National Liberty Alliance

Monday Night Conference Call

January 2, 2017

Opening Song: due to technical difficulties there was no music

Topic: Open Forum

Call-In Number: 712-770-4160 Participant Code: 385698

Questions can be e-mailed to [questions@nationallibertyalliance.org](mailto:questions@nationallibertyalliance.org)

Please support our business partners. You can find their banners on the right hand side of the website. Proceeds support National Liberty Alliance’s effort to save America.

In the absence of John, Gerard will host the show

We got a number

They accepted our case today

U S v Williams was what got us on point

The principle under that case is so powerful

U S v Williams sums up the whole thing

“We the people have been providentially provided legal recourse to address the criminal conduct of persons themselves entrusted to dispense justice. In the Supreme Court case of United States v. Williams, 112 S.Ct. 1735, 504 U.S. 36, 118 L.Ed.2d 352 (1992), Justice Antonin Scalia, writing for the majority, confirmed that the American grand jury is neither part of the judicial, executive nor legislative branches of government, but instead belongs to the people. It is in effect a fourth branch of government ‘governed’ and administered to directly by and on behalf of the American people, and its authority emanates from the Bill of Rights. “

We are the People and we are coming in as the Tribunal

Glenn Beck had millions of people in Washington D C but it didn’t do anything.

There was no instruction.

You got to push an issue forward with a civic action

You can’t just wave signs on a corner because they don’t care.

You have to force them to answer by having your case in front of them

Your case is in their hand Answer the People Answer the paper

We the People did not set up a government to make rules and regulations on how we live our lives.

The rules and regulations are for them not us not for a free people.

The government has plenty of money to run and we don’t need to be taxing people’s land away.

Government has gotten so big

Your personal income tax doesn’t go for one iota of government service, it goes to service the debt to the bankers.

You are paying those trillions of dollars to bankers.

We’ve been brainwashed

They only put income tax in way back after the First World War to pay back the war debt and as soon as the debt is gone we will take it away That was a lie It never went away.

Pay your taxes so we can pay this war debt for wars that we could have avoided

The bankers want to put the countries under their thumb with the fiat dollar

We finally have a President that maybe we can do something

We are in a very treacherous time between the inauguration, we don’t know what is going to happen because the other side has lost big and they don’t like it.

We don’t know what they are going to do

We need to pay attention we need to be ready

Jan had three e-mail questions

QUESTIONS

Question 1:

(18:08)

Could you please give your thoughts on the differences between unalienable rights , constitutional rights , and civil rights?

Civil rights are something that the government gives you.

Civil rights are something that can be taken away or given.

There is no such thing as constitutional rights.

The Constitution is a contract with the government that tells them what they can do.

Your rights are unalienable and they come from God.

The Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights used to be called the Bill of Prohibitions because it told the government what they can’t do

The only one that has constitutional rights is the government.

Brent added:

There are constitutionally protected rights because the Constitution is there as a written guarantee that the government will protect those rights

The distinction that is overlooked is the distinction between fundamental rights and civil rights.

Fundamental rights are those rights that God delegates direct to the man, direct to the individual, we call those fundamental rights

They are nondelegable as a matter of law

A right is a responsibility

You don’t have the authority to delegate that to somebody else.

A right is a duty A right is a responsibility

(22:40)

Civil rights, civil is the old Latin word for city, the city law, as Blackstone says, the municipal law, he calls it in his first volume. Those rights and responsibilities are those that the government conjure up themselves.

Man makes those up.

Civil rights are the rights, the responsibilities , the duties that men put upon men.

Fundamental rights are those responsibilities that God delegates direct to the individual.

Those are nondelegable.

Question 2: Could you please provide me with two Supreme Court cases from the 1980s that smashed judicial immunity for judges in America?

(25:51)

They would never have a case go through that would smash judicial immunity.

First of all judicial immunity is not necessarily a bad thing

The reason that that whole process came about was in order for a judge to do his job he has to have a certain immunity and not worry about having repercussions of him making the right decision. There has to be some sort of immunity. But they have taken it to the point where you can’t hold their feet to the fire for anything now.

They are out of hand. And they declare their own immunity.

(33:50)

Question 3: I am in the process of replying to court filings in opposition. My question is: Can I open a court of record from the Superior Court even after a disfavorable judgment ? I am contesting on foreclosure due to securitization of my loan and mortgage. Is there anyone at NLA that can help?

If you record what’s going on there or the court records of if there is a stenographer taking down the words that are said then it is a court of record.

If there is no stenographer there then you can hire one.

You can make it a court of record.

It is a court that makes a record of the proceedings.

If they are making a record then it is a court of record.

That means a record that you can appeal on.

If there is no record to appeal on then the right to appeal is pretty weak.

That concludes the e-mail questions

(40:00)

Brent began his lesson

Brent will talk about the militia clauses a little more

We have been discussing this for several months

There are four militia clauses of our Constitution

The best known militia clause of our Constitution is the fourth one which is the Second Amendment

Your freedom depends upon the absence of government enforced monopolies of private trade and of public trade.

The British people had plans to wipe out the American colonies with the smallpox virus.

And they had plans to vaccinate the slave population here in America and send the smallpox throughout the colonies and destroy our population

Their plan was to kill all of us

We separated ourselves from Britain

Britain wanted to remove our right, our responsibility, to self defense to keep and carry firearms.

And so we struck back.

It was a responsibility.

Brent wanted to mention Rules of Interpretation of our Constitution

Rules of Interpretation of our Bible of our Constitution of the United States

(there was audio difficulties)

“The language of the Constitution cannot be interpreted safely except by reference to our common law as it was when the instrument was framed and adopted” (Chief Justice Taft)

Ex parte *Grossman*, 267 U.S. 87, 108–09 (1925). Accord, e.g., *United States v. Wong Kim Ark,*169 U.S. 649, 654 (1898); *South Carolina v. United States*, 199 U.S. 437, 449-50 (1905); *Dimick v. Schiedt*, 293 U.S. 474, 476 (1935).

Thoreau had it right The three key things for a happy life

The first is simplicity The second is simplicity and the third is simplicity

Simplify, simplify, simplify

What did these words mean according to our common law back in the 1780s?

Read Blackstone’s four volumes of his commentaries of the laws of England published around 1765.

Those four volumes are used more than any other reference in our courts from the beginning of our country until 1890 or 1900

Blackstone was quoted more than any other reference.

The next rule of interpretation:

Where the words are clear and unambiguous presume the easy natural straightforward sense of the words

The next rule of interpretation:

If the words are unclear and ambiguous do not separate the text from the historical background for if you do you will have perverted and subverted the Constitution which can only end in a distorted bastardized government. (James Madison)

The next rule of interpretation:

Our Constitution has no superfluous words and we are to presume any writing of legal significance has extra words that are not needed. Thus in order for our Constitution’s lawful meaning to surface to be seen the common law meaning of no word or phrase can be ignored.

Our Constitution is not an instrument for the government to restrain the People

It is an instrument for the People to restrain the government lest the government come to regulate our lives and our interests. (Patrick Henry)

Thomas Jefferson said: Always remember the sacred rights of mankind , the rights of mankind, that means his responsibilities The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for   among old parchments or musty records. They are written, as with a sunbeam, in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of Divinity itself and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power.

Brent concluded

(1:07:37)

CALLERS

Caller 1: Jeremiah California

11120 of the California government code says: the people do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. Jeremiah believed that Gerard did not think that he was sovereign.

Gerard does not remember saying that people aren’t sovereign. All sovereignty rests in the people . That’s a fundamental principle as far as our relationship to the government.

The people are the sovereigns of the government here on Earth.

God first Then the people.

You have to have limits on freedom

My freedom ends where yours begins

Jeremiah questioned about police power and taking of property.

The police power is the power of the states

The only police power that the federal government has under the Constitution regardless of what anybody says the only police power they have is on federal property, military bases owned by the general government sitting in Washington D C. Police is from the Greek word polis. It is a city law term. A term of the civil law that came out of the Greek city states. And it has to do with in our Constitutional understanding it means anything that regulates the health, education, and welfare of people. Health, education, and welfare. Therefore state governments have the police power within the boundaries of the state to regulate the health, education , and welfare of the people that live within the boundaries of their states.

(1:23:17)

Therefore, the state government under the police powers, the states have the power, the legislatures, to pass laws concerning the future. To control the behavior of men in the future.

Caller wants to know if they are using police power to keep his friend off his property.

The municipality became a market participant.

They are also trying to use police power.

They are using police power. They’re saying that this is an eminent domain case and that we can take this property for the health, education, and welfare of the residents of this state. We think that it is more important for public use , the welfare of the residents of this state than it is for your use but they have to provide just compensation.

Caller questioned: But not if they are using police powers?

Brent said they have to give them just compensation.

If they are a market participant then usually they have to be treated like any other corporation and give just consideration, the government. But if they use police powers, that’s different. You have to go in and sue in a judicial way because they are exercising the judicial arm of the government to do what they are doing if they use police powers.

They’re always using police powers

The taking of private property for public use falls into that category, eminent domain, they call it.

Caller 2 New York Mike

(1:27:08)

Mike was watching the law program, The Practice, because he likes to see the unethical behavior of these attorneys.

An attorney used the term res ipsa duce

Brent doesn’t know what it is and wishes we would get rid of all those foreign words.

Res means a thing or matter or property

Ipsa is a common foreign legal word it means itself

Caller 3 Kansas Jan

Caller disagrees with Brent

A right is not always a responsibility

It is also a just claim of something that belongs to you

In the Declaration of Independence we the people are the beneficiaries of the endowment gift donation of the donor Creator whose name is Nature’s God and where we are the beneficiary of those endowments donated by the Donor which the presence of a Creator donor and 2) endowments and 3) rights to use those endowments and donation conferred prove that and end with no consideration exchanged prove that the trust agreement was formed and not a contract which would require such consideration not endowments which are gifts and finally the beneficiary’s participation within the trust is limited to the right to use the endowments gifts or donations such that there is no responsibility on the part of the beneficiary at all as the receiver of the gift and donation given by the donor and so without the element of the exchange of consideration which is necessary for a contract no contract exists but a trust does.

A right is not always a responsibility.

Brent answered: When I say a right is a responsibility what does the word mean? and the word is an Anglo Saxon word and it’s an old Germanic word right means duty.

It means responsibility.

Right means responsibility It means duty

If someone is given a gift then that gift becomes his responsibility and he better deal with it the way the lawgiver wants him to deal with it. He becomes a steward.

And that is the meaning of that Germanic word.

Caller said that the stewardship is the responsibility of the position of trustee within a trust and not of the beneficiary.

Brent said that if a gift has been given and the beneficiary has a right to a disbursement , that right is a responsibility.

The trustee owns the property He owns the legal title. The beneficiary owns the beneficial title

The beneficiary has a right and if he has a right then he has a duty.

Caller still disagrees.

Brent said once you are given a right You are responsible for it.

Caller still contends that a right does not always carry a responsibility with it.

Caller 4 North Carolina April

(1:49:43)

Caller believes that all rights carry responsibilities

Brent believes that all rights are responsibilities

Caller asked where she can e-mail questions

You can e-mail questions to commonlawyer.com

Is there any way that she can sue CPS? or do something about them keeping her from seeing her grandson?

Her grandson is in CPS in North Carolina

Right now he is in guardianship of another grandparent in Virginia

Brent suggested to find a lawyer in that jurisdiction that can deal with it because you are going across state lines You need counsel.

Or you can try to navigate it yourself.

Brent does not know the customs and laws of those states.

Is there anything in the Constitution or case law that would help her in the way that they are discriminating against her?  
She is handicapped and they questioned her about being handicapped.

They keep her on supervised visitation

The mother and father of the child (her son) had joint custody

The mother of the child married someone else and they committed a crime against another child and had all of the children taken away

The children were placed in CPS

Her son had joint custody but CPS ignored the fact that he had joint custody.

They ignored that he stated that he wanted his son to be raised by her.

They took the child’s mother’s custody rights away.

Caller’s son is incarcerated right now so they will not let him talk to his son.

They are alienating him and discriminating against her.

That is a convoluted case.

Brent does not know what the laws of that state says and all states are different.

Go to the internet and type in grandparents’ rights

Use key words.

It’s good to do your own research

Caller has power of attorney for her son

They are supposed to give her all paperwork including the judge’s orders

They are refusing to accept her power of attorney

They refuse to give her any paperwork

Her son is incarcerated and so he can’t do anything about it

She has power of attorney for her son And her son is in jail

Caller can go to the court and get copies of those orders

Whatever court he was convicted in will have the record of his case.

It should be public record

And you can go to that court and ask them for copies of orders

She wants the records concerning her grandchild.

In family court they don’t release stuff.

They are ignoring her power of attorney

The CPS lawyers are saying that they don’t have to give her copies of anything.

The only remedy you have is to go to court and see if you can get a judge to force them to do it.

You could go to legal aid based on your income.

Legal aid where she is at, they send you to a clinic

They give you paperwork and they don’t help you.

Lawyers are required to do a certain amount of bonified work every year.

Find a lawyer that is required to do bonified pro bono work

Her problem is that she is working within two states

Use the lawyer in the state where her son is.

You got a lot of hurdles.

Her son is bipolar and suicidal

Her son is 34

If you can find a lawyer then use them

If not then keep plugging away at what you are doing

She is going to do a habeas corpus

She is doing the courses first

NLA stopped doing habeas corpuses because they had too many and they could only take them to the default stage

But all of that information is still at the National Liberty Alliance website

There are examples.

At some point somebody will start doing them again.

The examples are online.

Her son is autistic bipolar

Caller 5

Question about jurisdiction

Is a conviction valid if a judge never asked you to enter a plea ?

It was a motor vehicle issue

Caller asked the judge questions about the nature of the charges.

That set the judge off and he immediately threatened to incarcerate him

He didn’t ask me to enter a plea

Finally we went to trial and caller told judge that he never asked him to enter a plea.

Judge said we are not going to go through this now and proceeded with the trial

Caller should have objected

Would this be a valid conviction if you try somebody without asking them to enter a plea and convict them?

(2:08:54)

That would be a valid complaint

They can’t do that even though they do.

Caller may take action against this judge

Caller 6 John

Caller has looked up the term “holder in due course”

one other than the original recipient who holds a legally effective negotiable instrument and who has a right to collect from and no responsibility toward the issuer

When you purchase property you have to have proof that you paid for it.

When caller bought his property back in 1970 he was the second owner from the original actually he was the first owner away from the original

He had the original patent

Caller bought half of the property

The same patent number should carry over to him

How then could they lawfully or legally take that property and put it on the tax rolls.

“They” meaning the county tax office.

There are three different kinds of deeds

You never get to accept the deed especially if there is a mortgage because the bank likes to leave that open so that when it comes time to steal your property they put their name in there.

That is a negotiable instrument that is open

You need to accept it that it is yours so you will become the holder in due course and that property is yours forever.

Go to YouTube and put in Rob Ryder accept your deed

He goes through it step by step

Caller 7 Gary from Michigan

We had a situation in central Michigan with a group that he is associated with you could call them We the People They are upset with a posting at World Net Daily It listed all executive orders coming down from Obama compared with all the previous Presidents.

(2:22:28)

Caller read his response to that posting:

You might at first glance think that all of these executive orders indicate that a President that really does not have the best interest of We the People at heart and I think that would be exactly correct but how can this happen in America, the land of the free and the home of the brave? Well the check on these executive orders that have not been played in Congress it is their duty to review and stop these orders if they do not agree. Can you hear the silence? It’s deafening. And why is that happening? It is happening because We the People have not held Congress’ feet to the fire like we are duty bound to do. We are the people that we have been waiting for and we have let us down. In 2017 let us We the People change all of this.

Caller was interested in comments from Brent and/or Gerard.

There is no provision in the Constitution for Obama to be writing all of those executive orders.

He may be the chief executive and he can give orders to those agencies that he’s in control of . A lot of what he is doing goes way beyond that. And there is no authority there.

They are null and void and just need to be nullified.

Hopefully when Donald Trump gets in he will write them out with a stroke of the pen.

He wants to do as much as he can before he leaves that can’t be changed.

Those executive orders could just be false flags just to get us ticked off.

Executive orders properly used are lawful.

Every time the executive department gives an order to the chief of staff of a military establishment then that is lawful because that is his job. That is his duty.

Traditionally executive orders were for the executive to direct those under his authority as to how to enforce the law that Congress had passed.

Presidents through the centuries from the very beginning have chosen to enforce the laws that they wanted to enforce and not enforce others.

This has worked real well for us these independent judgments of our Presidents as long as Presidents had a sincere bonified devotion to the Constitution. I do not see that now.

This President’s executive orders have been lawless

Caller 8: Rod from Oregon

(2:41:00)

Caller wants to mention about a case law from North Carolina Supreme Court back in 1779.

Cruden vs Neale in North Carolina back in 1796

(2:43:27) " When a change of government takes place, from a monarchical to a republican government, the old form is dissolved. Those who lived under it, and did not choose to become members of the new, had a right to refuse their allegiance to it, and to retire elsewhere. By being a part of the society subject to the old government, they had not entered into any engagement to become subject to any new form the majority might think proper to adopt. That the majority shall prevail is a rule posterior to the formation of government, and results from it. It is not a rule binding upon mankind in their natural state. There, every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen without his consent." CRUDEN v. NEALE

(2:45:00)

In Oregon this was a law or statute put on the books in Oregon back in 1923

ORS 336 057 and 067

# Courses in Constitution and history of United States

In all public schools, courses of instruction shall be given in the Constitution of the United States and in the history of the United States. These courses shall:

**(1)**Begin not later than the opening of the eighth grade and shall continue in grades 9 through 12.

**(2)**Be required in all public universities listed in ORS [**352.002 (Public universities)**](https://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/352.002) and in all state and local institutions that provide education for patients or inmates to an extent to be determined by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

**Topics given special emphasis in instruction**

**(1)**In public schools special emphasis shall be given to instruction in:

**(a)**Honesty, morality, courtesy, obedience to law, respect for the national flag, the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Oregon, respect for parents and the home, the dignity and necessity of honest labor and other lessons that tend to promote and develop an upright and desirable citizenry.

**(b)**Respect for all humans, regardless of race, color, creed, national origin, religion, age, sex or disability.

**(c)**Acknowledgment of the dignity and worth of individuals and groups and their participative roles in society.

**(d)**Humane treatment of animals.

**(e)**The effects of tobacco, alcohol, drugs and controlled substances upon the human system.

**(2)**The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall prepare an outline with suggestions that will best accomplish the purpose of this section, and shall incorporate the outline in the courses of study for all public schools

To this very day that has not been implemented.

This is their law They put it on the books Why isn’t it happening?

It has been buried for many years for nefarious reasons.

There is a law in the books in New York state that says that they are supposed to be teaching the Constitution and American History up through twelfth grade and it isn’t happening.

(2:48:54)

Caller 9 Jeremiah in California

Jeremiah talked about the Family Law

Go to your law library and do a search and read some articles about your particular issue.

Judges have to make determinations that will affect a future decision , it is called a rule, they will make a rule, they have to be very careful about the rights that they are going to be interfering with when they do make their decision.

Brent said that marriage has never been a contract. The marriage ceremony, we call it marriage vows.

Vows are promises made direct to God.

In a contract, if the other side, if you exchange promises between yourselves, and the other side doesn’t keep their promise, that is called breach, and you have the option of disregarding the contract entirely.

That’s not true of marriage because your promise is not to each other. It’s to God.

It’s a vow.

And you make it before God, to God, before witnesses.

Marriage is not a contract It is a set of vows that each person makes to God.

In New York State, the State Education Department has changed the education law that read , it used to read for many many years, that the parent is the primary educator of the child. And they turned that around and they said that the state is the primary educator of the child. It is very prevalent in many states. Donald Trump said that he was going to change it back to the parent being the primary educator of the child. He’s got the bully pulpit and I hope he uses it.

Closing Song: Eye in Sky