The Trials and Tribulations of Judith Kay Cormier
Chapter II

Some days I have more to do and think about than others. It's difficult to write with a chronological sequence to the multitude of abuses of powers that I endured and how I coped with them at the time. It's like having a jigsaw puzzle with 2,000 pieces whereby I can finally see the full picture only after having put it all together myself. I suspect that thousands of others are doing the same thing, trying to put the puzzle together, one piece at a time ... or looking for a shortcut by trying to gather up sections of the puzzle from others, and trusting that those *others* somehow have the whole picture that will give them an 'instant' fix or economic remedy for the losses already incurred. Reminds me of a gambler who keeps playing even when he knows that the 'house' has all the cards rigged so that odds are not in his favor. Goes to show that 'hope' dies hard, cause he plays anyway.

I really don't want to add to the half-ass information that is already out there. That's the reason why I kept my correspondence to the abusers private and didn't publish them on the net or elsewhere. All that happened to me was "speech" related rather than "tax" related or any other "cause" that might give rise to *legal* claims for processing.

Every one has his or her own "word filter". We all interpret words in accordance with what they mean to us when filtered through what we think we know at the time. What they mean often changes as we receive supplemental information. That's why it's absolutely impossible to avoid a contradiction in what we say today with what we might have said at a different time and in different circumstances. That's why targeted victims are so easily framed for criminal "false statements" charges. It's also impossible for any man or woman – even those with membership in a State bar association – to accurately present to any jury the contents of the mind of the one accused of some offense premised solely upon circumstantial (made up to meet the present-day circumstances) 'evidence'. "Mind rape" is the essential component of representation because the speaker can only empty the contents of his own mind out of his mouth – and to attach those words to another living being for the sake of argument within the 'rules of practice' has no rational justification.

A district judge is obliged to 'warn' a lawyer or a party before he can justify a 'contempt of court' charge. The Federal U.S. District Judge, Robert J. Jonker did just that when he told me that if I opened my mouth in front of the jury I would be removed from the courtroom. Imagine that. Taking a 'Senior Citizen" to the Federal courthouse in shackles and chains for an unwanted 'jury' trial and then threatening her with removal if she spoke in front of the jury. Come to think of it, no one asked if the alleged 'defendant' wanted to testify either.

When Judge Jonker asked if I understood that (warning) I didn't bother to open my mouth to answer him either. So, he took it as if I understood; silence can be taken as an agreement in that hostile arena. I had no intentions of participating in any criminal trial anyway. I was just an observer, a witness as to just how low the actors could go without sliding across the floor like a serpent. Some came closer than others. The speaker always reveals his own focus, I think.

I know that 'oral intercourse' is synonymous with "spoken communication" between two people. I nearly choked when Donald Davis read a letter I wrote to him about the "writings" he had referred to as oral statements in his pretrial documents to the jury. He actually added his own statement that my letter to him had "sexual implications". In his dreams, maybe! But it sure indicated his own impotent abilities to communicate without his mind being in the gutter. Thus, some actors slithered around like a snake better than others. Donald Davis has had more practice than others in doing just that, I think.

So, today, I'm thinking more about the "freedom of speech" and the inherent right to "communicate" with one's own thoughts within one's own community. There was a time when the plantation owners would severely punish a slave for learning to read and write. And there was a purpose behind that punishment. The object seems to have been to prevent the slaves from communicating beyond the immediate locality and thus to learn that not all situations and circumstances were the same – as much depended upon the character of the "master" and his style of controlling the 'workplace'.

Many years ago, I watched a televised speech that Justice Clarence Thomas was giving before a live audience. When he tried to share what it was like to be before a committee that would determine whether he was qualified for the appointment to the United States Supreme Court, he choked up and couldn't continue. And, then he apologized to his audience because he thought he could talk about those 'hearings' and even though it was many years later, he still couldn't do it. Justice Thomas faced an accusatory committee that brought up claims that went right to the core of the man and his relationship with a woman who had accused him of making improper advances on her – at best. Perhaps only someone who has had his integrity and character verbally assaulted can understand the emotional pain that results – even when its only a lingering memory. How any man or group of men can be proud of doing that to someone as part of a 'job interview' is beyond me. Yet, that's what "litigation" is all about as well.

I know of some prisoners who, like me, believe that its right to value people and use things, and wrong to value things and abuse people to acquire them. Unfortunately, the criminal segment of the brotherhood of the bar and bench don't seem to see it that way. I remember reading a CJLF document captioned "Prisoners do not have a First Amendment Right to Provide Legal Assistance to Other Inmates." What really impacted me at the time was a quote from NAACP v Button (1963) claiming that the NAACP wasn't infringing upon the rights of the exclusive legal artisan's society because "*litigation is not a technique of resolving private differences, it is a means for achieving ... equality of treatment by all government, federal, state, and local, for the members of the Negro community in this 'country'*" It reminded me that "equality" under the Dred Scott decision probably wasn't something I'd want for myself or any one else. But the quote went even further than identifying the character of "litigation" as a "technique" that didn't reach to resolve private differences. It further said that "*it is thus a form of political expression" for groups that find themselves unable to achieve their objectives through the ballot and frequently turn to the courts".* The lawyers who wrote that article surely knew that *Federal* civil rights didn't include political or religious "rights".

The article went on to say that the First Amendment doctrine is 'unnecessary' in the prison context because prisoners already have a right of access to the courts. They didn't have the right of association as commonly understood in the collective bargaining of union members, though. (Those prison labor camps aren't designed for competitive wages or work conditions disagreements). I can't help but see the advantage that those with exclusive 'litigation' rights would have in a complete overthrow of the State Constitutions and the laws made in accord with them if they could silence all forms of political expression contrary to those objectives.

The tool of 'pretrial detention' – often for more than a year – not only gives the co-operative *county* correctional facilities the opportunity to filter all the written incoming and outgoing 'speech' but the tool of 'segregation' also prevents any exchange of verbal 'speech' with those who are not a staff member. Some institutions enforce this 'rule' more than others.

Being locked up for months in solitary confinement at FMC Carswell and threatened on a regular basis with involuntary treatment with mind-altering drugs goes beyond 'prior restraint' for whatever written speech the prosecutor, Donald A. Davis, ("USA" Plaintiff) didn't like. That sure struck me as a technique he was using and abusing for resolving our private political and religious differences of opinion. What a waste of governmental and judicial resources. When a test of one's "faith" becomes a "test" of one's endurance of psychological abuses and physical deprivations, the one who orders and conducts the evaluation or 'assessment' borders on sociopathic conduct not the one who's being so mistreated. Anyway, that's how I see it. And, I'm the only expert on my own viewpoint and my own experiences.

Words can be intentionally deceiving or they can be intentionally encouraging. Only the speaker can know the intent of his own words. Grownups are not required to put blind faith in any man or woman who has not earned that trust. And, yet, in the open market place buyers and consumers of the services of others do so every day. Only on the field of "litigation" do they get imprisoned for their having done so. Speech can be a weapon that traumatizes when the targeted person to be charged in a commercial transaction has been made "subject to" the added force of armed assault and battery to obtain the necessary consumers of litigation services. It is especially so if one has the belief that those legal services are intended to *protect* the 'presumed innocent' and the service provider intends to exploit the target's English language weaknesses to his own commercial advantages. Freedom isn't 'free' my friends. It comes with the high cost of penal servitude after the contest is over. The concept of "I serve that you may serve" meets the challenges of the Federal corporate *insider traders* quite well.

So many of us put our faith in the protections and immunities embodied in the First Amendment. We just don't know that 'truth' as we know it can be intentionally distorted with half-truths and omissions in every BAR-gaining transaction. I can't begin to tell you how fortunate I was that I had developed the habit of looking up words to see how they might be used in the lawyer's arenas. For example, I knew that "legal" and "lawful" were not necessarily synonymous. I had looked up the word "lawful" in Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Ed. (1991) and knew that "legal" was not only constructive but it was also the opposite of

"equitable". So, I wasn't misled by the false belief that the trial courts had anything whatsoever to do with fair play. I grew up just blocks away from the U.P. State Fairgrounds and I knew that "fair" was a place where the prize animals were auctioned off and sent to the slaughter houses. Thus, watching the sideshow that the trials against me were, I was not traumatized by false expectations of legal protections or fairness in the transaction even as I was shocked by the inhumanity of the actors who would do such on a regular basis to those with even less knowledge than I had.

The trial 'evidence' consisted of letters I had written – and the fact that I had the good sense to bill for my 'time served' in the processing at a prevailing rate. Looking back on that trial of the little straw doll that I had sent to Donnie Dearie as the prize for his title-object jurisdictional rites has it comic aspects. I had previously determined that the "trial" was nothing more than a fund-raising theatrical event for the purpose of raising 'defense bonds' in the Bush campaign for a 'faith-based government' to go with the Federal 'faith-based" currency. In that event, and others of a criminal character, words are weapons aimed at the targeted 'defendant's' from both the offense and defense sides of the constructive arguments.

The First Amendment to the Constitution for the union of sovereign States was, for example, directed at Congress. "Congress shall make no law ..." is the opening phrase that doesn't have any application in the Federal 'common law' courts . It was beyond interesting to sit and listen to U.S. District Court Judge Jonker read his "jury instructions" to the jurors that convicted the tangible doll of actual 'straw' of a 'conspiracy'. Sometimes, it was really difficult not to see that there are two faces to the symbol of a theatrical stage. One depicting tragedy and the other comedy. For those that don't know that the 'trial' is a staged event and also an 'experiment' the tragic consequences attach like a cancer that is both painful and often fatal.

It was also interesting to see that Judge Jonker's jury instructions generally referred to "the defendant" but referred to "Ms. Cormier" when claiming the powers of Congress and handing them over to his jurors. I say "his jurors" because those who were to determine my fate were under a direct oath to him to accept his instructions and the alleged 'law' as he presented it to them. Because his "speech" is so illustrative of how the transformation of the function of an independent jury of one's peers to that of a subservient servant of the director of the staged event can be effected, I'm going to share the jury instruction with the title:

8.02 Experiments, Research, and Investigation

> "Remember that you must make your decision based only on the evidence that you saw and heard here in court. Do not try to gather any information about the case on your own while you are deliberating.
>
> "For example, do not conduct any experiments inside or outside the jury room; do not bring any books, *like a dictionary*, or anything else with you to help you with your deliberations; do not conduct any independent reasearch, reading, or investigation about the case; and do not visit any of the places that were mentioned during the trial.

"Make your decision based only on the evidence that you saw and heard here in court."

That's like telling the judges of the live stock to put blinders on when determining the condition of the animal that is to be awarded the blue ribbon at the fair. At the same time, the title of that section indicates the nature of the trial as being tied to both experiments and research in a covert investigation into the matter (thing of substance) at hand. As I heard those instructions, I thought: "Atta boy, judge. Put blinders on that horse cause it's a lot easier to drive the team where you want it to go when it isn't distracted by more favorable options. What a psychological insult to the jurors that whole 'experiment' was. I've heard the comment that a good prosecutor could get a jury to convict a ham sandwich. I don't know if that's ever been *tried*, but I do know that when the prosecutor and the defense attorney join forces with the judge, it isn't any problem to get a jury to convict a little doll of straw sitting on a block of wood with the title JUDITH KAY CORMIER and a price tag of 100,000 dollars on it. Donnie Dearie plays in the market where 'delivery and acceptance' constitutes the 'deal' but I have yet to receive the 100 grand for the "prize" presented to the jurors by his IRS 'witness'. He employed it at all stages and didn't return it either.

Sometimes I get a little sidetracked on what I want to convey to those with the patience to read what I write. Forgive me. Lest Judge Jonker be unduly implicated with respect to his "speech" to the jurors, it is only fair that I include what appears to be the only instruction that employed the title "Ms. Cormier" (which also did not include a code number for reference purposes). This instruction to the jurors was captioned "First Amendment". As you read this instruction, bear in mind that there cannot be a 'conspiracy' of any kind that doesn't engage the mind of the person to be charged under that term of art. Bear in mind also that an "it" may be comprised of several persons of a like-mind but an individual indicates just one. Also, the word '*lawless*' would indicate that one might be construed to be in 'outlawry' – outside of any body of laws whatsoever. The employment of that term of art to any individual who is also a Citizen of a sovereign State just doesn't attach by mere construction of the instructions.

Another example is that the word "illegal" denotes some thing outside of the the legal artisan's formal construction and may also indicate a deed or act that is expressly prohibited by a statute, such as when used to describe an "illegal combatant" in a trial court contest. Also keep in mind that the phrase "*the government*" that drafted the "criminal justice standards' was the American Bar Association, which has its own "house of delegates" that approved those drafts. It is a *government* "in" but not "of" the United States.

Bear in mind that one of the ways I cope with unbearable emotional trauma is to jump into my head and out of my heart where my empathy lives. I could not write this at all if I allowed myself to relive the terror that I felt when I was so powerless to control my own fate. So, if this story sounds analytical and devoid of feeling it is only because of that coping mechanism learned to survive what life has dished out. I believe that tears are a prayer that God alone can hear and respond to. I also believe that he listens through the ears of those who would not sell their soul to the devil's advocates. This story is for the courageous few and these are the instructions given by the minister / director of the second "trial" of my faith.

First Amendment

"In this case, part of *the government's* proofs against Ms Cormier includes statements that *it* says she made advocating her point of view and advising others with respect to the demands *the government* was making on them. Whenever a [C]itizen speaks freely, expresses points of view about *the government,* or even argues for action that violates *government* policies, the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and the right to petition *the government* come into play. The First Amendment protects speech that induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with existing conditions, or even stirs people to anger and violence. Although the freedom of speech is not absolute, it is protected against censorship or punishment unless shown likely to produce a clear and present danger that rises above mere public inconvenience, annoyance, or unrest."

"This means that in considering whether *the government* has carried its burden of proving each element of the conspiracy crime charged against Mr. Cormier the only speech of hers that you may consider and weigh against her is speech that you find was both (1) directed to inciting imminent *lawless* acts; and (2) likely to incite or produce such *lawless* acts."

"Speech is directed to inciting an imminent *lawless* act when the *speaker* intends to cause others to commit the advocated act. It is not enough that a *speaker's* words have the unintended consequences of inspiring others to commit an *illegal* or dangerous act. In other words, the act must have been a specifically intended consequence of the speech."

"Imminence" is a function of time. It refers to an act that is ready to take place, threatens to happen momentarily, is about to happen, or is at the point of happening. An act is imminent when it will befall before there is opportunity for full discussion and reasoned consideration. An imminent act is one that so threatens the purposes of the law that an immediate check is required to stop it from occurring. An act is not imminent merely because it is certain to be committed at some indefinite future time."

"Speech is likely to incite *lawless* action only when there is a strong, direct connection between the speech and the action. There must be more than a mere tendency of the speech to lead to a foreseeable *lawless* act, and speech with only a remote connection to others' thoughts or impulses cannot be said to be likely to incite an imminent *lawless* act."

"So when you decide whether *the government* has met its burden of proving each element of the conspiracy crime charged against Ms. Cormier, you may not use any speech by Ms. Cormier that you find is protected by the First Amendment under the instruction I have just given you. You may, of course, use any speech that you find is not protected by the First Amendment under this instruction.

Every time I review a document, it seems that information gained during the interim period between one review and another shines a new light on it. I heard those instructions during the trauma of the 'trial' itself. The first time I had access to them in their written form was about a month before the final 'sentence' was handed down by Judge Jonker on May 29th, 2008. The public trial of the little straw doll ran from January 29, to February 2nd or 3rd. T

The first time I read this instruction, I didn't see anything good in it. It was just all a charade that justified another 'holding' period while the legal actor's tried to figure out a new way to ensnare me into their "criminal" case – or torture my mind and spirit until I gave in to whatever would justify the records developed by those whose function it was to produce (manufacture) them.

What I saw over a year ago, was that Judge Jonker was instructing the juror's to make a determination as to the application of the First Amendment by 'the government'. Since the First Amendment is directed towards Congress alone, only the Supreme Court for the United States has the authority to rule on any matter connected to that First Amendment. I was angry because what speech is or is not protected by the First Amendment is not determined by a district court judge and his indoctrinated and incorporated jury. The usurpation of Supreme Court powers seemed to me to be an act of "contempt" for that authority over the Federal court systems. I was also focusing on Brandenburg v Ohio, 395 U.S. 447 (1969) and Rumsfeld v FAIR , 126 S.Ct. @1309 which seemed to be so very relevant to "speech" during a trial.

But, now I see what a mistake it was to focus on such when I was still feeling 'defensive' even though I realized that I couldn't defend where there is no defense allowed. Now I see, among other things, the repetition of the phrase "the government" in connection with the phrase "First Amendment" was more to mislead the jurors. When an American hears the words "the government" in relation to "First Amendment" their natural inclination is to connect the two with the government for the Union of States, the U.S. government. At first glance – *and* first analysis, I did the same thing.

But, now that some of the wounds have began to heal, I am more able to see the thing from a healthier perspective. I hold to the principle that 'if I didn't create something or buy it with lawful coinage (money), "IT" ain't mine!" That attitude caused a lot of problems for those that took me by force and violence to promote their criminal litigation projects.

This 'jury instruction' is actually a gift that will keep on giving. The use of the phrases "her .. speech", "speech of hers that you may consider" in connection with "Ms. Cormier" in the second paragraph really destroys the verdict of the jury because I said not a "peep" in front of the jury after having been warned that if I did I would be removed from the courtroom. The jury simply had no speech of her's to consider. The phrase "the speaker intends.." and "a speaker's words..." in the third paragraph make it plain that the 'speaker' owns the 'speech' that comes from his own mouth. How's that for food for thought until next week? I will have more to say on these instructions and the 'lawless' acts of those co-operative attorneys who were the actual "speakers" both at trial and elsewhere.

The trials and tribulations of Judith Kay Cormier
Chapter III

I can't begin to tell you of the shock I felt when first taken in shackles and chains from the Ford Federal Building in Grand Rapids, Michigan, to the Newaygo County Jail on April 7, 2003. There I was, sixty two years old, without so much as a parking ticket, in *JAIL.* All it took was an aggressive United States Attorney ("USA") with the power to command the assistance of the United States Marshals and cover up his own culpability with a co-operative IRS "informant". *Unbeliveable!* At least to me it was at one time.

The misuse of the pronoun 'your' in initiating those staged arguments called "litigation" ran throughout the criminal justice actions that provided the foundation for the assaults upon my character and my physical being. I have always held that if I didn't create whatever "it" was, and I didn't buy it no one else can make it mine if I don't accept it. Therefore, the phrase "*your* case" or "*your* lawyer" doesn't attach to this old body. There isn't enough wallpaper paste or Elmer's glue that can stick some of the prosecutor's or pretense-defense attorney's own lie-abilities' on me.

That same concept goes for legal labels, too. There's no way in H.... that I would *defend* that which I know to be wrongful and even evil in its applications. That's exactly what the concept of "vicarious liabilities" is all about. It's the imposition of blame and shame – and costly litigation - on the "presumed innocent" and it's a favorite tool in the lawyer's arsenal of legal weaponry. There is but one thing for certain in the fields of litigation. The user of the rights and receiver of the benefits always pays one way or another. Freedom isn't free. It takes a lot of attention and work to know what to do when under assault by sophisticated legal artisans seeking rewards for their crafty designs.

That means that at sixty-eight years old, I have not applied for a "social" security benefit or for "insurance" benefits without the written policy in hand. Yes, my *faith* was on "trial" and "tested" daily. But, you see, I've known for some time now that "love" and "faith" are not for sale. I have been so blessed. My 'social' security is in the community of loving friends that I have had over the years. Love is a gift. It isn't something we 'get' or manipulate someone out of. Love is something we 'do'. I am so grateful to have had the gift of 'love' along this journey we call life. It's time I give back my own story and my own 'argument' for change and recognition of our own government(s).

And that simple analysis brings me back to the subject of the "freedom of speech" that so many Americans have taken for granted (as if by *grant* from some superior force) instead of rightfully asserting as a gift from the Creator of this earth and all of its living and changing life forms. Isn't it strange that written words would have life everlasting while mankind has no such guarantee on this earth? "Should" we then be bound by words on paper while turning our backs upon and discounting the gifts of the Creator of all mankind and other living things?

It is a scientific fact that all life must change or it dies!! That goes for a plant, for an animal, and for a man or woman with a mind to think and a voice to speak his or her changing

thoughts and perceptions without punishment for having done so.

The First Amendment to the Constitution for the Union of States (U.S.) operates on the Congress of the United States and no other legislative body of law makers. Congress does not control the State legislators or supplant them.

The First Amendment to the contract for the Union of States (U.S.) with respect to 'beliefs' plainly says:

> "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...".

With respect to the freedom of speech or of the press, it plainly says:

> Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press...".

As used in the First Amendment, "abridgment" means neither adding or subtracting from what the speaker or the press intended to communicate. Lawyer's would like to restrain such speech by labeling it the "unauthorized practice of law" and have managed to get their brethren in the law-making branch of our governments to pass enabling statutes to back that "viewpoint" up. The First Amendment does not prohibit lawyers or any other creative group of individuals from acting as an "it" with a legal mask (persona) from applying their own 'group psychology or political and moral philosophy (also known as "criminal law") from doing just that.

In fact, we all do just that every day. We sift and sort through the words of another and attempt to attach a meaning that we can relate our own experiences to. Without a shared understanding there can be no reliable 'communication' between persons who have not been reduced to the status of living 'things'. To my mind, there is nothing more degrading than to be made 'subject to" to another's definition of who or what one is or believes. Yet, prosecutors in today's courts of "concurrent jurisdiction" claim the privilege of doing just that. Character assassination, putting an individual in a "false light" before the public "trial" is another weapon that is rampant in the staged events of this current 'information age'.

It took years for me to shed the *characterization* applied to me in my childhood. Today, I ask myself whether the label of "stubborn" or "stupid" or other degrading identifiers fits my own reality. Yes, I can be persistent in standing up for what I believe but at the same time I know I am open to seeing another's viewpoint and learning without abandoning my inherent 'self' in favor of that other's opinion. I know that there are lawyer's that are bound by oaths and obligations that conflict with his or her own conscience and that is a choice that each one must also make for him or her 'self' as well.

It is said in 12-Step Recovery Programs that "we are as sick as our secrets". I tend to think that 'secrets' are merely the mask for that which we don't want others to see and that always brings up more questions. Why? What *exactly* is it that should be kept from the view

of others? What's behind the "secret"? Why is it important that others should not know of it?

I struggle every day to communicate what I am learning that might be beneficial to others. But my words are still open to interpretation by the receivers of my speech or writings. Nonetheless, I cannot be compelled to play host to the speech of an attorney who will choose a defense strategy that serves his own purposes and provides for his own commercial advantages. Nor can I be compelled to 'practice' any art or craft that expressly prohibits me from engaging in for my own benefit.

Labeling me "stubborn" or claiming that I speak "gibberish" may insult my intelligence and my integrity, but it is still only a verbal assault, an offense in an adversarial, hostile, combative field, at best. Today, I don't wear the shame or blame that doesn't belong to me. Today, I take silent notice of the fact that I am not responsible – not able to respond in an intelligent, non-assaultive manner to every 'opinion' that is directed to me.... or at me. Delivery and acceptance does not constitute the contract that I have no "responsibility" for in its formation or performance as a matter of 'statutory' law.

Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Ed. (1991) p. gives a term (a label) for just such a situation. "Illegal contract." It leads to an "illegal combatant" in a private 'common law' forum.

Some years ago, I was reading a transcript of the prosecution of a man of the Jewish faith. Magistrate Hugh W. Brenneman, Jr. was acting as "The Court" on that particular day. I have observed that particular man in action a few times. I think we all judge the judges at times and I was no different in that respect. I considered 'Judge' Brenneman to be a man of style and skill without being unnecessarily abusive or verbally demeaning to achieve the objects of the scripted 'arraignment'. That day, according to the transcript alone, "The Court" said three things that really caught my attention. This is what the statements were:

(1) "This is the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, which means it is a *Federal* court;

(2) "I'm not asking if you agree with the charges or not agree with the charges, but do you understand the *nature* of the charges?" [and directed to the named non-attorney 'defendant']

(3) "Mr. Konicov, if you don't know who you are, I'm afraid I can't explain it to you I'm not gong to get into an argument of *semantics* with you."

I have emphasized and underlined the key words to *any* meaningful comprehension of what was actually going on in that place and at that stage of the process. The first statement required the receiver of that communication to know that the reach of the Federal government is universal in its ecclesiastical and British corporate character. The Federal government trades commercially as a business and as a corporate entity worldwide. It is not the government of the Union of States as we commonly understand such to be. As I see it, the Federal court system is not 'of the' United States. It is merely 'in' every State of the Union, just as the Catholic Church is. The Federal Judges know that what they refer to as "the government" was created not by Article III of the Constitution for the United States but by the

Judiciary Act of 1789 and is a collateral entity within the direct supervisory reach of the Supreme Court.

I remember reading a U.S. Supreme Court decision captioned "United States v United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan". Huh? (If you want a good read about invasion of privacy and the powers of surveillance to be used against the Citizens of the sovereign States (in union contract) take the time to read that one.) At the time, my attention was shocked with the internal questions. 'How can the United States sue its own court?". Why would the United States *want* to sue itself? Isn't a "United States District Court a United States Court?" After years of diligent effort and research I have found my answers to those questions.

If you want to know something, you must either venture on that intellectual journey for yourself or ask someone who has 'been there and done that' and remember that such a one can still only give you his 'opinion' or 'viewpoint' which you must still consider within the context of the one who speaks of it. Otherwise you get to guess, which is all we can do when FEAR (Future Events Appear Real) governs our travels.

The second Brenneman statement was a direct question that might have prompted a return question. "Is this a criminal case?" An affirmative answer might have ended the 'test' of Barrie Konicov's morals. It also would have taken the 'courage' of one's own convictions (beliefs) to answer intelligently. Upon being told it was a *criminal* case, I might have answered: "I try to be an honest individual and because of that, as a matter of good conscience, I must refuse to participate in this *criminal* action."

In the English language, the adjective modifies the noun and the adverb modifies (changes) the verb. In legal-land words are often construction jobs. Such as "criminal" being the shorthand version of "crime-in-all" It would take more than the attachment of the word "law" to get me to join or defend any constructive fraud. Judge Brenneman fully disclosed it was a Federal court and asked if the participant understood the *nature* of the *charges*. He did not ask if he understood the nature of the accusation. "Charges" are an accounting term; usually attached to goods or services being sold to a *willing* buyer by a *willing* seller. "Charges" are also a military term for an offense – usually with intent to destroy something or harm some one. There's no way that Konicov could have understood that broad question because it was taken out of context.

And then he truthfully told the individual before him that he wasn't going to get into an argument about *semantics* with him. I'll admit I had to look up the word 'semantics' and I didn't find it in Black's Law Dictionary or Ballentine's Law Dictionary; but I found it in a 'lay' dictionary. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2004) defines "semantics" as "*the study of meanings in language*". If there is no shared meaning to the words there can be no meeting of the minds in any language. I'd be inclined to say that is the root of the toxic tree that is spreading its seeds of mass destruction throughout this land of the 'free' and home of the 'brave'. Freedom isn't free nor can it be taken for granted.

The most important statement directed to "Defendant Konicov" was the simple fact that if he didn't know who he was the masquerading "Court" couldn't tell him. I think that's because only the individual man can define who he is in relation to *any* society.

I know that the lawyer's target (person sought to be charged) was born in one of the sovereign States of the Union. I don't know which one. I know that Congress was neutered as to its power over religion, speech, and the press. I know that as a birthright Citizen of the sovereign territorial Republic/State of Michigan, I do not have to look to Congress to protect my civil liberties. I have a right and an obligation to look to my own "Government" first to do that.

The Constitution for the territory of Michigan was formed in 1835 before Michigan applied for a share in the Federal Councils by joining the union of States for the purpose of doing business with Great Britain and other European Countries. I have a right to claim the Michigan "bill of rights" expressed in the Constitution I rely upon.

That constitution's Bill of Rights plainly says in Article I

> (3) No man or set of men are entitled to exclusive or separate privileges.
>
> (6) The civil and religious rights, privileges and capacities of no individual shall be diminished *or enlarged* on account of his opinions or belief concerning matters of religion.
>
> (7) Every person may freely speak, write, and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right; and no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech or of the press. In all prosecutions or indictments for libels, the truth may be given in evidence to the jury; and if it shall appear to the jury that the matter charged as libelous is true, and was published with good motives and for justifiable ends, the party shall be acquitted, and the jury shall have the right to determine the law and the fact.

I wasn't taken from my apartment by force and hauled away in handcuffs for all the world to see because I had made any public speeches. I was abducted on April 7, 2003, in execution of what could only be called a "citizen's arrest" by the very man who had me held in a Federal lockup during the time he had scheduled a "show cause' hearing. Supposedly, I was abducted because I didn't voluntarily go before a Federal grand jury to testify about a "possible violation of a Federal criminal law." I was held in civil 'contempt of court' without ever seeing a judge or magistrate or the so-called Grand Jury for over 130 days. The 'show cause" stage was held while I was in custody in the very building that the alleged hearing was held. That non-appearance eventually added a second "contempt" count as an excuse for another six months incarceration.

I know that the assaults upon my integrity and the threats to send me off for "treatment" with mind-altering drugs were intentionally inflicted and terrorizing. I know that my own 'script' didn't fit the pattern that was called for in a Federal grand jury investigation. I know I dared to

refuse to contribute to the lie-ability behind the so-called 'investigation'. I know how much courage it took to accept the possibility that I was no better than the little nut that stood its ground to become the mighty oak tree.

There is another wonder of nature that reminds me of the power of faith in the Creator of this universe. When I was a child, I was fascinated with the caterpillar that I found in my grandfather's garden and the story about how it must die before it could be marvelously free. Sure enough, the creepy crawlers would build a cocoon and shut out the world as it knew it. Before long, out came a magical butterfly with freedom that the crawling horny little worm would never know.

I know people like that too. Such are so busy with 'appearances' that it seems there is no real "self" to relate to. And if a "USA" prosecutor wants to act like a horny little worm, he may certainly choose to do so. Some wounded frightened souls even allow others to refer to him or her as "The Court" or "Your Honor" or whatever elevates their *social* status above the men and women to be 'arraigned' or 'judged' in accordance with whatever ritual might be deemed to be 'due process' in that hostile arena. Litigation is civil 'warfare'.

So, when such "its" or artificial "persons" want to sell you a work of art (a designated "Advice of Rights" form) with the forged (printed) "X ______________________________" seeking the *signature* that assigns the lie-abilities that will subsequently come with the question "Do you understand the charges?" perhaps it would do you well to tell the one looking for the "Defendant's" signature (to back up the signature "X" from the "it or artificial "person" that is unable to read or write his own name) that the document appears to have been signed already.

Perhaps, when the question comes you might want to reply: "Of course not. I haven't seen the books and records and couldn't possibly understand the charges. You wouldn't be hiding anything from me, would you judge?"

A mindless "it" has no liberty of conscience, no religious liberty, and no liberty of speech where the object of the "trial" is to mislead or mute the 'person sought to be charged' to the benefit of the regularly licensed litigators seeking to add their own "vice" to the unwary "presumed innocent". And when the con's test seems somehow 'wrong' in both spirit and substance, remember that administrative law judges consider *abandoned* 'property' to be "fair game" for *conversion* purposes.

I refused to play or to 'book in' for an event on the private racket court of a private fraternal organization. I was held hostage to the private commercial interests of a private organization that eventually exposed itself as "USA Plaintiff" - United States Attorneys, period.

Next week, I will share some of what I experienced on that that forced journey in Federal legal-land. All of it came with a lesson that "faith and credit" need not be attached without cause at the crossroads between the Sixth and Seventh Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.