump official written rules, that immature members of British society succumb to animal pack instincts and gang up against anyone who stands up to them, and, therefore, civil order is coming unglued at Duxford airshows, making it potentially dangerous to be an airshow fan at your venue because your agents' failure to enforce your rules emboldens bullies, liars, and rule violators.

Summary of My Assessment of Duxford's Officials

Some of Duxford's "Visitor Services" and "Public Safety" officials did the following:

1. Never saw me commit a crime because I did not commit one.
2. Never saw me violate a published official Duxford rule because I did not violate one.
3. Allowed hundreds to bring in stepladders contrary to *your* rules.
4. Never told anyone to stop using stepladders.
5. Did not support me—even after I complained to *three* officials about rule violators and demanded that officials enforce *your* rules.
6. Did not enforce your rules.
7. Enforced only their ad hoc rules—inconsistently.
8. Undermined *your* official written rules.
9. Turned their implementation of *your* rules into a farce.
10. Aligned themselves with Duxford's airshow fans who violated Duxford's rules.

11. Sided with and emboldened troublemakers who made what amounts to a successful grab for power at *your* airshow venue.
12. Took the easy way out [ejected me].
13. Did nothing to address, tackle, or solve the over riding problem that ensues at airshows—troublemakers are ruining the enjoyment of airshows for most fans who are mature and obey the rules.
14. Established a horrible precedent: Duxford’s officials tolerate rule violators and eject and ban anyone who complains about rule violators and/or Duxford’s officials’ failure to enforce the rules.
15. Shuffled Duxford’s rules like a card shark shuffles a deck.
16. Made egregious decisions: wrongly singled me out for punishment, did nothing constructive to provide a *service* that intelligently mediated or alleviated the problem caused by troublemakers, and imposed a life time ban against me, which has emboldened the troublemakers.
17. Did not mediate the problem(s) I complained about intelligently, with competence.
18. Admitted they did not even know *your* rules in *your* official brochure.
19. Looked at and saw people standing on ladders and never told anyone to get off a ladder.
20. Did not tell the man on Sunday who blocked my view to stop doing so.
21. Made me a victim of their incompetence and egregious decisions.
22. Misused and abused their power.
23. Accelerated the decline of public safety at, and enjoyment of, airshows at your venue.
24. Demonstrated that it is imprudent for an airshow fan to ask a Duxford “Visitor Services” official for help, or to complain about a rule violator to such an official, for fear of what bizarre *service* will be provided.
25. Morphed Duxford into a dangerous airshow venue, a playground for rule violators, rude people, immature people, bullies, and liars.
26. Empowered rule violators and troublemakers to use me as an excuse to smear me and my reputation, and to harm my Internet business, www.cloud9photography.us , via their libelous postings about me on the Internet, and by their snide remarks about me and my friends via their hurtful text that accompanies their pictures of me and my friends engaged in conversation at RIAT 2009.
27. When the complete facts are known, made *your* rules a farce.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Stepladders are a line of sight obstruction, a cause of disputes, and a public safety hazard. that can trigger protracted, expensive litigation, but there is a proliferation of ladders and an escalation of the “ladder race”. Footing of ladders—on soft grass or dirt and even on a paved surface—is not stable. A person falling from a ladder can seriously injure himself and/or others around him.

Windbreaks are a lesser line of sight obstruction that block off too much premium ground that are also a public safety hazard and a hazard for taxiing aircraft. A gust of wind can uplift a windbreak and blow it into human beings or into taxiing aircraft or both.

To rectify the problems I have brought to your attention, to make all future Duxford airshows a well managed, enjoyable, and safe experience for airshow fans and families, and to insulate Duxford's reputation from meritorious criticism, you should embrace recommendations that follow.

1. Fire Duxford's "Visitor Services" officials who performed incompetently and who made horrific wrong decisions that exacerbated this dispute.
2. Make a Herculean effort to have an ample number of competent officials enforce the rules, intelligently and evenhandedly, at future airshows.
3. Intercept and ban all non-media stepladders at the gate, to make it impossible for people to stand on them once inside.
4. If you catch anyone who is non-media with a stepladder, eject them, but allow them to return without the ladder.
5. Promptly confiscate all stepladders from those caught with them inside who fail to promptly take them outside.
6. Post a new set of rules on the brochure that you give out at the admission ticket booth and gate. These rules should include the following:
 - A. Do not obstruct the view of others. Those who do will be ejected.
 - B. All stepladders are banned and not allowed, except for media. Anyone caught using a stepladder who is not media will be ordered to promptly remove the stepladder from the premises, and, if they fail to comply promptly, their ladder will be confiscated and they will be ejected.
 - C. Media using stepladders are confined to one area.
 - D. All non-media stepladders, all tents, all gazebos, and all windbreaks will be intercepted at all entry points and not permitted onto the airshow grounds.
 - E. No one can erect a tent, a gazebo, or a windbreak on the airshow grounds. If a person refuses to promptly remove a tent, a gazebo, or a windbreak, such items shall be promptly confiscated and not returned.
 - F. No one can stand on anything to get a better view if doing so obstructs the view of another person who complains.
 - G. No one is permitted to lift a child up above an adult's head, place a child on their shoulders, or lift anything more than three feet above them.
 - H. Tripods and monopods are permitted.
 - I. No one can touch another person's tripod or monopod without the owner's consent. Adults must supervise their children to keep them from getting under or climbing on another person's tripod or monopod.
 - J. No one is permitted to crowd in on a person who is using a tripod or monopod mounted camera.
 - K. The practice of putting a chair or anything else on the ground to "hold their spot" in their absence is not allowed. Abandoned chairs shall be confiscated and not returned.

- L. Smoking is not permitted within 100/200/300 feet of static aircraft. Anyone caught smoking within that distance shall be ejected.
 - M. No one is permitted to have a BBQ or anything with a flame anywhere on the premises if not an authorized vendor.
7. Large signs with such rules should be placed around the site in an area that would not impair the view of taxiing aircraft.
 8. The Public Address System announcer should periodically articulate these rules.
 9. There should be an ample set of officials who are always in public view to enforce these rules.
 10. A well chosen, appropriate size area should be set aside for accredited media photographers and the general public should not be permitted in this area.
 11. You should create several well chosen, roped off, vantage points that you set aside for the exclusive use of serious, non-accredited media, photographers who are professionals or advanced amateurs with large lenses. [If you want to, you could charge an additional fee for access to these areas.] You should separate this type of photographer from the general public which uses mobile telephone cameras, point and shoot cameras, and other amateur cameras. You should also keep an official posted at these areas to keep the public from crowding in and to mediate any dispute that might arise among these photographers.
 12. You should avoid overcrowding by restricting your ticket sales so you do not sell tickets in excess of the space you have for airshow fans to enjoy an unobstructed view, and you should have officials use barriers to control the number of people who enter a limited area so that a crowd cannot crowd in on and obstruct the view of people who staked out an unobstructed view in that area early. [I understand you want to raise as much money as possible but you must put public safety before revenue enhancement.]
 13. You should instruct the people who erect your public address system to keep the outdoor speakers low because high speakers are a major line of sight obstruction.
 14. You should scrutinize vendors and their products that you allow onto your premises and ban vendors who sell products that are superficially innocuous but, in reality, are a potential public safety hazard. Examples: A) Do not let any vendor sell anything that a child can throw, run after, or let rise into the air. A thrown object often hits someone. A running child often collides with someone or fragile equipment or often falls and gets hurt. Hundreds of children doing this are hundreds of potential safety hazards. Hundreds of children holding onto balloons on a string constitute hundreds of line of sight obstructions; B) free floating bubbles from a bubble wand stick are made from a soap solution that stings when it bursts near a person's eyes. The solution temporarily blinds a person. These bubbles are a distraction, are something children chase, are a line of sight obstacle, and, when they burst on camera gear, their sticky solution gums up camera gear, which often causes a malfunction that requires an expensive repair. Since the child can't pay for a camera repair, the parents will not want to pay for the repair, and, ditto the vendor and the airshow organizer, it is best to ban that product.
 15. An airshow should be a venue only for things directly related to *aviation*. The trend to morph airshow venues into a fair and a broad market place of non-aviation related items

has gotten to the point that for aviation enthusiasts, large parts of airshows have become irrelevant, counter-productive, and non-enjoyable.

8. PROPOSED AMICABLE SETTLEMENT OF THIS DISPUTE

I am a published aviation photojournalist, the owner of a popular aviation photography oriented Internet site, www.cloud9photography.us , and a member of a network of aviation journalists and photojournalists. My work, and that of my friends and colleagues, have been published in a variety of books, magazines, television, and Internet publications.

I have remained publicly silent about this “Duxford dispute”, even in the face of non-meritorious severe criticism of me, which includes defamatory statements, as a result of *your* agents actions against me. I will not remain silent indefinitely. You have a narrow window of opportunity to resolve this dispute with me, amicably.

I hope that when I begin to publicly publish my side of this “Duxford dispute”, and invite a public response to it, I will then be able to report that your official response to my objections, to my complaints, and to my recommendations, were reasonable and appropriate, and I consider this dispute resolved, amicably and to my satisfaction.

To facilitate an expedited, amicable, settlement of this dispute, I propose you embrace the four concepts below and communicate that fact to me promptly.

1. Promptly send me a signed letter of apology with an unequivocal recession of the life time ban.
2. Refund the admission ticket price for both days.
3. Post on your Internet site for 90-days a succinct statement to this effect: A) Duxford’s senior leadership officially apologizes to all airshow fans for its officials’ failure to enforce its rules for this airshow and pledges to enforce them rigorously in the future; B) Duxford’s senior leadership officially apologizes to me—by name—for how its officials treated me; and C) The life time ban imposed against me is rescinded.
4. Do something meaningful to compensate me for the grief, heartbreak, and anguish your officials’ inflicted upon me, and the resultant damage to my reputation through libelous remarks and rumors that have been posted on the Internet, triggered by what your agents set into motion. A settlement might not require monetary compensation. I might consider something of value to both of us, such as a series of dedicated air-to-air photo sessions of airplanes at your expense.

9. QUESTIONS

1. Did Duxford’s “Visitor Services” officials violate my contract with Duxford and/or my rights when they ejected me? When they banned me?
2. Are the ejection and the life time ban an injustice?
3. What is the extent of Duxford’s officials’ liability to me arising from these facts?
4. Do you ratify [approve] what your officials did regarding me?
5. Do the unimpeachable facts support me or you?

6. Do Duxford's rules support me or you?
7. After you read the attached EXHIBIT "A" and "B", what are you going to do about this "Rob Howarth" who I tell you, truthfully, whispered what he did to me, who pushed me, who obstructed my view, who has portrayed me falsely on the Internet? Are you going to reward him what for he did by continuing to give him access to Duxford while denying me access? Why?
8. After you read the attached EXHIBIT "A" and "B", what are you going to do about these persons who publicly declared their intent to deliberately obstruct my view—for their amusement? Are you going to give these people access to Duxford? Why?
9. Are you going to let the "Rob Howarth"s and these people who declared their intent to obstruct me view gain a bigger foothold at Duxford—empower them so they can intimidate others? Why?
10. Are you going to accept any of my constructive recommendations? If not, why not?
11. Are you going to rescind the life time ban slapped against me?

Do not ignore these questions.

Winston Churchill opined, "Men occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry off as if nothing happened."

I have done my utmost best to convey the truth, as I know it, to you.

Do not "hurry off as if nothing happened." Egregious things happened at your 2009 Flying Legends airshow. The truth is stark. The unimpeachable facts are what they are. My analysis and opinions are meritorious.

What your agents did against me smacks of an injustice. Your agents have created a problem. I have brought the problem to your attention. You need to deal with this problem, to remedy this injustice.

I want answers.

Others want your answers, too.

I have put all of my cards on the table, face up, for you to evaluate, as a courtesy.

I am giving you an opportunity to tell me your side of this dispute, to cite me British law that might support you.

10. REGRETS?

I regret A) Duxford's "Visitor Services" officials' dereliction of duty, siding with rule violators, and promotion of a lawless atmosphere; B) their decision to eject me and to ban me; and C) their apparent inability to function with fidelity to *your* rules. I further regret A) my being on the receiving end of a perceived threat; B) no official was in sight so I could have reported this perceived threat to an official; and C) the officials' dereliction of duty forced me to be proactive to mitigate my damages, to be assertive to enforce my rights.

I do not regret what I did. I am proud that I did what I could to stand up for the rules, to resist rule violators. I stand on the correct side of the rules—*your* rules.

11. APOLOGY?

For the reasons stated, I owe no one an apology. I was provoked. I acted prudently, in response to the provocation. I did not violate a rule. I did not commit a crime. I was never unhinged.

A character in one of Shakespeare's plays said: HE WHO NEVER FELT THE WOUND MOCKS THE SCAR. I agree. I felt the wound. My rights, my enjoyment of that airshow were violated, for the second year in a row, and no Duxford official did anything effective to remedy the problem.

My motives were pure. I was motivated to promote the common good. I was trying to be a force for good. I am a force for good. My criticism will spur reforms.

12. CONCLUSIONS

I made sustained, peaceful, logical, meritorious, constructive, complaints to *three* of your officials. I asked them for their help. I urged them to enforce *your* rules. My complaints to them were intended to spark a constructive reaction on their part, namely, rule enforcement, but my complaints backfired on me, and, on you, too. This is because *your* agents made egregious decisions that wrongly put me on the losing side, for now. Stark, sobering facts, however, exist in my favor: The unimpeachable facts support me, not them or you. *Your* rules support me, not them or you. I stood up for *your* rules. You, and your agents, should be happy that I stood up for *your* rules.

Troublemakers challenged your rules, violated them, tested your officials, and found them to be impotent. These troublemakers now intend to replace your rules with theirs, via their intimidations, their lies, and their mutual support.

Troublemakers are now in control because your agents manifested a gross dereliction of duty, never stood up to them, never stopped them, never supported me.

You have serious "crowd control/rule enforcement/public safety" problems at your airshow(s), exacerbated by what *your* agents did and did not do regarding me. What your agents did and failed to do does not reflect well upon them or you.

You should not dither. You should not deny the merit of my logic. You should not delay implementation of what I have recommended to you.

Denial and delay work to the advantage of troublemakers in your midst. These troublemakers are running amuck, spewing venom, and tossing out accusations with abandon, indifferent to their liability exposure for libel and slander.

It is now incumbent upon you to disavow what your agents did, to apologize for what they did, and to rescind the life time ban.

My criticism should spur reform—for the good of all.

I have given you my cerebral input, for free, because I give a damn, I am constructive, and the injustice your agents inflicted upon me is indefensible.

I have also given you an easy out to resolve this dispute. You should take it.

You should also embrace my recommendations because implementation of same would substantially allow you to control troublemakers at your airshows, and decent fans will drift away, until you do that, which means loss of revenue for you.

How you respond to me will be a measure of your leadership and damage control skills.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely,

Peter J. Mancus

Attorney at Law

Owner, Cloud 9 Photography, www.cloud9photography.us

* * *

NOTE:

1. EXHIBIT "A" starts with the next page, and is followed by EXHIBIT "B".
2. Around the time you get this letter, there is a possibility that one or more British Internet forum moderators will have pulled down from their Internet sites some or all of the Mancus-bashing posted on them. If you cannot find what I referred you to I assure that what I have represented to you in EXHIBIT "A" was on the Internet, I have not misrepresented what I quoted or summarized, and I have copies of same which I can make available to you.
3. Before I was ejected, I toyed with the idea that when the exchange rate was in my favor I would love to return to Duxford and pay for dedicated air-to-air photo sessions with some of your aircraft. However, after your agents did what they did to me do you think I want to give you any of my money?

EXHIBIT "A"

INFORMATION CULLED FROM BRITISH INTERNET AVIATION FORUMS

I have read what some people who do not know me and/or who do not know the complete facts about what happened at Duxford regarding me have written about me on Internet sites. Some of these sites are:

www.forum.keypublishing.com

www.warbirdinformationexchange.org

www.forums.airshow.co.uk

www.fightercontrol.forumotion.com

Certain people on these sites have voiced their opinions about me and/or about what happened at Duxford when they do not know the Who, What, Why, When, Where, and How. These people are proof of what Benjamin Disraeli opined, "It is much easier to be critical than to be correct."

Some of these people who are engaged in Mancus-bashing have publicly threatened me with physical violence, and some of them have committed themselves to alleged facts that are false. Some of these people cite your agents' ejecting and banning me as justification for their threatened violence.

Some of these Mancus-bashers have also made remarks about my 600 mm lens. I suspect that a lot of this Mancus-bashing is fueled by the following: A) "Lens envy"—immature photographers who cannot afford such a lens loathe people who have one. [I bet if I offered to give them mine they would accept it and use it with glee.]; B) "Anti-American" sentiment—my lens has a decal of the American flag on its lens shade, and some of these people have made snide remarks about Americans; C) Anti-Lawyer sentiment—Many of these postings make reference to my occupation as a lawyer and include near virulent loathing for lawyers; and D) Anti-"Poaching" sentiment—some of these photographers appear to be territorial, namely, they loathe American photographers photographing in the UK.

Some of these Mancus-bashers have also accused me—belatedly, on the Internet, of the following crimes of violence against human beings when I was at Duxford: Punching someone in the back, hitting someone with my lens, and throwing a ladder at someone and hitting them with the ladder. These accusations are false.

I have also received emails from people around the world threatening me with physical harm, because they do not approve of what they think I did at Duxford—or what others have encouraged them to believe I did.

It has also been stated that I have been ejected from Nellis AFB, Nevada media events. That allegation is false. I am confident that Nellis AFB's most senior Public Affairs Officer would not confirm the accuracy of that allegation.

Your agents' actions and decisions have set into motion Mancus-bashing, threats of physical harm, and certain photographers have even posted on the Internet they intend to deliberately obstruct my view.

At www.forum.keypublishing.com, there is a 22 July 2009 posting at 20:55 that asked one question, “Was RIAT a Mancus-free event?”

The correct answer is: Yes. I attended that entire airshow, without incident. I did see at RIAT, however, photographers who pointed their lenses at me. I did not know why. I presumed they wanted to photograph the www.cloud9photography.us URL that I had put on my lens shade.

I am not aware of any claim on the Internet that I did anything objectionable at RIAT.

A moderator for www.forum.keypublishing.com, posted this intelligent thought on 22 July 2009 at 21:29:

Can we be somewhat circumspect on comment on an incident where we don't know all of the facts please. Mr. Mancus has been happy to use the law to his advantage in the past, and no doubt would not hesitate again. [Underline emphasis added.]

I do not know the name of the man who obstructed my view on 11 July 2009, who told me he could make my day “uncomfortable”, who pushed me toward a slope; however, this man might be one “Rob Howarth”. I theorize that based on what someone claiming to be “Rob Howarth” has posted on the Internet.

I submit to you that much, if not all, of what this “Rob Howarth”, and others, have posted on the Internet about this dispute is 100% compatible with my statement of the facts, above.

Facts and Opinions About “Rob Howarth” and the July 11, 2009 Duxford Incident

1. I incorporate here, in fully, by this reference, my discussion of the facts stated in my letter to you for what happened on 11 July 2009.
2. At www.forums.airshows.co.uk, someone on 13 July 2009 at 4:42 pm, in reference to Duxford's airshows, made this posting:

All very relaxed up to 2pm but, sure enough, at 2pm, people who had literally just arrived at the tank end start to shuffle forward to try and get the best picture (many with useless kit or even mobile phones!” [Emphasis added.]

This posting is 100% accurate.

My core approach to people includes this mind set: Everyone starts out with 100 points, the maxim, with me, and they, based on their conduct, either keep those points or subtract them. “Up to 2pm” no one obstructed my view; therefore, I was “very relaxed”, calm, and quiet.

3. I am not programmed to be intimidated. What the man on my left told me he could “make my day uncomfortable”, what he told me was one of the most counter-productive things he could have said. Two of my heroes are Winston Churchill and Mahatma Gandhi. They would not be intimidated.
4. The secret of happiness is freedom and the secret of freedom is courage.

5. I experienced this man to be a bully with a camera who intended to intimidate me via his statement to me, which I construed to be a threat.
6. I believe this man whispered what he told me because A) he wanted to intimidate me and B) he knew that if he said what he told me out loud some in the crowd would turn against him.
7. Shortly after this man whispered what I perceived to be his threat, when more planes were taking off, to cope with his line of sight obstruction, I took my 600 mm lens off of my tripod and stood in front of my tripod, to the right of this man, at the end of the flat area, where the slope begins, to try to get take off shots that this man prevented me from getting.
8. I then felt this man's hip pushing the left side of my hip. It seemed to me as if he was pushing me off the flat part of the ground I stood on, perilously close to the slope, while I held about \$18,000 of camera gear in my hands.
9. To keep from being pushed onto the slope, where I would be off balanced, and might fall onto others, hurting myself and/or others and/or my camera gear, I dug in my feet and pushed back. I did that to keep from falling.
10. I believe I had a right to do what I did, to avoid injury to myself, to others, and to my camera gear.
11. Per those circumstances, I also hoped my pushing back sent this man a message: I would not be intimidated.
12. That was the only time this man and I had physical contact, and he started by crowding in on me, by what he told me, and by his making a non-consensual physical contact with me.
13. After this man made his initial physical contact with me and pushed me, I feared that he would become more aggressive and would attack me.
14. To deter this man from having any further physical contact with me, I repeatedly yelled at him, "DO NOT TOUCH ME!" I yelled that to establish boundaries, to deter him, to let him and others around me know that there was a problem, he was the problem, and I anticipated he might assault me.
15. I was not an aggressor.
16. My yelling "DO NOT TOUCH ME!" was an instantaneous spontaneous exclamation in reaction to my perception of him as a would-be intimidator immediately following his non-consensual pushing me toward the slope.
17. When I yelled at this man at that time, I was prudent. I was not unhinged. I was in control of my mind and my emotions. I was proactive in response to a perceived threat.
18. It is a maxim of mental health that an extreme reaction to an extreme provocation is a sign of excellent mental health.
19. www.forums.airshows.co.uk has a posting at 12 Jul 2009, 9:41 pm that states:

Ahhh, he was on top of the bank just behind me on Saturday . . . creating quite a scene in the process. **Have never heard someone shout "Don't touch me!!" more times than he did!!** [Emphasis added.]

This poster confirms I yelled, “Don’t touch me!” “Don’t touch me!” is 100% *defensive*, 100% *non-violent*, and 100% *lawful*.

This poster does not know *why* I yelled what I did. Without knowing *why*, the pejorative insinuation of his “creating quite a scene in the process” remark lacks a context and is misleading.

20. www.warbirdinformationexchange.org has a posting by a person who asked a question that references the *why*—why I did what I did. This poster asked:

Are you able to share with us **the details of what your friend allegedly did that turned this other photographer into Mr. Hyde?**

This poster, to his/her credit, wanted “the details of what” the person I yelled at did; however, in context, this poster, after effectively admitting that he/she does not know “the details”, unencumbered by his/her ignorance, appears to have jumped to the conclusion that I “turned . . . into Mr. Hyde.”

21. www.warbirdinformationexchange.org , has a **preposterous** posting for 22 July 2009 at 4:12 pm. This posting is fairly long so I will summarize part of it and quote part of it.

Per this poster, I was, and I am, accused of “clouting someone in the face” with my lens. That allegation is false. I am programmed to respect everyone’s physical security. I would also not use as a weapon fragile, expensive camera gear that I bought with my own money that I need to take pictures.

This poster also wrongly attributes to me that I claimed I had been at Duxford all Saturday night and since 7 a.m. on Sunday, and I used that as “justification for maintaining a ring of clear space in a location that gets very crowded.” I never claimed any such thing. I slept at a B&B Saturday night.

This poster continues with:

When you consider just how crowded it is, you can appreciate that **swinging the ‘saturn V’** [a reference to my 600 mm lens] **was going to cause problems**. Everyone paid for their place on the bank so should everyone else accommodate Mancus? Having had this experience on the Saturday it was madness not to find somewhere with a bit more space. [Emphasis added.]

My commentary:

1. This poster’s reasoning is **preposterous**, for these reasons: A) when I staked out my spot on Saturday and on Sunday there was lots of space around me; B) people crowded in on me, not me on them. The only way my “swinging” my lens would cause a problem would be if people who arrived late crowded in on me, obstructing my view; C) I was there first; D) the unspoken premise of this poster’s reasoning is this: when people crowd in around anyone with a big lens, everyone with a big lens should

stop using their big lenses and should yield to everyone else who crowd in on them, late, just before the flying starts, even if the person(s) with the big lenses were there first, and even if they paid to get in like everyone else; E) *nothing* in Duxford's official written rules sanctions this poster's logic; F) per your official rules, all airshow fans, regardless of their camera equipment, have a right to enjoy an unobstructed view, but, this poster's attitude is this: the crowd has a right to show up late, crowd in on those who were at a spot first, obstruct their view and ruin their enjoyment of the airshow; G) this poster's logic, is, in effect, his rationale for a different set of rules—ad hoc rules, invented by him, which are not Duxford's official written rules; H) this poster's "rules" are not, and never were, binding on me. His "rules" are a manifestation of his lack of critical thinking skills; I) this poster is entitled to his opinions, but he is not entitled to his own facts; J) it is an unimpeachable objective fact that Duxford's official written rules support me, not him, and his "rules" are not binding on me or anyone else; K) this poster's logic is 100% devoid of any reference to Duxford's official written rules. Apparently, this poster does not feel encumbered by, or does not want to be encumbered by, those rules; L) opinions are like belly bottoms as rectums: Everyone has one. So what? Not all opinions are entitled to equal weight; M) This poster used the word *madness*. He slung that word around indiscriminately. I challenge him to cite me to any rule or law that supports his analysis, his naked opinion(s).

3) If I gave this poster my "saturn V" lens [a Canon 600 mm] for him to keep, do you think he would accept it? Keep it? Use it? Swing it? Insist upon his right to swing it? Complain about people who obstructed *his* view?

4) If the answers to No. 3 are "Yes," those answers are tantamount to recognition that a lot of this Mancus-bashing is a function of the bashers' "lens envy"—frank, common as dirt, immaturity—*theirs*, and jealousy—*theirs*.

5) For the reasons stated, this poster's analysis is a manifestation of his application of his naked opinions to this dispute when he did not know all of the facts, and *that* smacks of a form of "madness"—*his*.

6) I, correctly and logically, reasoned from and to *your* official published written rules, but this poster piped off about his self-serving ad hoc rules that conflict with *your* official rules, which this poster never acknowledged.

7) I was not the only one there with a big lens. There were several of us on the hill by the tank track with big lenses on tripods.

8) A fair summary of what this poster is arguing for is: People with big lenses who stake out a position first, and who hold it for hours, should yield to the crowd when the crowd crowds in on them, late, even if the crowd's members are using only mobile telephone cameras and point and shoot cameras, and this is because the crowd, and its members, have a right to crowd in and to violate this Duxford rule: "Do not obstruct the view of others.", and, anyone with a big lens who does not yield to the crowd is *obnoxious* and should be ejected.

22. On Sunday, when the female “Visitor Services” official who asked me if there was a problem told me, “Oh, so you are the one. I’ve heard about you.”, I had no idea what she was talking about. However, now that I have learned that one “Rob Howarth” has posted his pictures on the Internet, and has labeled me “the loud American”, I theorize that the man who obstructed my view on Saturday, on his way out of Duxford and/or on Sunday morning, made good on his threat to make my day “uncomfortable” by telling one or more officials about me.
23. I further theorize that this man probably made a disingenuous complaint to one or more officials, exaggerated his complaint, and withheld from official(s) what he did to trigger my yelling at him “DO NOT TOUCH ME!”.
24. I also theorize that this man might have also discussed me with his buddies, without telling them the entire truth.
25. If you do a Goggle search for “only slightly marred by a very loud American man shouting at me”, inside quotation marks, that search term, as specified above, will take you to a page that has pictures attributed to one “Rob Howarth”, which are posted on a “fightercontrol.forumotion.com/airshow-pictures” Internet site.
26. At this forum, per that search term, the first picture, to the right of Mr. Howarth’s name, states the “subject” of the picture is from Duxford’s 2009 Flying Legends airshow.
27. Someone, presumably this Mr. Howarth, added this text that accompanies this first picture:

A few of my efforts from a very enjoyable day at my first legends, **only slightly marred** by a **very loud American man shouting at me** for coming within his **self imposed 3 meter exclusion zone** **around his tripod** on the Tank Bank, anyhow here we go.
[Emphasis added.]

28. *Three meters* is approximately ten feet! I never tried to impose a “3 meter exclusion zone around [my] tripod.” A ten feet exclusion zone around my entire tripod would be absurd. Such a wide space—a twenty feet diameter—exclusive of the width of the tripod’s legs, would be unnecessary. I did not need it. I did not want it. I have never told anyone to say “3 meters” or ten feet away from my tripod or anything to that effect.
29. Question: Since I do not need 10 feet to move around my tripod to take pictures, is it probable that I would tell anyone that they had to honor a “3 meter exclusion zone around [my] tripod”?
30. Mr. Howarth portrayed me falsely.
31. I submit that Mr. Howarth has memorialized his apparent tendency to flirt with the truth, to embellish.
32. Even though Mr. Howarth made a reference to “a very loud American shouting at [him]”, he failed to disclose what he—Mr. Howarth—did to provoke that American to shout at him, to become loud.
33. It is a maxim of law and logic that when a person makes a disclosure it is incumbent upon them to disclose the complete facts.

34. Mr. Howarth's complaint about "a very loud American shouting at" him is analogous to the Japanese complaining about the A-bomb dropped on Hiroshima without mention of what they did on December 7th.
35. Mr. Howarth did not disclose that I was there first, that he obstructed my view, that he refused to step back, what he whispered to me, and that he pushed me toward the slope.
36. If Mr. Howarth's position and mine were reversed, do you think he would tolerate what he did against me? I doubt it.
37. Even though Mr. Howarth made a reference to "a very loud American shouting", he admitted that the shouting "only slight marred" his otherwise "very enjoyable day; thus, the "loud American" must not have given him much of a sustained bad time. That part is true. That part is 100% compatible with my statement of the facts.
38. If you scroll through Mr. Howarth's pictures at this site, you will see his pictures of historical reenactors. Those pictures are probably circumstantial evidence that before the flying began at 2:00 p.m., he took pictures of historical reenactors, hundreds of yards away from where I was set up with my tripod. While he was doing that, I was, from 8:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., standing by my tripod. I staked out a spot and remained in that spot, even though I, too, wanted to photograph reenactors. Mr. Howarth, however, apparently, pre-positioned a chair, abandoned the chair, went hundreds of yards away to take pictures, and, shortly before the flying started, came back, and rudely stepped in front of me and refused to stop obstructing my view.
39. If you further scroll through this thread, on this forum, you will find another entry attributed to one Mr. Howarth:

Hi Lozza yes unfortunately that was me. He almost got his **tripod shoved right up his a***, but with over 1000 witnesses it could have been a problem.** Cheers Rob [Emphasis added.]

40. Mr. Howarth memorialized on the Internet *his* violent thoughts regarding me.
41. Mr. Howarth's use of asterisks do not disguise his vulgarity.
42. What Mr. Howarth memorialized, here, in this posting on the Internet, is consistent with what I attribute to the man who whispered to me what I construed to be a threat, a man who, by what he wrote, acknowledged he was concerned about witnesses. But for witnesses, that man probably would have physically attacked me. Thus, my yelling, "Do not touch me!" probably had a deterrent effect on him.
43. A man with violent thoughts who wanted to shove a tripod up my ass, who was concerned about witnesses, is—logically—the kind of a person who would whisper what he did to me.
44. www.forum.keypublishing.com/showthread, has this posting dated 13 July 2009:

That guy was being something of an obnoxious t**t on Saturday for sure – shouting down several people and getting in their faces **just before the flying show started.** Fortunately **he quientened [sic] down after a few minutes** Good show anyway - shame about

TFC (and the obnoxious Yank!) [Emphasis added.]

This poster did not approve of my behavior. However, since he/she did not hear what was whispered in my ear, he/she did not have all of the facts, and he/she did not know *why* I did what I did.

“Just before the flying show started” is precisely when many late arrivals, crowded in.

This poster did not and cannot cite me to any rule that required me to suffer, in silence, anyone who obstructed my view.

This poster admitted, in context, that I became vocal around the time the flying started, and I quieted down a few minutes later. *That*, too, is 100% consistent with my version of the facts.

45. If “Rob Howarth” is the man who obstructed my view, who refused to step to his left, who whispered what I attribute to him, who pushed me, his version of what happened between the two of us on Saturday, July 11, 2009, that he posted on the Internet, is incomplete, misleading, and self-serving.
46. For the reasons stated, it is my opinion that a compelling argument can be made that this “Mr. Howarth” is uncouth, is a troublemaker, is rude, is a bully, is disingenuous, and is a Duxford rule violator.

Another Preposterous Posting About the 12 July 2009 Duxford Incident

www.forum.keypublishing.com contains a posting by one “Dora Jar” for 12 July 2009 at 23:09:

He [referring to me] **seemed** to think he was **entitled to ALL the space on the tank bank and abusing others was ‘fair game.’**
[Emphasis added.]

My commentary:

1. *Seemed* is 100% subjective, not objective. I am not responsible for this poster’s lack of critical thinking skills. This poster’s thoughts are his or hers, and that is not the same as my actual conduct or thoughts or both.
2. I never believed that I was “entitled to ALL the space on the tank bank” or that “abusing others was ‘fair game’”.
3. This poster’s pejorative presumption, subjective beliefs, rush to judgment based on scanty facts, and lack of critical thinking skills do not reflect well upon this poster.

At the start of the flying everybody stood up (as they always do) and everybody moved forward a little **to see past the person who was next to them**. Rather than do likewise he shouted and balled at one person to “get out of the ***** way!” He also hit that person

with his camera lense and shouted in his face – just inches from him.

My commentary:

1. This poster's reasoning is his admission that "everybody" obstructed the view of everyone else, and, per this poster, it is then acceptable for everyone to move forward [obstruct] "to see past the person who [is] next to them." This poster's logic is non-meritorious. Just because everybody did it does not make it right. It just means everybody, or a large majority, are rude, violate Duxford's rules, and Duxford's officials do not do anything meaningful about these rule violations.
3. This poster, in context, opined that I should have done what others were doing: obstruct the view of others when someone else obstructs my view. Brilliant? Consistent with *your* rules?
4. I did not swear at any one, and I did not hit anyone with my lens. This poster has embellished. Since I know what I said and what I did, this poster's credibility with me is zero. Hence, I dismiss this poster as a frank troublemaker.

Instead of just standing behind his tripod he also wanted to have the space to walk around and was blocking other people's views, presumably to annoy them and try to drive them away. Put simply he was obnoxious.

My commentary:

1. I did not stand behind my tripod because people who showed up late crowded in and obstructed my view and refused to step back.
2. Those people were rude, inconsiderate, and *obnoxious*.
3. I did not intend to annoy anyone.
4. I intended to be productive. To be productive, since late arrivals crowded in on me and officials did not enforce the rules, I had to be proactive.
5. I had a right to assert my right to an unobstructed view; otherwise, your rules are a farce.
6. I had a duty to mitigate my damages by asserting my rights.
7. This poster's analysis, like others, makes no reference to Duxford's official written rules. When those rules are factored in, this poster's analysis is non-meritorious.
8. With every paragraph, this poster affirms his lack of critical thinking skills. Example: What he/she presumes about me is not the equivalent of what my actual thoughts and motives were. I throw off the pejoratives that this poster burdens me with.

Later he took objection to someone standing on a step-ladder. Although the ladder was at the very back of the area (and probably needed to see over his huge tripod!) The American ‘gent’ decided it was in the way . . . so he removed the guy from the ladder and threw it across the grass.

My commentary:

1. Hundreds were standing on stepladders, not “one guy”.
2. This poster’s criticism side steps one of Duxford’s official written rules, namely, “**Do not obstruct the view of others. Stepladders are not allowed**, except for accredited media, who must report to the Media Marquee.” (Exact quote.) [Underlined emphasis added.]
3. People standing on ladders, even ladders “in the very back”, obstructed the views of thousands. People on ladders in “the very back” are a line of sight obstruction for photographers not on ladders and airplanes climbing out after taking off and airplanes making low passes. The rules do not permit non-accredited media with ladders, period, anywhere, including “at the very back.”
4. This poster, in context, in effect, either does not know of Duxford’s rules or does not like them and is engaged in his/her inept ad hoc attempt at belated rule making. He has no authority to make any rule, to violate the rules, to try to make his ad hoc “rules” binding on me. This poster, in effect, is railing against Duxford’s official written rules—*yours*.
5. I did not “remove” anyone from their ladder.

At that point the first person he’d ‘attacked’ clearly decided enough was enough and got the security staff involved. Eventually the police ejected him from the museum - that’s when you heard the cheers and the applause from the crowd! . . .

My commentary:

1. *Attacked* is a pejorative conclusion without a factual basis to support it.
2. I did not *attack* anyone.
3. This poster slings around his pejoratives without a factual basis with reckless abandonment.

You don’t expect to be shouted at, abused or forced off your step-ladder . . . Duxford dealt with the ‘incident’ well – it could’ve escalated as he was winding up lots of people. I honestly thought somebody was going to thump him.

My commentary:

1. This poster's remark that, "You don't expect to be shouted at, abused or forced off your step-ladder" points a damning finger at Duxford's officials. This poster's remark is tantamount to evidence that Duxford's officials do not enforce Duxford's rule banning stepladders. The fact that this poster wrote that people on stepladders do not "expect to be shouted at, abused or forced off [their] ladder" is a result of Duxford's officials tolerating and condoning widespread violation of *your* stepladder ban.
2. What this poster opined about "I honestly thought somebody was going to thump him" because "he was winding up lots of people" is telling. It suggests that the Duxford airshow crowd has a disproportionately high number of immature persons who are latent bullies, who are volatile, who are quick to result to a violent self-help remedy, prematurely, when they do not know all of the facts, who lack maturity to the point that they let themselves get so wound up, like a toy, and are incapable of functioning as mature adults capable of critical sustained thought.
3. This poster's opinion further suggest that many Duxford airshow fans do not respect and/or do not fear Duxford's officials or the constables or both, because some were seriously contemplating a violent self-help remedy. Thus, this poster's criticism of me is a manifestation of his or her belief that some among Duxford's airshow fans have a latent mob mentality.
4. This poster did not articulate a scintilla of respect for individual rights, including the right to enjoy an unobstructed view.
5. This poster, in his/her entire lengthy posting, did not make any reference whatsoever to *your* rules.
6. This poster's entire posting is a classic example of non-critical, self-serving, jump to conclusion, don't confuse me with the facts, don't confine me to the rules, mind set.

Troublemakers' Declarations of Their Intent

At www.forums.airshows.co.uk, there is a 13 July 2009 at 7:34 pm posting where one person wrote, in apparent reference to me:

If I see him I'll make a point to stand in front of him . . .
[Emphasis added.]

This contributor added a smiley face after his public admission that he would deliberately go out of his way to obstruct my view.

At the same forum, another person made this posting on 15 July 2009 at 12:13 am, in reference to me:

Look forward to seeing him at RIAT . . . the bloke really wound me up with his attitude, so **it will amuse me if I see him in the FRIAT enclosure, for amusement value alone I'll see how much I can p*** him off**, in a discrete manner of course.
[Emphasis added.]

At this same forum, another contributor posted this on 27 July 2009 at 10:28 am:

I want to see this guy at an Airshow **purely so I can stand in front of him, irritate him** and ask him why he's at an Airshow to photograph Jupiter [Emphasis added.]

These posters, because of their declared intent to cause trouble for their amusement, have earned their spot in a God forsaken place—ASSHOLEDOM.

QUESTIONS:

1. What are you going to do about these troublemakers?
2. When your agents wrongly ejected me and banned me, they, in effect, pinned a bull's eye on me, emboldened these troublemakers, and gave these troublemakers—and thousands more like them—a green light to function as bullies, obstructionists, and troublemakers.
3. Do you think these troublemakers will confine their trouble-making to only me?
4. My motive was: To stand up for *your* rules, for the benefit of myself, all photographers, and all airshow fans. These troublemakers have this motive: To cause more trouble for their amusement.
5. Do you comprehend how much trouble these troublemakers can, and will, cause others at other airshows unless you stand up to them and stop them, namely, ban them from your airshows?
6. Why should I be banned for life—or at all—when these troublemakers feel so comfortable with your officials' implementation of your rules that they boldly and publicly proclaim their intent to violate *your* rule: “**Do not obstruct the view of others.**”?
7. Have some British Internet aviation forums that allow such postings become a den for troublemakers to spew forth their poison? To display their immaturity? To display their proclivity for lawlessness?
8. Do you want *these* troublemakers to show up at future Duxford airshows?
9. When *your* agents refuse to enforce *your* rules, when *your* agents ban fans like me who want the rules enforced, who is going to enforce *your* rules? Troublemakers? Airshow fans who are easily intimidated by troublemakers? Airshow fans who fear *your* agents will eject them, too?

Stepladders, Rude Airshow Fans, and Troublemakers Are a Problem

At www.forums.airshows.co.uk, someone on 12 July 2009 at 11:14 pm posted a complaint about a person “standing on a step ladder about 10 feet back from” the barrier who obstructed viewing and, “When a guy went and asked politely if he would mind not using it, he wasn’t having any of it. Are these situations happening more and more at airshow now . . . without consideration of others?

On the same forum another contributor on 16 July 2009 at 12:33 pm posted this:

Also near me on the TB [tank bank] on Sunday, one guy was sitting in his chair just at the top of the hill and started **shouting** at a guy and his female companion who decided to stand right in front of him – he wasn’t best pleased. [Emphasis added.]

Thus, I was not the only one who objected to person’s obstructing their view, who shouted or yelled, but I was the one ejected and banned.

On this same forum, the next immediate entry is this:

I think I saw that. Wondered what was happening, **all the madness on the tank bank! What the Hell is going on?!** [Emphasis added.]

I submit to you that the answer to the question, “What the Hell is going on?” is this: The bullies, the liars, and the rude people have discovered they can violate Duxford’s rules with impunity.

Your officials, by ejecting and banning me, established a horrible precedent [rule violators are tolerated; meritorious complainers who want the rules enforced are ejected and banned.]

Your officials, by establishing that precedent, sent an egregious message to everyone who agrees with me, and they created a *disincentive* that deters people who agreeing with me to support me and what I am telling you.

Lawlessness is spreading and breeding at Duxford airshows. Your officials sowed the seeds for this weed.

This same forum has this posting on 21 July 2009 at 5:12 pm, in reference to a picture of me holding my big lens off its tripod:

Why bring and set-up a huge tripod if you are going to hand hold the entire time? Just seemed a bit strange at the time, and makes a bit of sense now that I read what happened on the Sunday.

Answer: The tripod was intended to be used so I could use slow shutter speeds to blur props. The lens was off the tripod because people crowded in and refused to stop obstructing my view with the lens on the tripod.

Thus, this poster's "sense" of why I took my big lens off the tripod is flat out wrong. Furthermore, I reject the implied idea that it is somehow wrong or illegal for a person with a big lens on a tripod to take it off of the tripod.

High Praise for An Objective, Mature, Intelligent, Thoughtful, Poster

www.forums.airshows.co.uk has this posting dated 13 July 2009 at 3:25 pm:

Let me ask this question and **be honest now, how many of you have had a similar situation as the one mentioned above, at any airshow. Or how many times have you set up hours before the show, only to have somebody set up right in front of you 2 minutes before the show starts? Just how great does that feel.**

. . . **when some pillock sets up a ladder in front of me, I feel like ejecting him from it! . . . People seem to be increasingly inconsiderate at airshows and without a doubt Duxford is the worst. I deliberately stayed at home when legends was on this year so as to avoid the push and shove which is so now the standard there. (First time I've missed it in 10 years!)**

Perhaps Dux should follow the examples set by places like Old Warden who have banned ladders. I know DUX have banned windbreaks as they announced it at the May airshow **(not that they seem to enforce it)**

I'm sure this will get worse before it gets better, so I would have to say that yes situations like this are happening more and more and will happen more and more. Sad but true. . . . [Emphasis added.]

This poster, to his/her credit, cut through the nonsense on these forums that reeks of Mancus-bashing. This poster asked this question because he/she, apparently, like tens of thousands of other photographers, has experienced this problem [rude late comers obstruct your view], which is rampant, and the obstructionists get snarly when politely asked to stop being an obstructionist..

EXHIBIT "B" is on the next page.

EXHIBIT “B”

A LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR ME CRITICAL OF YOUR AGENTS and CONCLUDING COMMENTARY BY ME

A British citizen who knows of my dispute with your agents, on 13 August, 2009, sent me an email telling me that he sent you a letter, which is quoted verbatim, below, as I received it from him, with emphasis in bold and underlining, added by me.

To whom it may concern I would like to say that **the Flying legends airshow was one of the worst I attended this year in the 10 years I have been going, The crowd control was non existent, and your visitor services seem to do a poor job in controlling stepladders that were being used by people to gain an advantage, to the detriment of others, You need to get a grip of this issue, following the examples of the Shuttleworth collection and RIAT. **Windbreaks need to be addressed** also as marking off a 10 meter exclusion zone for 2 people to stand in is just ridiculous. **I am seriously thinking I not attending future events because of this.** I noticed by reading various forums that a gentleman was ejected from this years events, because of this issue, and for what I can gather, it seems after taking out the obvious idiot and disturbing bashing of this gentleman, **it seems to me that you got the wrong man, he appears to be trying to do your job for you and got punished for it. All you have seem to have done is empowered the bullies** that go around to carry on with what they won't to do without being punished. Regards Mr Watson**

FRIENDLY ADVICE

You need to heed what I told you in my letter, what this “Mr. Watson” told you in his letter [above], and what “rascly” said in his 13 July 2009 www.forums.airshows.co.uk posting, above, namely, 1) **“I deliberately stayed at home when legends was on this year so as to avoid the push and shove which is so now the standard there (first time I’ve missed it in ten years)”**; 2) **“Perhaps Dux should follow the examples set by places like Old Warden who have banned ladders”**; and 3) **“I am sure this will get worse before it gets better.”**

If you ratify what your agents did and if you do not implement the recommendations I made to you, the crowd control problems at your venue “will get worse before it gets better.”, but, you can avoid that. “It” does not have to “get worse”.

“It” can get much better if you embrace reality and manifest enlightened, firm, leadership consistent with the excellent recommendations I made to you in my letter.

“Rascly” made it clear: You have already begun to lose revenue because you and your agents have grossly mismanaged a large part of the non-flying display aspects of your airshow. He stayed away for the first time in ten years. Others will stay away, too. Mr. Watson told you he is thinking of staying away, and I, per these circumstances, am unwilling to pay you an admission fee or a dedicated air-to-air photo session fee.

“Rascly” also claimed that you announced in May that Duxford had banned windbreaks. That is new information to me, yet I saw many windbreaks at Duxford in July. Hence, that is another reason why your rules are a farce. They are a farce because even though they are good they are not enforced, and your agents created this precedent: Anyone who demands rule enforcement will be ejected and banned for life.

WHAT DO YOU HAVE?

You have 1) a major disconnect between your rules and the behavior of your officials and the crowd, 2) a problem of your making that arises from your lack of adequate training and supervision of your agents, 3) your agents failed to enforce your rules, 4) your agents mishandled my complaints to them about troublemakers and rule violators, 5) a problem that has begun to cost you revenue, 6) a potential public relations disaster in the making, 7) an exposure to legal liability, 8) a proposed settlement, 9) excellent recommendations from me, and 9) a narrow window of opportunity to redress these issues, to remedy these problems, and to resolve this dispute.

I presume you are reasonably constituted critical thinkers. If what I presume is accurate, I am confident that I have demonstrated to you that A) the ejection of me was and is an injustice, B) the life time ban was and is an injustice, C) the criticism of me on British Internet aviation forums is non-meritorious and D) you have a problem that is getting bigger and needs to be fixed.

Winston Churchill said, “So long as I am acting from duty and conviction, I am indifferent to taunts and jeers. I think they will probably do me more good than harm.” I agree.

- END -