"Christian-Israelite Common-Law Court of Justice for the People of Oregon".
(Articles of Incorporation Filed with Secretary of State; RN: 76-7130-84; 27-9-2000)
Co: Chief Justice of the Peace: Charles Bruce, Stewart;
39275 Hood St., # D; Sandy Oregon [97055]; 503-668-3932.
EMail: <Charles@christiancommonlaw-gov.org>
January 30, 2001

To: Judge Wallace Carson; Chief Administrative Head of the Judicial Department of Civil-Government for Oregon.
Delivered by: Fax Transmition, to Judge Carson;'s Office, at the Supreme Court Building in Salem.

Judge Carson.

Thank you for returning our call earlier this month. There-in you stated that it would be best for us to contact you near the end of the month here. You further asked for an Outline of the "Issues we would like to Address". Please consider this Letter/Fax to be your requested "Outline" of the "Issues we would like to Address".

Again we want you to know we appreciate your rare & precious candor. You seem to us to be a rare "Peace-Maker" who seems to be surrounded others of seriously less functionality of "Conscience". Though here-in we take you to task for what appears to us on the surface to be almost impossibly Abysmal Ignorance, we need to emphatically re-affirm that our criticism of the manners in which you are construing "Over-Arching" Constitutional-Law, is not "Adversarially" designed. We merely seek to effectively communicate the Anguish which is being Suffered among the Populace as a direct result of the cold & mechanical implementation of the "Malum Prohibitum" polices which you over-see. We have become aware of the difference between "Adversarial" Process & "Inquisitorial" Process, & here-by we seek to Respectfully "Inquire" from you of the things outlined here-in, so that we may get a clear picture of the Nature of the Spiritual-Battle which we confront.

Perhaps it is good here to address a few "Issues" which are very general in nature, & upon which all of the other Issues seem to find important foundational positioning. We find much to be expanded upon from the Transcript of our last meeting,. We find that there-in you nicely suggested a Focus for upcoming meetings, as follows:

WC: I suspect that this will break-down into ... into Procedural Aspects; and then Over-Arching Law Aspects.

This to us seems to be the first task at our hands. By your experience as the Chief Justice of Oregon's Supreme Court, you are probably fully aware that the nature of the authority which our spokes-people here before you are exercising, rather Simple. Our role in these "Procedural Aspects; and then Over-Arching Law Aspects", is probably presently of very little mystery to you.

Piercing the Veil:

However, Your presence with us in these meetings is Not so "Simple", for us to comprehend. Your Powers, Authorities, & Duties Remain Clouded in Mystery to us. And as we gently & respectfully attempt to "Inquire" & "Lift the Veil" concerning these Mysteries, you have frequently raised the Caveat that the Issues we are touching upon could become portions of a case before your court. There-under you argue that you are bound by your Code of Ethics to Refrain from Commenting there-on. We find this to be A Most Important "Procedural Aspect" Issue, for we find it being used Epidemically among All "Civil Servants" to Obstruct & Limit our ability to Inquire & Discover whether said "Civil Servants" are committing Treason to the State & Federal Constitutions. This is an especially serious problem when communicating with Civil Servants who hold them-selves to be Constitutionally-Lawful Franchisees of the Judicial Department. In such situations, Every Other Matter then before us is there-by greatly Obstructed at all turns. We view this effectively to be an "Obstruction of Justice" itself. The source of this problem seems to be a selective interpretation of Cannon 3 (6) of Oregon's Code of Judicial Conduct. It reads:

"A judge should abstain from commenting about a pending or impending proceeding in any court, and should require similar abstention on the part of court personnel subject to his direction and control. This subsection does not prohibit judges from making public statements in the course of their official duties or from explaining the procedures of the court."

This seems to be the "Basis in Law" for these concerns of yourself & others over discussing issues which could possibly come before your court. It seems to us that the Intent behind this Rule is to prevent Prejudice to

"Private" Parties. That would be applicable in Civil Procedure, which is concerned with merely "Private Law". It would Not be Applicable when concerns over "Public" & "Criminal" Activities, as is the case presently.

In further effort to counter this tendency among the Civil Servants in the Judicial realm to Justify this tendency towards Secrecy, it seems to us that the following Statutes all seem to address the Failure of such as "Public Servants" who Fail to do an "Official Duty". They read as follows:

ORS 162.325 Hindering prosecution.

(1) A person commits the crime of hindering prosecution if, with intent to hinder the apprehension, prosecution, conviction or punishment of a person who has committed a crime punishable as a felony, or with the intent to assist a person who has committed a crime punishable as a felony in profiting or benefiting from the commission of the crime, the person:

(a) Harbors or conceals such person; or (b) Warns such person of impending discovery or apprehension; or

(c) Provides or aids in providing such person with money, transportation, weapon, disguise or other means of avoiding discovery or apprehension; or

(d) Prevents or obstructs, by means of force, intimidation or deception, anyone from performing an act which might aid in the discovery or apprehension of such person; or

(e) Suppresses by any act of concealment, alteration or destruction physical evidence which might aid in the discovery or apprehension of such person; or (f) Aids such person in securing or protecting the proceeds of the crime.

(2) Hindering prosecution is a Class C felony.

162.415: Official misconduct in the first degree.

(1) A public servant commits the crime of official misconduct in the first degree if with intent to obtain a benefit or to harm another:

(a) The public servant knowingly fails to perform a duty imposed upon the public servant by law or one clearly inherent in the nature of office; or

(b) The public servant knowingly performs an act constituting an unauthorized exercise in official duties.

(2) Official misconduct in the first degree is a Class A misdemeanor.

163.275 Coercion.

(1) A person commits the crime of coercion when the person compels or induces another person to engage in conduct from which the other person has a legal right to abstain, or to abstain from engaging in conduct in which the other person has a legal right to engage, by means of instilling in the other person a fear that, if the other person refrains from the conduct compelled or induced or engages in conduct contrary to the compulsion or inducement, the actor or another will: * * *

(f) Testify falsely or provide false information or withhold testimony or information with respect to another's legal claim or defense; or

(g) Unlawfully use or abuse the person's position as a public servant by performing some act within or related to official duties, or by failing or refusing to perform an official duty, in such manner as to affect some person adversely. (2) Coercion is a Class C felony.

164.075 Theft by extortion.

(1) A person commits theft by extortion when the person compels or induces another to deliver property to the person or to a third person by instilling in the other a fear that, if the property is not so delivered, the actor or a third person will in the future: * * *

(g) Testify or provide information or withhold testimony or information with respect to another's legal claim or defense; or

(h) Use or abuse the position as a public servant by performing some act within or related to official duties, or by failing or refusing to perform an official duty, in such manner as to affect some person adversely; * * *

(2) Theft by extortion is a Class B felony.

164.085 Theft by deception.

(1) A person, who obtains property of another thereby, commits theft by deception when, with intent to defraud, the person:

(a) Creates or confirms another's false impression of law, value, intention or other state of mind which the actor does not believe to be true; * * * .

These Statutes all seem to us to Require that the Public/Civil-Servants of this State such as your-self are to hold the concerns expressed in the Cannon 3 (6) further above, are to be held in "Balance" with the "State & Public Justice" Concerns out-lined by the statutes in & near this Chapter 162. Clearly the "Public Welfare" is of Greater importance than a theoretical possibility that some-case at some-time in the future may come before the court in which a persons rights may then be adversely affected by said past discussion. The second statement in the above Cannon 3 (6) clearly makes exception for these "Public" Concerns when the "Official Duties" of the Judge are in question. Questions of Treason & Terrorism by Rogue Lawless Civil-Servants are before us in these meetings, sir. Surely you see that it is quite unbalanced to so insist upon this Secrecy when such uncontrovertedly realistic "Public" concerns are before us.

You The Oath to "Support" the Constitutions of America & Oregon quickly come into concern . There-by you are Obligated under Duty to Prioritize your Support of Peace, Justice, & Conscience. These seem to us to cause these concerns to come under your previously mentioned Doctrine of "Ultimate Necessity". You are Not there-by obligated to Support Any Secrecy. These Constitutional "Duties" are of Much Greater Public Concern than are maintaining this selective view of the first half of Cannon 3 (6) of Oregon's Code of Judicial Conduct.

The Transcript which reflects our last meeting, (& which you have indicated to be accurate by your silence), reveals clearly that you were presented with much testimonial evidence & were told clearly of the epidemic perspective among Oregon's "Qualified Electors" that it is a "Terrorist Regime" over which you are presiding. Here-by you have been made fully aware of the very Desperate Nature of the Mind-Set of "We the People" out here, at the grass-roots level in Oregon, as well as the "Well Reasoned" Basis in Law for that Mind-Set.

Thus far, you & all others have Failed to Rebut these "Critical & Fundamental Issues" concerning Terrorism &Treason among Oppressive & Corrupted Civil Servants, as raised in this & the other documents. Our group seeks to work with you in efforts to Defuse this Explosive Situation. This could easily turn into a Blood-bath, sir. These Concerns of the People over Corruption among Civil-Servants seem to us well-founded. We need Rebuttal of these "Critical Issues" by showing where these Common People's Perspectives are in Error. Or in the alternative that these views are accurate, we need to see Good Faith Effort to Remedy the Constitutional Discrepancies, Forth-with.

We need to work together to Define the "Applicable Law" which should govern the "Procedural Aspects" & "Over-Arching Law Aspects" between you "Civil Servants" & the smaller groups of "We the People" who are proceeding before said Civil Servants. Whether in an actual Controversy, or in less formal meetings such as these, our smaller groups of Oregon's People have the Right to appear before you Judges in our "State Ex Rel" Capacity, aka: under traditional "Quo Warranto" Provisions, as provided in ORS 30.510. Here-by, these members of our Groups "Are the State". We are the previously mentioned "Joint Tenants in the Sovereignty". And it appears to us that the Civil Servants such as yourselves, are under Master/.Servant Relationship "Duty" to Respond with "Open" Communications, when any among us so respectfully command.

These are the "Procedural Issues" which need to be "Addressed". "Lives" could be lost because of the "Failure of Communication" from your end because of some theoretical Judicial Code which works toward the Stifling of these Over-Riding Concerns for maintaining the Public Peace. We desperately want to Avoid gun-pointing between State Police Officers & Article 4 Section 23 Constable/Peace-Officers. That is precisely what is on the horizon unless we from the differing Civil or Common-Law Realms of Judicial Authority can come to Agreement on what precisely is the "Over-Arching Law" which is Constitutionally Applicable to addressing these "Critical Issues".

We truly do have People who believe that the Constitutionally-Lawless Corruption in the Civil Government is so Epidemic that they need to Take Up Arms and March on the Multitudes of Civil-Servants who are enforcing "Malum-Prohibitum" Laws from within Salem. The few of us who have been meeting with you & Respectfully Demanding these meetings from the others, we few are trying to convince these Desperate Other Concerned Oregonians that there is No "Culpable Mental State" behind the actions of many of you "Civil-Servants".

We told them that chances are very good that that particular fraction of the "Civil Servants" of the "State of Oregon" who are Knowingly & Willfully so Criminally Acting, can be brought to Accountability by way of that "Due Course of Law", as specifically Guaranteed to "Every Man" at Article 1 Section 10of Oregon's Constitution.

As our perceived first-step in this "Due Course & Process of Law", we need to address those "Over-Arching Law" & "Procedural" Issues which you gracefully directed us to focus on. And among the First there-in is whether or

not "Civil Servants" Owe "Duty" to "We the People" in our capacity as the ORS 30.510 "State", to Answer Reasonable & Courteous Issue/Questions, such as those in the "Constructive Notice of Treason".

We need to know whether you recognize that the Failure of those other Civil-Servants to make Good-Faith Efforts to Answer these Questions from the People, are Grounds upon which a Lawful Jury may Find these Silent Accused Civil-Servants Guilty of said charges of "Treason".

And if you do Not recognize this, then: What is your "Basis in Law" for said failure to so recognize?

Please explain these "Critical Issues" of "Over Arching Law" to us, so that from as sound "Basis in Law", we may present Well-Reasoned Argument to these Out-raged Individuals in our efforts to Abort these massively angry under-currents among the populace.

We have come to know that "Law" concerns with the proper administration of the Force of the State. One of Oregon's Statutes draws this out nicely, as follows:

ORS 161.245 "Reasonable belief" described; status of unlawful arrest.

(1) For the purposes of ORS 161.235 and 161.239, a reasonable belief that a person has committed an offense means a reasonable belief in facts or circumstances which if true would in law constitute an offense.

If the believed facts or circumstances would not in law constitute an offense, an erroneous though not unreasonable belief that the law is otherwise does not render justifiable the use of force to make an arrest or to prevent an escape from custody.

(2) A peace officer who is making an arrest is justified in using the physical force prescribed in ORS 161.235 and 161.239 unless the arrest is unlawful and is known by the officer to be unlawful.

Now our self-elected Neighborhood Peace-Officer "Constables" are now before you, at least by agency, & respectfully asking you if you have any "Basis in Law" why they should not be Encouraged to Arrest various Corrupted Sheriffs, Judges, & other assorted Corrupted but Influential Public Servants. These are the People who believe that it is time to Take Up Arms because the Corruption, Carnage, & Terrorism of Oregon's Populace is so UnSalvageably Epidemic. If you refuse to answer these "Critical Issue" Questions, what other conclusion may our Peace-Officer Constables arrive at, than that our Interpretation of Constitutional Law is Correct? It would then appear clear that these Smaller Groups of "We the People" do truly have the Constitutionally-Lawful Authority to use "Whatever Force is Necessary" in order to Surgically Remove this Parasite Class of Corrupted Civil Servants from this State's Body Politic. "Reason" is to Govern the Administration of the Force of this State, along with the triply redundant "Conscience". These two are to work together in the surgically-precise limiting of the Administration of the Force of this Constitutionally-Lawful State. We are here before you seeking this "Reason" & "Conscience". Lives are on the Line. Please refrain such excuses as this "Case could come before me", & there-by Retreating into Secrecy, sir. These are Over-Ridding "Critical Issues" of Law we are seeking to resolve from you. They are of a Most Serious & Pressing Nature. Of Course these Issues of Law could possibly touch upon cases which could come before you. But they are not focused on any particular case. These concerns are General in Nature, they are "in the course of (your) official duties", & they are designed to motivate you into "explaining the Procedures of the Court."

"Administrative Justice & the Supremacy of Law":

You previously introduced yourself at our last meeting as the "Chief Administrative Head of the Judicial Department" for this Constitutionally-Lawful "State of Oregon". You made it clear that your presence at that meeting was in this "Administrative" capacity.

We would like to know if there is a "Judicial Head" of the "Judicial Department". And if so, is that you? And if so, can we talk to you this time in that "Judicial" capacity, instead of your "Administrative" Capacity ?

Further basis to be expanded upon from the Transcript of our last meeting, & which focused on this "Administrative" Issue, is as follows:

"WC: * * * Arnold Denecke * * * he was the "Chief Justice" of the Supreme Court ..., but his role as an "Administrator" was quite Limited. And so Now it is a ... quite Expansive. And a ... we have "State Court Administrator", which we had prior to that time, and most of the... , we try to keep "Local Control" as much as we can, under the State Constitution the State Law.

But ahm ... as you're aware, the Cultures of the various Communities are Different, and they still Have to Follow the Law & the Constitution; I want to be Clear about that; but uhh ... How They Set Their Program Up, & What They Put Emphasis On, Is generally Left; again with-in the Constitution & Statutes, to "Local Control".

And the Presiding Judges, who are Appointed by Me; with what I call a Veto, under Chapter 1. But every two years the Chief Justice appoints a Presiding Judge, who is ahhh, the "Chief Administrator" of the various ... we have 26 Judicial Districts in 36 Counties * * * and uhh .., Bob Selander, up in Clackamas. And they are the Administrative ... . They're not called the "Administrative Head", but they are the Presiding Judge of those respective Districts."

At our last meeting I gave you & Mr Garza copies from portions from a Law Text-book of which I would here like to reference as foundation for our next meeting. It there-in focuses extensively on this Issue of 'Administrative Justice". A limited cite there-from reads as follows:

""Administrative Justice & the Supremacy of Law in the United States"; By John Dickenson; 1927, by the President & Fellows of Harvard College; 1955, Russell & Russell, Inc; By Arrangement Harvard University Press; Dedicated to Pound & Frankfurter; Studies from Princeton, Johns Hopkins, Columbia & Harvard Universities.

"The multiplication in recent years of public bodies like public service commissions and industrial accident boards, accompanied by vesting of ampler powers in health officers, building inspectors, and the like, has raised anew for our law, after three centuries, the problem of executive justice. That government officials should assume the traditional function of courts of law, and be permitted to determine the rights of individuals, is a development so out of line with the supposed path of our legal growth as to challenge renewed attention to certain underlying principles of our jurisprudence. ...

In the age of Coke such questions as these arose in connection with what has since been called "executive justice." To-day the term "executive" seems fitted to a narrower need, and "administrative justice" suggests itself a better name for the broader current legal development. (Chapter 1, Page 3)

The introduction of administrative justice has encountered in our constitutional doctrine of the "separation of powers" a barrier which has been evaded only by the invention of a new set of glaring legal fictions embodied in such words as "quasi-legislative," "quasi-judicial," and the like. To review the development of these fictions would supply an instructive commentary on an important branch of American constitutional law, but it would not shed helpful light on the more fundamental problems presented by the substitution of administrative justice for adjudication by courts of law. These problems reach below the special limitations of American constitutional law and turn up for inspection some of the deepest principles of the Anglo-American legal system.

"In Anglo-American jurisprudence, government and the law have always in a sense stood opposed to each other; the law has been rather something to give the citizen a check on the government than an instrument to give the government control over citizens. There is a famous phrase, which has long been attributed to Bracton, ... that "the king has a superior, to whit, the law; and if he be without a bridle, a bridle ought to be put on him, namely, the law." This "rule of law" as Dicey calls it, or "supremacy of law," in Libeler's phrase, has uniformly been treated as the central and most characteristic feature of Anglo-American juristic habit; and nothing has been held more fundamental to the supremacy of law than the right of every citizen to bring the action of government officials to trial in the ordinary courts of the common law. That government officials, on the contrary, should themselves assume to preform the functions of a law court and determine the rights of individuals, as is the case under a system of administrative justice, has been traditionally felt to be inconsistent with the supremacy of law. It was the ground of attack on the Court of Star Chamber, in the days when the Chancellor was still mainly an administrative officer of the King. Lieber mentions freedom from "government by commissions," and from the jurisdiction of executive courts, as one of the elements of Anglo-American Liberty." (Chapter 2, Page 32)

"The orthodox doctrine of the supremacy of law has been stated by Dicey as including two principles: "It means in the first place that no man can lawfully be made to suffer in body or goods except for a distinct breach of law established in the ordinary courts of the land." It mans in the second place "that no man is above the law, but that every man, whatever his rank or condition, is subject to the ordinary law of the realm, and amenable to the jurisdiction of the ordinary tribunals . . . With us, every official, from the Prime Minister down to a constable or collector of taxes, is under the same responsibility for every act done without legal justification as any other citizen."

(Law of the Constitution, 8th edition., p.185 & 189)

"In short, every citizen is entitled, first, to have his rights adjudicated in a regular common-law court, and, secondly, to call into question in such a court the legality of any act done by an administrative official." ...

"The substantive difference between administrative procedure and the procedure by law is that the administrative tribunals decide controversies coming before them, not by fixed rules of law, but by the application of governmental discretion or policy.

It is this last point which is of capital interest here. The competition between administrative & legal justice, is ... a phase of the age-old struggle between discretion and fixed rule, between *vouops* and *ekleiakela,* between equity and the strict law."

In so far as administrative adjudication is coming in certain fields to take the place of adjudication by law courts, the supremacy of law as formulated in Dicey's first proposition is overridden. But a possible way of escaping this result is left open by his second proposition. An administrative determination is an act of a governmental officer or officers; and if it

be true that all the acts of such officers are subject to be questioned in the courts, it is then possible to have the issue of any questionable administrative adjudication raised and decided anew in a law court, with the special advantages guarantees of the procedure at law. We see here the reason why the question of court review of administrative determinations has become of such central importance and has been the focus of so much discussion since the rise of the administrative procedure. For just so far as administrative determinations are subject to court review, a means exists for maintaining the supremacy of law, though at one remove and as a sort of secondary line of defense. The special advantages of the administrative procedure may be substantially retained, while at the same time, in a given case, the result can be brought to the test of the procedure at law. Administrative justice exists in defiance of the supremacy of law only in so far as administrative adjudications are final and conclusive, and not subject to correction by a law court. (Pages: 34, 35, 36, 37, & 38)

We find that the Main Point to be gleaned from this last text is well stated as follows:

"The substantive difference between administrative procedure and the procedure by law is that the administrative tribunals decide controversies coming before them, not by fixed rules of law, but by the application of governmental discretion or policy. * * * The competition between administrative & legal justice, is ... a phase of the age-old struggle between discretion and fixed rule, between *vouops* & *ekleiakela,* between equity & the strict law."

This text shows clearly that your "Administrative" process is entirely in Opposition to that "Remedy by Due Course of Law" which is Guaranteed to "Every Man" in Oregon at Article 1 Section 10 of our State's Constitution. There is No Middle-Ground. Either the "Rule of Law" will Prevail, or the "Discretion" of some Power-Monger Tyrant will Prevail. The Constitutionally-Lawful "State of Oregon" does Not Allow for Tyrants to Prevail. Here-under it does Not Allow for "Administrative Process" to Supplant "Due Process of Law". Yet that seems to be precisely what is forth-coming from your quadrant. These are "Critical Issues" we need to discuss, sir.

You further made reference above to the effect that :

"we try to keep "Local Control" as much as we can, under the State Constitution the State Law." * * * the Cultures of the various Communities are Different, and they still Have to Follow the Law & the Constitution; I want to be Clear about that; but uhh ... How They Set Their Program Up, & What They Put Emphasis On, Is generally Left; again with-in the Constitution & Statutes, to "Local Control". * * * every two years the Chief Justice appoints a Presiding Judge, who is the "Chief Administrator" of the * * * 26 Judicial Districts in 36 Counties * * * And they are the Administrative ... . They're not called the "Administrative Head", but they are the Presiding Judge of those respective Districts."

Your words here reveals much precious insight into the manner in which the "Local" Governing structures function. We find much room for discussion here. Many avenues for possible reconciliation of differences. " Wiggle Room" is a nice phrase. You praise-worthily affirm that the "Local" "Administrative Head" is subjected to the Constitution of Oregon. Now if we can just come agreement on precisely what Oregon's Constitution does or doesn't allow, we will be doing nicely. But that big project is off point at this juncture. Here we should focus on the specific of how these "Local" "Administrative Heads" actually function, & why. And by the way, technically they are more properly called "Administrative Heads" than "Presiding Judges", Correct? And Judge Selander here in Clackamas County would more properly be called "Chief Administrator" of the County, Correct?

And a further technicality as revealed in the text of Mr Dickenson above, is that this term "Administrative" is a recent "Invention" for what has traditionally been identified as "Executive". In terms of Tradition, this is More Proper, ie: More Honest. This goes to the point which we previously touched on of "Separation of Powers". Pamela has found some text from Oregon's web page concerning the Judicial Department which affirms this use of the term 'Executive" with reference to what purports to be the Judicial Department Activities as transpiring within your realm. Though I don't have it handy, I saw what appeared to be an accurate email copy of it myself. This all tends to indicate that the so-called "Judges" who are functioning from under this form of "Administrative Procedures", are in reality "Executive" Department Personnel, & that they Directly Administer the Force of the State, & they do Not Truly consider themselves Bound by any "Separation of Powers" Doctrine. This is all precisely identical to how the King of England operates, along with the Roman Models of Caesar & the Pope. Mr Dickenson points this out as:

"The introduction of administrative justice has encountered in our constitutional doctrine of the "separation of powers" a barrier which has been evaded only by the invention of a new set of glaring legal fictions embodied in such words as "quasi-legislative," "quasi-judicial," and the like. To review the development of these fictions would supply an

instructive commentary on an important branch of American constitutional law * * *."

This Administrative process is all so well engineered to effect such a Masterful Deception. This is the precise same Dynamic which Corpus Juris Secundum admits to regarding "Master Servant" Relationships, as:

"While the relationship of master & servant is not capable of exact definition & cannot be defined in general terms with substantial accuracy, it may nevertheless be stated that broadly that the relation is that which arises out of contract of employment, express or implied, between a master or employer on the one hand & a servant or employee on the other. The relationship of employer & employee is substantially the same as that of master & servant, but it has been said that the terms "employer" & "employee" make a better designation of the relationship in this industrial age, particularly in view of the fact that Americans as a rule do not like the word "servant". ... (Volume 56; Ss1)

See sir? The Deception is Clear. The Deception is Epidemic. This is just another Bad Faith Lie in "the age-old struggle between discretion and fixed rule, between *vouops* and *ekleiakela,* between equity and the strict law." This is just another in a long string of "Glaring Legal Fictions", which are specifically designed to "Evade" the Constitutionally Required "Separation of Powers" Doctrine; all just precisely as Mr Dickenson has so candidly set-forth, but to repeat with more focus again as follows:

"In the age of Coke such questions as these arose in connection with what has since been called "executive justice." To-day the term "executive" seems fitted to a narrower need, and "administrative justice" suggests itself a better name for the broader current legal development. The introduction of administrative justice has encountered in our constitutional doctrine of the "separation of powers" a barrier which has been evaded only by the invention of a new set of glaring legal fictions * * *."

See, sir? This Conflict is very Old & Large & Powerful. It has its own body of "Organic Law", which is Parasitical in its Essential Nature. Mr Dickenson links it directly to the ancient Evil "Star Chamber" Courts of England. This can-not co-exist with-in the Constitutionally-Lawful "State of Oregon". And this Epidemic of "Administrative Justice" over which you preside, provides Breeding Grounds for this precise same ancient Parasite-Classes to Suck the Life-Blood from Oregon's Constitutional Body-Politic. Perhaps we are not telling you anything you don't already know. These are "Critical Issues" which we need to Address, sir.

In your efforts to explain how these "Local" Governing Bodies Function under this "Administrative" set of guidelines, you went on to mention above here that the "Cultures of the various Communities are Different". Because of this you went on to state that "How They Set Their Program Up, & What They Put Emphasis On, Is generally Left; again with-in the Constitution & Statutes, to "Local Control"."

This is nice, sir. This provides our "Wiggle Room". How-ever we must point out that those entities are Not functioning under Christian Common-Law, but rather as "Municipal" Franchises. Here-by they do Not provide for "Due Process of Law" for accused members of Oregon's Constitutional Body-Politic.

You indicate by your use of the term "Culture" that this "Justifies" the allowance for Latitude for these Municipal Administrators such as Mr Selander to decide among themselves "How They Set Their Program Up, & What They Put Emphasis On". Our "Culture" is very different than the "Culture" of Babylonian Talmudian Pharisees like Mr Selander. I've been in his court, & forcibly removed there-from for attempting to secure Justice by acting as Assistance of Council for a fellow Christian. Mr Selander Commands that precise same Conscienceless Obedience as Adolph Hitler Commanded of the Nazis who were Hung for this precise sort of thing at Nuremberg. But I digress.

The point is that "Culture" is Different. As shown above, the difference between "Administrative Justice" & "Due Process of Law" gets back to the Difference between the Christians & the Pharisees. Yes. The Pharisees are the modern posterity of the Ancient Babylonian Salve-Trading Codes of Nimrod. Christians are Commanded to "Come Out of Babylon" in Revelation Chapters 17 & 18. These two Can-Not be Mixed, sir. Our "Cultures" are entirely Different. The Host Must Rid It-self of the Parasite Class, or it will Die. The Parasite Class must learn to survive on its own without Parasite Activities, or face starvation. Sorry. Perhaps if their ancestors had not screamed as a Lawless Mob to have Christ Jesus & his Followers Nailed to Crosses &/or Stakes, then their modern cultural descendants would have buy now developed the skills for getting dirt under their fingernails & surviving off of the land by honest labor.

But the "Administrative" machinery over which you preside has facilitated this Non-Judicial form of Local

Government. In the Spirit of Fairness, You should allow other Local "Self-Governing" Entities to exist, especially when they are trying to maintain harmony with those Christian Common-Law Principles which are Required under Oregon's Constitutional Social Compact. Not to mention we are also seeking ends to the many "Emergencies".

Now allowing this Parasite Class to operate may be tolerable, for Revelation indicates that it is to be allowed to exist, & to syphon off all for it's plunder who do not maintain Faithfulness to the Pathway of Christ Jesus. However to cut-off the Only Mechanism for God's People to find Protection & Safety by establishing their own "Jural-Society" Communities, well this is in Direct Opposition to every Principle of Liberty as embodied with-in Oregon's Constitution. We must have "Equal Protection of the Laws" here sir. "Consent of the Governed" Must be Maintained. We do Not "Consent to be Governed" by this "Administrative Process"; Nor by Municipal Franchisees; Nor by Pharisees who follow the Babylonian Talmud. We Demand Our Constitutionally Cherished Common-Law Realms, Sir. A citation in support here-to is as follows.

"An important cannon of construction is that constitutions must be construed with reference to the common-law, since, in most respects, the federal and state constitutions did not repudiate, but cherished the established common law. ... the instrument & the plan of the government of the United States were founded on the common law as established in England at the time of the Revolution. Therefore, it is a general rule that phrases in the Bill of Rights taken from the common law must be construed in reference to the latter ... It is a cardinal rule of construction that a constitution must be construed as to give effect to the intention of the people who adopted it, and ... it will be construed with reference to the doctrines of the common law ..." (16 Am Jur, 2nd Sec.547; SS: 114: Constnl Law)

If you can give Municipal License to the Administrators of these Municipal Franchisee Salve-Trading Districts, then you can allow "Comity", & "Full Faith & Credit" to the Christian Common-Law People of this State. In fact, this is precisely what Mr Dickenson sees as being the "Narrow Pathway" Solution to these problems. To repeat the above, he expanded on that precise point as follows:

"In so far as administrative adjudication is coming in certain fields to take the place of adjudication by law courts, the supremacy of law as formulated in Dicey's first proposition is overridden. But a possible way of escaping this result is left open by his second proposition. An administrative determination is an act of a governmental officer or officers; and if it be true that all the acts of such officers are subject to be questioned in the courts, it is then possible to have the issue of any questionable administrative adjudication raised and decided anew in a law court, with the special advantages guarantees of the procedure at law. We see here the reason why the question of court review of administrative determinations has become of such central importance and has been the focus of so much discussion since the rise of the administrative procedure. For just so far as administrative determinations are subject to court review, a means exists for maintaining the supremacy of law, though at one remove and as a sort of secondary line of defense. The special advantages of the administrative procedure may be substantially retained, while at the same time, in a given case, the result can be brought to the test of the procedure at law. Administrative justice exists in defiance of the supremacy of law only in so far as administrative adjudications are final and conclusive, and not subject to correction by a law court ."

Note please the component elements of this last sentence here: "Administrative justice exists in defiance of the supremacy of law". It doesn't get much clearer than that. Mr Dickenson goes on to say that those words apply "only in so far as administrative adjudications are final & conclusive, & not subject to correction by a law court."

This is his best "Justification" for the Existence of this otherwise Constitutionally Repugnant "Administrative" Process among "We the People" of this Constitutionally-Lawful State. Note please that this Preserving of "Adjudication by Law Courts" is the Only "Escape" from the "Over-Ridding" of the Constitutionally Required Doctrine of the "Supremacy of Law". Oregon's Constitution in it's Amended/Supplanted format has made very important provision to preserve this precise process at Amended Article 7 Section 2b, which reads:

"Inferior courts may be affected in certain respects by special or local laws. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 23, Article IV of this Constitution, laws creating courts inferior to the Supreme Court or prescribing and defining the jurisdiction of such courts or the manner in which such jurisdiction may be exercised, may be made applicable: (1) To all judicial districts or other subdivisions of this state; or (2) To designated classes of judicial districts or other subdivisions; or (3) To particular judicial districts or other subdivisions."

This shows that the "Jurisdiction * * * Exercised" by the Legislatively Created Tribunals over which you supervise, such as the Circuit & Appellate Courts, are of a Constitutionally Limited Nature which is NOT-WITH-STANDING to the "Jurisdiction Exercised" by those People's "Courts of Justice" which proceed under "Common-Law" as specifically protected in Oregon's Constitution in the above mentioned Article 4 Section 23, which reads:

"Certain local and special laws prohibited. The Legislative Assembly, shall not pass special or local laws, in any of the following enumerated cases, that is to say:

Regulating the jurisdiction, and duties of justices of the peace, and of constables; For the punishment of Crimes, and Misdemeanors; Regulating the practice in Courts of Justice; Providing for changing the venue in civil, and Criminal cases; Granting divorces; Changing the names of persons; For laying, opening, and working on highways, and for the election, or appointment of supervisors; Vacating roads, Town plats, Streets, Alleys, and Public squares; Summoning and empaneling grand, and petit jurors; For the assessment and collection of Taxes, for State, County, Township, or road purposes; Providing for supporting Common schools, and for the preservation of school funds; In relation to interest on money; Providing for opening, and conducting the elections of State, County, and Township officers, and designating the places of voting; Providing for the sale of real estate, belonging to minors, or other persons laboring under legal disabilities, by executors, administrators, guardians, or trustees.

As is clear here-by, these People's Realms are Outside of & Independent of the Authority of the Oregon's Civil Government's Legislatively Created Tribunals. These Powers are Preserved "Locally" & "Specially" to the Smaller Jurisdictions of "We the People", such as Counties, Precincts, Churches, & Trade-Unions. This was the "Original Intent" when Oregon's Constitution was first formed in 1857, & it was a respectful bone thrown to the People by way of the above quoted Supplanted/Amended Article 7 Section 2b.

William Blackstone in his "Commentaries on the Laws of England" (1753-1766), sets forth this precise & very Ancient "Basis in Law" Dynamic with-in our Anglo-American system of Constitutional Jurisprudence at "SS 43: Early Judicial Systems", as follows :

"The policy of our ancient constitution, as regulated sand established by the great Alfred, was to bring justice home to every man's door, by constituting as many courts of judicature as there are manors and townships in the kingdom; wherein injuries were redressed in an easy and expeditious manner, by the suffrage of neighbors and friends. These little courts, however, communicated with others of a larger jurisdiction, and those with others of still greater power; ascending gradually from the lowest to the supreme courts, which were respectively constituted to correct the errors of the inferior ones, and to determine such causes as by reason of their weight and difficulty demanded a more solemn discussion.

The course of justice flowing in large streams from the king as the fountain, to his superior courts of record, and being then subdivided into smaller channels, till the whole and every part of the kingdom were plentifully watered and refreshed . An institution that seems highly agreeable to natural reason, as well as of more enlightened policy; being equally similar to that which prevailed in Mexico & Peru before they were discovered by the Spaniards; and that which was established in the Jewish republic by Moses. ...

In like manner we read of Moses, that finding the sole administration of justice too heavy for him, he "chose able men out of Israel, such as feared God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens : and they judged the people at all seasons ; and the hard causes they brought unto Moses, but every small matter they judged themselves."

These inferior courts, at least the name and form of them, still continue in our legal constitution : but ... these petty tribunals have fallen into decay, and almost into oblivion ..."

This entire process is, very very Ancient, sir; precisely as Mr Blackstone affirms above. Those men who participated in the Amending/Supplanting of Article 7 governing Oregon's Judiciary, surely were aware of these over-ridingly powerful under-currents which are so fundamental to our American & Oregon Constitutional Systems. As shown in the above Amended Article 7 Section 2b, this basic Constitutional Pattern was to be left in-tact. The 1910 "Hiatus" mentioned in the elsewhere shown Madden v Crawford case, as an "Emergency" situation, was Not Allowed to Alter this Fundamental Principle of maintaining Many "Little Courts" throughout the entire Nation. These "Little Courts" were "subdivisions" of the larger Common-Law Courts, "till the whole and every part of the kingdom were plentifully watered".

These very "Ancient" Principles of Judicial Organization were parts of the 1910 Agreement when the "Supplanting" Occurred, sir. We are Respectfully Demanding that this 1910 Agreement be Honored. It is clear that the Constitutionally Intended form of "Civil Government" for Oregon has been Entirely Obliterated. That is ok by us. The "Civil" form of Governments are based on Roman/Babylonian Slave-Trading Codes, anyway; & they were there-fore a Bad Idea to start with. The Anglo/Saxon Christian Common-Law Model, similar to that outlined by Mr Blackstone above, is greatly superior. And here-by we want to Responsively "Self-Govern" under these Very "Ancient" & Constitutionally Preserved Provisions of Article 4 Section 23, & the "Dictates of Conscience" which flow from "Almighty God". We want "Comity", & "Full Faith & Credit" from your Jurisdictions, sir. We are

Constitutionally Entitled to this. This is probably the single Most Important Issue we need to Address, sir.

We further desire to Address the "State Take-Over" of the previous form of County Governing Process which you mentioned as being established in January 1983. Please note that President Clinton's Executive Order 13132 of August 10, 1999 stated clearly at Sec. 2 (a) that:

"Federalism is rooted in the belief that issues that are not national in scope or significance are most appropriately addressed by the level of government closest to the people."

This is a Fundamental Principle os All American Constitutional Law, Including that of Oregon. Mr Clinton's EO 13132 earlier stated in Section 1 under "Definitions", that (b)

``State'' or ``States'' refer to the States ... and, where relevant, to State governments, including units of local government and other political subdivisions established by the States."

This shows that the "Local" Governments, such as the Counties, are recognizable a "State" itself. This dove-tails perfectly with the ORS 30.510 "State Ex Rel" process, in that these smaller units, on down even to "Private Parties", can proceed in the "Name of the State". Oregon's Constitution at Original Article 7 Section 8, makes mention of "... each County organized for judicial purposes ..." . It here-under seems clear to us, especially in light of Article 4 Section 23, that the "Administration of Justice" was to be "Politically Sub-divided" among the various Counties of this Constitutionally- Lawful "State of Oregon".

Hereby, within the Borders of Clackamas County, a Constitutionally-Lawful Governing-Body of Clackamas County, Is the "State of Oregon". This seems clearly to reflect the Christian Common-Law Influence upon the Social-Compacts under which the Constitutions of American & Oregon were formed. This is backed up in the 1989 version of Oregon Blue Book in it's section on "County Government" which starts out stating that:

"the American county, defined by Webster as "the largest territorial division for local government within a state ...," is based on the Anglo-Saxon county of England dating back to about the time of the Norman Conquest. Counties were brought to America by the colonists and were later established in the central and western parts of this country by the pioneers as they moved westward."

Our group has already presented you & the many others with extensive documentation of the "Anglo-Saxon" Model of "Free Governments". Here-by "Law" was defined by the smaller jurisdictions, & the larger jurisdictions were but forums for these smaller jurisdictions to come together to unanimously but democratically work towards agreement as-to what was Truly Godly Conscionable "Law". This was the "Council of Wise Men", or "Witenagemote". It was basically a National Unanimous Common-Law Jury. It parallels the Twelve Apostles of Christ Jesus & the Revelation 21 & 22 prophecies concerning the Twelve Gates to "New Jerusalem".

Diametrically Opposed to this form of Voluntary Cooperating Sovereign Jurisdictions is the "Municipal" form of Government. That works on Franchise, Privilege, & License. "Municipal" Governmental Franchises are Diametrically Opposed to the "Special or Local" Self- Governing Rights of "We the People", because they are based on the Ancient Babylonian Salve-Trading Codes. The Romans were Slave-Traders, as everyone knows; & they engaged in Acts of Aggressive Warfare to Conquer More Salves. This is where the term "Municipal" comes from, as shown in the book "History of Rome" Apollo edition, by "Cyril E. Robinson", 1956; as follows:

"Many factors contributed to (Rome's) success; but more important than her military powers, were the political methods where by she contrived to ... conquer. ... In 381, after overcoming the ... town of Tusculm, she ... admitted it to terms ... (under which it was) compelled to pay the war-tax, & ... a town thus treated was known as a muni-cipum or "burden-holder". (Chapter 4, the Conquest of Italy, Pages 26 & 27)

This "Municipum" form of Government is all entirely repugnant to those forms of "Free Governments" which are specifically referenced & prioritized up front in Article 1 Section 1 of Oregon's Constitution, & as recognizably Intended to be Preserved for "We the People" in Article 4 Section 23 there-in.

We can go on with more, but this is sufficient to document that the State's Civil Legislative Assembly was Constitutionally Intended to be Prohibited from Meddling in the "Right of Local Self-Government" of the Counties by setting-up Municipal "Puppet Regimens" there-in. "Sovereignty" in the true sense of the word actually flowed to these Truly Local County Governments in those early days. ORS Chapter 203 still has much in support of this, as:

ORS 203.035: Power of county governing body or electors over matters of county concern.

(1) Subject to subsection (3) of this section, the governing body or the electors of a county may by ordinance

exercise authority within the county over matters of county concern, to the fullest extent allowed by Constitutions and laws of the United States and of this state, as fully as if each particular power comprised in that general authority were specifically listed in ORS 203.030 to 203.075.

(2) The power granted by this section is in addition to other grants of power to counties, shall not be construed to limit or qualify any such grant and shall be liberally construed, to the end that counties have all powers over matters of county concern that it is possible for them to have under the Constitutions and laws of the United States and of this state.

203.111 County governing body; legislative authority; quorum.

Unless otherwise provided by county charter, a county court shall be the governing body and shall exercise general legislative authority over all matters of county concern and shall consist of the county judge and two county commissioners and a majority of those persons shall constitute a quorum.

These Statutes Correctly Affirms that the Anglo/Saxon Model of "County Court" is the Constitutionally-Lawful form of Governing-Body for Oregon's Countries, Correct?

Yet almost all present "Governing Bodies" of Oregon's Counties are either directly "Municipal Franchisees" under the deceptively entitled "Home-Rule" Model, & where-in they are reduced under the Impotency of Non-Sovereign "County Commissioners"; or else the members of these "Governing Bodies" are Entrenched into Acting like "Municipal" Forms of Government, & they refuse to budge to revert to the Article 4 Section 23 "Local" Sovereign Independent Responsible Form, without threatening Deadly Force gunplay against those trying to bring about these changes. Such is the precise case in Clackamas County, as mentioned a bit further below.

Your assistant Keith Garza voiced concern over time limitations just as we were beginning to focus on these "Critical Issues" of County Independence form the Civil Governing Authority of this State. This is especially true with regard to the "Administration of Justice" in manners similar to the "Neighborhood Courts" which you courageously raised. You voiced the opinion that the Counties did not posses this Judicial Independence. I told you I could show you where this was wrong & then Mr Garza cut us off. To follow through with that point we need to look at Original Article 7 Section 1 as follows:

"The Judicial power of the State shall be vested in a Suprume Court, Circuits Courts, and County Courts, which shall be Courts of Record having general jurisdiction, to be defined, limited, and regulated by law in accordance with this Constitution. ..."

This "General Jurisdiction" which is here exercisable by the "County Courts" is Defined in Blacks Law Dictionary as follows:

"Such as extends to all controversies that may be brought before a court within the legal bounds of rights & remedies; as opposed to special or limited jurisdiction, which covers only a particular class of cases, or cases where the amount in controversy is below a particular sum, or which is subject to specific exceptions. ..."

This is precisely similar to our "Courts of Justice" Powers as set forth in ORS 1.010, as follows:

ORS 1.010: "Every court of justice has power:

(1) To preserve and enforce order in its immediate presence.

(2) To enforce order in the proceedings before it, or before a person or body empowered to conduct a judicial investigation under its authority.

(3) To provide for the orderly conduct of proceedings before it or its officers.

(4) To compel obedience to its judgments, decrees, orders and process, and to the orders of a judge out of court, in an action, suit or proceeding pending therein.

(5) To control, in furtherance of justice, the conduct of its ministerial officers, and of all other persons in any manner connected with a judicial proceeding before it, in every matter appertaining thereto.

(6) To compel the attendance of persons to testify in an action, suit or proceeding pending therein, in the cases and manner provided by statute.

(7) To administer oaths in an action, suit or proceeding pending therein, and in all other cases where it may be necessary in the exercise of its powers or the performance of its duties."

Please note that the wording of both of these citations clearly implies that a "Criminal" Jurisdiction is to be preserved here-in. This is clearly how the "County Courts" were & are to function, as well as for the Precinct & Township Courts. They are all these "Courts of Justice", for they all follow "Common-Law".

This shows that your assertion that "Neighborhood Courts" are not Constitutionally Lawful, is erroneous, at least on the County level, sir; just precisely as drawn into question before Mr Garza voiced time concerns.

The Precincts, Townships, Churches, & "Special & Local" Jurisdictions also seemingly have this very powerful "Court of Justice" Criminal Jurisdictional Authority, sir.

Further, we find support for these concepts in Oregon Revised Statutes; Chapter 401 governing the Policies of the State's Civil Government for rendering "Emergency Services"; as follows:

ORS 401.015 Statement of policy and purpose.

(1) The general purpose of ORS 401.015 to 401.105, 401.260 to 401.325 and 401.355 to 401.580 is to reduce the vulnerability of the State of Oregon to loss of life, injury to persons or property and human suffering and financial loss resulting from emergencies, and to provide for recovery and relief assistance for the victims of such occurrences.

(2) It is declared to be the policy and intent of the Legislative Assembly that preparations for emergencies and governmental responsibility for responding to emergencies be placed at the local government level. The state shall prepare for emergencies, but shall not assume authority or responsibility for responding to such an event unless the appropriate response is beyond the capability of the city and county in which it occurs, the city or county fails to act, or the emergency involves two or more counties.

This Again Re-Affirms the Fundamental Principles of Anglo/American Jurisprudence as set forth by Mr Blackstone above, & as preserved in Article 4 Section 23. It further shows how it is entirely Alien for the Administrative/Municipal Forms of Governing under Malum-Prohibitum has crept into Oregon's Counties. The wording which hinges the authority of the Civil Government of the State upon the "County Fails to Act" wording is clear. ORS chapter 203 states with equal clarity that the "County Court" shall be the "Governing Body of the County". Yet everywhere there is Municipal/Administrative "Home Rule" Governmental Structures in place, which appear to us to be nothing less than DeFacto Usurpations by Organized & Syndicated Criminal Conspirators.

You seemed to Admit that the People have the Right to make Arrests. But you entrenched on the People Not being able to Establish with-in their own "Neighborhoods", their own "Courts of Justice". This seems very goofy. What good is it to be able to make arrests, if foreign jurisdictions have Monopoly Authority to Try the Criminal ?

What about our terms "Comity" & Full Faith & Credit"? If everyone is just an Obedient Franchisee of a Superior Court some-where, then Why are these terms even in our Constitutional Jurisprudence?

Our readings are that the term "Venue" is synonymous with "Neighborhood". These traditional Anglo-Saxon Common-Law Rights of "Venue" are preserved to "We the People" in ORS 14.030 through 14.110. It is clearly still there. And the citations from Black's Law Dictionary & Words & Phrases in support of these two terms being synonymous, are multitude.

Further, the "Oregon Blue Book" in it's Judicial Section, under "Justice Court" states as follows:

"Justice court is held by a justice of the peace within the district for which he or she is elected, except in those cities where district courts have been established. The county commissioners have power to establish justice court district boundaries. The justice of the peace is the remnant of territorial days when each precinct of the state was entitled to a justice court. Thirty-five justice Courts currently administer justice in 21 counties.

Justice courts have jurisdiction within their county concurrent with the circuit court in all criminal prosecutions except felony trials. Actions at law in justice courts are conducted using the mode of proceeding and rules of evidence similar to those used in the circuit courts, except where otherwise specifically provided. * * * "

This clearly shows that "Each Precinct" was previously "Entitled" to a Court which exercised a "Criminal" Jurisdiction. This merges nicely with the previous cite that "The American County * * * is based on the Anglo-Saxon county of England * * * ". This means that the "Hundred Courts" are the traditional model which is applicable to modern American "Precincts". Though the cite concerning "Justice Courts" here indicates that this is a distant & obsolete relic of the past, the cite concerning County Governing on the Anglo-Saxon Model indicates that this entire Model is still modernly applicable. We believe that Smaller Groups of "Qualified Electors" have the Constitutionally-Lawful Authority (as recognizable in Article 1 Section 1) to "Move into the Vacuum" so-as-to Re-Establish these "County Courts" under "County-General-Law", & "Common-Law". And the same we believe to be true for Precincts &Townships, just as set forth by Mr Blackstone & Moses. If you have information to the contrary, sir; please present it to us. If your realm intends to direct the Force of your State to Obstruct us in these moves, Please Explain WHY.

After exhaustive efforts at discussions in Clackamas County, the County Commissioners, Sheriff, Clerk, & Attorneys; they have Refused to carry on Good Faith Discuss of these matters with us. There-under we feel that we are Constitutionally-Lawfully Authorized by way of "Necessity" & "Justification" to "Move in the Vacuum" of Constitutionally-Lawful Government here . There-by, We have taken the Liberty of Registering a "Clackamas County Court" with the Secretary of State. Here-under, we believe that we have the Right to Elect our own County Court Officers, as the County Judge/Justice of the Peace, Clerk, & Sheriff; & Organize the Posse Comitatus, & Hold a Unanimous Twelve Man Jury Trial proceeding under those Rules of Conscience & Reason as revealed in the Common-Laws of Christians , & Arrest, Try & Punish Duly said Duly Convicted Criminal Usurpers.

Here-under & in General Terms & not applying to any particular case, if the Voice of "Justice" Directs any smaller group of Qualified Electors among "We the People" to Take Up Arms against those "Local" Organized Criminal Conspirators who are attempting to Terrorizing & Coerce the General Populace into Submission to the DeFactos Private & Constitutionally-Lawless Municipal Form of Government, do the "Procedures" of Your Civil Realm Court Respect the Right of these smaller & "Local" groups of "We the People to handle these problems ourselves, or will your Procedures recognize a plea of Emergency pursuant to the above mentioned ORS 401.015; & there-by direct the State Police &/or other Civil Executive Personnel to Interfere on behalf of these DeFactos?

We need to discuss these "Critical Issues" of "Law" behind these controversies, so that if our people are Wrong on their Interpretation of "Law", we may proceed immediately to explain such mis-conceptions to our angry People, & there-by to DeFuse the possible Lawless Violence which would then theoretically be coming from them. We Need for You to Exercise the same "Faithfulness to the Law" with Your "Civil-Servant" People. There-by every-one will become Fully-Aware & Perfectly-Clear as-to Precisely "Where" the "Lines of Demarcation" between Peace or Justifiable Defensive but Bloody Warfare Are Constitutionally-Lawfully Marked. Both Sides are Constitutionally Required to "Seek Peace", here; sir.

"Supplant"

You commented that the clear use of the term "Supplant" at the head of the Amended version of Article 7, "Is Odd". Thank you for this candor, sir. For we find this to be another "Critical Issue" . "Supplant" is clearly linked with "De-facto Government", as the Transcript where-in we discussed the Black's Law Dictionary Definition of "Government de facto" clearly shows; & as the previously supplied & cited definitions from the non-legal dictionaries clearly linked the term with "Usurp", "Force", & Fraud".

We believe that this use of the term "Supplant" here, is an Admission of the Constitutionally-Lawless Nature of the present Civil Government from within which your court operates. Your Courageous Admission that this term being so used "Is Odd", seems to us to Impose Duty upon Your People to "Get to the Bottom" of this, & to share it with "We the People".

The evidence clearly indicates to us that a "Usurpation" has occurred. If we are to convince the many angry people that your present Civil Government is Constitutionally-Lawful, & there-by stave off armed confrontation; then we have "Necessity" to find the "Reason" behind this Admitted "Oddity". Your resources are way more powerful than are ours. It seems to us that your realm of "Civil Servants" should carry this "Burden of Proof". This is the process which is applicable pursuant to ORS 30.510 State-Ex-Rel Quo-Warranto proceedings, which this controversy could easily mushroom into. And it is the "State" which is placing this concern before you, sir. It seems to us to be clearly within the "Course of (your) Official Duties", & it is for "Public Information". It is there-by Excluded from the concern for prejudicing a private controversy, as otherwise is cautionable under Judicial Code Cannon 3 (6).

Further, your Oregon Code of Judicial Conduct states at Cannon 2 A that :

"A Judge ... should conduct himself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity & impartiality of the judiciary".

It is our position that there are hoards of well-compensated Subversives & "Infidels" who are falsely expressing "Public Confidence" in the "Integrity of the Judiciary" in it's presently Corrupted Form. These "Infidels" are given much coverage in the Corrupted News Media, & they speak with very loud voices which are very hard for the poorly financed Majority of "We the People" to over-come. But we are certain that there is an very angry silent majority ground-swell of "We the People" who are very near the end of our toleration threshold on these Issues.

The True "Public Confidence" in the "Judiciary" of Oregon is in the toilet, sir. It's obscene smell is masked by the cheap perfume of loud mouthed & well paid moral prostitutes, who are Conspiring to Sell "We the People" into

a "New World Order" of Totalitarian-Slavery. And the People are Spooked. The People are Desperate. We hear rumors of Gunderson Steel here in Oregon making Human Cattle Cars to pack us off to Concentration Camps. We see photos of Russian & Chinese Troops & multitudes of their Tanks being brought into this country, with no Reasonable Explanation, & the media whores are avoiding the evidence like the plague. And then we see your Administrative/Judiciary Refusing to Address Our Needs of Naturally Conscionable Justice. Our "Public Confidence in the Integrity of the Judiciary" is ZERO, good sir. This is TOTAL EMERGENCY, CONDITION RED.

What is your "Code of Judicial Conduct" to you Judges. A Joke? Do you guys sit around the coffee tables in the mornings & laugh about how this phrase "Public Confidence in the Integrity of the Judiciary" is actually taken seriously by some naive & trusting Oregonians who are routinely having their Lives Destroyed as a result of their placing their trust in your "Administrative Tribunals"? We need to "Address" these "Critical Issues", sir.

With regard to the "Emergency Declarations" at the end of many of the Legislative Enactments our conversation flowed as follows:

"WC: ... the "Emergency Clause" has One Simple, but important, Function; in the Statute. And that is that allows the Legislature to Advance the Effective Date of the Bill." ...

"WC: ... I guess my answer is "No". I don't see the "Connection" that you make, between this "1973 study", and the "Emergency Clause" at the bottom of a bill last year. Now maybe there is. But I don't see it.

CS: Ok. To Re-Phrase the Question: "Do you see that "Emergencies" are being used ... that this Evidences that "Emergency Declarations" are being used to step Beyond "Constitutional Parameters" ?

WC: Well, I haven't read that. I looked at it briefly. But when I saw the Connection I thought you were making between that Document and the "Emergency Clause" of State legislation, I moved on to other-parts of your materials, that you've provided me. So, I have No Opinion on that."

Sir, we find that these "Emergency Declarations" are what are being used to authorize the "Malum-Prohibitum" Jurisdiction to be applied over us. We find this to be used to circumvent normal limitations on Constitutional Authority of Civil Servants, just precisely as the US Senate Report so stated. You down-play this as a legitimate possibility, sir. We have obtained a copy of "Oregon Laws: 1995; Chapter 658: which there-in states at Section 151: "This Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health & safety, an emergency is here-by declared to exist, and this act takes effect on it's passage."

There are many other sections which use this precise same language. This section specifically addressed the Authority of the "Chief Justice of the Judicial Department" (yourself) to make Appointments of other Judges to the Circuit & District Courts. You argue above here that "the "Emergency Clause" has One Simple * * * Function * * *. And that is that allows the Legislature to Advance the Effective Date of the Bill."

A review of the precise wording of Chapter 658 above, indicates that the Legislators who enacted that provision, intended something other than your "One Simple Function". That wording indicates that the "Public Peace, Health, & Safety" were then in such "Immediate" Danger as to make it "Necessary" for the passage of the Bill. That is the precise effect of the wording contained in the above provision, & probably all others similar.

Now some-one is mis-representing the Truth here, sir. Is it your position that in their effort to Expedite the Passage of this Legislation, that the entire Legislature has Conspired to Purposefully Include Wording there-in which is Falsifying the Intent behind said Legislation?

That seems to be the effect of your words sir. But, Why would the Legislators Purposefully Falsify the Intent behind Legislation merely to Expedite Passage of these kinds of Bills? I mean this is effectively "Perjury" of their Oath of Office. That is Class C Felony, sir. This kind of Legislation Governing Oregon's Judiciary Affects the Lives of All Oregonians. This is No Small Matter. Why would they Risk All of this Merely because a 30 or 90 day time frame rush ?

Sir, there is clearly more to these "Emergency" declarations than you have been conceding to "We the People" of this "State of Oregon". You need to stop this "Hedging", sir. Your Destroying your Credibility, sir. This could be construed as "Culpable Mental State", sir. The Private-Special-Interest-Group "Powers That Be" need to be told that this Charade is No Longer Plausibly Maintainable. There are just too many holes in the dam/dyke. Your either going to have to import Russian or Chinese Mercenaries to Execute Violent & Treasonous Hostile-Take-Over of this State & Nation., or your going to have to back of & allow "We the People" to bring our Corrupted Civil-Servants to an Accountability under "Due Process of Law". The effects of this latter option will there-by shrink the Powerful

Special- Interest-Group's Abilities to Continue their Pillage & Plunder of the People of Oregon. A tough nut for them to swallow, we realize. But from the perspective of the Constitutionally-Lawful "State of Oregon", it's not our problem. May-be they should content themselves with a single class of People on this earth, & finding their peaceable place there-in, just as Almighty God YHVH & Christ Jesus & so intended.

Your above comments indicate that you had not studied the 1973 Senate Report 93-549 with these concerns in mind at the time of our last meeting. We need to "Address these Issues" in our next meeting, sir. If you could indulge us as "State-Ex-Rel" Masters of the Civil-Servants of this State in preparing to "Address these Issues" this time around, we would be greatly appreciative.

Further "Critical Issues" from the previous discussion's Transcript which we find in Need of being "Addressed", are as follows:

CS: ... Im looking for a Recognition of the Difference between "Malum Prohibitum" and "Malum in Se". ...

WC: I learned that in Law School. I know the Latin phrase ... phrases. I know what you mean. But then to move forward ... on to as to how it's going to operate ... I'm not so certain. I mean you started out with "Mens Rea" aspect ... and ... I don't need to repeat it, ... it's ... but I hope it illustrates that it isn't just as simple as saying: "Here's "Malum Prohibitum", & Here's "Malum in Se", & the Legislature is Violating the Constitution when it passes a Law that is Based on "Prohibitum'". Maybe ... Maybe not."

With regard to the above words, May we construe that you are Admitting that the Legislature is passing "Malum Prohibitum" Legislation?

It appears so, & it seems a reasonable inference, how-ever we find Admissions to this effect rare. A part of the "Conspiracy", many of us do theorize. If we may build upon this as an Admission from you, this would help greatly towards resolution of these controversies. Please object timely, sir.

And further sir, we note two Un-Certainties on your part here, which are "Issues to be Addressed" in our minds. The second one being here-buy addressed first. You state that you are "Not Certain" if the "Legislature is Violating the Constitution when it passes a Law based on "(Malum) Prohibitum". Maybe ... Maybe Not."

This seems to us to be Admission that you are Not Sure if all of the "Malum Prohibitum" Legislation which is being passed is, "Constitutional". You further Admit that you are "Not So Certain" as to "How" the Difference between Malum Prohibitum & Malum in Se "is going to Operate" within this Constitutionally-Lawful "State of Oregon" .

We find this mind-boggling, sir. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon is "Not Certain" if all of the "Malum Prohibitum" being routinely passed by the State's Legislature is within Constitutional-Parameters. Cheez. This is a very "Critical Issue" we need to "Address", sir.

This is a good time to assure you that we seek no embarrassment of you. You seem to us to be a rare Peace-Maker, who is surrounded by cowards, bullies, & parasites. As stated before, we find your courage in facilitating these communications, precious; & we will do everything in our power to keep you in the most favorable light, at least so long as your good faith seems intact, of which we are optimistic.

But "We the People" deserve Reasonable Answers to these "Critical Issues" sir. Passages like the above reveal that there may very well be grounds for "We the People" Taking Up Arms against the Legislators, Judges, & Executive Department Personnel who are Conspiring to En-Force this "Malum Prohibitum" over Us.

"Conscience", is made clearly redundant reference to Three Times in the First Seven Sections of the First Article of Oregon's Constitution. . This seems to us to clearly Prohibit "Malum Prohibitum". Our last discussion focused on the "Special Laws" Prohibition of Article 4 Section 23 as being our groups main basis for Ridding this State of it's present "Malum-Prohibitum" Jurisdiction. And we still believe that to be sound, though our ability to articulate it remains elusive. So we would like to shift-gears over to these "Conscience" Requirements of Oregon's "Bill of Rights". These seem to us to clearly Prohibit the State's Civil Legislature from Enacting "Malum Prohibitum" over "We the People". We would like to also "Address" this "Critical Issue", sir.

With regard to the "Constructive Notice of Treason" Documents which were presented to the Law Commission, Judicial Commission, & the Supreme Court, & Similar to the Governor; we ask that these meetings recognize latitude for the "Critical Issues" of Evidence of "Treason" as out-lined there-in be recognized as proper supportive reference materials of the concerns outlined herein.

Also, the Religious End of these things needs to be addressed sir. In our Cover Letter to the Transcript which we faxed to you, along with other previous materials; we have pointed out that the Roman Roots of the Civil/Municipal forms of Government are to be found in the ancient Babylonian Slave-Trading Codes. As stated there-in, the Biblical Book of Revelation & other Biblical Citations Commands that Christians to Not Subject Them-Selves to these Municipal Slave-Trading Codes of Babylon. The Romans were clearly Slave-Traders, just like the Babylonians. They used the same Slave-Trading Codes. This seems to us why Webster's New international Dictionary (1950) Defines a "Municipal District" as "A subdivision of a region inhabited chiefly by non-Christians."

This together with the Oregon Blue Book Cite on County Governments above, makes it clear to us that American's & Oregonians are to be Governed by "Free Governments" under Christian/Common-Law.

And here-under need to ask you if you consider yourself a Christian, sir. We find that this has become a "Spiritual Battle". We can no longer pretend that it may be contained to the secular realm. Ten Thousand People are having their Lives Destroyed in Oregon's Prisons, and probably not a single one of them can be shown by any Civil Servant to be there by way to true Conscionable "Due Process of Law".

This is outrageous, sir.

Discovering whether you consider yourself a Christian is a "Point of Law" which has become important us in these discussions. It goes to Good-Faith, sir. Lord Coke described Non-Christians as "Infidels", being there-by un-trust-worthy. We all like you. You have been gracious. But there are too many chips on the table. We take this as serious work on behalf of that "Almighty God" of Article 1 Section 2. These are the Chips of "Almighty God". We dare not gamble them recklessly.

We suggest another two hour meeting. Our people will exercise diligence in restraining them-selves from again digressing into listing our grievances to you. 1:00 pm or so of any day is ideal.

Feel free to share all of these materials with others as you may see fit.
It would be good if other Judges could be motivated to share there-in.

We hope this letter/fax finds you & yours well.

God's Will be Done.

_____

Charles Bruce, Stewart.