

## CONTEXT

"Noun: the circumstances that form the setting for an event, statement, or idea, and in terms of which it can be fully understood and assessed." *From Oxford via Google*

A term in which the Reuters article refuses to apply in their article referencing me. In a narrative of attempting to show law enforcement as extremist in need of federal intervention Reuters conducts a two-year investigation, fueled at least in part by my prior political opponents, to find and write an article surrounding just two complaints in over seven-plus years. Those complaints stem from a 30-minute segment, out of several hours of class time, designed to spur thoughtful discussion contrasting Political Correctness versus the duty to Serve and Protect. Using Reuters' stats, from the number of persons I've trained that is a 99.9% approval rating, more context they avoided, but clearly showing only a fraction of a percentage of persons failed to understand the context of the discussion. I think any business or manufacturer would gladly accept that failure rate.

When I became aware of their investigation, in complete transparency, I invited the writers to attend my training to get firsthand experience. One attended one day out of four they were invited. Finding nothing that fit their narrative, they were left to write their article based on assumptions and a complete lack of context.

Yes, I believe in our country's founding documents, and on three occasions throughout my career, I have taken an oath to defend our constitution. I have never rescinded that oath.

What does it say about the state of our nation when believing in its Constitution has you deemed an extremist?