

SOMETHING SERIOUS TO THINK ABOUT

Grand Jury, The Supreme Authority Never To Be In Subservient Role

In messages to our readers, we often purposely repeat some vital cases concerning Bill of Rights and Constitutional wrongs to fix in their mind that any government is capable of the most outrageous actions. If our readers are getting the message, they won't be surprised at the more aggressive approach now being taken by the **Foundation For Rights** in this document. America has returned to the overbearing insolence suffered by early Americans prior to the Declaration of Independence. We the People have not enforced our Bill of Rights, therefore they have become of no avail. It has become urgently necessary that We the People assert our Sovereign Authority over public servants.

Indictment and conviction by Grand and Trial Juries are the methods people must independently employ for quick direct action against the public officials who are abusing our rights, liberty and property. However most people don't know how to go about being an active independent Grand or Trial Juror dedicated to seeking justice and keeping government in line. Several of the following facts

By **Ralph Boryszewski**, Founder, **Foundation For Rights**

about our American history will better enable you to realize what brought about our present plight and hopefully compel you to speak out against the usurping Judiciary.

American colonists may have been annoyed with "Taxation without Representation," but they were downright angry over the English system of law. As Jurors, they were commanded to follow the law as given by judges. Americans were aware that in England, Jurors were jailed for rendering decisions not agreeable to the court. Such Jurors were jailed until they relented and followed the Judge's commands. In British Colonial America, if a Grand Jury refused to indict a person, the prosecutor (lawyer) would sign an Information that could have that person confined to a prison cell. The Judge would then order the American to be tried by a Jury in far off England, where a guilty verdict would more easily be obtainable.

In June 1788, the American people ratified the US Constitution which makes no mention of the office of attorney general, attorney for the government, nor "officer of the court", attorney or lawyer. The people absolutely believed that under the new Constitution, there

would be no conducting of any legal business except by a non-lawyer judge and Jury who would together administer a simple and understandable judicial process.

State judicial officers (attorneys) would not be acceptable for federal offices in their judicial capacity, for there were no titles, qualifications or duties for attorneys provided in the federal Constitutional system. In fact, Article I, Section 6. Clause 2. forbids a sworn judicial officer from taking a second oath as a lawmaker and enforcer of impeachment provisions. The Constitution defines a process by which the President would nominate, and the Senate confirm only lay persons to serve as judges. In the best interest of Justice, non-lawyer Justices on the US Supreme Court would better honor and preserve the intended purpose and wishes of the people. The delegates who ratified the US Constitution did so with full knowledge that without the presence of an attorney general and US attorneys for the government, the federal courts would not be able to conduct or assume positions as adversarial parties. Lay people instead would sit, as a hearing jury and directly question the accused

and witnesses to decide the validity of a charge or claim. If the people decide guilt, they would then examine the criminal record of the accused in order to fit the punishment to the crime.

Under such a people's legal system, every person would, in any case, receive a just and speedy trial by Jury. Under our existing debauched system, over 90% of the accused never see a Jury. Both the Bill of Rights and Constitution command "all" to a Jury trial. The Bill of Rights offers the additional protections of a "speedy" and "public" trial by an "impartial" Jury. There are no speedy trials and many (excluding children) are purposely not made public. After receiving partial instructions as to the law from a lawyer judge, it is impossible for a Jury to render an "impartial" decision. A major cause of today's Judicial corruption began in 1789. The lawyer-dominated First Congress in violation of the separation of powers, and without the people's consent, unconstitutionally delegated to the US Supreme Court the authority to make its own rules. This making of rules has proven to be repugnant to the Bill of Rights and totally destructive to those seeking justice. The following is a small part of one such rule that has led to everyday corruption:

The indictment or information shall be a plain, concise and definite written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged. It shall be signed by the attorney for the government.

Grand Jury Power Is To Be Used To Hold A Usurping Judiciary In Check

In 1970, I was in contact with the acting Foreman of a Federal Grand Jury in Maryland. That Federal Grand Jury was enraged because it had been prevented by a judge and prosecutor from making known to the people much criminal evidence against high officials. In their investigation of a multi-million dollar bribery scandal, the Grand Jury had indicted two US Senators and was prepared to indict Speaker of the House John W. McCormack and several other House members. US Attorney General John N. Mitchell successfully checkmated the Grand Jury by ordering Steven Sachs, the attorney for the government, not to sign the Grand Jury indictment, thus ending any chance of justice being done.

By its rule requiring the signature of an attorney for the government to validate indictments, the US Supreme Court outrageously assumed command over people's Bill of Rights powers and protections.

The rule prevented the Federal Grand Jury in Maryland from completing its investigation and indicting high-ranking lawyer members of both Houses of Congress. The Grand Jury complained to Chief Federal District Judge Roszell C. Thomsen and sought his assistance in making public their Presentment that explained the

bribery corruption cover-up in detail. The Judge refused and instead ordered sealed the Grand Jury's Presentment, which had been sent to the *New York Times*. The Judge then ordered newspaper officials not to publish the document. Here we have an example of lawyers in government conspiring to undermine the people's exercise of their Bill of Rights.

A Presentment is a written statement by a Grand Jury to notify the public that their help is essential to fully expose governmental corruption. Over a long period of our history, Presentments by Grand Juries were a common occurrence. Much governmental corruption was exposed by Presentments issued by Grand Juries. The people could then clean house by voting out corrupt administrations.

In sealing the Presentment of the Grand Jury in Maryland, Chief Federal District Judge Thomsen was guilty of obstruction of justice. He covered up crimes and corruption by House and Senate members and prevented indictments of them. He protected and covered for criminal obstruction prosecutor Sachs and US Attorney General Mitchell who was later indicted and convicted on other criminal and corruption charges.

Most shamefully, Chief Federal District Judge Thomsen covered for the US Supreme Court for making and maintaining of unBillofRightable Rules, especially the ones that prevent the fulfilling of indictments of high officials.

Grand Juries Must Be More Active And Completely Independent

When sitting members of a Federal Grand or Trial Jury obediently follow the instructions as to the law from the Judge or prosecutor, they unwittingly become a party to a criminal act. They help a corrupt judiciary from being exposed as criminals. This practice occurs on a daily basis across America. The Grand Jury, without hesitation, had the duty to turn things around by indicting Chief Federal District Judge Thomsen for obstruction. They should have asked the people in a Presentment to the public-at-large to support their Grand Jury in further bringing to justice the corrupt members of Congress, the entire Justice Department for obstructing justice, and the higher court judges for not over-ruling the cover-up judge. Above all, the Grand Jury should have condemned the Supreme Court for imposing any rule that has the force of law. A rule or law that grants the authority to stop or infringe upon any of the Bill of Rights must be challenged by every Grand and Trial Jury. In the Judge Thomsen case, the Grand Jury could have clearly shown the people that the American Bench and Bar has a history of organized criminality and warned the legal profession that it could not engage in a monopoly dangerous to the liberties and well-being of the American people.

Every Grand Jury must open its doors at stated times to the public. Jefferson urged that certain days should be set aside hearing reports of crimes committed by public officials. Also, others should be heard by a Grand Jury who were intimidated and forced to accept a plea bargain instead of receiving a trial by Jury as both the Bill of Rights and Constitution command.

During the entire exposé, the House (of lawyers) never once attempted to investigate or impeach the Speaker of the House or other House members and Senators who accepted millions in bribe money from a Baltimore builder. Neither did a single member of the thousands of attorneys holding office in the Justice Department bring about criminal actions against these Congressmen who had accepted bribes. The attorneys of the Justice Department had a duty to inform the Supreme Court that it assists in a criminal act when it continues to allow Court Rules to help government attorneys of all three Departments and Branches commit and cover-up their own crimes.

The Department of Justice unconstitutionally established in 1870 with the Attorney General at its head, has given the attorneys the perfect place to cover-up their own criminal acts and to attack or obstruct honest citizens who want to see justice served. A separation of powers is basic to a Constitutional government, so it was the Supreme Court's duty to speak out against the establishment of a Justice De-

partment in which "officers of the Court" would be in command of the Executive power. The Constitution commands "The Executive power shall be vested in a President." No Constitutional amendment for that change was presented for the people's approval.

Individuals and organizations must learn the basics about the great powers of Grand and Trial Juries so that we can join forces to expose outrageous criminal corruption by the Federal Judiciary.

The fraudulent adoption of the 16th Amendment (income tax) should be a lesson to all as an example of the teamwork of government lawyers in all Federal Departments. They must be held responsible for this outrageous criminal act and the next-to-the-longest cover-up in our "Constitutional" history. By this time, all organizations should realize it is useless to humbly Petition a criminal government. The lawyers who are running it aren't about to give up their seats and go to prison.

Private practice lawyers are officers of the court, and sworn to support the Bill of Rights and Constitution. They profit well as lawyers but fail to serve the best interests of the people. Every day these lawyers see the endless abuse and injustice caused by court-made rules. Aware of the above, they have the duty to challenge the court's right to make its own rules. A long time ago, any private practice lawyer could have filed a complaint in a District Court against the making of any court rule. The

case would eventually have had to have been appealed to the US Supreme Court. There the Justices would be confronted with the Canon of Ethics which commands that no court can sit in judgment of its own cause. That in itself is proof enough. The Supreme and inferior Courts do not have the right to make any rule. Therefore no private practice lawyer can claim to be without guilt. Everyone of them still sides with the corrupt system that brings them wealth and power instead of justice to the people.

Every Grand Jury To Assume Complete Command To Keep Government Under Control

When you next serve on a Grand or Trial Jury, it is your duty as a good citizen to present to the judge of the court a copy of this document. Tell him the information contained herein has been prepared by **Foundation For Rights**. The Foundation complains that the Federal Judiciary since 1870, has usurped complete domination of the Legislative, Executive and Judicial departments so that lawyers in their various roles can commit criminal acts with impunity.

This document specifically details that the Justices of the US Supreme Court, the US Attorney General, the US Attorney for the government and a Chief Federal District Judge cooperated in a lengthy series of criminal acts to render the people's Bill of Rights

of no avail. Members of every Grand and Trial Jury therefore must always disregard the advice and instructions of judges, attorneys general and attorneys for the government so that justice can truly be served. For over 200 years, lawyers and judges have forced upon us their self-serving adversarial system that is beneficial only to themselves.

We the People is an organization of tax protesters questioning the legality of the 16th Amendment. On February 16th of 2001, they published a full-page ad in *USA Today* outlining their cause for complaint in detail. Toward the end of the ad, the following disclaimer appeared:

This message is presented solely for educational and informational purposes. It is not intended and should not be construed as legal advice. We The People Foundation does not advocate disobedience to any laws and does not advise or recommend the non-filing of any return or non-payment of any tax for which any person is legally liable. For legal advice, consult your attorney.

This Disclaimer weakens the resolve of the people seeking justice or reform and should not be a part of a public notice of protest. Organizations that claim their ad is for informational purposes and not to be construed as legal advice or for the advocating of disobedience to any laws, appear weak and

submissive. The men of 1776, who wrote and published the Declaration of Independence never submitted a disclaimer, for their neighbors would have shown their utter disapproval.

The **Foundation For Rights'** primary mission is to educate citizens in matters relating to the maintenance of separation of powers. Our members know an Executive order of a President is not a law, nor can a rule by a Supreme Court have the force of law. They also know that every Congress has been dominated by lawyers who have each and every time failed to order the President and Supreme Court that it is in violation of the basic law when they assume the legislative power.

Every person should go forth to teach people about the vital need of a separation of powers or instead be prepared for the terrible violence that will eventually bring the government of lawyers down.

Ralph Boryszewski, Founder
Foundation For Rights
PO Box 17699
Rochester, NY 14617

Every reader should send a copy of this Document to the Editor of his newspaper and organizations dealing with Bill of Rights, justice and liberty. Editors have the responsibility as a free press to bring the matter to the public's attention.