

NEW LAW FORM?
by michael-herbert: keehn

An issue has come up and is gaining momentum that is of concern to me. I became aware of it in an email, sent by a friend who seemed excited about this issue. Here is what my friend had to say:

Michael...I have happily found a woman on the net..on You Tube, called Cindy Currier..and she has (with attorneys) drawn up an American Law of the Land..using Natural Law, or law that a child could understand and agree to..NOT this fraud and corruption we have been dealing with.

See her site below...and also go to 'Rise Together' on YouTube. She is rather Christian, but savvy completely on the fraud perpetrated by D.C., the judicial in this country, etc. I am with her all the way...and I am as always hopeful, optimistic.

The web-page link she provided is:

<http://www.americanlawoftheland.com/>

So I took a look at what this web-page had to say and analyze it paragraph by paragraph, noticing that there is no author taking credit for its construction. Here is the opening paragraph.

A Law By and For the People

Why a new law form? First, because English Common Law (Anglo-American Common Law) functions in violation of natural law, which is observed and oral, not written. Second, because English Common Law is developed by paid judges rather than the people. Third, because English Common Law is based on precedent (prior court decisions) rather than on the current cultural context of the case. And we could go on, but you get the idea. Probably the most important reasons, though, are that 1.) the precedent set in Britain (and thus, America) adheres to International Uniform Commercial Code (reorganized as the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods or CISG Vienna Convention) derived from Vatican Law, and 2.) law in America has been based on a misrepresented 1789 United States Constitution which operates under Commercial Law (Vatican Law), not Common Law. Seem convoluted and confusing? Yes, we think so too.

What's missing here is context. The first reference is to *the Common Law*. What has not been revealed or presented is that *the Common Law* is the law of

the republic of these united States of America. The more sophisticated reader will know that the lowercase “u” on “united” is not an accident or oversight, it is proper case for the republic since “united” is an adjective. However, with the declaration of bankruptcy of the United States by then President, Franklin D. Roosevelt in Executive Orders and the passage of the Emergency Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933, our law form changed.

With the passage of the Banking Relief Act, the whole of government became *publically traded for profit*, and this can be confirmed with appropriate searches on Dun & Bradstreet. The researcher will find that every Office, Agency, Bureau and Department of Government is publically traded for profit. This creates an *irreconcilable conflict of interest*.

Take the Superior court for example. The Court has a fiduciary obligation to the *administration of justice*, however, it also has an obligation to an *investor* as a publically traded entity. And, the obligation to the investor always trumps the fiduciary obligation to the administration of justice, thus creating an *irreconcilable conflict of interest*. In the case of the Court, it, or they, package and sell convictions on a securities and exchange. Every conviction has a dollar value and benefit to the Court, thus making it very difficult, if not impossible, to get justice. And this is true for every Office, Agency, Bureau and Department of Government. It is the means by which current *defacto Government* finances itself!

In the second sentence the author states that *English Common Law functions in violation of natural law*. *Natural Law* generally means the following:

Natural law, or the **law of nature** is a philosophy of law that is supposedly determined by nature, and so is universal.

Now we are talking about *survival of the fittest*. This is *Natural Law*. Is that what we want? Do we want a situation in which my gang is bigger, or tougher, or better able to kill than your gang, therefore I can take your property and your life? Of course, *English Common Law* functions in violation of *Natural Law*, that's is to bring civilized behavior to the people and to the law.

The *English Common Law* has roots in the Magna Carta. The time is 1215, and the barons have revolted against King John, giving him the opportunity to sign the Magna Carta, or if he failed to sign, then at night-fall, the land would be without a King. John signed.

In effect, the English were telling John that he had his powerful Navy thus, his law could be upon the sea, *Admiralty - Maritime jurisdiction*, the law of pirates. But, beginning at the ebb-flow of the tide and upon the land shall be the common law, which is God's Law, taken from the bible and applied to cases in the common law. An *at-law* action refers to the common law. In American Law, the word "law" is a reference to the common law, but that distinction has been corrupted by virtue of Leadership referring to corporation rules (statutes) as law. *The United States* is a corporation, thus, "Statutes" are not laws, they are corporation rules. And "YES", the word "The" is part of the name of the corporate United States. "Statutes" are Rules for a closed society of those corporation members. And "code" is not law, it is an administrating agency's interpretation of the statute.

Then, in the third sentence the author goes on to say:

"Second, because English Common Law is developed by paid judges rather than the people."

This is simply not true. The Common Law is a body of law based on custom and general principles of the people and their culture, embodied in case law which serves as precedent and includes those principles, usages and rules of action applicable to the government and security of person and property, which do not rest for their authority upon any express and positive declaration of the will of the legislative body of the country in question. The Common law applies only to civil cases.

In federal rule making, an *Act* is generally assigned an identity. For example, in the House of Representatives, an *Act* may be assigned HR-1234, and in the Senate, it may be assigned SR-5678. The "R" in the identifier stands for "RESOLUTION" which is corporate law. If the representatives were passing law for the republic of these united States of America, there would be no "R" in the identifier. For the house it would be H-1234, and for the Senate, S-5678. And

if one were to do their homework, they will find many acts before 1933 in which there was no "R" in the identifier. Take a look in Title 18. I don't think that any act since 1933 has failed to have an "R" in the identifier.

In the next sentence, the author goes on to say:

Third, because English Common Law is based on precedent (prior court decisions) rather than on the current cultural context of the case.

This is true, and it is GOOD! But we need to be clear and in context once again. The Common Law of these united States of America does not march in lockstep with English Common Law. Customs and culture are different, and so is the Common Law of the two countries. That said, it is true that the Common Law depends of precedent set by prior court decisions, but that does not exclude current context of the case at hand. It only means that a similar case can be relied on for decision in the current case, and this is good because the law is not different on different days, or with different people. It makes us *equal in the eyes of the law!*

Can we see a situation where a woman is stoned to death, or perhaps has her head bashed in by a family member in an Arab community holding a different cultural belief than other community's in America, and that behavior is excused on the basis of *cultural difference*?

At the tail-end of the first paragraph, the author has this to say:

and 2.) law in America has been based on a misrepresented 1789 United States Constitution which operates under Commercial Law (Vatican Law), not Common Law. Seem convoluted and confusing? Yes, we think so too.

Again, the stage has not been set and context is missing. Many Americans do not yet know that there are at least three "*United States*" defined in law, one of them corporate.

"United States. This term has several meanings. It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in a family of nations, it may designate territory over which sovereignty of United States extends, or it may be collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution.

Hooven & Allison Co. v. Evatt, U.S. Ohio, 324 U.S. 652, 65 S.Ct. 870, 880,89 L.Ed. 1252." [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

We are told that we have a Constitution and that we are a Constitutional Republic. But the fact is that our Constitution has been commandeered and replaced. And this has been done in a most stealthy manner. When the United States corporation was created in 1871, it came with its own Constitution which looks very similar to the Constitution for the republic of these united States of America. The change was so minor as to go un-noticed by the majority of Americans and while the scholars in the main stream media were almost certainly aware of the change, they never reported it. The change was only one word, but *one word* is all that was needed. Where as the Constitution of 1787 read:

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution **for** the United States of America."

The corporate Constitution reads:

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution **of** the United States of America."

Changing the word "for" to the word "of" changes the source of the Constitution from the *people of the republic* to the [corporate] people of the [corporate] United States. And just like we have three "United States" defined in law, we also have two United States Constitutions. And this is where it gets tricky because when an individual, except the President, elected or appointed to an office of honor or profit in the civil service or uniformed services, shall take the following oath...

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and

domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God." – 5 U.S.C. § 3331

... it brings into question which Constitution is being referenced. Because there are two United States Constitutions this whole swearing of an oath becomes ambiguous at best, and intentionally criminal (through fraud perpetrated by deception) at worst. This whole matter could be put to rest if the target Constitution were appropriately referenced. For example, *defend the 1787 Constitution of the republic of these united States of America*. Or, in the alternative, *defend the 1871 Constitution of the corporate United States*. But if the intent is to operate as criminally deceptive as possible, this type of clarity cannot be tolerated.

There are many positive aspects of the *American Common Law*, but if one were to put it into a word, the best description is that the *American Common Law* is *JUST!* For an example, take a look at the Constitution.

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury..." – Constitution for the republic of these united States of America

This common law provision provides that *we the people* hold each other accountable and that we were not giving that power to government.

The common law also provides that we can face our accuser, which is blatantly absent in today's legal processes.

The common law requires that there is an injured party, that is a living man or woman of the land who bleeds. In other words, dead people, like corporations, do not qualify as an injured party. Today, 85% of the people in American jails and prisons have not damaged any property, nor have they harmed anyone. They have made the mistake of acting like the **sovereigns** they are!

The common law holds that we, the living men and women of the land who bleed, are all equal in the eyes of the law. Yet, I read this from the web page of

the individual you referenced in the email, the following:

"Third, because English Common Law is based on precedent (prior court decisions) rather than on the current cultural context of the case." –
<http://www.americanlawoftheland.com/>

This language paves the way to treat the people un-equally, depending on the current cultural context of the case. This is the words of a liberal who wants to create hatred by treating everyone differently depending current cultural context of the case.

It is true that the American Common Law is based on previous court decisions, it's called, *stare decisis*, or "once decided." This meant that the people could rely on the law to be consistent. That is, not different on different days, or different because of different judges, or different because it involved different people of different-nationalities and cultural backgrounds. It meant we were all EQUAL in the eyes of the law, and we could depend on the law being fair across the board.

The American Common Law is a harsh, but yet, very just body of law. It is just fine for resolving all the cases that need justice applied.

In the end, it becomes very easy to sway and cajole a stupid and un-educated people, and I suspect that is the goal of this effort. Attorneys are the ones that created the current debacle in the administration of justice, why do we wish to continue believing in people who continually lie to, and mislead us?

The Common Law has not been operational since 1933, now 82-years (May 31, 2015) and virtually no one today has seen it in operation. I think that we should all see the *Common Law* in operation before deciding to replace it!