

Fanciful Notices: Should You Post a Warning Sign on Your Property?

www.thelastbastille.com/2016/03/08/fanciful-notices-should-you-post-a-warning-sign-on-your-property/

"The right to privacy comes from 'Thou shalt not steal.' I don't want you to steal from me and I'll bet that you don't want me stealing from you, so I think you probably agree with me that it's a desirable law. 'Thou shalt not steal' is the basis of property and property rights, and privacy is incident to property. Privacy and property go together like a pilot fish suckered on a shark. If you want privacy, you have to have property rights."

– The Anti-Terrorist



During the early morning hours, the family dog can be heard barking unusually loudly, until he is permanently silenced by a quiet attacker. Suddenly, a boot crashes through your front door, and a dozen **armed men clothed in black rush throughout your entire home** pointing automatic weapons at everyone in your household. Yelling, shrieking, and flash bangs are the sounds that greet you as you awkwardly jerk from your slumber.

Whether it be due to **growing cannabis** or **homeschooling** your children, **the State** will use whatever (flimsy?) pretext by which to literally invade your life. Seriously disrupting your lifestyle by grinding everything to a screeching halt is what Leviathan excels at doing. The only question at this point is, considering the fact that **America is a police state**, what can be done to prepare for such an event?

Some have suggested investing in custom aluminum warning signs that describe what the government's own laws say with regards to search warrants. What is being presumed here is that when the police officers who executed the warrant are testifying later in court, they will be compelled to admit, under penalty of perjury, that they saw your warning sign, and instead of approaching you like civilized men, they decided to raid the joint like a gang of well-armed thugs; it is further assumed that by doing so, they will be conceding a favorable court decision to you that will end up curtailing the power of government, or at the very least, getting you financial recompense for your endurance

of the whole ordeal. Although this tentatively sounds like an intriguing idea, in reality the actual exercise of carrying this out presents noticeable obstacles in terms of its efficacy.

For instance, an aluminum sign costs quite a bit more than a rigid plastic one [by a factor of between one & one and a half times](#). Rounded corners cost somewhat more, but the range of the ratio is still about the same, even though it costs about \$5 more in order to [not have sharp corners that can cut you when mishandled](#). Generally speaking, for custom aluminum signs in 12 x 6" dimensions, you're looking at \$20 – \$25; in 24 x 12", it's more like \$30 – 40. Obviously, if you're getting more than one sign, then just multiply the estimated cost range by how many you want; for example, if you want two signs in 12 x 6", you're looking at \$40 – \$45, whereas a set of **four** signs in 24 x 12" will be roughly \$120 – 160. As can be expected, it's cheaper buying one or two signs for your external doors (even in a larger size) than it would be getting multiple signs, in almost any size, for different points along your fence, including the gate.

Unfortunately, such a monetary investment in this kind of warning sign is the antithesis of the [grey man](#). Much like [bumper stickers on your car](#), these warning signs, whether they be on the front door or the gate to your property, call attention to yourself as someone who is (falsely) perceived to want to "[police the police](#)." At best, you'd be loud and proud in a rural area, but in a suburban or urban setting, warning signs really only serve as an undesirable [target identifier](#); this is especially pronounced if you live in an apartment, as opposed to a house.

Constitutionally, the federal and Texas governments have clauses relating to warrants as well as searches and seizures. The [Fourth](#) and [Ninth](#) Amendments to the [United States Constitution](#) and Article I §§ 9 & 29 within the [Texas Constitution](#) say, respectively, that:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

"The people shall be secure in their persons, houses, papers and possessions, from all unreasonable seizures or searches, and no warrant to search any place, or to seize any person or thing, shall issue without describing them as near as may be, nor without probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation."

"To guard against transgressions of the high powers herein delegated, we declare that everything in this 'Bill of Rights' is excepted out of the general powers of government, and shall forever remain inviolate, and all laws contrary thereto, or to the following provisions, shall be void."

In other words, both governments claim to value the right to privacy implicitly, as the only legal exception to this is when they are investigating crimes, and even then, they are hypothetical "[limited](#)" to what they can do, hence the warrant clauses found in both constitutions. Reality, however, testifies to a wholly dissimilar conclusion, at least with regards to the [history of dragnet wiretapping](#) by the [federal](#) government.

Given that there are [two classes of American citizenship](#), perhaps [jurisdictional arbitrage](#) can be leveraged here in order to gauge the likelihood of securing a legal victory against the government for [color of law](#) violations. According

to Title 18 United States Code § 242:

"Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, that are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death."

In other words, if you violate someone's rights under color of law, you could be fined and jailed for not longer than one year, but if there is a threat or actual injury resulting from such violation, you'd be fined and incarcerated for up to a decade; if you go further by attempting to kidnap, rape, or kill under color of law, then you'd be fined and rotting away your life in prison or suffering the death penalty, as all are on the table (some may also cite [42 USC §§ 1997a & 14141](#), but these only deal with the Attorney General having grounds to sue based upon the rights of the "institutionalized" generally, or juveniles specifically, being violated, respectively). By contrast, [Texas Penal Code § 39.03](#) says:

(a) A public servant acting under color of his office or employment commits an offense if he:

1. intentionally subjects another to mistreatment or to arrest, detention, search, seizure, dispossession, assessment, or lien that he knows is unlawful;
2. intentionally denies or impedes another in the exercise or enjoyment of any right, privilege, power, or immunity, knowing his conduct is unlawful; or
3. intentionally subjects another to sexual harassment.

(b) For purposes of this section, a public servant acts under color of his office or employment if he acts or purports to act in an official capacity or takes advantage of such actual or purported capacity.

(c) In this section, "sexual harassment" means unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, submission to which is made a term or condition of a person's exercise or enjoyment of any right, privilege, power, or immunity, either explicitly or implicitly.

(d) An offense under this section is a Class A misdemeanor, except that an offense is a felony of the third degree if the public servant acted with the intent to impair the accuracy of data reported to the Texas Education Agency through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) described by Section 42.006, Education Code, under a law requiring that reporting.

Put another way, what would be punished more harshly by the feds is, presumably, in Texas, usually just a Class A misdemeanor, which according to [§ 12.21 of the Penal Code](#), is only a maximum penalty of a \$4,000 fine and one year in jail. Interestingly enough, [what else is considered a Class A misdemeanor in Texas?](#) Well, victimless crimes like selling liquor on Sundays, selling beer on Sundays before noon, openly carrying a handgun *without* a license, *repeated* prostitution or pimping, desecrating either the Old Glory or Lone Star flags by burning, disorderly conduct, possession of cannabis between 2 – 4 ounces, possession of “drug paraphernalia” with “intent to deliver,” resisting arrest, failure to appear (that is, bail-jumping), and my personal favorite, escaping *unlawful* custody.

Imagine, if you will, a SWAT team were executing a search warrant, and that warrant was proven to be defective in court, as well as the fact that the police officers were found guilty **by a jury** to be acting under color of law in serving the defective warrant – then statutorily, [felony convictions would be on the table](#) if the case was being tried in federal court, but if it was under the jurisdiction of Texas, then it would only be a misdemeanor, from what I can tell.

Codifying in statutory law what is described by them as **official oppression** as only being as serious as selling liquor during “unapproved” times, or possessing cannabis in “unapproved” amounts, really only demonstrates the trivial attitude the Texas government appears to have towards their own employees and agents acting under color of law. Not that the feds are much better, for the FBI admitted that there were only [72 indictments in 2014 for color of law violations](#), nevermind *convictions*.

What about [suing the government](#), instead? Some might think that rather than filing a criminal complaint with [any Texas county attorney](#) or the [Offices of the United States Attorneys](#) in order to prosecute illegal SWAT raids, it'd be more effective to approach any sort of litigation through civil remedies, strategically speaking. I think the [seven different civil court cases of varying jurisdictions between 2007 – 2015](#) I've examined reveal the counter-productiveness of initiating lawsuits, at least within that sample. Regarding Texas specifically, the [Civil Practice & Remedies Code §§ 9.011 & 11.054](#) already present some hurdles that *pro se* litigants will likely have to contend with, whether it be demonstrating that they are not engaging in “groundless pleadings” (such as those in bad faith) or being found as a “vexatious litigant” who is then required to furnish a security – any failure to pony up some cash is grounds for dismissal of the lawsuit.

If you do decide to invest in a warning sign for your property as a way to “[hedge your bets](#)” as it were, what should it say? This is more of a matter of personal taste, not to mention being dependent upon which American legal jurisdictions are applicable to you, but I would venture a guess that the following phrasing **might** apply to Texans (as shown on this article's companion picture):

NOTICE

To all public servants of the United States and Texas governments:

This property and its inhabitants enjoy both the United States & Texas Bill of Rights.

Government employees are bound by their respective oaths to these American constitutions to obey the limits imposed by these bills of rights.

Your particular attention is directed to the Fourth & Ninth Amendments to the

United States Constitution & Article I §§ 9 & 29 within the Texas Constitution.

Entry to this property will be allowed with a properly drawn & signed warrant, reviewable by this property's occupants and/or their attorneys at time of entry.

Also, be advised, public servants, that no one is obligated to answer any of your questions outside a court of law, pursuant to both

Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(2)(A) & Texas Rule of Evidence 801(c)(2)(A).

Obviously, feel free to substitute Texas (as well as the constitutional and evidentiary references) for wherever you live, but if this purported method of using a warning sign had any efficacy at all, this is approximately the wording I'd like to squish in there, if at all possible. I doubt that if a police officer on a SWAT team would testify under cross-examination that he took the time to read the warning sign, and then disregarded it via color of law by conducting the raid anyway. Not only that, but considering the different types of [exceptions to the warrant clause](#), I'm pretty sure that all any police officer has to do is convince the jury that any potentially defective warrant wasn't required anyway, and if he's persuasive enough, he'll walk away clean without being convicted and punished for acting under color of law, thus rendering warning signs moot.

While I am certainly a fan of [legal opportunism](#) whenever there is a chance to exploit loopholes in order to increase American liberty, I think there are better alternatives to warning signs that don't compromise security culture. [Role-playing police interrogations](#) would be my first recommendation, followed closely by formulating an [arrest plan](#). The main idea here is to learn and practice [refusing consent](#) and [keeping your own counsel](#) until it becomes second nature.

Although originally touted as a security culture technique, in reality, this advocacy for investing in custom aluminum warning signage is quite an exercise in [wishful thinking](#). Warning signs haven't satisfied [Hitchens' razor](#), given that I am unable to find any court cases that have been successfully litigated where the presence of warning signage made the difference in favor of the homeowner. Once you understand that [the law is a racket](#), then you can redouble your efforts in seeking more plausible options for restoring liberty.