

----- Forwarded Message -----

**Subject:** Re: Pardon my imposition

**Date:** Wed, 4 Apr 2018 00:42:24 -0700

**From:** Charles Stewart <charles@constitutionalgov.us>

**To:** Hartford VanDyke <+15097383039@efaxsend.com>, Hartford VanDyke <hartfordvandyke@gmail.com>, Arnie Rosner <arnie@arnierosner.com>

**CC:** Z-ConferencesGCUUSA <conferences-gc-usa@wavecable.com>

Thank you Arnie & Hartford.

The differing views between my-self & Arnie on this matter do deserve to be reduced to a text-based summary; as Arnie has so prompted here-in below.

Much of Arnie's version of our agreement is accurate, i do agree; but i do have some differing-views on some points; as i respond here-in below, line-by-line & point-by-point.

On 04/03/2018 08:15 PM, Arnie Rosner wrote:

Greetings Hartford.

This is an unexpected message. Forgive my imposition. It has to do with a possible responsibility you have for actions taken by Charles Stewart, or at least he has inadvertently so indicated.

I do not believe i have ever "indicated" that Hartford is "Responsible ... for actions taken by" my-self; Arnie.

I merely indicated that i respect Hartford's judgement; & that i am inclined to believe that his council will be helpful in resolving our differing views on this controversy; & that if Hartford's judgement is that i am the one who is "in error" that i would suffer serious second-thoughts about the actual merits of my position.

I hasten to explain:

1. After sending Charles the initial National Liberty Alliance version of the current indictment citing Hillary and a host of others complicit in LaVoy's murder, I followed up with a phone call. My intent was to see how we might use that indictment to pressure de facto into some reasonable and lawful position on the matter.

See the email version I also sent you. The link will be active and you will not be required to type in the link.

<https://scannedretina.files.wordpress.com/2018/04/charles-contracting-to-create-criminal-indictment-2186.mp3>

2. In order to facilitate funding and engage the proposed legal scholarly team I expedited the funding process on a Sunday night to provide Charles with the \$5,000 specified to accomplish the intended objective. Note...at that time Charles made no mention of requiring any council from anyone to proceed as he had committed.

Arnie's request for a refund is not with-in the parameters of "proceeding as i have committed".

We did not discuss any possible "refunds"; & there is no mentioning of any possible "refunds" with-in the text of the invoice document here-in below cited.

Arnie's copy of the "Invoice" document here-in below is accurate.

[See Attached Document, in "pdf" format; entitled similarly as "Invoice".]

3. In a follow-up call, shortly after sending the \$5,000, it quickly becomes apparent, Howard, Jen

"Jen" is Not the Correct Name of the woman who linked us to "Howard Griswold". Her name comes in various packages, including "Mel" "Mighty Mo", & "Mary Lou"; the former of these three being the one which i believe Arnie has confused.

and possibly others originally committed to the project most likely would not be available as originally specified.

My mentioning the Names of Hartford, Howard, & Mel, David Schied, Rocko, Rocko's friend Bernie, & others; were merely cited as intended Examples of the Sorts of People i still believe can be brought together to form the "Community of Competent Constitutional-Law Scholars" who are capable of accomplishing the task of insuring that the final document is based solidly in applicable "Law"; & that with support from said community of scholars through the following efforts to move forward in producing the desired results of actual lawful convictions of the criminal defactos.

*Special note: It is my understanding that any lawful process fails at its first defect. Misrepresentation, deliberate or not certainly qualifies in my view as a defect. The agreement became null and void at that point.*

I believe sincerely that i did Not represent to Arnie, that, any of these people were Guaranteed to be part of this developing "Community of Competent Constitutional-Law Scholars".

All that i represented to Arnie, i believe, was that, if we had these economic recourses; that, this sort of a "Community of Competent Constitutional-Law Scholars", would be assembled, by my-self.

I believe i am still capable of filling that promise; if i can begin focusing my energies directly there-on, instead of suffering these distractions.

In other words; this specific point that Arnie is complaining of; has Not "Become Null & Void"; merely because Mel has caused distance between Howard & me.

Footnote: i think it likely Howard might still be brought on board; but through different angles than reliance on Mel; & further, there are many other quite "competent law scholars" who would likely be quite willing to place their weight behind this noble cause if we merely compensate them reasonably for their time & energy; & this is the bottom-line that my personal commitment to Arnie was "good-faith grounded" in.

Even Hartford him-self might reject involvement here.

I am not stupid enough to actually commit Hartford, Howard, or others; before i even talked with them about the project; & there is nothing written in the invoice terms to indicate that i did so commit.

With all due respect to both of you; Arnie is mis-construing the terms of our agreement.

4. So not as to loose momentum for the effort even only partially underway, I asked if our direction could possibly focused on restoring your reputation, (although you didn't see the need to do so), restore Thomas Deegan's reputation and get Randy Due out of prison but not necessarily in that order.

Charles gave an encouraging response so that tended to offset the lack of the entire team as initially described.

And so we met with you and some others and that is where you decided your reputation did not need to be restored and so that essentially ended that conversation and the continued effort to move ahead as discussed.

5. In the interim, Charles was redrafting the NLA document on his own.

Until Arnie sent his email to me, requesting a refund; he had not given me any notice that he was unhappy with how i was progressing with our project.

I only discovered Arnie had any displeasure about how my work was progressing; when Arnie sent me his email, at 122-am, on 30-March-2018.

That email did not mention any disappointment about Howard becoming less likely to partake in our project; but rather it only voiced displeasure through words focused as, "... the time frame being relative was more important to me."

Note-worthy here is that even these words from Arnie

were preceded by Arnie's own admitted caveat words, that: "Though it might not be as we originally intended ...".

Those immediately-preceding words, from Arnie, seem to me to admit, that, there was No "Original-Intent/Meeting-of-the-Minds", to the effect, that; our Agreement was Predicated on being fulfilled within any specific "Time Frame".

I will include this entire original email from Arnie to me, at the end of this email.

Our Invoice document, as Arnie has included here-in above; did Not specify Any "Time Line" in the completion of this project; but merely that: "Good Faith will be observed in all stages & portions of this transaction."

I have invested a lot of time & energy in this project, up to this point; & i still thirst to complete it; & i Am Proceeding in "Good Faith" & "Honor" here; & i dare submit modest counter-complaints against Arnie because he should be smart enough to know that he is complaining against me "un-fairly" here.

6. And a new issue emerged in the form of a false claim from the California Franchise Tax Board against a variation of my name with an incorrect middle initial.

I provided that set of documents for Charles to also review as a potential matter to also be addressed.

Which he did indicate he began to process.

Thank you for your "full disclosure" here, Arnie.

I spent significant time & energy reviewing Arnie's documents here; & even in getting started on two powerful documents in response.

Arnie did indicate to me clearly, that, This Issue Was "Time Sensitive"; & here-under, i Presumed that Arnie Approved of me Prioritizing this "Cal FTB Case" Over our Larger Document-Composing & Assembling-of-Law-Scholars effort.

I sincerely believe my presumption here was "Reasonable"; in light of the fact, that, prior here-to, No Mention was made by Either of us of any Priority for Document-Composing & Law-Team-Assembly Over Other Projects such as this "Cal FTB Case".

I would not have invested that time & energy in this & the single other project which Arnie & i actually got involved in, if i had had any indication from Arnie at all, that, Arnie was going to try to scuttle the entire ship if i did not meet his own arbitrarily & unilaterally imposed "Time Frame".

7. After about 15 days, with no real progress visible on which to move ahead, the impact of the release and timing of the original NLA document began slipping away.

We never discussed any necessity for considering that the goofy "Indictment" document as issued from Darash & NLA might some-how be presenting a short "Window of Opportunity" or "Time Frame", with-in which it was necessary for us to compose & file responsive documents.

I was completely "blind-sided" when Arnie so un-expectedly demanded the refund. Until that email from Arnie; i had no indication from Arnie that he was un-happy with my progress.

I thought, & continue to think & believe, that we were & are still making good progress; with the singular exception of this present distraction we are suffering here-in.

So I decided to publish the documents which were originally available. I created a package and had it hand delivered to AG Sessions, Trump and other officials related to an internal FBI investigation.

#### 04-01-18 WE THE PEOPLE DEMAND ACTION!

The following Link will be active in the email version I am also sending you.

<https://scannedretina.com/2018/03/31/04-01-18-we-the-people-demand-action/>

A second version of that same document is available on Arnie's Scanned-Retina cite, here:  
<https://scannedretina.files.wordpress.com/2018/03/04-01-18-we-the-people-demand-action2.pdf>

Referencing two "2-page sections" in each of those documents; in the former, pages 11 & 12; & in the later, pages 12 & 13; both pages in both versions of this same document clearly Include emphatic reference to Arnie's "Cal RFTB Case".

This is Evidence that i was "Justified" in Presuming that it was a "Priority" for me to "Take Time" from our larger project, to make sure our position was solid for responding to Arnie's "Cal FTB Case".

I know for a fact that this was Clearly Implied by Arnie; for me to Prioritize his "Cal FTB Case".

I believe the true explanation for this dispute, is, that, Arnie has just become "Impatient", & now he is attempting to alter the terms of our agreement; after i have invested a lot of time & energy in service to Arnie's specific agenda.

8. Concurrently, Charles and I were engaged in exploring another parallel activity to create a community based effort around the precinct or ward model.

We were holding some pretty regular meetings with several others with like interests.  
So there were some competing issues at play

Again; Thank You Arnie for your "Full Disclosure" here.  
Thank you for using the specific wording "Competing Issues".

Please allow me to "cross-examine", by asking:  
"Did you Ever inform me that these 'Competing Issues' should Not be Allowed to Distract from our Larger Project?"

You could have made your priorities here clear to me; Correct?  
But you did Not do that; Correct?

Further; did we not fully discuss how our "Community of Competent Constitutional Law Scholars" was Directly Related to our Grass-Roots Empowerment efforts thru the "Precincts & Wards"?  
I believe we did discuss those precise points.

I believe that both of these concepts are "Intimately Inter-Twined", as also is your "Cal FTB Case"; & that, here-under, you are being Un-Fair & Un-Reasonable in your attempts here to Scuttle the Ship & Abandon Support for the long hours of work i have already placed in-to our larger project here.

but had nothing to do with the original project to which the \$5,000 funding was earmarked.

There was No "Meeting of the Minds" on this point.

There was No "Original Intent" evidencing support of Arnie's argument here, neither from our "Invoice" document; nor from our private discussions.

**9. Since the original objectives of the original agreement were not met**

There was No "Time Frame" agreed up-on from which to draw any necessary support for Arnie's argument & complaint against me here.

The vast majority of the "Original Objectives" Have Been "Met"; that being the Completion of the Document that was Singularly Itemized in the very subject-line/summary of the entire agreement.

I blasted long-hours to complete it & send a copy to Arnie; just a bit over 2-days after Arnie Jerked my chain by suddenly informing me he was demanding a refund.

I mailed my email with the completed document to Arnie; at: 6:52-am, 1-April-2018; or about 53 hours after first Arnie notified me of his displeasure & refund request.

in the time required to meet my use, even though no specific deadline was specified,

Thank you Arnie for again Admitting "No Specific Deadline Was Specified".

Thank you, Arnie, Sincerely.

I indicated to Charles that I would appreciate a refund of the \$5000, since I had been required to accomplish my mission without any of the resources for which the \$5,000 was intended to provide.

You Presumed that your actions were some-how "Required" with-in your own short "Time Frame", Arnie.

You did Not Communicate with me any single smidgen of concern about your own personal "Mission" here; but rather you gave me entirely contrary indicators that you approved of my merging this larger-project with your "Cal FTB Case", & also with our efforts in promoting the "Precincts & Wards" thru conferencing & work-sessions with Frank, John, & Abe; in the "CommonGood.Earth" group.

<http://commongood.earth/>

In one conference there-in, i clearly recall all of us agreeing, including you Arnie; that our work there-in had "Divine Blessing".

How can you now say that time & energy invested there-in constituted my own "Bad Faith" in neglecting to compose our single document with-in the "Time Frame" that you have unilaterally decided is the singular good-faith interpretation of our agreement?

I am going to be really surprized if Hartford finds merit in your arguments & complaint against me here Arnie.

10. This matter is now before you as Charles indicated he had to consult with you on issuing the refund.

Yes. I need some-one with a good reputation for making "Honorable Judgements" to Review the Merits of All of the Evidence related to your complaint against me here, Arnie; & Hartford presently occupies the top-position in my own very short list there-of.

11. So in summary, Charles seemed to have no issue with accepting the specified \$5000, for the specified task.

But now that I have requested a refund for services paid but not delivered... he has chosen to ignore the statements of good faith as listed on the invoice,

I suppose that is an excellent point up-on which to draw Hartford's attention.

Hartford; does the evidence here-in presented by Arnie & my-self, collectively; evidence beyond any reasonable-doubt, support of Arnie's accusation, that, i have "chosen to ignore the statements of good faith as listed in the invoice"?

and deferred to you as if you hold some level of authority over his decisions and moral and ethical obligations.

You mis-construe my calling on Hartford to assist us in resolving this dispute, Arnie.

I am calling on Hartford to assist us, by rendering his wise counsel & insights, to admonish & correct which-ever one of us is "ignoring statements of good faith as listed in the invoice".

I do not believe it is me who is "ignoring" these fundamental principles of "good faith", & your arguments thus far have certainly not convinced me other-wise; but i admit i am not perfect, & i am prepared for the remote-possibility, that, Hartford might actually be capable of articulating some sort of a well-founded criticism of my actions, which you seem completely incapable of presenting.

I have related the details to the best of my recollection.  
And I actually resent to be placed in such a position to impose on you, and at the same time, be confronted with the fact that I may not have been dealing with the man I first believed Charles to be.

Ahh, haa.

I am sorry that our friendship seems to be suffering "bruises" here, Arnie.

But until some-one with a better ability than your-self can articulate a well-worded argument to me about how i have some-how diverted from "Good Faith" or "Honor", then i am going to continue to believe that you are just behaving in an impatient & un-reasonable manner.

Perhaps Hartford will be the man to "burst my bubble", by presenting me with such a "rude awakening"; but nothing you have presented here-in even remotely accomplishes that.

I will email a copy of this message once I am assured you have received your copy.

Please call me to confirm you received this message and/or have any questions. 714-964-4056

I told Arnie i would call him today; but investing that time/energy in composing this response seemed like a worthy reason for diverting there-from.

Hartford; i truly do consider you to be a wise & fair-minded man; & please be assured that i will take your counsel very seriously if you adjudicate that it is "I" who is acting in "bad faith" or "dis-honor" here.



Arnie; my regular phone-calls to you recently have been motivated by my hopes that we could re-channel our energies in the projects still desperately needing to be addressed; but your presenting this all here-in to Hartford has now rather rendered that effort impotent; & thus, i now think it is better, at least for the near future, for each of us to just communicate about this thru Hartford.

Hartford; i also said i would try to call you later today; but i suffered other distractions besides this one from Arnie; & i will try to call & discuss this matter with you tomorro.

Respectfully Submitted;

Charles Stewart.  
503-676-8048; any-time.

Thank you.

arnie  
[arnie@arnierosner.com](mailto:arnie@arnierosner.com)  
714-964-4056 24/7  
[scannedretina.com](http://scannedretina.com)

~~~~~

Exhibits A & B; Previous EMail Exchanges:

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded Message -----

**Subject:** Recognizing the truth  
**Date:** Fri, 30 Mar 2018 01:22:50 -0700  
**From:** Arnie Rosner <[arnie@arnierosner.com](mailto:arnie@arnierosner.com)>  
**To:** charles <[charles@constitutionalgov.us](mailto:charles@constitutionalgov.us)>

Charles...

Deeds...not words...

I take people at their word...description of the contracted services.

Please refund the \$5000.00.

Though it might not be as we originally intended...the time frame being relative was more important to me.

**03-30-18 WE THE PEOPLE DEMAND ACTION!**

\*\*\*\*\*

----- Forwarded Message -----

**Subject:** Rough Draft Completed; Ready for Final Review & Minor Editings; ...

**Date:** Sun, 1 Apr 2018 06:52:03 -0700

**From:** Charles Stewart <[charles@constitutionalgov.us](mailto:charles@constitutionalgov.us)>

**To:** Arnie Rosner <[arnie@arnierosner.com](mailto:arnie@arnierosner.com)>

Arnie;

The document originally contracted to be composed, is now generally & roughly "completed", as attached here-to.

Please review it, at your convenience; & share your thoughts about how it might be improved &/or placed in-to motion; for bringing about the positive but dramatic changes which we both affirm to be our honor-bound "duty" to support.

Sincerely & respectfully;

Charles; ...  
503-676-8048; any-time, literally.