National Liberty Alliance

Monday Night Conference Call

September 30, 2019

This week’s Lead in Song – Kansas "Away From You" from album Monolith
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(5:30)

Scripture Reading:   Mark 4 : 35 - 41

( 6:50)

We are trying to find another platform for our conference calling

If anybody is aware of any good conference calling program that we could move over to let us know

Tonight we’re going to look at the republic

Democracy vs Republic

We’re not a democracy

We wrote a paper we did file it with the court it didn’t get filed today it went into the mail today It should be there the day after tomorrow

All of the filings up to this last one have been covered this last one we’re still working on

We could still use some volunteers for this last one

Anyone who would like to volunteer to assist us in some mailings This one is five pages

It’s probably one stamp

Anyone who wants to volunteer to send them out

We’re sending them out to 94 federal district courts

and numerous others governors and some others

I sent some out today they went to the judiciary committee the House and the Senate

they went to the United States Supreme Court a copy went to Attorney General Barr

also sent a copy to the President Trump

and a few other places we sent it to

We sent a copy to We the People Robert Schultz

We filed quite a few papers so far

This is an education

The purpose of these papers that we’re filing every paper that we’re filing from this point forward is a decision of the court

We have filed six decisions so far of the court

The first paper filing for the decision was fifty pages

Everything after that is less than eight pages

Basically five, six , or seven pages

They’re all important papers

We’re also filing indictments

We have been in court for over two years

We have been filing papers to all of these people for over three years

We filed in under the auspices of the court up in the Northern District of New York for two years

They have not answered any paper that we sent them

They’ve tried closing us down numerous times

A major part of this is education

Not only for the individuals we are filing against

It’s for educating the people too

Every person that belongs to National Liberty Alliance any member that we have anybody that is active should be reading these papers to become educated

Education is the key

Next week things will become real clear with the paper that we are putting out

It’s a paper that a wrote for the sole purpose of laying out National Liberty Alliance’s plan in the nutshell

It’s going to be about thirty minutes long

We’ll put it on our front page as soon as we have it

We may read it next week

It’s an extremely important paper

It really explains very specifically focused on exactly where we are how we got here

how they colluded to destroy our Republic

To make people think we are a democracy and not a republic

Tonight we’re going to hear a little bit about what our founding fathers had to say

about a democracy and a republic

We’re going to read this paper

I filed this paper up at our website

If you want to follow along go to our website nationallibertyalliance.org

Highlight “Grand Jury”

click on “Action Against the Judiciary”

We have been filing one paper every week

The first one we filed was on the 17th

That was August 17

Then September 3, September 9, September 16 September 25 and now September 30

Every 7 days we’ve been filing a paper

We want to continue to do that

These papers in themselves is a huge education

They’re eye openers they really explain the problem

and also gives the solution

and at the end of every paper we give an order

Obey the law

These people are under that Constitution and they ignore it

They think they are protected

Hopefully over time as we keep filing these papers that will become clear

At some point in time they will not be able to ignore us

The main reason they are not responding properly yet is because they think they are under the protection of the Deep State

They didn’t get the memo yet

The Deep State is on it’s way out

People should keep up to date on what is happening by listening to X 22 Report

These papers people should be reading them carefully

We need to become educated

Tonight we are going to be reading through a paper

Democracy vs Republic

It is a paper that we filed

If you want to follow along

Click on “Grand Jury”

Highlight “Action against the Judiciary”

it’s dated September 30

It’s written up as a Writ Mandamus and Information Concerning the Republic

(23:48)

The paper begins as follows:

DEMOCRACY -v- REPUBLIC Article IV Section 4: The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion;

While trying to discover a form of government John Adams wrote that: “Democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There was never a democracy that did not commit suicide.”

Our Founding Fathers reviled democracy and gave their posterity a Republic, as Thomas Jefferson said: “The Republican is the only form of government which is not eternally at open or secret war with the rights of mankind.”

Edmund Burke – “Of this I am certain, that in a democracy the majority of the citizens is capable of exercising the most cruel oppression upon the minority...”

Thomas Jefferson – “A democracy is nothing more than mob rule, where 51 percent of the people may take away the rights of the other 49 percent.”

Benjamin Franklin – “Democracy is two wolves and a lamb voting on what to have for lunch. Liberty is a well-armed lamb contesting the vote.”

Winston Churchill – “The best argument against democracy is a five-minute conversation with the average voter.”

Aristotle – “Unlimited democracy is, just like oligarchy, a tyranny spread over a large number of people.”

The paper concludes with the following:

In a Republic, a Constitution or Charter of Rights protects certain unalienable rights that cannot be taken away by the government, even if it has been elected by a majority of voters. In a democracy, the majority is not restrained in this way and can impose its will on the minority. Although we choose most of our representatives and local heads of state and judges democratically they are all governed by the Law of the Land which restricts their powers and jurisdiction in order to conform to the will of the People through the Constitution by authority vested in the People via Natural Law (God).

“To highlight the offensiveness to liberty that democracy and majority rule is, just ask yourself how many decisions in your life would you like to be made democratically. How about what car you drive, where you live, whom you marry, whether you have turkey or ham for Thanksgiving dinner? If those decisions were made through a democratic process, the average person would see it as tyranny and not personal liberty. Isn’t it no less tyranny for the democratic process to determine [what is lawful and what is not lawful] whether you purchase health insurance or set aside money for retirement? Both for ourselves, and our fellow man around the globe, we should be advocating liberty, not the democracy that we’ve become where an unscrupulous Congress does anything upon which they can muster a majority vote.”

In 2016 we stood at the precipice, today we stand at the doors of Justice.

“Silence can only be equated with fraud where there is a legal or moral duty to speak, or where an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading.”

ORDERED, Congressmen, Senators, Judges, and all appointed and employed bureaucrats are commanded to honor their oath to guarantee a “REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT“ and stop trying to convince the average voter that we are a democracy, the NWO is DOA.

(38:06)

The original Federalists Papers that came out in 1787 when they finished their conversations and prepared a Constitution but it was a little later with a debate the Antifederalists picked up on and the difference between the federalists and the antifederalists mainly is that the federalists generally wanted bigger federal government

where the antifederalist they wanted a federal government that had powers that were very limited

The real solution that the antifederalists came up with the Constitution was signed in 1789 but the fruits of the labor of the antifederalists really didn’t get picked up until 1791 and that was through the Bill of Rights

The fruit of the antifederalist Article 1 Section 9

The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

It was Madison and Jefferson mainly who framed out the Bill of Rights

Jefferson was out of the country at the time

Preamble to the Bill of Rights

**The** Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution.

In the Declaration of Independence

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

There is the foundation of our law

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.

The Preamble of the Constitution:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America

The Declaration of Independence is the foundation of our law

The Constitution is the framework of our law to control our government

The capstone is liberty

The capstone is the Bill of Rights

The capstone is restrictive clauses telling them not to violate this right , not to violate that right

We have these unalienable rights

We have been trying to petition the government for redress of grievances

in a thoughtful, lawful, and historical way over the past twenty years

Starting off with the work that Robert Schultz had done with We the People organization

One of the first things he brought in was to petition the government for redress of grievances

They decided not to hear

They met us with silence

This has been going on for twenty years

We’ve been in the courtroom for twenty years

All the papers were properly filed

They broke the law removing many papers ignoring them

And when we started picking up here at National Liberty Alliance filing papers three or four years ago they ignored them

We got them into a place under the auspices of the court

They continue to ignore them

They meet us with silence

It’s all a fraud case is over we are now making decisions

And that’s what it’s all about at this point making decisions

orders and decisions and in that process

Teaching people through the writing of these papers

as well as the people who are supposed to be our servants

This will be successful at some point it time

It’s going to require a mass of people to move forward on this

We need to hit the point of critical mass

I see us approaching it

The other thing is not only hitting critical mass but for the Deep State to be going down

We’re going to be talking more about the committeeman process and how we take control of the political process

The power point video that I’m putting together I hope to have it done this week

That’s going to cover how to take back not only the judicial power and authority but also how to take back our political process

We’re going to encourage people to run for committeeman

By November we should be heavily into talking about taking control of the political process

We may call this video NLA’s Plan in the Nutshell

It will be about thirty minutes

It’s going to explain how we got here what we’ve done where we are in the court

how we’re going to take back the judicial process

detailed points on how we’re going to take back the political process

It’s up to the people to respond to it

It’s up to us to get the message out

1:00:00

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Welcome Committee is down to bare minimum

We could use help calling people

We could use help with our continuous mailings each week

(1:00:30)

QUESTIONS

Question 1 James has advised me to inquire with you about the joinder procedure because

my wife has changed her name legally from Leela to Paula However on her tax court case her older name is reflected On our intake form on the check we wish to send to you it has her new updated name and my given birth name which is not exactly the same as on the intake form or the tax court case We are asking if any changes need to be made

Also can I send the payment by priority express since our trial is scheduled for mid November

and our time is limited

Once we get the paperwork going James will start moving on the papers As soon as he gets the joinder paper out for signature we prepare it directly it goes out for signature and you drop it in the mail within two days as long as Jim is caught up within two days those papers will go out

and will move along but it’s going to take time

The amicus curiae which is what we’re doing the major point of that is challenging jurisdiction jurisdictions unknown and denial of due process

We have to give them thirty days to respond

This is where these papers that we’ve been filing not only in the Northern District court

with all of the players involved as far as being defendants

but also getting a copy out to these federal district courts and other places

plays an important role because it gets the word out of what we’re doing

I’m trying to frame a paper and if I can get it done it should shake them up a little bit

lay out the power and authority of the people make it clear what our intentions are

and that we’re going to be asked at the end of the day all those found still in resistance

they have time to repent and turn away over time that olive branch that we’re offering will eventually fall away

at the end of the day whoever is found in resistance at that point we are seeking to go after them for denying our unalienable rights for subversion

subversion against the Constitution

subversion against the people

In that process we’re going to ask for the ultimate penalty

We’re giving them plenty of time We still got lots of papers we continue to file

There’s still time before we hit critical mass

There’s still time before the Deep State finally collapses

People are going to start to go to jail

At that point in time when the clock runs out we’re going to seek the maximum

What they have done was to destroy our law destroy our Constitution

to deny our unalienable rights

and they did that by rule and in this paper we’re going to make that point

They made it obscure and hard to see

Treason is what we’re going after them for

and the maximum penalty for that

Just think of all the lives that have been destroyed by these evil courts

Hopefully the next paper will focus in on that so that these people understand

Regarding the question they had changed their names recently and the tax court names were different than their new names

Probably in their affidavit they should make the point try to bring that story down to minimum sentences Make it clear that this is what your birth name was Get a paragraph in there that talks about all of these names

Make the point at the end Here in after whatever name you want to use at that point

Make a paragraph explaining it

Here in after you will be identified or known as whatever name you end up with

That one paragraph will clarify things

( 1:12:39)

Question 2: I have an issue with the state of Idaho Department of Finance suing me relating to a failed business venture involving an Idaho investor

They’re suing me for fraud saying I violated the Securities Act

They are relying on a deposition from the investor doesn’t really say much and a sworn affidavit from someone I don’t know at all presumably paid for by the state

Since I am an LLC accepted benefit doing business in their state did I somehow grant them jurisdiction or myself personally I’d like to joinder my case and Jim said that I needed to find this out first

They aren’t allowing me a trial by jury It looks like the judge is going to enter MSJ Monday

I think that a very short synopsis of the case I would like to look at

If they’re coming out after you personally and they’re not coming out after you as a corporation but as a person

and it’s the government that is coming out after you as a person

If that is the case short and simple that way then yes we could do a joinder

The key thing to this whole thing is that we’re not agreeing with someone that they’re innocent or guilty We’re not making those decisions that’s not what we’re doing

The problem is that you’re in jurisdictions unknown

and if they want to try to prosecute you for something then they should be doing it properly

in a court of law

And if they won’t do it in a court of law then they should do it in no court at all

That’s what the Constitution requires

That’s your unalienable right to have access to a court of law

You must be indicted by a jury of your peers

And then you must be convicted by a jury of your peers

They have to believe that you’re guilty of something and it’s up to them to decide what type of penalty needs to be paid In most cases it should not be jail at all

Jail is not the answer or the solution

It’s not the way to solve a problem

It’s not the way to bring the injured party back into a restored condition

We’re going to put together a really good orientation program

We have to be very careful on what we introduce to them

We don’t want to create bias from a different perspective

People need to understand that they have to come with a sense of honor , justice, and mercy

At the end of the day they have to always consider mercy

(1:18:30)

Terry asked Brent to talk because we lost John

Brent:

Let’s talk about the Constitution of the United States

We left off coming up to Article 1 Section 10 Clause 3

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

This clause of our Constitution bars any of the several states from entering a confederation with any foreign power

(1:20:19)

This clause applies the Christian Just War Tradition to the states

This is well known among folk who spend their time studying such things

The Just War Tradition at bottom says this we shouldn’t go to war unless somebody is trying to invade us

unless somebody tries to attack us unless somebody does attack us

or are going to invade or attack

The Just War Tradition limits war powers to defense against aggressors

forbidding any state to keep regular troops or war ships in peace time without the consent of Congress

This clause says that if Congress consents Texas or California Oregon or Washington

they can have their own Navy if Congress consents if Congress doesn’t consent then their not allowed to do that without Congress states are not to have a navy or a standing army

They do have a militia though Every state has a militia whether they understand it or not

Whether they use it or not

The militia are the people

The people are the militia

That’s every able bodied male that’s the militia

Article 2 Let’s talk a little bit about that

Article 2 Section 1 Clause 1

The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four Years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same Term, be elected, as follows:

Our Constitution is not about what ought to be done

It’s about how it ought to be done

Our common law is not about what ought to be done

It’s about how

how thing ought to be done

The most important right of our Constitution is due process

The process that is due and owing to all concerned

It is how things are to be done

The way that we are to proceed

Our common law is due process

My comments are my own the people at NLA may not necessarily agree with my comments

Brent and a mutual friend are going to get together and have a debate a trial

It would be called the Constitution of the United States on Trial

for being an AntiChrist document

I’ll be the lawyer for the defense

He’ll be the lawyer for the prosecution

It will be structured like a trial

It will be educational and informative

He wants to put it live on the internet

That’s going to be on March 28, 2020 in the evening

If this thing actually plays out then I will be posting it

commonlawyer.com

I think it will take place in Springfield , Missouri

(1:48:17)

John talked about the joinder

We don’t want to discuss the details of any case

Generally we do ask people to write a synopsis of what their court case is about

CALLERS

Caller 1: Cody in Illinois

(1:55:00)

It’s been two months since the border patrol took my phones

I called them today

They finally gave me a little more of an answer

They’re not forfeited They’re supposedly in some sort of a lab They’re probably going to ruin my data trying to crack my phones when I wasn’t doing anything illegal

Can we indict the border patrol for their Fourth Amendment violations?

We’re not at a place where we might want to do something like that

You can’t indict a border patrol

You might be able to get an individual indicted

People are indicted not organizations or groups of any kind or agencies or anything of that nature

If an individual violated your unalienable right you can file a complaint and ask the grand jury for an indictment you have the right to access but you’re not going to get it not yet

There is no access to a grand jury

When you file a complaint they take it to the DA and they make a decision whether they want to pursue it or not

It’s not their decision That’s why we need to take the courts back

People need direct access to the grand jury

(2:00:30)

Caller 2: Rebecca from Arizona

My husband and I e-mailed some questions in

court on Wednesday

We did the denial of jurisdiction

Did we do an amicus curiae for you? Yes

They received it

He doesn’t know why they’re bringing him into court

There’s money to be made there

People have to have patience and endurance

When we go into court they ignore us

a lot of the courts that we file our papers in will ignore us

They’re on file things are moving we’ll go on to the next step

At some point they’re going to wake up

We will be doing lots of indictments

We intend on indicting every single judge that denies the process that we are going through

We will file an indictment on them

The grand jury has come together and made that decision

that any judge that resists and denies and rejects is owed an indictment

at the point we go to the amicus curiae they throw it out they ignore it

We move then to the motion to move the court into the federal district court

They try to neutralize that

We go to the end of thirty days we give more than thirty days

we go to the end of thirty days and then we file an indictment

Nobody does anything

Nobody gets arrested

We keep going we keep filing we keep indicting

We keep doing the things we have to do that are proper and lawful

at some point in time when critical mass is met by that point in time where the final collapse of the Deep State and then there will be a power vacuum

The judges won’t know what to do anymore

Status quo is not a good thing to do any more because there isn’t any protection

The whole thing crumbles and falls apart

My biggest question what happens if she throws him in jail again

He’s already been unlawfully thrown in jail

She has no reason to bring him to court

Now she’s trying to hold him in contempt

He doesn’t know what to say or do

He can rest on our paperwork

They can ignore it and deny it

Rest in the fact that they don’t have jurisdiction

The grand jury has challenged jurisdiction on my behalf

At my request I asked them to intervene in my case and they did so by the process amicus curiae

My biggest concern I’m going to basically tell this judge that there is a cause for jurisdiction and we cannot proceed until that has been answered

What that will do is buy more time

30 days transpires then we move to the next step moving it for cause

They signed for it last week

I’ve been checking the court website

It’s not posted on the website

This judge has the tendency to deny everything that comes in front of her

When I was incarcerated my wife filed paperwork on my behalf to show cause for jurisdiction

The judge denied that stating that she was not a party to the case

Liberty Alliance filed on my behalf the grand jury filed what they filed on my behalf last week the court the clerk signed for it

It typically takes two days to get on to the court’s website so that you can see that it’s been filed

Nothing’s on there

We have a paper I meant to put this up online I’ll put it up tomorrow

It will be in front of all the other papers that we filed Highlight “Grand Jury” go to

“Action Against the Judiciary”

Right now you’ll see Filed August 17, 2019 and then all the others

Right on top of that I’m going to place a paper

which was done as a mandamus and order

I will put this paper on the website

It’s two pages

You can tell them that the paper is being filed in the federal district court

concerning these kind of cases

are being filed under the order of the grand jury

with the clerk to file and not break the law

I’ll talk with Jim

Maybe we will do a one pager in front of these papers

You can take the paper that I’m going to put up there and it’s two pages you can make copies and bring it into the court It applies to that clerk and any clerk in any court

It applies to them all

they have a job to do

When that clerk gets that paper that clerks only job is to file

If they reject only because there’s a prima facia defect

If there’s a prima facia defect they must let the person know what that defect is and they have the opportunity to correct that defect

That clerk does not have the power or authority to judge that paper

Their duty is to file

It is a crime to remove a paper that is in the judicial process

You cannot remove it it is not to be defaced destroyed or anything

It must go through the process

A judge trying to intervene on those papers and say don’t file that paper that’s a crime

If a judge intimidates a clerk and orders the clerk to remove those papers 20 years in jail

(2:15:30)

Caller 3 Jim from Pennsylvania

Is a nonjudicial foreclosure the same thing as an attainder?

The Constitution forbids the federal government or the Congress the general government from passing any bill of attainder. A bill of attainder is a bill that targets a specific person and says that what they did was a crime If Congress tries to pass a law that says Donald Trump committed a crime When he did this we passed a bill after he did it saying that

that was a crime. There are those occasions when those things arise

What we’re doing concerning the nonjudicial foreclosures is something different

As Brent said a bill of attainder is let’s say someone does something and someone in government doesn’t like it so they get a law through and then they try to arrest the person

for a law that didn’t exist at the time they apparently broke it

Without a trial

It would be Congress or the state legislature declaring somebody a criminal

If they pass a bill of attainder it would declare somebody a criminal that’s the result of it without a trial without a jury A legislative body doesn’t have judicial power

separation of power forbids that only the courts would have the power for a grand jury indictment and a jury trial and all those things that would be necessary

A nonjudicial foreclosure taking something away from you without going through the judicial process That totally lacks due process only that can happen under civil law which is what these courts think that they’re operating under

They’re under a false understanding of that

They’re going to have to pay a heavy price if they continue in this

They changed all these laws to civil law by a rule Rule 2

Congress gave them the power and authority to write the rules

The United States Supreme Court working in collusion with the BAR Association who is directing this whole thing both in Congress and in the Supreme Court really moved it in in a tricky way to try to use a rule to combine law and equity

Civil law is not equity Civil law is not law

Civil law is municipal law law of the city

all of that is unlawful and that’s what they’re operating under

A nonjudicial foreclosure takes place in a court

To do a nonjudicial foreclosure what they’re really doing they’re working behind the scene changing ownership changing the paperwork

playing a paper game

they file with the court this nonjudicial foreclosure

it’s never going to be heard in a court at all

No judge is going to sign it

It’s all done to make it look like it’s lawful

It’s operating under the color of law

to make them believe that this thing is lawful

so that the people don’t catch on

they’re just trying to take your home without due process

Attainder as Brent said is if you do something and the legislators go out there and make it a crime after the fact

The Constitution of the United States forbids the Congress from passing any bills of attainder

Bills of Attainder have been used in the English speaking world they’re against the common law and they were declared as such but they have happened

Attainder is an old Norman French word

Attainder means it’s an old word it was used to talk about taking a person’s life his liberty or his property

Article 1 Section 9 Clause 3 says

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

It was used originally to execute people

During the 1600s the King of England wanted to get his throne back

He was run out by putting William and Mary on the throne in the late 1600s

He went back to Scotland

and the Scotland legislators compiled a list of three thousand names of persons who were not loyal to him

and they passed a bill outlawing them

That means that you kill them on sight

A bill of attainder is a bill passed by the government usually the legislative body

that outlaws or says that a certain person or a certain number of persons their property life or liberty or combination thereof the government is going to take it from them as soon as they see them

A bill of attainder is a legislative act directed against a designated person pronouncing him guilty of an alleged crime without trial or conviction according to the recognized rules of procedure and pronouncing sentencing of death and attainder upon him

It’s trial by legislation

(2:33:28)

Caller 4 Did not want to give his first name

You guys talk about an ex post facto law

They change the rules to declare something unlawful

When you do an act and it’s not unlawful

The legislators make a law to make whatever act you committed a crime

You did it before it was a law

A law written after the fact

You heard about the whole Ukraine issue that’s going on

Ex post facto works in that situation

What they did they actually went down and changed the rules

the congress did

they went and changed the rules concerning the definition concerning the basically they changed the rules that was after the fact

The rules required that there has to be firsthand knowledge

They removed that firsthand knowledge and changed that so that a person’s hearsay could be applied against Trump as far as trying to bring them up as a witness and using hearsay whereas the rules of law and the rules of process on how they act also that was changed there for the fact that would be ex post facto right there

They’re all going on national television and smiling and lying to everyone’s face

They’re being played

Everything that they’re talking about they’re talking about themselves

their guilt

This is all part of the plan

The whole process is going to turn on them

Those people are going to be brought through the process

They’ve been talking about themselves

They were the ones guilty with dealing with the Russians and other governments

They were the ones guilty of doing something with the voting

They were the ones guilty of lots of things

It’s all going to turn on them soon

John read part of the paper that he read earlier on the call

2:43:55

“We constantly hear Congressmen, Senators, Presidents, and even United States Supreme Court Justices refer to America as a democracy. Are our elected servants that ignorant of our Constitution, our History, and our Heritage? Or is there a methodical covert conspiracy hell-bent on destroying our Republic? Just how close are we? Or should I say how close were we? I think the following says it all when President Barack Obama during the 2016 White House Correspondents’ Dinner where he predicted Hillary Clinton’s presidency in 2017 said;

‘The end of the republic has never looked better.’

And then the unexpected happened, by God’s mercy and divine providence the coup failed and President Trump was elected in her stead and declared in contrast;

‘In America, the people govern, the people rule, and the people are sovereign. I was elected not to take power, but to give power to the American people where it belongs.’”

At National Liberty Alliance there’s nothing that we’re doing that hasn’t been done before

What we’re doing has never been done by combining numerous things together to execute what we’re trying to do

We’re doing what our founding fathers said to do

We have the right to change our government to change the players

If Congress won’t do their job of impeachment then We the People have to step up

We have to take our political process back

We have to take control of our courts and bring them to trial

Get knowledge

Is anyone in your organization in contact with Trump? yes

Censorship on the internet is war

All of that is going to change

A lot of people in the news media will be arrested for treason

They were able to provide the cover

You can’t impeach a president without a crime

I wouldn’t be surprised if Trump didn’t win every state in the 2020 election

They’re fighting for their lives

Start following the X 22 Report

That’s one of the best news sources

(2:55:40)

Caller 5 Shawn from Arizona

A quick question on the process I have an amicus curiae I have it prepared to file

I will be filing it tomorrow

after my court today of them entering a motion for summary judgement

What can I do without jeopardizing what we’re filing here with the grand jury to stop any proceeding on the judgment against me?

The amicus curiae in law should stop everything in it’s tracks because the amicus curiae is challenging the jurisdiction of the court

Once jurisdiction is challenged it must be proven

You can bring that up yourself

If an amicus curiae came of my behalf from the grand jury I would make sure that I had a couple of copies when I went in there

If the judge says I’m discarding this they don’t have any business

I would before I go into court I would put an X across for the grand jury and I’d put my own name in there and have that paper in my back pocket

and then once the judge says Well we’re not accepting that into the record

and then hand it off What about this one?

Some words everything is the same but it’s coming from me

I’m challenging jurisdiction

You don’t have jurisdiction

Once jurisdiction is challenged it must be decided

and it can’t be decided by you because you already believe that you got jurisdiction

It’s got to go up the level to another court of record for that decision to be made

That should buy you time

Prior to today I had filed the challenge jurisdiction

I had defaulted them on the challenge

They just blow past it

The next step is to move it into federal court for cause

We can’t promise rainbows and lollipops

At the end of the day we do believe that we are going to get justice

At the end of the day we do believe that we’re going to win

I’ve been at this for a long time

Judgment is going to come to nations

At the end of the day you’ll get justice

Read the papers that we’ve been filing

Be in the course and get educated

Consider becoming an administrator

Run for committeeman