

FROM THE EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR 2

ROSENTHAL CASE 5

LETTERS 6

ON THE GRAND JURY 8

THE POWER
OF ONE JUROR 11

Don't miss an issue!
Check the Expiration
Date on your label ~
is it time to renew?
Renew Today!

AMERICAN JUROR

Quotes from Memorable Court Cases

Mattox v. U.S., 156 US 237, 243. We are bound to interpret the Constitution in the light of the law as it existed at the time it was adopted.

S. Carolina v. U.S., 199 U.S. 437, 448 (1905). The Constitution is a written instrument. As such, its meaning does not alter. That which it meant when it was adopted, it means now.

Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137 The Constitution of these United States is the supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is null and void of law.

Murdock v. Penn., 319 US 105 No state shall convert a liberty into a privilege, license it, and attach a fee to it.

Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 373 US 262 If the state converts a liberty into a privilege, the citizen can engage in the right with impunity.

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation, which would abrogate them.

Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.

Miller v. U.S., 230 F.2d. 486, 489 The claim and exercise of a Constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime.

Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742, 748 Waivers of Constitutional Rights, not only must they be voluntary, they must be knowingly intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness.

Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S.Ct. 1401 (1958). No state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it.

The constitutional theory is that we the people are the sovereigns, the state and federal officials only our agents." *Colten v. Kentucky* (1972)407 U.S. 104@122, 92 S.Ct. 1953; Dissent by Douglas.

Before we place the stigma of a criminal conviction upon any such citizen the legislative mandate must be clear and unambiguous. Accordingly that which Chief Justice Marshall has called 'the tenderness of the law for the rights of individuals' [FN1] entitles each person, regardless of economic or social status, to an unequivocal warning from the legislature as to whether he is within the class of persons subject to vicarious liability. Congress cannot be deemed to have intended to punish anyone who is not plainly and unmistakably within the confines of the statute. *United States v. Lacher*, 134 U.S. 624, 628, 10 S.Ct. 625, 626, 33 L.Ed. 1080; *United States v. Gradwell*, 243 U.S. 476, 485, 37 S.Ct. 407, 61 L.Ed. 857. FN1 *United States v. Wiltberger*, 5 Wheat. 76, 95, 5 L.Ed. 37.

We do not overlook those constitutional limitations which, for the protection of personal rights, must necessarily attend all investigations conducted under the authority of Congress. Neither branch of the legislative department, still less any merely administrative body, established by Congress, possesses, or can be invested with, a general power of making inquiry into the private affairs of the citizen. *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U. S. 168, 196 [26: 377, 386]. We said in *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U. S. 616, 630 [29: 746, 751]-and it cannot be too often repeated-that the principles that embody the essence of constitutional liberty and security forbid all invasions on the part of the government and its employees of the sanctity of a man's home, and the privacies of his life. As said by Mr. Justice Field in *Re Pacific R. Commission*, 32 Fed. Rep. 241, 250, "of all the rights of the citizen, few are of greater importance or more essential to his peace and happiness than the right of personal security, and that involves, not merely protection of his person from assault, but exemption of his private affairs, books, and papers from the inspection and scrutiny of others. Without the enjoyment of this right, all others would lose half their value."

... It is scarcely necessary to say that the power given to Congress to regulate interstate commerce does not carry with it any power to destroy or impair those guarantees. This

For FIJActivists
everywhere! Go! Hand
out literature!
Enjoy!



2007 Porcupine
Freedom Festival
“Discover New
Freedoms, New
Communities, and
New Beginnings!”
June 18 - 24, 2007
Gunstock Mountain
Resort, Gilford, NH
more info at
www.freestateproject.org/events

The American Juror

Newsletter of the Fully Informed Jury
Association/American Jury Institute

Iloilo Marguerite Jones
Executive Director/Editor
The American Juror

Published quarterly, \$30 annual
subscription, by the

Fully Informed Jury
Association and

American Jury Institute

The staff hereby grants permission
to reprint any part or all of this
publication provided that bylined
articles, graphics and photos are
credited to their author(s), and

American Juror is referenced. Submit
all materials for publication to:

The American Juror
Iloilo Jones, Editor
Post Office Box 5570

Helena, MT 59604-5570

Send e-mail to: aji@fija.org

Copy should be submitted in the
body of the e-mail and not as an
attachment.

Postmaster:

Please send all address corrections to

FIJA/AJI P.O. Box 5570

Helena, MT 59604-5570

Non-Profit postage paid at Helena,
Montana, and at additional mailing
offices.

From the Executive Director

Helena, Montana May 15, 2007

Dear Friends,

This issue features a collection of significant quotes on the jury and the sovereign citizen. I hope you will use these quotes as “intellectual ammunition” during discussions and talks. The citations are included, so you will be able provide a source if you need it.

Have you been watching the irrational actions of our bureaucrats and congress critters? Who can fail to see the usurpation of rights taking place in this country by a government which I no longer claim as “mine”. I dearly want back the Constitution I was taught as a child! We are here to get it back. I want to write a bit about what is going on here at FIJA for this issue, suggest some actions we can all take, and call upon each of you to do a bit more.

As most of you already know, one hundred years ago, most of the “crimes” for which people are now prosecuted were not crimes at all, but the private, personal actions of private, sovereign citizens. Think about it. We have been slowly losing practice at that most precious possession, individual responsibility. I think each of us can trust our own minds and decisions to take better care of our bodies, lives and property than can any government bureaucrat. But in order to exercise this precious, mature, liberating and fulfilling human characteristic that is individual self responsibility, we must get government’s interfering bureaucrats and laws out of the way.

The only sure method I have found to do this is through juror veto. When a juror refuses to send someone to prison for any action which was a personal choice, which harmed no other person, and which was the right of any human - as a matter of individual ownership and responsibility - to decide and do, then we have begun to reclaim our role in creation as individually responsible humans. Do you really trust government bureaucrats or politicians more than yourself to take care of your life? I don’t think so, and I doubt that anyone else, if they really think about it, does either.

That is what juror veto, juror nullification and jury authority are all about. Jury Rights Day is coming up in September. Please make plans now to distribute literature, get a proclamation signed, speak to a group, appear for an interview, write a letter to an editor or opinion column, hand out our Media Disc or other activities to inform and encourage others to celebrate individual responsibility and juror authority. Handing out literature required good judgment - I have received a few complaints about FIJA literature which blew around neighborhood after being left in doors of homes, and of flyers left on windshields which also blew away. Hand literature to another human, please. Check web pages for current advice, or request one of our sheets on handing out literature.

You can check the web page and forums for current educational projects. Be sure to check with state contact people who may have something planned now or for Jury Rights Day and Bill of Rights Day. In this issue, you will see the text of our new Grand Jury handout, which is available on the web, or through e-mail orders.

There are several projects going on. We are working on a new DVD right now. It is all about Juror Authority as the final check on bad laws. We are also taping a short segment for the internet. I hope to distribute the DVD free. It should be out in a few months. Our street worker projects are going very well - thank you to everyone who has sent funds for this project, which has been active from Florida to California!

Remember, we have, on the FIJA Media Disc, that great new Power Point Presentation, which works well as the background visuals during any talk, and is also a good script for your talk. You can also use the Disc as an educational gift, because it has past issues of the newsletter, lots of literature, and archives as well as the Presentation.

Let me know how things are going, what you are doing, and especially if I can be of any assistance in your efforts.

For Liberty and Justice for All ~ Iloilo Marguerite Jones

(Continued from Page 1)

court has already spoken fully on that general subject in *Counselman v. Hitchcock*, 142 U. S. 547 [35: 1110], 3 Inters. Com. Rep. 816. ... Suffice it in the present case to say that as the Interstate Commerce Commission, by petition in a circuit court of the United States seeks, upon grounds distinctly set forth, an order to compel appellees to answer particular questions and to produce certain books, papers, etc., in their possession, it was open to each of them to contend before that court that he was protected by the Constitution from making answer to the questions propounded to him; or that he was not legally bound to produce the books, papers, etc., ordered to be produced; or that neither the questions propounded nor the books, papers, etc., called for relate to the particular matter under investigation, nor to any matter which the Commission is entitled under the Constitution or laws to investigate. These issues being determined in their favor by the court, the petition of the Commission could have been dismissed upon its merits. *Interstate Commerce Comm'n v. Brimson* (1894), 154 U.S. 447, 38 L.Ed 1047, 1058, 14 S.Ct. 1125.

Common law, by constitution, is law of state. *Beech Grove Inv. Co. v. Civil Rights Com'n* (1968) 157 N.W.2d 213, 380 Mich. 405.

"As men whose intentions require no concealment, generally employ the words which most directly and aptly express the ideas they intent to convey; the enlightened patriots who framed our constitution and the people who adopted it must be understood to have employed the words in their natural sense, and to have intended what they have said." See: *Gibbons v. Ogden*, 27 U.S. 1

People are supreme, not the state. See: *Waring v. the Mayor of Savannah*, 60 Georgia at 93.

A constitution is designated as a supreme enactment, a fundamental act of legislation by the people of the state. A constitution is legislation direct from the people acting in their sovereign capacity, while a statute is legislation from their representatives, subject to limitations prescribed by the superior authority. See: *Ellingham v. Dye*, 178 Ind. 336; 99 NE 1; 231 U.S. 250; 58 L. Ed. 206; 34 S. Ct. 92; *Sage v. New York*, 154 NY 61; 47 NE 1096.

The question is not what power the federal government ought to have, but what powers, in fact, have been given by the people. . . . The federal union is a government of delegated powers. It has only such as are expressly conferred upon it, and such as are reasonably to be implied from those granted. In this respect, we differ radically from nations where all legislative power, without restriction of limitation, is vested in a parliament or other legislative body subject to no restrictions except the discretion of its members. See: *U.S. v. William M. Butler* , 297 U.S. 1.

The people themselves have it in their power effectually to resist usurpation, without being driven to an appeal in arms. An act of usurpation is not obligatory: It is not law; and any man may be justified in his resistance. Let him be considered as a criminal by the general government; yet only his fellow citizens can convict him. They are his jury, and if they pronounce him innocent, not all powers of congress can hurt him; and innocent they certainly will pronounce him, if the supposed law he resisted was an act of usurpation. See: 2 Elliot's Debates, 94; 2 Bancroft, History of the Constitution, 267.

But it cannot be assumed that the framers of the Constitution and the people who adopted it did not intent that which is the plain import of the language used. When the language of the Constitution is positive and free from all ambiguity, all courts are not at liberty, by a resort to the refinements of legal learning, to restrict its obvious meaning to avoid hardships of particular cases, we must accept the Constitution as it reads when its language is unambiguous, for it is the mandate of the sovereign powers. See: *State v. Sutton*, 63 Minn. 147, 65 WX N.W., 262, 101, N.W. 74; *Cook v. Iverson*, 122, N.M. 251.

In this state, as well as in all republics, it is not the legislation, however transcendent its powers, who are supreme— but the people— and to suppose that they may violate the fundamental law is, as has been most eloquently expressed, to affirm that the deputy is greater than his principal;

(Continued on Page 4)

"It is impossible to introduce into society a greater change and a greater evil than this: the conversion of the law into an instrument of plunder."

~ Frederic Bastiat
(1801-1850) French economist, statesman, and author. June 1850 Source: *The Law*, by Frederic Bastiat, 1850

"The system of private property is the most important guaranty of freedom, not only for those who own property, but scarcely less for those who do not."

~ Fredrich August von Hayek (1899-1992), Nobel Laureate of Economic Sciences 1974

"By the power to lay and collect imposts Congress may impose duties on any or every article of commerce imported into these states to what amount they please. By the power to lay excises, a power very odious in its nature, since it authorizes officers to examine into your private concerns, the Congress may impose duties on every article of use or consumption: On the food that we eat, on the liquors we drink, on the clothes that we wear, the glass which enlighten our houses, or the hearths necessary for our warmth and comfort. By the power to lay and collect taxes, they may proceed to direct taxation on every individual either by a capitation tax on their heads or an assessment on their property. By this part of the section, therefore, the government has a power to tax to what amount they choose and thus to sluice the people at every vein as long as they have a drop of blood left."

~ Luther Martin (1744-1826)
Maryland delegate to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia

"Everyone has his own conscience, and there should be no rules about how a conscience should function."

~ Ernest Hemingway
(1899-1961) Author

“The more one considers the matter, the clearer it becomes that redistribution is in effect far less a redistribution of free income from the richer to the poorer, as we imagined, than a redistribution of power from the individual to the State.”

~ Bertrand de Jouvenel

(1903-1987) Source: The Ethics of Redistribution [1952] (Indianapolis: Liberty Press, 1990), p. 72.

“We need true tax reform that will at least make a start toward restoring for our children the American Dream that wealth is denied to no one, that each individual has the right to fly as high as his strength and ability will take him.... But we cannot have such reform while our tax policy is engineered by people who view the tax as a means of achieving changes in our social structure.”

~ Ronald Reagan (1911-2004) 40th US President

“The privilege of giving or withholding moneys is an important barrier against the undue exertion of prerogative which if left altogether without control may be exercised to our great ppression; and all history shows how efficacious its intercession for redress of grievances and reestablishment of rights, and how improvident would be the surrender of so powerful a mediator.”

~ Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826), US Founding Father, drafted the Declaration of Independence, 3rd US President

(Continued from Page 3)

that the servant is above his master; that the representatives of the people are superior to the people themselves; that the men acting by virtue of delegated powers may do, not only what their powers do not authorize, but what they forbid. See: *Warning v. the Mayor of Savannah*, 60 Georgia, P. 93.

There have been powerful hydraulic pressures throughout our history that bear heavily on the court to water down constitutional guarantees and give the police the upper hand. That hydraulic pressure has probably never been greater than it is today. Yet if the individual is no longer to be sovereign, if the police can pick him up whenever they do not like the cut of his jib, if they can “seize” and “search” him in their discretion, we enter a new regime. The decision to enter it should be made only after a full debate by the people of this country. See: *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 39 (1967).

“Personal liberty, or the Right to enjoyment of life and liberty, is one of the fundamental or natural Rights, which has been protected by its inclusion as a guarantee in the various constitutions, which is not derived from, or dependent on, the U.S. Constitution, which may not be submitted to a vote and may not depend on the outcome of an election. It is one of the most sacred and valuable Rights, as sacred as the Right to private property ... and is regarded as inalienable.” 16 C.J.S., Constitutional Law, Sect.202, p.987

Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power. For the very idea that one man may be compelled to hold his life, or the means of living, or any material right essential to the enjoyment of life, at the mere will of another, seems to be intolerable in any country where freedom prevails, as being the essence of slavery itself. (*Yick Wo vs. Hopkins*, U.S. 356 (1886). “...The Congress cannot revoke the Sovereign power of the people to override their will as thus declared.” *Perry v. United States*, 294 U.S. 330, 353 (1935).

“In the United States, Sovereignty resides in the people, who act through the organs established by the Constitution.” *Chisholm v. Georgia*, 2 Dall 419, 471; *Penhallow v. Doane’s Administrators*, 3 Dall 54, 93; *McCullock v. Maryland*, 4 Wheat 316, 404, 405; *Yick Yo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 370.

“The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government.” *City of Dallas v Mitchell*, 245 S.W. 944

Supreme Court Justice Brandeis spoke, in the case of *Olmstead v. United States* when he said: “Decency, security and liberty alike demand that government officials shall be subjected to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the citizen. In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the laws scrupulously. Our government is the potent omnipresent teacher. For good or ill, it teaches the whole people by it’s example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a law breaker, it breeds contempt for the law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy. To declare that in the administration of criminal laws the end justifies the means—to declare that the government may commit crimes in order to secure the conviction of a private criminal—would bring terrible retribution. Against that pernicious doctrine this Court should resolutely set its face. ...And so should every law enforcement student, practitioner, supervisor, and administrator.....”

“Trust in the jury is, after all, one of the cornerstones of our entire criminal jurisprudence, and if that trust is without foundation we must re examine a great deal more than just the nullification doctrine.”

Judge David L. Bazelon, Dissent in *United States v. Dougherty*, 473 F.2d 1113, 1142 (D.C. Cir. 1972). “The jury has an “unreviewable and irreversible power... to acquit in disregard of the instructions on the law given by the trial judge... The pages of history shine on instances of the jury’s exercise of its prerogative to disregard uncontradicted evidence and instructions of the judge; for example, acquittals under the fugitive slave law.

U.S. v. Dougherty, D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, 1972, 473 F.2d at 1130 and 1132.

(Nevertheless, the majority opinion held that jurors need not be told this. Dissenting Chief Judge Bazelon thought that they ought to be so told.)

“If the jury feels the law is unjust, we recognize the undisputed power of the jury to acquit, even if its verdict is contrary to the law as given by a judge, and contrary to the evidence... If the jury feels that the law under which the defendant is accused is unjust, or that exigent circumstances justified the actions of the accused, or for any reason which appeals to their logic or passion, the jury has the power to acquit, and the courts must abide by that decision.” United States v. Moylan, 4th Circuit Court of Appeals, 1969, 417 F.2d at 1006.

“The judge cannot direct a verdict it is true, and the jury has the power to bring in a verdict in the teeth of both law and facts.” Mr. Justice Holmes, for the majority in *Horning v. District of Columbia*, 254 U.S. 135, 138 (1920).

Judge Says Charges Against Rosenthal Vindictive, But Prosecutors Decide to Waste More Tax Dollars

The federal prosecutors have decided to proceed with a trial against Ed Rosenthal although U.S. District Judge Charles Breyer ruled that prosecutors had illegally retaliated against Ed Rosenthal, 62, when they added tax-evasion and money-laundering charges to his previous indictment for growing marijuana for medical patients. New charges were based on old evidence, the judge had said, and appeared to be aimed at punishing Rosenthal for winning his appeal and for complaining publicly that his trial had been unfair.

Prosecutors' actions and statements seemed designed “to make Rosenthal look like a common criminal and thus dissipate the criticism heaped on the government after the first trial,” Breyer said. That perception, he said, “will discourage defendants from exercising their First Amendment right to criticize their prosecutions and their statutory right to appeal their convictions.”

Breyer left the marijuana-growing charges intact but noted that prosecutors could not seek to add to the sentence the judge imposed on Rosenthal before the convictions were overturned ~ one day in prison, which Rosenthal has already served.

Rosenthal said it was time to bring the case to an end. “The court’s ruling is reassuring, but my continued prosecution on the marijuana charges is still malicious,” he said in a statement released by his lawyers. Joe Elford of Americans for Safe Access, an attorney for Rosenthal, said,

“Taxpayer dollars should not be wasted on a vendetta carried out by the government.”

Rosenthal was arrested in February 2002 on federal charges of growing hundreds of marijuana plants in a West Oakland warehouse for patients served by the Harm Reduction Center, San Francisco medical-cannabis dispensary.

Breyer, the judge at Rosenthal’s trial, refused to let the jury hear evidence about California’s medical marijuana law or Rosenthal’s status as an official in Oakland’s medical marijuana program. A jury convicted Rosenthal of three felony cultivation charges in 2003.

A majority of the jurors disavowed their verdict after learning of the excluded evidence, however, and urged leniency. Breyer sentenced Rosenthal to the one day in prison he had already served, rather than the usual five-year term for the crimes, saying Rosenthal had believed he was acting legally because of his position in the Oakland program. (See Spring 2003 and Spring 2006 FIJA newsletters at our web site www.fija.org for more background-ed)

In overturning the convictions, the appeals court cited a juror’s telephone call to a lawyer friend, who told her she could get in trouble if she didn’t follow Breyer’s instructions to consider only federal law. The court also indicated that Breyer had acted within his authority in imposing a one-day sentence and

(Rosenthal Continued on Page 10, col. 2)

*“When you get into politics, you find that all your worst nightmares about it turn out to be true, and the people who are attracted to large concentrations of power are precisely the ones who should be kept as far away from it as possible.” ~ Ken Livingstone
Member of Parliament*

*“The way to crush the bourgeoisie is to grind them between the millstones of taxation and inflation.”
~ Vladimir Ilyich Lenin
[Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov]
(1870 - 1924), First Leader of the Soviet Union*

“You know your country is dying when you have to make a distinction between what is moral and ethical, and what is legal.” ~ John De Armond

*“Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.” ~ Mao Tse-Tung
Premier of China
(1893 - 1976)*

*“We could not leave them to themselves ~ they were unfit for self-government ~ and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain’s was ... there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them.” ~ William McKinley
(1843-1901) 25th US President
Source: 1899, on the Filipinos, following the U.S. invasion of the Philippines in 1898. During the invasion and occupation, U.S. forces killed an estimated 200,000 Filipino civilians. Address to the Methodist Episcopal Church; cited in Olcott, *The Life of William McKinley* (1916), v. 2, p. 110; estimate of civilian casualties from U.S. Library of Congress, “The World of 1898: The Spanish-American War,” 1998.*

"History teaches that wars begin when governments believe the price of aggression is cheap."

- Ronald Reagan (1911-2004)
40th US President

"There is no distinctly native American criminal class save Congress." - Mark Twain

[Samuel Langhorne Clemens]
(1835-1910)

"Liberty is not a means to a higher political end. It is the highest political end."

- Lord Acton (1834-1902), First Baron Acton of Aldenham Source: *The History of Freedom*, 1907

"The objector and the rebel who raises his voice against what he believes to be the injustice of the present and the wrongs of the past is the one who hunches the world along."

- Clarence S. Darrow (1857-1938) Source: *Address to the Court, People v. Lloyd*, 1920

"The question is not what anybody deserves. The question is who is to take on the God-like role of deciding what everybody else deserves. You can talk about 'social justice' all you want. But what death taxes boil down to is letting politicians take money from widows and orphans to pay for goodies that they will hand out to others, in order to buy votes to get re-elected. That is not social justice or any other kind of justice."

- Thomas Sowell (1930-) Writer and economist

Letters

Ilo -This was sent to the Revolutionary Coalition by M.Trevino. I must check out this VOLUNTEER stuff in Alabama. I did not know that. In all the four years that I worked at the Courthouse as Chairman of the Board of Registrars, I never saw such a notice posted on the notice board and I did check it. - Margi

You may know in a room filled with 70 jurors waiting for 12 to be chosen, none, will ever admit wanting to be there. What you may not know is that every county must have a sitting grand jury, who indict at the loco public serpents whim but whose primary duty, is to indict those very same serps. Check your state codes. Every state is the same.

Grand jurors are chosen from a pool of persons who VOLUNTEER only, responding to the clerk's notices posted, supposedly, for maximum public expose. It is exceedingly important people call their clerk and request a packet to submit for grand jury duty; made available near the end of the fiscal year. 19 persons per year, generally, are chosen by the judges. Never more than 25, even in LA.

It is VERY easy to pad a grand jury here because no one thinks to volunteer, but people who associate extensively in or around the courts. Good Luck in your endeavours ~ Coalition.

Hello There!

Handing out FIJA literature from Starchild about teaching Jury Nullification

As long as you're not doing it in regards to any specific case, it's not jury tampering. This has been my understanding, and I was told the same thing by the woman coordinating the C.A.N. action. She said that people have come out to talk to the activists doing the fliering, and that some of them would be confrontational and others more "chatty," trying to get the activists to say they were there for a specific case. I haven't experienced this myself yet at the federal building, although I wonder whether one guy who seemed to be deliberately sitting within earshot of me for a while was trying to catch me saying something incriminating.

But one morning I'd been out there fliering ,I also stopped by the nearby municipal courthouse afterward and stood outside there

handing out fliers for a few minutes. This sergeant happened to step outside, probably not in response to me since I'd just arrived, but anyway I handed her a flier and she read it and after asking me if it was trying to get people to acquit and I said yes, she said it was "making a mockery of the system." That's what I like to hear! The system needs mocking. I didn't actually say that of course; I think what I actually said was that there are too many bad laws on the books which makes a mockery of justice. Then she asked me, "What case is this in regards to?" When I said "no specific case," she looked crestfallen. I was burning to tell the evil b**** off for trying to entrap me, but discretion and all that. Anyway, we exchanged a few more words about the desirability of jury nullification, and she went back insidewithout bothering me any more.

Love & liberty, <<< starchild >>

2 March 2007

Dear Iloilo:

I'm attaching an item I just downloaded from the NBC web site regarding the Lewis (Scooter) Libby case. (*Here is the relevant section-ed*)

"How do you read the body language of a jury? That was the big question in U.S. Judge Reggie Walton's courtroom this afternoon, as he brought in the 11 remaining jurors in the I. Lewis (Scooter) Libby case for a little chat. After nearly six days of deliberations, the jurors—many of them dressed in blue jeans and other casual clothes—had asked a couple of seemingly innocuous questions: Could they look at a dictionary? And, even more revealing, could they leave early Friday? Walton delivered his answers: No, they could not see a dictionary; if they had any questions about the legal meaning of words in the indictment or his instructions, they should ask him. And yes, they could leave early at 2 p.m. on Friday. Translation: there will be no verdict in the case this week."

The Jury actually felt they had to ask the Judge if they could see a dictionary. Ridiculous!! They should have told the Judge they wanted to see a dictionary, and if he refused (as he did), they should have kicked some ass. Anyway, you might find it

worthwhile to devote a paragraph to this topic in a future Newsletter.

With kindest regards, Frank Stratton

PS. My favorite quote, again: "The reasonable man* adapts himself to the world: the unreasonable man persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable man." George Bernard Shaw

*Using "man" in the general "mankind" sense.....

Letter to the Newspaper Editor in N.C.:
April 14, 2007

Dear Editor:

Tar Heels for the past year have been peppered with "news" in respect to three members of the Duke University lacrosse team who were indicted for raping an "exotic dancer". Now this same media is telling us the Durham County District Attorney, Mike Nifong, knew before the Grand Jury indictment, based on DNA examinations of the accuser, her accusation was false and the three accused men were innocent of these charges.

If these media reports are accurate then the District Attorney himself is guilty of obstruction of justice and should be prosecuted for this crime! The problem with this is it puts the N.C. Department of Justice and the legal profession in the embarrassing position of "the kettle calling the pot black"! Obstruction of justice is a crime and should be prosecuted in every case where it exists, yet most judges are guilty of this crime and most of them get away with it!

British Common Law from the Magna Carta of 1215 A.D. is a part of the U.S. Constitution by reference and below are several supreme Court rulings based on this:-

(1) "The jury has the right to judge both the law as well as the fact in controversy." John Jay, 1st Chief Justice U.S. Supreme Court 1789

(2) "The jury has the right to determine both the law and the facts." Samuel Chase, U.S. Supreme Court Justice, 1796

(3) "The jury has the power to bring a verdict in the teeth of both law and fact." Oliver Wendell Holmes, U.S. Supreme Court 1902

(4) "The law itself is on trial quite as much as the cause which is to be decided." Harlan

F. Stone, 12th Chief Justice U.S. Supreme Court, 1941

(5) "The pages of history shine on instances of the jury's exercise of its prerogative to disregard instructions of the judge..." U.S. vs. Dougherty, 473 F 2nd 1113.1139 (1972)

The only power a judge has over a jury is their ignorance! In an effort to expand power and control, many judges impose oaths upon juries. Jurors need to know that such oaths are ultra vires and cannot be enforced. A juror cannot be prosecuted for ignoring a court oath!!

The Fully Informed Jury Association at P.O. Box 5570, Helena Montana 59604-5570 has more information on the traditional and present authority of the juror. Who knows when/or if you may become the victim of a false witness and a "power prone" District Attorney who is interested in convictions rather than justice!!

Sincerely, Frank B. Turberville, Jr.

Hi FIJA, I am trying to figure out how to get the word out here. Any suggestions? Al

Hi Al- The three best ways we have found to inform entire jury pools - and entire communities - of their authority and responsibility as jurors are:

1) Radio interviews on local radio shows, with emphasis on controlling government action through juror veto power;

2) Letters to the editor and ads in local papers. We have boilerplate letters, or language can be used from our brochures (which are all available on our web site under FIJA Documents - brochures) and we have both print and graphics ad copy available on email request to us at aji@fija.org;

3) Handing out brochures on a regular, consistent basis around courthouses, from public sidewalks, getting permission to leave posters and brochures in local cafes, restaurants, coffee shops and other commercial establishments. Brochures can be ordered on line from our web site Supply Shop, or email us at aji@fija.org for more information. let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Iloilo M. Jones

North Platte NE 69103 18 April 2007

Hello, Iloilo:

(Letters Continued on Page 9)

"Now those who seek absolute power, even though they seek it to do what they regard as good, are simply demanding the right to enforce their own version of heaven on earth, and let me remind you they are the very ones who always create the most hellish tyranny."
- Barry Goldwater (1909-1998) US Senator
Source: Acceptance Speech at the Republican National Convention, 1964

"A tyrant must put on the appearance of uncommon devotion to religion. Subjects are less apprehensive of illegal treatment from a ruler whom they consider god-fearing and pious." - Aristotle (384-322 BC) Greek philosopher

"The cry has been that when war is declared, all opposition should therefore be hushed. A sentiment more unworthy of a free country could hardly be propagated. If the doctrine be admitted, rulers have only to declare war and they are screened at once from scrutiny." - William Ellery Channing (1780-1842)
Source: Life, 1848

"Men in authority will always think that criticism of their policies is dangerous. They will always equate their policies with patriotism, and find criticism subversive."
- Henry Steele Commager (1902-1998) Source: Freedom and Order, 1966

"Those in power need checks and restraints lest they come to identify the common good for their own tastes and desires, and their continuation in office as essential to the preservation of the nation."
- Justice William O. Douglas (1898-1980), U. S. Supreme Court Justice
Source: We, The Judges, 1956

"It would be thought a hard government that should tax its people one tenth part."
 ~ Benjamin Franklin
 (1706-1790)

"I know no class of my fellowmen, however just, enlightened, and humane, which can be wisely and safely trusted absolutely with the liberties of any other class."
 ~ Frederick Douglass
 [Frederick Baily] (1818-1895),
 escaped slave, Abolitionist,
 author, editor of the North
 Star and later the New
 National Era

"To compel a man to furnish funds for the propagation of ideas he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical."
 ~ Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826), US Founding Father,
 drafted the Declaration
 of Independence, 3rd US
 President Source: Virginia
 Statutes of Religious Freedom,
 1779

"... every tax or rate, forcibly taken from an unwilling person, is immoral and oppressive." ~ Auberon Herbert
 (1838-1906) English author
 Source: "The Principles
 of Voluntaryism" [1897],
 reproduced in *The Right
 and Wrong of Compulsion
 by the State, and Other
 Essays* by Auberon Herbert
 (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics,
 1978), p. 393

"I don't know if I can live on my income or not - the government won't let me try it." ~ Bob Thaves
 Source: comic strip "Frank & Ernest"

On the Grand Jury

The U.S. Attorneys Manual states that prosecutors "must recognize that the grand jury is an independent body, whose functions include not only the investigation of crime and the initiation of criminal prosecution but **also the protection of the citizenry from unfounded criminal charges**" (USAM, Section 9-11.010). The Manual recognizes that targets of investigations have the right and can "request or demand the opportunity to tell the grand jury their side of the story" (USAM, Section 9-11.152).

The Supreme Court states that the independent grand jury's purpose is not only to investigate possible criminal conduct, but to act as a "**protector of citizens against arbitrary and oppressive governmental action,**" and to perform its functions, the independent grand jury "**deliberates in secret and may determine alone the course of its inquiry**" (United States v. Calandra, 414 U.S. 338 (1974)). An independent grand jury is to "**stand between the prosecutor and the accused,**" and to determine whether a charge is legitimate, or is "dictated by malice or personal ill will" (Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 (1906)). **The grand jury is to protect citizens against "hasty, malicious and oppressive persecution" and to insure that prosecutions are not "dictated by an intimidating power or by malice and personal ill will"** (Wood v. Georgia, 370 U.S. 375 (1962)). The independent grand jury is described as "a body with powers of investigation and inquisition, the scope of whose inquiries is not to be limited narrowly by questions of propriety or forecasts of the probable result of the investigation" (Branzburg v. Hayes, 408 U.S. 665 (1972)). "Without thorough and effective investigation, the grand jury would be unable either to ferret out crimes deserving of prosecution, or to screen out charges not warranting prosecution." (U.S. v. Sells Engineering, 463 U.S. 418 (1983))

Here are some comments from a person who was brought up for indictment: "Obviously a grand jury could not fulfill its duties if it is only allowed to hear evidence which the government chooses to let it hear. Therefore, while I would be more than happy to answer any questions that you or members of the grand jury may have, and while I have no intention of engaging in a prolonged, unlimited monologue, there is additional information which must be provided to the grand jury in order for the members thereof to thoroughly perform their Constitutional duties. I trust that you, the prosecutor, will not attempt to censor me, or suppress such information from being seen by the grand jury, when I am testifying." The grand jury refused to indict her after hearing her testimony, by the way.

Find out if there is a sign-up sheet to volunteer to get on grand juries in your county, state, and federal jurisdictions. Sign up if you can! **It is the best way to put a lid on out-of-control government prosecutions.** If you are serving on a grand jury, you have the authority and the duty to call in the person or persons being accused, to dismiss the prosecutor and government employees from the room, and to question and hear from the person the prosecutor wants to charge. You have the duty to ensure that no person is brought to trial unless there is obvious and sufficient evidence to return an indictment. As a grand juror, you are the first line of defense for private citizens against ambitious prosecutors and unconstitutional laws being used against The People.

Our founders intended that our independent grand juries protect people from ambitious or tyrannical government employees and laws. You, as a grand juror, stand as the first bulwark against government tyranny. While you must protect us all from dangerous people who harm others, you must always be aware the your first job is to protect harmless people from unfair, unjust and unreasonable government laws. When laws encroach on private individual rights, you cannot be required to enforce them by returning an indictment. When you refuse to indict harmless people, you help to protect us all, you included, from out-of-control government actions. As an independent grand jury, you also have the right to initiate your own investigations on evidence presented to you, and to indict anyone if you feel they are guilty of wrongdoing, including those government employees and elected officials who are not upholding an oath of public office.

Order Document OTGJ#1 (April 30, 2007) Also on our web site in pdf to download and print free.

(Letters Continued from Page 7)

I thought you'd be interested in this weekly paper's cover story. I don't bother with the local daily paper (no issue on Mondays) except with an op/ed-page letter every six weeks or so. The daily does print special half-page "Viewpoint" extended-coverage essays from local citizens/subjects. Yes, it is rather frustrating to change venues as rural areas continue to be deserted in favor of larger urban areas and regions. And every U.S. citizen regardless of character (unsavory or not) is entitled to legal counsel...if Article of Amendment VI means anything (U.S. Constitution).

I also thought you'd be encouraged to see that I'm using A.J.I./F.I.J.A material in a general complaint about our Department of Motor Vehicles print matter. No, I have not been ticketed and/or fined or arraigned for not wearing a seat belt, but I personally don't know of anyone of my acquaintance who has been done so. I have not been called up for a jury pool since I moved here August 1995 as I was in my last four years in North Carolina, 1992 - 1995.

This most recent draft letter to the local paper, deposited at their office 17 April 2007: I wonder if they'll print it. Would a grand, then petty jury treat sharia law as they did the Fugitive Slave Acts of 1793 and 1850, should our own judges turn a blind eye to this new menace to our liberties?

Thanks for listening. (Somewhere between legal counseling and spiritual counseling of wayward clients would be "Behaviour-Modification Counselling," like, direct, blunt questions that require direct answers. No preaching or lecturing. "Come on, now, did anyone ever force you at gun point to go into that watering hole and get drunk and get into that brawl?")

Yours for a better, more free future,
Arthur E. Prosser

P.S. "J.D." can be either "iuris," genitive singular - a specialist or "iurum," genitive plural - a generalist (renaissance person) "Doctor" traditionally a teacher by profession. (Etymology.)

TO THOSE THIS WILL CONCERN:

Department of Motor Vehicles, Lincoln,
NE Nebraska State Unicameral
U.S. Congressperson Adrian Smith (R-NE,

Third District)

The cover of the January 2007 Nebraska Driver's Manual shows two violations of founding government principles:

(1) Printing a state publication in languages other than English. This violates the Nebraska state constitution. See the enclosed draught of a public letter as marked in rubric;

(2) Enforcing the "Click it or Ticket" policy. This violates the U.S. Federal Constitution and 800 years of painfully constructed common law. See the enclosed commentary on Article I, Sections 9 and 10 of that Constitution, unreasonable-cause presumption of guilt, not of innocence.

Inside the manual on pages 7 and 9, my original Social Security card from 1957 clearly says For Social Security Purposes. Not for Identification. See enclosed enlarged photo copy. The wording on page 7 says the same thing, though in different word order. I get no Social Security payments at age 76-plus, never deal with the Social Security Administration, so why must I use my Social Security number at all? Page 9, secondary document. Agencies and businesses who require, even demand it, are violating Federal law...unless the law has been rescinded since 1957. At any rate, he gummint" violates its own laws and constitutions. Judge Andrew Napolitano, where are you when we need you?!

Back to the "Click It or Ticket" outrage. Voters in Nebraska defeated passage of the seatbelt law in the early 1980s, but by a narrow margin. Pro-seat-belt forces outspent the pro-freedom forces by a seven-to-one ratio in the advertising campaign up to the elections. Statistics mean nothing. Episodic and anecdotal it may seem, but I have cases on file where people died because they were safely strapped in their vehicles, and cases where lives were spared when unbuckled people were tossed clear of crushed vehicles. One instance of the latter took place in Columbia, SC, 1971, where the wife of a co-worker of mine was tossed from her car at a railroad crossing. The car was "totaled." She was in good physical shape and so, she suffered only a few scratches and minor bruises. It is not as if she and others in similar unbuckled situations were dropped from a second-story or even first-story window, being tossed only

(Letters Continued to Page 10)

"Today the grand jury is the total captive of the prosecutor who, if he is candid, will concede that he can indict anybody, at any time, for almost anything, before any grand jury." - William J. Campbell, Judge, U. S. District Court *Newsweek*, 22 August 1977

"On account of being a democracy and run by the people, we are the only nation in the world that has to keep a government four years, no matter what it does."

- Will Rogers (1879-1935)
American humorist

"The purpose of government is to rein in the rights of the people."
- Bill Clinton (1946-), 42nd US President *Source: during an interview on MTV in 1993*

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of ordinary Americans..." - Bill Clinton [William Jefferson Blythe III] (1946-), 42nd US President *Source: USA Today, March 11, 1993*

"The best way to put more money in people's wallets is to leave it there in the first place." -
Edwin Feulner (1941-) Founder and President of the Heritage Foundation

"A wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement." - Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826), US Founding Father, drafted the Declaration of Independence, 3rd US President 1801 *Source: First Inaugural Address*

"I think we have more machinery of government than is necessary, too many parasites living on the labor of the industrious." - Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826), US Founding Father, drafted the Declaration of Independence, 3rd US President *Source: Letter to William Ludlow, 1824*

“It is the highest impertinence and presumption, therefore, in kings and ministers, to pretend to watch over the economy of private people, and to restrain their expence, either by sumptuary laws, or by prohibiting the importation of foreign luxuries. They are themselves always, and without any exception, the greatest spendthrifts in the society. Let them look well after their own expence, and they may safely trust private people with theirs. If their own extravagance does not ruin the state, that of their subjects never will.” ~ Adam Smith (1723-1790) Scottish philosopher and economist 1776 Source: *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* par. II.3.36

“The mania for giving the Government power to meddle with the private affairs of cities or citizens is likely to cause endless trouble, through the rivalry of schools and creeds that are anxious to obtain official recognition, and there is great danger that our people will lose our independence of thought and action which is the cause of much of our greatness, and sink into the helplessness of [those] who expects his government to feed him when hungry, clothe him when naked, to prescribe when his child may be born and when he may die, and, in time, to regulate every act of humanity from the cradle to the tomb, including the manner in which he may seek future admission to paradise.” ~ Mark Twain [Samuel Langhorne Clemens] (1835-1910)

(Letters Continued from Page 9)

a few feet about the ground, in a parabolic free-fall arc in a gravity field.

So, howcum Nebraskans got desensitized to this loss of natural rights?! Blackmail by the Federal government to pass a mandatory seat-belt law, or lose Federal highway funding. That’s howcum. Minus a huge bureaucratic overhead/brokerage fee, of course. The creature (Federal government) turns around to devour its creator (“the people” of the separate states). Call it “Frankenstein redux,” if you will. And it’s a very dishonorable, contemptible way to do any kind of business, in violation of John Locke’s “social contract.” It would be much more cost effective to have kept that earmarked highway money at home in the first place.

My home state of New York had 4,200 miles of private thoroughfares, operated by 300 private road companies in 1851, before we had motorized traffic besides electric street cars. Log roads, stage roads, plank roads...same in Virginia and Pennsylvania. More diversity than we have today. Socialism destroys diversity - in road building, in health choices, in education choice, in housing, in science research...

I left Nebraska June 1960 and returned August 1995. I catalogued 14 natural rights I lost in those 35 years to the regulatory/legislative state. No sales tax and no state income tax in “The Beef State” back then, when there were only 43 Senators in the Unicameral. When I left North Carolina August 1995, pro-freedom activists had already gathered 500,000 signatures to have the state seat-belt law repealed, in effect since October 1985. Typically, powerful special interests in the name of “the public good” thwarted the public will. The current “Click It or Ticket” outrage in Nebraska adds insult to injury, makes private citizens captive chattel property of the Nanny State, determined to dumb us down as tax-subsidized public education already has. FORGET about those dumbed-down achievement tests! North Carolina grass-roots organizers said “Seat belts, yes. Mandates, no!” whether unfunded or funded by “the public.” Let Thomas Jefferson’s “rule of reason” return. Balanced daily diets, yes. State-mandated balanced daily diets, no! Guidelines, yes. Mandates, no. Our private responsibility to make our

own INFORMED decisions, and pay for our own follies.

There are far more honorable ways to raise public revenues than by harassing and punishing non-violent, non-fraudulent, peaceful, productive citizens who in no way threaten or endanger the lives and property of others. Please read the Federal constitution again. If I refuse to pay the fine, I would be (wrongly) charged with a crime, in which case, I am entitled to a jury trial to have a bad nuisance law vetoed in my case.

Arthur Prosser

(Rosenthal Continued from Page 5)

that prosecutors could not win a longer term for the same charges. The new indictment, issued by a federal grand jury in October, included the previous marijuana charges along with money-laundering ~ four transactions, totaling \$1,850, that Rosenthal was accused of structuring to hide marijuana proceeds ~ and five counts of filing false tax returns that omitted his marijuana income.

The non-marijuana charges were punishable by up to 20 years in prison, although Rosenthal’s attorneys said federal guidelines would call for a sentence of less than two years.

At a hearing in October, Bevan noted Rosenthal’s post-verdict complaint that he hadn’t gotten a fair trial because jurors hadn’t heard the full story. “So, I’m saying, this time around, he wants the financial side reflected, fine, let’s air this thing out,” Bevan said. “Let’s have the whole conduct before the jury: tax, money-laundering, marijuana.”

In Wednesday’s ruling, Breyer commended Bevan for his candor but said his comments only “confirm the appearance of vindictiveness.”

Prosecutors had Rosenthal’s tax returns and financial records before his first trial but apparently decided to pursue them only after being criticized by Rosenthal and his supporters and losing in the appellate court, Breyer said.

He said the U.S. Supreme Court has consistently ruled for more than 30 years that charges or potential punishment can’t be increased after a successful defense appeal unless prosecutors come up with new evidence to justify harsher treatment.

The Power of One Juror to Protect your Rights

Robert Thornton

Two things happened around the first week of January that should be of interest to every gun owner. However, many will not immediately see how either of these events is related to the "Second Amendment". January marked the opening of the 2007 session of the Georgia General Assembly, and with it came a veritable avalanche of bills to fundamentally change the way Juries work in Georgia.

Georgia State Representatives Barry Fleming and Timothy Bearden have sponsored two of these bills. Under HB-126 a person would be convicted in felony cases (death penalty cases excluded) even if one of the Jurors voted for not guilty! The second bill (HB-185) applies to the "sentencing phase" of death penalty cases. Fleming and Bearden want a Judge to be able to order death, even if three Jurors vote for life without parole. These proposed changes in the law are an abomination!

Our Founding Fathers saw the Jury as the most critical "check" in the system of "checks and balances" that they devised for our judicial system. Juries not only find "guilty" and "not guilty" verdicts; they have the right and responsibility to nullify unfairly applied laws as well. Jefferson, Madison, Adams and the rest, knew that "well intended" laws could be used improperly by a bad government. The Founders knew that the law is just a cold set of rules devoid of empathy and vulnerable to being abused by the unscrupulous. You need look no further than the Duke Lacrosse Team case to see that!

Our Founding Fathers loved Liberty. They risked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to secure it for their posterity. That is why they felt; "It is better to allow 100 criminals to go free, than to send one innocent man to jail." It is for just this reason that the Founders required a unanimous verdict for conviction. It is the duty of the attorneys and the Judge to apply the law. But, it is the sacred duty of the Jury to seek Justice! That is why the Founders gave each member of the Jury the power to stop a case through what is known as a "hung Jury".

I said that there were two incidents in January. An innocent man was released from

State prison. At the very same time as Rep. Fleming and Bearden were introducing their bills to make convictions easier for DA's to obtain, DNA evidence proved that the man did not commit the crime. He had languished in State prison for over 21 years on a faulty conviction.

That man's life has been destroyed by the State. In that old case, it took the unanimous vote of all twelve Jurors and they still made a terrible mistake. How many more tragic mistakes will we see if some politically motivated DA needs to convince only 11 out of 12 Jurors?

At this point, you may ask, "So, what has all this got to do with gun owners?" Well, if you own a gun in America, you are in a minority. Not only that, you are in a minority that is more likely to be arrested! The vast majority of gun owners are law abiding citizens and think of themselves as "good guys", which they are. But, there are more than 20,000 Federal, State and local gun laws on the books in America. These laws usually do not require criminal intent. So, the average gun owner, by definition, is more likely to run afoul of the law simply because he possesses a gun. Any doubt about this should have been dispelled in the wake of the government attacks at Ruby Ridge and at Waco.

Additionally, the "media elite" consider gun owners as a dangerous counter culture. How many times have you been sitting home, watching the news, and had an announcer exclaim, "The criminal had over a hundred rounds of ammunition in his house when police arrested him!" Hell, I usually keep a "brick" of .22's in the toolbox of my truck!

Or, how about the poor guy being led to a police car in handcuffs while the announcer gasps, "Police found an arsenal in the home!?" Then they show a picture of 3 rifles, two shotguns and a pistol. Any time a gun owner has an unwanted encounter with the law, even for an innocent oversight with no criminal intent, the press will demonize him. Politically motivated DA's will yearn to prosecute him for the free publicity that the

(Continued on Back Page)

*"The jury has the right to judge both the law as well as the fact in controversy."
- John Jay (1745-1829) first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, First President of the United States - preceding George Washington, one of three men most responsible for the US Constitution Source: Georgia v. Brailsford, 1794*

"Those who want slavery should have the grace to name it by its proper name." ~ Ayn Rand, Anthem

*"But, when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."
- Declaration of Independence July 4, 1776*

*"Everyone wants to live at the expense of the state. They forget that the state lives at the expense of everyone."
- Frederic Bastiat (1801-1850) Source: The Law, by Frederic Bastiat, 1850*

"Death is better, a milder fate than tyranny." ~ Aeschylus (525-456 BC) Greek playwright Source: Agamemnon



FULLY INFORMED JURY ASSOCIATION

PO Box 5570 • Helena, MT 59604-5570

Address Service Requested

NON-PROFIT ORG.
US POSTAGE
PAID
BUTTE, MT
PERMIT #33

(Continued from Page 11)

media is sure to provide. Being a “good guy” and having a clean record will count for nothing!

But, you’d never do anything wrong, right? During the weekend of the 17th of February 2007 a young man went out for the evening in Athens, Georgia. As is permissible after 5 P.M., he parked his car in a U of Georgia. parking lot. When he returned, the police were waiting. A UGA Police Officer on foot patrol had observed a gun in “plain view”, locked in his car. He probably said, “Oh no, Officer. This is all a big mistake! I’m no criminal. See, it’s not a gun, it’s an AIRSOFT toy pistol.” During the subsequent “search incident to arrest”, they also found a small (3 ¼ inch blade) knife in his car. That was the basis for the second charge!

There may be a technical basis for the arrest of this innocent man. He’s charged with 2 felony counts for bringing “weapons” within 1000 ft. of a school campus (Ga. Code 16-11-127.1). The maximum sentence is ten years in prison and a \$10,000.00 fine for each count. He will need at least one person on his Jury who has the common sense to know, even if a technical violation may exist, that this was not a crime! He needs a Juror, who understands “Jury Nullification”, to vote “not guilty”.

In another case, a GSSA member was up north combining a hunting trip and a visit with his son. On the way home, he was stopped for a traffic violation, near Detroit. The Officer freaked out when he started finding numerous guns in the SUV. You have to understand, in Michigan, it is a felony to have a baseball bat in your car, unless there is a glove and ball with it. Even then, if the snow is on the ground, you’ll probably be charged with transporting a weapon. This member called me for help. He said, “I’m no criminal! I tried to tell them to call my Pastor! I know the Sheriff and most of the Deputies at home. They wouldn’t listen!”

Luckily, I served in the Marines with a “gun guy” who happens to be a very good, therefore expensive, lawyer in the Detroit area. Fortunately, my friend arranged a misdemeanor plea for our GSSA member and he avoided a felony conviction. But, the guns were forfeited, and he had a huge financial burden from fines, court appearances in Michigan, court costs,

and attorney fees. It was a very expensive education for him, and it could have been much worse!

So, considering all the circumstances; gun laws that don’t require criminal intent, a hostile media, politically motivated prosecutors, and cops that don’t give a damn who you know. Can you see the risk you run by being a gun owner? God forbid that, someday you may be on trial and have only one gun owner on your Jury. Do you want to give the Judge the power to ignore his “not guilty” vote? Then why would you ever support a politician who wants to strip the power of Juries and provide for convictions with only 11 of 12 Jurors finding for “guilty”?

For free information on the power of Juries contact the Fully Informed Jury Assn. at P.O. Box 5570 Helena, Montana 59604-5570. Or, call their toll-free information number, 1-800-TEL-JURY which, in numbers, is 1-800-835-5879

You can contact your State Representative by calling 404-656-2871, or 404-656-2000. Or, you can address a letter to him at “Georgia General Assembly, Atlanta, Georgia 30334”. If you don’t know your State Representative or State Senator, you can find them both along with a specific address and phone number through a link on the GSSA website. Go to: <http://www.gssa.com>

(For those of you in other states, check on the bills concerning juries - and guns - which are before your legislators, and let them know you want to protect the role of the jury and all your rights. Also remember to check on Federal legislation concerning juries and rights, and let national politicians know that you expect them to protect your rights on a national level -- ed.)