

opening

047 ↓

047

8

The Phsycological doctor stupidly asked the Defendant, why go to Ukraine--WHY--why does anyone go to Ukraine- to fight and die for freedom and democracy. When life is done, toast, a wrap, nothing left one goes to Ukraine to volunteer to fight with helmet and vest and fearlessness planning for bag or box home. That was the INTent- as we are always looking for Intent. As one ^{party's} parties intend is on ruling the world the other parties intent is for/for absolutely nothing/nothing; but a casket filled with valient effort, honor, dignity, intregity, character, morals, persistence and all theat/that represents America. How does one end a life with absolutely nothing- without having taken a single cigarette, or beer, or drink, or drug having worked and run as fast and as hard as one could seven days a week, land with nothing. perhaps the phrase- Put in more than you take out is a reality, of giving and givnig and giving unitl.until gone. Perhaps it is mere stupiditiy. Perhaps the defendant wanted for nothing but altruism and to do the right thing at every turn, no matter what. Perhpas there was no scorecard; no one wathcing, no one concerned; quietly working without fanfare or note.(docotrs say)

Why must we recap it now--oh, you wish to kknow/know my intent, to
ascertain if ~~I~~ am a dangerous person--that would be NO. Muyst/ Must
the defenand=t
we recap a lifetime of good deeds to display every moment of caring and kindness and consideration. The courts are challenging the good nature and character of the defendant, hoping that you the jury can imagine some sort of Intent and they will spend weeks attempting to pry into the brain of the defendant. But quoting directly from
standard pattern jury instructions 047--Attmepted nurder requires proof of a specific Intent to kill the victim. Recklessness and anwanton conduct, grossly deviating from a reasonable standard of

?

047

047

~~Next Intent~~



dangerousness



9


care such that the Defendant was aware of the serious risk of death, with NOT suffice as proof of an intent to kill. (Braxton V US) Although a murder may be committed without an intent to kill, an attempt to commit murder requires A SPECIFIC INTENT TO KILL.

(US V Kwong) So the entirety of this case hinges on what was in the defendants head---what was his overall intent, his goal, his thought process. A mere push to sway an election away from catastrophe, to raise the flag of alarm and concern of such a horrible choice, or were there other private motivations. But again it all ends with INTENT and character and ~~teh~~ the question of how someone that is so loving and caring and kind and tender, that even is concerned for the ants there on the floor- how in the world would they ever be able to pull a trigger to end a life- it is impossible. We in fact have the definitive proof; if the prosecution argues/argues that in fact the defendant was there, and the victim there in plain sight in range and the trigger was not pulled, then there is your proof of lack of INTENT. It does not get much clearer tahn/than that. ^{Proof that the defendant is a coward,} Likewise the prosecution a pussy, a pansy, a twit, a weakling, a runt, queer, weak, not a man, could will argue that the Secret Service stood in front/front of the end not just pull the trigger, how easy is that, to simply pull a trigger. of the barrel of a rifle and yet was not shot in the leg or foot.

of self
Narcissism

5:3


or nothing, not even a scratch---How much more lack of Intent do you need. There is no need to assume or speculate as you have definitive hard evidence that there was no INTENT.



The Florida 11th circuit a defendant who raises an as applied challenge

to the constitutionality of 922g1 may succeed if he can make an individualized showing that he himself is not actually dangerous.

To determine, courts are to make fact specific Dangerousness



1st Amendment next
peaceably Assemble

10

determinations after taking into account the unique circumstances of the individual. (Williams113 US V Henson) So that is the challenge before the jury, to decide if the defendant is a dangerous person, is he harmless, would you invite him over for dinner, a pool party with the kids, hiking, camping, read a story to the first grade class, all the ~~sin~~ things done over the past 60 years. You must measure a man and his deeds; and see if worthy to walk among you. The man not playing basketball as ants are on the court and setting out old cans and food so they can eat; the volunteer ~~plants~~ getting water and care, watching everything and constantly thinking of what is needed and missing to make others lives better, a step ahead to be the help that is needed. It goes back to the original question- of WHY do we live--to look out and care for one another, that is everything, that is life, and that is the defendant; offering everything one has to others in need. Yes, the shirt directly off ones own back for the homeless girl lacking coverage, money for the neighbors power bill that must be paid, a sick friend and work stops for a trip to the doctor/doctor; a poor neighbors plumbing that must be fixed, a roof blown off to redo, a shed falling but no money must be fixed, a truck loaned to make another's life easier. A life without any accounting or balance sheet, no tally or score- money to the Ukrainian in Spain, the soldier in Kenya, the Afghan family in Iran, refugee in Pakistan, or the homeless at the 711, wherever there is sadness in the eyes and offer of help. The flat bicycle tire, the car out of gas, the hood up needing a jump, the person just there and asking- "are you good",; that is what humanity demands, that is this defendant. The homeless sheltered at the office shed,

11
and office floor and the bosses bed and room given to the needy,
the homeless camp needing a bathroom-all items delivered and/facilitated,
joining to serve food at the shelter when possible, signing up and
all the classes for foster parenting to offer a home for kids,
every moment thinkigg of others and offering everything, selfless
and caring with no limit. So is this defendant dangerous- NO- he
is the exact opposite- he is the height of considerateness- as
quiet as a mouse to ensure not to infringe on anothers human rights,
always putting others first and himself last- you go ahead, never
wanting or needing much,getting by with little, so others can have
more, Is that not America, sto sacrifice and want for nothing and
keep pushing forwards constanltly- selflessly- is that not what
humanity demands. To go to Ukraine and be there in the center of
Indepedence Square daily asking-"how can I help"--the unit that needs
food, drones to be delivered, a soldier needing a battalion, a mother's
son lost in action, another father that needs to be remembered, a
lost homeless man signed up to/fight, soldiers needing a bed or gear,
volunteers looking for a place to work, --serve up your toughest
challenge- huge weather balloons =found-lviv taxi, nova postcha to
yourrdoor -name it -it willhappen. No problem is too hard to solve.
And it lands as the p̄fect job for this defendant to be there 24/7
to administer and care for everyones needs- why leave- send him back.
He needs no instrucion as failings in war are obvious- the great
need ot/to honor those dying every day with a flag memorial for all
to see the tremedous tragic loss daily and to weep in horror-it had
to be done. And cuontry flags to honor the golbal support and each
hero/hero lost and begging for more support and a wall to honor all
the foreign volunteers. So, dangerous-never- caring- always.

1st Amend ↓



12

The defendant recruiting daily from home was asked by all the Afghan soldiers to go back to Ukraine and make a deal for Visas so all the Afghan coalition forces could fight, and he went to DC for weeks and Ukraine again for 3 months because he cared about the life and wellbeing of strangers- Afghan families and kids looking for a better life; what more should a human do for his struggling fellowman; to leave a beautiful beach back to a war-zone in the hope that another's life may be better and maybe a war won--and is this love; or dangerousness. What would you ask of a man? Zelenskyy demanded US salaries and the Pentagon refused, so on to Taiwan, finding them paralyzed, unable to act in fear of provoking an attack, so a lifetime of failure adds one more to the pile. And now an American president void of a heart and a soul and both countries are now lost, how did America vote for this. Dangerousness--who would be the poster-child of dangerousness? Where does it land with lives lost? January 6th yields three, add Ukraine and Gaza and you push 2 million, and who is dangerous. The January 6th attempt to overthrow our government and this case have striking ironic parallels. The US constitution guarantees the right of the people to peaceably assemble and protest, so assumably one could stand on the grounds of the Capitol with some sort of weapon all day long as long as no one was bothered and it would be legal under the constitution. Hence, Likewise if the defendant or anyone were standing on a public road right of way with a legal weapon it too seems legal under the constitution. A protest is a protest. Every single January 6th defendant faced the exact question as we are faced with here today--"What did each actually do?" --did they push, or bump, or touch anyone, or did they stand motionless not ~~and~~ harming or touching anyone or anything. In our



Jan 6



INTENT NEXT

case no one was pushed, punched, touched or scratched or even breatheed on, so how is there a crime. Would the defendant have been more legitimate on the steps of the Capitol. Most every January 6th case seemed to hinge wholly on character; for Mr Brown" the court weighed in Browns favor crediting positive accounts of his character, his pretrial conduct, Noting Laudable that he worked and served others" (Alford 89f). In the Ms Lee case the defense states-" the government opposition is rooted in a blithe assertion of Ms Lees dangerousness." Another case equates no violence equals No credible danger- which seems logical. Just as Mr Brown, this defendant also only works to serve others and for the kids- ziplines, climbing walls, ferriswheels, Halloween events, hovercrafts, science fairs, every animal--goats sheep-rabbits and even a horse ended up in the house. A kids clothing business to busy them, yard sculpture made, tree-houses, and when the neighborhood kids wanted a skatepark a lot was found and a park was built for them to play and learn and grow- no cost or effort was too great to show the possibilities of what can be done with work, to the kids, so that they know they each can achieve anything. The defendant showed them how to plan events with music to promote a city skatepark and how to be engaged with the community and government to push a project forward meeting with donors and city managers and city council meetings. How does one foster the ideals of self-governance in ones children better than a community project they believe in. Perhaps the intended influence and result failed, but the INTENT once again was there, to shape young minds into good humans and American citizens that were also loving and caring and kind. The skatepark project evolved and expanded into a public access TV

Intent ↓



14

show to cover all community issues and ~~hall~~ the local leaders shaping the future. Again teh kids were able to p~~z~~roduce their own shows on topics of their own interest and learn adn grow and see what it means to be enaged and involved. Perhaps the defendant has taught his children nothing, perhaps in a lifetime of failure, he has failed yet again, but hopefully two words taht grandfather muttered will stick-"never quit"-perhaps by example maybe taht ideal will resonate with some future generation. Maybe teh tatered ^{documents} ~~remnants~~ of a campground for the homeless will spark a little motivation or all of teh stupid documents of the old mans crime reporting website will seem curious and interesting and create some impression or thought. Perhpas the artwork, plans,s- drawings and documents to save the Historic Haiku stairs will land with some curiosity and interest and a little inquisativeness to think what else needs work and help ad= and should not be overlooked or forgotten. Maybe the defendants lifetime of work will render maybe the smallest impact and thought of a better world. 1.52 million years and ~~my~~-direct ancestors did not leaveme a single document or note of a single sthought. All of those generatinnas of struggleand pain and hearthache and not one written thought- sad. At least this poor failed defendant will leave behind some evédence for his grandchildren and future generations that his Intent in life was good and noble and honorable and worthy and moral, even if he always failed. His Intent was good. He meant well even if fruitless. His intent was harmless, and mere planning of something is not intent. You can plan for decasdes to quit your job and start your own business and map it all out and never intend to do it. You may want your best friends ~~li~~ wife so



Intent



Intent
girl
Boat
can

badly and wish to kiss her and plan for years of how to make it happen and end up on her porch at her front door, and turn and walk away, as it was only a dream and fantasy that you never intended on executing. You can research and plan and shop for years on end for that classic sportscar you always wanted- that old R Ferrari, and go and look and test drive but you know that you are not capable of taking that leap, and pulling the trigger, as they say. That beach house^{or boat} that you have planned your whole life around, every detail and thought, plan and plan and plan and you go and look and study ~~but~~ never intend on buying. So mere planning does not equal intent. You can stand on the porch with your finger at the doorbell and your ~~dear~~ dreamgirl listening just on the other side of the door, but you cannot do it, it is not in you, you are not that person, not capable of violating the social standards, the morals and ~~this~~ ethics and all that glues our community together. That is the whole of this case, it was never going to happen; it is not in the defendants heart. A lifetime of caring for others, and love and concern and tenderness cannot simply be switched off and erased, it is in fact innate, in ones DNA, the most remote capability to harm has been totally proven here, to not exist-it is impossible. All effort was wasted, as it could never happen.

life is too precious and human rights far too important to violate as it is the whole of America and Humanity and should^{have been} be for the

last 1.52 million years and the next 1.52 million years. We

should try to do better with our democracies and human systems so all are protected and can pursue happiness and meet their full potential around the world. We must do better. Our fellowman are counting on us. - At the end of the play "Good Night + Good Luck" about Edward R. Murrow they ask who will step forward and "what will you do!"