

# Conspiracy to Commit Disarmament Terrorism

by Ronald F. Avery

Texas Architect

9/18/19

Submitted at the San Antonio 3rd Town Hall Meeting on Mass Shootings

Phil Hardberger Park Ecology Center - 8400 NW Military Highway

<http://LiveStream.com/RonAvery/StopThePresses>

Protected by the Texas Citizen Participation Act

What is disarmament terrorism and who is guilty of it and when? Before we can call something terrorism we need to know what terrorism really is. It is not simply the use of violence to cause fear and terror in the victim or the victim's class. This term has been improperly used over and over to the point that we think anyone who does violence is a terrorist because the act alone produces terror. We also need to know what conspiracy is and how to prove it. The term conspiracy has been continually used by law enforcement and government officials to the point that most people think there is no such thing as conspiracy. But there is indeed conspiracies in the real world and they are provable in a real court of law.

## ***Definitions:***

### **Terrorism:**

**The use of violence or the threat of violence in order to alter existing public policy or law.**

Therefore, if the object of the violence cannot be shown or is not perceived then the violent act is simply in violation of the law which produced fear as many crimes do. The object of the violence must be shown in order to correctly define it as terrorism. Simply causing terror is not terrorism in the legal sense. And it is improper to call someone who is advocating the enforcement of the current law of the land a terrorist as they are not calling for alteration of the law but rather the enforcement of the law or the preservation of current lawful society.

Just recently the FBI field office in Phoenix Arizona issued a finding that those who speak of conspiracy theories are potential terrorists. This makes no sense on the face of it. Conspiracies targeting the people of America or society have as their goal the alteration of current law or policy not the enforcement of the law. Those people speaking of conspiracies therefore are speaking to those who are trying to alter or abolish current law. When was the last time you heard of a conspiracy to get the government to follow or enforce the law. That's not a conspiracy that is self defense and defense of the nation and state. But those that do advocate the enforcement of the law of the land or the Bill of Rights and the second amendment are called "anti-government conspiracy theorist." But how can such an action be called "anti-government" when they are advocating the preservation of lawful government? All of this is the misuse of terminology to create fake enemies of society and take the public eye off tyranny and put it on innocent defenders of society. Cleaver but not logical.

Let's also take the Parkland Florida high school mass shooting as an example: Can we call Nikolas Cruz a terrorist in the legal sense? Has the government official story ever told us what the object of the shooting was? What public policy or law was Cruz trying to alter by shooting students at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School? The only cry for the alteration of public policy or law was from the students and parents and public officials. The role of student spokesmen was assumed by David Hogg who later turned out to not be a student at the school. So if that was the goal of the shooting then it would destroy its purpose to have the shooter declare their purpose. Who would be in favor of picking up all our guns at gun point? Who would be in favor of giving up their right to keep and bear arms under the threat of the use of guns? That would make no sense and no one would support such a threat. But if the shooter makes no declaration of goal and the only cry we hear is for "gun control" and alteration, violation or infringement of the second amendment, we can safely and rationally conclude that the shooter is either a lunatic or part of a conspiracy to disarm the public or both. Mr. Cruz would need others to cry out for "gun control" as he would not be able to do so to achieve his goal. If he had no goal, he is lunatic and it makes no sense to disarm America because of lunatics or terrorists either. Violence simply cannot be a justification for the disarmament of the people. The existence and rise of violence is rather the justification for the Second Amendment.

### **Conspiracy:**

**A combination or confederacy between two or more persons formed for the purpose of committing, by their joint efforts, some unlawful or criminal act, or some act which is lawful in itself, but becomes unlawful when done by the concerted action of the conspirators.** The goal or object of a conspiracy may be lawful but the means to achieve it may be unlawful like mass shootings.

The crime of conspiracy is distinct from the crime contemplated by the conspiracy. Some jurisdictions do not require an overt act as an element of the crime. Conspiracy alone is not a crime in Texas. A conspiracy may be to commit a crime or compel someone to do something that is lawful against their will. It's not unlawful to sell your house but if you are being coerced by a the efforts of a group of people to sell against your will that constitutes a conspiracy.

A conspiracy may be a continuing one; actors may drop out, and others drop in; the details of operation may change from time to time; the members need not know each other or the part played by others; **a member need not know all the details of the plan or the operations; he must, however, know the purpose of the conspiracy and agree to become a party to a plan to effectuate that purpose.**

### **Disarmament Terrorism:**

**The use of perceived violence to alter the law of the land under the Second Amendment of the US Constitution.** We must address potential goals of these increased mass shootings to reduce their occurrence.

First let's consider the fact that terrorism is hard to prove when its goal is to support the current law of the land or policy of the state. No one can be proven to be a terrorist by using violence to enforce the second amendment as that is already the current law of the

land. It would be much easier to prove some act is terrorism if it is intended to alter the current law of the land.

The use of violence to alter or abolish the second amendment is properly termed *disarmament terrorism* because the harm is done to alter or abolish the current law of the land. The perpetrator would not likely tell you that they are doing the violence to abolish or alter or infringe on the Second Amendment as that would likely defeat its purpose. Therefore other false justifications are given for the violence. That would explain the need to publish these so-called "manifestos" by mass shooters. These would of course be distraction from the real purpose. If the object or goal of the mass shooting is to infringe upon the second amendment then it cannot be expressed by the shooter or those calling for "gun control."

A conspiracy to commit Disarmament Terrorism is simply the agreement of parties to use violence to achieve their goal of altering the second amendment. The use of force to prevent the violation of the second amendment would not be terrorism but rather lawful defense. Aimlessly shooting people would not be a way to defend the second amendment. So we can safely determine that the object behind these mass shootings are not for the defense of the second amendment and maintenance of the law of the land but rather for the alteration or abolition of the second amendment.

**And as you now know the conspirators need not know one another or their role in the operations to achieve the goal. Those that do the violence need not be the one calling for the alteration of the current law, nor does the one calling for alteration of the current law need to be the one doing the violence for both to be guilty of the conspiracy to use violence to alter the law of the land.**

The purpose of this paper is to show that most of these mass shootings are not the mere acts of crazy people but that there is an effort, of varying degrees, behind them to alter the most essential law of the land. And it is not irrational to suggest such a thing based upon the fact that there is a federal program being implemented in America called "Freedom From War." This plan calls for the complete and total disarmament of the American people and the delivery of heavy armament to the UN making it the strongest force in the world assuring compliance of all nations to UN directives. The federal and state government would only retain small arms sufficient to maintain civil order or to oppress the people.

We also know that such a plan would be a hard sell in congress and the debate would be fierce but if mass shootings are described in a distorted fashion the people will demand their own disarmament. This is the new way laws are made and altered in America, namely, by scripted and managed events including acts of violence. Things that would not be supported in congress are demanded by a deceived people making it easy for tyrants to get what they want.

**It is most evident that there are many people in America that want to alter, abolish, or infringe upon the second amendment and they are willing (in agreement) to use the violence of others as their justification which is by definition "disarmament terrorism." When the evidence in these mass shootings is contradictory and unresolved we must logically consider the potential of a**

**conspiracy to commit disarmament terrorism. Most all of the mass shootings are of this nature.**

Why is it that there are conspiracies all over the television of every sort but if you think of them in reality you are labeled a "potential terrorist" by the FBI? Those who make these programs and put them on TV want you to believe in such things as entertainment but not in reality. When you shut off the TV you shut off fantasy and live in a perfect society absent of conspiracies and tyranny to alter your nation and way of life.

### ***Relevant Current Laws of all the States of Union under the Federal Constitution:***

#### **Murder:**

**It is against the law to kill someone unless it is in self defense.**

#### **Disarmament:**

**It is against the law to disarm someone or the whole people of the United States.**

#### ***Summary:***

Why is it that after a murder is committed with a gun that a large number of people want to harm innocent individuals or the whole people of America by disarming them? If anything is true, it is that the existence and growth of violence is more reason for the people to keep and bear arms for self protection from criminals and for use to protect the local community, state and nation from tyrants within and from enemies abroad.

Why violate the most necessary law of the land when a murder or multiple murders are committed with anything including guns? It is illogical to disarm people by violence of others. Disarmament Terrorism must be stopped by making sure that the second amendment is always enforced regardless of the increase in mass shootings. When the goal is understood to be unobtainable by mass shootings their frequency will diminish rapidly.

Those who are willing to use the violence of others, or mass shootings, to disarm the public are disarmament terrorists and should be arrested and charged as terrorists. Murder is against the law and the advocacy of murder is against the law. Disarmament is against the law and so is the advocacy of disarmament. The second amendment is the only defense to abject tyranny and the only reason to disarm the people is so they will be defenseless against tyranny. Disarmament is the most serious crime against society and it should not be achieved by mass shootings. Those who say that mass shootings are a reasonable and just cause for the disarmament of the people are disarmament terrorists and should be arrested and tried as such.