Treason

Across the United States during the last two centuries, thousands - perhaps millions, of organizations have sought governmental reform. Most instead have handcuffed themselves from peacefully bringing any major change. None have properly informed their membership how best to contain lawyers, the biggest enemy to any Constitutional system. Lawyers always have been warning organizational and civic leaders that they "must work within the system." It is the lawyers who have caused all of our problems by not working within the Constitutional system. The lawyers are in violation of the Constitution's major premise - a separation of powers to provide for a system of checks and balances.

by: Ralph Boryszewski

Chapter 2
Separation of Powers: A Guard Against Treason

The US Supreme Court has not been a true guardian of Constitutional process. The following should give the reader good reason to agree. On July 6, 1965 the Supreme Court was duty bound to examine and then reject the proposed 25th Amendment's submission for ratification to the State Legislatures by the 89th Congress. Section 2 of that Amendment states: "Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both houses of Congress." Section 2 of the new Amendment was in conflict with Section 1, Clause 1 of Article II of the US Constitution. That Section, in force since 1789 commands: "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as follows: .... “Therefore before a 25th Amendment to the Constitution could be considered and proposed, [52] Section 1 Clause 1 of Article II had first to be considered for repeal. The 89th Congress did not dare propose repeal of Section 1. The people would have been outraged against repeal of a Constitutional provision that authorized the people to elect Presidents and vice- presidents. Here again was treason against the people by the lawyer- dominated 89th Congress and a lawyer- dominated Supreme Court that did not declare against the submission and passage of an amendment that would negate people power.

There were two delegates at the Philadelphia Convention, who voted against the adoption of the Constitution. Both believed that pardons would be used to screen and secure from punishment those who engaged in treason. George Mason of Virginia stated: "The President of the United States has the unrestrained power of granting pardons for treason, which may be sometimes exercised to screen from punishment those whom he had secretly instigated to commit the crime, and thereby prevent a discovery of his own guilt."

At another time, Luther Martin [53] of Maryland stated: "The Power given to the President of granting reprieves and pardons, was also thought extremely dangerous." What the Founders appeared to be the most concerned about, as Martin put it, the President was given the "power of pardoning those who are, guilty

of treason" and the danger with that, he narrowed the point "it is said that no treason was so likely as that in which the President himself might be engaged." He knew the President would "attempt to assume to himself powers not given by the constitution, and establish himself in regal authority; in which attempt a provision is made for him to secure from punishment the creatures of his own ambition, the associates and abettors of his treasonable practices, by granting them pardons should they be defeated in their attempts to subvert the Constitution."

The 25th Amendment was ratified by lawyer controlled State Legislatures on February 10th, 1967. The amending process, as directed by Article V is improper. All Amendments must be submitted to the people for ratification. It was declared by the [54] Philadelphia Convention in 1787 that it was the people's Constitution. It was not ratified by the States The people have the Right to reject any Amendment. The 89th Congress was without authority to draft the 25th Amendment, which would deprive the people from electing all Presidents and vice-presidents. Furthermore, it was criminal of that Congress to choose the State Legislatures to be a party to their crime of denying the people of a vital Right provided by the Constitution. This was all done to cover up on-going corruption by the Legislative and Executive Departments while the Supreme Court (the Judicial Department) silently viewed all of the on-going criminality. In 1973-74 the 25th Amendment served well a shameful Nixon administration. A corrupt Vice President Spiro T. Agnew was forced to resign on October 10th, 1973. Under the terms of the 25th Amendment President Nixon nominated Gerald Ford to be the new Vice President. He was confirmed by a majority vote in both Houses. On December 6th, 1973 Ford was sworn in as the 40th Vice-President, the first [55] under the 25th Amendment. On August 9th, 1974 Nixon resigned and Gerald Ford was sworn into office the same day. On September 8th, 1974 one month after Nixon resigned, Ford, a President by an act of usurpation issued a pardon to ex-President Nixon for all federal crimes that he "committed or may have committed" while President. This act by Ford, a lawyer, was in reality a grant of immunity. Ford usurped the Constitutional power of a vice-president and then President. Ford also usurped a Grand Jury power in his grant of immunity to Nixon. On August 20th, President Ford, In another act of usurpation nominated Nelson Rockefeller to be his Vice President. Rockefeller became the second non-elected vice president on December 19th, 1974. Section I. Clause 1 of Article II, never repealed was to be a Constitutional safeguard that all Presidents and vice-presidents were to be elected by the people. Congress in proposing the 25th Amendment authorized a majority of its own members to vote approval of a vice- [56] president nominated by the President. But the proposed Amendment was in violation of Article II Section 1 of the Constitution, which states: "He [the President] shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the vice-president, chosen for the same term, be elected ...." Again, the Supreme Court failed in being a Constitutional guardian. It did not declare the 25th Amendment unconstitutional.

In July of 1965 a Petition by this author was directed to the Congress proclaiming the 25th Amendment could not be put into motion because it would deprive people of the Right of Suffrage.

A dangerous Constitutional provision for enlarging federal power is the requirement in Article VI that states: "This Constitution, and the laws of United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land." It

further states that all US senators and representatives "and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of [57] the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution ..."That meant judges, Attorneys General and prosecutors from every State would then become active supporting members of what Thomas Jefferson called. "the Consolidated Federal Judiciary." Every lawyer is required to take an oath to honor and support the Constitution as "the supreme law of the land." All State lawyers therefore became supporting members of "the Consolidated Federal Judiciary," along with those admitted to the federal bar. That in itself was a planned Act of treachery that furthered the cause of treason that deprived the people of the right to rule their own government.

The decision to make the Bill of Rights amendments to the Constitution was a treasonous act by the first Congress. The Congress knew the inalienable Rights of the people cannot be taken away or transferred from the people. As an amendment, the people's Bill of Rights was wrongfully placed under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and Congress where our rights, by court opinion, can be subjected to [58] change, as can be any other part of the Constitution. The Courts, by its opinions" and Congress, by its laws, have subverted and distorted the true purpose and meaning of' the people's rights. One Congressman has already submitted a proposal to repeal "Amendment II," the right of the people to bear arms. Such tampering by the Courts and Congress has destroyed the Bill of Rights' intended purpose - a direct and quick check by people over all Constitutional officials.

For years the National Rifle and other Associations should have been using our dues and extra collections of money they receive to better educate their members, or better yet, the general public in matters basic for our survival as a free people. Instead, leaders have been following the false advice of the Consolidated Judiciary. Several years ago, I informed National Rifle Association leaders that I would only contribute my annual dues, but no longer extra money to help elect favored Congressmen. There are many ways in which people, at little cost, can place our officials on the defensive. We can educate and encourage the people to [59] work for term limits and also work to end federal pensions for Congressional, Executive and Judicial officials. The Constitution itself provides the means to achieve that end. (Article I Section 6. Clause 1; Article II Section 1. Clause 6; Article III Section 1.) Million dollar pensions must end. Everyone goes on Social Security. The public will gladly cooperate in such a movement. We invite the more active, thinking members of the National Rifle and other Associations to set aside $5.00 from their extra donations and send it to the Foundation for Rights. That will be your annual dues, which will entitle you to receive other documents or articles. It will also entitle you to half price on our pamphlets and book. This Foundation is not building another fiefdom. We want to give the people information long withheld from them. We need the most intelligent and dedicated members of other organizations to join with us to help in properly educating people to the need of honest government. The first thousand who fill out the application and remit their dues will become worthy Charter Members. There are 800,000 lawyers in the United States. Once we [60] inform and earn the respect of a million new members, the lawyers will no longer be capable of keeping secret their long-held powers that they have stolen from the American people.

Opportunities often arise in which really dedicated organizations can help keep the public informed and aroused as to corruption that is too often over looked. For example, in the Senatorial Race of 1998 the National Rifle Association raised millions of dollars to support the re-election of incumbent Senator Alphonse D'Amato to defeat his challenger Representative Charles Schumer, an outspoken anti-gun advocate. Both candidates were lawyers. The Rifle Association had a terrific opportunity to use its four million members, and many dollars to get publicity in support of The Foundation For Rights' Petition to Congress. The Petition informed the Congress and public of the unconstitutional action of Representative Charles Schumer and other Democrat Representatives, who were seeking the office of a U.S. Senator. In the House, Representative Schumer worked diligently to oppose the Impeachment of President William [61] J. Clinton. In the meantime, President Clinton at the public's expense was using Air Force One to fly around the country raising millions in campaign money to help elect Candidate Schumer and others to the Senate. Upon successfully being elected to the Senate, Schumer then voted against conviction of impeachment charges. Schumer received millions in campaign funds from Clinton, the first known President ever who bribed members of a Senate trial body to successfully escape conviction of impeachment charges. You can bet that most members of that Senate Trial body were lawyers who are the real enemy.

We will again seek the impeachment of former Attorney General Janet Reno, Senator Charles Schumer and others on charges too numerous to state at this time. Janet Reno can be impeached, convicted, and disqualified from again holding any office of honor, trust or profit after she has vacated her office. In 1876 Secretary of War William Belknap was impeached by the House. Belknap resigned and President Grant had accepted the resignation. The Senate [62] followed up, but the trial ended in an acquittal. However, if found guilty, the Senate could have imposed the disqualification clause and Belknap would have been deprived of his pension and been forbidden to hold any office of honor, trust or profit.

The danger of the Consolidated Federal Judiciary can best be explained by an experience with just one of its members. In 1966 this author challenged and won a Constitutional confrontation against both the City of Rochester and NY State Officials. Members of the Police Union congratulated and then urged me to be their next union president. I accepted the offer on the condition that they follow my lead so worthwhile goals for the better enforcement of law could be attained.

The Supreme Court's Miranda decision in 1966 was a blow to police morale. In 1968 shortly after being elected to head the Police Union, I informed the membership that I had drafted a Resolution that would put a stop to a usurping, power hungry Supreme Court. But I explained it was necessary that I receive a unanimous [63] vote on the Resolution that was to be passed. The members were first informed that the Resolution would not be put into operation until we succeeded in getting other NY State Police conferences to go along in support of the Resolution. We picked some of the most vocal supporters from the Rochester Union to attend a special meeting with the Central Police Conference in Syracuse, NY. We did the same in Buffalo and other cities where we also obtained unanimous votes with the understanding that nothing would be done until later that year when all Conferences would attend our annual Convention in Albany, NY. We believed the entire NY State Police Conference representing 52,000 police officers would give us the final necessary vote to put the Miranda Resolution in motion.

We were confronted with difficulties at the Rochester meeting. Our Resolution required every police officer to agree that as of a pre- established date, he would not give the Miranda warning to any person he arrested. That would force judges to dismiss all criminals the police in NY [64] State had arrested. This would bring the matter to a head and awaken the American people. It would give the police (executive officers) the opportunity to speak out and expose a corrupt self-serving judiciary. Early on, some members of our Rochester police union were frightened. They told me we are police officers; we have to uphold the law, not break it. I told them the Judges, Attorneys General and lawyers are breaking the law every day of the year. The Supreme Court does not have the power to make law. The court is only supposed to decide the case before it. The Congress knows this, and the members of both Houses must submit the controversial substance contained in the Court's Miranda decision as a Constitutional amendment to Conventions of people for their approval and ratification.

Instead the lawyers who dominated both Houses let the Court's Miranda decision stand as if it was an actual Amendment to the Constitution. The Supreme Court, of course, would remain silent.

Earlier in this document, readers were informed that the major premise of the Constitution demands [65] that there must be a division of powers between the three branches of government. This is an absolute necessity for the system of checks and balances to operate. Lawyers, in controlling numbers in all three branches, are in violation of the separation of powers. We have also shown earlier that Article I Section 6. Clause 2 makes the point clearly that lawyers are forbidden to be members of Congress. I will now clearly demonstrate how one member of the Consolidated Federal Judiciary, a lawyer and counsel to the NY Police Conference, and the Police Officers who were the highest elected officers of the Conference, betrayed the entire membership at our annual meeting in 1968. When I, in a short explanation, attempted to present the Miranda Resolution to that Convention for its vote of approval, a requirement, that every police officer in NY State would not read the Miranda warning to any person arrested, Mr. Harvey, the lawyer- counsel, jumped from his chair and shouted loudly - "This man is telling you to break the law." I said, "Mr. Harvey you have no right to be counsel [66] here at our Police Conference. You don't allow any outsiders to attend your National Bar Association meetings and Conventions. At your meetings, Bar members break the law when they secretly cook up corrupt deals - who knows maybe even this Miranda spectacle was born there." At that time, three or four Conference Officials and lawyer Harvey went into a huddle. The President immediately emerged and informed me, even before I could present the details of the Resolution, that I would have to have a member second the Resolution or I could not proceed. Police Officers are brave when a man points a gun, but abject cowards when a lawyer or politician tells them they are breaking the law. I loudly condemned them for their fear of seconding the motion to introduce the Resolution that I am sure the police in the streets and American people would have whole-heartedly supported. Failing in my mission, crime since 1966 has gotten out of hand. Criminals and lawyers have become the beneficiaries of Miranda and many other outrageous court decisions. The Organized Criminals of the American Bench and [67] Bar violate the separation of powers in managing and controlling the Congress, Courts and Justice Department. This relatively small alliance of lawyers is growing stronger every day. But the day is

coming when the people will awaken to discover that treason and tyranny are synonymous.

To bolster the purpose and meaning of the resolve, I informed the Police that they were executive officers. They must enforce the law by arresting those who break it. When we advise violators as to their rights, we become a judicial officer, in conflict with our rightful duty as an executive officer. For more than 170 years, a police officer had been allowed to question those he arrested to make a stronger case when he appeared before Grand and Trial Juries. We are not lawyers or judges and should not be intimidated or forced by Court decisions to inform those we arrest to remain silent. Those we arrest have a right to counsel, but only after they are questioned, charged and processed by the executive powers (the police). Judicial officers are required to explain the law at the time of the criminal prosecution. Grand Juries must [68] be open and available at stated times weekly. Its members should be picked by lot so that people of all races would serve and be available to hear the cases of people whom the police supposedly abuse during the questioning process. These Grand Jurors should periodically speak out as they used to in order to obtain witnesses to come forward.

I sincerely believe if lawyer Harvey had not been in attendance at our Convention, as legal counsel, the Resolution would have been passed and we would have won the day for the American people. From past experience, I know I had the ability to arouse and obtain the immediate support of the great majority of the leadership in attendance. The President and other officers of the NY State Conference would have quickly fallen in line. For our cause, we could have obtained National publicity where we could have urged other member States belonging to the National Police Conference to join with us in putting a check on Miranda and the entire Federal Judiciary that completely violates the separation of powers. As an aside, one effect of the Miranda Ruling is that it forces police [69] officers to shill for lawyers. The National Rifle Association and other big organizations have their own staff of lawyers who, like Mr. Harvey, are constantly guarding the status quo. Members pay millions in dues to support the Rifle Association and the salaries and expenses of lawyer officials such as Mr. Harvey who really work against the best interests of such organizations and of the people. The Foundation For Rights is the only organization in the Country that claims the Bill of Rights is separate from the Constitution and supreme in its authority. Otherwise we cannot claim to be a government of the people. Our intended purpose is to educate people to correctly assert themselves by using the Bill of Rights keep the government in check, as was its intent. Better educated Grand and Trial Jurors could better administer their duties by exposing and speaking out against the evils of the Consolidated Federal Judiciary.

During the last 200 years, the Judiciary has told the American people so many lies they don't know what to believe. Constitutional historians have never honestly informed Americans that [70] since February of 1790 the people have been governed simultaneously by the provisions of two separate and different Constitutions, the reason being that neither Constitution, by itself, was capable of fulfilling its purpose and nobody can dispute this.

On June 21st, 1788 the first Constitution was ratified. The people of nine States ratified it because Constitutional power was placed in the hands of lay people. A lawyer, in fact, wasn't even an entity. The words lawyer and attorney are not to be

found in any provision of the Constitution or Bill of Rights. If the Constitution, first presented to the people by the Congress of the Confederation, on September 28th, 1787 had been prefaced with a Bill of Rights and placed before the ratifying conventions, it would have immediately been accepted. Laymen had everything to gain by the terms of the First Constitution. They, not lawyers, would be in command of the Congress and there they would have been able to create one Supreme Court. However, they would have refused to establish inferior courts. Laymen would serve as the Justices of the Supreme Court. A [71] layperson would always serve as the President. There would be a distinct separation of powers: no lawyers - no conflicts of interest - no adversarial proceedings. Lay people on Grand and Trial Juries would be the enforcers and judges in the management of the Bill of Rights. Juries would readily indict and speedily convict a President or any other official for corruption or Constitutional wrongdoing. No lawyer would be there to take an appeal to a higher court (more lawyers) where cases are interminably delayed for the purpose of cover-up.

During most of our history, there has been a second Constitution that has wrongfully put lawyers, instead of lay people, in complete charge of our government. The second Constitution was a creation of a seven-member Senate Committee. The committee met for the first time on April r, 1789 and for the next five months, labored in secret sessions behind locked doors of the United States Senate. The seven- man committee was dominated by lawyers. Two of the lawyers, Oliver Ellsworth and William Paterson, were the chief architects of the second Constitution. Both were former [72] members of the Philadelphia Convention where they could have easily established a Supreme Court of six Justices. That would have been acceptable to the people, but not to the Founding Fathers. The Founders, mostly lawyers, had to establish inferior Courts 50 the States could be divided into thirteen Federal Judicial districts, and a Judge in each District Court would become a vital link to the US Supreme Court. The people would have strongly opposed the First Constitution if inferior courts were an established part of it. The people had their own State Courts and they had insisted that the Federal government be very limited in its powers. The former Crown lawyers had first to get the people to ratify the Constitution in which the people believed they would be in control. Once this was done election of a Congress and a President would be in order.

In that first election it was essential that the Federalists elect a majority of former Crown lawyers so they would be in charge of the First Congress, the lawmaking body. The Federalists had actually elected to the First Congress, nineteen former [73] members of the Philadelphia Convention, and also the twentieth, Washington, President of the United States. Washington had previously served as President of the Philadelphia Convention.

Senator Ellsworth's second Constitution contained twenty-one pages of fine print and consisted of thirty-five sections - approximately 8,500 words - about double the 4543 words contained in the original Constitution, signed on September 17th, 1787. The second Constitution established a Supreme Court of six Justices. Inferior Federal courts were also created.

The office, qualifications and duties of an Attorney General of the United States were created, along with the office, qualifications and duties of an attorney for the government to be active in every Judicial District. Judges were given the broadest of powers. English common law remedy could be invoked by them. "That all said

courts of the United States shall have the power to grant new trials, in cases where there has been a trial by jury for reasons for which new trials have [74] usually been granted in the courts of law: and shall have power to impose and administer all necessary oaths or affirmations, and to punish by fine or imprisonment, at the discretion of said courts, all contempt of authority in any cause or hearing before the same; and to make and establish all necessary rules of the orderly conducting [of] business :.:, the said courts, provided such rules are not repugnant to the laws of the United States." The last lengthy sentence just quoted, would have been totally repugnant to every American patriot.

But the people weren't informed that the Constitution they had rarified in June of 1788 was to be secretly amended by thirty-five new sections and actually put into force in February 1790, still minus a Bill of Rights, The new sections drastically changed the Constitution that was to be administered by, of and for the people, to a Constitution that was to be operated by lawyers for the benefit of lawyers. If tae people had been so informed, they would have rebelled. The lawyers in Congress had to keep such dangerous information secret from the people. The [75] lawyers had quietly passed, and had President Washington sign "an Act to establish the Judicial Courts of the United States." That Act is better known as the First Judiciary Act.

An Act of law containing thirty-five additional sections had secretly been passed off as a Constitutional Amendment. It should have properly been called a second Constitution since all three departments of government would be seriously affected by the additional sections. In quietly signing it, President Washington purposely deceived the people into accepting an act of law to serve as a Constitutional Amendment. The First President and First Congress intentionally robbed the sovereign people of their right to govern themselves. Instead they placed lawyers as the sovereign authority by creating and placing a Consolidated Federal Judiciary in complete command of the new government. In time, the

Consolidated Judiciary would control both the central government as well as the States. The members of the First Congress and President Washington were not properly under a [76] "Constitutional oath" that they were required to obey, during the planning and passing of the First Judiciary Act. That in itself made the Act void.

In the last 212 years, an Act of Law has wrongfully been allowed to serve as an amendment to the Constitution without the consent of the people. Instead of protecting us, the Supreme Court remained silent during those years of outrageous deceit. More contempt and outrage was to follow.

The First Judiciary Act was passed on September 24th, 1789. Section 35 of the First Judiciary Act provides for the office, qualifications and duties of persons who shall act as attorneys for the United States. Also provided is the office, qualifications and duties of a person "to act as Attorney General for the United States."

Eighty-one years later, the "Department of Justice was established by the Act of June 22nd, 1870 with the Attorney General at its head. Prior to 1870 the Attorney General was a member of the President's cabinet, but not the head of a department, the office having been created under the authority of the **Act of September 24th, 1789**... [77] The chief purpose of the Department of Justice is to provide means for the enforcement of the Federal laws.... “Not true.” The real

purpose of the lawyers in establishing the Department of Justice was to greatly expand the powers and duties of the Attorney General and Prosecuting Attorneys. Lawyers as executive officers could join with the judge of the Judicial Department and take command over both Grand and Trial Jury bodies. Judges have unlawfully been making rules to limit the powers of Juries, and lawyer-Congresses have been making laws to enhance the powers of the Attorney General and prosecutors. These judicial officers holding executive powers, with the help of judges keep public scandals involving mostly lawyers from being exposed. That is why people on Juries must insist upon taking full and independent command in their determinations for voting.

Former President Clinton, a lawyer, nominated Janet Reno, a lawyer, to be Attorney General. She served him well. On August 23rd, 2000 she decided against naming a special prosecutor to [78] Investigate, Vice President Al Gore's 1966 campaign fund raising "because further investigation is not likely to result in prosecutable case." Reno told “I have concluded that a special counsel is not warranted." Robert Conrad Jr., the supervising heading up the department's probe that Gore was less than truthful in an April 18th interview on his role in improper campaign finance practices. Reno announced that she did not reach the same conclusion.

The Grand Jury has the duty to investigate the case involving Gore and the entire Justice Department and its history of shielding the corrupt. Instead, the innocent, who attempt expose the corrupt tax system are framed and indicted along with the whistle blowers-blowers who reveal corruption, and other wrongdoing. “The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America “He shall be elected and hold his office for the term of four years. How can a constitutionally unauthorized, selected Attorney General be the head of the Department of Justice and “Chief Law officer of the [79] Federal Government?"

Since the beginning, people have been electing lawyers to serve as a majority in all of the Congresses. Millions of laws and law decisions have been made to enlarge upon the judicial power. Thus lawyers have, over a long period of time, succeeded in gaining complete control of the three branches of government. Madison stated in his #47 Federalist Papers: "The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive and judiciary, in the same hands ... may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

Lawyers are responsible for the tyranny that exists in America. They fraudulently annexed the people's Bill of Rights to be a part of the Constitution in order to have control of them. With the consent of Congress, a lawyer dominated Supreme Court made Rule 7 (c). That rule commands: "The indictment or the information shall be a plain, concise and definite written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged. It shall be signed by the Attorney for the Government.... "

Now let every person think [80] very carefully about the following facts and information: The office and qualifications of a US Attorney for the government were not established by the trams of the Constitution ratified in June, 1788. Neither did the Constitution establish the office and qualifications of an Attorney General. No amendment has been proposed by Congress or consent given by the people for the creation of the office of US Attorney for the government or that of an office for a General. The Constitution, furthermore, does not assign any duty e officers are to perform. Therefore, the Attorney General and US Attorneys for the Government

have always been impostors. Since 1870 those judicial officers have been fulfilling both Executive and Judicial powers. In doing this, that has totally corrupted the legal system. A Supreme Court of lawyers created 7(c), which requires an Attorney for the Government to sign all Grand Jury indictments supposedly to make them valid. That rule, pure and simple, is an obstruction of the Administration of Justice.

Indictment and trial by Grand [81] and Trial Juries are the only method the people can employ to enforce the protection of our rights, liberties and property. About thirty years ago, through a newspaper account, I discovered that a federal Grand Jury in Baltimore, Maryland had indicted Senator Russell Long and former Senator William Brewster, both lawyers. Congressman Hale Boggs, Clarence D. Long, Samuel Friedel and Speaker of the House John W. McCormack were also under further investigation in the same $5 million bribery scandal with Maryland building contractor Victor Frenkil. The Grand Jury report listed forty-five overt acts through which Frenkil allegedly sought to defraud the government. Along comes Attorney General John N. Mitchell, who ordered US Attorney Steven Sachs not to sign the indictments of the other House members who were involved in the scandal.

By phone, I contacted the acting Grand Jury Foreman in Maryland, and identified myself. I informed him not to seek help from Chief Federal District Judge Roszell C. Thomsen or the US Attorney because [82] they were expected to uphold Supreme 7(c) regardless of the corruption that it covered up. I told the Foreman that his cause would gain good publicity if his Grand Jury prepared a detailed Presentment and sent it to a Select House committee for impeachment of those involved in the building scandal. I told him to make copies Media. I also sent the Forman section 603 of the House rules,
http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2006/04/24/18177161.php
which states: "The House of representatives has various methods of setting an action for impeachment in motion… One is by a charge from Grand Jury.

For years, members of the Association For Grand Jury Action Inc used Rule 603 on many occasions to inform Grand Juries that they had the right to issue a Presentment for the impeachment of a Federal Judge, a US Attorney General, a US Attorney or any federal official. We successful in obtaining publicity that exposed many officials. On one occasion, this author was personally involved in getting Abe Fortas, Associate Justice of the Supreme [83] Court to hurriedly resign his seat on the High court. Before the media would look into my Petition for impeachment to remove, The Association For Grand Jury Action had been informing the public about never-ending corruption by members of the Supreme Court.

Today, persons interested in reform are not organized and have no leaders to follow. This is the time for all good people to join in the support of the Foundation For Rights which will enable you to gain vital information that will secure a long awaited government of, by and for the people. You will make history as part of an organization working strictly in the people's interest. Presently, the Constitution and Bill of Rights offer little, if any, protection to any of us. The facts and information in our documents will, in time, arouse enough people to restore our Bill of Rights, Grand Juries and Trial Juries to positions of power.

It's a waste of time, effort and money to organize a million man or million woman March on Washington. It just tires the people, and accomplishes little. Radio and TV

talk show hosts may arouse their audience but they don't [84] know the means and methods to have their audience follow through a course of common action.

We especially desire the membership of independent thinking people, such as those involved in home schooling. They will be able to teach the young that our Bill of Rights and Constitution have been totally distorted and what they must do to obtain an honest government. If the people would properly utilize the original US Constitution which the people in 1788 believed would serve them well, we could become a government of, by, and for the people.

It is the duty of 280 million Americans to honor, obey and enforce the Bill of Rights as the ultimate law, designed for individual protection against governmental usurpation and tyranny. We state that the Bill of Rights is the ultimate law because it puts limits on the Constitution and is therefore superior to it. We the people have the truth, the right and the might on our side. When we are abused, and our land is being corrupted, we must readily invoke Bill of Rights authority.

Under the overall authority of [85] the ninth Article of the Bill of Rights, a Grand Jury is empowered to indict any official who would wrongfully use his authority to deprive any person of his life, liberty or property. Article 9 of the Bill of Rights commands that "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." That means the people on a Grand Jury have the power to indict for acts manifestly subversive to powers specified in the Bill of Rights or Constitution. Conduct clearly destructive to government by the people or dangerous to the wellbeing and liberty of the people need not be specifically defined by statute.

Whenever you petition the government for a redress, you must also direct a copy of the same petition to a federal or local Grand Jury for follow up action. Judges and US Attorneys obstruct the administration of justice when they withhold your petition from the Grand Jury. From years of experience (1946-2001) I can attest that federal, state and local governments invariably do little or nothing to assist petitioners. Instead lawyers and judges [86] in command of all departments of government immediately go into action to cover up corruption for which they, themselves, are most often responsible. That is also why our criminal judiciary created the US Department of Justice. They have thus placed a US Attorney in close proximity to Grand and Trial Juries. This is done to keep us from informing our fellow citizens on Grand Juries about criminal acts that are everyday occurrences. The leaders of most organizations are easily frightened and don't have the courage to inform their membership that US Attorneys intercept the people's Petitions to Grand Juries and the judges assist in cover-ups. The judges threaten the brave and the bold with contempt and warn the naive and perplexed citizens and jurors that they must "work within the system." It's a rigged system where petitioners and juries are at the advantage of lawyers, judges, prosecutors and attorneys general

This Document is intended to alert the reader that our Founders were connivers who prepared a Constitutional system that would best serve their own interest. Who else but lawyers would [87] have thought of the idea of enacting a Constitutional oath that none of them would be required to obey? The existing oath is meaningless and unenforceable. Currently every member of every branch of government is violating the Constitution on a daily basis. So the Foundation for

Rights advocates the first reform - a Constitutional Oath that requires officials to "obey" the Constitution.

The second Constitutional reform is the immediate rejection by all of the Treason provision contained in Article III Section 3. Clause l. However this provision must continue to remain in the Constitution as a memento to all succeeding generations on how our conniving Founders ironically guaranteed Constitutional protection instead of punishment to those who do commit treason.

In the next Document, the reader will learn from facts and information therein presented, that there has been a long history of organized criminality by members of the American Bench and Bar. To achieve the first of their criminal goals, the founding lawyers pretended to attend a [88] Convention in Philadelphia "to revise the Articles of Confederation." Instead, without authority or input from the people, they drafted a Constitution and then falsely claimed it was the people who formed the new Union. At first hand, most of the people rejected it. Our enemy, the lawyers, needed time and reinforcement. Therefore they did not call for one general Ratifying Convention; there the Delegates from all of the States would have assembled and could properly have compared notes. Instead, the Founders called for each State to elect its own Ratifying Convention. The Federalists would then be able to concentrate their forces from both inside the Convention and among the general public to counteract any opposition. The people in most of the Conventions said they would not give their consent unless a Bill of Rights would be made available. So again, with more promises, the people in Conventions were informed to ratify the Constitution and also to prepare a list of Rights to be submitted with additional Amendments the people believed necessary. The people, who ratified the Constitution, submitted a total of 124 [89] Rights, including a few proposed Amendments to the First Congress. Many of our readers have already been informed of the usurpation involved in attaining and putting the new Constitution into motion. Next you will be informed how the First Congress also sabotaged the purpose and true meaning of the Bill of Rights. The First Congress reduced the 124 submitted provisions to only twelve. This huge reduction - from 124 down to twelve - was kept a secret from the State Conventions. It was real criminal act by the First Congress to send the people's inalienable rights, as game to lawyer dominated State Legislatures rather than back to the State Conventions. It was also criminal for the State Legislatures to purposely delay ratification for twenty-seven months. This enabled the First Congress, President Washington, and the newly created Supreme Court to unconstitutionally establish a government of lawyers instead of a government by and of the people.

The people have never learned the number one lesson that a separation of powers must always be maintained. Lawyers who dominate all three [90] departments will not work for reforms; neither will they surrender their usurped powers. They have become rich and powerful. For a starter, it's up to the people to vote all lawyers out of Congress and our State Legislatures. Chapter 8 of The Constitution that Never Was explains how the 14th Amendment was unlawfully passed (1866) and ratified (1868) at gunpoint.

Deceit and trickery were used in ratification of the 16th Amendment dealing with the income tax. In July 1909 Congress passed the 16tb Amendment. It was falsely claimed to "have been ratified on February 25th, 1913. An extensive search of

various State archives proved it was never ratified by the required number of States.

Most Americans have never heard of the Titles of Nobility Amendment. Amazingly, after fifty years of publication as an official amendment, the original 13th amendment suddenly disappeared from the Constitution in the aftermath of the Civil War. But thanks to two American patriots, enough evidence has been recovered that should encourage the [91] people to replace the Titles of Nobility Amendment, to make sure lawyers and money changers are kept out of government. In my next issue, I will discuss this in depth.

Presently, the most dangerous threat to our lives, liberties and property is an Executive Order. Yet most people don't know what an Executive Order is. In your next Document, the Foundation For Rights will explain what an Executive Order is and also offer a novel, daring plan to put a swift end to all Executive Orders. Join and help the Foundation For Rights bring this message to millions of Americans.

Conclusion

In summary: We have tried to show you there were two American Revolutions; the first when we as Colonies separated from England and the second continuing one is how the people have gradually been denied the fruits of the first in a carefully planned and executed effort by a group composed of mostly greedy, power hungry lawyers. In commanding numbers they have seized control of the three branches of our government in [92] violation of its own laid out provisions.

Today, 280 million Americans have steadily been losing ground to a relatively small group of judicial officers whom our forefathers intended and actually voted to exclude from the new government. We therefore must awaken to the task before us: banish lawyers - stop their corruption, endless laws and paperwork, waste and debts and most importantly - end the great divisions they have purposely placed between us.

Remember in the beginning the people desired and worked to form and maintain a very limited government to prevent the tyranny that big government eventually forces upon its people. We need to reinstate the old rallying motto "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" and be prepared this time to stand up to judicial usurpers who have made King George look like an amateur. [93]