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OVERVIEW

Pursuant to the matter of Raland J. Brunson vs. Alma S. Adams, et, al., Thomas Carmalt Blow II (hereafter referred to as Thomas Blow), submits this Amicus Curiae on behalf of the Petitioner(s) Raland J. Brunson and *"We The People."*

## BASIS

### Thomas Blow is a retired US Air Force Major with three Masters degrees and trained in research by a PhD while serving a three year tour in the Air Force’s think-tank, the Airpower Research Institute, as a military doctrine analyst. Thomas Blow has invested several man years of labor in reviewing ongoing events in the United States, reading books, writing essays (especially responses to internet-posted videos), to piece together (in part through a process called *discernment)* what has gone wrong with America (versus the intent of the Constitution) and deriving a set of specific reforms to legislative and Constitutional law to ensure that, if the malefactors causing chaos and destruction in the United States are removed, they will not then be replaced by others repeating the same destructive activities. The consequent book is freely available [here](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HCzGbI8-LJGIhffft5SptEtD0P19D2q6/view) (https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HCzGbI8-LJGIhffft5SptEtD0P19D2q6/view).

Loy Brunson has publicly called for supporting Amicus briefs and this is a response to that call.

This Amicus brief is also a response to the US Judiciary and the US Federal Government that believes it may do what it wishes with immunity for its decisions. Thomas Jefferson: “When the government fears the people, there is Liberty. When The People fear the government, there is Tyranny.” *Governmental Immunity is by its inherent nature Tyrannical.* Also, Jefferson wrote: “…it becomes necessary to dissolve the political bands…(in order to assume)…the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature (i.e., Natural Law)…entitle(s) them”. This latter statement from the Declaration Of Independence summarizes the primary Intent Of The Constitution as a document to secure the Rights of The People under Natural Law. Therefore one of the intentions of this Brief is to state flatly that the duty of the Supreme Court of the United States is wholly dysfunctional if it simply interprets the Constitution. It must judge instead by the Constitution’s Intent which is to preserve the rights of The People that are *self-evident*, as stated also in the Declaration Of Independence,

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such forms, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.”

This Amicus Brief is also a response to the Court which has demonstrated by failing to hear Brunson vs Adams, et al, as ruled on 6 January 2022, that it is *not* providing We The People with Assured Recourse, which is the basis of Justice, but instead is tipping the scales of Justice in favor of whomever it pleases them to do so. This alone *violates* the rights of The People (including Raland Brunson and Thomas Blow) to be heard, as they are *not* granted a *hearing* on a subject which is so simply explained and obvious that to a generally-educated observer it is *obvious and self-evident.* It is *doubly* egregious that such a statement must be made to public servants who purport to be experts on and conservators of the Constitution, but through their actions, demonstrate no such ability or intent, or the wisdom which would drive their actions in support of The People.

Therefore, Thomas Blow, aware of his right to present a **Motion to be Admitted as an Amicus** and offer his thoughts and opinions pursuant to this specific case before the courts, through this process of **Motion to be Admited as an Amicus** (Rule 37), files this brief. In this matter, Thomas Blow petitions for redress of grievances herein as authorized by Article I of the Constitution, the Supreme Law of the Land, hence requiring no inferior state or federal statute to do so.

ARGUMENT

1. Natural Law

# The Declaration of Independence is often cited as having passages which indicate the Intent of the Constitution. In that respect it is worth citing the work of Carl Becker who wrote a book, The Declaration Of Independence, in 1922 (ref <https://archive.org/details/cu31924019911670>). Becker states in Chapter 2, titled “Historical Antecedents of the Declaration: The Natural Rights Philosophy” that “Whether the political philosophy of the Declaration is true or false has been much discussed. In the late 18th century it was widely accepted as a commonplace.” The chapter title and this statement lead us to the idea that the Declaration is only an expression of the Natural Rights philosophy. Also, it implies that later in our history there was *not* such an acceptance, basically because, according to Thomas Paine, “What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: it is dearness only that gives every thing its value.” (ref. <https://gutenberg.org/ebooks/3741>.) Prosperity bred a prosperous middle class in the US that had less use for recourse to secure their rights, hence the discussion of natural rights fell in favor of those specifically secured by language in the Constitution.

It is important to provide an example of an essay discussing a Natural Right, in order to show its relevance to today. One such is the Philosophy Of Liberty” as written by Dr Ken Schoolland (link <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V1sX1qkngSg>):

"The Philosophy of Liberty is based upon the principle of self-ownership. You own your life. To deny this is to claim that another person has a higher claim on your life than you do. No other person or group of persons owns your life, nor do you own the lives of others. You exist in time: past, present, and future. This is manifest in Life, Liberty, and the product of your Life and Liberty. To lose your Life is to lose your Future. To lose your Liberty is to lose your Present. And to lose the product of your Life and Liberty is to lose your Past that produced it. A product of your Life and your Liberty is your property. Property is the fruit of your Time, Energy, and Talents. Property is that part of Nature which you turn to valuable use. Property is the property of others that is given to you by voluntary exchange and mutual consent. Two people who exchange property are better off or they wouldn't do it. Only they may rightfully make that decision for themselves. At times some people use Force or Fraud to take from others without voluntary consent. The initiation of Force or Fraud to take a life is murder; to take liberty is slavery, and to take property is theft. It is the same whether one person is acting alone, or the many are acting against the few, or even by officials with fine hats. You have the right to protect your own Life, Liberty, and justly acquired Property from the forceful aggression of others. And you may ask others to help defend you, but you do not have the right to initiate force against the life, liberty, and property of others. Thus, you have no right to designate some other person to initiate force against others on your behalf. You have the right to seek leaders for yourself, but you have no right to impose rulers upon others. No matter how officials are selected, they are only human beings, and they have no rights or claims that are higher than those of any other human beings. Regardless of the imaginative labels for their behavior, or the numbers of people encouraging them, officials have no right to murder, to enslave, or to steal. You cannot give them any rights you do not have yourself. Since you own your life, you are responsible for your life. You do not rent your life from others who demand your obedience. Nor are you a slave to others who demand your sacrifice. You choose your own goals based on your own values. Success and failure are both the necessary incentives to learn and grow. Your action on behalf of others or their action on behalf of you is virtuous only when it is derived from voluntary mutual consent. For virtue can only exist when there is free choice. This is the basis of a truly free society. It is not only the most practical and humanitarian foundation for human action, but also the most ethical. Problems in the world that arise from the initiation of force by government have a solution. The solution is for the people of the earth to STOP asking government officials to initiate force on their behalf. Evil

does not arise only from evil people, but from good people who tolerate the initiation of force to their own ends. In this manner, good people have empowered evil people throughout history. Having confidence in a free society is to focus on the process of discovery in the marketplace of values, rather than to focus on some imposed vision or goal. Using governmental force to impose a vision on others is intellectual sloth and typically results in unintended, perverse consequences. Achieving a free society requires courage to think, to talk, and to act, especially when it is easier to do nothing."

The conclusion of the discussion above is basically that Socialism, because it creates a claim on someone else’s labor, is by its nature a form of slavery. It would be Wrong for the highest court in a nation to deny the validity of this reasoned statement because it did not appear in its constitution. However, it is worth noting that within the Constitution resides an argument that Socialism is, in fact, criminal. Loy Brunson makes this argument in his book The Constitution of the United States of America (link <https://7discoveries.com/collections/all/products/pocket-constitution-pdf-only>):

Although not mentioned in the United

States Constitution, socialism—a philosophy

of government hatched in the bowels of

oppressed European nations too late for the

Founding Fathers to take note of it—directly

contradicts both the spirit and letter of the

Constitution. In fact, socialism is an existential

threat to Constitutional government.

Based on Articles III and VI and

Amendments V, IX, and XIII of the United

States Constitution—the fundamental law

of the land that is to be held inviolate—it is a

crime, a felony, to promote the insidious foreign

philosophy of socialism in the United

States of America, because:

1. Socialism is involuntary servitude, which,

according to Amendment XIII, is against the

law in every state.

2. Socialism permits (encourages) having

your private property (your money and

possessions) taken from you for public use

without just compensation, which, according to

the last line of Amendment V, is against the

law. It is theft, pure and simple.

3. Under socialism, your private property

(your money and possessions) is often taken

from you against your will for the benefit

of foreign governments, which in some cases

amounts to giving aid and comfort to enemies

of the United States. According to Article III,

Section 3, of the U.S. Constitution, that is an

act of treason. (See 18 U.S. Code § 2381.)

4. When two or more people work together

in order to commit a misdemeanor, the crime

rises to the level of a felony. It is a crime of

felony theft when two or more legislators act

together in order to have your property taken

from you for the sole purpose of giving it to a

foreign government or someone else.

5. When legislators work together to make

laws in order to take your private property

(your money and possessions) against your

will, they are violating their oath of office,

which includes the binding commitment to

defend the Constitution against all enemies,

foreign and domestic. With this action they

automatically become enemies of the United

States Constitution and are therefore enemies

of the United States and should be warned of

or charged with felony crimes of perjury, treason,

conspiracy theft, and oath-breaking.

It is well worth understanding that though in this case the Constitution reflects Natural Law, it is self evident that when Socialism was first introduced to the United States in the form of the “Great Society” of Lyndon Johnson, and later consecrated by the phrase “kinder, gentler government”, that The People as well as the Courts were unaware of where this path would lead. Now, by live test, we have a well-demonstrated result which The Court should accept as self-evident. Socialism is the most important cause of the departure from the Intent of the Constitution to create a society based on protecting human rights and instead is oriented toward redistributing Other People’s Money, a society based upon materialism rather than respect, human dignity, and honesty. The existence of a government in which it is accepted that one may advocate the destruction of human rights so long as it benefits a majority by redistributing the wealth of others to its political group, the existence of this as permissible in government, creates an “every man for himself” atmosphere in which anything one does that is sanctioned by legislated law, so there are no consequences, is fine. In fact, government actions that violate natural law are in fact criminal, they *criminalize* government. Government becomes a simple political struggle for other people’s money, with little or no common ground for the functions Good Government. This entire idea of government is dysfunctional and ignores the iceberg hitting the ship, while rearranging deck chairs.

Perhaps no citizen has ever made this argument to the Court but isn’t it about time? However, this example is related to an additional relief this Amicus brief seeks, as will be evident in questions put to the Court and stated in the summation.

1. Specific argument in Natural Law

Government is (or should be) a social contract by The People that is freely entered into and demands allegiance as part of the contract. There is also an idea called The American Idea which is reflected in the word “Liberty”. This Idea is considered the entire difference between The United States and other nations, because the United States was founded to secure it. Other nations are not founded on an Idea. It would seem logical that, if this Idea is the basis of the nation, that acceptance of that Idea would be fundamental to the social contract enabling Citizenship. However, for reasons unknown, an understanding and acknowledgement of this Idea is not required for voting. This is probably another influence that has degraded an awareness over the years, among citizens, such that the intent of the Constitution has been able to be freely ignored by its government. However, as earlier observed, the United States has descended into such chaos that the Sleeping Giant has again awakened, and men cry out for Liberty. They cry out to the Court for Liberty. Yet, so far, their case will not even be *heard.*

The right to vote is a fundamental right within a Republican form of government, which, in fact, the Constitution *guarantees*. Who is going to enforce that Guarantee? Is the Court willing to do this? Or, by omission, will the Court be stating, “No, the whole idea of self-government was a ridiculous dream; Liberty is a fantasy; The People need to take orders from their betters; none of Thomas Jefferson's writings amount to a hill of beans.” This statement would also establish an understanding of the scope of tyranny in this present government and the inability of any branch of the government to resist it. However, in the view of the complainant, the frog is no longer going to sit and wait for the pot to boil. If the Court wants to end this Tyranny in a legal manner, that would help avoid a considerable amount of additional suffering among the nation and also *some* consequences for those currently in government. There is no downside to doing this, as the nation is so aware of what is going on now that even even if draconian measures are introduced to perpetuate the tyranny, it will provoke an even greater response by The People that will overwhelm the tyranny.

Brunson vs. Adams, et al, makes the case that the rights of The People were violated because those calling for investigation of the election fraud were shouted down despite a clear requirement for the Constitution to conduct an investigation.

If the Court does not side with Brunson in this suit, it is also clear that those voting against Brunson are “adhering to the enemy” and without Honor, and deserve the same fate as the legislators who suppressed the investigation.

The Court does *not* function in an elite cocoon with no consequences.

ALLEGED MATERIAL FACTS

# The Petitioner asks the Court itself first to establish certain initial facts by way of a request for Declaratory Judgment on the following questions.

Wikipedia [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oath\_of\_office](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oath_of_office" \t "https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "sent/_blank) “Some oaths of office are statements of allegiance and loyalty to a [constitution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Constitution" \o "Constitution" \t "https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "sent/_blank) …Under the laws of a state, it may be considered [treason](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treason" \o "Treason" \t "https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "sent/_blank) or a [high crime](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High_crimes_and_misdemeanours" \o "High crimes and misdemeanours" \t "https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "sent/_blank) to betray a sworn oath of office.”

1. Is it treason or a high crime for a US federal officer (civilian or military) to *knowingly*violate his oath of office?

2. If one violates but doesn’t *knowingly*violate the Oath, is it *prima facie*evidence the violator is unqualified for public office (due to ineptitude)?

Wikipedia ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treason\_laws\_in\_the\_United\_States](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treason_laws_in_the_United_States" \t "https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "sent/_blank))

states Treason is defined on the federal level in [Article III](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Article_Three_of_the_United_States_Constitution" \o "Article Three of the United States Constitution" \t "https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "sent/_blank), Section 3 of the [United States Constitution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Constitution" \o "United States Constitution" \t "https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "sent/_blank) as: "only in levying War against [the United States], or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort."

3. Does Treason apply only in war?

4. Is the Oath Of Office only binding in war?

5. Is the US at war via irregular warfare (e.g., between the US and the CCP, the WEF, Big Pharma, MSM, et al)?

6. Is the US rendered vulnerable to irregular warfare by Socialism, which instills materialism as a greater value than supporting and defending the Constitution?

7. Is Socialism a root cause motivating respondents to neglect their Constitutional duty?

8. Can a modern nation function that only requires allegiance in time of war?

Wikipedia ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High\_crimes\_and\_misdemeanors](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High_crimes_and_misdemeanors" \t "https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "sent/_blank)) “A high crime is one that can be done only by someone in a unique position of authority, which is political in character, who does things to circumvent justice.”

9. If the US is not at war, is it a high crime (and *not*treason) to knowingly violate the Oath, even if it deliberately serves the purposes of a foreign power to the detriment of the US?

Further Facts:

FACT - The PETITIONER’s Action is brought against 388 Respondents.

FACT - The Respondents have taken the required Oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and as such they are liable for consequences when they violate the Oath of Office.

FACT - Respondents were properly warned and were requested to make an investigation into a highly covert swift and powerful enemy, as stated below, seeking to destroy the U.S. Constitution and the United States, purposely thwarted all efforts to investigate this, whereupon this enemy was not checked or investigated, therefore the Respondents adhered to this enemy.

FACT - The Respondents’ intentional refusal to investigate this enemy, motivated the Petitioner, Brunson, to bring his action against the Respondents because he was seriously personally damaged and violated by the action of Respondents, and consequently this action unilaterally violated the rights of every citizen of the U.S.A. and perhaps the rights of every person living “we the people”), along with all courts of law.

FACT - On January 6, 2021, the 117th Congress held a proceeding and debate in Washington DC. The Proceeding was for the purpose of counting votes under the 2020 Presidential election for the President and Vice President of the United States under Amendment XII.

FACT - During the Proceeding over 100 members of U.S. Congress claimed factual evidence that the said election was rigged. The refusal of the Respondents to investigate this congressional claim is an act of treason and fraud by Respondents. A successfully rigged election has the same end result as an act of war; to place into power whom the victor wants, which in this case is Biden, who, if not stopped immediately, will continue to destroy the fundamental freedoms of Brunson and all U.S. Citizens (“We The People”) and the courts of law.

FACT - Brunson’s case represents a national security breach on an unprecedented level, never seen before, seriously damaging and violating Brunson, his brothers, and collectively every citizen of the U.S.A. (“We The People’s”) rights, and the courts of law.

FACT - Despite the grave importance of this case, the trial courts granted the Respondents’ motion to dismiss by stating Brunson’s action was dismissed without prejudice.”

FACT - Brunson’s opposition (which was not properly addressed by the lower courts) has standing and this Court has full proper jurisdiction to rule on the merits of this case.

FACT - Dismissing a case for “lack of standing” is now well-known among The People as a highly over-used excuse for justice denied by corrupt courts at all levels, and the further use of this as an excuse for not hearing this case would either demean the Court or show it for what it really is, as the facts of and rightful ruling for this case are both obvious to even the casual, honest observer. Ruling for “lack of standing” would be an insult to every citizen of the United States, saying to them, they cannot file pro se, they must be “special”, that is, justice is only for elites (aka “Just Us”).

ACKNOWLEDGED OBSERVATIONS AND FACTS

The Constitution of the United States and those of the several States do not grant rights to the People. These instruments were designed to measure, bank, curb, and cool the power of the rulers but in no way do they measure the rights of the governed, nor are they the origin of The People’s rights but rather acknowledge the existence of unalienable rights. The US Constitution and the State constitutions were put in place to protect individual person’s rights from the government and other people. Therefore, the statutes and case law cited by Respondents claiming immunity from Brunson’s claims are unconstitutional and the Court needs to rule in that manner. The Oath Of Office proves that the false doctrine of “absolute immunity” is a complete fallacy by the simple fact that the oath-taker solemnly swears and promises to protect the Constitution from both enemies foreign and domestic, and the Constitution says this is a *binding* oath. In other words, taking an oath of office does *not* crown the person as a king “who can do no wrong” for they then would be incapable of sedition, treason, or any wrongdoing. Further, it is *not* the intent of the Constitution to establish an elite class of rulers who may do what they please with no consequences, and any court, legislator, or other government officer who said this would suffer the wrath of the Nation.

This Amicus Curiae invokes and endorses Brunson’s use of the First Amendment of the Constitution which states:

Congress shall make no law prohibiting the right of the people to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The courts have consistently held that fraud vitiates whatever it touched, *Morris v. House,* 32 Tex. 492 (1870)”.

#### As per declaration by the U.S. Constitution, this court is lawfully endowed with authority to remove the Respondents from their offices under 18 U.S. Code § 2381 which states:

“Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than $10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States.”

The Respondents, who have taken the Oath of Office, and have, in fact, actually violated their oath of office — whether intentionally, ignorantly or stupidly, it matters not — and as such have adhered to a domestic enemy, and must be removed from their office, as correctly suggested by Brunson.

Brunson does have an unfettered right to sue the Respondents under the serious nature of his claim, and no legislation can measure Brunson’s right to sue the Respondents. Furthermore, Brunson’s allegations against Respondents’ adhering to a domestic enemy, and committing acts of fraud are not protected be any kind of legislation of jurisdictional immunity. Essentially, acts of Congress cannot protect fraud, nor protect the violation of the Oath or that give aid and comfort to enemies of the United States Constitution or America as alleged in Brunson’s complaint against the Respondents.

It is an incontestable fact that the Respondents committed fraud and treason breaching national security, thus adhering themselves to a domestic enemy that continues to breach our national security on a daily basis. This national security breach is having the same end result as an act of war; to place into power the one whom the Respondents want. which in this instant case was one Joseph Biden and a host of others. **Therefore, this Court must immediately grant to Brunson the removal from office of all trespassing Respondents and grant the damages he seeks in his complaint. It is necessary to secure our national security while there is an opportunity to secure it, and to do so without any further delay.**

#### Jurisprudence requires this Court to revoke the doctrine of equitable maxim that it created and to instill the doctrine of the object principle of justice more thoroughly throughout the entire court system in America.

**SUPREME COURT RULE 14(F) PROVISIONS**

Amendment I of the Constitution of the United States:

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting ... the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

Article VI of the Constitution.

“This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made Pursuance thereof; ...shall be the supreme Law of the land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby.”

Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

“... Nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law... nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

Section 3:

“No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any state, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any state legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any state, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.”

### Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution:

“No person shall...be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law...” Ninth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States; “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

Finally, the US Supreme Court's ruling will confirm this Court's position as to whether public opinion does, in fact. matter.

Through the matter before this Court, we see that the Judicial System has become dysfunctional and inefficient, at best, and very corrupt at its worst. Certain laws have been passed and actions taken that, in effect, reward (pay money, perks, or subsidies) to those who are willing to subvert the law.

As a society it seems that we have allowed an ideological division of The People against each other, and it is time to question whether or not our governing system will provide the protections that are guaranteed by the Constitution.

One only needs to review local news sources in virtually any city in American to see that something is greatly amiss. In fact, many of those sources have been referenced to the concerns raised herein. *“Where there is smoke, there is fire!”* The Cambridge Dictionary of American Idioms suggests the meaning of this phrase is, *"if it looks like something is wrong, something is probably wrong."*

Therefore, "We T*he People"* of this community raise our voice of warning that something appears to have been seriously amiss in the 2020 elections and Congress should have taken the required time to investigate the alleged violations!

Lord Acton reminds us fat *“Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men, even when they exercise influence and not authority; still more when you add the tendency of the certainty of corruption by authority,“* and serves as a reminder of a local vernacular which states: *”We have learned by sad experience that it is the nature and disposition of almost all men. as soon as they get a little authority, ... they will immediately begin to exercise unrighteous dominion.“* Lord Acton cautions us wit an understanding that no matter how hard we try, *“the will of the people, whether in a tyranny of majority or by individuals cannot resist that which is unjust”.*

The actions of the Respondent(s) in this matter appear to be intent on the DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW in violation of 18 U.S. Code § 242 and CONSPIRACY AGAINST CIVIL RIGHTS under 18 U.S. Code § 241:

**USC** 18 **Code** § 242 - **Deprivation of Rights** Under **Color of Law** - Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State the deprivation of any rights shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; (USC 42 §1983) includes judges specifically / highest punishment = death)

**18 U.S. Code** § 241 - **Conspiracy Against (Privileges, Immunities and] Rights** - If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured — They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

### Actions which were designed to defraud the Petitioner and “we *the people”* along with:

#### 42 U.S. Code § **1983** - **Civil** Action **for Deprivation of Rights** - Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, sh&1 be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except fat in any action brou@t against a judicid officer for an act or omission taken in such officer’s judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia

**18 U.S. Code** § 2381 - **Treason** - Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than $10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States.

In the next two code cites it must first be noted that by definition and statute when a government official is advised of possible treason and/or sedition, that the official who does not investigate the allegation of potential treason and/or sedition may be found guilty and punished for same, for having not acted to investigate and address such criminal actions to root them out from the body politic.

**18 U.S. Code** § 2382 - **Misprision of Treason** - Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States and having knowledge of the commission of any treason against them, conceals and does not, as soon as may be, disclose and make known the same to the President or to some judge of the United States, or to the governor or to some judge or justice of a particular State, is guilty of misprision of treason and shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than seven years, or both.

**18 U.S. Code** § 2384 - **Seditious Conspiracy** - If two or more persons in any State or Territory, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, conspire to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States, or by **force** to **seize,** take, or possess any property of the United States contrary to the authority thereof, they shall each be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.

There is ample evidence presented in Brunson's motion and this Friend of the Court Brief to show that Brunson’s claims have plausible merit. The Respondent(s) in concert with others have conspired to cause harm and have willfully sought the destruction of Brunson’s (and "*We The People’s)* Rights, which lies at the heart of this matter.

The public corruption discussed herein may well fall under The RICO Act, which focuses specifically on racketeering and it allows the leaders of a syndicate to be tried for the crimes, which the order others to do or assisted them in doing, closing a perceived loophole that allowed a person who instructed someone else to, for example, murder to be exempt from the trial because they did not actually commit the crime personally.

Therefore, it is incumbent upon you, Your Honors, as officers of the Court and Servants of *We the People,* to bring this out into the light of day and expeditiously restore law and order to the nation.

**CONCLUSION**

The Brunson petition has been submitted, in the interest of justice, seeking protection of Brunson’s right to petition for a redress of grievances against Brunson, and ensuing that his (and our) right of due process against the encroachment of the doctrine of equitable maxim, and charging those Respondents, who failed to investigate the allegations of a rigged election, of TREASON and removing them from office without further delay, and prosecuting them to the fullest extent of the law.

##### "DUE PROCESS OF LAW"

The Constitution and the Bill or Rights guarantee several specific rights of "We T*he People,"* many of which have been discussed above. In addition to these narrowly defined rights also provide the broad guarantee that no one shall be deprived of "life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

The "due process" guarantee includes the rights outlined in the Constitution as well as others not specifically mentioned. In fact, some observers have referred to the due process clauses as the "wild card" of the Constitution because of the opportunity they provide for the judiciary to interpret individual rights expansively. In the simplest of terms, however, the due process guarantees of the Constitution assures that everyone will be treated equitably, as promised by Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan, in the courts as "level *playing fields"* where citizens receive *"equal justice,"* as so engraved on the front of the Supreme Court building: *"Equal Justice Under Law."*

SUMMATION

1. Brunson has an air-tight case that Respondents neglected and ignored their Constitutional duty to investigate fraud in the 2020 election despite a binding oath to do so.
2. If an oath is binding it must have consequences if broken.
3. The relief sought of removal, disqualification, and vulnerability to further prosecution for treason and/or sedition seems just and necessary to preserve the Constitution.
4. Regardless of the Constitution, this Amicus brief asserts that by Natural Law, which is the basis for the Constitution and embodies its intent, the Court has the duty to grant the relief sought, as otherwise it stands by and watches a foreign power capture the United States Of America by irregular warfare, while also shirking its sworn oath to uphold and defend the Constitution from all enemies, foreign and domestic.
5. In addition to the relief sought by Brunson, this Amicus brief seeks additional relief as necessary; specifically, a declaration by the Court that **Socialism Is Unconstitutional**. Such a declaration addresses a root cause and very probably the major root cause of Respondents’ neglect of duty. But further, such a declaration would have a wide-ranging effect on legislation and legislative reforms going forward, and thus be an incredibly powerful curative for the United States to embrace the intent of the Constitution.
6. This Amicus brief asserts the relief sought by Brunson plus the further relief sought in item 5 above are all necessary immediately to avoid a situation in which the vast majority of an armed citizenry become aware of a fraudulent, treasonous, parasitic, and exploitative government, willing to expose them to genocidal harm and to become the puppets of a foreign power. In that situation it is obvious there will be retributive justice, not only for those who engaged in the genocidal fraud, but for any and all officials of any branch who gave aid and comfort to the enemy that promulgated it. This will be avoided if it is observed that the cancer is being removed and proof against recurrence is put in place.
7. **Action by the Court should not be delayed by any advice by the Military about coordinating actions worldwide, etc., as such delays could be based upon fraud also, those urging caution and delay could have ulterior motives, and they have no basis for staying the hand of Justice. Justice must be served regardless of what the Military wants, it is not a matter of military convenience. An awake, armed citizenry are NOT going to stand for waiting for delayed Justice, and if this gets out of control, especially after several more athletes collapse on live television, there is no shortage of empty lampposts in America, and those who have wronged America will face vigilant, summary justice.**

For a society to work, the members of the society must have a common agreement between them; one which would allow the attainment of what each individual needs; physically, emotionally, intellectually, economically and spiritually. In return each individual is responsible to serve society to the best of that individual's talents and abilities. Socialism replaces Duty, Honor, and Country with materialism, disregard for rights, parasitism, and treason, while in the sheep’s clothing of Charity.

The “Principles of Good Business°“ seemingly reflect a common thought that each of us must have: 1) A Stewardship of Responsibility; 2) Adherence to Ethical Standards; 3) The creation of Abundance; 4) A Pledge to Do No Harm; and 5) A Duty to give Back to the Community. Simple principles, that when followed, form the moral basis of a free society and guarantee the trust and confidence of our communities through a common acknowledgement of our expectations.

Even to the casual observer, there appears to be a preponderance of evidence to show that basic rights afforded "we the people" have been repeatedly violated and it is the duty of the Court to apply a curative.
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