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Please support NLA

Scripture Reading: Matthew 14 : 15-36

(5:45)

Robert had an update for P3s

Last Thursday court became a travesty of justice much worse than what the norm has been.

Eric Parker was on the stand to testify and he was asked “Where were you looking?” and he said, “ In front of me and up” “What did you see?” “I saw snipers on the hilltop with rifles trained on us.” The court blew up. Two officers drug Parker off the stand.

The judge halted the court. She had a written question from the jury so she picked that up, read it, she threw it on the desk and she stomped out of the courthouse. Court ended for the weekend. It just started again today. All morning the prosecution was asking for sanctions against the defense.

When all that blew up the jury’s mouths dropped open and their eyes got big in disbelief. They couldn’t believe what they were seeing.

 The jury asked when they were going to see the evidence from defense

The judge told them that they have no evidence You are going to have to rely on testimony

At the beginning of the defense part of the trial she decided that anybody testifying for the defense was going to have to testify to her first before the jury heard it and she would determine whether it was relevant or not before the jury was to hear it.

She denied testimony from every one of the witnesses except for the defendant’s.

She made the ruling that because everyone of the witnesses for prosecution was a law enforcement official that the defendants were not allowed to defend themselves against what law enforcement said. They had already decided that defense could not talk about what the BLM did or FBI or anybody They could not talk about any of the negative stuff that was done by the BLM

Since all the prosecution witnesses were law enforcement then defense is not even allowed to cross examine them.

The supporters outside made a callout for everybody to show up in Nevada

They had about 80 people outside in support this morning.

By the expression on the jury’s face, they have to know what’s happening.

If they don’t come up with a not guilty verdict there’s a problem

There’s something going on.

This judge is a female judge

Do they have something on her that she is so bent on making this case found guilty?

She’s an immigrant She came from Cuba

Ollie had some additional information

One comment that Andrea made today in addition to what Robert said the judge told them that when they were up against law enforcement they did not have the right to lay down and protect themselves behind the barrier. They had no rights whatsoever to defend themselves or even duck for cover. The judge said this

She’s a Cuban immigrant

Two or three days ago Ollie begged Andrea Parker for affidavits.

Ollie begged with pleads we need affidavits.

Robert added: With the testimony they have Scott Drexler testifying

The judge ruled that if she so much raised her hand the testimony was to stop immediately

She was talking to the defense

Whenever they had jury selection there were five people that were denied by the defense and the judge at the end of the selection she brought those five back out and she said that they were OK and they were going to be on the jury.

Five were hand picked by the judge

She is threatening the defense lawyers to the point where they themselves told her today that they felt threatened and that they were asking for attorneys to represent them.

Ollie is working with a lady in Nevada hoping that she can get the transcripts.

QUESTIONS:

Question 1: One form of lawsuits that you want to learn about is injunction also called the power of the People. Injunctions are able to command high officials to answer your questions and concerns about what they are doing with your children your tax dollars, and the future of your country. There are no limitations on injunctions.

You can file a complaint seeking an injunction to require a local school board to tell your children and they are being taught non traditional values.

You can file an injunction to stop chemical dumping or to fill in dangerous holes left by abandoned excavations . You can even bring an action to enjoin leaders to explain why government doesn’t teach it’s public even the simplest points on how to win in court. Force government and giant industry to answer you on the public record or go to jail. It’s your right. It’s your power . Demand justice

(20:50)

John didn’t realize that you could do so much with injunctions. We’ll take a look at injunctions.

Question 2

Is from someone who has a Native American friend who has a land grant from President Andrew Jackson. It states that she owns 88 acres in northern Minnesota

Does she have any recourse to secure this property through the courts?

(21:30)

Of course, I don’t see why not.

Even if it was an Indian issue that has to be dealt with by the United States

Even Indians, everybody, it doesn’t matter who you are, even if you’re an immigrant visiting this country you have all your unalienable rights and we must adhere to those unalienable rights to our visitors and friends and relatives and anyone in the United States .

Question 3

Felicia gets on the call around 10:30 so we can save her question until later.

That ends the questions

CALLERS

Caller 1 Terry from New Jersey

(26:42)

Gloria Navarro her parents were immigrants from Cuba according to an article in Redoubt News You can go to Redoubt News.com she’s 51 years old

Caller 2 Ed from Duncan

Ed apologized for not being on the Thursday Night Natural Healing

He was the one that started doing it

Is there any other NLA members that are in LasVegas that have connections with sheriffs that are on our side that can get there and help with the cause?

Sheriffs are frightened because they don’t know the law and they are not educated

They’re not even educated in the Constitution

None of us are

People have no clue on how serious this is

The Sheriff has already proven to be not constitutional

Caller 3 Lory from Colorado

She just heard from John Lamb and the courtroom has been packed with courtroom observers. They’ve been waiting in line

When someone comes out of the courtroom then they send new people in,.

(30:46)

The jurors have made a request to get legal advice because if Navarro is going to file something against them they want to know where they stand with it. So the jurors are going out for attorneys. You spell Navarro N – A – V – A – R – R – O

That’s something when the jury has to get lawyers

That is the strangest thing

Judge Navarro has said that if anything is said and it gets back to her then they are going to be charged. Charged with what? She didn’t say.

We need affidavits

If anybody can get ahold of the transcripts that would help.

Caller 4: Kenneth in Georgia

Does not have a question He thought that he was muting himself

Caller 5 April from North Carolina

Did you hear what Jeff Sessions is going to do about the Federal Marijuana Act?

Jeff Sessions is trying to get Congress to squash legalizing the Federal Marijuana Act where it is federally legal in all states for medical use. He is trying to squash it.

That’s something that we want to battle these people that are trying to stop the use of drugs for pain.

He said the medical marijuana is more dangerous than any drug out there.

People have the right to take care of and deal with their behavior on their own.

They don’t need the government stepping in.

You can’t take knives away from people or even cars because cars are weapons

You should take hammers away.

All the reasoning behind this is the pharmaceutical companies cornering the market on drugs that do destroy.

John’s doctor has given him many things and John won’t take any of that stuff.

John looks for natural stuff to assist him and he has been pretty successful dealing with his problems using natural remedies

We got so many issues we got so many things going on we got to ask the question “What do we really want to fight first?”

We want to help the people who are in serious trouble in jail on trial

We are getting ready to file a lot of stuff on LaVoy Finicum

We need affidavits

Marijuana in accordance with the federal government is illegal

It’s the individual states that made marijuana legal in their states

The federal government can’t override state law

They don’t have the authority to ban anything

Kratom Speciosa MMM It’s a plant in the coffee family that has been around for decades.

A couple of centuries ago it became legal in the United States

People are getting off pain killers and people are getting off of drugs with it.

They want to take away all our rights so that we have no choice but to take their chemicals

They are trying to ban painkillers.

Oxycodone you can kill yourself through an overdose

But on the long term if you are using it just for pain and you don’t get high off of it

The key is to not get high The key is to take only enough to bring your pain level down to bearable You could be taking it for ten years and you could stop on a dime

Kratom got caller off of oxycodone with no side effects

Maybe you took a little too much more than you should have taken

If you just take it to the point of your pain barrier use it for pain if you take too much and you’re getting dizzy or high you will develop an addiction

(52:05)

Caller 6 Terry from New Jersey

RedoubtNews.com has an article that says that they witnessed telling the jury that they cannot consider jury nullification or the Constitution.

John should get in contact with the author of this article if you are looking for affidavits.

That’s at RedoubtNews.com

Caller found the article It says:

“Gloria Navarro probably grew up listening to many stories about the treachery of Fidel Castro but somehow has been unable to see how it correlates with people like Harry Reid.  In future articles we will talk about Harry Reid’s relationship  to the BLM and his corrupt dealings in buying and selling BLM property.”

“Navarro Jury Cannot Use The Constitution Navarro said I am a witness , [jury nullification](https://redoubtnews.com/2016/08/12/michele-fiore-jury-nullification/) must be prohibited and no jury instruction should include any mention of the 1st and 2nd amendment. She went on to say that bringing any mention of the 1st and 2nd amendment to the jury would not be helpful and [would confuse them](https://redoubtnews.com/2016/01/04/jury-nullification-why-it-is-important-shari-dovale/). Should there be any violations of the 1st and 2nd amendment or other constitutional questions, that it could be appealed and it was for the appellate court to decide, not the jury. Of course, that is an outrageous statement, starting with the fact that constitutional questions are for the jury to decide as facts may relate to it and appeals means long prison time for the defendants as they await an appellate decision.”

This guy would be a good affidavit writer

We need to do a Show Cause for this judge By what authority

We need people to give us affidavits and tell us what is exactly going on in the court

These people doing affidavits should be telling us word for word what is happening.

(58:15)

Caller 7 Margie

Caller looked it up

Gloria N – A – V – A – R – R – O

Judge She was appointed by Barrack Obama

She was recommended by Harry Reid

Caller has a friend Caller just came from the jail

Caller’s friend has a long history Caller wants her friend to write an affidavit

One of them is a common law robbery

They’re going to try to do a jury trial

It was a common law robbery That’s what they say

She did take the money

She has a drug problem Her name is Shelly

Caller would like Shelly to get into a program

She got two other things that are coming up Wednesday in another county

These are old charges

One is writing a bad check

The other is larceny after break and enter No injured party

She’s in jail right now Is there anything that we can do?

Nobody is getting due process

Clearly she didn’t get due process

Clearly she didn’t get justice

When people are stealing because they are on drugs and need money and they go out and steal money to buy drugs you need to have compassion

But you don’t want to enable her.

If she’s robbed somebody and she’s caught in the act clearly one of the things that the court should do is to require her to get drug free. Maybe she needs to be in a rehab program. She needs to get a job.

She needs counseling. She needs to pay back that money that she robbed. Maybe threefold.

Caller will have her write an affidavit so that she learns

Another inmate in there didn’t do anything and she is in there and she is 55

Shelly is 44

Caller 8 Barrett from North Carolina

A guy earlier was asking about sheriffs

Caller has a sheriff that wants to learn

Caller is trying to get a package together to take to him so we can get a common law grand jury in our county

We need people to be trained to administrate to people to give the administration process to the people that are coming to be grand jurists or trial jurists

And that is one of the key things that we need to do

People can become educated They can come to our website and become educated

You should suggest to the sheriff to come to our website

We have a page for sheriffs

We have the free Constitutional Course and the Civics Course

And we are going to in the near future hopefully put a couple more courses up there that will be free.

The sheriff can have his deputies take these courses too.

Caller has already taken the courses

The sheriff can monitor the deputies’ progress in taking the courses.

NLA can give them a certificate when they complete it

(1:15:49)

Announcement: Andrea Parker who has been visiting the court everyday is online and we can unmute her She has some stuff that she’d like to say

Andrea Parker:

She is the wife of Eric Parker

We had a big day in court today

Her husband is Eric Parker

He is in trial this is the second the retrial of the first Bundy ranch trial the gunman

The prosecution just rested

And they tried to pull a bunch of stuff

They made us proffer all of our witnesses and none of them were allowed to take the stand before the jury

The only two people that were allowed to take the stand in front of the jury is Eric Parker on his own defense and Scott Drexler on his own defense

Eric Parker took the stand on Thursday

He could not get a sentence out They were objecting to him what he was saying they objected to him saying “First Amendment zone” they objected to him saying the word “snipers”. They objected before he actually said something. They were in fear of what he was going to say so they objected. They took him off the stand for saying “My focus was forward and up toward the right”

His lawyer had a really good argument “You’ve given us all of these parameters We can’t talk about fear But he can describe what he saw “ And the judge said, “You misheard me

“He can describe what he saw as long as it goes to a defense that is afforded to you”

These gentlemen are not afforded a self defense or defense of others defense because the government says the protesters went to the BLM

So the BLM and their reaction cannot be looked at as a excessive force when the protestors went to them and so they’re not allowed a self defense or defense of others defense

So they’re saying anything that he says about BLM heavy handedness it goes to jury nullification

So he was taken off the stand for that

This morning they had a motion that all of the defense witnesses except for Perez , not the witnesses, the defense itself, had to give up their closing statements for the prosecution to approve before trial. And that Scott Drexler would have to proffer his testimony in front of the judge and prosecution and not just the jury. We took an hour break and Leventhal came back in and he backed that judge into a corner.

She told him basically she is threatening the lawyers and he threw it back at her

He said “I feel like all of our lawyers we need to be appointed lawyers and talk to them because you’re threatening us with contempt of court. And I don’t feel like I can defend my person under the constrictions that you have me under.” And so she changed her mind

She is not going to make the defense give up their closing statement

And Scott was able to take the stand in front of the jury today

And they didn’t object and he was able to get his whole testimony out

They did object a lot but he was still able to finish a sentence unlike Eric Parker was.

And at the end he was able to get out that he was in fear of his life twice.

The jury was very upset when Eric was taken off the stand.

The jury gets to ask questions after each witness

The jury today they had ten jury notes for Scott Drexler

Only five of them were asked out loud in the courtroom.

So the other five we don’t even know

We had a rally today and threw tea at the court steps

We filled the courtroom completely full and there were people outside waiting to get in.

The candy bowl was not passed around during the sidebars today

Normally when they have a sidebar since the second day they’ve brought in a bowl of candy to pass out to the jurors during the sidebar so that they think it’s a good thing instead of a bad thing.

One of the jurors questions was:

“Did you know at the time you provided the interview to Long Bow Productions that they were the FBI?”

He said, “No”

Another of the questions again was about the undercover agent

Another question was “Were you going to Bunkerville to get credit with a certain militia and why did you choose that militia over a different militia?”

Another question was “The Idaho Three PerCent doing community service but is there still training and militia aspects?”

And he said “Yes there is training for safety with firearms which is always important”

Another question : “Were you aware of Three Percent of Idaho prior to the ranch?”

He said “No Actually Three PerCent of Idaho was not around prior to the ranch.”

That were the only questions of ten that were even asked.

So we don’t know what the other questions were and the judge said they were not in the parameters and we need to stick to what the parameters are

Jurors don’t generally ask questions directly to the witnesses

An inquisition is when a judge comes up and you don’t have the prosecutor you don’t have a defense lawyer An inquisition is where an individual comes up the judge and asks questions And that’s not a trial by jury that is clearly not trial in a common law setting

Common law is adversarial One side against the other It’s a fight

You got the prosecution making a fight against the defendants. It’s a battle

The purpose of the jury is to be a tribunal

When they start asking questions it starts to turn them into an inquisitor

That is not common law

This sounds like it is an opening to something that is going to become a common thing to push the jurors across and eventually get to inquisitors

There is a movement in this country for quite some time

They’ve been teaching this in school

30 years ago John’s brother went to law school and he was telling John about it

And they are teaching them positions that jurors shouldn’t be

They have no understanding of the law

They’re looking for a jury of lawyers

Can you imagine a jury of lawyers asking questions?

This could become a problem

There was a mistrial the last time and they wanted to be able to train their case by the jury’s questions It was one of these things that they wanted to use for their benefit

That if the jurors asked a certain question then they can provide the evidence and that way they feel that they get around it and have a better chance of getting a conviction

This backfired on them

You only need one person to ask common sense questions and then all of the other jurors start thinking about those questions or the answer to those questions

So that one person if they ask enough questions they can sway people

We have a Constitutionally minded juror that keeps asking constitutional minded questions and it is growing

Once they bring out a point and it is pointed out everyone starts to see it too

This judge has already told them that they can’t use jury nullification

She already started out by neutering the jury telling them they can’t use jury nullification

When they told them that they didn’t have a defense because they came to the BLM it was all about the militia and discrediting and neutering the militia action

They’re so afraid that if these guys get innocence there will be militia actions against the government when the government violates the people.

What does she mean “You came to the BLM”?

The BLM were burning cattle

That’s when the militia is supposed to come

She’s telling them that because you came there then you’re the aggressor

No The BLM were the aggressor and the people have the right to put their militia out

They’re saying you have no right to be in the militia and if you’re in the militia then you’re a terrorist

That’s what this trial is about

You had militia there

That’s what’s bothering the government

That’s what they want to squash

And they also want to squash the jury

They want to squash jury nullification They want to squash due process

Caller 9 Felicia

(1:32:52)

She went to the courthouse to the sheriff’s office. They stated that they don’t have a record of her speaking with them

Basically he told her that it wasn’t a legal document

She told him that it was a legal document

The sheriff stated that they don’t go by the Constitution any more

They actually sold her house already That means that they took fiduciary authority

NLA did a nonjudicial foreclosure paper on Felicia

They’re saying it’s not valid

They’ve been served

Make a copy and give it to the sheriff again

Let him know that he has been served

Do an Affidavit of Service give a copy of the Affidavit of Service to the sheriff

Make sure a copy is placed into the court

Do an Affidavit of Filing

It can’t be you It has to be someone who is not part of the case

(1:49:30)

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

Brent’s website is commonlawyer.com

We are talking about the Declaration of ‘76

Brent prefers to call it the Declaration of ’76 because nowhere on that paper is it called the Declaration of Independence

It is a name we have given it over the decades

It is not a declaration of independence

It is a declaration of shifting dependence

Shifting dependence from the Powers That Be namely Emperor George the Third shifting dependence from him for protection to the God of all Providence

There is a shifting dependence

Men are weak

The strongest men acknowledge their weakness and depended upon their Maker

We have been going through the Declaration of ‘76

We got up to about paragraph 5

Paragraph 5 of the Declaration of ’76 says this:

“He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.”

Now this king, was king in England, King George.

He said he was emperor in his empire.

The American colonies were not England.

Therefore they were not free soil.

Therefore slavery was lawful here.

Slavery has never been legal in England.

Even a serf in common law has rights that he can enforce.

He is attached to the land and cannot be sold away from that land

There is so much a fellow learns just living whether or not he tries to or not

There are some things that only time can bring

Americans back in the day of the Declaration of ’76 were pushing beyond the frontier As they did so they set up common law courts They pushed into areas where there was no government. They set up courts

Moving into the Allegheny moving down the Ohio Valley you can read the accounts of how men dealt with crime and how men dealt with disagreement They did it by establishing juries and asking twelve men swearing them in to decide

We still have juries

Brent just got in the news that the Bundy trial was a mistrial The jury was hung

And as bad as the judge may appear in that case we must be thankful that we have the machinery in place called the jury

The jury did what we want juries to do in spite of any lawlessness that occurred.

I feel sure that the jury was stacked It is in most federal criminal cases

The jury was hung Who knows what will happen next?

We have what we call the common law tradition and that makes all the difference in the world regardless of any tyranny of any judge

We ask people to govern our country and make decisions for us such as young people sitting on the benches of our land who never practiced law who do not have a grasp of the fundamental ideals of Americanism and we’re asking them to administer our courts and if we really knew who these people were in many cases we wouldn’t let our children near them . That’s how bad they are They’re evil Some of them are very evil Dangerous

Paragraph 6 of our Declaration of ’76 says this:

“He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.”

(2:06:23)

If you just did what I want then I wouldn’t make life so hard on you

As much as possible people must keep their legislatures and courts close and accessible

Closeness never ensures accessibility

The Evil Empire and the Useful Idiots can find ways even if your courthouse is close to keep you out of it.

And if people are not comfortable going into courthouses trials are not truly public.

And if trials are not truly public then it won’t be long before those administering them and keeping court will be doing things that are not lawful

Americans must empanel the jury in their church assemblies, in their townships, in their villages, in their cities, in their water districts , in their irrigation districts , in their mining districts and they must do so in order to keep courts accessible.

The Evil Empire and the Law of the City try to obliterate any mention of our past history.

All of the things about our past are here for our learning and if we are not able to access that if our children are unable to access local courts we will forget our tradition of freedom

Brent concluded

(2:14:14)

Caller 10 Jeremiah California

Territorial jurisdiction is an important point to bring up

As we begin to establish our common law jurisdiction it is important to remember that not everybody that has the knowledge of the law has to actually have that knowledge in order to be protected by the common law community members.

Brent said that we should form local things

The whole committee of safety idea is built on that. That’s how you start

That’s the people assembling in their communities and discussing these things and then taking lawful action outside the accepted norms of government

Your right to assembly is there All your Constitutional rights are there

And so you get together with a group of people and you act

And that was the whole idea behind the Committees of Safety

2:21:51

Caller 11 3002

Has a question about a false traffic ticket

She filed using common law jurisdiction special appearance it is just a bogus charge.

The sheriff was involved There were about five or six officers

She called 9 1 1 that she was going to pull over travelling at night alone as a female.

She has experienced police brutality before

She had been threatened They threatened to pull her out of the car , bust the window , impound the car, all these things

And she had somebody else on the phone

 She filed a motion to dismiss demand to dismiss They haven’t stated a claim There is no injured party She filed a notice of abatement

Previously the judge put her in jail because she moved for a continuance

That’s why all that other stuff you did didn’t work. Because they don’t listen to it. That’s the problem.

They gave her two tickets Each had two charges on them

One was no drivers license She is a legal inhabitant in Atlanta, Georgia

Our home place is in North Carolina

She was travelling because she had an appointment the next day where she needed to file documentation

She doesn’t have a North Carolina drivers license

She lived in Atlanta since ’97 and prior to that she lived in Boston

The officer alleged that she crossed the yellow line

On that highway it is not even possible.

The other charge was failure to stop for the blue light or siren

He also charged her with resisting officer

If he can’t prove that you crossed the yellow line then he has no probable cause to get you into all of the other stuff that he did

Resisting arrest was only after the fact that you stopped

These things can go on forever and ever and ever

These judges don’t mind putting you in jail

Especially if you start to get the upper hand then they will throw you in jail even quicker

They don’t ever want to give you a jury

They probably want to plea bargain for a couple hundred bucks. Unless you want to fight it on a matter of principle. But you are going to be years down the road with these idiots.

You may never get in front of a jury

It gets tangled and ugly

If you got one of those officials mad at you they’re working behind the scenes against you

And you’re going into their court they won’t give you justice

The judge in court said that she was banned from filing any further documents

If I filed any documents they are not going to accept them

With no jury of your peers he is taking away your due process rights.

He doesn’t have that authority

Eddie Craig has you learn a dialog for when the police pull you over

Stick to that dialog exactly as it is learn it by heart

Or you could read it from a paper

If you follow that dialog then when you get into court there’s another dialog that hooks into that and if you follow his dialog at the car they never gain jurisdiction over you

By the answers that you give and the questions that you ask and they ask they basically hang themselves If you get that far they usually back off

You want to record it

You can’t beg them for mercy

They’re not going to give it to you

It takes time and it takes effort

Sometimes it’s better to pay the fine and go after them when things change

You have to pick your battles

Any one of these courts can throw you in jail That court doesn’t have the power to confine But they do.

It is important to document everything

You are building a federal case

Then you sue them in the federal court for violation of your unalienable rights

You want to do a good case and have a good Wherefore Clause

Everything they do is violating your due process

You move it to the federal court for cause

In the case that we have it says Removal for cause

You will see it in the docket

You will see it in the sample court cases that we have

Go into “grand jury” then go into “docket” and look at our main case

and read the sample court cases

You can use the same format

(2:47:40)

Caller 12 Barrett from North Carolina

Caller wants to ask Brent about citizenship status.

A state national versus a United States citizen

A fellow can’t be a citizen of the United States unless he is first a citizen of the state where he resides.

Federal citizenship, if there is such a thing, is a function of state citizenship.

Not the other way around.

For the last 130 years or more the federal government has not looked upon it that way.

Since the Civil War the Uncivil War the War between the States they say that war abolished the whole idea of state citizenship being necessary before there was such a thing as being a United States citizen

It is confusion at this point and probably will remain so because our Constitution didn’t understand it that way and it’s trying to do away with the whole idea of local government and state government and trying to make the centralization of all government power in Washington DC by saying that you can be a citizen of the United States without being a state citizen.

It all happened after the War between the Northern and Southern Tiers of States and then there were many freedmen some people say between 250,000 and 500,000 ex-slaves

And some of the states in the South after the reconstruction and the occupation of federal troops and all that the states would not allow the freed slaves the same status as a white citizen.

And that went on unaddressed until a littler earlier than 1960 at that time the whole idea came up again and the federal government begin the push that they had left off since the days of reconstruction after the war between the Northern and Southern Tiers of states

They went back in and tried to say that there is no such thing as state citizenship

You’re a citizen of the United States or you’re nothing

The madness has continued

Federalism is our Constitution’s balance of power between each of the sovereign states and the sister states and then the general government that’s what they used to call it they didn’t call it the federal government before the war They called it the general government in Washington DC

1989 Bill Clinton Executive Order 13 13132 Federalism allowed the People of states the right to determine their own legal status.

It is not the prerogative of the general government to make that decision

It is the prerogative of the state according to our Constitution

My status as a man or a woman’s status as a woman and what their status is before the law is a matter of state law

A phrase that we use that isn’t accurate is :

This is not common law jurisdiction

No There is no such thing in this world as any jurisdiction that is not under our common law But that does not mean that they are practicing it That doesn’t mean that they are observing it. But it means that our common law is applicable to all men at all times in all places on every continent at every age because it is the Law of Nature unwritten in the nature of things

U S Code Title 8 Section 1408 is a national which is a state citizen not a federal United States citizen

It is governed by consent

Statutes and codes only apply to government they don’t apply to the people

The grand jury always requires twelve

If there are twelve on the grand jury it requires twelve

If there are 18 members of the grand jury it requires twelve

If there are 24 members of the grand jury it requires twelve to indict

Our grand jury is not a majority based institution.

Neither is our trial jury

It is the number 12 that is significant.

Show me in the state Constitution or the federal Constitution where the government has the authority to legislate to the People.

They can only legislate to government units.

The custom in our country and the custom in England before us and the custom in preNorman England the legislature petitioning the executive branch is thus the arisal of our right and freedom of petition and then if the king at that time would sign off on their petition it became law it became something that was enforceable.

And today we have sophisticated that process

When the Congress sends bills to the President to sign what they’re sending is a petition as our representatives Does that apply to us? Our juries have agreed over the years that that applies to us in many cases.

If a statute is passed reinforcing the crime our Constitution calls treason a jury should recognize that.

Treason against the United States, counterfeiting the current coin and securities of the United States, piracy and felonies committed on the high seas, and violations of international law, those are the four crimes that the federal government has jurisdiction the right to pass legislation concerning.

Anything outside of that they have no right.

And they’re doing it

A state citizen owes allegiance to the state that is the land and the people.

And the law of the land.

A fellow has to ask himself: What are the Laws of Nature and what are the Laws of Nature’s God?

There are two volumes there.

Those two volumes of law delineate themselves detailing many things.

Everybody is bound by the Laws of Nature and the Laws of Nature’s God.

And if we violate those then we will suffer the consequences.

The Laws of Nature the first volume is the law unwritten

The second volume is the law written which is the Bible.

Anything that is outside of those two but is contrary to those two is no law at all.

Every man is responsible to do and speak according to the Laws of Nature and the Laws of Nature’s God

Our legislators in Congress when they pass legislation their legislation if it is not within the ambient and in support of the Laws of Nature and the Laws of Nature’s God then it’s no law at all

It’s unconstitutional it’s not part of our common law

Our common law is substantially that first volume

Everyone of us is responsible

If you are a Congressman the laws you pass are to be in conformity with the first principles of the Laws of Nature and the Laws of Nature’s God

Don’t give credibility to their fiction

Just follow the fundamental principles

Knowledge , Knowledge, Knowledge