

Christopher A. Brown
POB 61925
Santa Barbara CA 93160
christopheralfredbrown@gmail.com
805-967 4055

Randy E. Barnett
Carmack Waterhouse Professor of Legal Theory
Georgetown University Law Center
600 New Jersey Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20001

1/14/16

RE: The American lawful and peaceful revolution.

Dear Randy E. Barnett,

I cannot express how refreshing this was to read.

"So members of the Council on Foreign Relations are turning against each other, and Randy Barnett is a very intelligent Attorney, this NAFTA, TPP, TPA, EU Concept is connected to the United Kingdom, England, Mr. Barnett has made it very clear, that the Constitution has been infiltrated and altered to serve the needs of the Central Banking System of England and now the United Nations, wants to take over the whole Ball Game."

I understand you are supportive of an Article V convention. Excellent! However, there may be a serious problem if it is not done correctly, and I'm not convinced that the structure in place is safe from manipulation. Accordingly, this communication is to inform you of a possible problem and of my effort to assure that all amendments at Article V have constitutional intent. I've learned that almost no one is certain what constitutional intent is, particularly the most prime intents. That must change.

Have you seen the video of Mark Levin at the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) meeting in Washington, D.C. on December 4, 2014. Sponsored by the Convention of States (COS) Project?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r6xEHPkYE1g>

See what he says at 9:37 - again at 10:14 "Less than 70 of you in the same room. Two from each state." He is talking fast, perhaps trying to make it confusing, so I've paraphrased. Then at 29:30 to 30:30 he describes many more people involved related to rejecting fears of a runaway convention.

During the height of OWS, I was on their forum and people were trying to say I was working with/for ALEC. To prove them wrong I created an online petition. Covert agents at OWS working with admin colluded to misrepresent me to sabotage my efforts. That petition died. Fifteen user names were banned before I gave up. Since then made two petitions to both ALEC and COS. None received support.

<http://www.thepetitionsite.com/956/975/440/does-alec-really-want-an...>

<http://www.thepetitionsite.com/298/672/130/do-cos-and-alec-really-w...>

I had done quite a bit of research to try and connect ALEC with COS, which seems a lot more on the level of the people. I could not connect them. However, neither ALEC or COS would respond to my inquiries about the concept of preparatory amendment to assure all amendments have constitutional intent. Now I find out that they are obviously working together!

Since then I've dialoged with people at the westernfreepress.com, who seem to be close to COS, and they are not showing they have interest in constitutional intent. I've discovered a massive covert infiltration in all web forums that unaccountably attack my proposal for what I call "Our lawful and peaceful revolution".

It's actually quite simple, particularly for one such as yourself with your background. It is strictly rooted in the ideals of the constitution. I've used some exclusive education I have from Indigenous Americans who were present and very influential in development of the framing documents from about 1744 forward. I will keep this as short and simple as possible for you by first making the inquiry that all Americans will need to do in order to become "the rightful masters of the congress and the courts". This is the basis for the people educating themselves into using law to purify politics.

Do you agree and accept that the framers of the founding documents intended for us to alter or abolish government destructive to our unalienable rights?

Do you agree and accept that the framers intended the ultimate purpose of free speech to enable the unity adequate to effectively alter or abolish?

The next step is an agreement between the people that the 9th amendment describes how the American people, if decided in a large enough group, can define a right to prepare for Article V to assure that all amendments have constitutional intent. Preparation includes revising the 1st amendment to end the abridging of the purpose of free speech, securing the vote and campaign finance reform by amendment of the federal and states constitutions of 3/4 of the states. No further amendment takes place until the people can pass their own tests and assure they can define constitutional intent.

At a point, perhaps 5,000 citizens per state who are mobile and active, with many more signing an online petition, serve a petition with the above inquiry expanded to include this entire concept, on the least constitutional member of their state legislation. The representative explains to the rest of the legislation that they too will be served in 45 days the same petition and that the one served is being used to make an example of the people's power of agreement upon constitutional intent under the constitution.

After 45 days, the response or lack thereof, from the state legislator served the petition; if not responding, or failing to agree with and accept the defined constitution intent relating to alter or abolish and the purpose of free speech, the 9th amendment and its use to prepare; another petition is drafted to all of the state legislators asking for their agreement upon the duty of impeaching the state legislator. The justification is that the legislator has proven they cannot represent the people at an Article V convention because only the people can define constitutional intent, not congress, not the court, not the president, not the senate and not states legislators and the legislator refuses the peoples definitions. That legislator is prepared to deprive the people of their right to have all amendments with constitutional intent pursuant to Article V.

At this point the people learn if their state has any intention of recognizing and following the constitution for the united states of America, or their states constitution.

My guess is that many legislators will realize that the people are leading, and they will follow. If not, the state supreme court is challenged in the impeachment issue to explain how the framers intended for Americans to enable their unity adequate to alter or abolish government destructive to unalienable rights, if free speech was not to serve the purpose of enabling that unity.

State by state is controlled this way by the people and their agreement, until 3/4 of the states are ready to have conventions within them proposing amendments. All 3/4 propose preparatory amendment, and all 3/4 ratify.

IMPLEMENTATION: Through their invocation of their first amendment right; citizens who qualify by a petition with 200 signatures; are provided a court order by their states supreme court, with the application for the order carried by the state legislator served with the petition, ordering the largest television media corporation in the state to produce a 30 minute or 60 minute production with content completely controlled by the petitioning citizen. Qualification would have to meet these requirements following and the challenge to the petition would be in that court.

REQUIREMENTS:

The information must be vital for the defense of unalienable rights. It must not be generally available by virtue of the majority not even knowing what to search for on the internet. The petition signers attest to this. The information to be made available to the majority must require at least \$100,000 dollars worth of publicity to be made available to the national public in places of prominence where it would be expected that a majority, within 6 months would be aware of the threat to unalienable rights the information represents.

Completely idealistic to be certain, but never the less, I believe that it is all completely lawful, and actually fairly close to what the framers envisioned for Article V under the worst case scenario, something like what we have right now. Your written opinion on the lawfulness of this proposal will go a long ways towards defense, preservation and enforcement of our constitution. Any way you might provide that, if you will, would be most welcomed.

There is another matter you may have interest in, and may provide assistance with. The 9th circuit district court made a secret revision in 2005 of local court rules dramatically impacting pro se civil rights. The separate section title "Assignments of Magistrates and Judges" was removed with no note of revision. Now, none of the circuit courts have that section. The particular rule automatically assigned a new magistrate and judge to a pro se civil rights suit filed, dismissed, then re-filed with new co-plaintiffs. The ACLU has no interest, but perhaps you do. If you could locate a copy and send it to me, America will deeply be indebted to you.

Thank you sincerely for reading, be safe and be well Randy E. Barnett!

Christopher A. Brown

