On Jun 20, 2017, at 12:45 PM, Anna von Reitz <avannavon@gmail.com> wrote:
I understand the frustration many people feel and their forthright and even outraged rebuttal of the false claims that have been made about them and "in their behalf". I also understand the confusion that results.

But we ARE in fact "sovereign" in our own native jurisdiction on the land, both the land of the states and in the international jurisdiction of the land (postal districts).

Our Forefathers set it up so that we are each one of us the "king" or "queen" of ourselves and our land assets. This is what is known as "free sovereignty" and it is internationally recognized---- not a matter of Joe the Plumber pounding his chest and making claims out of thin air.

That said, we have been one by one kidnapped by our own employees and shanghaied in gross Breach of Trust into the international jurisdiction of the sea and our identities have been stolen, so that we appear to be stateless "vessels", when in fact we are the landlords of this entire country and are Protected Persons owed
every jot of the actual Constitution.

Now, this is the situation we are in. Robinson Crusoe has been picked up out of the "ocean" where he was cast adrift and the circumstance of his being there has been investigated and the perpetrators have been discovered and they are being prosecuted. What remains is for "Robinson" to take prompt and effective steps to reclaim his identity and his assets and to restore his lawful government.

Those responsible for creating this situation are all dead and gone, but anyone who participates in or benefits from the fraud foisted off on Americans is fair game for prosecution upon notification of the facts. There are approximately 1.5 million Bar Attorneys and three times as many paralegals and court clerks and others who have to be notified. There are probably 10-15 million law enforcement officials.....515 members of the "federal" government in Washington, DC.....

On Tue, Jun 20, 2017 at 9:36 AM, L r Dutton <roketscience@ymail.com> wrote: Correction ..
What do you think I was talking about? It was just a comment on the bull shit that these people you comment on that are living in a make believe world in a country = "sovereigns (King or Queen) of these united states?" that doesn't exist because our life, as we knew it, is now not what we think it is, and has not been what we thought it was, EVER! I originally thought "United States Citizens", was just prior to the CW, but now believe it NEVER was anything more. It has always been the "United States Citizens", and never "sovereigns (King or Queen) of these united states?"

Arnie & Judge Anna I GET WHAT YOU ARE SAYING, however, when you are living amongst the CAPITAL LETTERS and get caught up in their snares i.e. the Bundy's, Terry Lakin, Fitzgerald, and many more who have all been JAILED as I HAVE in the WAR ON THE lowercase letters, than, by all means, come talk to me.

Arnie, I did not see you object to Tony Caputo begging Trump to bring in marshal law to save us. Why, then, do you hang on to a comment I made on the nonsense that some fruitcake sent you that is just 'a chaos to order' propaganda piece? And solicit Judge Anna to shame me?

I believe our real interest is not being served as long as these well intentioned " lowercase letters ", that you deal with all day long, keep batting around the propaganda make believe trash funded by " The CAPITAL LETTERS ".

I could be wrong about any and all of this.

~L
If you have to say, “It’s not a conspiracy”, then it just might be one! So now what?

Isaiah 26:3 Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee.

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: L r Dutton <roketscience@ymail.com>
To: Arnie Rosner <arnie@arnierosner.com>; "avannavon@gmail.com" <avannavon@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 8:39 AM
Subject: Re: Execution by Firing Squad PASS IT ON!!!

What do you think I was talking about? It was just a comment on the bull shit that these people you comment on that are living in a make believe world in a country = "citizens of the United States?", that doesn't exist because our life, as we knew it, is not what we think it is, and has not been what we thought it was EVER! I originally thought "United States Citizens", was just prior to the CW, but now believe it NEVER was. It has always been the "United States Citizens", and never "citizens of the United States?"

Arnie & Judge Anna I GET WHAT YOU ARE SAYING, however, when you are living amongst the CAPITAL LETTERS and get caught up in their snares i.e. the Bundy's, Terry Lakin, Fitzgerald, and many more who have all been JAILED as I HAVE in the WAR ON THE lowercase letters, than, by all means, come talk to me.

Arnie, I did not see you object to Tony Caputo begging Trump to bring in marshal law to save us. Why, then, do you hang on to a
comment I made on the nonsense that some fruitcake sent you that is just 'a chaos to order' propaganda piece? And solicit Judge Anna to shame me?

I believe our real interest is not being served as long as these well intentioned " lowercase letters ", that you deal with all day long, keep batting around the propaganda make believe trash funded by " The CAPITAL LETTERS ".

If you have to say, “It’s not a conspiracy”, then it just might be one! So now what?

*Isaiah 26:3 Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee.*

From: Arnie Rosner <arnie@arnierosner.com>
To: Lr Dutton <roketscience@ymail.com>
Cc: Anna von Reitz <avannavon@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 2:40 AM
Subject: Re: Execution by Firing Squad PASS IT ON!!!

Ms. Dutton...

Judge Anna just interjected...
"United States Citizens" and/or "citizens of the United States"
Shall we put the cards on the table?

What do you think she is talking about…?

Were you addressing "United States Citizens" and/or "citizens of the United States?"

When you commented…

"Arnie, they are speaking of every badge toting, SWAT teamster, filthy, corrupt excuse for law enforcement. I, for one, am NOT surprised or unaware of this crap."

arnie, just one of the people.

arnie@arnierosner.com

714-964-4056

On Jun 19, 2017, at 9:55 PM, Anna von Reitz <avannavon@gmail.com> wrote:

If you insist on being "United States Citizens" and/or "citizens of the United States" you have no "constitutional rights".

Period.

So just go on bitching and doing nothing useful or substantial to correct the actual problem.
Shall we put the cards on the table?

On Mon, Jun 19, 2017 at 8:16 PM, Arnie Rosner <arnie@arnierosner.com> wrote:
Thank you…

And from whom are they taking their orders?

arnie, just one of the people.
arnie@arnierosner.com
714-964-4056

On Jun 19, 2017, at 8:46 PM, L r Dutton <roketscience@ymail.com> wrote:

Arnie, they are speaking of every badge toting, swat teamster, filthy, corrupt excuse for law enforcement. I, for one, am NOT surprised or unaware of this crap.

If you have to say, “It’s not a conspiracy”, then it just might be one! So now what?

Isaiah 26:3 Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee.

From: Arnie Rosner <arnie@arnierosner.com>
To: coll46 Frank <fcoll82@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 19, 2017 10:30 PM
Subject: Re: Execution by Firing Squad PASS IT ON!!!

There are approximately 2112 words used in describing this
Shall we put the cards on the table?

situation.

Specifically...About whom are we speaking?

arnie, just one of the people.
arnie@arnierosner.com
714-964-4056

On Jun 19, 2017, at 8:03 PM, Frank P Coll <fcoll82@gmail.com> wrote:

H/T NANCY

Execution by Firing Squad: The Militarized Police State Opens Fire


“It is often the case that police shootings, incidents where
law enforcement officers pull the trigger on civilians, are left out of the conversation on gun violence. But *a police officer shooting a civilian counts as gun violence*. Every time an officer uses a gun against an innocent or an unarmed person contributes to the culture of gun violence in this country.”—Journalist Celisa Calacal

Legally owning a gun in America could get you killed by a government agent. *(KINDA MAKES BLACK MARKET MAKE SENSE, DON’T IT?)*

While it still technically remains legal to *own* a firearm in America, possessing one can now get you *pulled over, searched, arrested*, subjected to all manner of *surveillance, treated as a suspect* without ever having committed a crime, *shot at* and killed.

This same rule does not apply to government agents, however, who are armed to the hilt and *rarely given more than a slap on the wrists* for using their weapons to shoot and kill American citizens.

According to the *Washington Post*, “*1 in 13*”
people killed by guns are killed by police."

Just recently, for example, a Minnesota jury acquitted a police officer who shot and killed 32-year-old Philando Castile, a school cafeteria supervisor, during a routine traffic stop merely because Castile disclosed that he had a gun in his possession, for which he had a lawful conceal-and-carry permit.

That’s all it took for police to shoot Castile four times as he was reaching for his license and registration. Castile’s girlfriend and her 4-year-old daughter witnessed the entire exchange.

Earlier this year, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit ruled that Florida police will not be held accountable for banging on the wrong door at 1:30 am, failing to identify themselves as police, and then repeatedly shooting and killing the innocent homeowner who answered the door while holding a gun in self-defense.

Although 26-year-old Andrew Scott had committed no crime and never fired a single
bullet or lifted his firearm against police, he was gunned down by police who were investigating a speeding incident by engaging in a middle-of-the-night “knock and talk” in Scott’s apartment complex.

As attorney David French writes for the National Review, “Shooting an innocent man in his own home because he grabs a gun when an unidentified person pounds on his door or barges through it isn’t just an ‘unreasonable search or seizure.’

It’s a direct violation of his clearly established right to keep and bear arms.”

Continuing its own disturbing trend of siding with police in cases of excessive use of force, a unanimous United States Supreme Court recently acquitted police who recklessly fired 15 times into a backyard shack in which a homeless couple—Angel and Jennifer Mendez—was sheltering.
Angel Mendez suffered numerous gunshot wounds, one of which required the amputation of his right leg below the knee, and his wife Jennifer was shot in the back. Incredibly, the Court ruled that the Los Angeles County police officers’ use of force against the homeless couple was justified as a defensive action, because Angel was allegedly seen holding a BB gun that he used for shooting rats.

In yet another case, a Texas homeowner was subjected to a no-knock, SWAT-team style forceful entry and raid based solely on the suspicion that there were legally-owned firearms in his household. Making matters worse, police panicked and opened fire through a solid wood door on the homeowner, who had already gone to bed.

In Maryland, a Florida man traveling through the state with his wife and kids was stopped by a police officer and interrogated about the whereabouts of his registered handgun. Despite the man’s insistence that the handgun had been left at home, the officer spent nearly
two hours searching through the couple’s car, patting them down along with their children, and having them sit in the back of a patrol car. No weapon was found.

In Philadelphia, a 25-year-old man was confronted by police, verbally threatened and arrested for carrying a gun in public, which is legal within the city. When Mark Fiorino attempted to explain his rights under the law to police, police ordered him to get on his knees or else “I am gonna shoot ya.” Fiorino was later released without charges.

What these cases add up to is a new paradigm in which legally owning a gun turns you into a target for government sharp-shooters. Ironically, while America continues to debate who or what is responsible for gun violence—the guns, the gun owners, or our violent culture—little has been said about the fact that the greatest perpetrator of violence in American society and around the world is the U.S. government.
**Government violence is the missing link in the gun control debate.**

Violence has become the government’s calling card, starting at the top and trickling down, from the more than 80,000 SWAT team raids carried out every year on unsuspecting Americans by heavily armed, black-garbed commandos and the increasingly rapid militarization of local police forces across the country to the drone killings used to target insurgents. The government even exports violence worldwide, with one of this country’s most profitable exports being weapons.

Thus, any serious discussion about minimizing the violence in our society needs to address the manner in which the government and its cohorts (the police, the various government agencies that are now armed to the hilt, the military, the defense contractors, etc.) use violence as a means to an end, whether domestically or in matters of foreign policy.

**You want to reduce gun violence? Start with the government.**
Except that the government has no intention of scaling back on its weapons.

To the contrary, the government’s efforts to militarize and weaponize its own agencies and employees is reaching epic proportions, with federal agencies as varied as the Department of Homeland Security and the Social Security Administration placing orders for hundreds of millions of rounds of hollow point bullets.

**Talk about a double standard.**
The government’s arsenal of weapons makes the average American’s handgun look like a Tinker Toy.

Under the auspices of a military “recycling” program, which allows local police agencies to acquire military-grade weaponry and equipment, more than $4.2 billion worth of equipment has been transferred from the Defense Department to domestic police agencies since 1990. Included among these “gifts” are tank-like, 20-ton Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles, tactical gear, and assault rifles.
Ironically, while gun critics continue to clamor for bans on military-style assault weapons, high-capacity magazines and armor-piercing bullets, expanded background checks, and tougher gun-trafficking laws, the U.S. military boasts all of these and more, including some weapons the rest of the world doesn’t have.

Included in the government’s arsenal are armed,

• surveillance Reaper drones capable of reading a license plate from over two miles away;
• an AA12 Atchisson Assault Shotgun that can shoot five 12-gauge shells per second and “can fire up to 9,000 rounds without being cleaned or jamming”;
• an ADAPTIV invisibility cloak that can make a tank disappear or seemingly reshape it to look like a car;
• a PHASR rifle capable of blinding and disorienting anyone caught in its sights;
• a Taser shockwave that can electrocute a crowd of people at the touch of a button;
Shall we put the cards on the table?

- an XM2010 enhanced sniper rifle with built-in sound and flash suppressors that can hit a man-sized target nine out of ten times from over a third of a mile away;
- and an XM25 “Punisher” grenade launcher that can be programmed to accurately shoot grenades at a target up to 500 meters away.

In the hands of government agents, whether they are members of the military, law enforcement or some other government agency, these weapons have become accepted instruments of tyranny, routine parts of America’s day-to-day life, a byproduct of the rapid militarization of law enforcement over the past several decades.

This lopsided, top-heavy, authoritarian state of affairs is not the balance of power the founders intended for “we the people.”

The Second Amendment, in conjunction with the multitude of prohibitions on government overreach enshrined in the Bill of Rights, was
supposed to serve as a clear shackle on the government’s powers.

As 20th century libertarian Edmund A. Opitz observed in 1964, “No one can read our Constitution without concluding that the people who wrote it wanted their government severely limited; the words ‘no’ and ‘not’ employed in restraint of government power occur 24 times in the first seven articles of the Constitution and 22 more times in the Bill of Rights.”

To founders such as Thomas Jefferson, who viewed the government as a powerful entity that must be bound “down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution,” the right to bear arms was no different from any other right enshrined in the Constitution: it was intended to stand as a bulwark against a police state.

Without any one of those freedoms, we are that much more vulnerable to the vagaries of out-of-control policemen, benevolent dictators, genuflecting politicians, and overly ambitious bureaucrats.

Writing for Counterpunch, journalist Kevin Carson suggests that prohibiting Americans from
owning weapons would be as dangerously ineffective as Prohibition and the War on the Drugs:

“What strict gun laws will do is take the level of police statism, lawlessness and general social pathology up a notch in the same way Prohibition and the Drug War have done. I’d expect a War on Guns to expand the volume of organized crime, and to empower criminal gangs fighting over control over the black market, in exactly the same way Prohibition did in the 1920s and strict drug laws have done since the 1980s. I’d expect it to lead to further erosion of Fourth Amendment protections against search and seizure, further militarization of local police via SWAT teams, and further expansion of the squalid empire of civil forfeiture, perjured jailhouse snitch testimony, entrapment, planted evidence, and plea deal blackmail.

This is exactly what those who drafted the U.S. Constitution feared: that laws and law enforcers would be used as tools by a despotic government to wage war against the citizenry.
This phenomenon is what philosopher Abraham Kaplan referred to as the law of the instrument, which essentially says that to a hammer, everything looks like a nail.

As I explain in my book *Battlefield America: The War on the American People*, we the citizenry have become the nails to be hammered by the government’s battalion of laws and law enforcers (its police officers, technicians, bureaucrats, spies, snitches, inspectors, accountants, etc.), and we’re supposed to take the beatings without complaint or reproach.

**Now don’t get me wrong.**

I do not sanction violence, nor do I believe that violence should ever be the answer to our problems. As John Lennon warned, “When it gets down to having to use violence, then you are playing the system’s game.”

The establishment will irritate you—pull your beard, flick your face—to make you fight. Because once they’ve got you violent, then they know how to handle you.”
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Still there’s something to be said for George Orwell’s view that “that rifle hanging on the wall of the working-class flat or labourer’s cottage is the symbol of democracy—-

—It is our job to see that it stays there!”

The Second Amendment serves as a check on the political power of the ruling authorities. It represents an implicit warning against governmental encroachments on one’s freedoms—the warning shot over the bow to discourage any unlawful violations of our persons or property.

Certainly, dictators in past regimes have understood this principle only too well.

As Adolf Hitler noted, “The most foolish mistake we could possibly make would be to allow the subject races to possess arms.”
History shows that all conquerors who have allowed their subject races to carry arms have prepared their own downfall by so doing.”

It should come as no surprise, then, that starting in December 1935, Jews in Germany were prevented from obtaining shooting licenses, because authorities believed that to allow them to do so would “endanger the German population.”

In late 1938, special orders were delivered barring Jews from owning firearms, with the punishment for arms possession being 20 years in a concentration camp.

The rest, as they say, is history. Yet it is a history that we should be wary of repeating.
Shall we put the cards on the table?

Frank p
Has the thought occurred to you as you read this exchange, that those agents from the agencies representing themselves as our legitimate government are only pretending to be from the government? That the American people have no legitimate government…?

-Arnie, just one of the people…