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Scripture Reading John 10: 22 - 42

(8:00)

In the past we considered starting off with a prayer Someone just recently was asking about starting things off with a prayer We decided to start things off with reading a piece of the Gospel instead of a prayer When we read that we’re in prayer and also we get the gospel message We don’t get lost in vain repetitions or vain requests or statements concerning God For that reason we read Scripture instead of saying a prayer

Last week Jan and I finished up on an Information that we’re going to be sending to the Senate

probably this week

I’d like to read it It’s extremely short It’s one and a half pages

We filed Informations before

We’re going to be filing under our case number up here in Albany Northern District where we have a case open for the sole purpose of being under the auspice of the court

We’ll file this paper up there in the Northern District

It’s an Information filed under that case number

And it’s addressed to the 116th United States Congress

Copies sent to Senate President Mike Pence and President Pro Tempore Chuck Grassley

for distribution to all Senators and restoration

We’ll probably send a copy to the Congress too the Representatives not just the Senators

The purpose of this Information is to notify the United States Senate of their error for correction concerning the Three Fifths Rule also known as the Filibuster or the Nuclear Option. This Information is directed to President Mike Pence and President Pro Tempore Chuck Grassley for distribution to the other ninety-nine Senators. Also carbon copied to President Trump Chief Justice Roberts and acting Attorney General Matthew Whitaker and I might add a couple of people from Congress for distribution there too

Not that they’re going to obey us which they should

It’s building a case at some point in time when We the People step up and get educated then we will be able to make a difference and make changes

but only then can we take control and power the authority that the People should have

We don’t have it and the only reason that we don’t have it is because of ignorance

If the People weren’t ignorant then they wouldn’t be able to resist us

We would come down on them so hard and require the repair of all the errors of their way and be relentless about it

They wouldn’t be able to turn one way or the other without having to deal with us

If We the People were educated but we are not

Hopefully people will become educated by taking our course and when we get the book out getting that I’ve been ill for about a month Bedridden for two weeks

I didn’t do anything for four weeks absolutely nothing

I could have had a lot more accomplished

I am working as diligently as I can on it and hopefully things will get done soon

We all need to educate ourselves and get other people to educate themselves

I get a lot of information on the Man on the Land stuff That’s not going to happen

I got educated on a lot of this stuff

I understand what they’re doing and how they’re doing it

It’s much more important to understand the law

understand our Founding Fathers, understand our Founding Documents what is true law what is positive law what is the law of the land

This is all extremely important and if we have knowledge of the enemy why participate in the fraud we should be spending more time in the things of substance

things that can and will empower We the People

We need a large percentage of People

to come to the knowledge of truth to take back control

We need 15,000 people with knowledge across the United States to seize control of the courts We the People should have control of the courts

Regarding this paper We read the first page as far as who it was addressed to

We start:

The United States Constitution Article 1 Section 3 states:

each Senator shall have one vote

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided

which confirms majority rule

The Senate by rule cannot rewrite law

Nor can the Senate rest in the precedence of corrupt Republics before us

These facts are clarified by Article 5 which states

No state without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The definition of equal suffrage stands as follows

Each voter is equal in his influence upon the results to vote with every other elector

So it’s an even vote The majority rule

(19:11)

Therefore to hold a minority’s votes as having more influence than the majority would deprive the majority their equal suffrage and lawful rule and thereby an obstruction of justice

via Article 1 Section 5 Clause 2

We the People gave authority to each House to determine the rules of its proceedings

The purpose of a rule is to establish uniform procedures in order to maintain order

Rules are not law

Congress cannot change laws via rules

Consequently all rules and practices which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void

Thus the Senate’s Three Fifths Rule also known as Filibuster is a nullity

because it seeks to change the law of majority rule and equal suffrage that We the People ordained and established By our prerogative and to prevent Congressional abuse by a majority We the People via Article 5 require 2/3 of both Houses in order to propose amendments to this Constitution and three quarters to ratify

via Article 1 Section 5 Clause 2 we require the concurrence of 2/3 to expel a member for bad behavior

via Article 1 Section 7 we require 2/3 of both Houses to defeat a President’s rejection of the bill

and finally via Article 2 Section 2

The President with the advice and consent of two thirds of the Senate has the power to make treaties everything else is majority rule

If we didn’t give them the authority they don’t have it

They can’t change the rules

This is something that has been frustrating justice

It has been frustrating President Trump

It has been frustrating many other people

That these people make rules to do what they do

And if you go and look this up and start getting involved in this these are Parliament rules

We’re not Parliament We’re not England

We need to take power back and rewrite the rules

We’ve done that already

We’ve done that in a conference in Kingston , New York

We had our conference up there

We got together all of the real elected committeemen

We took it to court We did lose it in court

The judge decided to make a rule We were ignorant in those days

and he maintained the status quo

Back to the paper

In conclusion if we wanted to give the minority the destructive Three Fifth Rule also known as Filibuster or Nuclear Option we would have ordained and established it

And since we didn’t there can be no rule making to change a rule of law

Such actions are an obstruction of justice because it disregards the will of We the People

Therefore the Senate is to cease from exercising power that we did not give them

So that’s the paper we’re going to be filing

serving on to the Senate probably this week.

(24:39)

Once it’s put on the website we will send an e-mail out

letting you know where it is located at

We’re going to send it to the President will get a copy Chief Justice Roberts will get a copy acting Attorney General Matthew Whitaker will get a copy and we will probably copy the Congress the people’s representatives as well as the Senate

I’m working on Chapter 7 in the course
That’s knowledge on Jefferson and slavery

I’m finding a lot more

This man was relentless Every time this man got power he was relentless on trying to free the slaves on trying to change the law

People talk about Jefferson being an enigma because he wrote the Declaration of Independence and wrote about liberty and yet he himself had slaves

Let me read a couple of paragraphs that’s going into the book

I’d like to read a few chapters here or there

(26:44)

I start off

If you want to destroy the heart and soul of America you must first assassinate the reputation of Thomas Jefferson.

By the way, as I went on in this, and I’m still researching some of this Jefferson was called the Founding Father Apostle because he was so godly and focused on righteousness

Reading on

you must first assassinate the reputation of Thomas Jefferson

Ever since I can remember I have heard destructive statements such as

Jefferson’s remarkable declaration was an enigma. He proclaimed listen to the lies they got in here He proclaimed that all men were created equal and possessed natural rights however as Jefferson wrote those words he owned slaves whose natural rights were not respected or protected. Not long after he wrote the Declaration of Independence his views on race became the basis for the movement to deport freed blacks to Africa or the West Indies

Come on now, nothing could be further from the truth

Where did this guy get this but anyway

Jefferson bought and sold slaves throughout his adult life

Another lie

Jefferson never bought nor never sold a slave He inherited all the slaves that he had and he seeked three times two times through the legislature and one as the governor and then other places too where he tried to be able to free his slaves

because in Virginia there was a law that prevented emancipation of slaves

If you wanted to get rid of your slave you had to sell him

and he refused to sell his slaves that’s why Jefferson owned slaves

Every step of the way he tried to turn away from this

Let me go back

However as Jefferson wrote those words he owned slaves whose natural rights were not respected nor protected

And he did have a lot of respect for his slaves

And he did protect them

If you read some of the things that people wrote about him and his slaves

he had a very good relationship with them and there’s some really good stories

People should read this book, “The Real Thomas Jefferson”

You can get that book at NCCS .net

Jefferson bought and sold slaves throughout his adult life

That’s a lie

He even sent bounty hunters after runaway slaves

Another lie

Some Christian writers such as David Barton claim that Virginia law prevented Jefferson from freeing his slaves However this is not true That’s a lie

And let us not forget these people’s most useful tool claiming sexual deviancy against their victims You can find a credible argument in support of Jefferson’s character and get witnesses as to where these lies came from by the people who knew Jefferson in the book “The Real Thomas Jefferson” Chapter 18 titled “A Season of Slander”

So when I was putting this together and I went back and started to read because I read that chapter before and I was looking through it and I wanted to extract some information from there and put it in to my book and give credit to where it came from but there was so much. People should read that entire chapter

“A Season of Slander”

This whole thing about his sexual deviancies and have relationships with a slave that reported one woman had his children This all started on his second run as President

(31:33)

We even know the individual who started this

As a matter of fact it was an individual who was unjustly imprisoned and one of the first acts that Jefferson did was to have that man freed

And yet this guy went out and wrote all of these things and so on and so forth

Very interesting story on how Jefferson dealt with all of this extremely interesting he just ignored it

“Season of Slander” Chapter 18 “The Real Thomas Jefferson”

You can get the book at NCCS.net

“The Real George Washington”, “The Real Benjamin Franklin”, “The Real Thomas Jefferson”, and “The Making of America” Those four books particularly is what I would suggest to buy and read

There was one thing that I wanted to read

The first act of Jefferson’s political career as noted earlier was an attempt to make it legal for slave owners in Virginia to emancipate their slaves

That bill was rejected

He was called to go to the Virginia Legislature and he was called twice for that job and he went twice

and both times his first order of business trying to change the law

That bill was rejected as was the condemnation of slavery in his original draft of the Declaration of Independence

He wanted to create a nation without slavery

They pulled it out because they knew it wasn’t going to fly

His labor in this cause finally met with some success in 1778 when he introduced a bill in the Virginia House of Delegates to prevent the further importation of slaves into the state

The proposal was approved but he realized that it only stopped the increase of the evil by importation leaving to future efforts it’s final eradication

It was Jefferson’s desire to open the way for this final eradication

the very next year when his committee submitted their proposal for the revision of Virginia’s legal code However he ascertained through conversations with his colleagues that the legislature was not yet prepared to consider such a progressive step

So he calculated another strategy The bill on the subject of slaves was a mere digest of the existing laws respecting them without any intimidation of the plan for future and general emancipation

It was thought better that this should be kept back and attempted only by way of amendment

whenever the bill should be brought on

When the bill did come up for debate Jefferson was unable to get his amendment passed

It was found that the public’s mind would not yet bear the proposition

Yet the day is not distant when it must bear and adopt it he wrote or worse will follow

Nothing is more certainly written in the books of fate that these people are to be free

Jefferson would be heard from again on this issue of slavery

It goes on

Let me jump on to another paragraph

(37:25)

The vast area between the Appalachians and the Mississippi River had long been claimed by the several original states. But the recent session of these claims placed the area under the control of Congress in early 1784 Jefferson was appointed chairman of the committee to settle many land disputes which had risen and to prepare a plan for the government of this western region.

Jefferson himself drafted the report known to history as the Ordinance of 1784

According to one scholar the plan ranked second in importance only to the Declaration of Independence … This document became the basis for the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 … But Congress rejected a very significant element in Jefferson’s report

He had included in the bill a clause barring slavery … a measure that might have adverted the Civil War. But this proposal was defeated by one vote…

… I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just That His justice cannot sleep forever…”

This is the Introduction that I’m writing

It’s an introduction to our Founding Documents

This is Chapter 7 which is probably going to be broken up

7A being the Introduction

Last week we talked a little bit about the difference between the authorities and powers

the state power and the people power

there’s judicial power and Presidential power

I want to read out of the Federalist Papers Number 39

(43:45)

Federalist Papers Number 39 written by Madison

Could any further proof be required of the republican complexion of this system, the most decisive one might be found in its absolute prohibition of titles of nobility, both under the federal and the State governments; and in its express guaranty of the republican form to each of the latter.

"But it was not sufficient,'' say the adversaries of the proposed Constitution, "for the convention to adhere to the republican form. They ought, with equal care, to have preserved the FEDERAL form, which regards the Union as a CONFEDERACY of sovereign states; instead of which, they have framed a NATIONAL government, which regards the Union as a CONSOLIDATION of the States.'' And it is asked by what authority this bold and radical innovation was undertaken? The handle which has been made of this objection requires that it should be examined with some precision.

Without inquiring into the accuracy of the distinction on which the objection is founded, it will be necessary to a just estimate of its force, first, to ascertain the real character of the government in question; secondly, to inquire how far the convention were authorized to propose such a government; and thirdly, how far the duty they owed to their country could supply any defect of regular authority.

First. In order to ascertain the real character of the government, it may be considered in relation to the foundation on which it is to be established; to the sources from which its ordinary powers are to be drawn; to the operation of those powers; to the extent of them; and to the authority by which future changes in the government are to be introduced.

On examining the first relation, it appears, on one hand, that the Constitution is to be founded on the assent and ratification of the people of America, given by deputies elected for the special purpose; but, on the other, that this assent and ratification is to be given by the people, not as individuals composing one entire nation, but as composing the distinct and independent States to which they respectively belong. It is to be the assent and ratification of the several States, derived from the supreme authority in each State, the authority of the people themselves. The act, therefore, establishing the Constitution, will not be a NATIONAL, but a FEDERAL act.

That it will be a federal and not a national act, as these terms are understood by the objectors; the act of the people, as forming so many independent States, not as forming one aggregate nation, is obvious from this single consideration, that it is to result neither from the decision of a MAJORITY of the people of the Union, nor from that of a MAJORITY of the States. It must result from the UNANIMOUS assent of the several States that are parties to it, differing no otherwise from their ordinary assent than in its being expressed, not by the legislative authority, but by that of the people themselves. Were the people regarded in this transaction as forming one nation, the will of the majority of the whole people of the United States would bind the minority, in the same manner as the majority in each State must bind the minority; and the will of the majority must be determined either by a comparison of the individual votes, or by considering the will of the majority of the States as evidence of the will of a majority of the people of the United States. Neither of these rules have been adopted. Each State, in ratifying the Constitution, is considered as a sovereign body, independent of all others, and only to be bound by its own voluntary act. In this relation, then, the new Constitution will, if established, be a FEDERAL, and not a NATIONAL constitution.

The next relation is, to the sources from which the ordinary powers of government are to be derived. The House of Representatives will derive its powers from the people of America; and the people will be represented in the same proportion, and on the same principle, as they are in the legislature of a particular State. So far the government is NATIONAL, not FEDERAL. The Senate, on the other hand, will derive its powers from the States, as political and coequal societies; and these will be represented on the principle of equality in the Senate, as they now are in the existing Congress. So far the government is FEDERAL, not NATIONAL. The executive power will be derived from a very compound source. The immediate election of the President is to be made by the States in their political characters. The votes allotted to them are in a compound ratio, which considers them partly as distinct and coequal societies, partly as unequal members of the same society. The eventual election, again, is to be made by that branch of the legislature which consists of the national representatives; but in this particular act they are to be thrown into the form of individual delegations, from so many distinct and coequal bodies politic. From this aspect of the government it appears to be of a mixed character, presenting at least as many FEDERAL as NATIONAL features.

The difference between a federal and national government, as it relates to the OPERATION OF THE GOVERNMENT, is supposed to consist in this, that in the former the powers operate on the political bodies composing the Confederacy, in their political capacities; in the latter, on the individual citizens composing the nation, in their individual capacities. On trying the Constitution by this criterion, it falls under the NATIONAL, not the FEDERAL character; though perhaps not so completely as has been understood. In several cases, and particularly in the trial of controversies to which States may be parties, they must be viewed and proceeded against in their collective and political capacities only. So far the national countenance of the government on this side seems to be disfigured by a few federal features. But this blemish is perhaps unavoidable in any plan; and the operation of the government on the people, in their individual capacities, in its ordinary and most essential proceedings, may, on the whole, designate it, in this relation, a NATIONAL government.

But if the government be national with regard to the OPERATION of its powers, it changes its aspect again when we contemplate it in relation to the EXTENT of its powers. The idea of a national government involves in it, not only an authority over the individual citizens, but an indefinite supremacy over all persons and things, so far as they are objects of lawful government. Among a people consolidated into one nation, this supremacy is completely vested in the national legislature. Among communities united for particular purposes, it is vested partly in the general and partly in the municipal legislatures. In the former case, all local authorities are subordinate to the supreme; and may be controlled, directed, or abolished by it at pleasure. In the latter, the local or municipal authorities form distinct and independent portions of the supremacy, no more subject, within their respective spheres, to the general authority, than the general authority is subject to them, within its own sphere. In this relation, then, the proposed government cannot be deemed a NATIONAL one; since its jurisdiction extends to certain enumerated objects only, and leaves to the several States a residuary and inviolable sovereignty over all other objects. It is true that in controversies relating to the boundary between the two jurisdictions, the tribunal which is ultimately to decide, is to be established under the general government. But this does not change the principle of the case. The decision is to be impartially made, according to the rules of the Constitution; and all the usual and most effectual precautions are taken to secure this impartiality. Some such tribunal is clearly essential to prevent an appeal to the sword and a dissolution of the compact; and that it ought to be established under the general rather than under the local governments, or, to speak more properly, that it could be safely established under the first alone, is a position not likely to be combated.

If we try the Constitution by its last relation to the authority by which amendments are to be made, we find it neither wholly NATIONAL nor wholly FEDERAL. Were it wholly national, the supreme and ultimate authority would reside in the MAJORITY of the people of the Union; and this authority would be competent at all times, like that of a majority of every national society, to alter or abolish its established government. Were it wholly federal, on the other hand, the concurrence of each State in the Union would be essential to every alteration that would be binding on all. The mode provided by the plan of the convention is not founded on either of these principles. In requiring more than a majority, and principles. In requiring more than a majority, and particularly in computing the proportion by STATES, not by CITIZENS, it departs from the NATIONAL and advances towards the FEDERAL character; in rendering the concurrence of less than the whole number of States sufficient, it loses again the FEDERAL and partakes of the NATIONAL character.

The proposed Constitution, therefore, is, in strictness, neither a national nor a federal Constitution, but a composition of both. In its foundation it is federal, not national; in the sources from which the ordinary powers of the government are drawn, it is partly federal and partly national; in the operation of these powers, it is national, not federal; in the extent of them, again, it is federal, not national; and, finally, in the authoritative mode of introducing amendments, it is neither wholly federal nor wholly national.

Once We the People get into power and take control of both the political and judicial realms which is our right our heritage That is government by consent Through the juries and through the committeemen Once we do that then we can correct the problems of the Seventeenth Amendment The Seventeenth Amendment was never ratified The states are no longer free Between the Sixteenth and the Seventeenth Amendment the slaves have been enslaved by the federal government and the people have been enslaved by the federal government We have all the fraud that we are dealing with in the courts We are no longer a free people because we’ve been incarcerated in statutory prison

The states have absolutely no say

We have to return the power back to the states by getting rid of the Seventeenth Amendment

which is null and void anyway

People need to read Federalist Paper Number 39

We are no longer a republic

The Sixteenth Amendment and the Seventeenth Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment have destroyed that

We talk about that in our course and also in our book we’re putting together

(1:00:00)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Last week the Prayer Group came up and it has been meeting at 9:00 PM on Tuesday evenings

Doug Keller has agreed to take it over

It will still be meeting on Tuesday nights at 9:00 EST

John would like to talk with him before we continue with that

We need to stay on the very focused principles of the Bible

Set a meeting up to make sure that we adhere to sound doctrine in prayer

We are now at 1,048 grand jury administrators

We need more grand jury administrators

On our special meeting last Wednesday we picked up 13 volunteers to help make calls

We still need volunteers to staff a committee to arrange for interviews for John and Gerard

by the news media

We’re still looking for speakers for the Natural Healing Call

E-mail or call Jan

You don’t have to be a member of NLA to be a speaker at the Natural Healing Call

QUESTIONS

(1:05:00)

Question 1: If you recall about a month ago we had someone on who was the plaintiff in a case and she was to be deposed. The deposition lasted about nine and a half hours

It turns out that the defense attorney decided that she didn’t answer all of her questions so she filed a motion to sanction her for $6,970 Can they do that? What are the comebacks?

Brent answered

The judge can do anything that he wants to do

It doesn’t make it right

If people don’t like it then they can appeal it

If the person doesn’t pay the fee and the judge doesn’t back off then the judge can throw them in jail for contempt

Find cases in the jurisdiction that you’re in that talks about that kind of thing or gives an opinion on that kind of question

If it is a matter of the Fifth Amendment and she didn’t want to answer the question because she believed it would put her in prosecutorial danger if you can convince the judge that it will then you’re entitled to not answer the question.

It was a deposition in federal court

For a deposition the same rules pertaining to the Fifth Amendment would apply

The one thing that you can’t do and get away with it never take what the law calls a Blanket Fifth Never say I’m not answering any questions

You can say that when you’re talking to a police officer

But once you get on the witness stand a blanket fifth will get you in trouble for contempt

You say No I will listen to every question that’s asked I’ll consider it and decide whether or not I think I should answer it

That’s the way you take the Fifth on the stand

You don’t just say I’m taking the Fifth

When you take the oath to tell the truth the whole truth and nothing but the truth

that’s tempered by your option to listen to each question individually and decide whether or not you want to answer it

When you take the oath you’re not taking a blanket oath

You’re taking an oath to answer the question each one as they are delivered to you

If you listen to each question and decide whether or not it puts you in real prosecutorial danger and if you believe it does then our Constitution of the United States and state constitutions we’re common law jurisdiction with common law protection you’re entitled to not answer the question You have to say so on the witness stand

And when you’re in deposition you’re on the witness stand

even though you may be setting at a table in the conference room.

In depositions the scope of questioning is much broader

Discovery allows a whole lot of questions

The Fifth Amendment is available if you’re under oath

If you’re under oath whether in deposition or in the court you are entitled to listen to each question individually and take the Fifth or don’t take the Fifth to each question

but you are not entitled in any event to broadly say I’m not answering any questions

if you’re under oath

If you’re not under oath if you’re at the police station you can say I’m not talking but when you say that now since the last few years now you have to say something like I take the Fifth or I evoke the protection of the Fifth or I evoke the right to remain silent

it’s not enough just to say nothing anymore

The courts say that you got to verbally reference the right to remain silent

(1:20:00)

Question 2: It deals with unemployment tax on S corps in the state of New Hampshire

I am currently dealing with the state of New Hampshire in an issue where they are requiring me to pay unemployment tax for my solely owned and run S corporation I’m trying to prove that

1. I don’t meet the definition of employing unit under the requirements in their RSAs as all my services are performed outside of the state They then declared that I am an American employee under their RSAs which uses United States in the definition

Jan lost his connection

We will move on to Brent

(1:22:40)

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

Brent’s website is commonlawyer.com

We’re going to talk about the Constitution

Brent’s comments are his own

This is some of my thoughts on the Constitution of the United States

Section 8 Clause 2 of Article 1

Article 1 addresses matters concerning the Congress of the United States

It says in Section 8 Clause 2

The Congress shall have the power to borrow money

to borrow money upon the credit of the United States

Now the power of Congress to borrow money upon the credit of the United States means to borrow money upon the backs of individual Americans

Government doesn’t have any money

The only way that government gets money they don’t earn it they take it at the point of a gun with force or threat of force That’s what taxes are

Taxes are obligations

There’s a difference between an obligation at law and a debt

Debt that means contract

Because you live here the government says you got to pay

Have they followed the proper process that the common law gives us by means of the words of our Constitution

The power of Congress to borrow money on the credit of the United States

The borrower in this case Congress enslaves the individual American to the lender that is bankers

When the Congress borrows money Congress enslaves the individual American to the lender that means the banker

We’re talking about usury

Usury in Europe and in England was called for centuries the scourge of all mankind

The reason for that is because Jesus Christ cites usury is against the law

In the Old Testament even one percent usury is condemned is unlawful because of the law that was given in the first five books of the Bible condemns usury

What is usury? If you lend something it’s called lending The banks don’t lend money

To lend something means that you get it back

The banks when they lend money they don’t get it back It’s spent

It’s given to the person called the borrower who is not the borrower He didn’t borrow anything The Bible says that there are two things that are not to be given on interest

Food and money

Those two items are given for the purpose of being consumed

You either spend the money or eat the food

The Bible forbids the giving of food or money with a surcharge

It’s given to be consumed

Usury was against the law in America because it’s always been against common law

Jesus Christ himself affirms that usury is evil

The borrower is enslaved to the lender

That’s Proverbs chapter 22 verse 7

History speaks clear the same banker using debt will readily enslave nations at war with each other

Bankers will loan to both sides and keep the war going if they can

That’s what usury is It’s an evil craft

It’s a tool of warfare according to the Older Testament

Section 8 Clause 3

It says that Congress has the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several states and with the Indian tribes

This is the Commerce Clause Section 8 Clause 3

This is the clause that is said to grant more power to Congress than any clause in our Constitution

There is hardly anything that goes on in America under jurisdiction law of statutes of Congress that they don’t do it and claim jurisdiction to do it under this one little clause

15 words and Congress claims to be able to do anything they want to do under this clause

They say that there’s nothing that goes on in America that doesn’t affect commerce between the states

Government uses the commerce clause as a license to unlimited power instead of a bar on government power That’s the real intent of our Constitution is to bar government power not give license to government power

that turns the whole Constitution upside down

because when the courts refuse to limit Congress’ reach as the commerce clause requires

Law school nowadays teach that Congress has unlimited power in America to do whatever they want

The Framers however meant instead for this clause to empower Congress to keep the states from hampering free flow of goods and services and people to and from other countries to and from the Indian tribes to and from and between the states of the United States themselves

and any act of Congress beyond this is unconstitutional it is lawless

Caller bought Brent’s book “Militia of the Several States” and says that it’s a wonderful book.

He also plans of getting Brent’s book “The Declaration of 1776”

Caller agrees with John that it is knowledge that is needed across our population

Only through knowledge will we be able to achieve our ultimate goal

If you go to republickeepers.com you will find information about Texian Jural Society

The jural society is a body politic made up of We the People for the purpose of administering justice

Caller believes that everybody should know the Federalist Papers

Caller has obligations to the Texian Jural Society so he cannot be as involved in NLA because of his other commitment

NLA uploads the MP3s from the Monday Night Call

The only reason we are three hours long is to accommodate people on the West Coast

We start at 9:00 Eastern Time

A lot of the good stuff takes place at the beginning of our program

the first hour or two we try to focus on a specific subject matter

And then Brent comes on and does some teaching

That is the meat of what we are doing

Also is important is the Q & A time where people can ask questions and there’s an education there

If you want to pick up and catch up on the meetings if you can’t be here they are recorded and they’re up on the Monday Night page

Caller believes that things are moving in a positive manner

It’s because of people like Brent and John and groups like the one that the caller is in

We just need to keep hammering it

Hopefully we will come together We will be victorious

(2:10:40)

Jan re-read Question 2

(2:11:40)

This pertains to the state of New Hampshire and they’re requiring this fellow to pay unemployment tax He’s the sole owner and runs an S corp

I don’t meet the definition of employing unit under the requirements in their RSAs as all my services are performed outside of the state They then declared that I am an American employee under their RSAs uses United States in the definition

They’re misrepresenting their own RSAs and I’m trying to make the argument that I’m not an American employee because I do not reside in the United States

Also how can there be an employee when the definition

John inquired: Where does he reside?

He obviously resides in New Hampshire

He does reside in the United States

By reading what we read in Federalist Paper Number 39 It kind of answers that

We are both federal and national

There is a federal government and there is a national

National being part of your state

And collectively we are together It’s a very unique union that our Founding Fathers came up with

John told Jan to continue

Also how can there be an employee when the definition of employing unit is not met

Thus there being no business technically to be an employee for

He’s making the wrong argument

The argument should be I just don’t have any employees

If he’s a subchapter S means he can act in a certain fashion and get certain benefits

As long as he has less than a certain number of employees

Nevertheless if you’re taking money out of your company and you’re not paying yourself as an employee which you shouldn’t be and you’re the only one in it There is no employees

The unfortunate thing is that these people don’t want to hear it

Especially if you rub them the wrong way They get these vendettas

They’re going to come after you because you gave them a hard time

The servants have taken over the house That’s the problem

I have a lot of experience in this because one of the way I got involved in studying law not at the time but immediately after one problem dealing with unemployment and the other dealing with the IRS and eventually we started studying law because we needed to deal with the problem with the committeemen

But nevertheless it’s something that did build up and was a problem

I went through that process

I fought with these people tooth and nail

They are evil and ugly people and they don’t care about nothing

The more you push back the more angry they get

They want to put you in jail if they could

You can just let them know my corporation has no employees I’m the only individual at this point in time When I have some employees and I want to participate then I will give you a call

You got to do this in writing

If they ignore you and harass you then you got to lay out the law to them and what it is that they’re doing to you and how they’re injuring you There’s an eight point process called Notice and Demand You should be able to find it on our website

You can find it on Bill Thornton’s website

With writing the book and the course we will be covering Notice and Demand

You do Notice and Demand You do certified You do Notice and Demand in an affidavit form You want to sign it as a sworn affidavit

On the top you want to put whatever county you live in

ss sworn statement at the top

on the bottom you have the notary thing

A Notice and Demand must fulfill the points and must tell them what you’re going to do if they don’t obey

Before you do the Notice and Demand you want to get back and forth communications to see what their positions are what they’re thinking

You got to know what their position is so that you can defend yourself from whatever it is that they’re saying

And that’s when the Notice and Demand comes out if they continue you correct that

and they continue to harass you because they don’t accept the correction

Whenever you’re dealing with any government agency dealing with anything legal lawful

in any way shape or form anytime you’re dealing with the government you want to respond to them Do not not respond

In law you acquiesce when you don’t respond

They’re setting you up

They’re getting you to agree with them by acquiescing

(2:32:28)

CALLERS

Caller 1 James Georgia

A lot of the churches that I go to Romans Chapter 13 has three verses

Once they get to the obey authority part they stop there

Romans Chapter 13 deals with honoring authority

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.

Romans 13:4 For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.

**10**Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.