

## THE ASSASSINATION OF LAVOY FINICUM

I have been watching with interest some of the predictions that supposed “prophets” of Yahweh have been broadcasting. I say predictions because there are so many false prophets around these days that until a prediction becomes fact and becomes a valid prophecy, I cannot give credence to its validity.

Many of those who have been broadcasting predictions have stated that 2016 will be the year that “all hell will break loose.” Of course, predictors say that same thing at the end of every year in regard to the upcoming year. However, I’ve felt a stirring in my soul; a feeling that this year they could be correct (if you try it for umpteen years, you’re bound to be right) and it we could be in for one heck of a year.

When you think about it, the new century has been relatively quiet in regard to blatant federal abuses likened to events such as Ruby Ridge, the Koresh Compound and other citizenacide is concerned. Yes, we had the Bundy Ranch standoff in 2014 which ended in something that the average patriot never figured would happen; the government backed down. Personally, I think that this event is just in flux for now seeing that the Federal government never takes no for an answer, no matter how wrong they are.

The problem is that the Federal Government has stolen too much land. When you look at the Constitution of The United States, it is quite clear that the only land that the Federal government can lay claim to is the area included within Washington DC. Constitutionally, all other land belongs to the states. One of the prime duties of the Federal government is to protect US Citizens and US property. With this in mind, how did the US Government get a hold of so much land?

*As the country expanded West, the federal government sought to protect some areas, such as Yellowstone National Park in 1872, and took control in the 1900s of unclaimed areas that were generally too harsh and difficult for homesteaders to make a living.*

*For example, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management administers much of the sagebrush steppe of the Great Basin, which is habitat for the imperiled sage grouse but unsuitable for farming. (Source: <http://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2016-01-04/key-things-to-know-about-federal-land-ownership-in-the-west>)*

Okay, so if land has some protected species of animal living on it then the Federal government can step in and seize the land because technically it is protecting US Property. The article also mentioned that the Federal government feels that it can seize land if it isn't usable for farming? Well, just looking at some farming practices around the world shows that mankind can farm just about everywhere. In ancient times the Inca's farmed the mountainsides. Just look at the evidence of steppe farming near Machu Picchu, Peru. Israel has proved that farming in the desert is not only possible, but quite profitable. So aside from the very mountaintops, the canyons and perhaps the frozen parts of the polar regions, farming is possible just about everywhere that a man can imagine. In addition, the article mentioned that land can be seized if the Federal government feels that indigenous life is in peril. In my estimation, it is no coincidence that it is the Federal government that conducts research, or hires scientists to conduct research into what animals might be endangered at any one piece of land. It isn't inconceivable to me that a humble annelid could be labeled as "endangered" so as to spur the Federal government to seize acres or square miles of land.

The question then arises; how much land does the Federal government own in the Western half of the United States?

*It controls about a million square miles, mostly in the West, according to the Congressional Research Service. It owns 85 percent of Nevada, 66 percent of Utah, 62 percent of both Idaho and Alaska, and 53 percent of Oregon.*

*Most of the land is managed by U.S. agencies including the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service.*

*The federal government also owns significant portions of California and Wyoming, at 48 percent each; Arizona, at 42 percent; Colorado, at 36 percent; New Mexico, at 35 percent; Montana, at 29 percent; and Washington state, at 28 percent.*

*(Source: <http://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2016-01-04/key-things-to-know-about-federal-land-ownership-in-the-west>)*

Let's revisit again the fact that the Federal government cannot own or control property outside of the square mileage of Washington DC. That very fact makes Federal ownership of the land in any states illegal. The fact that the states in which these federal lands reside cannot administer that land for their own use is again, illegal. I'm including a clipping from a very interesting article that talks about this very subject. If you are able, please read the whole article by clicking on the link after the link:

*The single most important case regarding the subject of federal jurisdiction appears to be Fort Leavenworth R. Co. v. Lowe, 114 U.S. 525, 531, 5 S.Ct. 995 (1885), which sets forth the law on this point fully. There, the railroad company property which passed through the Fort Leavenworth federal enclave was being subjected to taxation by Kansas, and the company claimed an exemption from state taxation. In holding that the railroad company's property could be taxed, the Court carefully explained federal jurisdiction within the States:*

*“The consent of the states to the purchase of lands within them for the special purposes named, is, however, essential, under the constitution, to the transfer to the general government, with the title, of political jurisdiction and dominion. Where lands are acquired without such consent, the possession of the United States, unless political jurisdiction be ceded to them in some other way, is simply that of an ordinary proprietor. The property in that case, unless used as a means to carry out the purposes of the government, is subject to the legislative authority and control of the states equally with the property of private individuals.”*

*Thus, the cases decided within the 19th century clearly disclosed the extent and scope of both State and federal jurisdiction. In essence, these cases, among many others, hold that the jurisdiction of any particular State is co-extensive with its borders or territory, and all persons and property located or found therein are subject to such jurisdiction; this jurisdiction is superior. Federal jurisdiction results only from a conveyance of state jurisdiction to the federal government for lands owned or otherwise possessed by the federal government, and thus federal jurisdiction is extremely limited in nature. And there is no federal jurisdiction if there be no grant or cession of jurisdiction by the State to the federal government. Therefore, federal territorial jurisdiction exists only in Washington, D.C., the federal enclaves within the States, and the territories and possessions of the United States. (Source: <http://www.constitution.org/juris/fedjur1.htm>)*

It's no secret that the Federal government has been harassing ranchers for decades. A simple google search yields a plethora of newspaper articles and court cases showing this to be true. The government asserts that they own the land, but we know that it is illegal for the Federal government to own any land outside of Washington DC, or any parts of a state that the state has given up to the federal government. Such lands include military bases and national monuments. The Bundy's and others are ranchers who were letting their cattle graze on land that anyone should have access within.

Before we get to the murder of Lavoy Finicum we should look at one more thing. Can the states get the stolen property back?

*State lawmakers, notably in Utah and Idaho, have sought a legal way to take control of federal land. However, Idaho Attorney General Lawrence Wasden has said the state's constitution gave up claims to the land when Idaho joined the union.*

*Congress has the authority to turn over federal land to the states, but efforts to pass such a law have failed so far. (Source: <http://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2016-01-04/key-things-to-know-about-federal-land-ownership-in-the-west>)*

Okay, so Idaho gave up its rights when it joined the Union, but the other states haven't done so. What I find of interest is the last sentence, where it states that Congress has the authority to turn the federal land over to the states, but efforts to pass such a law have failed so far. Okay, if Congress already has the authority, then why do they need a law to turn over the land. The fact that they already have the authority means that they can conduct themselves in such a manner that they do not need a law enacted to accomplish it. A simple House or Senate resolution would make it a reality. Since the land was taken illegally, such an act should pass through Congress unhindered.

Okay, now on to Lavoy Finicum. When I was a child my mother would always warn me that I should always be careful when I spoke because words can come back to be used against you. I feel that this is what happened to Lavoy Finicum. He told a reporter that he would rather not be taken alive if a scuffle occurred. He said that he didn't want to live the rest of his life in a cement box. Man, what a perfect way to hand yourself over to the Federal Government for execution.

The story says that on a way back from a meeting the FBI and Oregon State Troopers set up a roadblock for the two vehicles. The first vehicle was a white pickup truck that contained Lavoy, another man and some women. The Jeep that followed held Bundy and other. The two vehicles encountered law enforcement (that's an oxymoron) upon which time the two vehicles stopped. During that time Bundy exited the vehicle after being wounded. The truck sped away but about a minute later encountered a roadblock which Lavoy tried to avoid by taking the left shoulder. From what seemed like nowhere, what appears to be a law enforcement officer jumped in front of the truck causing Lavoy to brake. After he stopped Lavoy exited the truck with his hands in the air. He faces the officer that emerged from the woods and then turns around to face an officer on the road. At this time Lavoy reaches to his left side with his right hand, makes a motion and then goes to that area again upon which the officer from the woods fires a fatal shot.

The news media is adamant that Lavoy was reaching for his gun which they was a 9mm pistol in a holster on his left side. There are problems with this story. The first rule of thumb is that unless he's wearing a shoulder holster, you grab for the gun on your left hip with your left hand. Remember, the news media and the FBI are all saying that it was a gun holstered on his left hip. Lavoy was an avid shooter and he knew that you grab a gun with the hand that's going to pull the trigger. Remember that there was never a mention of a shoulder holster, although I think that they will tweak the story on reflection that they messed up their story by using the hip holster scenario. Now it is possible that Lavoy somehow slipped in the high snow, perhaps stepping on something under the snow that made him lose balance in which case he would move one arm to counterbalance himself. If that was the case then he didn't deserve to be shot and the officer should have been able to make such a determination.

Another question begs for an answer. There was a time when law enforcement officers aimed at assailants to take them down so as to arrest them. Yes, Lavoy was shot in the abdomen (which is not a disabling shot but a kill shot) but he was unarmed. Why would the second officer shoot a man who was not yielding a weapon? The answer is simple, the Feds wanted him dead to send a message to all others that Patriots will not be tolerated.

The reason that I see Lavoy reaching for his left abdomen or hip are is if he was shot there. There couldn't have been a hip holster there because Lavoy would have reached for it with his left hand. Remember also that Lavoy stated that he didn't want to be taken alive because he didn't want to sit in a cement box the rest of his life. What better permission did he give the Feds to shoot and kill him. He set himself up for a suicide-by-cop escapade that the Feds were all too happy to oblige him with. Another story that is going around is that Lavoy charged the cops. Lavoy wasn't an idiot, he was very intelligent. There is no way that such an intelligent man could charge the officer in snow what was knee deep. Not only would he not do it, it is impossible. Anyone who grew up with snowy winters knows that it is impossible. Also, the video doesn't show Lavoy charging. No, he was standing there with his hands in the air obeying the orders he was being given. It must have been exasperating for the police that wanted to gun him down, when Lavoy wouldn't go for his gun. In an effort for him to do something stupid the officer on the road shot Lavoy in the left lower abdomen to provoke him. When this didn't work, and knowing that the orders had gone out that Lavoy was to be killed and they must be carried out, the officer in the woods shot and killed Lavoy. It would have worked had someone come up with a more plausible story, but trying to say that a right handed man, or any man for that matter would use a right hand to go for a left hip holstered gun showed us all that this was not the taking down of a criminal, but the assassination of an American Patriot.

Now let's set aside the fact that Lavoy was a Mormon and the fact that according to the FBI and others, Lavoy and the other patriots were at refuge illegally. It was a crime that Lavoy was killed the way that he was. I am surprised at how people stood against what these brave men were doing. The news instantly polarized the public to see Lavoy and the others as highly armed radical militia members but what was really the case? We know that the public and law enforcement were given permission to enter and leave freely from the Refuge. We know that these men maintained the place while they were there. They even asserted that the land should be given back to the Indian tribe that the "Federal government" stole from them many years ago. Christians especially were polarized against these people because they were Mormon. These same Christians, who glorify the Founding Fathers, who were mostly Deists (no they were not Christians) demonize Mormons who are trying to preserve and reestablish states' rights, personal rights and other things. Yes, I am vehemently against the Mormon religion, it is anti-Christ and Satanic, but I can't bring myself to vilifying them because of their religion. They never said that they were taking over the land for their religion. They never brought religion into it.

I have been dead set against abortion since I was a young man. There are others who are against it too, and they do not hold to my values. They are Catholic idolaters, Mainline Christians who are spiritually dead, some Jews who don't believe in Jesus, and yes, even atheists. All of us hold the conviction that abortion is murder and we join together because we all have the conscious thought that murder is wrong. Yes, Lavoy was a Mormon, and his beliefs are opposed to Biblical Christianity, but he and other patriots are not willing to see our children and grandchildren enslaved by a Satanic Federal government that is hellbent to kill everyone that upholds some sort of moral and ethical ground where freedom is concerned.

I've got news for you. We've lost this country and it will never return to what it formally was. What we have to decide is if we want to protect our families from the evil that is coming very soon. Are you a man or woman that cares enough to lay your lives down for your children and grandchildren, or are you willing to surrender them to Yahweh's foes? Yes, we will probably all lose our lives to the wickedness that is The United States Government, but do you want to go down fighting like a free man, or do you want to be a jellyfish. Even if you don't want to pick up arms, you can fight spiritually with prayer, fasting and supplication. Whatever your form of warfare, remember that Yahweh gives us our families to protect and nurture and if you fail to do that will you hear that, "well down thou good and faithful servant?"