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Gerard hosted the call

Scripture Reading: Psalm 89

(7:30))

We’re working this New York case that the judge answered

The New York Gun case is in the federal court as is our master case is in federal court

There seems to be no difference in either case as far as the judges want to treat this to bring this out of common law and into a statutory proceeding civil everything is civil

You go in and you fill out a civil cover sheet

They put you in this chancery civil court that basically denies your unalienable rights

They feel comfortable doing that They feel comfortable throwing their statutes at us.

If you go to the NLA site you will see the Writ of Errors that we have issued to these judges in the New York case and in the other case

Each case is teaching us a little bit more about how they operate

Each time they pull something we start to close the doors and pretty soon they have no place to turn because we’re going to answer them and they’re not going to be able to answer us

The other side never answered our case they defaulted

The way they answered they asked for 45 days in order to make a motion to dismiss

They come into the court We file papers as the plaintiff They come in They don’t answer the case They answer it with a motion requesting 45 days in order to do a motion to dismiss We called them on that They quoted some rule that wasn’t even in existence that we couldn’t find as far as asking for the 45 days

We are of the opinion that you can’t ask for time for an extension of time before you answer If you haven’t answered then how can you make a motion on anything?

We put a case in and they didn’t answer all they did was answer with “we need more time and we want it dismissed”

That’s not an answer

We slapped the judge, the magistrate, and the clerk

All of them have violated our due process rights

We’re going to file an amicus brief

Amicus brief which is a friend of the court

But we’re doing it as a grand jury as a friend of the court

The grand jury is going to be the one filling the paperwork out

Slapping them and putting them back in their place

As far as we’re concerned they’re defaulted

They wanted 45 days the judge granted them We said, “You can’t grant days on something that hasn’t been answered.

They said, “Yes we can”

So now we’re going to do this amicus brief through the grand jury of the People it’s going to outline all of the things that they’ve done to violate our due process

John has it pretty much worked out

Next week he will probably go through it in detail

Everybody should read this stuff because it’s an education

We’re educating the court and we’re educating the people that are there

They have no idea what they’re talking about

We have to educate them about common law and the difference between fictional law and real law

They’re not operating under real law under common law

We’re going to address every single point that they brought up

They didn’t answer hardly anything that we asked them they answered us statutorily

They can’t answer with law because they’re wrong

When they answer and give a wrong answer it’s like they didn’t answer

They’re still in default because they didn’t give a real answer

The amicus brief is going to explain that

It’s going to explain what they do with their paperwork and how they’re sucking you into their jurisdiction and then dismiss you and they feel comfortable doing that

And we’re going to do it through the grand jury because that’s where it needs to be

We the People

And then copy Jeff Sessions and President Trump

Crystal had a good idea she used the President’s Executive Order that Donald Trump made on the 12th of December to people who are subverting the government doing acts of treason and if you read through that executive order you’ll see that it fits

Because they’re all doing the same thing and it all goes back to the same money

They are terrorizing the people

(18:00)

QUESTIONS

Question 1: The first question involves a case where they took NLA’s papers and changed them

and then submitted them They got a negative response back

Did they do something wrong? Is it just more judicial fraud?

The response that he got back:

So-and-So has not filed a complaint and what he did he filed a basic Show Cause order.

It was a Show Cause to this court The court says has not filed a complaint because he is proceeding pro se

He is entitled to a liberal reading of his allegations even when such allegations are inartfully pled

Even with a liberal reading his pro se pleading is not a complaint

and it fails to assert a clearly identifiable claim against the defendant

A generous reading of the pleading is that he seeks a judicial determination of his rights against WFFCU the credit union and a declaration that any foreclosure would be unwarranted because he failed to file a complaint invoking the court’s jurisdiction

The court has no subject matter jurisdiction to entertain his request for relief

I used basically your Show Cause format to submit a second Show Cause order for another home I own which is being threatened to be foreclosed on unjudicially by the bank

and below is some of the denial order from the judge

It’s tough to comment on all of that stuff

If I knew if it was a federal court or not then I could address some of the stuff

You’re not going to get into the nitty gritty of the case

You’re going to get into where they violated your due process rights

They’re claiming that he never filed a complaint

Maybe he never did

Maybe he’s taking their case number and putting a Show Cause on it

They may be right

You always got to have a cause of action

They’re looking for the statutes that were violated as far as due process

You have to be very diligent on how you file these things

(25:00)

Question 2

How do I submit a question for tonight’s call?

Send an e-mail to [questions@nationallibertyalliance.org](mailto:questions@nationallibertyalliance.org)

Why does NLA request us to study the original Constitution of 1787 when because of the Act of 1871 The Organic Act we slaves have and continue to be raped by the DC Corporation?  
Why would you want to study any other Constitution but the real one?

The only cure for lawlessness is the law

You have to know the law to use the law

(27:33)

Brent Allen Winters is author of “Excellence of the Common Law”

Brent’s website is commonlawyer.com

The only remedy to lawlessness is true law

Brent’s comments may or may not be the position of NLA  
The phrase in Article 6 of our Constitution supreme law of the land

is an antichrist phrase it’s a lawless phrase

It says that the Constitution is above the laws of nature and the laws of Nature’s God

The phrase “supreme law of the land” is taken from Magna Carta

The phrase in Magna Carta Chapter 39 was in wide use at that time as a matter of spoken law

At that time our common law was not called the common law It was called the volk recht

which means the people’s right or the people’s duty

The phrase “supreme law of the land” does not mean that our Constitution is above the laws of nature and the Laws of Nature’s God

The phrase “Law of the Land’ taken from Magna Carta what it does mean is that our Constitution as a matter of common law as a matter of the first volume is the highest law as a matter of the law unwritten the highest law of process not substance not right or wrong You use good process due process Our common law is a law of process

The phrase “supreme law of the land” means that as to the general government set in Washington DC this is our understanding Our highest understanding is what we agree upon as representatives of the Several States

We agree that there is a way that things got to be done

Our Constitution of the United States is a document of process

It tells how people get appointed to the general government

It wasn’t written to restrict the powers of the state governments

Our Constitution of the United States is applied primarily to the general government of Washington DC

Those that founded our country those that hammered out the Constitution of the United States and signed the Declaration of ’76 quoted Edward Coke more than any other man to justify what they were doing

Edward Coke was the man that wrote the great commentary on Magna Carta

He was a justice in England

King James jailed him and wanted to try him for his life because he was a strong proponent of our common law King James wasn’t

The Laws of Nature unwritten in the nature of things and the Laws of Nature’s God written in the Bible those first principles of law have never changed never will change

They’re applicable to all men at all times all places

Here’s one way you can know what is true law and what isn’t

Just ask yourself Is this thing here that I’m looking at is this thing that I’m looking at applicable to all men? Can we apply it to all men at all times in all places no matter where they are or what kind of circumstances they find themselves in?

If the law you’re talking about the standard you’re considering is not applicable to all men at all times and all places then it’s not true law

It’s not one of those first principles of law

You might say that these principles in the Constitution don’t apply to men who are locked up in prison If you don’t think they are I would ask you to reconsider

Men who are in prison form their own governments

Let’s look at the Declaration of ‘76

(40:54)

We’re up to Paragraph Number 22

It’s say here we’re ticked off the thirteen colonies

we’re ticked off at George III He says he’s king in England and he says he’s emperor here

That means common law doesn’t apply that means we’re part of an empire and not part of common law England

We don’t like that We’re ticked off at him

Paragraph 22 We’re ticked off at George III for abolishing the free system of English laws and neighboring province establishing therein an arbitrary government and enlarging it’s boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies

That had to do with the Quebec Act and the establishment of Canon Law in French speaking Quebec because they were Romanist up there They still are

And then they extended the boundaries of Quebec clear down to the Ohio River to take in all of Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, part of West Virginia right up to Kentucky the Ohio River And then we move to Chapter 23 For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our government

It’s a common law government

So what is the form of the common law government?

People say it’s a republic Not fundamentally It has republican form but that only applies to one part of our government That’s the legislative branch

Our Supreme Court has recognized this and has said that our Constitution guarantees the general government in Washington DC according to our Constitution is supposed to guarantee a Republican form of government to each of the states

Did the state in question send representatives to Congress?

If they did then we’re not concerned and we’re not to be concerned about anything else

That’s what a republican form of government is

It’s a government that has a legislative branch

Our governments are common law governments

The fundamental thing is that we are a common law country

That means that we have three branches of government and there’s a separation of powers

You can have a republican form of government just have one branch namely the legislative branch and they’re sovereign and nobody can tell them what to do and when you have that what you’ll have is tyranny and you’ll have a dictatorship you’ll have a bevy of men that combine their will into one call it a statute and make you do it whether it’s right or wrong

We don’t have that here

The courts have the task as a matter of theory it doesn’t always work we have the courts

The legislators can write the law but they don’t get to show how they apply

The courts can say this isn’t even constitutional

And the President Executive Branch or the governors of the states they don’t have an obligation to do what he Supreme Court says or the courts of the state

Nothing that says that the courts have to enforce what the legislators say in their statutes

There is nothing that says that the legislature has to follow what the President says

The can if they want and they often do

The courts more often than not do what the legislature passes

And the President and the governors more often than not enforce the laws that the legislature passes

They enforce what the courts might say

A jury is all or nothing and it’s twelve men

Anything else is not a common law jury

It works better than anything that has ever been tried in the history of Adam’s race

We talked about charters and what a charter is

Magna Carta means Big Charter

The word Charter is from the Latin word Carta

It means big white piece of paper

A charter is a set of agreements or commitments undertakings promises contracts it is a widely applicable word to all sorts of writings of legal significance

Under Paragraph 23 we’re mad at King George III we just want to get away from him because he took away our charters The charters that the Crown wrote when they granted land on the eastern seaboard to the individual 13 colonies those grants of land usually stretched clean to the Pacific Ocean

The Quebec Act of Parliament extended Quebec hundreds and hundreds of miles

from the Great Lakes clear down to the Ohio River

When they did that that was a violation of the charters of all of those colonies along the eastern seaboard whose land had been given to them to extend clean to the Mississippi River and they said “You’re going back on your word”

Diffidatio is an old common law doctrine Diffidatio was a breach of a promise

A breach of a promise between the Crown Parliament recognized this between the Crown and a person or a group of persons

Under the doctrine the teaching called Diffidatio the King’s broken promise justified withdrawal of allegiance but it justified withdrawal of allegiance only if his broken promise caused serious injury If serious injury is caused by the broken promise of the Crown the common law entitled the injured party to end the relationship under this teaching of common law called Diffidatio It’s called Diffidatio because the word Diffidatio signifies a solemn and open gesture of defiance towards the King’s misuse of power

Diffidatio is a solemn and open gesture of defiance towards the King’s misuse of power, that’s common law teaching

Diffidatio is a right inherent in our common law ideals of limited government

There has to be a serious injury

The plan of government was to infect the slave population of the American colonies

Slavery extended from New England clear down through the southern states

They had plans to infect germ warfare

Infect the slave population with smallpox and wipe out the American colonies

George Washington asked the continental army to submit to smallpox vaccination which in that day was not perfected They figured that ten percent of the army would die

The continental army all said “yes”

They did it in sections knowing that they could die And having to take a month off for each section as they vaccinated them so that they could recuperate

They might wipe out the population but if that happens we’ll have the army and we’ll keep on fighting We’re not quitting

That’s the kind of resolve that they had

That was voluntary He didn’t make them do it

He asked them if they would And they all said “yes”

This doctrine called Diffidatio according to the Declaration of ’76 justified the English colonies to break faith because of the damage that the Crown of England was inflicting upon them

And this gesture of defiance is necessary to break the relationship in cases of great damage done to you The instrument of defiance necessary under the teaching of Diffidatio in this case is our Declaration of ’76

That is the document that fulfilled the requirements under the doctrine Diffidatio.

England’s Glanvill in the year 1187 he was the man that first set forth in writing the power limiting principle our common law calls Diffidatio in the year 1187

He said this:

No person owes his king any more than his king owes him reverence alone excepted

And if the king breaks faith he releases that person from his obligation of loyalty to the king

This is the doctrine of Diffidatio that allows a person to break faith with a sovereign

This is the common law power limiting principle of Diffidatio

No person owes his king any more than his king owes him reverence alone excepted

And if the king breaks faith he releases that person from his obligation of loyalty to the king

On the basis of this also Scotsmen up in Scotland signed their solemn league and covenance according to the same principle of Diffidatio

Your duty of loyalty to our Constitution of the United States and true law is fixed

Your duty to the Constitution of the United States and true law is unchangeable

Just injury alone is not enough to justify removing allegiance from any government

It’s when the hostility to our way of doing things our due process our law of the land when it causes serious injury of which you have no genuine opportunity to remedy

Read the Declaration of ’76 that’s why it was written it was that gesture of defiance that that teaching called Diffidatio required They did it and they catalog in there how bad it was

And that’s why they did it

As long as our courts are open we should use the courts

That is what Brent sees NLA trying to do

They’re trying to do it They believe that the courts are important

Brent’s opinions are his own

(1:08:25)

CALLERS

Caller 1 Crystal

About the illegal foreclosures and stuff

The judge told Crystal to bring the paper back

She stated that she has the deed and all that stuff

When she got home she had the foreclosure papers in the mail

On Thursday they came to her house at 5:00 in the morning and put the foreclosure sign up

The judge said he was going to send Crystal a letter in the mail

She has not received the letter

On Friday Crystal went to the police department and filed a harassment fraudulent and illegal foreclosure She used the Executive Order of December 21, 2017

Do no harm Elderly abuse Perpetrating a fraud Abuse of power

She said these are all the things

Everybody’s going to the police department and filing the same thing

So now they have to investigate it

Is this a complaint that you filed with the local police?

Actually it’s a crime that I filed with them

They’re harassing me

It terrorism It’s criminal what they’re doing

They had to take the complaint

They’re going to do the investigation

Crystal was at the courthouse she said “By the way I was here last week I haven’t heard from the judge and his decision”

She goes, “Well he didn’t rule on it He’s giving it 120 days”

Crystal said, “That’s four months”

The judge gave himself 120 days to answer Crystal

They want her out May 26

They are going to foreclose on May 26

This brief that NLA is going to do that we’re going to file that would be another paper that Crystal could attach to and put into the court

We like the idea of the Executive Order that Donald Trump wrote because it fits

When you read that order you understand the way he wrote it and what they’re doing

It’s covered under that particular order

We’re going to put it into our case

You’ll be able to put in what we file under the Grand Jury which will be a longer explanation of why we are using that and how we’re using it

You can put it in as an amendment

Crystal has given it to the police department she has given it to the clerk the mayor all the head officials

Everybody has been watching my case

They can’t understand how this has been going on since 2014

Someone asked how Crystal could still be living in the same house

She told them Jehovah God and Jesus Christ Crystal told him she has been learning a lot of stuff from National Liberty Alliance

Everybody’s trying to ride on Crystal’s coattail

When Crystal first started

She asked, “Am I a public servant ?” The judge said “No”

Crystal asked “Is this my grand jury?” The judge said “No he’s the grand jury”

Crystal told him that he just committed a treason and she would like his resignation

He told her to get out of his courtroom

Every time Crystal goes into court this is what she does every time She says “I swear the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help me Jehovah God and Jesus Christ”

The judge says, “I didn’t ask for that”

They never swear anybody in

Crystal has witnesses there

If they file affidavits it’s good to get a mass action going

If it’s the same group of lawyers taking everybody’s house that needs to be investigated

The people need to stick together

Crystal said “This is what we’re doing Today 12 people” She’s filing her complaint and they’re all following through

The warrantee deed is in her name We are the sole owners

She paid the property off in 2011

In 2014 this attorney put their names on my property and are perpetrating a fraud. I never signed off A week later they put me in foreclosure

They wanted to extort $7,000 before December 1st before twelve o’clock

She got the money but right before 12:00 she took the money out of the account and she got a receipt on that

Then he sent her a letter that they’re going to do a short sale on her property on December 14th

Crystal went to the court and said that she never signed a letter or nothing Show me your proof and show me the contract She told them that they were perpetrating a fraud

On December 16, 2014 they withdrew

On January 18, 2018 they withdrew

Every time the withdrew they made up their own excuse

This is criminal and it’s all in writing

She is going to file criminal charges on all these attorneys

They have to do an investigation

Maybe next week NLA will have something that Crystal can add

Caller 2 California Fred

(1:26:40)

The Congress writes laws and then the agencies take the areas the grey areas and they write what they call guidance In the guidance that they write it’s not law written by Congress So it has no weight no value The IRS uses their quote guidance to railroad people

They treat it as though it’s law

These two runaway rogue attorneys Wiseman and Mueller these guys should be disbarred I don’t see how these criminals can still have badges They’re going way beyond the prosecutor book

There is a book that the Department of Justice puts out It’s a guide for the prosecutors

It spells out what duties they have what they’re supposed to do and not supposed to do

These criminals are going way beyond what is in the prosecutor book.

They are actually inventing information

There’s stuff that they are not using that is information that would clear a person

Earlier Brent said that as long as the courts are open I’d like to use them

The last time Fred heard that quote it was a time when someone was being hung around 1870

Brent asked Fred to send him the site or article

A guy was going to be hung They said as long as the common law courts are open we’re not going to have a military tribunal And the man was saved from hanging by going to court

That might have been the Milligan case

All of our courts regardless of what anybody says all of our courts in America that are part of the judicial branch are common law courts

Whether or not they follow the process of common law

Whether or not they give you a real trial by jury

That’s another question

The tools are all there to do it

The common law courts have not always followed our common law

What is common law? Due process

That means notice and opportunity to be heard empanelling the twelve man jury that are your neighbors from the district

The amazing thing about our common law is that even when you don’t follow all of the rules just right and by the way there has never been a common law trial that followed all the common law rules just right Never has been

If the common law is followed you can still get the truth out and the right thing can happen

And that’s what we count on here substantial justice in America

We’re not seeking for precise justice Men aren’t capable of such things

That’s what the law of the city is about hyperdetail

There are problems with the system there always will be there always has been

That’s the beauty of common law It’s resilient

Stacked juries have delivered the truth

Our common law is resilient against mistakes

We don’t follow the common law in our courts

Shadrach, Meshach , and Abednigo would not bow to the golden image

Only three Hebrew boys wouldn’t do it

By doing that we would have to disobey what God says

You can obey government and not have to disobey God

In those cases where obedience to government constitutes by that very act of obedience disobedience to the True Lawgiver then that when you got to starting thinking about now what are we going to do.

That’s what these three Hebrew boys faced.

They faced the situation where bowing down to this statue is disobedience to their True Lawgiver.

They would not bow down

The king commanded the men who fired up the furnace to fire it up seven times higher that it had ever been before

It was so hot that the soldiers who threw them into the fire perished.

In the end the True Lawgiver delivered.

Things haven’t changed

The state keeps trying to force us to do things

Things haven’t changed The government still wants to kowtow

The only remedy to lawlessness is true law

What is lawbreaking? to put it in Old Anglo Saxon they had a nice three letter word for lawbreaking The word is “sin”

S-I-N that’s the Old Anglo word for lawbreaking

Sin is breaking the law

Brent’s comments are his and not necessarily those of National Liberty Alliance

(1:56:00)

Caller 3: Terry from New Jersey

Regarding the Executive Order of December 21st

The order says:

“Sec. 13. This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.”

It seems kind of ambiguous because it basically says that it is not intended to, and does not create any right or benefit substantive or procedural enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States , its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person

It sounds like it’s blanket immunities

It’s the Executive Order from December 21st

Brent read section 13 again

What he’s saying is this isn’t law and no executive order is law

Executive Orders are written to his employees bureaucrats to limit what they do or order them to do something

If the President of the United States orders a standdown

or orders troops to deploy that’s an executive order

It’s the President of the United States or the Governor of a State giving orders to those within his jurisdiction of authority

Sometimes they’re used in wrong ways

They are him telling other people how he wants them to go about enforcing the laws of the United States.

That’s what an Executive Order is

An Executive Order is not legislation

It doesn’t create any new laws

He wants to make sure that he says that here so nobody thinks that that’s what he’s doing.

Brent read the beginning of the Executive Order

“By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) (NEA), the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Public Law 114-328) (the “Act”), section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)) (INA), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code,”

“I, DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the United States of America, find that the prevalence and severity of human rights abuse and corruption that have their source, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States, such as those committed or directed by persons listed in the Annex to this order, have reached such scope and gravity that they threaten the stability of international political and economic systems. “

Brent needs to read the entire executive order Brent has not contemplated this

Brent asked Gerard for his comments

NLA just started looking at it We thought about ways that we could use his executive order

for some of the stuff going on in the courts

Gerard took a look at Section 13

Brent thinks that he is saying in this order what our Constitution says he has no legislative power to do such things

Brent said that it looks like he is just reiterating that

Only Congress has the power to make law

Respecting the general government in Washington DC

And so he says I can’t do that I can’t change due process that’s procedural

They have broken the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America including all these international emergency economic powers the order didn’t do that they did that

These acts are the law that was created that addresses their crimes

This order isn’t creating any kind of new crime or any situation that we can say that we’re not hold against the government based on this order

No, the order is saying You’ve broken the Law of the Land and you’ve done it this way and if you are aiding and abetting any of the people who have done these things you too can be gone after But that’s not a “Get out of Jail Free” card.

He doesn’t have to say that but he did say it to be safe

So it doesn’t look like he’s being a dictator making new law

He’s saying here’s our targets I’ll give you their names and I’ll give you their birth dates so that there’s no mistake who these targets of the federal government are

He has drawn a crosshair on these 13 men

He’s saying we’re not going to let any of these fellows do any financial transactions

We’re going to block them He got it all laid out here

Property and interest in property are blocked pursuant to this order

He’s going after their property

It sounds like it’s pretty wide reaching It doesn’t exempt anybody

Terry continued the conversation and talked about the grand jury with Gerard and Brent

The Grand Jury has power the trouble is that power because of the ignorance and lack of confidence in grand juries has fallen completely under the spell of US attorneys in the federal courts and prosecutors in the state courts

There was a case in England, Justice Mansfield, right about the time our country was formed

Justice Mansfield was Chief Judge The question was: Does the jury have power to ignore the law or do they truly have authority to ignore the law?

Nobody even today or back then ever questioned the power of the jury to come back against the law and ignore the law

People have always believed that

The debate what the fight has been over was whether or not the jury has authority to do that.

There’s a difference between authority and power

If a police officer follows the law he has authority

If he breaks the law in what he does he doesn’t have authority but he has power to do what he did

The Nazis and Japanese didn’t have authority to abuse prisoners

They had the power but they had no authority

Justice Mansfield said that the jury has the power but they don’t have the authority

We in our common law country and our common law tradition have never come to a conclusion a clear establishment of whether or not the jury has authority to disregard the law.

But we have come to the conclusion that says they clearly have the power

Brent thinks that Mansfield was wrong

If you have the power and I can’t punish you for doing it then you have the authority too.

As Americans the jury can disregard the law and bring their verdict in opposite to what the law says if the jury wants to and as a matter of law there’s nothing anybody can do about it

For centuries that’s what juries have done

Gerard was reading an article

New York trial courts have a mandated duty to prevent improper and impermissive nullification conduct. It has long been recognized in our jurisprudence that it is the jury's duty to be governed by the instructions of the court as to all legal questions ․ they have the power to do otherwise, but the exercise of such power cannot be regarded as rightful

That’s exactly what Justice Mansfield said

That argument has been going on for centuries

Criminal jury instructions in no uncertain terms inform jurors that it is their duty to follow the law as explained by the court

Generally if it is established during  voir dire that a perspective juror is unwilling to do so that juror may be excused for cause

That’s another way that they stack the jury

They do it everywhere

They say “You took an oath to do what the judge says”

Why do you need a jury then?

Judges do not know everything That’s why we have juries

If someone takes and oath in good faith that the judge is going to instruct me and they hear the judge giving the instructions and they think that ain’t right and they go against it

They have not broken their oath

No man has a right to do wrong

Once you discover that you oath is unlawful they have a duty to disregard it

An oath to do wrong is unlawful

You got a duty to back out once you understand it

Once you’re convicted that it’s wrong you got to back out

(2:42:00)

Caller 4 Tara New York

now newly elected senator of the republic for the nation’s state of New York

We have completed our Committee of States for our group 37

In her state particularly she is working on doing grand juries

She has a petition signed by 200 of our constituents

They are looking to join a grand jury for a few of their cases

Especially to deal with foreclosures

This will be the first attempt by our constituents to do such a thing

She would like to get with the Grand Jury from New York and see if we can work together

and bring our ideas together

We don’t have grand juries per se

We’re operating as a grand jury on the big case that we’ve opened up

But we don’t have any local grand juries picked because the trouble with picking a grand jury and saying “We’re the Grand Jury” is that then you have a grand jury that is seated forever and that’s not good That makes misuses

We’re not actually picking juries and grand juries per se

We want to get four administrators per county that are going to administer juries and grand juries

and educate them and make sure that they operate within the law

Make sure that there is no jury tampering

We’re not really picking grand juries at this point

There is no seated grand jury other than the one that we have right now which includes all of us in every state in this one case that we put in our master case and we’re going to stay seated until that case is accepted and prosecuted by a prosecutor

That grand jury is in session

It’s called the Unified Grand Jury

We created The Unified Grand Jury of the United States in order to bring all of these abuses forward into the Congress and the President and have them prosecuted under the law

But we’re not really picking seated grand juries at this point

Committees of Safety are great because they will end up being juries and grand juries in particular local stuff that goes on

But until you have a case that needs to be investigated that’s when a jury gets picked

We’ve tried to get into the courtroom to act as juries when we started this thing way back four or five years ago and they would not let us in

They refused to give us a room and so that is part of why our case is in the federal court

Have your read US vs Williams as far as the relationship between the grand jury and the courts?

That’s very important to know that

They’re almost like a fourth branch of government

You have to operate under the auspices of the court

That’s why we went and got a number and put our cases into court

We’re not going to do what some other people have done who are now sitting in jail

because they started their own courts and their own judges and their own things outside the system that is in existence

Our system has problems We know that we have voter fraud We know that we have corruption When the court is open it’s up to us to go in there and enforce the law

The cure for lawlessness is the law

We pushing our way back into our courts that they have stolen from us

But we’re not appointing people or electing people on our own

Her group is fully seated as a republic

Her group is fully seated as a government as a lawful republic

As a senator she believes that she can operate as a United States official

We are the only real lawful government that is in existence right now

Everything else is corporate

We will be able to operate without having to go under their index numbers

We’re common law We’re Article III

They could get you for subversion

You are working outside the system and are operating on dangerous ground

You’re basically starting a revolution

Our forefathers went through a process of petitioning

That’s what National Liberty Alliance is doing

We’re moving through the courts through this system

You don’t need to start a new government to get rid of income tax

all you got to do is enforce the law

It sounds like they’re starting a new government which is a second revolution which means that whatever is here now is completely thrown out which means that Donald Trump is not really our president that could bring us to bullets

There’ve been a lot of times in our own history and the history of other countries where people have done that It didn’t usually go anywhere because there was no teeth in it

The only way our government keeps going is it has an Executive branch that enforces what it decides to do The President of the United States is in command of the army, the navy, the air force, the marines not to mention all the other people that carry guns in the alphabet soup bureaucracies There’s an enforcement power that goes with government

Brent said that if due process was followed then he would have heard about it

The Constitution tells how the President is to be elected and how Congress is to be elected

They don’t have a House of Representatives

They only have a Senate which was the original plan

The original Constitution before 1776 after that they took it and ran with it

adding on the House of Representatives adding these corporate fictional officials

They never allowed the first constitution to really blossom

We’ve been operating under bankruptcy

You got to be very discerning about the paths that you take

I’m not saying that you’re doing bad things

You have to be careful People are going to woo you They’re going to put that carrot on a stick They’re looking for chaos to bring good people against good people

We need to discuss where we’re going, what we’re doing , and how we’re doing it.

We need to discuss where we are as a nation and a people

Pray

We are at a turning point

We could go either way We could go off one end or the other end

Evil is prevalent all over