

29 Jewlie 08.

Many thanks for your great letter of 27 Jewlie. I guessed you were busy with litigation. Congratulations! It seems you are doing a good job. I gather that the ZOG's case against you was on false footing to begin with. Bad zoggies.

The words of the judges' oath, which includes "performance & discharge" is a form of redundancy typical of legal language, as when a witness swears "to tell the truth, the whole truth & nothing but the truth." By adding "discharge" to "performance," the oath emphasizes that the judge, in performing his duty, will complete & conclude his task. If I perform my duty as a pizza deliveryman, it is assumed that the customer got his pizza, but, should there be any doubt, I shall perform & discharge my duty as a pizza deliveryman, thereby assuring that the customer really did get his pizza. I see no sinister intent in those words.

Anglo-Saxon justice is monarchical throughout The Former British Empire. The judge is the representative of the king, before whom all are inferior. When the judge enters his court, all must rise, thereby demonstrating their inferiority & their respect. This tradition is much older than the USA. Anglo-Saxon justice is adversarial. The 'king' presides over a jousting match between the Prosecution & the Defense, if things are on the up & up. If not, the judge is partial to one side or the other, & if the attorneys are Freemasons, the Defense may be in cahoots with the Prosecution, as I've seen in actual trials. At best, the judge is a good umpire, to see that the rules of the game are followed by everyone. At worst, he is a partial proponent, a drunken incompetent, a crook, &c., like a corrupt king. The judge's job is to uphold the law, whereas the jury's job is to determine the facts of a case. They may even decide to nullify the law under which the accused is tried. This I've also seen! A key factor in Anglo-Saxon justice is the presumption of innocence. The burden of proof is upon the accuser, not the accused. Hence, the accused is required to do nothing, except attend his trial. He need say nothing in his own defense, as I've also seen in the trials I've attended as plaintiff, witness, defendant & reporter. It is not up to the defendant to prove his innocence. It is to the prosecutor to prove his guilt.

Because of the importance of the jury, there are jury-selection firms which assist the prosecution or the defense to pack the jury with persons whose sympathies lie on one side or the other. The fact that such firms exist & are allowed to do business indicates that corruption does exist in our justice system. I've seen jurors whose minds are made up, regardless of facts presented to them. One jury could not distinguish between live persons & dead ones when they testified in court! Four witnesses said they'd been confined in Auschwitz & then transferred to other camps or factories in wartime Germany. A 5th witness, who may never have been there, lied under oath that NO ONE was ever transferred from Auschwitz. They either "went up the chimney, dead, or they went under the wire in their escape," as he alleged in his case. The jury accepted all the testimony, uncritically, & unthinkingly! Had I not been in court, I wouldn't have believed it.

Obviously, some judge must have jurisdiction in your case, which I take to be an appeal. It would seem that an overlapping of jurisdictions would offend against due process. If I understand correctly, that is why we have court districts.

The federal government has been violating the U.S. Constitution (our paper king) in terms of habeas corpus, that is, proof of a crime, as in a dead body. The words mean, "Do you have the body?" (of the victim). Frequently, we see a person incarcerated without a criminal charge, nor a trial, & subjected to torture, based on undefined accusations, such as "terrorism." This is not due process, nor is it justice.

Anglo-Saxon justice relies heavily upon precedent, that is, case law, based on verdicts rendered by courts throughout the former empire. Case law may be cited from different countries within the Anglo-Saxon justice system. The omission to cite case law may result in considerable injustice, as I witnessed in Canada, where a defendant was charged under a law which had been abolished in Britain. His case went twice to The Supreme Court of Canada, which belatedly abolished the law under which he was tried! Such a deal! The Zionist establishment of Canada lost out, but they used tax-payers' money to persecute a truth-teller for thought-crime. Today, "Truth is no defense" in Canadian thought-crime cases, & they say so in official documents, which I've read, to my amazement. In fact, the truth can get you in jail in most Zionist-ruled countries, including Europe, North America, Australia & New Zealand. The ADL (Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the kosher Freemasonic lodge) is working to impose such thought-crime laws on U.S. citizens, so stay tuned.

All the best. ORION!

