

# SPECIAL POLICE OFFICER BULLETIN

**AID & ABET** newsletter

Constitutional Issues For Lawmen

NO. 11

## U.S. COURTS CONFIRM "DRIVING A MOTOR VEHICLE" IS A RIGHT NOT GOVERNMENT PRIVILEGE.

For many years professionals within the criminal justice system have acted upon the belief that traveling by motor vehicle upon the roadway was a privilege that was gained by a citizen only after approval by their respective state government in the form of the issuance of a permit or license to that particular individual.

Legislators, police officers and court officials are becoming aware that there are now court decisions that prove the fallacy of the legal opinion that "driving is a privilege and therefore requires government approval, i.e. a license". Some of these cases are:

Case # 1 - "Even the legislature has no power to deny to a citizen the right to travel upon the highway and transport his property in the ordinary course of his business or pleasure, though this right may be regulated in accordance with the public interest and convenience. - Chicago Motor Coach v Chicago 169 NE 22

("Regulated" here means traffic safety enforcement, stop lights, signs, etc. NOT a privilege that requires permission i.e. - licensing, mandatory insurance, vehicle registration, etc.)

Case # 2 - "The right of the citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, either by carriage or by automobile, is not a

mere privilege which a city may prohibit or permit at will, but a common right which he has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." - Thompson v Smith 154 SE 579.

It could not be stated more conclusively that Citizens of the states have a right to travel, without approval or restriction, (license,) and that this right is protected under the U.S. Constitution. Here are other court decisions that expound the same facts:

Case # 3 - "The right to travel is a part of the liberty of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the 5th Amendment." - Kent v Dulles, 357 U.S. 116, 125.

Case # 4 - "Undoubtedly the right of locomotion, the right to remove from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal liberty, and the right, ordinarily, of free transit from or through the territory of any State is a right secured by the 14th Amendment and by other provisions of the Constitution." - Schactman v Dulles, 96 App D.C. 287, 293.

### FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT

As hard as it is for those of us in Law enforcement to believe, there is no room for speculation

in these court decisions. The American citizen does indeed have the inalienable right to use the roadways unrestricted in any manner as long as they are not damaging or violating property or rights of another.

Government, in requiring the people to file for "drivers licenses, vehicle registrations, mandatory insurance, and demanding they stop for vehicle inspections, DUI/DWI roadblocks etc. without question, are "restricting", and therefore violating, the Peoples common law right to travel.

Is this a new legal interpretation on this subject of the right to travel? Apparently not. The American Citizens and Lawmen Association in conjunction with The U.S. Federal Law Research Center are presently involved in studies in several areas involving questions on constitutional law. One of the many areas under review is the area of "Citizens right to travel." In an interview a spokesman stated: "Upon researching this subject over many months, substantial case law has presented itself that completely substantiates the position that the "right to travel unrestricted upon the nations highways" is and has always been a fundamental right of every Citizen."

This means that the "beliefs and opinions" our state legislators, the courts, and those of us involved in the law enforcement profession have acted upon for years have been in error. Researchers armed with actual facts state that U.S. case law is overwhelming in determining that - to restrict, in any fashion, the movement of the individual American in the free exercise of their right to travel upon the roadways, (excluding "commerce" which the state legislatures are correct in regulating), is a serious breach of those freedoms secured by the U.S.

Constitution, and most state constitutions, i.e - it is unlawful.

THE REVELATION THAT THE AMERICAN CITIZEN HAS ALWAYS HAD THE INALIENABLE RIGHT TO TRAVEL RAISES PROFOUND QUESTIONS TO THOSE WHO ARE INVOLVED IN MAKING AND ENFORCING STATE LAWS.

The first of such questions may very well be - If the States have been enforcing laws that are unconstitutional on their face, it would seem that there must be some way that a state can legally put restrictions, such as - licencing requirements, mandatory insurance, vehicle registration, vehicle inspections, D.W.I. roadblocks, to name just a few, on a citizens constitutionally protected right. Is that not so?

For the answer to this question let us look, once again, to the U.S. courts for a determination on this very issue.

The case of Hertado v. California, 110 U.S. 516. states very plainly: "The State cannot diminish rights of the people."

"the assertion of federal rights, when plainly and reasonably made, is not to be defeated under the name of local practice."- Davis v. Wechsler, 263 U.S. 22, 24.

Would we not say that these judicial decisions are straight to the point - that there is no lawful method for government to put restrictions or limitations on rights belonging to the people?

Other cases are even more straight forward:

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them."  
- Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S.

"The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime." - Miller v.U.S., 230 F 2d 486, 489.

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights."- Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 945 . ( There is no question that a citation/ticket issued by a police officer, for no drivers license, no current vehicle registration, no vehicle insurance etc. which carries a fine or jail time, is a penalty or sanction, and is indeed "converting a Right into a crime".)

We could go on, quoting court decision after court decision, however, in addition, the Constitution itself answers our question- "Can a government legally put restrictions on the rights of the American people at anytime, for any reason" ? (Such as in this particular case - when the government believes it to be for the safety and welfare of the people).

The answer is found in ARTICLE SIX of the U.S.Constitution:

"This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof;..shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding". (This tells us that the U.S. Constitution is to be upheld over any state, county, or city laws that are in opposition to it.)

In the same Article it goes on to say just who it is within our governments that is bound by this Supreme Law:

" The Senators and Representatives

before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution;". - ART. 6 U.S. CONST.

We know that police officers, are a part of the Executive branch. We are "Executive Officers".

Article 6 above, is called the SUPREMACY CLAUSE, and it clearly states that, under every circumstance, the above listed officials in these United States must hold this documents tenets supreme over any other laws, regulations, or orders. Every U.S. Police officer knows that they have sworn a oath to the people of our nation that we will not only protect their lives and property, but, that we will uphold, and protect their freedoms and rights under the Supreme laws of this nation, - the U.S. Constitution.

In this regard then, we must agree that those within government that restrict a Citizens rights,(such as restricting the peoples right to travel,) are acting in violation of his or her oath of office and are actually committing a crime against such Citizens. Here's an interesting question. Is ignorance of these laws an excuse for such acts by officials ?

If we are to follow the "letter of the law," (as we are sworn to do), this places officials that involve themselves in such unlawful acts in a unfavorable legal situation. For it is a felony and federal crime to violate, or deprive citizens of their constitutionally protected rights.

Our system of law dictates the fact that there are only two ways to legally remove a right belong-

ing to the people. These are -  
#1 - by lawfully amending the constitution, or #2 - by a person knowingly waiving a particular right.

Some of the confusion in our present system has arisen because many millions of people have waived their right to travel "unrestricted" upon the roadways of the states and opted into the jurisdiction of the state for various reasons. Those who have knowingly given up these rights are now legally regulated by state law, the proper courts, and "sworn, constitutionally empowered officers-of-the-law," and must acquire proper permits, registrations, insurance, etc.

There are basically two groups of people in this category:

#1 - Any citizen that involves themselves in "commerce," (business for private gain), upon the highways of the state.

Here is what the courts have said about this:

"...For while a citizen has the right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, that right does not extend to the use of the highways, either in whole or in part, as a place for private gain. For the latter purpose no person has a vested right to use the highways of the state, but is a privilege or license which the legislature may grant or withhold at its discretion..." - State v Johnson, 243 P. 1073, 1078.

Other U.S. court cases that confirm and point out the difference between the "right" of the citizen to travel and a government "privilege" are - Barney v Board of Railroad Commissioners; State v City of Spokane, 186 P. 864.; Ex Parte Dickey (Dickey v Davis), 85

S.E. 781.; Teche Lines v Danforth, 12 So.2d 784.

There are numerous other court decisions that spell out the JURISDICTION issue in these two distinctly different activities. However, because of space restrictions we will leave it up to officers to research it further for themselves. (See last page for additional references).

#2 - The second group of citizens that are legally under the jurisdiction of the state is the individual citizen who has voluntarily and knowingly waived their right to travel "unregulated and unrestricted" by requesting placement under such jurisdiction through the acquisition of a state - drivers licence, vehicle registration, mandatory insurance, etc. (In other words "by contract only".)

We should remember what makes this "legal," and not a violation of the individuals common law right to travel "unrestricted" is that they knowingly volunteer, freely, by contract, to waive their right. If they were forced, coerced or unknowingly placed under the States powers, the courts have said it is a clear violation of their rights.

This in itself raises a very interesting question. What percentage of the people in each state have filed, and received, licenses, registrations, insurance etc. after erroneously being advised by their government that it was mandatory?

Many of our courts, attorneys and police officials are just becoming informed about this important issue and the difference between "Privileges vs. Rights". We can assume that the majority of those Americans carrying state licenses, vehicle registrations etc., have

no knowledge of the rights they waived in obeying laws such as these that the U.S. Constitution clearly states are unlawful, i.e. "laws of no effect". In other words - "LAWS THAT ARE NOT LAWS AT ALL."

#### OUR SWORN DUTY

An area of serious consideration for every police officer, is to understand that the most important law in our land he has taken an oath to protect, defend, AND ENFORCE, is not state laws, nor city or county ordinances, but, that law that supercede all other laws in our nation, - the U.S. Constitution. If laws in a particular police officer's state, or local community are in conflict with the SUPREME LAW of our nation, there is no question that the officer's duty is to "uphold the U.S. Constitution."

What does this mean to the "patrol officer" who will be the only sworn "Executive Officer" on the scene, when knowledgeable Citizens raise serious objections over possession of insurance, drivers licenses and other restrictions? It definitely means these officers will be faced with a hard decision. (Most certainly if that decision effects state, city or county revenues, such as the issuing of citations do.)

Example: If a state legislator, judge or a superior tells a police officer to proceed and enforce a contradictory, (illegal), state law rather than the Supreme Law of this country, what is that "sworn officer" to do? Although we may not want to hear it, there is but one right answer, - "the officer is duty bound to uphold his oath of office" and obey the highest laws of the nation. THIS IS OUR SWORN DUTY AND IT'S THE LAW!

Such a strong honest stand taken by

a police officer, upholding his or her oath of office, takes moral strength of character. It will, without question, "SEPARATE THE MEN FROM THE BOYS." Such honest and straight forward decisions on behalf of a government official have often caused pressure to be applied to force such officers to set aside, or compromise their morals or convictions.

As a solace for those brave souls in uniform that will stand up for law and justice, even when it's unpopular, or uncomfortable to do so...let me say this. In any legal stand-off over a sworn official "violating" or "upholding" their oath of office, those that would side with the "violation" should inevitable lose.

Our Founding Fathers assured us, on many occasions, the following: Defending our freedoms in the face of people that would for "expedients sake," or behind the guise," for the safety and welfare of the masses," ignore peoples rights, would forever demand sacrifice and vigilance from those that desired to remain free. That sounds a little like- "Freedom is not free!"

Every police officer should keep the following U.S. court ruling, that was covered earlier, in mind before issuing citations in regard to "mandatory - licencing, registration and insurance" - verses - "the right of the people to travel unencumbered":

"THE CLAIM AND EXERCISE OF A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT CANNOT BE CONVERTED INTO A CRIME." - Miller v U.S., 230 F 2d 486, 489.

And as we have seen, "traveling freely," going about ones daily activities, is the exercise of a most basic right.

## THE FREEMAN MOVEMENT -

There is a growing national movement of Americans that go by titles such as - "Constitutionalist", "Freeman," and "Patriots".

We have been told by federal officials and agencies that these individuals are any, or all, of the following: radicals, racists, violence prone, anti-American, anarchists, communist, bigots, tax protestors, neo-nazis, right-wing fanatics, to name just a few. The latest is "White Supremist." This seems strange to many Police officers since professional encounters have proven that there are Indians, Orientals, Hispanics, Caucasians, and Blacks in many of these groups.

Many police officers are voluntarily attending local meetings of such groups, which are open to the public, in an effort to find out what these "crazy" Americans are all about. In almost every letter our agency has received over the last 5 years from police officers who have personally attended such meeting, we have heard a far different story about these people. These officers will commonly use several or many of the following in describing these individuals. They describe these people as - well educated in the law, history and national affairs, morally upstanding and honest, non-violent, rational, hard working, and fanatically dedicated to God and Country. Indeed, just the kind of Americans for our government to beware of!

Whatever these people are, there is one thing we all can say for sure. These individual Americans are unlike most of the people in our nation today in one very obvious way. This group of people believe in study and acquiring knowledge. They have an unusually well founded understanding of the rights of

every American. Which is more than we can say for most government officials.

Another thing we know as "fact" is that many of these individuals are also very defensive and protective over any government infringement on what they believe to be "God given rights."

A hundred years ago these fanatical Patriotic Americans would have been held in high esteem by their fellow countrymen. But today, in our highly controlled society where the vast amount of Americans have been taught that Government is seldom to be challenged and always obeyed without question, this last remnant of free thinking individuals now find themselves scoffed at by their less "courageous and informed" countryman.

It is no secret to police officers why these people are so reviled and pursued by government officials whose job it is to prepare this nations people for greater restrictions and control over their daily lives - "for the good of Society as a whole" of course.

## MAKING ADJUSTMENTS - DIFFICULT

To make adjustments in the system at this time for "rights" that only a relatively few such "informed" Americans realize they have, would be difficult at best. It is also quiet understandable that this is upsetting to those in government who for years have not had anyone around to call attention to such infringements on the publics rights. In addition, it seems the general consensus among these government officials is that such insignificant issues as this "right to travel vs privilege to drive" is something that seems to be such a -"small and necessary infringement when one considers the overall good which comes through strong government control

over all of our lives".

In keeping with this philosophy, our leaders annually promote the adoption of approximately 17,000 new laws and hundreds of thousands of new regulations in the U.S.. For every new law or regulation passed, someone's freedoms are restricted. The mistake made by many is believing that only the "Bad Guys" rights are restricted by new laws. The wise police officer, who has to enforce all these new laws, knows that if this "there ought to be a law" mentality continues, a police state is inevitable. Of course not all police officers are against being given more power and control over our fellow countrymen each year.

As to the drivers licence issue, there are many of the Peoples "Servants" that believe it's in the best interest of Government that the People, knowingly or unknowingly, trade their "common law rights" for "government granted privileges". Of course a government granted privilege or permit can be rescinded at any time, an IN-ALIENABLE RIGHT of the People can not.

#### SAVE US FROM "EDUCATED" AMERICANS--

As difficult as it is for some officials to adjust to, (officers included), we now have some Americans among us that "know their rights". And, as if that wasn't bad enough, these individuals profess that - "every Right is as important as the next."

Of course they're correct, but, the truth is, we Police officers get a bit indignant over being told we have erred in the past by ignoring some of our countrymen's basic rights. Even so every police officer has an important choice to make when it comes to handling these "Freeman" today. Several are as follows:

1. Officers can make it as rough as possible on these individuals who wish to retain their freedoms. Officers can come down hard on these sometimes arrogant, (and perhaps a bit foolish), Americans that are firmly convinced that they still live in a nation with a government "of, for, and by the people. .... OR -

2. We can try our best to understand them and their obsessive desire for "freedom", which isn't illegal as of this writing. In so doing, we can try to understand their "reasoning", which is surprisingly very similar to some of our nations past Statesmen, like Danial Webster, when he reminded our forefathers:

"IF THIS CONSTITUTION BE PICKED AWAY BY PIECEMEAL, (piece by piece), IT IS GONE AS EFFECTIVELY AS IF A MILITARY DESPOT HAD GRASPED IT, TRAMPLED IT UNDERFOOT, AND SCATTERED IT TO THE WINDS."

Another American recently made this rather radical statement:

"IT IS NOT THE FUNCTION OF OUR GOVERNMENT TO KEEP THE CITIZEN FROM FALLING INTO ERROR; IT IS THE FUNCTION OF THE CITIZEN TO KEEP THE GOVERNMENT FROM FALLING INTO ERROR." - Justice Robert H. Jackson, 1954. (This, of course, sounds like SEDITION to a Bureaucrat.)

As to "officer choices"...it is more than obvious that if we choose to support our oaths, and therefore our fellow countrymen's rights, we will need great courage. It will require that "both sides" become more understanding of each others obligations and duties. As officers, you will at times, be sorely taxed and tempted to "correct a particular attitude forthwith", when a Freeman, Patriot, Constitutionalist, (what-ever-the-name,)

rather crudely, or rudely, express their views to you.

It will take great patience to understand that these people are attempting to regain and save certain rights that belong not only to them, but, to every police officer and their family.

We must remember that EVERY AMERICAN, ..(police officers, and Freeman included,) have not just the right, but the DUTY, to point out perceived injustices in our system of government. The truth is, most police officers would have little respect for any American that shirked this most important patriotic duty.

#### HOW TO TELL A BOGUS FREEMAN

I inquired of a very respected and well known Freeman as to how an Officer could tell a true, died in the flag, FREEMAN from a fake. Here is a small portion of his response:

"A Freeman does not believe he is above the law. To the contrary. Those who truly understand, take full responsibility for their own actions. They do not drive while under the influence, DUI/DWI. They are very cautious in their driving habits. They obey the rules of the road. They take personal responsibility for damage they may cause to the person or property of another. They expect the 'police powers' to correct them if they become inattentive or careless. When observed committing some act or omission that is a clear endangerment to others, they will expect to be confronted and if necessary, arrested.

The Freeman's real 'bone of contention', according to my friend, "is the manner in which the government, surreptitiously, converts rights, belonging to the people, into a government granted, regulated and taxed privilege. He further stated "Freeman object to

the use of the 'police powers' as a 'revenue enhancement' tool via the cash register courts."

I explained to him that many Police officers feel the same way about being trained to, daily, hunt, track and capture the unsuspecting citizen as PREY, "bounding-up" this prey for the Courts to methodically SKIN. Lastly, the officer objects to being made to take the "HEAD"(count) of his prey for the precinct wall where hangs the monthly officer recap or quota sheets.

I further explained that the intelligent, dedicated, Police officer resents being made the peoples ADVISORY. They want to work with the people as a friend and serve them as their protectors, as was the "Peace Officers" role of the past.

It seems to be a poor judgement call or a case of misplaced priorities, in the minds of most city police officers, when they are made to spend a majority of their -"non radio call" time, lurking on street corners, attempting to track and capture good citizens going about their daily activities for traffic violations when the real criminal element is in these same citizens homes and neighborhoods raping, robbing and burglarizing at will.

After my unexpected little speech, my Freeman friend drew silent for a moment. He then looked me in the eyes, as if in disbelief, and said, ...."and where might these fine Officers be found ?".

#### A ROSE BY ANY OTHER NAME.....

By any name, Freeman, Patriot, Constitutionalist, I doubt that there are many Police officers that don't hope and pray that Americans will always cry out



loudly, and take the firmest stand, when they honestly believe they have grievances with their government. I hope, for our nation, and for the sake of our children's future, that I echo the feelings of most U.S. Lawmen when I say that rather than LESS of these "loud-mouth" concerned Americans, who are not afraid to stand up and be counted, (even if they go to jail or worse), that we need MORE Americans that care enough to fight for what they believe is right.

As for me, I'm much more afraid of the growing numbers of "SPINELESS, PUSSY-FOOTIN, LIMP-WRIST, MEALY-MOUTHED, FORKED-TONGUED, COM-PROMISING, PUSH-OVERS" that pass themselves off for REAL AMERICANS, than I am of those who, RIGHT OR WRONG, "tell it the way they believe it is", and stand squarely behind their convictions. Can I have a AMEN to that ?

It is for this reason, this editor believes, - we should not fear these Freeman/Patriots. Instead, perhaps, we should have great concern for those among us that turn a deaf ear to "voices" that expound the values that have established this land that we are privileged and proud to live and raise our families in.

It might very well be said that the strongest evidence that we still live in the Land of Liberty, would be if these Freeman were able to exercise their rights to speech and to redress the government of their grievances, without police officers and the courts seeking them out and persecuting them for being so bold. (Of course if we could just convince them to promote something important and wholesome like... ..say....Satanism, Drugs, Sodomy, Pornography, Marxism, etc. etc. we Police Officers wouldn't be allowed to touch them. But, preach the CONSTITUTION and LIMITED GOVERNMENT and you and I know...they are

asking for big trouble !

ONE FINAL THOUGHT - (straight from the editor) -

For you BRAVE STREET SOLDIERS who want a truly invigorating experience, try this:

The next time you encounter, "professionally", one of these unusually concerned American Freeman" who has just told you that "he or she is not legally required to have a licence", -(and is now standing-by to absorb your wreath"), try... extending your hand in friendship, put on a smile, and utter words something like this -

"My family and I thank you for your vigilance and commitment to our liberties, and we hope you will continue to fight and stand up for all of our Rights. May God go with you my Countryman."

#### RISK POTENTIAL

Yes, there is a risk to such actions taken by a police officer. Not a risk to the officer, however, but to the "Freeman", who may have a coronary attack at the scene.

Several officers have written to express their own personal reactions, after having taken similar "irregular actions" when confronting a Freeman in a "enforcement" scenario. One officer said..it felt good.. like he had just "pushed some tea in the harbor somewhere!" Another officer explained it this way: .."for a fleeting moment..I really felt what it was like to be a friend of the motorist, instead of playing the role of the plunderous - Sheriff of Nottingham !"

I think it's important to note that no officer, after having

warmly greeted and congratulated a Freeman, without issuing a citation," has reported - "the earth opening up and swallowing them."

- THE EDITOR

EDITORS REQUEST:

Aid & Abet News requests input on the proper implementation of an orderly method for returning to the days when Americans did not have drivers licenses, registrations, insurance etc. It has been many years that police, and other government agencies have used this information for what is believed to be for "the good of the community", i.e. investigating Hit and Runs, stolen vehicles, and other crimes where a vehicle was involved, to name just one such area.

"Just how can we continue to compete with the criminal element if government were to do away with such means of recognition"- is one of the major questions that has perplexed many officers?

Recognizing that these requirements placed on the People by their government is a violation of their rights, and can not be enforced "legally" is only half the battle. What is needed now is a time of "cease fire", a moratorium for every police officer to stop writing tickets for such laws. It is a time for officers to use their own good judgment. Officers may find themselves pressured to continue to violate the peoples rights by those who's only concern is government revenues and more government power and control.

We, the "Peoples protectors", must remember - "No one in government, not legislators, judges, bureaucrats, nor government superiors, can make a police officer violate his or her oath of office ! That is a very personal decision that we

each will make and live with. This is a time for reflection and research into which of these "restrictive devices", in the eyes of the public, and the eyes of the government, is actually NECESSARY, not -"just nice to have".

It is important that logic rather than emotion be used to pave the way back to the time when an individuals rights were not trampled by swarms of government agencies and officials.  
IF WE CARE - IT CAN BE DONE.

FOR MORE INFORMATION on this interesting subject we recommend that you write and ask for several books that are available through AID & ABET NEWS - BOX 8787, PHOENIX, AZ. 85066

- 1) - Break the Rules and Win
- 2) - Pied Pipers of Babylon  
(15.00 each - postage paid)

COSTS UP - PRICES UP !

Aid & Abet News, since it's beginning, has never raised prices even though there has been a number of increases in postage and printing costs.

We have been strongly committed to keeping the costs as low as possible over the years to facilitate growth in subscribers and gift subscriptions.

Due to the recent increase in postage we have finally had to call for assistance and understanding from our fellow supporters. As many of you know- no one, not even the editor / publisher, has ever received any pay for any of the daily work and effort contributed to the production of this publication. Every dime that comes in goes to pay for getting important issues

into the hands of fellow U.S. police officers.

ALL LABOR IS VOLUNTEER LABOR HERE AT AID & ABET. - However, the printer and the government postal service do not volunteer their services and labor. For sheer survival sake we have had to raise some of the subscription/ donation etc., prices. The two exceptions are subscription for an officer and for those who wish to pay for a gift subscription for a police officer or national guardsmen. We have left that donation price at 10.00 to continue to encourage the sharing of such subscriptions.

We wish to thank all of those that support this humble labor of love and commitment to education.

- THE STAFF

COPIES of this special bulletin may be ordered for 2.00 donation for one. (1st. class pstg. pd.) 2 to 5 copies at 1.00 ea. Bulk order donations - 6 to 20 copies -.80 ea. 21 & up - .50 cents ea.

AID & ABET NEWSLETTER is published for U.S. Lawmen. However it is available to the private sector as well. Police officers subscription/gift subscription donation is 10.00 for six issues. The private individual or organizations may subscribe for a donation of 15.00.

### Officer with 'heart' sabotages tickets

LOUISVILLE, Ky. — Police on Thursday were investigating about 1,050 apparently bogus traffic tickets written by a veteran officer who said he simply didn't have the heart to write any more real tickets.

Michael Ghrist, a 17-year veteran of the force, was suspended Tuesday for 25 days.

"I had a conscience. I had a heart," he said. "I started seeing the human beings behind the driver's wheels."

Compiled from *The Associated Press and United Press International.*

DISCLAIMER: The publisher and staff of AID & ABET NEWS to Lawmen are not attorneys and do not practice law nor give legal opinions - even though we believe we should have this freedom under the Constitution. Free discourse on the law is imperative to not just Police officers, but, to every American. It is too bad that certain individuals within society have been allowed by the Courts, (which these same ELITISTS control,) to monopolized this vital area and make it a criminal act for others.

It is our opinion that if our present day attorneys and jurist had been around when Moses returned from the mountain proclaiming to the people the TRUE LAW we can be assured they would have called a police officer and had him CHARGED & BOOKED.

(Sounds like a good subject for another Aid & Abet Bulletin.)

RESEARCH AND OPINIONS ARE REQUESTED AND APPRECIATED.

## ABOUT THE EDITOR

Officer Jack McLamb RET. is one of a new breed whose dedication to his job, his country, and it's constitution goes beyond the usual. Jack's writings to his fellow police officers in the U.S. on constitutional and moral issues have helped to educate many in the need to study and put into practice those values that are responsible for making our nation the foremost bastion of freedom in the world.

- Arizona State Senator,  
Wayne Stump



**THE  
FREEMAN-PATRIOT**

**WHO  
ARE THEY ?**



**AID & ABET** newsletter

**P.O. BOX 8787, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85066**

**ORDER A SUBSCRIPTION FOR A LAWMAN OR NATIONAL GUARDSMAN TODAY.!**

