

5  
6  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
June 26, 2025

7 TO:

8 Constitution Society  
9 c/o Larry Becraft  
10 403-C Andrew Jackson Way  
11 Huntsville, AL 35801

12 Ref:

13 (1) Correspondence of June 26, 2025 regarding DMCA takedown of constitution.org content

14 Dear Constitution Society,

15 Thank you for sharing your ambiguous concerns and histrionically venting without giving me any concrete actionable facts  
16 or evidence upon which to comply with your irrational demands. I am legally educated, willing and able to comply with an  
17 evidence-based, rational, lawful request, but I'm not a mind reader. I don't respond to anything but ACTIONABLE FACTS  
18 accompanied by supporting law and evidence signed under penalty of perjury by a fact witness with personal knowledge who  
19 is NOT an attorney. That's the way every other DMCA takedown works that I have ever received or initiated. Anything else  
20 is ipse dixit frivolous correspondence that can only have malicious motives behind it. I sincerely hope we can promptly  
21 dispense with all such issues to reach an amicable compromise and reasonable, factual, objective accommodation. I am  
22 therefore writing you this letter in an attempt to:

- 23 1. Request for a copy of the delegation order applicable to me throughout my service as a trustee, signed both by me and  
24 by the Secretary, defining my duties with sufficient specificity for an objective third party jurist to be able to determine  
25 that those EXPRESS duties were violated. Include the minute order that authorizes it.
- 26 2. Request prompt specific actionable definition of terms used in your correspondence and a list of SPECIFIC content  
27 within that category. This includes:  
28 2.1. Content derived from constitution.org.  
29 2.2. Copyrighted materials.  
30 2.3. Defamatory content.  
31 2.4. Misrepresentations or unauthorized use of brand, content, or reputation.
- 32 3. Identify specific actions taken to date to address your concerns.
- 33 4. Establish the there is not now and never has been a commercial use or benefit to me of anything on the site complained  
34 of.
- 35 5. Demand to remove all my work product from your site since it was not part of the defined scope of my former actions  
36 as trustee.
- 37 6. Response to specific FALSE allegations  
38 6.1. Trademark and trade dress infringement.  
39 6.2. Unauthorized Distribution via Archive.org.  
40 6.3. Breach of Fiduciary Duty.  
41 6.4. Defamation.
- 42 7. Establish a timeline for compliance after receipt of further clarification of your concerns.
- 43 8. Get interrogatories answered about how to comply with your request answered within the time limit specified. All  
44 questions not expressly answered in your timely response shall assume the default answer provided.

45 As I'm sure all of you know, real law cannot require an impossibility. Any word or phrase ambiguously used or not  
46 specifically defined represents an impossibility that cannot reasonably be accomplished or complied with. All law requires  
47 accurate definitions and a factual evidentiary basis to be reasonably and objectively accomplished by people with no  
48 knowledge of the subject matter other than that which is expressly specified.

1 **1 Request for a copy of the delegation order applicable to me throughout my service as a**  
2 **trustee**

3 This document must be signed both by me and by the Secretary, defining my duties with sufficient specificity for an objective  
4 third party jurist to be able to determine that those EXPRESS duties were violated. I certify under penalty of perjury that I  
5 don't recall ever receiving such a document or that it was ever approved in any minute order. Such a document would be the  
6 starting point for any dispute over alleged breach of trustee duties. More on this later in section 6.3.

7 **2 Request prompt specific actionable definition of terms used in your correspondence and**  
8 **specific content within that category.**

9 The following subsections itemize specific ambiguous demands or terms used in your correspondence and ask for an itemized  
10 list of SPECIFIC content on the offending site that falls in that category. Anything NOT expressly specified in the 7 day time  
11 limit specified shall be:

- 12 1. Subject to estoppel from raising as an issue should future litigation ensue.
- 13 2. Conclusively presumed to NOT be the subject of any thing or class of thing ambiguously identified in your deliberately  
14 vague, threatening, and histrionic correspondence.

15 **2.1 Content derived from constitution.org**

16 As the constitutionresearch.org domain indicates, 97% of the content posted on the site originates from other authors.

17 *A business model like the Constitution Society designed around selling advertising using content that only*  
18 *3% is original and owned by the Society seems doomed to fail.*

19 *[About Constitution Research; <https://constitutionresearch.org/1-About/about.htm>]*

20 Proof of copyright ownership and authorship of each item you wish to take down must be provided in affidavit form as an  
21 itemized list per the DMCA page:

22 <https://famguardian.org/Ministry/DMCA-Copyright.htm>

23 None has been provided. Only ambiguous threats using undefined words and no specific content has been identified in your  
24 notice. This violates the terms of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA). When you comply fully with the act, you  
25 will receive all the cooperation you deserve but not before. That requires you to provide the admissible evidence of injury  
26 and property ownership demanded in this correspondence promptly and within the time window you initiated, which is  
27 entirely unreasonable given the complexity and size of the content and the unreasonable ambiguity of the demand and its  
28 violation of due process and intended chilling effect.

29 **2.2 Constitution society copyrighted materials**

30 2.2.1. Please produce evidence of authorship and copyright ownership over the specific URLs and content within each URL  
31 which you claim authorship and ownership over currently posted on constitutionresearch.org.

32 2.2.2. Explain why each of the following criteria excluded for exclusion from copyright protections is not compliance with  
33 your conception of copyright law implemented in the Copyright Act and the specific authorities you rely on in reaching that  
34 conclusion:

35 *2. About the Content on This Site*

36 *Content on this site derives from:*

37 *1. Original content created by famguardian.org.*

38 *2. Original content created by sedm.org.*

1                   3. Public domain content outside the current copyright window of 75 years..

2                   4. Content from third party sources that either:

3                   4.1. Does not indicate that is copyrighted.

4                   4.2. Gives permission to repost either with or without attribution.

5                   4.3. Does not indicate the author or have a copyright notice.

6                   5. Governmental sources that cannot be copyrighted under the Copyright Act.

7                   6. Lists of links to content on and off this site that cannot be copyrighted.

8                   The copyright protecting this site does not protect any of content listed under items 3 through 6 in the  
9                   above list.

10                  [Constitution Research, DMCA/Copyright page; [https://famguardian.org/Ministry/DMCA-  
11                  Copyright.htm](https://famguardian.org/Ministry/DMCA-Copyright.htm)]

12   2.2.3. Explain why each item identified in 2.2.1 above is NOT excluded from copyright as indicated on the site below:

13   2.2.4. If a specific page you identify as infringing copyright contains materials written by another author, then explain why  
14   you think the page is YOUR property or exactly what ASPECT of the page makes it your property. The footer as a simple  
15   table? I don't have a clue why you think you own the copyright to such a page or why you think you can control such a page.  
16   Where is your permission from the author to steal their property in doing this? Over 97% of the content on constitution.org  
17   fits in this category, by the way.

### 18   **2.3    Alleged defamatory content**

19   2.3.1. Explain how anything on the site can be factual since the disclaimer indicates that nothing on it IS factual or even  
20   admissible as evidence in any court proceeding.

21   <https://famguardian.org/Ministry/DMCA-Copyright.htm>

22   2.3.2. Explain how any specific content can be defamatory without being factual.

23   2.3.3. Explain exactly what URLs on constitutionresearch.org you think are inaccurate and how each can be inaccurate while  
24   not even being factual or admissible as legal evidence per the DMCA copyright page.

### 25   **2.4    Misrepresentations or unauthorized use of brand, content, or reputation**

26   2.4.1. Please provide an itemized list of statements URLs and statements within the URL of every statement alleged to  
27   misrepresent anything. The entire site identifies itself as non-factual non-actionable beliefs and opinions that are not  
28   susceptible of being false, fraudulent, or inaccurate at:

<p>29   2.4.1. To require authorization, you must have an intellectual property ownership in the thing you seek to authorize. Please 30   produce evidence of authorship and copyright ownership over the specific URLs and content within each URL which you 31   claim authorship and ownership over indicated in section 2.2 earlier. DO NOT include the content itemized earlier in item 32   2.2 above without at least providing evidence why you think the criteria is unreasonable or non-actionable.</p> <p>33   2.4.2 Specifically identify exactly what images, symbols, trademarks, service marks, phrases, or any other thing that 34   comprises your "brand, content, or reputation" and provide a copy of your Trademark or Service Mark registration with the 35   U.S. Patent and Copyright Office for said markers. I am completely unaware of any such things on the Constitution Research 36   site which might fit in that category.</p>
--

<https://famguardian.org/Ministry/DMCA-Copyright.htm>

### **3 Specific actions taken to date**

To date:

1. Constitutionresearch.org is no longer a subdomain of famguardian.org. This will ensure when the DMCA battles ensue, the risks of damage can be minimized. Those battles threaten your domain as well, because you clearly are receiving the benefit of copyrighted work product I was never authorized by the site to produce and which is my private property as the original author. See section 5 later and refuse to even prove what exactly you have a copyright over, given that over 97% of the content posted on your site is by authors you never got the permission to post, which is outside the copyright window, and which you have added no value to.
2. The constitutionresearch.org zip file has been temporarily removed from Archive.org pending receipt of the information demanded in this correspondence to facilitate compliance. If that information is never received within the time limit specified, it will be restored.
3. Constitutionresearch.org remains online so that you may use it to comply with the requests in this letter and provide the information specifically requested about the content you take issue with.

### **4 Establish the there is not now and never has been a commercial use or benefit to me of anything on the site complained of**

As the site itself indicates, the content has never been sold, commercialized in any way, or benefitted me personally.

*This is a non-profit site. We do not:*

*1. Sell any of the content offered herein*

*2. Make any money from advertising or guest posts.*

*3. Participate in any referral or affiliate program of any third party site.*

*4. Have licensed attorneys on staff who might compromise the completeness or accuracy of the information offered herein. So long as attorneys are licensed by the state and worried about losing that license and putting their own risk management and revenues ahead of telling the truth, they will inevitably censor the WHOLE truth about their own misdeeds and those of their benefactors in the government. [Click here](#) for a dramatization of this fact from Satan, the CHIEF lawyer himself.*

*We believe doing any of the above would compromise the objectivity of this site and any other site desiring to present a COMPLETE exposition of all the corruption and problems with the government and the legal profession documented here. We also believe that advertising would distract attention away for the important issues on this site and shrink the important audience of people interested in our content. We hate advertisements and censorship.*

*[About Constitution Research; <https://constitutionresearch.org/1-About/about.htm>]*

We have also NEVER received any donations in connection with the constitutionresearch.org site and we don't even solicit them. Given that there is no intent to deprive anyone of commerce or to intercept any part of the revenue stream that any subset of it might produce, it is clearly unreasonable to claim any commercial standing or motive whatsoever to sue for copyright infringement.

Given this scenario, I have a copy of all the minute orders. If you decide to go back and doctor them so that you can contradict or disprove the above, I have the ammunition to defend myself. Such tactics, however, would constitute the WORST form of bad faith and malicious intent on your part.

### **5 DMCA Takedown and Notice and Demand to remove all my UNAUTHORIZED private work product from your site**

I was never asked specifically to do any of the things I did with or to the site when it was handed to me. This includes:

- 1 1. The entire menu structure, which is my UNAUTHORIZED invention that began on my site and was LOANED to the  
2 society in good faith without consideration.
- 3 2. The complete revision of the entire directory structure of the site AROUND the new menu structure. This required  
4 specialized expensive software tools and expertise the society never paid for or authorized the use of.
- 5 3. Statements on the opening page, which were derived from my own site and never requested in any meeting.

6 *The Constitution Society website aims to provide everything one needs to accurately decide:*

- 7 • *What applicable constitutions require those in government to do or not do.*
- 8 • *What is or is not constitutional at both state and federal levels.*
- 9 • *Precisely under what circumstances constitutional rights can be voluntarily surrendered by the*  
10 *human beings protected by it.*
- 11 • *The limitations, if any, that geography places on the protections of the constitution, statutory*  
12 *codes, the common law, and natural law.*
- 13 • *When and how the protections of the common law or natural law are surrendered or need not be*  
14 *recognized or enforced by a specific court.*
- 15 • *The relationship of absolutely owned private property to constitutional rights.*
- 16 • *When and how absolutely owned private property protected by the Bill of Rights can lawfully be*  
17 *converted to public property in which the government shares a qualified property interest*  
18 *(moiety), a usufruct, or any degree of lawful CIVIL control.*

19 *[Source: <https://constitution.org>]*

- 20 4. The removal of all Ezoic advertising on every one of thousands of pages so that advertising could automatically be  
21 streamed to minimize effort later to maintain the site.

22 The above work product took hundreds of uncompensated hours of my time. I only did it because I had been authorized by  
23 Jon to maintain a mirror site at the time, and because I thought you might benefit from that work as well. The changes  
24 originated first in the mirror site JON expressly authorized and were migrated to constitution.org later when complete. I  
25 NEVER would have accepted a trustee position WITHOUT the assurance from Jon of having a mirror site. To then  
26 retroactively PUNISH me and contradict the original origin and purpose of my involvement is the most irrational and  
27 ungrateful thing I can imagine as the ONLY compensation I ever expected for my involvement to begin with. So, there has  
28 been a breach of contract as far as I'm concerned by virtue of destroying all the consideration it was undertaken for. The trust  
29 and my position in it is the contract. No contract is valid without consideration and my involvement as a trustee was not  
30 consideration, but a moral obligation I felt as a result of my desire to reimburse the society FOR that consideration. Now you  
31 want to DESTROY ALL consideration and enforce the terms anyway. How irrational, ungrateful, and malicious is THAT?  
32 I call that theft. But I guess that means I can demand MY consideration back as well by insisting on you restoring the site to  
33 the condition it was before I was involved so that it doesn't benefit from unplanned (by the society) and unauthorized additions  
34 I made to. I never ASKED to be a trustee and in retrospect, serving as one was a horrible mistake on my part.

35 ALL of the above changes I did make, and especially the menu structure of the site and directory reorganization, were done  
36 without a request, consent or authorization by the society or even a minute order. After those changes were made, trustees  
37 repeatedly disagreed with the changes and never expressly authorized them. How can you claim ownership over work that  
38 was never requested or authorized or paid for by the society?

39 Thus, all the above changes were UNAUTHORIZED and OUTSIDE my delegated authority (whatever THAT was) to  
40 perform and I should have been terminated at that point. I even wish I was terminated at the point, in retrospect. Nor was I  
41 paid for any of the things I did, nor am I or was I EVER in receipt of a delegation order that even defines with sufficient  
42 specificity whether I could even reasonably be operating outside of the bounds of any alleged duties I might have had,  
43 especially in regard to the above changes. There were even fights with the ex President Ed over the changes I made that lead  
44 to voting him off the board. So these were certainly never authorized changes and lead to great conflict. Doing things like  
45 this in an unauthorized fashion and instead of asking for permission first has always been my style. And I never even asked  
46 for forgiveness after the fact either because of the passivity of the entire community of trustees. It was my understanding that

1 NOTHING would ever get done if I had to wait for permission at every micro-step from passive disinterested trustees who  
2 receive no compensation. You can count on that fact with a board full of trustees who are mostly lawyers usually hired for  
3 little more than risk reduction and not getting any real productive work done. That, in fact, is the reason I had to leave the  
4 society to begin with: Analysis paralysis and no sense of ownership, leadership, or purpose as far as I was concerned.

5 At the same time, you have been provided with a PRISTINE copy of the entire original site as a single zip, uploaded to the  
6 site before my departure.<sup>1</sup> It represents the entire site as it was when Jon died. So whatever changes I did make are entirely  
7 reversible by the Society at any time and on command without any injury on your part. So you can't claim that there is any  
8 long term damage to the society by virtue of my unauthorized changes to the site. I was always careful to ensure that copious  
9 backups of the site were maintained on a regular basis so that anything I did could be undone.

10 The UNAUTHORIZED changes I did make FIRST on the mirror site and later COPIED to the constitution.org site BEGAN  
11 as my OWN private and uncompensated work product outside the bounds of any trustee obligations I was aware of at the  
12 time, which were completely undefined anyway. You are now enjoying and benefitting from that UNAUTHORIZED  
13 commercial use of my work product on your site. If you want to claim that work product which began on my site is  
14 copyrighted or even owned by the society at this point without even demonstrating authorization or compensation to me to  
15 produce it over hundreds of hours, I have a HUGE problem with that. Claiming the output of labor I was never compensated  
16 for, never authorized or asked to perform, and which began as MY property and making it INVOLUNTARY property of the  
17 society will be HUGELY problematic in court later on.

18 The only way to resolve this issue is for you to RETURN the current constitution.org site to its original HORRIBLE and  
19 user-hostile menu and directory structure that I provided in its original form as a single ZIP at my departure. If you didn't  
20 download that and save it, shame on you. I insist on the society taking this path so that it doesn't benefit from work that was  
21 clearly unauthorized, never paid for, and which began as my private property SHARED but not donated or transferred to the  
22 society worth many thousands of dollars in uncompensated labor.

23 *Commodum ex injuri su non habere debet. No man ought to derive any benefit of his own wrong. Jenk.*  
24 *Cent. 161.*

25 *Cujus est commodum ejus debet esse incommodum. He who receives the benefit should also bear the*  
26 *disadvantage.*

27 *In mercibus illicitis non sit commercium. No commerce should be in illicit goods. 3 Kent, Com. 262, n.*

28 *Injuria propria non cadet in beneficium facientis. One's own wrong shall not benefit the person doing it.*

29 *[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;*

30 <https://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviereMaxims.htm>]

31 If you don't remove all of my unauthorized work product described herein from your site, and restore the site to the condition  
32 it was before I made the unauthorized changes described using the ZIP file I provided when I left, I too will consider doing  
33 the same thing to your site that you are trying to do with mine for the same reasons.

34 Like your original notice, you too have 7 days to restore the site to remove all unauthorized changes made that you even said  
35 during meeting minutes were NOT in the best interest of the site. I gave you a ZIP file of Jon's site prior to any changes on  
36 my part to facilitate that so you have no excuse not to.

37 If you completely retract Ref. (1) and all future claims in that document, I will reciprocate by retracting the content of this  
38 section for the same period that yours remains dormant to terminated permanently.

39 I certify under penalty of perjury from without the "United States" and within the "United States of America" per 28 U.S.C.  
40 §1746 that the facts in this section are true to the best of my knowledge and belief when litigated only under the common law  
41 and the constitution and not any civil statute.

---

<sup>1</sup> See: Farewell, dated August 31, 2023; <https://constitutionresearch.org/1-About/FarewellMessage.htm>.

## 6 Response to specific FALSE allegations

### 6.1 Breach of Fiduciary Duty

There can be no breach of a duty for the following reasons:

1. There was also great divergence between myself and the society on exactly what WAS in the best interest of the society. That is why I had to leave. There is no objective standard for what was in the best interest of the society and it never was revealed to me. I therefore had to invent my own in the form of the Change Management Specification dated August 2, 2020 and you shit on it before I left, which is part of why I left.
2. There was NO consideration for my participation and every possible effort on your part to ensure the destruction of any consideration.
3. I resigned as trustee immediately upon being removed as webmaster. I was removed from any affiliation with the society on the date that I resigned, which as I recall was the same date the order was issued regarding trustees not being able to maintain mirror sites, in contradiction with the email I received from Jon stating otherwise which was active the entire period of my involvement as a trustee.
4. The society resisted every opportunity to define the duties of webmaster or impose strict configuration control on the site that I had promoted and advocated. I was the ONLY one promoting the idea, in fact. I wrote a Change Management Specification for the site and provided it to the Website Committee. It was completely disregarded and ignored. The last revision of that specification was dated August 2, 2020. If anyone was violating the best interests of the Constitution Society, it was the other trustees who refused to implement configuration control that would protect the ONLY real property of the society, which was intellectual property it might have owned. But even that alleged ownership is dubious.

### 6.2 Trademark and trade dress infringement

The site specifically says it is independent not affiliated with constitution.org.

*“This website is in NO way affiliated or legally connected with constitution.org. The material and views expressed on this website are in no way attributable to anyone but the owners of this website.*

*[About Constitution Research; <https://constitutionresearch.org/1-About/about.htm>]*

Please specify why the above page is inadequately denies affiliation so that it can be fixed.

The constitutionresearch.org site uses no trade marks or service marks from you or anyone else. We aren't even aware there is such a thing. See section 2.4 for a request for evidence to prove you even have a trade mark or service mark. I am unable to locate any.

Specifically what content on the site is in violation? You must identify it so that it can be fixed. And the URL structure belongs to me as an unauthorized work product shared but not donated to you.

The menus aren't the same either.

### 6.3 Unauthorized Distribution via Archive.org

You must have a copyright and be the original author of any content that you must authorize. I'm still waiting for the express list of individual pages you own the copyright on in section 2.2. When I receive proof that you own and created the work or how to even JUDGE objectively that you are the owner, I will be glad to comply. But I'm not a mind reader, friends.

### 6.4 Defamation

Defamation is impossible if the speech accused of doing so represents itself as opinion or belief that is nonfactual. That is exactly what the site claims:

*This communication is privileged, nonfactual, nonactionable speech that is not admissible as evidence in any legal proceeding.*

2  
3 *We take our job of educating and informing the public very seriously. Every possible human effort has*  
4 *therefore been made to ensure that the information available through this website is truthful, accurate,*  
5 *and consistent with prevailing law. However, all information contained on this website originating from*  
6 *OTHER than government sources and which the courts themselves recognize as admissible evidence*  
7 *under the rules of evidence, along with any communications with, to, or about the author(s), website*  
8 *administrator, and owner(s) constitute religious speech and beliefs, and not facts. As such, nothing on*  
9 *this website originating from our own speech, writing, or testimony is susceptible to being false,*  
10 *misleading, or legally "actionable" in any manner. Since materials on this site spoken by us and all*  
11 *communications associated with, to, or about it are religious speech and beliefs, none of it is admissible*  
12 *in any court of law pursuant to [F.R.E. 610](#) unless accompanied by an affidavit from a specific person*  
13 *attesting to its truthfulness and accuracy, and such materials are only actionable to THAT SPECIFIC*  
14 *PERSON and no others in such a circumstance. Nothing here other than the governments OWN speech*  
15 *or publications can truthfully be classified as fact without violating the [First Amendment](#) rights of the*  
16 *publishers and author(s). It is provided for worship, law enforcement, education, enlightenment, and*  
17 *entertainment and for no other purpose. Any other use is an unauthorized use for which the author(s),*  
18 *website administrator(s), and owner(s) assume no responsibility or liability. Users assume full, exclusive*  
19 *and complete responsibility for any use beyond reading, education, and entertainment.*

20 *[Family Guardian Disclaimer; <https://famguardian.org/disclaimer.htm#I>. \_\_INTRODUCTION]*

21 Below is what Microsoft Copilot says on this subject:

22 *QUESTION:*

23 *Is defamation possible if the statements that are the subject of the allegation are not represented as*  
24 *factual or actionable?*

25 *ANSWER:*

26 *Great question, and one that cuts to the heart of how defamation law balances free expression with*  
27 *reputational harm.*

28 ***Generally, defamation requires a false statement of fact, not opinion. If a statement is clearly presented***  
29 *as an opinion—especially one that cannot be proven true or false—it's typically not actionable. Courts*  
30 *have consistently held that **pure opinions are protected speech** under the First Amendment and cannot*  
31 *form the basis of a defamation claim<sup>2</sup>.*

32 *However, there are important nuances:*

33 ***Mixed opinions**—those that imply the speaker knows undisclosed defamatory facts—can be actionable.*  
34 *For example, saying “I think she’s dishonest,” without disclosing the basis, may imply you know*  
35 *damaging facts that the audience doesn’t, which could support a defamation claim.*

36 ***Context matters.** Courts look at how a reasonable listener or reader would interpret the statement. Even*  
37 *if something is phrased as an opinion, if it implies a verifiable fact or is made in a context that suggests*  
38 *factual basis, it might still be defamatory.*

39 ***Satire, hyperbole, and rhetorical flourish** are often protected, but again, it depends on whether a*  
40 *reasonable person would interpret the statement as asserting actual facts.*

41 *So, if the statements are not represented as factual or actionable—meaning they’re clearly opinions,*  
42 *jokes, or rhetorical exaggerations—they’re usually not grounds for defamation. But if they carry an*  
43 *implied assertion of fact, especially one that’s false and damaging, then yes, defamation is possible.*

44 *Would you like to explore how this plays out in specific cases or jurisdictions? Some recent rulings really*  
45 *sharpen the distinction.*

## 7 Timeline for compliance following greater clarification

7.1. When I receive the detailed information requested in the communication, I will promptly comply. I am unable to comply without the detailed specificity indicated provided in affidavit actionable form.

7.2. I cannot bring down the site fully because (1) you need a method to provide the information I am asking for in this correspondence, which you will not be able to do if the site is shut down completely (2) if I don't do it this way, you will be damaging property that doesn't belong to you, which I can't permit.

## 8 Interrogatories

1. Do you believe that operating entirely upon presumptions about the status of our content with no facts or evidence disclosed constitutes an honorable, good faith effort in this case to comply with the requirements of law? Your missive was not signed under penalty of perjury and therefore is interpreted only as a threatening, unaccountable attempt at stalking me and maligning my good faith activities.

DEFAULT ANSWER: No.

2. Please precisely define "the best interests of the Constitution Society".

DEFAULT: It has never been defined.

3. Please provide a copy of the minute order authorizing Ken to send Ref. (1). Without a minute order, he had no authority to do so and is personally liable for doing so in such an ambiguous, threatening manner.

DEFAULT: We don't need no stinking delegated authority to do what we do, as long as we are dealing with an audience rendered compliant by legal ignorance and the intended fear it produces.

4. Copyright: Answering these questions is mandatory in order to prove property ownership and decide what can or must be removed.

4.1. Do you deny that the famguardian.org site has and always has had the same navigation structure as constitutionresearch.org in the form of a table at the bottom of each page, both before and after I became a trustee?

DEFAULT ANSWER: No.

4.2. Please explain why you disregarded the DMCA/Copyright page below protecting our site in your takedown notice and provided NO specific factual evidence useful in respecting your property rights?

<https://famguardian.org/Ministry/DMCA-Copyright.htm>

DEFAULT ANSWER: We only care about ourselves. Its OK to be a bull in a China shop when you have three attorneys on your board good at writing threatening, ambiguous letters without evidentiary foundation. Might makes right.

4.3. Do you believe that posting and publishing the approximately 97% of the content on constitution.org that is authored and published by others is the property of the Society or that doing so is NOT stealing? If so, provide evidence documenting the legal authority to do so

DEFAULT ANSWER: Yes.

4.4. Do you claim that mere lists of links can be copyrighted? What is your precise evidentiary basis for that claim?

DEFAULT ANSWER: No.

4.5. Exactly what aspect of the presentation of the work of others do you claim copyright ownership over?

DEFAULT ANSWER: If the item contains commentary on the item provided ONLY, or uses our trade mark or service mark.

4.6. Do you claim you have or claim copyright ownership over the works of others that are outside the copyright window of 75 years and if so, provide evidentiary basis for that belief?

DEFAULT ANSWER: No.

4.7. Do you claim ownership or authorship over anything done to Jon Roland's original site that the Society never expressly authorized or even requested as documented in section 5?

DEFAULT ANSWER: No.

4.8. Do you claim that pages on constitution.org not containing a copyright notice are copyrighted?

DEFAULT ANSWER: No.

5. Standing

5.1. Exactly what consideration do you claim that I received in exchange for the PRIVILEGE of serving as a Trustee?

DEFAULT ANSWER: None. A contract, including a trust, is unenforceable without consideration.

1 5.2. Do you claim that anything on constitutionresearch.org is factual or actionable and if so, please show WHERE it  
2 says that?

3 DEFAULT ANSWER: No.

4 5.3. Do you claim that mere opinions that identify themselves as non-factual and non-actionable beliefs and opinions  
5 posted on constitutionsociety.org fall within the category of defamation in this dispute?

6 DEFAULT ANSWER: No

7 5.4. Do you claim that you are exempt from the terms of the following copyright/disclaimer page protecting the  
8 content of constitutionresearch.org and if so, provide evidence proving why?

9 <http://famguardian.org/disclaimer.htm>

10 DEFAULT ANSWER: No

11 5.5. Provide a copy, if any, of policies in place that mandate non-disclosure of my experience as a trustee of the  
12 Constitution Society that prohibit sharing those experiences.

13 DEFAULT ANSWER: We have never had such a policy.

## 14 6. Compliance

15 6.1. Have you ever or will in the future doctor or alter the minutes or other documents of the society to unjustly  
16 exonerate yourself from any of the problems documented herein such as changing minutes, deleting or doctoring  
17 minute videos or email correspondence?

18 DEFAULT ANSWER: Yes.

19 6.2. Do you intend to comply with the demand in Section 5 as requested, and if not, why not?

20 DEFAULT ANSWER: No. Stealing is OK as long as we're the only one who can do it and not be held  
21 accountable for doing it.

## 22 9 Conclusions

23 As you can see, I'm going to great lengths to protect whatever property you do DEMONSTRABLY own just as I would  
24 expect you to do in my case. You can only deserve what you are willing to give. I just need court admissible proof of  
25 ownership and your detailed factual process for even JUDGING ownership and when I get it, I'll gladly and even timely  
26 comply with any copyright issues that remain.

27 It's my duty to inform you that if you don't like the impugning your own reputation, you might consider stopping the  
28 production of self-provoked dirty laundry like this to post on constitutionresearch.org. You don't need my help impugning  
29 your character. You're doing it to yourself by sending me the correspondence that is the subject of this response. It's better  
30 to remain silent and be thought a fool than to open your mouth and remove all doubt.

31 You have had plenty of time up until now to approach me about these issues without the need for litigation. It has been two  
32 years since I left the Society and haven't heard a peep since then. The constitutionresearch.org About page even invites such  
33 correspondence. Playing a last minute game of chicken using a completely unreasonable timeline with no evidence describing  
34 how to comply is irrational and will only delay the cooperation you would deserve if you acted more maturely, objectively,  
35 and responsibly. That scenario is why I had to leave the society to begin with, unfortunately.

36 If you doubt the veracity of my statements about what the constitution.org site looked like before I became involved, you can  
37 look at older versions of the site at the following location. Note that it looks NOTHING like what it looks like now. The  
38 reason that is so is because of changes made described earlier in section 5:

39 [https://web.archive.org/web/2025000000000\\*/constitution.org](https://web.archive.org/web/2025000000000*/constitution.org)

40 Its your burden of proof to explain why it doesn't look anything like it did before I became involved, that you ordered and  
41 provided consideration to me as trustee to make the changes, that they were within my expressly delegated authority to  
42 perform, and that they were also implemented FIRST on constitution.org. I alleged not only that none of this is true, but that  
43 the REVERSE is true: The changes were implemented on constitution famguardian.org first and later migrated to  
44 constitution.org. Thus they began as my private property loaned but not gifted permanently to the society. As a bare minimum  
45 the condition of that loan was that you would not try to destroy my copyright over the materials or use it to censor, chill, or  
46 punish the exercise of my First Amendment rights as you are attempting to do now with your malicious correspondence. See  
47 for yourself:

48 [https://web.archive.org/web/2025000000000\\*/constitution\\_famguardian.org](https://web.archive.org/web/2025000000000*/constitution_famguardian.org)

1 I respectfully request that anything you disagree with in this correspondence that you have evidence to prove be addressed in  
2 your response accompanied by the evidence that disproves it, itemized by exhibit number for later litigation use. Anything  
3 not timely denied within 7 days is admitted per [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8\(b\)\(6\)](#).

4 Your Ref (1) correspondence also provided evidence that you have been accessing copyrighted and license ORIGINAL work  
5 owned by me in order to compile it. A counterclaim is hereby submitted based on the following license protecting  
6 constitutionresearch.org which results in you becoming the substitute defendant in any issue in which you do not satisfy the  
7 evidentiary requirements and burden of proof established herein.

- 8 1. *Family Guardian Disclaimer/License Agreement*  
9 <https://famguardian.org/disclaimer.htm>
- 10 2. *Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement*, Form #06.027  
11 <https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/InjuryDefenseFranchise.pdf>

12 Should you need a delay to respond with the information requested to facilitate compliance, I will grant it if you reciprocate.  
13 I don't see any such flexibility on your unreasonable part so far, but things can change. Work with me, okay?

14 Attorneys are not fact witnesses, so please DO NOT respond to this request with anything signed by an attorney or  
15 representative. Only an officer of the society signing under penalty of perjury, NOT acting as counsel, and authorized to do  
16 by minute order may provide an actionable response to this correspondence. Anything not actionable or expressly authorized  
17 will be destroyed and disregarded.

18 Sincerely and respectfully,  
19  
20  
21

21 

22 Commercial use or litigation use of this correspondence or any of the original copyrighted work products found on  
23 constitutionresearch.org is governed by the above Injury Defense Franchise and must be taken into account in all arbitration,  
24 litigation, and discussions surrounding the issues addressed herein.