



Hillary Clinton's General Intent

Toddy Littman, Wednesday 19 August 2015 - 08:28:07

First, I would not for a moment assume I know the mind of Progressive and faithful to her well documented cheating husband, Hillary Rodham Clinton, who has, by staying with Bill and hiding behind his former Presidency in inference to why her email server is safe, has probably done more as a role model of failure for feminist causes than most women in America. I mean, to think they were broke after leaving the White House begs the question, then why did she stay with Bill? ...Yeah, very difficult to fathom there is a sentient being inside Hillary Clinton's body, unless channeling the blind loyalty of a 1950's housewife. No, instead this is a *Matrix*-like discussion, such as this one between Morpheus and Neo before Neo downs the red pill, italic emphasis of most pertinent parts to general intent : Morpheus: I imagine that, right now, you're feeling a bit like Alice [in Wonderland], tumbling down the rabbit hole? Neo: You could say that. Morpheus: I can see it in your eyes. *You have the look of a man who accepts what he sees because he's expecting to wake up.* Ironically this is not far from the truth....*Do you believe in fate Neo?* Neo: No. Morpheus: Why not? Neo: *Because I don't like the idea that I'm not in control of my life.* Morpheus: *I know exactly what you mean....*Let me tell you why you're here. *You're here because you know something. What you know you can't explain, but you feel it. You felt it your entire life, that there's something wrong with the world.* You don't know what it is but it's there, like a splinter in your mind, driving you mad. It is this feeling that has brought you to me....*Do you know what I am talking about?* Neo: Matrix? Morpheus: Do you want to know what it is? Neo: (*nods affirmatively/yes*)Morpheus: *The Matrix [a scheme of general intent laws governing your life] is everywhere, it is all around us, even now in this very room. You can see it when you look out your window, or when you turn on your television. You can feel it when you go to work, when you go to church, when you pay your taxes. It is the world that has been pulled over your eyes to blind you from the truth.* Neo: What truth? Morpheus: *That you are a slave Neo. Like everyone else you were born into bondage, born into a prison that you cannot smell or taste or touch, a prison for your mind.* This back and forth is at around the 26-minute mark into *Matrix* on DVD if you're interested in hearing the dialog for yourself. So now to correlating the legality depicted so well by actors Laurence Fishburne and Keanu Reeves in portraying what is essentially the Wachowski Brothers screen adaptation of the book *Simulacra & Simulation* by Jean Baudrillard (<http://www.amazon.com/>, which I strongly recommend one read). An aspect of the book is the explanation of a force existing and affecting our lives by absence. What is general intent? Well it would seem it is something entirely reserved to the States, as to if it exists or not, at least according to those scholarly in the law, <http://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/general-vs-specific-intent.html>, <http://www.legalmatch.com/law-library/article/specific-and-general-intent-crimes.html>, and http://www.constitutionaldaily.com/index.php?option=com_content&id=492:criminal-law-general-intent as some examples. Nolo Press is well known for their legal self-help guides and, in my 30 years of knowledge of them, have been very accurate of details often overlooked by many a legal scholar. What must be understood is that absence is an existence of its own, meaning here that where the States are presumed vested with a legal authority, as with general intent crimes, the absence of any actual delegation creates a vacuum, a double and shadow of its existence in counterparts. The shadow is subject to, albeit different, ever-changing rules as it becomes observable and allows the observers to claim the rules it operates by. This is how a vacuum becomes filled, by views entirely biased by the role of observer *of something* to then formulate, hypothesize, and presume the void filled by what the observer is certain of. This is how scholarly education persists in being a blind eye upholder of the status quo by the continued recognition of absence as a filled void, an object and assigning it powers, thereby applying rules that create a *something* no matter how fictional. And this may well be right and intended because we have to consider the ramifications of the definition of general intent as an existing relevant object to be authored by national government on its own terms and claims of authority: Most crimes require general intent, meaning that the prosecution must prove only that the accused meant to do an act prohibited by law. Whether the defendant intended



the act's result is irrelevant. -- <http://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/general-vs-specific-intent.html>. Contrast this to the Constitution's purpose to limit government, at least according to the Federalist papers via Madison dealing with an objection to the Constitution's provision, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay for the common defence and general welfare of the United States : But what color can the objection have, *when a specification of the objects alluded to by these general terms immediately follows, and is not even separated by a longer pause than a semicolon? If the different parts of the same instrument ought to be so expounded, as to give meaning to every part which will bear it, shall one part of the same sentence be excluded altogether from a share in the meaning; and shall the more doubtful and indefinite terms be retained in their full extent, and the clear and precise expressions be denied any signification whatsoever? For what purpose could the enumeration of particular powers be inserted, if these and all others were meant to be included in the preceding general power? Nothing is more natural nor common than first to use a general phrase, and then to explain and qualify it by a recital of particulars.* But the idea of an enumeration of particulars which neither explain nor qualify the general meaning, and can have no other effect than to confound and mislead, is an absurdity, which, as we are reduced to the dilemma of charging either on the authors of the objection or on the authors of the Constitution, we must take the liberty of supposing, had not its origin with the latter. -- Emphasis mine, http://thomas.loc.gov/home/histdox/fed_41.html. Let us apply this general intent principle, that it seems State legislatures have easily found is to be applied to the individual citizen by whatever the legislature defines as a rightful pursuit of State revenues, to government's delegated authority via the Constitution. Let us appreciate and understand the Constitution establishes the general intent of those seeking office, defines these candidate's criteria to determine their rightful intention, that it is by the Constitution's terms the candidates must intend to uphold the principles of Freedom and Individual Liberty as known and appreciated by the People, that the Constitution thereby is a statement of our Will, best described by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence as the consent of the governed. Thus it is clear that 18 USC § 1924 states a **specific intent crime**, and I express this to stake a claim on behalf of the American People for what general intent means at the national level, and that it must start with the laws governing those who represent us, from the bureaucratic, even contracted, Statistician whose data interpretation is being used by Congress to justify an expense/tax, to the President of the United States proclaiming what we need as though the office of President doesn't place its holder in a position of servitude stripped of any claims to a 1st person voice of the authority of the American people, stripped of being just any American living out their private life. We must make it clear that every office holder, be it elected or appointed must be subject to accountability to We the People for their actions, and what other than supporting the Constitution's intention could the Criminal Code of the United States be meant to carry out? Here's the text: (a) Whoever, being an officer, employee, contractor, or consultant of the United States, and, by virtue of his office, employment, position, or contract, becomes possessed of documents or materials containing classified information of the United States, knowingly removes such documents or materials without authority and with the intent to retain such documents or materials at an unauthorized location shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both. (b) For purposes of this section, the provision of documents and materials to the Congress shall not constitute an offense under subsection (a). (c) In this section, the term classified information of the United States means information originated, owned, or possessed by the United States Government concerning the national defense or foreign relations of the United States that has been determined pursuant to law or Executive order to require protection against unauthorized disclosure in the interests of national security. As I said, I am staking a claim on the use of the 18 USC code as a general intent enforcement of the Constitution, for when the Congress created the arguendo loopholes in this, with these phrases, without authority and and with the intent... the law, in the first phrase, exonerates former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. President Obama, by Executive Order, made former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton one of the people who defines what is or is not classified information, probably with a group of criteria, but she is authorized. However, and this is Hillary Clinton's problem, the fact her server was not within the government's security system (an absence) made it automatically an unauthorized location as Hillary Clinton is not authorized to certify a location as secure, and she has already admitted intent to remove the documents to an unauthorized location. The trouble remains there is an and between the authority and the removal, which, arguably, joins the intention to a rightful authority even



if the site was not secure... Yet former CIA director David Patraeus had the same, if not greater, authority regarding classification of information, but pleads guilty (<https://www.washingtonpost.com/>). I ask you, do you see how the same standard of law applied to you and I; how we live our lives (CFL bulbs, smart meters, Obamacare, etc.) how we are required to have a license and permit for everything we do; if we pay enough taxes; if we can build or develop or have a business on a piece of land that we own; is not the same application of law (by general intent) when they, government actors, act in the name of government with our tax dollars in a manner that could even place National Security at risk that the laws governing their actions contain escape clauses (specific intent) that their legislative promulgation makes sure that, in governing our actions, we are denied by general intent? (Example, California Drivers License requirements, <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>) It is this reversal of the purpose of government, as carried out by the political parties in their carrying on the life of a noble class, proclaiming from on high, *We know better than you do what you want* that has led to Donald Trump leading the polls for the Republican Nomination; that Carly Fiorina, Ben Carson, and my choice Constitutional Conservative Ted Cruz are rising in the polls. We the People are tired of being subjected to a government of political party elitists whose acts in promulgating legislation demonstrate a deliberate contempt for the Will of the People and an organized-crime-like appreciation of government's actions to assert the force of law as their license to steal. Done while never assuring the *general intent* of those in government is to serve the people and not party nor succumb to the corrupting influence of government power. Instead the law fails to bind these government actors to conscience as is caused by fear of the force of law being imposed on them with 10 times the force it is imposed on non-office holding Americans for having committed an act irrespective of results, the government actor's *general intent*. While some Americans contemplate armed revolution as an option, their point is to assure there is a fear in government actors that compels their loyalty to abide by our will and will aid in assuring that only those who appreciate the Honor of subservience to the Will of the People, to the Constitution, apply for the job of representing us, of being our voice for government to pursue what we've employed government for. So, as government gained its authority from our ratification of the Constitution in order for Congress to pass 18 USC § 1924, the specific intentions and joinder of issues loopholes embedded in the law are void ab initio (void from the beginning, nugatory). Those in government who work for us, who tax us to pay for their paychecks, their benefits packages, their vacations and bureaucrat conventions, etc. cannot build in loopholes to protect themselves; they cannot direct intention nor bind intention and authority as some scapegoat because their authority to act solely derives from us, and it is our general intent application of the Constitution upon government that governs, even governing the Supreme Court itself and the entire Federal Judiciary that was created by the Judiciary Act of 1789 by an act of the Legislature and not the Constitution. As long as government claims a general intent power it must be applied first to application of all laws imposed upon government, and then, using the limits of the Constitution, to pursue any application whatsoever upon the American People. That those in government, the government actors and their parties, have not done this, especially in recent memory of the last 3 or 4 generations of Americans, is irrelevant to the reality of the Sovereign Authority of the American People (see Justice James Wilson, <http://web.archive.org/>). God Bless you and thank you for reading and sharing this, Toddy Littman