

TRANSCRIPT CARL MILLER KNOW YOUR CONSTITUTION

HOW TO APPLY THE CONSTITUTION:

MOST TRAFFIC CASES. BE VERY COURTEOUS AT ALL TIMES, ANSWER YES SIR, NO SIR, THEY WILL RESPOND IN KIND AND TREAT YOU RESPECTFULLY. DON'T USE NEGATIVE ATTITUDES.

CONCEALED WEAPONS QUESTION – YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO HAVE ARMS
ONE HOW TO BE YOUR OWN COUNSELOR IN COURT
USE YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

PROCEDURE TO SAY AND WHAT NOT TO SAY:

THINGS TO DO FIRST OF ALL IS WHEN YOU ARE PULLED OVER TRY NOT TO DEMONSTRATE ANY RAPID MOVEMENTS OR ANY, THING LIKE YOU ARE REACHING UNDER THE SEAT OR REACHING IN THE GLOVE BOX, KEEP YOUR HANDS WHERE THEY CAN BE SEEN. DO NOT OVER REACT. TRY AND BE CALM. TALK TO THE OFFICER IN A MELLOW VOICE DON'T, YELL OR HOLLER OR USE PROFANITY WHATSOEVER.

BASICALLY IT IS YES SIR, WHAT CAN I DO FOR YOU SIR? THEY WILL USUALLY ASK YOU TO PRESENT YOUR DOCUMENTATION OF PROOF OF INSURANCE AND THE REGISTRATION OF THE VEHICLE. NOW WE ARE GOING TO GO INTO A LOT OF ISSUES ON THE PROGRAMMING TO COVER THAT ON WHAT YOU CAN DO OR OPT TO DO.

ALSO TREAT THE OFFICER VERY COURTEOUSLY BECAUSE THAT IS GOING TO GET YOU FURTHER AHEAD BY GIVING THEM HYPE, OR OUT SHOUT THEM OR GIVE THEM A LOT OF STATIC. SO MY HONEST COUNSEL IS TO SHOW YOU HOW TO PROCEED, AND MOST OF THE TIME YOU WILL BE ABLE TO LEAVE THE SCENE WITHOUT ANY INJURY. YOU MIGHT HAVE A TICKET OR THIS OR THAT BUT WE WILL SHOW YOU HOW TO DEAL WITH THAT OKAY.

BUT YOU NEED TO UNDERSTAND THAT THIS PARTY IS AN ARMED PARTY AND YOU DON'T WANT TO DO ANY MOVEMENT THAT WILL CAUSE HIM TO REACT TO ANY INJURY TO YOU. AND YOU WILL UNDERSTAND THAT THIS IS THE MOST DANGEROUS THING A POLICE OFFICER DOES IS TO STOP PEOPLE EVERYDAY, BECAUSE HE NEVER KNOWS WHEN SOMEBODY MIGHT DO SOMETHING THAT IS A REAL SERIOUS TRAMATIC THING. SO THEY ARE VERY NERVOUS ABOUT THIS, AND THE QUICKER YOU CAN RELIEVE THEIR NERVOUSNESS AND JUST BE A REGULAR PERSON AND LET THEM REALIZE YOU ARE JUST REGULAR JOE BLOW GOING TO TALK IN A PLAIN AND CALM VOICE. YOU WILL FIND OUT THAT YOU ARE IN A REAL COMMUNICATIVE SITUATION, AND PRETTY SOON YOU WILL FIND OUT IF YOU HAVE A COOPERATIVE OFFICER OR NOT BUT YOU'RE GOING TO BE IN COURT ANYWAY. JUST FOLLOW ALONG AND LET US DEMONSTRATE THROUGH OUR PROGRAM.

AGAIN WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO KNOW THAT YOUR BEST DEFENSES ARE IN YOUR CONSTITUTION. THAT, THE CONSTITUTION IS A VIABLE CONTRACT AND IT IS ENFORCEABLE IN A COURT OF LAW. THAT YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO CLAIM THOSE RIGHTS. THAT THE BURDEN IS ON YOU TO CLAIM THEM TIMELY, AND THE KEY WORD IS TIMELY OR YOU LOOSE THE RIGHT. SO YOU WANT TO BE CONGNIZANT OF YOUR RIGHTS AND BE ABLE TO TIMELY SPEAK UP.

LET'S GO ON TO A COUPLE OF THINGS HERE. WE'RE GOING TO CONCENTRATE AS WE DID BEFORE ON OUR MAIN BASIC CASES. WE ALSO WANT TO GIVE YOU SOME FURTHER ADVANCE PROGRAMMING.

THE BOOK THE FEDERALIST PAPERS BY HAMILTON, MADISON AND JADE? THOSE ARE THE GENTLEMENT WHO WROTE THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND YOU WANT THE MENTOR EDITION BECAUSE IT IS THE UNABRIDGED EDITION.

NOW THE SUPREME COURT HAS RULED IN THE CASE OF COLEN V. VIRGINIA, THAT IS RECORDED AT 6 WHEAT REPORTER VOLUME 6 PAGE 2; WHEAT IS AN OLD REPORT, AND IT WAS DONE IN 1821, SO YOU MIGHT HAVE TO GO TO YOUR LEADING LAW LIBRARY AROUND (IN OUR CASE UNIV OF UTAH) THESE PAGES WILL BE SO OLD THAT YOU WILL HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT HOW YOU TURN THEM WITHOUT SCREWING THEM UP.

THEY RULED THAT THE FEDERALIST PAPERS WAS THE EXACT RECORD OF THE INTENT OF THE FRAMERS OF THE CONSTITUTION MADISON, HAMILTON AND JADE. THOSE WERE THE GUYS WHO WROTE THE CONSTITUTION. SO OBVIOUSLY BEING ABLE TO READ THEIR PUBLISHED THOUGHTS AS THEY WERE DOING THIS CONSTITUTION IS VERY, VERY FORCEFUL IN TERMS OF CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATION; AND THE INTENT OF THE LAW MAKER IS THE LAW, AND IT SHALL BE LIBERALLY ENFORCED IN FAVOR OF YOU. YOU ARE THE CLEARLY INTENDED AND EXPRESSLY DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY. HAVE YOU GOT ME, SO EVERYTHING YOU CAN DO TO ENHANCE YOUR POSITION IN TERMS OF HOW YOUR LAW MAKERS THOUGHT WHEN THEY FRAMED THE CONSTITUTION CLEARLY MAKES YOUR CASE EVEN MORE STRONGER FOR THE CONSTITUTION BEING INTERPRETED IN YOUR FAVOR. SO WE RECOMMEND YOU GET A COPY OF THE FEDERALIST PAPERS, YOU WANT THE MENTOR EDITION READ IT COVER TO COVER. IT IS THE UNABRIDGE EDITION, YOU'LL FIND OTHER EDITIONS HAVE SOME OF THE PAGES PULLED OUT.

THIS IS THE ADVANCE SECTION AND WE'RE GOING TO BE COVERING PROCEDURES. WE'RE GOING TO BE TEACHING YOU HOW TO BE YOUR OWN COUNCIL, WE ARE GOING TO BE TELLING YOU SOME FACTS AND ISSUE ON WHAT TO DO, WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU GET PULLED OVER, HOW DO YOU EXERCISE YOUR RIGHTS IN A TIMELY FASHION? WE'RE GOING TO BE TALKING ABOUT SOME OF THE PROBLEMS THAT ARE GOING ON IN AMERICA TODAY. WE'RE GOING TO TALKING ABOUT SOME OF THE STUDIES THAT HAVE BEEN DONE.

WE JUST HAD A LAW REVIEW STUDY PUT OUT BY JOYCE LEE MALCOM, SHE STARTED OUT BY WORKING FOR THE ANTI GUN PEOPLE. SHE IS A HARVARD LEGAL SCHOLAR.

SHE IS VERY, VERY KNOWLEDGABLE, SHE RESEARCHED THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS OF THE PEOPLE BACK TO THE 1700 IN ENGLAND, AND SHE CAME TO THE HONEST BELIEF AFTER ALL OF HER RESEARCH, AND OF COURSE SHE WOULD BE FOLLOWING HER RESEARCH, BECAUSE SHE IS A PERSON OF ACCLAIM BECAUSE OF HER STUDY SHE RESEARCHED IT BACK TO THE 1700'S AND YEP OUR RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS IS A POSITIVE RIGHT, IT HAS COME FROM SERIOUS LAW ALL THE WAY BACK TO THE MAGNA CHARTA. SHE PUBLISHED A BOOK AND THE BOOK IS **"TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS"**. IT IS A RATHER EXPENSIVE BOOK. IT'S NOT HARD TO GET A HOLD OF. IT TOOK US ABOUT 10 DAYS TO GET A HOLD OF IT. IT IS A DEFINITIVE STUDY ON THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS AND VERIFIES THE HOLDINGS THAT THE AVERAGE PERSON, NRA OR WHOEVER IS CONSTITUTIONALLY NRA ORIENTED IS GOING TO BE HAPPY TO HAVE. BECAUSE BASICALLY THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS IS A PROTECTED RIGHT THAT GOES BACK WITH GREAT LEGAL SCHOLARLY STUDY. THESE BOOKS WILL HELP YOU UNDERSTAND AND DEFEND.

WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND AT THE BEGINNING OF EVERY ONE OF THESE LAWS THERE IS AN ENABLING CLAUSE THAT BASICALLY SAYS HOW THE LAW SHALL BE BROUGHT INTO BEING. AND THERE IS AN ARGUMENT THAT SAYS "THAT THE LAW THAT IS PRESENTLY HERE TODAY IS BASED ON SOME LAW IN THE PAST" OKAY AND ON ALL MOST EVERY ONE OF THESE CONSTITUTIONS ALL THE WAY UP THROUGH OUR HISTORY, THROUGH THE ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION, THROUGH THE CONSTITUTION, THROUGH THE BILL OF RIGHTS, THROUGH VARIOUS STATE CONSTITUTIONS, THEY WILL HAVE AN ENABLING LAW IN THE BEGINNING AND OF COURSE THE, THE ENABLING LAW JUST ALLOWS THEM TO BRING FORTH THEIR VERSION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF WHAT RIGHTS ARE THERE TODAY, THAT THE RIGHTS THAT WERE HAD BEFORE AND ARE CARRIED ON PLUS ARE FURTHER DELINEATED BY THIS CONSTITUTION. BUT AT NO TIME DO THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO ABRIDGE THE PREVIOUS DOCUMENT. NOW GOING ALL THE WAY BACK TO THE MAGNA CHARTA YOU CAN SEE THE DECISION WHERE IT COMES DOWN, THE MAGNA CHARTA, THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, THE ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION, THE US CONSTITUTION, THE VIRGINIA ACTS OF CONSESSION, THE NORTHWEST ORDINANCE, THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT INDIANA, THE INDIANA, MICHIGAN TERRITORIAL DIVISION. THE ENABLING ACTS THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO EXPLAIN TO YOU TODAY. WE HAVE THE MICHIGAN ORGANIZATION IN SUBMITTING ALTERNATIVES, AND THE MICHIGAN ASSENT TO THE CONDITION OF ADMISSION. THE STATE OF MICHIGAN BECAME A STATE IN 1837 AND THIS IS JUST FROM MY AREA.

I'M JUST TRYING TO GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE, WE HAVE A CONSTITUTION OF 1835, 1850, 1908, 1963 EVERYTIME ONE OF THESE CONSTITUTIONS COME BY THE ENABLING ACTS STATES THAT WHAT EVERY WAS GUARANTEED BEFORE IS BROUGHT FORWARD. SO ANYTHING BROUGHT FORWARD FROM BEFORE IS MADE STRONGER OKAY. IT'S NEVER MADE WEAKER. IT'S MADE STRONGER OR IT IS EQUAL TOO.

SO ALL THE RIGHTS BROUGHT FORWARD ARE CARRIED THROUGH AS A LINE OF SUCCESSION SO THIS IS EXACTLY HOW YOU REVIEW TRENDS AND WHERE IT COMES FROM AND HOW AUTHORITIES ARE ESTABLISHED IN LAW OKAY.

THE IMPORTANT THING TO UNDERSTAND IS THAT WE ARE GOING TO COVER PROCEDURES. WE ARE BACK TO OUR NORMAL PROCEDURE. WE HAVE OUR COURT CASES HERE. WE ARE GOING TO GIVE YOU EXAMPLES OF COURT CASES AS WE GO AND WE ARE GOING TO SHOW YOU HOW YOU CAN EXERCISE RIGHTS. AND ONE OF THE FIRST CASES THAT WE ARE GOING TO BRING IS BASICALLY THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL. NOW THERE ARE A LOT OF PEOPLE INTERESTED IN THIS PARTICULAR ISSUE, AND LICENSE PLATES, AND DRIVERS LICENSE AND ALL THIS, AND YOU HAVE A LOT OF PROGRAMMING THAT IS PROBLEMATIC FROM THIS AND, YOU HAVE A LOT OF PEOPLE WHO ARE LOOKING TO HARM YOU. SO WE WANT TO SHARE SOME BASIC ARGUMENTS WITH YOU.

WE ARE GOING TO CLAIM OUR FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO TRAVEL, SO WE'RE GOING TO CLAIM ALSO A 5TH AMENDMENT. IT IS GUARANTEED UNDER THE 5TH AMENDMENT OF DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW. ALL RIGHT WE LOOKED UP IN OUR CONSTITUTION, THIS IS OUR CONSTITUTION AND BASICALLY, WE HAVE A PROTECTED RIGHT TO TRAVEL. **"THE FREEDOM TO TRAVEL IS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT, THAT SHOULD BE UNLIMITED BY STATUTES, RULES OR REGULATIONS, WHICH UNREASONABLY BURDEN OR RESTRICT MOVEMENT."** **"A LAW WHICH SUBSTANTIALLY EFFECTS OR PENALIZES THE EXERCISE OF THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL MAY BE JUSTIFIED ONLY BY A COMPELLING STATE INTEREST, AND MUST BE TAYLORED CAREFULLY AS TO AVOID UNCESSEARY INFRINGEMENT ON THE RIGHT."**

WHEN WE COME DOWN HERE YOU'LL NOTICE SOME OF THE ARGUMENTS:

"FREEDOM TO TRAVEL THROUGH OUT THE UNTIED STATES HAS LONG BEEN RECOGNIZED AS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT UNDER THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION" (SEE NOTE 54) WE ARE GOING TO COME DOWN HERE, AND under #54 THE FIRST CASE IS **SHAPIRO V. THOMPSON RECORDED AT VOLUME 394, U.S. PAGE 618.**

BEGINNING OF THE CASE: **"THE PURPOSE OF INHIBITING MIGRATION BY NEEDY PERSONS INTO A STATE IS CONSTITUTIONALLY IMPERMISSIBLE. ALL CITIZENS MUST BE FREE TO TRAVEL THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES UNINHIBITED BY STATUTES, RULES OR REGULATION, WHICH UNREASONABLY BURDEN OR RESTRICT THIS MOVEMENT."**

"IF A LAW HAS NO OTHER PURPOSE THAN TO CHILL ASSERTIONS OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS BY PENALIZING THOSE WHO CHOOSE TO EXERCISE THEM IT IS PATENTLY UNCONSTITTUIONAL."

DOES EVERYBODY PICK UP ON THE JIST OF THE ARGUMENT HERE?

EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE PROHIBITS APPORTIONMENT OF STATE SERVICES ACCORDING TO PAR TAX CONTRIBUTIONS OF ITS CITIZENS ANY CLASSIFICATION WHICH SERVES TO PENALIZE THE EXERCISE OF THE RIGHT OF INTERSTATE TRAVEL MUST BE SHOWN TO BE A COMPELLING GOVERNMENT INTEREST IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

WE COME TO FIND OUT: THE RIGHT SHOWS NO EXPLICIT MENTION IN THE CONSTITUTION, YOU READ BETWEEN THE LINES IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT IS YOUR RIGHT TO LIFE, LIBERTY AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS? WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO YOU? YOU MIGHT SAY I HAVE NO IDEA, I'M TELLING YOU TO START HAVING AN IDEA. BECAUSE WHEN YOU HAVE AN IDEA, THEY'VE GOT TO LISTEN.

SO YOU SAY I HAVE AN IDEA, I HAVE A RIGHT TO TRAVEL FREELY AND UNEMCUMBERED RIGHT.

AND THE RIGHT WAS SO ELEMENTARY WAS CONCEIVED FROM THE BEGINNING, THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL: "THAT A RIGHT TO TRAVEL WAS SO ELEMENTARY THAT IT WAS CONCEIVED FROM THE BEGINNING TO BE NECESSARY CONCOMITANT OF THE STRONGER UNION. THE CONSTITUTION CREATED. IN ANY EVENT FREEDOM TO TRAVEL THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES HAS LONG BEEN RECOGNIZED AS A RIGHT UNDER THE CONSTITUTION."

WE'VE ESTABLISHED THAT THE RIGHT IS CLEARLY NOT IN ERROR, SO YOU ARE RIGHT, YOU HAD A FEELING THAT YOU HAD A RIGHT TO TRAVEL, AND YOU ARE RIGHT.

ONE OF THE WAYS TO FIND ARGUMENTS ABOUT THAT IS TO GO INTO THE FEDERAL DIGEST AT THE LOCAL LIBRARY RIGHT NEXT TO THE SHEPHERD CITATIONS. YOU LOOK UP THE BOOK CALLED WORDS AND PHRASES. AND IN THE BOOK CALLED WORDS AND PHRASES, YOU ASK FOR THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL, IT WILL GIVE YOU EVERY SUPREME COURT CASE THAT HAS ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL.

IN SHAPIRO V THOMPSON, IT IS SUCH A BASIC RIGHT IT DOESN'T EVEN NEED TO BE MENTIONED. BACK UP YOUR ARGUMENTS UP.

IN MOVING FROM JURISDICTION TO JURISDICTION THEY WERE EXERCISING THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT AND ANY CLASSIFICATION WHICH PENALIZES THE EXERCISE OF THE RIGHT UNLESS SHOWN TO BE NECESSARY TO PROMOTE A COMPELLING GOVERNMENT INTEREST IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

IN OTHER WORDS THEY EXERCISED THEIR RIGHT TO TIMELY TRAVEL, ALL RIGHT AND THE STATE DIDN'T WANT TO ALLOW THAT. LET'S FLIP BACK HERE.

I'M GOING TO ASK YOU A SERIES OF QUESTIONS:

FIRST OF ALL THE CONSTITUTION IS THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND, WHO SAID SO MARBURY V. MADISON 5 US 137 1803. THE CONSTITUTION OF THESE UNITED STATES IS THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND ANY LAW IN CONFLICT IS NULL AND VOID OF LAW.

NOW WE KNOW THAT THE CONSTITUTION IS SUPREME, WE KNOW THE LAW IS CLEARLY ESTABLISHED IN SHAPIRO V THOMPSON,

CAN A STATE ARBITRARILY AND ERRONEOUSLY CONVERT A SECURED LIBERTY IN THIS CASE THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL FREELY AND UNEMCUMBERED INTO A PRIVILEGE AND ISSUE A LICENSE AND A FEE FOR IT.

OBVIOUSLY WE DECIDED IN MURDOCK V. PENNSYLVANIA 319 U.S. 10 CLEARLY NO STATE MAY CONVERT A SECURED LIBERTY INTO A PRIVILEGE. NOW DOES EVERY BODY SEE HOW WE PLUGGED THAT IN.

JUST LIKE ON THE COMPUTER YOU FILL IN THE BLANKS OKAY. (USE IT AS A TEMPLATE FORMAT TO PUT YOUR CASE TOGETHER)

YOU HAVE THE COURT CASE THAT SAYS NO STATE CAN CONVERT A SECURED LIBERTY INTO A PRIVILEGE. NOW DOES THE STATE HAVE THE RIGHT TO MAKE YOU HAVE A DRIVER LICENSE NO? WHY, BECAUSE YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL FREELY AND UNENCUMBERED.

NOW WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE STATE REQUIRES YOU TO HAVE A LICENSE? SHUTTLESWORTH V BURMINHAM ALABAMA, 373 U.S. 262 YOU CAN IGNORE IT AND ENGAGE A RIGHT WITH IMPUNITY THAT MEANS THEY CAN'T PUNISH YOU. SEE ALSO MILLER V. UNITED STATES 230 F2ND 486

NOW WHAT HAPPENS IF THEY PULL YOU OVER, YOU'RE GOING TO GET A TICKET? YOU ARE GOING TO COURT AND FIGHT IT AND FILE A BRIEF AND WE'RE GOING TO SHOW YOU HOW TO DO THAT AT A LATER TIME. THESE ARE THE CASES THAT YOU ARE GOING TO BE PUTTING IN ON YOUR MEMORANDUM OF LAW, AS TO THE REASON YOU FEEL YOU ARE RIGHT.

FIRST: THAT YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT IS SUPERIOR TO ANY LAW THEY COULD ENACT. YOU HAVE THAT RIGHT AND THEY CAN'T PASS A LAW THAT TAKES AWAY THAT RIGHT.

SECOND: IF THEY DO IT'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL

THIRDLY: NO STATE MAY CONVERT A SECURED LIBERTY INTO A PRIVILEGE AND ISSUE A LICENSE AND A FEE FOR IT. AND IF THEY DO, YOU CAN ENGAGE THAT RIGHT WITH IMPUNITY, SUTTLESWORTH V BIRMINGHAM ALABAMA, AND SINCE YOU HAVE NOT WILLFULLY DONE ANYTHING EVIL, YOU HAVE RELIED ON YOUR CONSTITUTION AND ON SUPREME COURT DECISIONS. YOU HAVE A PERFECT DEFENSE TO THE CHARGE OF WILLFULNESS, SO YOU COULD NOT BE CHARGED WITH WILLFULLY NOT GETTING A LICENSE. DOES EVERYBODY SEE THAT OKAY. YOU HAVE A PERFECT DEFENSE. UNITED STATES V BISHOP 412 US 436, DEFINES WILFULLNESS: A WILLFUL INTENT TO AVOID A KNOWN DUTY OR TASK UNDER THE LAW WITH A MORAL CERTAINTY. OBVIOUSLY YOU DIDN'T DO THAT DID YOU BECAUSE YOU HAD A PERFECT DEFENSE, YOU RELIED ON PREVIOUS DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT, SUTTLESWORTH, MURDOCK AND MARBARY YOU RELIED ON YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO TRAVEL FREELY AND UNENCOMBUERED PURSUANT SHIPARO V THOMPSON. SO YOU HAVE A PERFECT DEFENSE, SO NOW WHERE ARE WE AT?

YOUR HONOR, MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT I MOTION FOR DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE BASED UPON THE PROSECUTIONS FAILURE TO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED AND I WOULD LIKE TO MOTION TO DISMISS AND I'D LIKE MY COST AND FEES FOR HAVING TO DEFEND THIS FRIVOLOUS CASE. AND YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO COLLECT YOUR TIME FOR GOING TO COURT. YOU SUBMIT YOUR BILL AND SUBMIT YOUR PROPOSED ORDER. YOU FILL OUT YOUR OWN PROPOSED ORDER THAT MAKES THE CASE GO FASTER AND THE JUDGES KIND OF LIKE THAT AND IT INTIMIDATES THE HELL OUT OF THE PROSECUTOR WHEN YOU DO YOUR OWN ORDER.

NOW LET'S SAY, "WELL THAT'S HOW YOU INTERPRET THAT, SIR" "YOUR RIGHT SIR, THAT IS HOW I INTERPRET IT." IN 16TH AM JURIS PRUDENCE 2ND CONSTITUTIONAL SECTION #97 SAYS THAT IT SHALL BE INTERPRETED IN MY FAVOR BECAUSE I AM THE CLEARLY INTENDED AND EXPRESSLY DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY, DECISION FOR RIGHTS AND PROPERTY. SEE BYARS V. UNITED STATES 273 U.S. 28 THAT DEALS WITH UNLAWFUL SEARCH AND SEIZURE, BUT IT IS SUPPOSED TO BE INTERPRETED IN FAVOR OF YOU DECLARING INTENDED PROTECTION OF YOUR RIGHTS AND PROPERTY.

NOW BOYD V. UNITED STATES 116 U.S. 635 (1886) "CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS FOR THE SECURITY OF PERSON AND PROPERTY SHOULD BE LIBERALLY CONSTRUED. IT IS THE DUTY OF THE COURTS TO BE WATCHFUL OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AGAINST ANY STEALTHY ENCROACHMENTS THEREON."

NORTON V SHELBY COUNTY, 118 USR 425 (1886) "AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT IS NOT LAW. IT CONFERS NO RIGHTS, IT IMPOSES NO DUTIES, IT AFFORDS NO PROTECTIONS, IT CREATES NO OFFICE. IT IS IN LEGAL CONTEMPLATION AS INOPERATIVE AS THOUGH IT HAS NEVER BEEN PASSED."

NOW AFTER YOU WRITE ALL OF THIS STUFF DOWN YOU CAN ACTUALLY SAY, WHEREFORE YOUR HONOR, I PRAY BEFORE THIS HONORABLE COURT FOR YOUR JUST AND LAWFUL RELIEF. I ASK THAT YOU DISMISS THIS CASE WITH PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED. AND I PRAY THE COURT FOR MY JUST RELIEF FOR HAVING TO DEFEND THIS FRIVOLOUS AND SPURIOUS CASE AND MY COST AND FEES AND I SUBMIT THAT I HAVE A PROPOSED ORDER YOUR HONOR ITS IN MY BRIEF.

WELL MR PROSECUTOR WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO DO WITH THIS, AND AT THIS POINT THEY ARE SO OVERWHELMED THEY JUST GO I'LL GO FOR THE DISMISSAL, YOUR HONOR. AND THE JUDGE WILL GIVE HIM SOME SLACK, WELL THIS YOUNG MAN IS NOT AN ATTORNEY, SO WHY ARE YOU, OVER WHELMED THAT ACCOUNTS FOR THE PROSECUTION A LICENSED ATTORNEY.

IT IS NOT MY GOAL TO MAKE PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS LOOK BAD, BUT TO MAKE YOU LOOK GOOD. MY GOAL IS TO MAKE YOU UNDERSTAND YOUR CONSTITUTION.

NOW IF YOU HAPPEN TO DO IT AND YOU DO IT BETTER THAN THE ATTORNEY, GOD BLESS YOU. AND GOD BLESS, AMERICA. AND IF THE ATTORNEY DOESN'T DO HIS HOMEWORK AND PREPARE HIS CASE, I HAVE NO SYMPATHY FOR HIM, BECAUSE HE SHOULDN'T HAVE DONE WHAT HE WAS DOING ANYWAY. IF HE HAD ANY BRAINS HE WOULD HAVE PULLED YOU ASIDE AND DONE WHAT OTHER ATTORNEYS HAVE DONE TO ME AND SAY, YOU KNOW I HATE GOING AGAINST A PRO SE LITIGANT ATTORNEY. ALMOST ALWAYS THEY ARE REALLY, REALLY GOOD. AND YOU KNOW I NEVER GET TO KNOW IF THEY ARE REALLY ,REALLY GOOD OR REALLY, REALLY BAD, UNTIL I SHOW UP AND THEN IT IS TOO LATE BECAUSE I AM ALL READY ON THE DIVING BOARD, AND EITHER THE POOL HAS WATER IN IT OR IT DOESN'T, AND USUALLY IT DOESN'T AND IT HURTS WHEN YOU HIT THE BOTTOM. SO THEY DON'T LIKE GOING AGAINST YOU PEOPLE. THEY WILL NOT LIKE GOING AGAINST YOU IF YOU HALF WAY KNOW WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT. THEY ARE GOING TO BE INTIMIDATED. I CAN TELL YOU MANY, MANY TALES. THIS ONE GENTLEMEN, HE DIDN'T HAVE ANY PLATES ON HIS CAR AND THEY CALLED HIM INTO THE COURT, AND HE WAS STANDING IN THE HALL, AND THE PROSECUTOR SAID WILL YOU COME ON OVER HERE I'D LIKE TO TALK TO YOU. HE WENT IN AND SAT DOWN AND THIS PARTY SAID TO THE PROSECUTOR, "WHAT CAN I DO FOR YOU?" THE PROSECUTOR SAID "SIR, "WHAT CAN I DO FOR YOU?" "IT'S NOT WHAT YOU CAN DO FOR ME I'M THE PROSECUTOR IT'S WHAT I CAN DO FOR YOU IN THIS CASE." "WELL I ASSUMED THERE WAS SOMETHING I COULD DO FOR YOU, YOU CALLED ME IN HERE." "WELL WHAT DO YOU WANT TO DO?" "HOW DO YOU WANT TO PLEAD ON YOUR CASE?" "I DON'T INTEND TO PLEAD SIR, I INTEND TO ANSWER IN AFFIRMATIVE DEMURE, SUCH THAT I DO NOT ACQUIESE TO QUSAI JURISDICTION BECAUSE THAT IS AN ISSUE TO BE BROUGHT UP IN MY PLEADINGS AND BRIEFS THAT I FILED WITH THE COURT." THEY GUYS MOUTH WAS ON THE GROUND. HE SAID "ARE YOU AN ATTORNEY?" HE SAID, "NO I'M A TRUCK DRIVER." THE GUY ABSOLUTELY WAS IN A PANIC. I HAD THE SAME GENTLEMEN, HE WAS WORKING AS A BRICKLAYER AND HE DID THE SAME THING. TOLD THE PROSECUTOR THAT HE WAS A BRICKLAYER, AND HE SHOWS UP AND HIS JAW WAS ON THE GROUND. IT BLOWS THEIR SOCKS OFF. AND HE REALIZES HE ARGUES LAW AND HE HAS TO TREAT HIM LIKE HE IS AN ATTORNEY. SO THE FIRST THING THE PROSECUTOR DOES IS GOES UP TO THE JUDGE AND SAYS, "JUDGE, I'M GOING TO DISMISS THIS CASE." BECAUSE HE REALIZED HE WAS GOING TO GET HAMMERED. MY GUY SAYS, "HE CAN'T DO THAT, I TOOK THE DAY OFF WORK TO COME OVER HEAR AND BATTLE." I SAID SHUT UP SIT DOWN AND RELAX YOU WON, DON'T SAY NOTHIN. AND THE JUDGE BROKE OUT LAUGHING BECAUSE THE GUY DIDN'T WANT TO QUIT. "WELL EVIDENTLY THE PROSECUTOR DOESN'T WANT TO PROCEED, SIR, AND I'M GOING TO HAVE TO DISMISS THE CASE, HE IS THE COMPLAINTANT." "CAN HE DO THAT JUDGE, HE CAN'T DO THAT." "I'M HERE TO BATTLE, LET'S GO, LET'S DO IT." AND THE JUDGE LAUGHED AGAIN, AND SAID, " WELL, APPARENTLY, SIR, I CAN'T SUSTAIN A COMPLAINT THAT IS NOT PROPERLY BEFORE THE COURT, COUNSEL FOR THE PROSECUTION HAS MOTIONED TO DISMISS, NOW IF YOU HAVE ANY OTHER OPTION, IF YOU WANT TO COUNTER SUE HIM THAT IS ANOTHER CASE. "WELL, I'LL DO THAT, I'LL DO THAT. I TOLD HIM " YOU WILL YOU BE QUITE AND SUBMIT YOUR BILL." "SUBMIT YOUR BILL YOU WON, SUBMIT YOU BILL FOR THE DAMAGES." SO HE DID, WELL, I'LL SUBMIT MY BILL, YOUR HONOR, FOR COSTS AND FEES FOR HAVING TO

DEFEND THIS FRIVOLOUS CASE.” AND THE JUDGE SMILED, BECAUSE PEOPLE DON'T USUALLY DO THAT. **BUT IF YOU WIN, THEY ARE REQUIRED TO PAY YOU. THAT'S THE RULES IF YOU LOOSE YOU PAY. SO THE BOTTOM LINE IS THIS, WHEN YOU FILE YOUR PAPERS AND THEY TURN AROUND AND YOU GET A WIN MAKE SURE YOU'VE GOT YOUR LITTLE BILL IN THERE FOR YOUR LOST TIME FROM WORK, ANY COPIES YOU HAD TO MAKE ANY MAILINGS ANY VISITS TO THE LAW LIBRARY, IT WHAT IS CALLED REAL AND PERSONAL DAMAGES AND DON'T PAD IT JUST GIVE AN ACCOUNT OF WHAT IT IS, BECAUSE IF THEY FORCE YOU TO PROVE IT, THEN YOU CAN GET BUSTED FOR PERJURY. I DON'T RECOMMEND YOU, SHALL WE SAY STRETCH THE PAD.** THE FACT THAT THEY GOT STUCK WITH THE STING, AND THE FACT THAT THEY HAVE TO PAY A COUPLE HUNDRED BUCKS IS ENOUGH OF A STING WITH LOST DAYS OF WORK. YOU BELIEVE ME THEY WILL GET A CODE ON YOUR PLATE, AND THE NEXT TIME THEY STOP YOU'LL THEY WILL TELL YOU TO SLOW DOWN AND HAVE A NICE DAY BECAUSE THEY DON'T LIKE PEOPLE LIKE YOU. BECAUSE YOU'RE AN AMERICAN, AND AN AMERICANS DON'T GIVE UP. THEY NEVER SURRENDER AND THEY FIGHT. **ONE JUDGE, TOLD ME ONE TIME, HAVE YOU GOT ANY IDEA OF HOW MUCH MONEY YOUR HAVE COST THIS COURT? I SAID I HOPE IT WAS A BUNCH, YOUR HONOR AND I HOPE YOU WRITE A WHOLE BUNCH MORE TICKETS TO BREAK EVEN. THE WAY I FIGURE THE MORE TICKETS YOU HAVE GOT TO WRITE, THE SOONER THE PUBLIC IS GOING TO WAKE UP TO THIS THEFT, AND MAYBE THEY WILL START DOING SOMETHING POSITIVE TO STOP THIS KIND OF STUFF, BECAUSE IT IS MY BELIEF THEY SHOULD BE HAVING MASKS ON OUT THERE, BECAUSE IF THEY WERE AN HONEST CROOK THEY WOULD BE HAVING MASKS ON WHEN THEY ROB THE PEOPLE. WELL HE DIDN'T LIKE THAT ANSWER TOO GOOD, BUT THE BOTTOM LINE IS HE KNEW I WAS RIGHT AND AFTER WHILE THEY REALIZE WHAT YOUR GOAL IS AND THEY KNOW.** HEY, THIS IS MORE FUN THAT EDGE WATER PARK AND I WANT TO GO ON ALL THE RIDES TWICE. I WANT TO HIT THE WILD MOUSE AND A WHOLE BUNCH OF THEM OTHER RIDES LET'S DO IT. WHEN THEY SEE THAT, THEY REALIZE THERE IS NO POINT, YOU'RE NOT GOING TO LEARN ANYTHING. YOU'RE GOING TO COST TIME, MONEY AND MATERIAL. NOW THE SYSTEM IS NOT PROFITABLE, AND THEY ARE NOT GOING TO DEAL WITH IT ANY MORE.

NOW WE TAKE THE LINE DOWN, THE LINE FROM THE CONSTITUTION, WE TAKE THE LINE FROM THE RIGHT.

NOW LET'S THINK UP ANOTHER RIGHT, HOW ABOUT THE RIGHT TO WORK TO CONTRACT YOUR TIME AND YOUR LABOR AND YOUR SKILL AND YOUR LIFE AS YOU SEE FIT. **YOUR RIGHT TO WORK IS PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT.** AGAIN, YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO CONTRACT YOUR TIME, YOUR SKILL, AND YOUR LABOR AS YOU SEE FIT. I GOT HAULED INTO COURT BEFORE THIS BIG JUDGE IN OAKLAND COUNTY. I WON'T GIVE YOU THE NAME OF THE JUDGE BECAUSE HE WAS A FAIR JUDGE AND A GOOD JUDGE, AND I'M GOING TO LET HIM SLIDE. BUT THE BOTTOM LINE IS THIS, HE LOOKED JUST LIKE AB LINCOLN, I MEAN EXACTLY, HE WAS THE SPITTING IMAGE. **HE LEANS OVER THE CHAIR AND HE SAYS WELL, "IT'S BEEN REPORTED TO ME SON, THAT YOU DON'T HAVE A LICENSE TO PRACTICE LAW, IS THAT CORRECT?"** AND I LOOKED UP AT HIM, AND IS SAID "JUDGE, I'M NOT

PRACTICING I KNOW WHAT THE HELL I'M DOING." AND THE WHOLE COURT BROKE OUT LAUGHING. HE SAID, "THAT'S PRETTY GOOD, THAT'S PRETTY GOOD, I LIKE SOMEBODY WITH A SENSE OF HUMOR, BUT THAT DOESN'T CHANGE ANYTHING SON. DO YOU HAVE TO HAVE A LICENSE TO PRACTICE LAW?" AND I SAID, "YOUR, HONOR, I'M AN UNENFRANCHISED COMMON LAW FREEMAN, I LIVE AT THE COMMON LAW I AM NOT A PARTICIPANT IN ANY TONTINE SCHEMES AND LIMITED LIABILITY IN A JOINT VENTURE FOR PROFIT WITH AN INSURABLE INTEREST REQUIRING ME TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE ILLEGAL CORPORATE PONZI SCHEMES. I'M JUST A JOE BLOW FROM COCAMO DOWN THE STREET. I JUST LIVE AT THE COMMON LAW. AND, I HAVE A RIGHT TO WORK AND CONTRACT MY LABOR AND MY SKILL AND MY TIME OF LIFE AS I SEE FIT, NOT AS SOME THIRD PARTY ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS BAR ASSOCIATION SEES FIT." AND THEY HAD LOADED THE COURT WITH ALL OF THESE ATTORNEYS. AND THEY WENT OOOOH. DID YOU HEAR THAT GUY. I SAID, "YOUR, HONOR, THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, ARBITRAILY AND ERRONEOUSLY CONVERTED MY RIGHT TO WORK INTO A PRIVILEGE, AND ISSUED A LICENSE AND A FEE FOR IT AND THAT'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL, YOUR HONOR, MARBURY V. MADISON (5 US 137 (1803)) ANYTHING IN CONFLICT OR REPUGNANCY IS NULL AND VOID OF LAW." CAN YOU SEE THAT MARBURY V MADISON. "AND SINCE THE STATE CONVERTED MY RIGHT INTO PRIVILEGE AND ISSUED A LICENSE AND A FEE FOR IT SEE MURDOCK V. PENN. NO STATE CAN CONVERT A RIGHT INTO A PRIVILEGE AND ISSUE A LICENSE AND A FEE FOR IT, AND IF THEY DO SHUTTLESWORTH V. BIRMINGHAM, AL SAYS "IF THE STATE DOES CONVERT YOUR RIGHT INTO A PRIVILEGE AND ISSUE A LICENSE AND A FEE FOR IT, YOU CAN IGNORE THE LICENSE AND A FEE AND ENGAGE THE RIGHT WITH IMPUNITY." THAT MEANS YOU CAN'T PUNISH ME. AND UNITED STATES V BISHOP DEFINES "WILLFULNESS – "AN EVIL MOTIVE OR INTENT TO AVOID A KNOWN DUTY OR TASK UNDER A LAW, WITH A MORAL CERTAINTY." I COULDN'T HAVE DONE AN EVIL TASK BECAUSE I WAS FOLLOWING THE CONSTITUTION AND THE SUPREME COURT. I WOULD SUBMIT THAT THE PROSECUTION COUNSEL'S PERTINENCE TO PROVE THAT I DID WILLFULLY AND KNOWINGLY AVOID A KNOWN DUTY AND TASK UNDER THE LAW, NAMELY TO GET THE LICENSE, AND I WILL SUBMIT THAT HE IS SPECIFICALLY PRECLUDED AND HE CANNOT PERFORM HIS TASK, AND I MOTION TO DISMISS, WITH PREJUDICE AND I WOULD LIKE TO SUBMIT MY COST AND FEES FOR HAVING TO DEFEND THIS SPURIOUS AND FRIVOLOUS COMPLAINT." JUDGE ROLLS BACK IN HIS CHAIR WITH A SMILE AND TURNS TO COUNSEL, AND SAYS, "WELL MR. ROSE, WHAT DO YOU THINK WE OUGHT TO DO ABOUT THIS YOUNG GENTLEMAN." THE PROSECUTION MOUTHS BACK "HOW ABOUT WE HONOR THE MOTION TO DISMISS YOUR, HONOR. " "GOOD ANSWER BECAUSE I DON'T THINK YOU ARE READY FOR THIS KID TODAY." AND THE WHOLE COURT BROKE OUT LAUGHING.

AN OLD GENTLEMAN WALKED UP TO ME AND SAID," SON, I JUST WANT TO SHAKE YOUR HAND AND TELL YOU FOUGHT LIKE KING KONG BECAUSE YOU JUST SLAMMED THE BAR ASSOCIATION. I'VE BEEN A MEMBER OF THE BAR ASSOCIATION FOR 50 YEARS, AND I'VE GOT TO TELL YOU THAT WAS ONE OF THE MOST MAGNIFICENT ARGUMENTS THAT I'VE EVER HAD THE PRIVILEGE TO HEAR IN A COURT OF LAW." NOW HE WAS AN HONEST ATTORNEY AND HE REALIZED WHAT KIND OF CHAIN WAS AROUND HIS ANKLE WITH THIS BAR ASSOCIATION AND THESE LAWYERS, THEY

RESENT THAT, THEY REALLY DO. THEY ARE PEOPLE JUST LIKE YOU. THEY DON'T LIKE TO HAVE ANY CHAINS ON THEM. BUT THEY HADN'T HAD ANYBODY QUITE SHOW THEM HOW TO GET THOSE CHAINS OFF. AND WHEN THEY SAW SOMEBODY DO IT WITH THEIR OWN SKILL WITH THEIR OWN CARDS ON THEIR OWN PLAYING FIELD, IT ACTUALLY IMPRESSED THE HELL OUT OF THEM. I HAD SEVERAL GENTLEMEN COME UP AND SHAKE MY HAND THAT DAY. NEEDLESS TO SAY THE CASE WAS DISMISSED AND I'VE BEEN HELPING LITTLE PEOPLE GETTING JAMMED FOR YEARS. EVERYTIME I SEE SOME LITTLE PERSON GET JAMMED I'M OUT THERE FLIPPING THAT WRENCH ZING, ZING, ZING AND I PUT THAT WRENCH ON THEM SO GOOD THAT USUALLY THEY JUST BACK OFF. DOCTOR KAVORKIAN WAS A PERFECT EXAMPLE. THE POOR MAN WAS JUST TRYING TO HELP THESE PEOPLE, AND THEY WERE JAMMING HIM EVERY WHICH WAY BUT LOOSE.

SO WHAT WE DID, WE TAUGHT THEM A THING CALLED QUO WARRANTO. I GOT A HOLD OF HIS ATTORNEY AND SUBMITTED ALL OF THE ARGUMENTS.

QUO WARRANTO: SEVERAL ARGUMENTS HERE. WE'RE GOING TO BRING UP POLICE POWERS AND QUO WARRANTO GOES BACK TO ENGLISH LAW. ANCIENT ENGLISH LAW: QUO WARRANTO AN OLD ENGLISH PRACTICE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF A WRIT OF RIGHT FOR THE KING AGAINST HIM WHO CLAIMED OR URSURPED ANY OFFICE FRANCHISE OR LIBERTY TO INCQUIRE BY WHAT AUTHORITY HAS HE SUPPORTED HIS CLAIM IN ORDER TO DETERMINE THE RIGHT. IT LAY ALSO IN THE CASE OF A NON USER OR LONG NEGLECTED OF A FRANCHISE, IS A CORPORATION, OR MISUSER OR ABUSER OF A FRANCHISE, MEANING A WRIT COMMANDING THE DEFENDANT TO SHOW BY WHAT WARRANT HE EXERCISES SUCH A CORPORATE FRANCHISE HAVING NEVER HAD ANY GRANT OF IT OR HAVING FORFIETED IT BY NEGLECT OR ABUSE. A COMMON LAW WRIT DEISGNE TO TEST WHETHER A PERSON EXERCISING POWER IS LEGALLY ENTITLED TO DO SO. AN EXTRAORDINARY PROCEEDING PEROGATIVE IN NATURE, ADDRESSED TO PREVENTING EXERCISE OF CONTINUED USE OF AUTHORITY UNLAWFULLY ASSERTED. JOHNSON V. MANHATTAN RAILROAD COMPANY N.Y. RECORDED AT VOLUME 289 U.S. PAGE 479. NOW

IT IS INTENDED TO PREVENT EXERCISE OF POWERS NOT CONFERRED BY LAW. IT IS NOT ORDINARILY AVAILABLE TO REGULATE THE MANNER OF EXERCISING SUCH POWER.

SEE POLICE POWERS ARE DEFINED AS A RIGHT OF EMINENT DOMAIN OF STATE OR A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION, TO ENACT LAWS FOR THE COMMON GOOD AND WELFARE. LET'S PULL THAT OUT. POLICE POWER: THIS IS OUT OF BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY FOLKS: AN AUTHORITY CONFERED BY THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM IN THE TENTH AMENDMENT U.S. CONSTITUTION UPON THE INDIVIDUAL STATES AND IN TURN DELEGATED TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN WHICH THEY ARE ENABLED TO ESTABLISH A SPECIAL DEPARTMENT OF POLICE., AND SUCH LAWS AND REGULATIONS AS SUCH TEND TO PREVENT THE COMMISSION OF FRAUD AND OR CRIME AND SECURED GENERALLY TO THE COMFORT SAFETY, MORALS, HEALTH AND PROSPERITY OF ITS CITIZENS BY PRESERVING THE PUBLIC ORDER AND PREVENTING A CONFLICT OF RIGHTS IN THE COMMON INTERCOURSE OF THE

CITIZENS. AND ENSURING TO EACH AN UNINTERRUPTED ENJOYMENT OF ALL THE PRIVILEGES CONFERRED UPON HIM OR HER BY THE GENERAL LAWS, THE CONSTITUTION. THE POWER OF THE STATE TO PLACE RESTRAINTS ON PERSONAL FREEDOMS AND PROPERTY RIGHTS OR PERSON FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND MORALS, OR PROMOTION OF THE PUBLIC CONVENIENCE IN GENERAL PROPRIETY. THE POLICE POWER IS SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATIONS OF THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS. (DID EVERYBODY CATCH THAT) AND ESPECIALLY TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF DUE PROCESS. POLICE POWER IS THE EXERCISE OF THE SOVEREIGN RIGHT OF THE GOVERNMENT TO PROMOTE ORDER, SAFETY AND WELFARE WITHIN CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS IS AN ESSENTIAL ATTRIBUTE. MARSHALL V KANSAS CITY MO. RECORDED AT 35 VOL. S.W. 2ND THAT'S ANOTHER REPORTER PAGE 877. NOW POLICE POWERS KEY WORDS WITHIN CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS. AND IT SAYS SEE THE TENTH AMENDMENT. THE BURDENS PLACED ON THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT AS RESULT OF THE STATES REGULATION OF THEIR INTERNAL AFFAIRS SAVE AS CONGRESS MAY ACT TO REMOVE THEM CONSTITUTES NORMAL INCIDENTS OF OPERATION WITHIN THE SAME TERRITORY OF A DUAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT. AND NO IMMUNITY OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENT FROM SUCH BURDEN AS TO BE IMPLIED FROM THE CONSTITUTION. PEN DAIRIES V MILK CONTROL COMMISSION RECORDED AT VOL 318 U.S 261 A PENNSYLVANIA CASE "THE PEOPLE RESIDING IN ANY STATE ARE SUBJECT TO TWO GOVERNMENTS ONE STATE AND THE OTHER NATIONAL, BUT THEIR NEED BE NO CONFLICT BETWEEN THE TWO BECAUSE THE POWERS THE ONE POSSESSES THE OTHER DOES NOT." THAT'S UNITED STATES VS. CROOKSHANK, A VERY FAMOUS SUPREME COURT CASE.

WITHIN THE AREA OF DELEGATED POWERS EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, THIS AMENDMENT DOES NOT REDUCE THE POWERS OF UNITED STATES, THAT'S U.S. V MANNING RECORDED AT 215 FED SUPPLEMENT ANOTHER RECORDER PAGE 272 IN THE FEDERAL UNION HAS ONLY THOSE POWERS EXPRESSLY CONFERRED ON IT AND THOSE REASONABLY IMPLIED BY THOSE GRANTED, WHILE EACH STATE HAS ALL GOVERNMENTAL POWERS EXCEPT SUCH AS THE PEOPLE BY CONSTITUTION HAVE CONFERRED ON THE UNITED STATES, DENIED TO THE STATE OR RESERVED TO THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES. ANDERSON V GLADDEN RECORDED AT VOL 188 FED SUPPLEMENT 666, THAT'S A BAD NUMBER. IT IS WHEN FEDERAL LEGISLATION ATTEMPTS TO CONFER POWER UPON THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT THAT IT IS NOT WITHIN THE EXPRESS OR IMPLIED POWERS GIVEN BY THE CONSTITUTION THAT THE LEGISLATION BECOMES VULNERABLE TO THIS AMENDMENT. NOW WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT HERE??? "THE BRADY BILL" THAT'S NOT WITHIN THEIR POWERS, THEY HAVE NO TENTH AMENDMENT POWERS TO TAKE AWAY THE SECOND AMENDMENT. DOES THAT MAKE SENSE TO EVERYBODY??? THEY DON'T HAVE ANY POWERS TO TAKE AWAY THE 2ND AMENDMENT OR ANY OTHER AMENDMENT. THE FOURTH AMENDMENT 5TH AMENDMENT NOTHING AND THE 9TH AMENDMENT PRECLUDED THEM FROM ADDING ON TO THE CONSTITUTION IN SUCH A WAY THAT WOULD TAKE AWAY THE POWER. SO THE NINTH AMENDMENT AND THE TENTH AMENDMENT THEY ARE TOTALLY LOCKED OUT FROM DOING THE MANY THINGS

THAT THEY DO. BUT SEE YOU HAVE GOT TO KNOW THAT AND BE ABLE TO TIMELY EXERCISE IT. SO IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND YOUR TENTH AMENDMENT POWERS.

NOW, WHEN IN THE COURSE OF HUMAN EVENTS IT BECOMES NECESSARY AND PROPER , AND THIS IS WHAT WE DID TO HELP OUT DOCTOR KAVORKIAN. WE MADE SURE THAT HIS LAWYER GOT THIS KNOWLEDGE, WE WENT UP AND DUG OUT THE WRIT OF QUO WARRANTO. THIS DOESN'T LOOK LIKE MUCH, BUT WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT DOING HERE, **SEE MOST CITIES AT LEAST IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ARE DONE BY PUBLIC ACTS 230 AND PUBLIC ACTS 287 OF PUBLIC ACTS, AND EVERYONE OF THEM THERE SAY RIGHTS AND POWERS IN THIS SECTION, USUALLY ITS RECORDED AT 2.2 OR 3.1 AND IT BASICALLY SAYS AND I QUOTE "SUBJECT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE GENERAL LAWS OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, THE CITY OF, OR THE TOWNSHIP OF, HAS RIGHTS AND POWERS TOO, AND THEN IT STARTS LISTING THE RIGHTS AND POWERS RIGHT TO HAVE A POLICE LISTING OFF ALL THESE POWERS.** NOW THE ANTI THESIS TO THE ARGUMENT IS **IF THEY ARE NOT WITHIN THE POWERS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE GENERAL LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES AND LAWS OF STATE OF MICHIGAN THEY DON'T HAVE ANY POWERS.** DOES THAT MAKE ANY SENSE TO YOU? **IN OTHER WORDS THEY ARE IN VIOLATION OF THEIR CORPORATE CHARTER, THEY ARE A FRANCHISE.** THEY PROMISED THAT THEY WOULD BE WITHIN THE POWERS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE GENERAL LAWS OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN. NOW A LOT OF PEOPLE DON'T UNDERSTAND THE POWER OF THIS ARGUMENT SO I REALLY WANT TO PUSH THIS HOME, SO YOU UNDERSTAND. WHENEVER THESE LITTLE TOWNSHIPS AND LITTLE CITIES START ACTING LIKE KING FARUKA, AND YOU DON'T MATTER, AND THEY DON'T HAVE TO LISTEN TO YOU AND THIS IS WHAT I WANT YOU TO DO. **YOU ASK THEM TO POINT QUESTION ARE YOU VIOLATING MY CONSTITUTIONALLY SECURED RIGHTS BY HOWEVER YOU CLAIM THEY ARE? BECAUSE, IF YOU ARE, YOU HAVE JUST WAIVED YOUR RIGHT TO BE THE CITY OF??** AND THEY WILL LAUGH AT YOU FOR A LITTLE BIT OKAY. THEN YOU EXPLAIN TO THEM **PUBLIC ACT 230 OF PUBIC ACTS WHICH STATES "IT'S THE RIGHT AND POWERS SECTION SUBJECT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE GENERAL LAWS OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, YOU HAVE RIGHTS AND POWERS, THE ANTI THESIS TO THAT ARGUMENT IS, IF YOUR NOT GOING TO BE WITHIN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, AND THE GENERAL LAWS OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN AND YOU ARE GOING TO VIOLATE MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND TRAMPLE MY RIGHTS, WHAT WE WILL DO HERE IS GO FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND A QUO WARRANTO.** THAT IS FANCY LEGAL TERM. BUT IT IS AN ANCIENT LAW THAT GOES WAY BACK TO ENGLAND AND THE ANCIENT TIMES. AND BASICALLY HERE IS A JUDGMENT AND A CAPIOUS ACTION FOR IT ALRIGHT: **CASE (NUMBER) CAME ON REGULARLY FOR TRIAL AND YOU PUT THE JUDGES NAME IN THERE WHAT IT IS ON A JURY TRIAL OR NON JURY TRIAL DATE OF SUCH AND SUCH, THE NAME APPEARED AS COUNSEL, AND NAME APPEARED AS OPPOSING COUNSEL, THE COURT HEARD THE TESTIMONY AND EXAMINED THE PROOFS OFFERED BY THE PARTIES THE COURT CONSIDERED ITSELF FULLY ADVISED ON THE PREMISE FILED IN ITS FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND**

DIRECTED THAT JUDGMENTS BE ENTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUCH FINDINGS, RIGHT, WHICH MEANS THEY FIGUERED OUT THEY VIOLATED YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND THEY DIDN'T HAVE A RIGHT TO VIOLATE YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND IN THE HEARING YOU SHOWED THEY VIOLATED YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND THE JUDGE FIGUERED OUT HE VIOLATED YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. SO NOW A PRAYER FOR RELIEF, WE'RE GOING TO GET THIS QUO WARRENTO: AND THIS EXACTLY WHAT HAPPENED TO THE HONORABLE DOCTOR KAVORKIAN.

YOU NOTICE HE WAS IN JAIL AND THEY WERE HAMMERING THE TAIL OUT OF HIM, AND THE NEXT THING YOU KNOW EVERYTHING GOT REAL QUIET AND NOBODY SAID NOTHING. AND THE NEXT THING YOU KNOW THEY WERE LETTING HIM GO AND THEY WERE MINDING THEIR BUSINESS. NOW THIS IS HOW IT HAPPENED:

IT IS THEREFORE, ORDERED ADJUGED AND DECREED:

1. DEFENDANT CORPORATION THE CITY OF YOU PUT DOWN YOUR NAME HAS VIOLATED PROVISIONS OF THE ACT UNDER WHICH IT WAS CREATED AND ALSO HAS VIOLATED PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC ACT 230 OR PUBLIC ACT SECTION 2.2 RIGHTS AND POWERS SECTION IN OTHER WORDS IT DIDN'T UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OR THE GENERAL LAWS OF THE STATE OF YOUR STATE.
2. DEFENDANT CORPORATION THE CITY OF ACCORDINGLY HAS FORFIETED IT'S CHARTER AND BECOME LIABLE TO BE DISOLVED BY THE ABUSE OF ITS POWER.

HOW MUCH MONEY ARE WE TALKING ABOUT HERE FOLKS, WE'D BE IN THE 9 DECIMAL PLACES WOULDN'T WE FOLKS NOW DO YOU THINK THEY ARE GOING TO WORRY ABOUT SOME LITTLE DOCTOR, WHEN THEY SEE THE SHUTTING DOWN OF A MAJOR CITY. WHAT DO YOU THINK IS GOING TO HAPPEN. EVERYTHING IS GOING TO GET QUIET AND THEY ARE GOING TO MIND THEIR OWN BUSINESS, AND LET THE GOOD DOCTOR GO. THE SAME THING FOR YOU.

3. DEFENDANT CORPORATION NAME THEREFORE IS DISSOLVED, AND THE CORPORATE RIGHTS PRIVILEGES AND FRANCHISES OF DEFENDANTS ARE DECLARED FORFEITED TO THE PEOPLE.
4. DEFENDANT CORPORATION NAME IT TRUSTEES AND DIRECTORS, MANAGERS AND OTHER OFFICIALS, OFFICERS AND ATTORNEYS AND AGENTS ARE FOREVER RESTRAINED AND ENJOINED FROM EXERCISING ANY OF THE CORPORATE FRANCISES POWERS RIGHTS AND OR PRIVILEGES PREVIOUSLY EXERCISED BY DEFENDANT SAID CITY AND FROM COLLECTING OR RECEIVING ANY DEBTS AND OR DEMANDS BELONGING TO OR HELD BY DEFENDANT CITY AND FROM PAYING OUT OR IN ANY MANNER INTERFERING WITH

TRANSFERRING OR DELIVERING TO ANY PERSON ANY OF THE DEPOSITS, MONIES, SECURITIES PROPERTY AND EFFECTS OF DEFENDANT CITY OR HELD BY IT. YOU NAME A TRUSTEE, WHICH THE STATE WOULD APPOINT, PROBABLY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, AFTER THE COMPLAINT IS FILED, IS APPOINTED RECEIVER OF ALL THE PROPERTY REAL AND PERSONAL, THINGS IN ACTION AND EFFECTS OF DEFENDANT CITY CORPORATION HELD BY INVESTED IN DEFENDANTS OR IN OR TO WHICH THE DEFENDANT MAYBE IN ANYWISE INTERESTED OR ENTITLED THERETO, PLAINTIFF THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF WHATEVER THAT'S US IN ARIZONA(MICHIGAN) SHALL RECOVER OF DEFENDANT CORPORATION CITY OF THE SUM OF DAMAGES, REAL AND PERSONAL. THEY DON'T LIKE THAT, BECAUSE IT COULD GO 100 MILLION THREE TIMES THAT AMOUNT IN PUNITIVE DAMAGES THEY GET A LITTLE UPSET. AS COST AND DISBURSMENTS OF THIS ACTION, AND THE RECEIVER IS DIRECTED TO PAY THIS SUM OUT OF THEIR POCKET TO, WHOEVER THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OR YOU CAN HAVE A PERSON STIPULATED DOWN THERE AS AN INJURED PARTY. NOW YOU PUT DOWN THERE THE HONORABLE JUDGE, --- PRESIDING, THE DATE ENTERED, AND HE SIGNS THAT, AND THAT CITY IS NO LONGER A CITY. YOU SEE WHEN THEY VIOLATE YOUR CONSTITUTION THIS IS ONE OF THE MOST POWERFUL TOOLS YOU CAN USE. AND WHEN YOU JAM THIS ON YOU BETTER WEAR A BULLET PROOF VEST TO COURT BECAUSE YOU MIGHT GET SHOT AT ON THE WAY HOME. BUT IT IS NICE TO THEATEN. JUST DROP ONE OF THESE IN THE MAIL AND SAY IF I DON'T GET REASONABLE CAUSE FOR MY ACTION IN THE NEAR FUTURE, YOU ARE GOING TO GET ONE OF THESE IN THE MAIL FOR REAL.

HERE IS A SUMMONS FOR QUO WARRANTO, JUST FOR STARTING THE THING. SUMMONS:

FORM 41, BY THE WAY YOU CAN GET THIS IN 21 AM JURIS FORMS AND PRACTICE, PRACTICAL FORMS AND PRACTICE. YOU NAME THE PARTY, YOU PUT DOWN WHO YOU ARE AND THE PEOPLE OF THE SATE OF ARIZONA, UTAH, MICHIGAN, VS. YOU ARE SUMMONED TO APPEAR IBEFORE SUCH AND SUCH A COURT ON SUCH AND SUCH A DATE TO SHOW BY WHAT AUTHORITY YOU CLAIM TO HAVE TO USE AND ENJOY THE RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES OF FRANCHISE NAMELY CORPORATION CITY OF SET OUT AND COMPLAINED OF IN SUCH AND SUCH A TIME AND SUMMONSED TO DO ALL SUCH THINGS WHICH THE COURT SHALL THEN ORDER CONCERNING YOU. THIS IS KIND OF LIKE PULLING THEIR DRIVER LICENSE FOR DRUNK DRIVING. NOW THAT'S AN OVER SIMPLIFICATION BUT SOMETIMES THESE CITY HALLS OPERATE LIKE A DRUNKEN SAILOR. AND THEY JUST THINK THEY CAN ABUSE CITIZENS RIGHTS AND TRASH THEM AND, DO YOU KNOW WHO I AM, YOU KNOW, BUT I DON'T CARE. DO YOU KNOW WHO I AM I'M YOUR BOSS, I'M THE PEOPLE, YOU'RE ELECTED TO WORK FOR ME. AND I'M TRYING TO BE NICE, SO I WOULD APPRECIATE IT IF WE COULD JUST SIT DOWN AND WORK THIS OUT. BUT IF WE CAN'T WORK THIS OUT I'M GOING TO SOCK IT TO YOU BABY, HAVE YOU GOT ME. THAT'S BASICALLY HOW I FEEL ABOUT IT.

NOW WE CAN GET INTO SOME OF THESE OTHER THINGS. RIGHT HERE, THIS IS A

VERY IMPORTANT POINT, YOU TRY AND GET THIS ACROSS TO PEOPLE AND THEY KIND OF LOOK AT YOU IN A BLANK STARRY EYED LOOK. BUT IN THE CONSTITUTION OF MICHIGAN, THE LATEST AND GREATEST, THE VERY FIRST THING THEY TALK ABOUT; NOTICE IT SAYS SECTION (1) "ALL POLITICAL POWER IS INHERENT IN THE PEOPLE. GOVERNMENT IS INSTITUTED FOR THEIR EQUAL BENEFIT, SECURITY AND PROTECTION. NOW LET ME ASK YOU A QUESTION DO FEEL EQUAL BENEFIT? I DON'T. YOU KNOW EQUAL PROTECTION AND DISCRIMINATION. NO PERSON SHALL BE DENIED EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. NOR SHALL ANY PERSON BE DENIED THE ENJOYMENT OF THEIR CIVIL OR POLITICAL RIGHTS OR BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST IN THEIR EXERCISE THEREOF BECAUSE OF RACE, RELIGION, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN. THE LEGISLATURE SHALL IMPLEMENT THIS SECTION BY APPROPRIATE LEGISLATION." AND THEY START GOING DOWN THROUGH ALL OF THESE, FREEDOM OF WORSHIP, YOU KNOW, I MEAN THIS IS WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HERE FOLKS. YOU KNOW YOUR RIGHTS YOU'VE GOT THEM YOU DON'T KNOW THEM YOU DON'T GOT THEM.

LET'S GET BACK IN HERE TO POLICE POWERS GENERALLY, THIS IS SOMETHING YOU GOT TO UNDERSTAND GENERALLY, THE POLICE POWER IS THE EXERCISE THE SOVEREIGN RIGHT OF THE GOVERNMENT TO PROMOTE ORDER, SAFETY, HEALTH AND MORALS AND THE GENERAL WELFARE OF SOCIETY WITHIN CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS. DID EVERYBODY HEAR THAT, WITHIN CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS. **AS OTHERWISE STATED THE POLICE POWER OF THE STATE IS A POWER OR ORGANIZATION OF A SYSTEM OF REGULATIONS TO FOSTER THE HEALTH, ORDER, AND COMFORT OF THE PEOPLE AND TO PREVENT AND OR PUNISH INJURIES AND OFFENSES TO THE PUBLIC.** BUT IT HAS TO BE WITHIN CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS. AND IT EMBRACES ALL RULES FOR THE PROTECTION OF LIFE, LIBERTY AND PROPERTY. I MEAN IT IS A CONTRADICTION OF LOGIC TODAY FOLKS. IT DOESN'T HAPPEN. YOU AND I BOTH KNOW IT. I MEAN, WHO, ARE THEY KIDDING. THEY AIN'T KIDDING ME. SO IT'S UP TO YOU AND IT'S UP TO ME.

WE'VE GOT TO GET A HOLD OF THIS BOOK RIGHT HERE, YOU GET A HOLD OF THIS CONSTITUTION, AND YOU START LEARNING THAT CONSTITUTION AND YOU QUOTE IT CHAPTER AND VERSE, AND GUESS WHAT YOU WILL NOTICE A UNIQUE DIFFERENT CHANGE. AFTER WHILE THEY START TO LISTEN. AND YOU ACTUALLY AFFECT WHAT IS CALLED POSITIVE CHANGE. AND EVERYTIME THEY SEE YOU IN THAT GOOFY HAT YOU WEAR, THEY GO, AAAH FOR GOD SAKE DON'T GIVE THAT GUY NO TICKET. I HAVE ACTUALLY BEEN PULLED OVER, LISTENING TO THE PROGRAM, DIDN'T HAVE NO PLATES ON MY CAR. THE POLICEMAN CALLED, "YOU GOT POSITIVE ID ON THE GUY?" AND A FRIEND OF MINE WAS TAPPING OFF HIS POLICE RADIO, AND HE SAID "YEAH IT'S HIM." "WELL FOR GOD SAKE DON'T GIVE THAT GUY NO TICKET." AND THE COP SAID, "SORRY CHIEF HE HASN'T GOT PLATES ON HIS CAR." AND THE OPERATOR SAID "I DON'T CARE WHAT HE HASN'T GOT ON HIS CAR." "DON'T GIVE THAT GUY NO TICKET." BUT CHIEF, YOU TOLD ME HE HAS BEEN WAITING TO FIGHT IT ALL THE WAY TO THE SUPREME COURT, AND I WROTE THAT ON THE TICKET." "YOU GAVE THAT GUY A TICKET, AND HE SAID, I JUST TOLD YOU NOT TO GIVE THE GUY A TICKET, WHAT ARE YOU DEAF." "DO YOU HAVE A PROBLEM WITH YOUR HEARING?" HE SAID "I TOLD YOU NOT TO GIVE THAT GUY A TICKET, NOW WHY DID YOU GIVE THAT

GUY A TICKET?" "I TOLD YOU HE DIDN'T HAVE PLATES ON THE CAR." "I TOLD YOU I DIDN'T CARE WHAT HE HAD ON THE CAR." THIS IS ALL RECORDED ON A RADIO BROADCAST. SO EVERYBODY WAS LAUGHING, EVERYBODY WAS LAUGHING. HIS BUDDIES WERE RIBBING HIM, THE SARGEANT TOLD HIM, 'FRANK KNOCK IT OFF, CLEAR THE NET THIS IS SERIOUS.' HE SAID "FINE YOU GAVE HIM A TICKET." HE SAID "FINE, TOMORROW MORNING I WANT YOU TO BE IN HERE AND THE CITY ATTORNEY IS GOING TO BE HEAR, THIS AND YOUR GOING TO PERSONALLY DELIVER THE TICKET TO HIM AND HE AINT' GOING TO BE REAL HAPPY WITH YOU." "BECAUSE HE HATES THAT GUY, EVERY TIME HE GOES TO COURT THAT GUY BLOWS HIS DRAWERS OFF." "HE MAKES HIM LOOK LIKE A FOOL." "YOU GAVE THE GUY A TICKET, NOW HE HAS TO GO TO COURT." SO SURE ENOUGH WE GO TO COURT. I CAME UP BEFORE THE COURT, THE JUDGE STARTS OPERATING LIKE A PROSECUTOR, HE STARTS ASKING ME ALL KINDS OF DISCOVERY QUESTIONS AS SOON AS THEY CALL THE CASE, NOW THIS IS SOMETHING REAL IMPORTANT. BE GRANTED YOU GOT TO UNDERSTAND, IF YOU ARE GOING TO BE YOUR OWN ATTORNEY, THEN YOU HAVE GOT TO KNOW ALL THE PROGRAMMING AND WHEN YOU HEAR THEM CALL YOUR CASE, YOU GET OFF YOUR TAIL FEATHER AND YOU RUN RIGHT UP THERE AS QUICK AND AS SPEEDY AS POSSIBLE WITHOUT KNOCKING ANYBODY DOWN. AND YOU SAY, "READY YOUR, HONOR." AND YOU STATE YOUR APPEARANCE, "I'M SO AND SO, HERE AND BEFORE THIS HONORABLE COURT." "I'M STANDING AS MY OWN COUNSEL, AND IN MY STATE ITS ARTICLE 1 SECTION 13 I'VE APPOINTED MYSELF MY OWN ATTORNEY AND I'M READY TO PROCEED IN MY ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS, AND AT THIS TIME, IF IT PLEASE YOUR HONOR, I MOTION FOR DISMISAL FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED." BINGO, NOW I'M APOLOGIZING FOR TALKING TOO FAST I'M GOING TO TRY TO SLOW DOWN A LITTLE BIT, BUT WHEN YOU ARE IN COURT AS MUCH AS I AM, YOU JUST LEARN TO TALK FAST OR YOU LOOSE. SO I APOLOGIZE IF IM GOING A LITTLE TOO FAST, I'M GOING TO SLOW DOWN. I'M TRYING TO MAKE IT EASIER FOR YOU FOLKS, OKAY.

BUT THE JUDGE STARTED OFF RIGHT AWAY, 'SO YOU GOT A TICKET ON SUCH AND SUCH.' I SAID "WOAH, YOUR, HONOR, ARE YOU THE JUDGE, A DISINTERESTED THIRD PARTY THAT'S TRYING THIS CASE??" "THE TRIER OF FACT." HE SAID, "YES". I SAID, "OKAY" I SAID, "IS THIS THE PROSECUTOR OVER HERE TO MY RIGHT?" HE SAID, "YEAH THAT'S HIM. I SAID, "OKAY." I SAID, "ARE YOU GOING TO PROSECUTE THIS CASE, YOUR, HONOR?" HE SAID, "NO, OH NO I'M THE JUDGE." AND I SAID "THEN WHY ARE YOU ASKING ME DISCOVERY QUESTIONS." "WELL I JUST WANT TO FIND OUT WHAT IS GOING ON." I SAID "ISN'T THAT HIS JOB OVER THERE?" "THAT'S WHAT HE IS SUPPOSED TO DO." "HE IS SUPPOSED TO PRESENT HIS CASE, AS PROSECUTOR, TRIER OF THE CASE." "YOU'RE THE TRIER OF THE FACT." "HE IS TRIER OF THE CASE." "SO IF YOU ARE GOING TO OPERATE AS THE JUDGE AND THE PROSECUTOR I'M GOING TO OBJECT ON THE RECORD AS A MISTRIAL." HE SAID, "OKAY I'LL ENTER THAT ON THE RECORD." I SAID "GO AHEAD." HE LET IT BE ENTERED ON THE RECORD AS AN APPEALABLE ISSUE. HE SAID "OKAY, NOW ITS ON THE RECORD." "LET ME ASK YOU THIS, DID YOU GET A TICKET ON SEPTEMBER THE 30TH?" I SAID, "YES SIR." HE SAID, "WELL LET ME ASK YOU THIS, DO YOU HAVE ANY PLATES ON YOUR CAR?" AND I SAID, "NO SIR, AND I DON'T INTEND TO GET ANY."

AND EVERYBODY IN THE COURT, SAID OOOH THIS GUY IS GOING TO JAIL. WATCH THIS, THIS IS GOING TO BE GOOD. HE SAYS TO ME, "I ASSUME YOU HAVE A VERY GOOD REASON FOR THAT." AND I SAID, "YES, SIR." AND I SHUT UP. I WAITED, AND HE SAID, "CAN I HEAR IT?" I SAID, "WELL, YOUR HONOR, I'M AN UNENFRANCHISED COMMON LAW FREE MAN I'M NOT A PARTICIPANT IN ANY TONTINE SCHEMES AND LIMITED LIABILITY AND I DON'T VENTURE IN ANY INSURABLE INTEREST THAT REQUIRES ME TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE CORPORATE PONZI SCHEMES. I'M JUST A LITTLE JOE, FROM COCAMO, I LIVE ON THE BLOCK AND I TRAVEL AT THE COMMON LAW AND I HAVE A RIGHT TO TRAVEL FREELY AND UNENCUMBERED AS PURSUANT SHAPIRO VS. THOMPSON, AND THAT RIGHT IS SO BASIC IT DOESN'T EVEN NEED TO BE MENTIONED. THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ARBITRARILY AND ERRONEOUSLY CONVERTED MY RIGHT INTO A PRIVILEGE AND ISSUED A LICENSE PLATE AND A FEE FOR IT. MURDOCK V PENNSYLVANIA, SAYS NO STATE MAY CONVERT A SECURED LIBERTY INTO A PRIVILEGE AND ISSUE A LICENSE AND A FEE FOR IT, AND IF THEY DO, SHUTTLESWORTH V BIRMINGHAM AL, SAYS I CAN IGNORE THE LICENSE AND ENGAGE IN THE RIGHT WITH IMPUNITY. THAT MEANS YOU CAN'T PUNISH ME, SINCE I HAVE RELIED ON PREVIOUS DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT, AND ON CONSTITUTIONAL DEFENSES I HAVE A PERFECT DEFENSE FOR WILLFULNESS, I AM IMMUNE TO THE PROSECUTION. THEREFORE PROSECUTION COUNSEL DOES NOT HAVE A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED, I MOTION FOR DISMISAL WITH PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED AND I'D KIND OF LIKE TO COLLECT MY COST AND FEES FOR HAVING TO DEFEND THIS FRIVOLOUS CASE." THE JUDGE STARTS READING THE TICKET, TELLING THE OFFICER, HE HAS JUST BEEN WAITING TO GET THIS TICKET SO HE COULD FIGHT IT AND TAKE IT ALL THE WAY TO THE SUPREME COURT. HE LAUGHED AND SAID, "MOTION GRANTED," AND HE RAN OFF THE BENCH BEFORE I COULD GET MY DAMAGES." SO I WENT OUT IN THE HALL, HE WENT TO THE CAN, AND I WAITED FOR HIM. HE CAME OUT OF THE CAN AND I SERVED HIM WITH MY PAPERS. HE SAID "YOU DIDN'T HAVE TO DO THAT." I SAID, "WELL I DIDN'T WANT YOU TO BE INCONVENIENCED JUDGE." HE SAID, "OKAY." HE SIGNED. I WENT BACK IN THE COURT AS JUST A CASUAL THING, TO SEE WHAT KIND OF REACTION WOULD HAPPEN AND I SAT DOWN. TWO CASES LATER THIS ELDERLY GENTLEMAN STOOD UP AND SAID, "YOUR HONOR, I'M NOT QUITE AS KNOWLEDGEABLE AS THIS YOUNG GENTLEMAN HERE TWO CASES AGO, AND I DON'T PRESUME TO UNDERSTAND ALL THE ISSUES THAT HE RAISED, BUT IT REALLY SOUNDED GOOD TO ME, AND I'D KIND OF LIKE TO DO EVERYTHING HE SAID ON TOP OF MY CASE." EVERYBODY BROKE OUT LAUGHING. THE JUDGE SAID, "ALL RIGHT, HOW MANY GUYS HERE DIDN'T HAVE ANY PLATES ON THEIR CAR?" FIVE GUYS RAISED THEIR HAND. AND HE SAID "OKAY EVERYBODY DISMISSED GET THE HELL OUT OF HERE." AND EVERYBODY BROKE OUT LAUGHING AND IT WAS LIKE, YOU KNOW THAT'S A CARNIVAL ON CHRISTMAS, OR SOMETHING YOU KNOW IT WAS A CARNIVAL ATMOSPHERE.

SO I'M TELLING YOU, YOU CAN EFFECT CHANGE, AND SEE THEY HAD ALL FIGURED, WATCH THIS GUY IS GOING TO JAIL AND THEN ALL OF A SUDDEN, BOOM, AND I'M TELLING YOU THIS LITTLE BOOK RIGHT HERE. YOU KNOW WHAT IS IN THIS BOOK, YOU HAVE POWER. KNOWLEDGE IS POWER. IF YOU KNOW WHAT IS IN THIS BOOK,

AND YOU KNOW HOW TO EXERCISE YOUR RIGHTS IN A TIMELY FASHION YOU HAVE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. AND IF YOU EXERCISE THEM AND USE GOOD JUDGMENT AND BE COURTEOUS AND JUST TREAT PEOPLE THE WAY YOU LIKE TO BE TREATED WITH A LITTLE DIGNITY. MOST, OF THE TIME 99% OF THE TIME I WIN. NOW, I WILL TELL YOU I'VE BEEN TO JAIL, I'M NOT GOING TO LIE TO YOU. WHEN I GO TO JAIL THEY REALLY HATE IT BECAUSE I USUALLY GET, OH THE LAST TIME I GOT FIVE GUYS CASES RE-TRIED AND I GOT ANOTHER FOUR GUYS OUT LIKE WITHIN 24 HOURS. AND THEN I GOT ELEVEN GUYS OFF OF THE CASE BECAUSE THEY SIGNED UP FOR DRUG REHAB. AND ONE BANK ROBBER CAME UP TO ME AND SAID TO ME, "I THINK YOU KNOW I'M A HARD CASE." AND I SAID, "YEAH I KIND OF GATHERED THAT." HE SAID "I WANT YOU TO KNOW YOU CHANGED MY LIFE, HE SAID I REALLY APPRECIATE YOU HELPING ME WITH MY PAPER WORK." HE SAID "THEY ARE GOING TO GIVE ME A NEW CHANCH. THEY ARE GOING TO LET ME OUT ON PROBATION." "I'M GOING TO MARRY MY GIRL FRIEND." AND HE STARTED CRYING, AND HE BASICALLY SAID, "I'LL NEVER FORGET YOU POPS, HE SAID YOUR SOME KIND OF GUY." "AND GOD BLESS YOU." "I FOUND GOD TOO, BETWEEN YOU AND CRAZY CHARLIE," HE SAID. CRAZY CHARLIE IS A MINISTER THAT GOES AROUND TO ALL THE JAILS, HE USED TO RIDE WITH THE OUTLAW MOTOR CYCLE GANG. CRAZY CHARLIE IS CLEARLY CRAZY, THE LAST TIME SAW CRAZY CHARLIE HE WAS RIDING DOWN EIGHT MILE ROAD AT 85 MILES AN HOUR STANDING ON HIS SEAT, AGAINST ANOTHER GUY WHO WAS STANDING ON HIS SEAT TO SEE WHO WAS GOING TO WIMP OUT FIRST. CRAZY CHARLIE DID ABOUT FIVE YEARS IN THE SLAM BECAUSE HE GOT CHARGED WITH MURDERING SOME GUY. CRAZY CHARLIE WENT TO JAIL AND HE FOUND GOD AND GOD SPARED CRAZY CHARLIE FROM A LIFE SENTENCE. AND CRAZY CHARLIE OWES IT TO GOD AND HE GOES THROUGH ALL THE JAILS AND HE PREACHES THE GOSPEL AND HE BASICALLY IS QUITE A GENTLEMEN. AND HE IS NOBODY TO SCREW WITH. AND WHEN WE WENT TO CHAPEL THE GUYS WERE ALL JOKING AROUND, "POPS, ARE YOU GOING TO CHAPEL?" I SAID "OH, YEAH." HE SAID "POPS YOU'RE A BAD ASS WHAT DO YOU WANT TO GO TO CHAPEL FOR?" "FIRST LET ME TELL YOU SOMETHING, YOU CAN ALWAYS LEARN SOMETHING AND I'LL TELL YOU ONE OF HE BEST PLACES TO LEARN IS THAT CHAPEL, SO WHY DON'T YOU COME ON AND YOU MIGHT LEARN SOMETHING." WE GO DOWN THERE AND WHO DID I SEE, CRAZY CHARLIE, I HADN'T SEEN CRAZY CHARLIE IN YEARS. HE LOOKED AT ME AND I LOOKED AT HIM, AND HE SAID, "WHAT IN THE HELL ARE, YOU DOING HERE?" AND I SAID, "OH, I DON'T WANT TO TALK ABOUT IT CRAZY CHARLIE" AND THE GUY TURNS AROUND TO ME AND SAYS "POPS IS THERE ANYBODY IN THIS JOINT YOU DON'T KNOW?" I SAID, "I'LL TELL YOU WHAT, THIS IS A GUY I WOULD LISTEN TOO BECAUSE HE IS SERIOUS. THE MAN IS SERIOUS AND HE HAS FOUND GOD AND HE IS GOING TO TRY AND HELP YOU FIND GOD AND THEN YOU'LL HAVE PEACE." WELL, THIS GENTLEMEN, THIS BANK ROBBER FOUND GOD, AND BETWEEN MYSELF AND CRAZY CHARLIE, HE FOUND GOD AND I WISH YOU COULD SEE THE PEACE ON HIS FACE. HE WAS IN A LOT OF TROUBLE. WE DID HIS PAPER WORK FOR HIM. WE HELPED HIM AND THEY BASICALLY RE-DID HIS WHOLE PROGRAM AND BECAUSE HE FOUND GOD THEY DECIDED TO PUT HIM OUT ON LIFETIME PAROLE AND HE GAVE RESTITUTION. HE GAVE THE MONEY BACK. HE CHANGED HIS WHOLE LIFE. HIS WHOLE LIFE WAS CHANGED JUST FROM THAT INCIDENT. SO I'M TELLING YOU, WHEN I GO INTO JAIL IT IS HILLARIOUS BECAUSE IT IS LIKE, THE JAILORS DON'T EVEN KNOW HOW TO ACT. AND HE ONE JAILOR TOLD ME

"I'M GOING TO MISS YOU POPS." THEY CALL ME POPS BECAUSE I'M OLDER. I WAS A LITTLE TEED OFF WHEN THEY CALLED ME THAT THE FIRST TIME, SO THIS KID CALLED ME POPS, AND "I SAID WHAT'S WITH THE POPS?" I SAID I BET YOU CAN'T EVEN DO 25 PUSH UPS?" HE SAID "YOU'RE PROBABLY RIGHT POPS CAN YOU?" BOOM DOWN I WENT "25 OUT AND I'LL RAISE YOU 25 AND HERE IS ANOTHER 25." "POPS, YOU'RE IN GOOD SHAPE." AND I SAID, "I'M GOING TO SHOW YOU HOW GOOD A SHAPE I'M IN IF YOU KEEP CALLING ME POPS." HE SAYS, "NO, NO, NO, YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND, IF YOU'RE AN OLDER GENTLEMEN IN THE JOINT THEY TREAT YOU WITH COURTESY, THEY CALL YOU POPS. AND IT IS JUST OUT OF COURTESY." AND I SAID, THEN YOU CAN CALL ME POPS, THAT'S COOL." "BUT DON'T YOU EVER THINK THAT I'M GETTING OLD BECAUSE I'LL FOOL YOU." SO THEY LAUGHED. WHEN I LEFT THEY LINED UP TO SHAKE MY HAND, AND EVEN THE JAILOR, SAID HE WAS GOING TO BE SORRY TO SEE ME LEAVE BECAUSE I WAS HELPING SO MANY PEOPLE. AND PEOPLE WERE GETTING THEIR LIVES TOGETHER. AND SO WHEN I GO TO JAIL IT IS KIND OF UNIQUE, I ACTUALLY GET A VACATION. I GOT THE TOP BUNK AND I LAID BY THE WINDOW AND I GOT GOD'S SUN SHINE IN MY FACE AND I GOT A SUN TAN AND I GOT GUYS WHO SAY, "POPS WHY DO YOU CLIMB UPON THE TOP BUNK?" I SAY, "MAN I'M OUT ON A BEACH GETTING SUN AND RAISE." "WHAT ARE YOU DOING?" "YOU KNOW POPS YOU ARE SOMETHING ELSE, YOU ARE AND YOU ARE GOING TO MAKE IT." I SAID, "I'M LAYING OUT HERE ON THE BEACH WHAT ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT." "I'M LAYING ON MY BED RIGHT NEXT TO THE WINDOW AND THE SUN COMES RIGHT THROUGH AND I'M ON THE BEACH, WHAT ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT." SO YOU'VE GOT TO MAKE THE BEST OF WHERE YOU ARE AT NO MATTER WHAT, IT KEEPS YOUR SPIRITS UP AND THE BOTTOM LINE IS THIS, I WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN IN JAIL IF I COULD HAVE MORE EFFECTIVELY ARGUED MY CONSTITUTION. I ENDED UP HAVING TO DO A BRIEF FROM THE JAIL 28 PAGES. I SHARPENED A PENCIL ON THE WALL, HERE IT IS, THIS IS A 28 PAGE MOTION TO, NO, IT'S MORE THAN THAT. I MEAN THIS IS ALL FROM LONG HAND AND WHEN WE GOT TO COURT THE JUDGE LOOKED AT IT AND HE SAID, "SIR, ARE YOU AN ATTORNEY?" I SAID, "NO, SIR." HE SAYS, "HAVE YOU EVER BEEN TO LAW SCHOOL?" I SAID, NO SIR." HE SAID, "YOU DID THIS FROM JAIL?" "YOU DID THIS FROM JAIL FROM MEMORY?" I SAID, "YES, SIR." IT'S RATHER EXTENSIVE, IT'S HUGE. RIGHT THEN THE PROSECUTOR KICKS IN AND SAYS, "DO I HAVE TO ANSWER THIS?" AND HE SAYS, OH, HELL YES." THIS GUY IS KIND OF LIKE THE JUDGE ON NIGHT COURT, KIND OF FLIPPANT. "OH, HELL YES COUNSELOR, WHAT IS THIS A NEW HOBBY YOU JUST TOOK UP?" HE SAYS. THIS GUY EVEN DID HIS OWN PROPOSED ORD." I DON'T EVEN HAVE TO FILL OUT AN ORDER." AND HE SAID, NOT ONLY THAT, I WANT IT DONE BY EIGHT O'CLOCK ON MONDAY MORNING." SO ALL WEEK END SHE HAD TO GO TO THE LAW LIBRARY AND ANSWER ALL OF THIS STUFF. SHE WAS NOT A HAPPY CAMPER. SO THEN SHE PROPOSED THAT I HAD TO HAVE A SHRINK, TO CHECK MY PULSE OUT TO SEE IF MY BATTERIES WERE CHARGED. BECAUSE IF YOU DEFEND YOUR CONSTITUTION YOU'VE GOT TO BE A CRAZY TURKEY. AND SHE FOUND OUT I'M PRETTY WELL SQUARED AWAY. I JUST ARGUED MY CONSTITUTION. I ASKED THE JUDGE, **"IS GOD IN THIS BED JUDGE, THEY GOT TO TOSS YOU IN THE NUT HOUSE TO DEFEND YOUR CONSTITUTION?"** AND HE SAID, **"NOT IN MY COURT."**

OKAY, HAVE WE GOT A QUESTION HERE? I'VE HEARD PEOPLE TELL OF, SAYING WHEN THEY WANT TO BASE THEIR ARGUMENTS ON CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS AND

I'VE HEARD OF JUDGES SPEAK OUT AND SAY THE CONSTITUTION HAS NO PLACE IN MY COURTROOM. HOW CAN THEY EVEN THINK ABOUT THAT? WHISTLES!!! THAT IS A VERY SERIOUS STATEMENT, BECAUSE WHAT THAT JUDGE JUST DID IN AN OPEN COURT OF LAW UNDER TITLE 18 US CODE SECTION 2381, IS HE JUST COMMITTED AN ACT OF TREASON. SEE THE JUDGE IS SWORN UNDER ARTICLE 11 PARAGRAPH ONE IN THIS STATE THAT HE WILL UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND MOVE AS MOST IMMEDIATELY AS IS PRACTICAL TO DEFEND THAT CONSTITUTION. AND A VIOLATION OF THAT ACT WOULD BE CAPITAL FELONY TREASON, UNDER THE PEOPLE AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND HE WOULD BE SUBJECT UPON CONVICTION TO BE HUNG BY THE NECK. THAT IS HOW SERIOUS THIS IS.

WHAT IF THE DEFENDANT HAD A DRIVERS LICENSE, AND THEY WERE TRYING TO ARGUE A TRAFFIC MATTER AND THEY WERE IN THE SYSTEM ALREADY. IS THERE A CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION THAT THE JUDGE MIGHT FIND THAT IT DOESN'T APPLY? WELL HERE IS HOW WE START A LOT OF THESE TRAFFIC CASES, AND I'LL GET RIGHT TO IT.

WHEN YOU FIRST WALK BEFORE A TRAFFIC COURT, YOU SEE WHEN THEY MERGED THESE COURTS TOGETHER IN 1963, THEY SCREWED UP. THEY WANTED TO LAY OFF HALF OF THE JUDGES SEE, THEY ONLY WANTED TO HAVE ONE BUILDING, SO WHAT THEY DID IS THEY MERGED THE TRAFFIC COURT PER SE, OR THAT DOCKET INTO THE CRIMINAL COURT DOCKET. AND WHEN THEY DID THAT, THEY DIDN'T CHECK THE RULES, YOU SEE. AND WHEN THEY DIDN'T CHECK THE RULES, THEY DIDN'T ALLOW FOR JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES BETWEEN THE TWO COURTS. SO WHAT HAPPENS NOW IS, YOU COME BEFORE THE COURT, AND THERE ARE SEVERAL WAYS YOU CAN COME BEFORE THE COURT. NOW SINCE YOU HAVE ENTERED INTO A CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE STATE, IN OTHER WORDS IT'S NOT A LAWFUL CONTRACT, BECAUSE YOU CANNOT ENTER INTO AN UNLAWFUL CONTRACT, DO YOU UNDERSTAND. IT IS A CONTRACT THOUGH BECAUSE IT'S RECOGNIZED AS A CONTRACT. BECAUSE YOU HAVE VOLUNTARILY ENTERED INTO THIS CONTRACT, YOU AGREED TO ALL THE RULES IN THEIR LAW BOOK FOR THAT CONTRACT. THIS IS WHAT WE CALL ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME JURISDICTION OR ARTIFICIAL JURISDICTION. AND IT IS A RATHER HEAVY ARGUMENT GOING INTO ERIE RAILROAD V THOMPSON, AND MUCOLICK V MARYLAND AND WE WILL GO INTO ALL OF THAT AT THE END OF THIS PROGRAM. BUT I WANTED TO SHARE WITH YOU BRIEFLY. WHEN YOU SIGN YOUR DRIVER LICENSE AND ESPECIALLY TODAY, AND YOUR VOTER REGISTRATION CARD YOU WILL NOTICE A LITTLE NOTE RIGHT UNDER YOUR SIGNATURE WHERE YOU AGREE TO THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE DUALITY OF CITIZENSHIP OF NOT ONLY AT THE COMMON LAW, BUT YOU ACCEPT THE NATIONAL UNDER ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME JURISDICTION, WHICH ALLOWS YOU TO BE SUCKED INTO ALL OF THESE UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE REQUIREMENTS. AND THIS IS A VERY SERIOUS THING YOU ARE SIGNING HERE. YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND IT, BUT YOU JUST SIGNED ALL YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS DOWN THE SEWER WHEN YOU SIGNED THAT DOCUMENT. AND WHEN YOU SIGN IT, THIS IS MY HONEST ADVICE, AND THIS IS FROM EXPERIENCE, YOU SIGN THE THING

RIGHT AT THE END OF YOUR NAME YOU WRITE U.D. AND AT THE END OF YOU NAME AND UNDERNEATH YOUR NAME YOU WRITE UCC 1-207 WITHOUT PREJUDICE. NOW WHAT THAT DOES, IS I'LL BE GLAD TO ACCEPT YOUR RIDICULOUS PRIVILEGE. I DON'T REALLY NEED TO, BUT I WILL JUST, TO KEEP MYSELF FROM BEING IN TROUBLE WITH THE COPS. AND I'LL TELL YOU WHAT WE WILL DO WE WILL EXERCISE OUR UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE CAVEAT THAT ALLOWS US TO KEEP ALL OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. IN OTHER WORDS, MY SIGNATURE IS NOT REALLY A SIGNATURE, ON CONTRACT, IT IS A SIGNATURE OF CONVENIENCE. THAT ALLOWS ME TO GET A PIECE OF PAPER TO PUT IN MY POCKET FOR IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES THAT ALLOWS ME TO SIGN MY CHECKS AND DO WHAT EVER I'VE GOT TO DO. BUT IT DOESN'T IN ANYWAY MAKE ANY ADMISSIONS OR CONFESSIONS OR REQUIRE ME TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF YOUR RULE BOOK SCHEMES UNDER YOUR ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME TONTINE SCHEMES. AND I'LL TELL YOU HOW CRAZY IT WAS, I JUST GOT ASKED BY AN ATTORNEY HOW HE WOULD DEFEND A PROGRAM THAT A GENTLEMEN HE WAS DEFENDING WAS ACCUSED OF HIGHJACKING A CAR. AND THEY WERE CLAIMING THAT BECAUSE THE CAR WAS MADE ALL OVER THE WORLD AND ALL OVER THE UNITED STATES, THAT THE PARTS EVEN THOUGH THEY WERE ASSEMBLED AT ONE POINT, THEY ARE IN WHAT IS CALLED THE INTERSTATE JURISDICTION. AND THAT BECAUSE OF THAT, THIS CRIME IS NOW A FEDERAL CRIME, THIS IS HOW FAR REACHING THIS HAS GOTTEN. AND WHEN THIS GENTLEMEN SIGNED HIS DRIVERS LICENSE, HE HAD NO IDEA HE WAS ENTERING INTO THIS THING AND WAIVING ALL OF HIS GOD GIVEN CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. AND THAT HE WAS NO LONGER A COMMON LAW CITIZEN. THAT HE WAS ACTUALLY UNDER ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME JURISDICTION.

NOW WHEN WE PULL UP SOME OF THESE STAUTORY REQUIREMENTS, IT IS AN INTERESTING THING THAT YOU BROUGHT UP. THESE REGULATIONS ARE NEVER ENACTED INTO LAW. WE'LL SHOW YOU SOMETHING ON THAT JUST A LITTLE BIT LATER. BUT THEY ARE NOT ENACTED INTO LAW, THEY JUST MAKE A REGULATION AND BECAUSE YOU VOLUNTARILY ENTER INTO THIS CONTRACT, ALL OF THESE REGULATIONS JUST COME UP AS ENFORCEABLE TO YOU. EVEN THOUGH YOU DON'T KNOW ANY BETTER.

NOW WE HAVE A FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT THAT SAYS IF YOU MAKE ANY LOAN OR GET INVOLVED IN ANY KIND OF CREDIT RELATIONSHIP THEY HAVE GOT TO TELL YOU EVERYTHING, HOW MUCH THE INTEREST RATE IS HOW MUCH THE PAYMENTS ARE, HOW LONG THE CONTRACT IS. AND THEY HAVE TO TELL YOU EVERY SINGLE THING ABOUT THE CONTRACT. AND IN THEORY, ALL CONTRACTS, YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO KNOW ALL OF THE FACTS IN REGARD TO THE CONTRACT, AND THEY JUST LEAVE THE CONTRACT ONE SIDED. AND THEY FIGURE, WELL THESE PEOPLE ARE NOT THAT WELL INFORMED AND WE ARE JUST GOING TO SIGN THIS ON THEIR DRIVER LICENSE AND THEY WILL VOLUNTARILY ACQUIESCE INTO THE SITUATION AND THEN WE CAN THROW ALL OF THESE REGULATIONS AT THEM AND THEY WILL NEVER KNOW OW WE HIT THEM. SO IT IS VERY IMPORTANT THAT YOU UNDERSTAND WHEN YOU SIGN SOMETHING, READ IT FOR SURE. IF YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND EVERYTHING THAT IS DOWN THERE, TAKE IT TO SOMEBODY AND ASK SOME

QUESTIONS BEFORE YOU SIGN IT. BECAUSE ONCE YOU SIGN IT, IT IS HARDER TO GET OUT OF. BUT I HIGHLY RECOMMEND EVERY BODY LOOSE THEIR WALLET AND GO DOWN AND **RE-DO YOUR DRIVER LICENSE AND SIGN IT U.D. WHEN YOU SIGN IT AND PUT 1-207 WITHOUT PREJUDICE.** BECAUSE RIGHT THEN AND THERE YOU CUT OFF ALL THIS ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME JURISDICTION AND YOU RETURN BACK TO YOUR CONTRACT LAW. A WHAT? **YOU ARE A COMMON LAW CITIZEN LIVING AT THE COMMON LAW.** AND THEY CAN HAVE THEIR CONTRACT, BUT IT IS NOT ENFORCEABLE. WHY IS IT NOT ENFORCEABLE, BECAUSE YOU CAN **STATE YOU SIGNED IT UNDER DURESS.** WELL HOW DO I KNOW, LOOK I PUT U.D. RIGHT AFTER MY NAME. LOOK U.D. WHAT DO YOU THINK THAT MEANS, UNDER DEVELOPMENT, UNDER THE DECK? THAT MEANS UNDER DURESS. WHEN I SIGNED THIS I WAS UNDER DURESS, I DIDN'T VOLUNTARILY SIGN THIS I HAD TO SIGN IT OR THE COPS ARE GOING TO CUFF ME ABOUT THE HEAD. **YOU SEE, I WAS UNDER THREAT, INTIMIDATION AND COERCION. I STILL BELIEVE I HAVE THE RIGHT TRAVEL FREELY AND UNENCUMBERED. NOTICE YOU ARE NOT DRIVING. YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO TRAVEL.** THE CUSTOMARY USAGE OF THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL IS YOU GET IN A CAR, YOU DON'T GO DOWN TO 7//11 ON YOUR BIKE, YOU GET IN A CAR. IF YOU WANT TO GO DOWN AND PICK UP A CARTON OF MILK, YOU GET IN YOUR CAR. **ANOTHER UNIQUE ARGUMENT ALONG THESE LINES IS, WELL JUDGE, LET ME ASK YOU A QUESTION, IF I GET IN MY CAR, THE CONSTITUTION WAS STILL IN EFFECT AND FULL FORCE BEFORE I GOT IN MY CAR, RIGHT. OH, YEAH. NOW WHEN I GOT IN MY CAR AND I HAD MY GUN IT WAS STILL IN EFFECT RIGHT, BUT WHEN I CLOSED THE DOOR HE CONSTITUTION WAS SUSPENDED, AND EVERYBODY BROKE OUT LAUGHING. HOW COULD THAT BE, THE ACT OF GETTING IN THE CAR AND SHUTTING THE DOOR MADE THE SECOND AMENDMENT UNCONSTITUTIONAL. I SAID, "THAT IS TOTALLY LUDICROUS." "HOW COULD THAT POSSIBLY BE?" YOU SEE THEY HAVE PASSED THESE LAWS, AND THEY HAVE GOTTEN AWAY WITH IT FOR SO LONG.** THAT THEY JUST, IT'S KIND OF LIKE A BANK ROBBER THAT HITS FIVE BANKS IN A ROW, AND GET A LITTLE MIFFED THAT YOU GET EXCITED. MAN I'VE DONE THIS 25 TIMES, WHAT'S THE BIG DEAL. NOW YOU ARE GOING TO BUST ME ON THE 26TH TIME, AND YOU ARE GOING TO GET ALL UPSET. SEE THEY HAVE BEEN GETTING AWAY WITH IT SO LONG, NOBODY HAS EVER TAKEN THEM TO THE TASK AND THEY FEEL LIKE, WELL, I SHOULD BE ABLE TO GET AWAY WITH IT ON THE 26TH TIME. **AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT, WRONGFULLY DONE, IT DOESN'T MATTER HOW MANY TIMES IN A ROW YOU DID IT, IT IS STILL UNCONSTITUTIONAL.** AND THE REALITY IS THE PERSON WHO IS PROPERLY MOTIVATED, AND PROPERLY TRAINED AND WILLING TO DO WHATEVER IS NECESSARY AND PROPER TO DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION, WILL ALMOST ALWAYS **PREVAIL ON THE MERITS.** AND THAT IS WHAT WE ARE DOING RIGHT NOW. AND THEY ARE SWEATING THAT RIGHT NOW. BUT THE REALITY OF THIS; AND YOU HAVE TO UNDERSTAND, THE BURDEN IS ON YOU. IF YOU WANT YOU'RE CONSTITUTION, THEN YOU DAMN WELL BETTER GRAB A HOLD OF IT, AND YOU BETTER HOLD ON TIGHT AND YOU DON'T LET GO FOR NOTHING. YOU READ YOUR CONSTITUTION AND LEARN YOUR CONSTITUTION. YOU QUOTE YOUR CONSTITUTION CHAPTER AND VERSE, FRONTWARDS, BACKWARDS UPSIDE DOWN. **WHEN PEOPLE COME UP TO YOU AND SAY WELL WE WANT YOU TO TAKE A DRUG TEST AS PART OF YOUR JOB. HUH, GO FISH. I AIN'T TAKING NO DRUG TEST. I'M NOT REQUIRED TO PROVE A NEGATIVE,**

YOU ARE REQUIRED TO PROVE A POSITIVE. IF YOU THINK I'M DOING SOMETHING NEGLIGENT FINE, THEN YOU GO FILE PAPERS, AND YOU TAKE NECESSARY PRECAUTIONS, AND WHAT HAVE YOU, AND WE WILL GO TO COURT. BUT I SAID I'M NOT GOING TO BE CONVICTED BEFORE THE FACT, AND THEN I'VE GOT TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE THAT I AM NOT GUILTY. THAT'S THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE. THAT'S BACKASSWARDS. I'M NOT GOING TO DO THAT. NOT ONLY THAT BUT THE FIFTH AMENDMENT SAYS I GOT A RIGHT NOT TO BE A PARTICIPANT IN A COMPULSARY PROCESS THAT'S GOING TO MAKE AN INCRIMINATING SITUATION OF ME, NOW I'VE NOT GOT NOTHING TO HIDE, AND I'M NOT EVEN ARGUING FROM WHAT I'VE GOT TO HIDE, I'M ARGUING FROM THE FACT THAT THE RIGHT STANDS AND I'M EXERCISING IT. AND THEN I USUALLY ASK SOME SIMPLE QUESTIONS. "WELL, IF THEY FIND ANYTHING, WILL I GET FIRED?" "HELL YEAH." "YOU ARE GOING TO BE PENALIZED." SO THERE ARE PENALTIES. "AND IF THEY FIND ANYTHING, WILL I BE CRIMINALLY PROSECUTED?" "COULD BE." HUH, SO WHY WOULD YOU WANT TO DO, SOME STUPID THING LIKE, THAT. GIVE THEM A PISS TEST. THIS GENTLEMEN CAME UP TO ME AT THE LAST CONVENTION THAT WE HAD, AND THEY WANTED TO TAKE A TEST AS TO WHETHER OR NOT HE HAS GOT ANY DRUGS IN HIS SYSTEM. I SAID WELL, WHAT IS IN MY SYSTEM IS BETWEEN ME AND MY DOCTOR, AND NONE OF YOUR DAMNED BUSINESS. I SAID I DON'T TAKE DRUGS, BUT I'VE GOT NOTHING TO HIDE, BUT I'M NOT GOING TO VOLUNTARILY ENTER INTO ANYTHING. WHAT IF YOUR GUY SCREWS UP, AND NOW YOU SAY I'VE GOT DRUGS AND I CAN'T GET A JOB EVER? WHAT ARE YOU KIDDING ME. SOME NEW HOBBY YOU JUST TOOK UP. I'M NOT GOING TO PLAY THAT GAME, IT IS NOT MY BURDEN TO PROVE A NEGATIVE, IT 'S YOUR BURDEN TO PROVE A POSITIVE. IF YOU HAVE A JUST CLAIM FOR WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED, YOU GO FILE YOUR PAPERS AND WE'LL SIT DOWN AND TALK. BUT UNTIL SUCH TIME YOU GO FISH, BECAUSE I'M NOT GOING TO PLAY. I'M NOT REQUIRED TO PLAY AND I'M NOT GOING TO PLAY AND IF YOU FIRE ME FOR THE EXERCISE OF MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT, I'M GOING TO TELL YOU ABOUT MILLER V UNITED STATES, WHERE IT SAYS: THE CLAIM AND EXERCISE OF A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT SHALL NOT BE CONVERTED INTO A CRIME. AND YOU ARE DOING THAT AND YOU ARE PUNISHING ME, AND IF YOU FIRE ME FOR IT I WILL SUE YOUR SOCKS OFF, AND ATTACH EVERYTHING YOU OWN BANK BUSINESS AND HOME, SO MAKE MY DAY, AND THAT IS HOW I FEEL ABOUT IT. SO YOU FIND ANOTHER TURKEY TO JERK WITH, BECAUSE I'M NOT GOING TO PLAY. OKAY.

NOW WE WANT TO GET INTO SOME SERIOUS THINGS, I WANT TO GET INTO THIS ARGUMENT ABOUT TRAFFIC CASES. THIS IS THE MOST PRACTICAL WAY TO DEAL WITH TRAFFIC CASES. WHEN YOU ARE PULLED OVER, WHAT IS HAPPENING? NOW YOU'VE GOT A POLICEMAN, HE IS CONDUCTING DISCOVERY, ANYTHING YOU SAY CAN AND WILL BE HELD AGAINST YOU. AND IF YOU DON'T THINK SO JUST KEEP RATTLELING. AND IT WILL ALL GET WRITTEN DOWN ON THE TICKET. I FOUND THAT OUT. I TOLD THE OFFICER I HAD JUST BEEN WAITING TO GET THIS TICKET SO I COULD FIGHT IT ALL THE WAY TO THE SUPREME COURT IT SAID IT RIGHT ON THE TICKET. SO WHEN THESE PEOPLE ARE WITH YOU, YOU KEEP YOUR HATCH BUTTONED, AND I MEAN I'M GUILTY, AND SOMETIMES I RATTLE ON. IT'S BEEN KNOWN TO HAPPEN. SO I'M TELLING YOU NOT TO DO IT. YOU BUTTON YOUR HATCH, IF YOU

SAY ANYTHING, SAY YES SIR, NO SIR. AND THEY ALWAYS LIKE TO SAY, "GOING A LITTLE FAST WEREN'T YOU?" "I, NEITHER, ADMIT OR DENY, I LEAVE YOU TO YOUR PROOFS." "OH, SO YOU'RE A LAWYER ARE YOU?" "NO, I'M NOT A LAWYER, BUT I'M SMART ENOUGH TO KEEP MY MOUTH SHUT, BECAUSE I REALIZE ANYTHING I SAY IS GOING TO BE PUT DOWN ON YOUR PAPER." "YOU GOT A CHARGE, YOU MAKE IT AND I'LL SEE YOU IN COURT." "OH, YOU WANT TO GO TO COURT." "OH, YEAH I ALWAYS GO TO COURT, I FIGHT EVERYTHING, EVEN MURDER ONE." "IT'S KIND OF LIKE A HOBBY OF MINE." "WELL, LET'S SEE WHAT WERE GETTING, AND HE WALKED BACK TO HIS CAR, AND THE STARTS WRITING. OR THEY USUALLY COME BACK AND THEY SAY, "WELL YOU WERE GOING A LITTLE FAST THINK ABOUT SLOWING DOWN, WE'RE GOING TO LET YOU GO WITH A WARNING, YOU GO AND HAVE A GOOD DAY." "THANK YOU OFFICER, YOU HAVE A GOOD DAY TOO, GOD BLESS YOU AND KEEP YOU SAFE."

OKAY, COURTESY, I CAN BLOW THEIR DRAWS OFF ANY TIME I WANT AND STILL, YES SIR, NO SIR, COURTESY. COURTESY PAYS, YOU TREAT PEOPLE THE WAY YOU WANT TO BE TREATED AND NINE TIMES OUT OF TEN YOU WILL BENEFIT. YOU TREAT PEOPLE LIKE A YAHOO, AND YOU'RE GOING TO BE TREATED LIKE A YAHOO YOURSELF. SO I HIGHLY RECOMMEND COURTESY AS AN EFFECTIVE WAY. I HAD A POLICEMAN ONE TIME TELL ME, "DID YOU EVER EAT A FLASHLIGHT THE HARD WAY." AND I SAID, "QUITE FRANKLY OFFICER, MOST OFFICERS I'VE RUN INTO ARE, EXTREMELY PROFESSIONAL." AND I TREAT THEM WITH A GREAT DEAL OF COURTESY AND PROFESSIONALISM BECAUSE I RESPECT WHAT THEY ARE DOING. AND, THAT THEY RISK THEIR LIFE EVERYDAY. "AND AT NO TIME WOULD I GIVE AN OFFICER ENOUGH STATIC THAT HE WOULD WANT TO MAKE ME EAT A FLASHLIGHT." I MEAN I TREAT THEM VERY CORDIALLY, AND I RESPECT WHAT THEY ARE TRYING TO DO. I DON'T AGREE WITH EVERYTING THEY DO, BECAUSE SOME OF THE STUFF IS KIND OF UNLAWFUL. BUT I WILL GIVE THEM THE COUTESY THEY HAVE COMING. HE TURNED TO ME AND SAID "I'M SORRY, I'VE GOT A BIG MOUTH, I DIDN'T MEAN IT." "YOU'RE RIGHT I WAS OUT OF LINE." SEE YOU TREAT PEOPLE WITH COURTESY AND NINE TIMES OUT OF TEN YOU CAN EVEN BACKDOWN SOME GUY THAT'S TALKING A LOT OF MANURE. BUT THE LOUDER YOU TALK, AND THE MORE BELLIGERENT YOU TALK, THE MOR ELOUDER AND BELLIGERANT HE HAS TO TALK. IT'S KIND OF LIKE NEWTON'S THIRD LAW OF PHYSICS, EVERY ACTION HAS AN OPPOSITE AND REACTION. YOU TALK CRAP AND THEN HE HAS GOT TO TALK CRAP. SO MY ADVICE TO PEOPLE IS DON'T, DO THAT IT'S UNMOTIVATED. REMEMBER THE BEST WEAPON YOU HAVE IS RIGHT BETWEEN YOUR EARS. SO USE IT. SO WATCH YOU MOUTH DON'T BE TALKING TRASH TO THESE POLICEMEN, THEY'VE HAD A BAD DAY, AND HE MIGHT HAVE HAD. AND YOU MIGHT HAVE A BAD DAY. BEST THING TO SAY IS YES, SIR AND NO, SIR. AND IF YOU'VE GOT AN HONEST BITCH, GO AHEAD MAKE MY DAY.

NOW WE HAVE GONE PAST THAT, WE'VE GOT A TICKET, WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO? WELL LOOK ON THE TICKET, SEE IF HE SIGNED IT. A LOT OF TIMES THEY DON'T SIGN IT. GUESS WHAT IF HE DIDN'T SIGN IT THERE AINT'NO SWORN COMPLAINT. HOW CAN YOU DEFEND AGAINST A NON SWORN COMPLAINT? A LOT OF TIMES THE COP DOESN'T SIGN THE TICKET. LOOK, OPEN YOUR EYES, GOD GAVE YOU A SET OF

EYES, LOOK. YEAH, THIS GUY DIDN'T SIGN IT TODAY, IT SAYS UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I ATTEST AND CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE IN FACT COMPLAINT. WELL WHAT HAPPENS IF THEY DON'T SIGN THAT, IT AIN'T A COMPLAINT.

DO YOU HAVE TO SIGN THE TICKET WHEN A POLICE OFFICER PULLS YOU OVER IN THAT SITUATION? DON'T THEY MAKE YOU SIGN? SOMETIMES THEY DO, IF YOU DO SIGN IT, PUT 1-207 WITHOUT PREJUDICE. THAT'S SAYING THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THE COMPLAINT. THAT'S ALL THAT'S SAYING, ALRIGHT. IT'S OKAY TO DO THAT THEN? YEAH, WHEN YOU PUT U.D. 1-207, IT'S NOT AN ADMISSION OF GUILT, IT JUST MEANS THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THE COMPLAINT. OKAY. IF YOU DON'T SIGN IT HE IS GOING TO TAKE YOU TO JAIL. I MEAN I REALIZE IT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL UNLESS YOU LIKE JAIL FOOD, I WOULDN'T DO IT. I'D SIGN THE THING U.D. 1-207 WITHOUT PREJUDICE. SO THE SIGNATURE DOESN'T DO ANYTHING, BESIDES YOU WANT A COPY OF THE COMPLAINT ANYWAY, BECAUSE YOU WANT TO FILE A BRIEF. HOW ARE YOU GOING TO FILE A BRIEF, IF YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT THE COMPLAINT IS, RIGHT? NOW THE NEXT THING YOU KNOW YOU HAVE TO NOTIFY THE COURT WITHIN THE TIME PERIOD AND IT IS USUALLY TEN DAYS. ONE OF THEIR DIRTIEST TRICKS IS YOU CALL IN AND YOU THINK YOU'VE GOT IT NOTICED, AND GUESS WHAT, THEY CLAIM YOU DIDN'T CALL IN AND THEY GO AHEAD AND SAY YOU DIDN'T WHO UP, AND THEN THEY FIND YOU GUILTY AND BINGO, YOU'RE OUT OF THERE. SO I RECOMMEND YOU CALL THEM, TELL THEM YOU WANT A FORMAL HEARING, AND ASK THE NAME OF THE PARTY YOU ARE SPEAKING TOO, "AND WHO AM I SPEAKING TOO?" SO THAT YOU HAVE A NAME OF SOMEBODY WHO WORKS THERE TO VERIFY THAT YOU CALLED. THEN IMMEDIATELY OR SOONER TYPE UP A LITTLE NOTICE THAT STATES: "I, PUT YOUR FULL NAME, DO HEREBY REQUEST A FORMAL HEARING." PUT THAT IN THE MAIL SENT CERTIFIED MAIL TO THEM, OR RUN DOWN THERE AND WALK RIGHT IN AND GET THEM TO SET UP A FORMAL HEARING. NOW YOU WANT A HEARING OKAY NOW 5 DAYS BEFORE THAT HEARING, YOU'RE REQUIRED TO SERVE PAPERS ON OPPOSING COUNSEL, IF YOU DON'T DO IT IN A TIMELY FASHION, MICHIGAN COURT RULES WILL SOCK IT TO YOU, AND YOU WILL NOT BE ABLE TO ENTER ANY OF YOUR BRIEFS. NOW SOMETIMES YOU WILL BE ABLE TO GET AWAY WITH IT THE LAST MINUTE HANDING IT TO HIM, AND THEY WON'T SAY NOTHING, BUT IF THEY WANT TO HAMMER YOU, THEY CAN USE THE FIVE DAY COURT RULE. I'VE USED IT EFFECTIVELY SEVERAL TIMES.

NOW YOU LOOK AT WHAT IT SAYS ON THE COMPLAINT, YOU SEE IT SAYS MCOA, WHATEVER YOU VIOLATED, AND YOU GO DOWN AND YOU GO TO THE LAW LIBRARY, YOU LOOK UP MICHIGAN LAW, YOU LOOK UP EXACTLY WHAT THEY SAY, AND THEN YOU ENTER A DEFENSE. I NEITHER ADMIT OR DENY AND I NEED YOUR STICTEST PROOFS, IN A COMMON LAW COURT OF JURISDICTION. TOTALLY GO THAT, DEPENDING ON HOW YOU WANT TO PLAY. IF YOU WANT TO BE THE HARDEST NOSE YOU CAN BE, YOU WALK INTO COURT AND YOU DON'T SEND THEM ANY PAPER. AND AS SOON AS THEY CALL THE CASE, AS EXPEDIENTLY AS POSSIBLE YOU MOVE TO THE FORUM UP FRONT AND IN A LOUD AND CLEAR VOICE, YOU SAY, "READY YOUR, HONOR." YOU STATE YOUR FULL NAME, I'M GIVING MY APPEARANCE IN THE

COURT IN PROPRIA PERSONA, WHICH MEANS IN YOUR OWN PROPER PERSON, AND SAYS IT'S PURSUANT IN THIS STATE IT'S ARTICLE I SECTION 13, I'VE APPOINT MYSELF MY OWN ATTORNEY, AND I'M READY TO PROCEED IN MY ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROCEDURAL MATTER, AND AT THIS TIME YOUR, HONOR, MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT I MOTION FOR DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE, FOR FAILURE SO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED. AND ALL OF A SUDDEN THE COP WILL GO, ESPECIALLY IF YOU WEAR AN ARMY JACKET AND YOU LOOK LIKE YOU'RE THREE SHEETS IN THE WIND. THE COP WILL LEAN BACK AND SAY OH, CRAP WE'RE GOING TO GET SUED. I DIDN'T KNOW THE GUY WAS A LAWYER, AND THEN HE WILL START TALKING TO THE PROSECUTOR AND THE PROSECUTOR WILL GO WHOOSH AT HIS HEAD. YOU TURKEY, YOU BROUGHT ME ONE OF THEM KIND. HUFF AND PUFF. I'M GOING TO GET KILLED, AND YOU'RE GOING TO SIT HERE AND PAY FOR IT, I PROMISE YOU.

AND THEN WHAT HAPPENS OUT OF YOUR MOUTH, YOU TELL THE JUDGE, IN THE MOST CLEAREST AND EXPEDIENT LANGUAGE. YOUR, HONOR, MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, IS THIS A COURT OF LAW, OR IS THIS A COURT OF EQUITY? HE WILL IMMEDIATELY SOUND OFF, WITH THERE'S NO EQUITY HERE, JUST LIKE HE GOT HIT IN THE KNEE WITH A HAMMER, AND HIS LEG JUMPED, AND JUST THAT FAST, IT WILL HAPPEN THAT FAST. BECAUSE HE THINKS THERE IS NO LAWSUIT HERE, BECAUSE THERE IS NO EQUITY. YOU SEE THE JUDGES DON'T EVEN UNDERSTAND WHAT HAPPENED WITH THIS SHIFT IN 1963, WHERE THEY MOVED THE COURTS TOGETHER. SO YOU'VE GOT TO FIND OUT WHAT HAT THE JUDGE IS WEARING, IS HE WEARING A CRIMINAL HAT, OR IS HE WEARING THE CIVIL HAT. SO YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO ASK, JUDGE IS THIS A COURT OF LAW OR A COURT OF EQUITY, AND HE'LL SAY HERE'S NO EQUITY HERE. NOW WE JUST DID THIS IN A BEAUTIFUL CASE. THIS LITTLE GAL COULN'T HAVE BEEN 80 LBS. SOAKING WET, AND THIS COP WAS ABOUT 6 FOOT 2, 320 BIG HEAVY DUTY STATE TROOPER. SHE WALKS IN, YOUR, HONOR I AM REPRESENTING MYSELF AS MY OWN COUNSEL, I WOULD LIKE TO PROCEED WITH MY ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS. BUT BEFORE WE GO, I HAVE A DECLARATORY RULING, SIR, COULD I ASK YOU A QUESTIONS? AH, SURE HONEY, GO AHEAD. BUT YOU UNDERSTAND ONLY A FOOL STANDS AS HIS OWN ATTORNEY. SHE SAID, THAT MAY BE, SIR, BUT I'M THE BEST PERSON THAT KNOWS THE FACTS IN MAY CASE AND I THINK I HAVE A CHANGE. I'D LIKE TO TRY, IS THAT OKAY? NO PROBLEM, YOU HAVE A RIGHT. IS THIS A COURT OF LAW, OR IS THIS A COURT OF EQUITY? AND THE JUDGE SAT UP AND SAID, THERE IS NO EQUITY HERE. SHE SAID, THANK YOU, SIR. SHE ROLLED UP HER HAND, IN THE HAND WAS A TICKET THAT SAID, CIVIL INFRACTIN RIGHT ACROSS THE TOP, AND SHE SAID, "HOW MAY WE HERE THIS CIVIL IN FRACTION, SIR?" THE JUDGE DID A HOMER SIMPSON, SO THAT'S WHERE YOU ARE GOING WITH THIS, HUH. THE WHOLE COURT BROKE OUT LAUGHING. THIS LITTLE GAL, I'M TELLING YOU SHE IS THIS TINY LITTLE THING, SHE IS JUST A SWEETHEART. THE WHOLE COURT REALIZED THE JUDGE DID A HOMER SIMPSON, AND THEN THE JUDGE REALIZED HE DID A HOMER SIMPSON, AND THEN HE LAUGHED. AND HE SAID, AH, HONEY, YOU'RE NOT GOING TO PULL THAT HERE TODAY ARE YOU? SHE GOT A LITTLE FLUSHED, SHE WASN'T SURE, THIS WAS HER FIRST TIME, SHE WAS A LITTLE SCARED, SHE LOOKED OVER AT AN ASSOCIATE OF

MINE, SHE LOOKED AT HIM, AND HE GAVE HER THE NOD. AND SHE TURNED AND SAID, YES I AM SIR. EVERYBODY BROKE OUT LAUGHING AGAIN. AND THE COP SAID, WELL IF THEY ARE GOING TO PLAY AROUND I'M GOING TO PUT 15 OVER ON THE TICKET JUDGE, AND THE JUDGE SAYS, NO, NO, NO YOU'VE GOT WHAT IS ON THE TICKET, YOU GOT WHAT'S ON THE COMPLAINT, AND YOU'RE NOT GOING TO CHANGE IT AFTER THE FACT, THAT IS PERJURY. DO YOU WANT ME TO PUT YOU IN THE COOLY, YA KNOW. A COMPLAINT IS A COMPLAINT, YOU SIGNED IT, IT'S TRUE. IF IT WAS 15 OVER YOU SHOULD HAVE PUT 15 OVER. HE SAID, WELL I JUST DON'T WANT TO SCREW AROUND, THIS IS GETTING OUT OF HAND. I MEAN SHE WAS GUILTY, DAH, DAH, DAH. SHE TURNED AROUND AND SAID, WE HAVEN'T EVEN GOTTEN TO THAT YOUR HONOR, THERE'S NO JURISDICTION, THIS IS WHERE WE'RE AT, WE HAVE NO JURISDICTION. JUDGE SAYS, YOUR, RIGHT, ARE WE GOING TO GO THROUGH WITH THIS NOW, COME ON TELL ME TRUTH. SHE SAID, YES I AM SIR I'M GOING THROUGH ALL THE WAY. ALL THE WAY TO THE SUPREME COURT, SHE SAID. AND THE JUDGE GOES OKAY, NOW. WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO SET A HEARING. SHE SAID, AND I'D LIKE A FORMAL HEARING TOO SIR. AND HE SAID, OKAY. AND I'D LIKE A TRIAL BY JURY, SIR BECAUSE THIS CONTROVERSY IS IN EXCESS OF TWENTY DOLLARS PURSUANT THE FIFTH AMENDMENT I HAVE A RIGHT TO TRIAL BY JURY. HE SAID, YEAH OKAY, OKAY. WE'LL SEND YOU A NOTICE, IT'S BEEN THREE AND HALF WEEKS, WE GOT NO NOTICE, WE CALLED THEM EVERYDAY, THEY, DON'T EVEN WANT TO TALK ABOUT THIS CASE. THE ONLY REASON THEY SAID THAT. WAS SO ALL THE POOR LITTLE PEOPLE IN THE BACK OF THE ROOM DIDN'T GET THE IDEA THAT THEY COULD GET UP THERE AND DO THE SAME THING THIS LITTLE GAL DID. THEY ARE NOT GOING TO CALL HER BACK BECAUSE THEY DON'T HAVE JURISDICTION. THEY ARE NOT GOING TO CALL HER BACK, BECAUSE SHE IS GOING TO BLOW THEIR DOORS OFF. NOW THAT'S ONE OF THE MOST BEAUTIFUL TEXTS AND THE FASTEST. AND ONE OF THE LAST TIMES I DID IT, IT WAS BEFORE A PARTICULARLY OBNOXIOUS JUDGE, AND HE BASICALLY SAID TO ME, "HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU PULLED THIS?" AND I SAID, "YOU KNOW, YOUR, HONOR, I THINK THIS WILL BE THE 12TH TIME." HE SAID, "AH, GOING FOR A LUCKY THIRTEEN, HEY." "THIS IS VERY CLEAVER, BUT I'M GOING TO GIVE YOU SOME ADVICE YOUNG MAN, DON'T EVER GET CAUGHT DOING NOTHING IN MY TOWN, GOT ME." I SAID, SIR, I NEVER DO ANYTHING I'M TRYING TO BE A REGULAR GENTLEMEN. HE SAID, WELL YOU HAD BETTER NOT GET CAUGHT DOING NOTHING BECAUSE I WILL HAMMER YOUR TAIL." "DOES THAT MEAN THE CASE IS DISMISSED, YOUR, HONOR." "THAT MEANS THE CASE IS DISMISSED, YOU'RE OUT OF HERE"

NOW I'M TELLING YOU THIS WORKS AND IT WORKS REAL GOOD. NOW THE NEXT EFFECTIVE STEP THAT YOU CAN DO IS YOU CAN TURN AROUND AND ASK THE JUDGE IF HE IS A LICENSED ATTORNEY TO PRACTICE LAW, BECAUSE NONE OF THE JUGES ARE LICENSED, TAKE MY WORD FOR IT. MICHIGAN CONSTITUTION SAYS UNDER THE AJUDICATURE ACT THAT THEY ARE NOT ALLOWED TO HAVE A LICENSE. THAT THEY ARE REQUIRED TO BE LICENSED BY THE STATE OF MICHIGAN. THE STATE OF MICHIGAN DOES NOT LICENSE ATTORNEYS, THE BAR ASSOCIATION LICENSES THEM. THEY GET GIVE THEM A PINK T NUMBER AN YOU'RE A MEMBER OF THE BAR

ASSOCIATION, BUT IF YOU CALL UP THE BAR, THEY WILL TELL YOU THEY DON'T GIVE ANYBODY A LICENSE. SEE MICHIGAN DOESN'T GIVE THEM A LICENSE, THE BAR ASSOCIATION DOESN'T GIVE THEM A LICENSE, SO WHAT LICENSE COULD THEY BE TALKING ABOUT?

A MICKEY MOUSE LICENSE, BECAUSE THAT IS THE ONLY ONE THAT IS LEFT. THE STATE DOESN'T ISSUE ONE, THE BAR DOESN'T ISSUE ONE AND THE ONE THEY GOT HANGING ON THE WALL IS NOT A LICENSE FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN. **AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN SAYS ALL JUDGES WILL BE LICENSED TO PRACTICE LAW BEFORE THE STATE.** AND YOU ASK THEM, WHERE IS THE GUYS LICENSE, AND HE DOESN'T HAVE ONE. **THEN YOUR, HONOR IF IT PLEASE THE COURT, IF YOU DON'T HAVE A LICENSE, I'M ASKING YOU TO RECUSE YOURSELF AND GO AND GET A JUDGE THAT HAS A LICENSE.**

NOW A LITTLE LADY, HER NAME **IS VIRGINIA KRAFT**, SHE IS THE ONE WHO PERFECTED THIS ARGUMENT. SHE IS A GENIUS AT IT. SHE IS A LITTLE SPIT FIRE. IF YOU EVER WATCH HER IN A COURT YOU ARE ACUTALLY GOING TO SEE A TREAT, BECAUSE SHE IS REALLY SOMETHING ELSE. SHE HAS GOT CHARACTER, SHE GRADUATED A FULL ATTORNEY FROM WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY, AND THEN SHE REFUSED TO JOIN THE BAR BECAUSE SHE DIDN'T WANT TO COMPROMISE HER RIGHTS WITH THEIR POLITICAL CHICANERY. AND SHE IS A FULL FLEDGED SERIOUS BUSINESS LEGAL PERSON. AND TO HEAR HER WORK IN COURT IS ABSOLUTELY LIKE HEARING STRATOVARIOUS WORK THE VIOLIN. SHE WALKS IN AND BLOWS THEIR DOORS OFF. SHE HAS GOTTEN ABOUT THREE JUDGES NOW FOR THIS SAME THING, SHE BLEW THE FIRST JUDGE OUT, SO THEN SET IN ANOTHER JUDGE, THEY MOVED HER OVER TO THE OTHER SIDE OF TOWN, OVER IN BERKLEY, MICHIGAN, AND THEN SHE WALKED IN AND BLEW THAT JUDGE OUT OF THE DOOR, SO THEN SENT HER TO ANOTHER JUDGE, AND SHE TURNED AROUND AND WENT BEFORE THE STATE LICENSING COMMISSION AND NOW THEY HAVE HANDED IT UP TO THE JUDICIAL PEOPLE OF THE STATE, TO TRY AND RESOLVE THE PROBLEM. THEY ARE GOING TO END UP DROPPING IT. THE JUDGE DOESN'T HAVE A LICENSE.

NOW LET'S SUPPOSE THE JUDGE COULD PROVE HE HAS A LICENSE, WHICH HE DOESN'T. "JUDGE, LET ME ASK YOU A QUESTION, UNDER YOUR RETIREMENT FUND, ISN'T IT A FACT THAT YOU GET A CERTAIN PERCENTAGE OF THE RAKEOFF OF ALL THE TICKETS THAT COME BEFORE YOUR BENCH? WELL, YEAH. AND ISN'T IT OUT OF \$40.00 DOLLARS THAT COMES ACROSS YOUR BENCH, YOU GET \$18.75 CENTS? WELL, YEAH. SO YOU HAVE A FINANCIAL INTEREST IN THIS MATTER, ISN'T THAT CORRECT? WELL, YEAH. WELL ISN'T THAT A VIOLATION OF JUDICIAL CANNON NUMBER SEVEN. YOU'RE NOT SUPPOSED TO HAVE ANY FINANCIAL INTEREST IN ANY MATTER THAT COMES BEFORE YOUR COURT. I'M GOING TO ASK YOU TO RECUSE YOURSELF FOR BIAS, YOUR HONOR, MAY IT PLEASE, THE COURT. AND EVERY SINGLE JUDGE HAS GOT IT. NOW DOES EVERYBODY UNDERSTAND HOW MANY WAYS YOU CAN HAMMER THEM, JUST OUT OF THE CHUTE, WITHOUT EVEN GETTING NASTY? **THE JUDGE DOESN'T HAVE A LICENSE, THE JUDGE HAS A PERSONAL INTEREST IN THE CASE FOR FINANCIAL REASONS. THERE IS NO JURISDICTION HERE TO HEAR THE MATTER. AND I'LL TELL YOU A LITTLE SECRET**

ONCE YOU CHALLENGE JURISDICTION THE BURDEN FALLS ON THE PLAINTIFFS TO PROVE JURISDICTION, AND HE CAN'T DO IT. IT CANNOT BE DONE, THERE ISN'T, ANY, THERE IS NO JURISDICTION TO HEAR A TRAFFIC TICKET IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. I KNOW YOU ARE SITTING BACK SAYING, OH, COME ON THEY'VE BEEN GETTING US FOR YEARS. A TRAFFIC TICKET IS A WRIT OF ASSISTANCE OR A BILL OF ATTAINDER. YOU LOOK IN YOUR CONSTITUTION AND YOU WILL FIND OUT THAT BILLS OF ATTAINDER ARE AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION. AND IT IS STATED AT LEAST TWICE THAT I KNOW OF, ALL RIGHT. I'M TELLING YOU READ YOUR CONSTITUTION THERE IS NO PLACE FOR A TRAFFIC TICKET. YOU CANNOT HAVE A WRIT OF ASSISTANCE THAT HAS CIVIL EQUITY ARGUMENTS THAT TRANSMIT INTO LAW OF PENALTIES. THEY CAN'T THROW YOU IN JAIL FOR A DEBT, BECAUSE, THAT IS A DEBTORS PRISON, WE HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENT AGAINST THAT ALSO. SO HOW DO THEY DO IT, CAUSE THEY WANTS TO, AND BECAUSE YOU DON'T KNOW ANY BETTER. THAT'S HOW THEY DO IT. OKAY.

WHAT IF THEY SAY IT'S A COURT OF EQUITY? ALL RIGHT, THAT IS A GOOD QUESTION, I'M GLAD THAT YOU ARE PAYING ATTENTION HERE. IF THEY SAY THEY HAVE A COURT OF EQUITY, AND IT IS EQUITY, THEN YOU TURN TO THEM AND SAY, "THANK YOU YOUR, HONOR, I APPRECIATE YOUR TIME, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHO IS THE INJURED PARTY, AND WHERE THE CONTRACT IS. CAN YOU SHOW ME THE CONTRACT. THERE IS NO CONTRACT UNLESS YOU DIDN'T SIGN YOUR LICENSE WITH U.D. 1-207 WITHOUT PREJUDICE. WHERE IS THE CONTRACT, IT'S WHERE YOU SIGN FOR THAT LICENSE. SO DON'T SIGN FOR THAT LICENSE UNLESS YOU PUT U.D. 1-207 WITHOUT PREJUDICE UNDER UCC 1-207. NOW THEY CAN'T PRODUCE THE CONTRACT, AND IF THEY CAN PRODUCE THE CONTRACT YOU'VE EXERCISED YOUR WAIVER UNDER THE CONTRACT NOT TO GIVE UP YOUR RIGHTS TO TRAVEL FREELY AND UNENCUMBERED, RIGHT. AND LET ME ASK YOU THIS, CAN YOU ENTER INTO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONTRACT, NOT LAWFULLY. THE CONTRACT IS VOIDABLE FOR NON LAWFUL PERFORMANCE. IT HAS TO BE A LAWFUL CONTRACT FOR YOU TO ENTER INTO IT.

ALL RIGHT, THE NEXT THING WHO IS THE INJURED PARTY? WHO GOT INJURED? SHOW ME JUDGE; THE PARKING METER OUT THERE? ANOTHER NEAT TRICK THAT I LIKE TO DO ESPECIALLY IN SPEEDING TICKETS, IS I LIKE TO CONFRONT MY ACCUSOR. I ALWAYS LIKE TO CALL THE BLACK BOX THAT ACCUSED ME OF SPEEDING UP TO THE STAND. AND THE JUDGE ALWAYS GET'S UPSET. AND I TELL HIM, "WELL YOUR, HONOR, I'VE BEEN ASKING THIS POLICEMAN HERE FOR THREE HOURS, HOW THE BLACK BOX HE HAS BEEN PLAYING WITH WORKS. AND HE CAN'T TELL ME. AND WE'VE BEEN THROUGH THE WHOLE STATIONARY MOBILE RADAR MANUAL FROM TACOMA COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADAMEY AND I'VE ASKED HIM EVERY QUESTION AND I DON'T KNOW HOW HE PASSED HIS SECOND CLASS RADIO OPERATORS LICENSE, BECAUSE HE DOESN'T KNOW HOW THE DAMN THING WORKS. HE DOESN'T EVEN KNOW HOW TO SET UP THE TEST TO PROPERLY SET THE THING, IN ALL ENVIRONMENTS. I SAID ON TOP OF THAT, HE IS NOT THE WITNESS, HE IS NOTHING BUT A HEARSAY WITNESS, AND HIS TESTIMONY IS INADMISSIBLE IN ANY COURT IN LAND, BECAUSE YOU CAN'T HAVE HEARSAY." "HE

SAYS, WHAT THE HELL ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT?" HE DID NOT ACTUALLY ACCUSE ME, THAT BLACK BOX, FLASHING IT LIGHTS ON AND LITTLE BEEPERS ACCUSED ME. I SAID, NOW IF I HAD A LITTLE BALCK BOX IN HERE WITH LIGHTS ON AND MAKING NOISE AND ACCUSING, AND SAYING HE DIDN'T SPEED, HE DIDN'T SPEED. WE KNOW HOW FAR THAT WOULD GO, JUDGE, YOU WOULD THROW IT RIGHT OUT THAT WINDOW. YOU LET THIS GUY BRING HIS IDIOT BLACK BOX IN WITH FLASHING LIGHTS AND BEEPERS ON, AND BE PRESENTED, AND HIS THING IS EXACTLY BY THE BOOK AND ADMISSIBLE IN COURT. HE CAN'T TELL ME HOW THE THING WORKS. WE'VE BEEN TRYING FOR THREE ½ HOURS TO TEST HIM TO SEE IF HE KNOWS HOW IT WORKS. HE COULDN'T PASS THAT TEST TO SAVE HIS LIFE, AND THE BOTTOM LINE IS I STILL DON'T THINK THE DAMN THING WORKS, AND PERSONALLY I WANT TO CALL IT TO THE STAND AND CONFRONT MY ACCUSOR. UNDER ARTICLE I SECTION 13 PARAGRAPH 5, I'VE GOT THE RIGHT TO CONFRONT MY ACCUSOR AND I'D LIKE TO CONFRONT MY ACCUSOR, AND I'M SERVING A SUBPEONA, A SUBPEONA DUCUS TEACUM AND THAT MEANS BRING YOUR BOOKS AND RECORDS TOO." HE SAYS, "THAT'S PRETTY CLEVER." AND I SAID NOW, ADMIT YOUR HONOR, HE IS ARGUING APPLES AND ORANGES, AND I'VE GOT A SPEEDOMETER IN MY CAR AND IT MIGHT BE PLUS OR MINUS 12 MILES AN HOUR ON A FACTORY MADE ONE. I HAND MADE ONE IS PLUSE OR MINUS 6 MILES AN HOUR. AND I SAID, MINE HAS GOT A LITTLE NEEDLE ON IT AND IT WORKS OFF A LITTLE CABLE THAT GOES INTO THE TRANSMISSION AND IT RUNS OFF A LITTLE GEAR. IT DOESN'T HAVE FOUR DECIMAL PLACES AND IT DOESN'T DO SPACE LOGIC AND ALL THAT OTHER STUFF, AND SHOOT OUT A MILE AND TELL ME HOW FAST THE TELEPHONE POLLS ARE GOING BYE AND BYE. HE HAS GOT THIS HANDY DANDY GAGET IN HIS CAR THAT IS MEASURING SPEED ON WAY AND I'VE GOT THIS ONE THAT'S MEASURING SPEED MY WAY. BECAUSE HOW CAN I BE GUILTY AT THE SPEED HE IS TALKING ABOUT, BECAUSE I DON'T HAVE ONE OF THEM IN MY CAR. SEE THE APPLES AND THE ORANGES HERE, JUDGE? IT'S NOT REALLY A FAIR TEST IS IT? HE GOES, 'THAT IS A PRETTY GOOD ARGUMENT YOU HAVE GOT THERE.' HE SAYS 'I'LL TELL YOU WHAT WE ARE GOING TO DO, YOU'VE COST MY COURT ENOUGH FOR TODAY AND WE'RE GOING TO DISMISS THE CASE, WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THAT?' "FINE BY ME, YOUR, HONOR, BUT BEFORE WE DO, I HAVE ONE MORE BITCH, YOUR, HONOR." "BITCH, WHAT IS THAT?" SEE THAT POLICE OFFICER THERE, I HAVE A GREAT DEAL OF RESPECT FOR THAT POLICE OFFICER, AND I DON'T LIKE TO SEE THAT POLICE OFFICER GET INJURED IN ANY CAPACITY. I PERSONALLY FEEL THAT, THAT OFFICER SITTING IN A CAR ALL DAY EVERY DAY GETTING HIT WITH HIGH MICROWAVE ENERGY IS AN INSULT TO THAT POLICE OFFICERS LIFE, TO HIS FAMILY. I PERSONALLY FEEL FOR THAT POLICE OFFICER, I WONDER WHY THESE GUYS ARE SO IRRITABLE. AND WHY THEY DON'T WANT TO EAT NO FOOD AND THEY DON'T WANT TO JUMP THE OLD LADY WHEN THEY GO HOME. AND I SAID I UNDER STAND WHY BECAUSE THEY ARE BEING BOMBARDED BY THIS HIGH ENERGY MICROWAVE. AND I SAID, SOME OF THEM ARE GETTING CANCER, AND I THINK THIS IS AN ATROCITY, AND I DON'T THINK THAT THAT OFFICER SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO SIT IN THAT CAR ALL DAY AND BE BOMBARDED BY THAT HIGH ENERGY MICROWAVE ENERGY, WHICH COULD CAUSE HIM TO GET TESTICULAR CANCER AND ALL OTHER KINDS OF PROBLEMS WITH HIS LIFE AND

JUST SO THE CITY CAN MAKE BUCKS OFF OF THESE TICKETS. IT'S JUST AN ATROCITY. "HE SAID, YOU DON'T WORRY ABOUT THAT POLICEMAN, THAT'S MY JOB." I SAID, "SIR, I WORRY ABOUT HIM HE WORKS FOR ME. I WORRY ABOUT HIM. NOW I HAVE PERSONALLY RUN TESTS ON THIS THING, WHERE WE TOOK A MICROWAVE LEAK DETECTOR RIGHT FROM RADIO SHACK THAT YOU USE TO TEST YOUR MICROWAVE RANGE AT HOME. AND I SAID WE WENT OVER BY THE CAR, HE FLIPPED THE SWITCH ON AND THING WENT IN THE RED, AND SO I KNOW THOSE GUYS ARE GETTING BOMBARDED BY HIGH MICROWAVE ENERGY. AND I KNOW IF I HAD A MICROWAVE ENERGY OVEN AT HOME THAT WAS LEAKING THAT BAD, IT WOULD GO IN THE TRASH. DO YOU UNDERSTAND BECAUSE OF THE HIGH ENERGY MICROWAVE ENERGY GIVEN OFF BY THE THING. NOW YOU ASK THE POLICE OFFICER HERE, MY FRIEND IN THE COMMUNITY THAT IS GOING TO PROTECT ME, TO PUT A RISK OF CANCER AND SOMETHING LIKE THAT ON HIS BODY, I THINK THAT IS ABSOLUTELY UNAMERICAN AND I'M PROTESTING." HE SAID "WELL I'LL TAKE IT UNDER CONSIDERATION." AND HE SAID "AND I THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONCERN FOR OUR POLICE OFFICERS." AND I SAID "THAT'S ALL RIGHT YOUR HONOR, I'M JUST TRYING TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN." AS WE WALKED OUT OF THAT COURT ROOM, THE COP WALKED UP BESIDE ME AND SAID, I AIN'T NEVER GOING TO TURN THAT DAMN THING ON AGAIN. WHAT ARE YOU BETTING THAT THIS ARGUMENT DIDN'T GO EVERYWHERE. NOW THAT IS PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE, FOLKS AND THAT IS HOW IT WORKS. AND I WAS RIGHT, AND I WAS HONESTLY TRYING TO HELP HIM. BUT HE TOLD ME HE AIN'T NEVER GOING TO TURN THAT THING ON AGAIN. NOW THIS HAPPENED ABOUT 1985, NOW THEY HAVE BEEN PUBLISHING IN THE NEWS, YOU HEAR THEM TELL HOW ALL OF THESE COPS ARE COMING UP WITH CANCER AND ALL KIND OF VARIOUS THINGS, WELL THIS IS WHY FOLKS, BECAUSE THEY ARE BEING BOMBARDED BY THESE HIGH ENERGY RADAR GUNS. IF I WAS A POLICEMAN, I WOULDN'T TURN THAT THING ON FOR NOTHING. I'D COOK THE WARE ON THE THING. I'M NOT TURNING IT ON WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THAT. I'LL WRITE A TICKET, I'LL LOOK AT THE SPEEDOMETER AND I'LL SEE HOW FAST THE GUY IS GOING. AND IF HE IS GOING FAST I'LL GIVE HIM A TICKET. BUT I'M NOT TURNING THAT THING ON JUST SO I CAN HAVE MY HAIR FALL OUT AND GET A CHEMOTHERAPY TREATMENT. I DON'T NEED THAT KIND OF STUFF, DO YOU UNDERSTAND. I TOLD THE JUDGE, DO YOU HAVE ANY KIND OF IDEA WHAT KIND OF POWER IS COMING OFF THE END OF THAT ANTENNE AT THE END OF THAT GUN. I SAID, FOR EVERY INCH THAT IT GOES PAST THE WINDSHIELD, THE POWER CURVE IS SQUARING ITSELF. NOW IT IS REACHING OUT A QUARTER OF A MILE. DO YOU HAVE ANY KIND OF IDEA HOW MUCH POWER IS COMING OFF THE END OF THAT ANTENNA? I SAID THAT POOR GUY IS BEING BOMBARDED WITH HIGH ENERGY MICROWAVE ENERGY. I DON'T THINK IT IS RIGHT. SO ANYWAY IT GOT DISMISSED AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE WORKED AND MOST OF THE COPS IN MY AREA DON'T EVEN HAVE THAT THING ON ANY MORE BECAUSE I NOTICE WHEN YOU GO BY THEM MY RADAR DETECTOR DOESN'T EVEN GO OFF. SO I KNOW THAT IT'S AFFECTIVE. NOW THAT IS PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE, IT'S A COMBINATION OF HONESTY AND BASICALLY I DO CARE ABOUT THE POLICE OFFICERS, I DON'T WANT THEM BOMBARDED. THERE ARE GOOD POLICE OFFICERS OUT THERE. THEY HAVE A RIGHT TO WORK AND HAVE A SAFE JOB JUST LIKE ANYONE ELSE. ANY MORE THAN I WAS WHEN THEY DUMPED AGENT ORANGE ON US

WHEN I WAS IN VIET NAM. I MEAN IT IS ILLOGICAL, OKAY.

NOW THE BOTTOM LINE IS, THERE ARE, A LOT OF THINGS GOING ON OUT HERE, AND YOU HAVE TO BE COGNIZANT OF WHAT IS GOING ON. AND YOU HAVE TO BE COGNIZANT OF YOUR RIGHTS. AND YOU HAVE TO BE WILLING TO TAKE THE NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE ACTION. AND YOU CAN HAVE SOME FUN WITH IT. I LIKE, AN ELDER GENTLEMEN WHO WAS ONE OF MY MENTORS, USED TO SMILE AND HE SAYS, "IF YOU'RE NOT HAVING FUN, YOU'RE NOT DOING IT RIGHT." I'LL, SUBMIT A BRIEF, AND SEND IT TO HIM AND HE WILL TELL ME ALL THE THINGS THAT ARE WRONG WITH IT, AND I'LL FIX IT, AND I'LL SEND IT RIGHT BACK TO HIM, AND I'LL ADD A FEW MORE THINGS IN THERE, AND THEN HE WILL GET ALL MAD THAT I FIXED IT, AND THEN HE'LL SEND ME BACK A THING AND TELL ME HE DOESN'T AGREE WITH IT AND I'LL SEND HIM BACK AN ANSWER TELLING HIM THAT'S TOO BAD. NOW YOU CAN HAVE A LOT OF FUN DOING THIS

ANOTHER NEAT THING YOU CAN DO IS GO DOWN AND SIT IN COURTS. I HIGHLY RECOMMEND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN WHO DON'T HAVE ANYTHING TO DO IN AN AFTERNOON, RETIREEES ESPECIALLY, GET YOUR BEST GAL, OR YOUR, BEST FRIEND, TAKE TWO OF YOU SAFETY IN NUMBERS. DRESSED IN YOUR BEST SUIT AND TIE, OR BEST SKIRT AND WHAT HAVE YOU; GO DOWN AND SIT IN COURT AND TAKE A LEGAL PAD, JUST TWO OF YOU. AND SIT THERE FOR THE DAY, AND YOU WANT TO SIT IN THE LEFT REAR SIDE, THE LAST PEW IN THE LEFT REAR SIDE. AND JUST SIT THERE AND DO NOT SMILE. THEY'LL THINK YOU ARE FROM THE JUDICIAL TENURE COMMISSION. YOU OUGHT TO SEE WHAT HAPPENS IT IS GREAT. EVERYBODY GETS READ THEIR RIGHTS, EVERYBODY GETS TREATED LIKE A HUMAN PREACHER, IT IS ABSOLUTELY UPLIFTING. THE JUDGE WILL STOP YOU AND ASK YOU, WE'RE NOT HERE FOR ANYTHING SERIOUS TODAY ARE WE? AND I'LL SAY, NO, SIR, YOUR, HONOR. I JUST CASUALLY OBSERVING. HE GOES, NO, NO, NO, NO, NO, NO, NO, WHY ARE WE HERE TODAY? HONEST SIR WE WERE HERE IN THE AREA, WE HEARD THAT YOU ARE A REAL GOOD JUDGE, AND WE WANTED TO SEE YOU IN ACTION. MY ASSOCIATE AND I WAS DRIVING IN THE AREA, AND WE WANTED TO STOP BY AND SEE. AND HE SAID THAT FISH SMELLS AWFUL LOOSELY WRAPPED TO ME. NOW YOU TELL ME WHY YOU ARE HERE RIGHT NOW. HONEST TO GOD SIR WE WERE JUST CASUALLY OBSERVING. OKAY, ALL LAWYERS IN MY CHAMBERS. SHUTS THE COURT DOWN, GOES IN HIS CHAMBERS. THEY START TRYING CASES IN THE CHAMBERS, AND THEY ARE STARTING THEM IN THE HALL WAY AND THEN THEY USED THE CLERKS OFFICE AT THE OTHER END OF THE HALL. THEN THEY COME BACK AND THE LITTLE GAL FROM THE PROSECUTOR SAYS, WHAT IS WITH THE NERD PATROL. THE JUDGE GAVE HER A LITTLE LOOK THAT WOULD KILL. DON'T YOU DO IT TODAY, HONEY. YOU, KEEP THAT MOUTH ZIPPED. THESE GUYS ARE FROM THE TENURE COMMISSION. WE DON'T WANT NO PROBLEMS WITH THE STATE. YOU BUTTON THAT HATCH. I MEAN YOU CAN HAVE A LOT OF FUN. MY ASSOCIATE WAS JUST ABSOLUTELY ALMOST IN TEARS, HE COULDN'T KEEP A STRAIGHT FACE ANY LONGER, AND I SAID ALL RIGHT WE ARE LEAVING. WE GOT OUT, HE LAUGHED ALL THE WAY DOWN TO THE CAR, HE LAUGHED ALL THE WAY ROCHESTER ROAD TO THE EXPRESS WAY. HE SAID, THAT IS THE MOST FUN I'VE HAD IN MY LIFE, JUST SITTING HERE THAT DAY. AND EVERYBODY WAS GETTING OFF. GUYS WERE GETTING SENTENCES

CANCELLED. GUYS WERE GETTING OUT OF JAIL. ONE GUY HAD \$2500 DOLLARS WORTH OF FINES AND IT GOT REDUCED TO TO A \$124.00 AND FIVE DAYS SERVED. THERE WAS ONE WITH \$240.00 DOLLARS AND TEN DAYS IN JAIL, BUT THE JUDGE TURNED TO ME AND WINKED, AND SAID I CAN'T THROW HIM IN JAIL FOR CIVIL INFRACTION. I KNEW THAT. SO THIS IS THE LAST OFFER I'M GOING TO GIVE YOU YOUNG MAN ITS GOING TO BE \$124.00 AND FIVE DAYS SERVED. DOES THAT SOUND GOOD TO YOU? THE LAWYER TURNED TO HIM AND SAID YOU BETTER TAKE THIS, THIS IS THE BEST DEAL YOU ARE GOING TO GET.

SO I'M TELLING YOU, YOU CAN BE EFFECTIVE AS CITIZENS. YOU CAN GET ON THE RADIO YOU CAN CALL UP, WE HAVE HERE, MARK SCOTT ON THE RADIO AND WE HAVE SEVERAL PEOPLE, MIKE REAGAN. THERE ARE AT LEAST TEN TOP PEOPLE. JOE MAXWELL IS ON THERE. AND THERE IS A NEWMAN FELLOW DAVE NEWMAN. WHEN YOU GET ON THE RADIO AND YOU HEAR THEM BRING UP THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES YOU POP OFF YOU SOUND OFF, YOU TELL THEM HEY, THIS IS AMERICA, THE LAST TIME I HEARD, WE'VE GOT AN AMERICAN FLAG ON THE POLE OUT THERE. LAST TIME I HEARD WE GOT A CONSTITUTION AND BY GOD WE'RE GOING TO KEEP IT FOREVER. ANYBODY GOT A PROBLEM WITH THAT?

NOW, THERE IS A BUNCH OF OTHER THINGS, WE'RE GOING TO TAKE A LITTLE BREAK HERE AND WE ARE GOING TO COME BACK AND GOING TO FINISH OFF WITH SOME REAL HARD CORE STUFF FOR ADVANCE STUDENTS. SO COME ON BACK WE'VE GOT SOME MORE STUFF FOR YOU, JUST LIKE THE OLD SQUIRREL SAID. BE RIGHT BACK. END OF TAPE 2. HOPE WE CAN GET MORE OF HIS INFORMATION FOLKS. AND I HOPE YOU ENJOY THE TRANSCRIPT AND CAN PICK IT APART AND ADOPT IT TO ANY CASE THAT MAY COME YOUR WAY. THE CONSTITUTION IS ALIVE AND WELL, AND LET'S USE IT WISELY.