



I Called Out a Defense Contractor for Blowing Taxpayer Money—and People Are Mad About My Pronouns

Description

For some time now, I've written extensively about [Cyberlux Corporation](#) (OTC: [CYBL](#)), and recently, that coverage has drawn new levels of scrutiny. From the moment I started speaking out about Cyberlux, people (who generally appear to be [paid promoters](#)) have accused me of being a [paid basher](#). After my latest article, [Why I Refuse to Stop Writing About Cyberlux Corporation: Because Taxpayers Deserve the Truth](#), gained traction, I was confronted by someone who assumed—wrongly—that I was being paid to criticize the company.

Let's get something straight: I am not paid by anyone to write about Cyberlux. I own no Cyberlux stock. I have no financial interest in its stock price rise or fall. What I do have is a deep frustration with how taxpayer dollars are spent—and in Cyberlux, I've found a case so blatantly egregious that it would be negligent not to write about it.

When challenged about my focus on Cyberlux, my critic asked: "You really think Cyberlux is the only company misusing taxpayer money?"

Probably not. But they are, to my knowledge, the only ones so brazenly reckless about it.

This is a company whose CEO, Mark Schmidt, openly boasted to the *Wall Street Journal* that Cyberlux is "a virus inside the body of DOD" and that they will either "influence the way they do things in the future or be ejected from the body." That alone is astonishingly arrogant, but what makes Cyberlux stand out isn't just their hubris—it's their actions.

Consider this: In the span of just 24 hours, Cyberlux went from having less than \$3,000 in their bank account to receiving a \$38.8 million advance payment for a U.S. government contract. And within 72 hours of that windfall, they [wired \\$213,000 of taxpayer money](#) directly to a Mercedes dealership in Newport Beach, California.

That's not just misuse of funds—that's stupidity on an almost impressive scale.

Cyberlux defenders can deflect all they want. They can claim that I'm biased, or that I have some hidden agenda. But here's my open challenge to them: If you have evidence of another company behaving this recklessly—wiring six-figure sums of public money for luxury cars within days of receiving a contract—show me. I'll write about them, too.

Instead, the ongoing conspiracy theory is that I must be on the payroll of George A. Sharp. Because obviously, the only reason someone would critique Cyberlux is if they were paid to do so, not because the company is under serious scrutiny for its financial decisions and a string of lawsuits. Funny how that works. Rather than engage with the growing body of evidence, stock pumpers would rather spin wild theories about my motivations than face the reality that the company they spend their time promoting is, at the same time, facing allegations of stealing from them—the taxpayer.

And now, the personal attacks have taken another turn. It's not enough for some people to deflect from Cyberlux's financial misdeeds—they need to turn this into a political fight, too. Apparently, being politically center-left automatically makes me the enemy in the eyes of some, as if my criticism of a company misusing taxpayer funds is some sort of partisan plot rather than a matter of basic accountability. I've been called a narcissistic liberal for daring to report on financial misconduct, as if reckless corporate behavior only matters when it suits a certain political narrative.

I've even been blocked by people who openly despise Mark Schmidt—because somehow, in their mind, my reporting comes with a liberal agenda. It's fascinating how some people will do anything to avoid confronting the simple, provable facts of this case. If you're more offended by what you think my political views are than by how Cyberlux has behaved, you might want to take a moment and ask yourself why.

What's more ridiculous is that people are more fixated on my pronouns than on Cyberlux's financial misconduct. I list them because my name—Jackson—is gender-nonspecific, and apparently, that confuses people. It's not a political statement, it's basic clarity. For some reason unknown to me, my parents thought giving a girl a gender neutral name would be a good idea. If that upsets you more than the documented financial misdeeds of Cyberlux, you're telling on yourself.

Until then, Cyberlux remains in a class of its own, and Mark Schmidt's own words suggest he should be ejected from the body of the Department of Defense before more taxpayer money vanishes into questionable transactions.

If you care about accountability, you should care about this. And if you're more concerned about my motivations than Cyberlux's actions, maybe ask yourself why.

For those who think I should spend my energy on something positive—I am. Exposing corruption is a public service. If you think calling out a company for wasting millions of tax dollars is crying over spilled milk, I can only assume you've never had to clean up the mess.

It's time to eject Cyberlux from the DOD's body.

Disclaimer

All posts, articles, and op-eds about Cyberlux Corporation are grounded entirely in information sourced from publicly available court records, government documents, and financial disclosures filed with OTC Markets. This content is intended for informational purposes only—it's not legal advice, it's not

financial guidance, and itâ??s definitely not an invitation to dive headfirst into investment decisions. Our interpretations, opinions, and conclusions stem exclusively from these accessible resources. Ultimate adjudication of legal matters rests with the courts and qualified legal professionals. As always, youâ??re encouraged to verify independently because, letâ??s face it, trust but verify is a motto that never goes out of style. If you believe there is an error in our reporting and have **verifiable** proof, we encourage you to present it, and we will promptly review and address any inaccuracies.

Category

1. Cyberlux

Tags

1. cyberlux
2. DOD
3. factoring
4. FMS
5. Ukraine

Date Created

March 19, 2025

Author

jackson