

Which acts are the truly offensive acts?

I am **NOT** the party that introduces the adversarial element into my dealings and interactions with Washington State government employees!! I am **NOT** the party that repeatedly, willingly and deliberately refuses to comply with their legal obligations as defined by both State and Federal statutes!!! I am **NOT** the party that repeatedly violates another's civil rights "under the color of State law"!!!

I engage in research and based upon that research I determine whether or not I am qualified for and entitled to receive certain services and benefits provided by either the State or the Federal government. I then request and submit applications for those benefits and services that my research indicates I am legally entitled to receive. Certainly those actions on my part cannot be viewed or even possibly misconstrued as introducing adversarial elements or hostile interaction??!! And my actions certainly do **NOT** qualify as anti-social behavior!!!

It is the response of the Washington State government employees who deny and refuse to provide the benefits and services (and/or applications for those benefits and services) I am legally entitled to receive that introduces that adversarial element into our interactions!!

My response to being denied the benefits and services I am legally entitled to receive is to vigorously assert and insist that I **AM** legally entitled to receive the benefits and services that I am being denied. As well as to state that being denied the benefits and services I have requested and am both qualified for and legally entitled to receive is a violation of my civil rights and to define the legal professional and personal consequences that exist for those responsible for denying me those benefits and services.

When Washington State government employees insult my intelligence and violate my civil rights by refusing to provide me with benefits and services that I am legally entitled to receive, am I required, by law, to respond to those insults and violations of the law and/or my civil rights in a manner that does not return and reflect those insults?? (I THINK NOT!!!)

When Washington State government employees act in a manner that violates my civil rights and do not show any respect for my civil rights, am I required, by law, to respond to that disrespect and violations of my civil rights using a respectful tone and language?? (I THINK NOT!!!)

To call a Washington State government employee an asshole, a dumbfuck, ignorant, incompetent and other such colorful and descriptive names and adjectives is to insult them, and the dictionary defines "insult" as being "disrespectful" and "contemptuous" - neither of which can be used to support or justify any claims that such insults constitute a threat or act of physical violence!!! While disrespect and contempt can certainly escalate to physical violence, in and of and by themselves, disrespect and contempt do **NOT** constitute a threat or an act of physical violence!!! Regardless of anyone's erroneous and repeated claims to the contrary!!!

Thus, while such language can certainly be accurately described as being "offensive" and "disrespectful", such language **CANNOT** be accurately described as indicating any potential for physical violence!! To use unpleasant and offensive language is to be obnoxious, which is also **NOT** any justification for an allegation of any potential for physical acts or threats of violence!! Again, regardless of anyone's erroneous and repeated claims to the contrary!!!

And while an insult might provoke the insulted party to consider and/or commit acts of "violence" in retaliation against the party issuing the insult, that does **NOT** mean that the insult itself (or the party issuing the insult) is guilty of making a threat of a violent nature!! Verbal abuse/insults, in and of and by themselves, do **NOT** constitute

an act or threat of physical violence!!!! And, AGAIN, regardless of anyone's repeated false statements to the contrary!!!

The law is quite clear that if I can prove it I can say it (The principle is called "Truth is the absolute defense") - regardless of anyone's objections to the contrary **AND** without any disciplinary or retaliatory actions being imposed upon me as a result of my stating such truths!! And since my letters exclusively target the official actions of Washington State government employees and I have documentation of those decisions to support what I say about those actions/decisions (illegal, unsupported, violations of my civil rights, etc) I can make those statements without fear of reprisal or disciplinary actions being taken against me!!! Such reprisals and imposition of disciplinary action against me for making such **TRUE** statements constitute civil rights violations because my right to file grievances to seek redress is a First Amendment protected civil right, as is my choice of language, both of which are also protected from any forms of reprisals or retaliatory actions!!

If the contents of statements made using unpleasant, offensive and objectionable language are true, then the individual making such statements is allowed by law to make those statements because there are **NO SUCH RESTRICTIONS** imposed regarding freedom of speech when applied to stating the truth!!! And if the truth indicates that there exists personal and/or professional risk and liability for Washington State government employees regarding their official actions as Washington State government employees then it would seem to me that it is the illegal nature of their official actions are the actual source of any threat to them, NOT any statements made, or the choice of language used, that indicate such personal and professional risks and liabilities exist regarding those official actions!! PLEASE REREAD THE PREVIOUS SENTENCE SO THAT YOU FULLY GRASP ITS IMPORTANCE!!!!!!

That **is** a truth that would be truly threatening to Washington State government employees - Personal and/or professional responsibility and liability for their official actions as Washington State government employees when those official actions violate someone's civil rights "under the color of State law." In fact, that is the law in Federal Court - believe it!!! Here's another truth in Federal Court - when a State law and a Federal law have a conflict - Federal law prevails!!!!!!

Funny thing about the truth - when you hear it you know it IMMEDIATELY is the truth. The truth is the truth - plain and simple - and not liking how that truth affects you is something that not only does not change the truth from being the truth, but not liking the truth's effect is not a factor in determining whether it is the truth or not to begin with!!!! You might not like what you heard, but you still know what you heard is the truth!!!!!!

Statements that indicate that such personal risk and liability do indeed exist for Washington State government employees would certainly be considered as "offensive" and "threatening" by Washington State government employees because such statements clearly educate those employees that the personal immunity that those employees have for their official actions under State law does not exist in Federal Court. It is hardly a giant leap of logic to understand how and why Washington State government employees would be moved to take offense, or perceive a threat, based on such statements??!! But even so, such statements **DO NOT** constitute an indication of any potential for acts or threats of physical violence by anyone making those statements!! Regardless of repeated claims that such statements **DO** constitute such threats!!!

I find it most interesting that one of the definitions for "offense" is "something that causes anger" and, again, it does not take a giant leap of logic to realize that Washington State government employees could/would be "angry" upon being informed that they are NOT immune, under Federal law, from personal liability for their official actions when those official actions violate someone's civil rights "under the color of State law." Especially since, generally speaking, Washington State government employees do possess personal immunity regarding their official actions under State law.

I do not think that it is an indication of my potential for violent acts when I vigorously assert (claim and defend) the fact that my Constitutional civil right to "file grievances to seek redress" is protected under the U.S. Constitution and the First Amendment!! Or when I truthfully state that the law requires certain action by various employees of a Washington State government agency!! Or when I assert ANY OTHER legal or statutory truths!!!!!! Such as the existence of personal liability for official actions in Federal Court!!!

Being assertive is **NOT** necessarily being aggressive, even though it is standard operating procedure for Washington State government employees to claim that being assertive constitutes being aggressive and therefore being assertive equals a threat of violence - which is completely non sequitor - the conclusion is NOT supported by the logic!! And to act upon and/or to retaliate or impose disciplinary action based such faulty logic and its erroneous conclusion is a violation of the previously mentioned First Amendment civil right because it is an obvious and blatant attempt to curtail/truncate/abridge my protected civil right to file grievances to seek redress by claiming that exercising and asserting my civil right is necessarily equal to making a statement that is "threatening in nature"!!

Since vigorously asserting (claiming and defending) my civil rights - whether that right is to file grievances to seek redress or to due process or to equal protection under the law or to freedom of speech - does **NOT**, in and of and by itself, constitute a threat of potential violence, what could realistically be perceived by Washington State government employees as posing such a threat?? Perhaps it is **WHAT** is being said rather than either the fact that it **IS** being said or the **MANNER** in which it is being said???

The making of statements defining the possible and potentially serious legal personal and/or professional consequences based on the official actions and decisions of those Washington State government employees to refuse to provide me with benefits and services that I am legally entitled to receive is protected and cannot be "abridged". So the fact that I do make such statements, and support my statements with citations of the relevant statutes/rules/regulations that are violated by those official actions and decisions by Washington State government employees to deny me those benefits and services cannot be used to justify or support any allegations that my making such statements constitutes a threat of a violent nature or presents the possibility of violence on my part towards them personally!!! Much less be used to justify the imposition of disciplinary actions against me for having made such statements!!!!!! Are you getting as tired of my repeating that fact as I am of repeating it???

Try living it and see how quickly you become tired of it!!!!!!

But that is exactly what has been done!!!!

A Washington State government agency reacted to my repeated vigorous assertions that the law required certain actions by various employees of that agency. And, in return, that Washington State government agency -

1. filed a criminal complaint against me for "threatening" an employee of the Washington State government agency;
2. had local police officers escort me off the Lynnwood, Washington WorkSource property;
3. banned me, on penalty of criminal arrest for trespass, from ALL WorkSource offices **STATEWIDE** for a full year.

On top of all that, this same Washington State government agency committed other serious violations of my civil rights - Breach of confidentiality; filing false criminal charges; Making deliberate and knowing misrepresentations of material facts - lying under oath; and more.

Like this one!!!! This Washington State government agency, administrating a Federally fund program (The WorkForce Investment Act), refused to provide me (at several

different times and WorkSource locations!) with disability placement services being paid for with money that the State of Washington had already accepted from the Federal government to pay to provide those services.

Does that sound as serious to you as it does to me?? How serious do you think it sounds to the State of Washington and its employees??? Who do not have personal immunity for their official actions when those actions violate someone's civil rights "under the color of State law"?? Does the phrase - "Shit a brick" sound like an accurate assessment of their reaction??

Would you call the above situation a realistic threat to those individuals??? But that threat is of a LEGAL nature, not a VIOLENT one!!!!!!!!!!!!!! And that difference is a VERY IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE!!!!!!

For Washington State government employees to insist that the assertive exercise of one's civil rights constitutes a threat of a violent nature is complete bullshit!!! But that is standard operating procedures for the Washington State government agencies that I have dealt with over the past fifteen plus years!!!

Since my right to make statements exercising my right to file grievances to seek redress is a civil right protected by the First Amendment, perhaps it is the fact that the official actions and decisions of the Washington State government employees to deny me benefits and services I am legally entitled to receive ARE in violation of the statutes I cite (which makes my statements the truth and therefore those statements are protected, etc, etc, etc) and that would constitute a real and tangible threat to Washington State government employees - which would make the official actions of the Washington State government employees the actual source of any such threat!! But, even if that is true, and it is my position that it is true, making statements regarding the existence of personal liability in Federal Court for official actions or that the law requires certain actions by various employees of a Washington State government agency still is NOT sufficient to justify or support any allegations that any violent acts are intended towards Washington State government employees or justify any disciplinary or retaliatory actions taken against me on the basis of my having made the above statements!!!

But rather than admit that my statements are the truth (and the law clearly states that if it is the truth and I can prove it I can say it!!!) and act to correct and eliminate the violations of the law and/or my civil rights committed by Washington State government employees, those same Washington State government employees (falsely) allege that my truthful statements informing them of the lack of personal immunity for their official actions in Federal Court or that the law requires certain actions by various employees of a Washington State government agency are "threatening" in nature and imply a potential for violence on my part towards them personally!!! And these same Washington State government employees use their false allegations and faulty logic to support and justify imposing disciplinary actions against me - even though my statements are a protected Constitutional civil right and cannot be curtailed or truncated or abridged!!!!!! Such actions are a direct and blatant violation of my First Amendment civil right as mentioned previously!!!!

It is my opinion and my position that since the Bill of Rights (First ten Amendments to the U.S. Constitution) protects my right to freedom of speech I can communicate what I can prove using ANY words I choose that accurately describe the situation!!! You don't have to like my position or agree with it!! You don't have to like or agree with the words I choose to express my position!!! But you are required, by law, to respect my right to express my position using any words I choose to express it - that is the bottom line in regards to freedom of speech!!! Freedom to express my position and opinion using the wording of my choice without fear of retaliation or disciplinary action!!!

If anyone attempts to censure me or allows anyone else to censure me it is a violation of my civil right to free speech - plain and simple!!! And if one person, or one group of persons, is censured for ANY reason - that sets a precedent that allows the

censuring of **ANYONE** at **ANY TIME** for **ANY REASON** - whether that reason is real or imagined - true or false!!!

TO PROTECT **YOUR** CIVIL RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH YOU MUST PROTECT MY ABILITY TO EXERCISE **MY** CIVIL RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH!!! **MY** civil rights are **YOUR** civil rights!!! And vice versa!!! We share the exact same civil rights!! That is what makes us a group of peers (equals)!!!

We are not necessarily equals socially - or economically. We do not necessarily share the same race, color, creed, religion or political philosophy. Yet, despite all of our obvious and varied differences, we are still equals, under the law, because we all share the same civil rights - at least in theory - at least in this country - or so we have all been taught - or so our government would have us believe????

A violation of **MY** civil rights is a violation of **YOUR** civil rights and a violation of **ANYONE'S** civil rights is a violation of **EVERYONE'S** civil rights!!! Therefore every one of us is obligated to protect each others civil rights to ensure that our own civil rights will continue to exist!!! Seems like a fairly simple and obvious equation to me. The Frenchman, Voltaire, said it best - "I despise what you write, but I will fight to the death to protect your right to continue to write it."

The questions that I think need to be asked and answered are -

Does our government not exist in order to protect our civil rights? Do we, or are we even required to, allow the government to continue to exist when it abuses and violates our civil rights?? I think that fits in the category of stupid questions because the system of government in the United States was created based on the concepts that we all possess certain "inalienable rights" which were codified (made into law) in the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights and that our government cannot act to take those rights away - that is what "inalienable" means - "cannot be taken away"!! The government did not grant us those rights (our Creator did!!) so the government cannot take those rights away!!!

Since one dictionary definition of violence is "harm done by violating rights", which party is guilty of actually **committing** acts of "violence"?

- a. Government employees who willfully, deliberately and repeatedly violate an individual's civil rights by refusing to provide that person with the benefits and services that person is legally entitled to receive??
- b. Government employees who deliberate misrepresent facts, evidence and the law in order to support making illegal demands in order to receive benefits and services??
- c. Or the individual who has been denied those benefits and services and has made statements that define the personal risk and liability that exists in Federal Court for government employees based on their refusal to provide that person with those benefits and services??
- d. Or the individual who has vigorously asserted that the law requires certain actions by various employees of a Washington State government agency??

Who has violated (same root word as violence!!!!) whose civil rights?? Who has acted within their civil rights?? And who has failed to comply with their legal obligations as dictated by both State and Federal statutes??

Who REALLY requires the anger management classes? Who should be considered as presenting a real threat of "violence"?? Who REALLY could benefit from some "sensitivity training"??

- a. A person who states the truth regarding the existence of personal liability and risk in Federal Court for the official actions of government employees??
- b. Or states the truth that the law requires certain actions by various employees of Washington State government agencies??

- c. Or the government employees who are pissed off because they **DO** have personal risk and liability in Federal Court in regards to their official actions that violate someone's civil rights??

What is TRULY offensive?? What is actually illegal AND unconstitutional??

- a. Official acts of Washington State government employees that violate someone's civil rights?
- b. Or the person whose civil rights have been violated calling the violation of their civil rights a bunch of bullshit?? And using exactly that word and others like it to accurately describe the situation and the individuals who are responsible for the violation of their civil rights??!!!!?

Are **OUR** civil rights truly "inalienable" or not!!!!!!!!!!!!

Are our Constitutionally protected civil rights and "universal human rights" to seek redress and freedom of speech protected from being abused and taken away by government agencies and their employees or not!!!!!!!!