National Liberty Alliance

Monday Night Conference Call

April 17, 2017

Opening Song: Standing on Higher Ground

Topic: untitled

Call-In Number: 605-475-3250 Participant Code: 449389

Questions can be e-mailed to questions@nationallibertyalliance.org

Please support our business partners. You can find their banners on the right hand side of the website. Proceeds support National Liberty Alliance’s effort to save America.

Please support NLA

Scripture Reading: Matthew 7 : 1-20

(9:47)

No particular topic tonight

NLA sent out the papers that we read a couple of weeks ago

They have been perfected but are pretty much the same.

You can get a copy of these papers at NationalLibertyAlliance.org, highlight “Grand Jury” then click “Docket”

or NationalLibertyAlliance.org/docket

It’s Memorandum of Law on Law Number 1021

And 1022 Memorandum of Law on Standing

We have sent them out to all people involved in our case

They went out today.

REQUEST FOR COURTROOM OBSERVERS

for Wednesday

Leland Cramer in Colorado

970-571-0104

He is going to court Wednesday, April 19th at 10:00 a m at the Logan County Combined Court at 110 North Riverside Drive It is in county courtroom 210 in Sterling, Colorado.

QUESTIONS

Question 1: You mentioned a few Monday Nights ago how the Declaration of Independence is a covenant with God. And that this covenant was sealed by the Constitution and certified by the Bill of Rights. Could you please speak a little more about this specifically explaining the meaning of the words covenant and sealed and certified in relation to the Declaration of ’76, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights?

We have the Declaration Of Independence

It says: “When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.”

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed”

When We the People call upon the Laws of Nature and Nature’s God and come underneath His law then that’s a covenant. We’re calling out to God to come under His law . We’re looking for His protection. We’re looking for liberty to be secured. Only God can give or secure our liberty. The Bill of Rights is a foundational list of the unalienable rights . Rights given to us from God. We called upon God and made a covenant. We the People made a covenant with God through the Declaration of Independence. We want to live under His law. Therefore we’re going to be obedient to that law. And we are going to fulfill that law to the best of our abilities. When we ordained the Constitution we read in the Preamble:

“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.”

There are six points:

(15:30)

Point number one: in order to form a more perfect Union

Point number two : establish justice

Point number three: insure domestic tranquility

Four: provide for the common defense

Five: promote the general welfare

Six: secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity

There are six points in the Constitution

Everything in the Constitution is to fulfill one or all of those six points.

The Bill of Rights is the certification of that That brings in the unalienable rights the Bill of Prohibition

The Preamble to the Bill of Rights reads:

“THE Conventions of a number of the States having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution”

(22:08)

Question 2:

<http://www.oregonlive.com/oregon-standoff/2017/04/chief_federal_judge_threatens.html>

Chief federal judge moves to prevent Marcus Mumford from practicing in federal court in OREGON

"Attorney Marcus Mumford, who last month had criminal charges dismissed against him stemming from his arrest on the day his client Ammon Bundy was acquitted of conspiracy in federal court in Portland, now faces more legal challenges.

Oregon's Chief U.S. District Judge Michael W. Mosman is seeking to revoke Mumford's ability to practice law in any federal court in the District of Oregon, a rare move.

The judge has given Mumford until May 4 to argue in writing why he should not impose such a sanction"

Is attorney Marcus Mumford receiving due process if he had a trial date set for April 13th and on April 12th the judge moved to remove attorney Mumford's ability to practice law in any federal court in the District of Oregon?  Important to note, there was no trial on April 13th.”

There was no due process, that’s the answer

NLA would like to do something about this

If anybody knows this attorney, maybe he would like to talk to us

We would like to do a Show Cause concerning this issue

By what authority does this judge act

We do have video on this

Robert is going to try to set up a phone call with Mumford

The video shows all of the details.

We would like to get a dialog with this lawyer

When you can’t make an argument in court and you get Tased and they try to take away your ability to argue in court because you were sticking up for your client because he just wanted to see the paper. If there is no papers continuing their incarceration then they got to be let loose.

They should have been let loose.

NLA is going to go forward with this NLA is going to do a Show Cause on this This guy is in bad behavior.

This guy should be indicted for assault

We should get the name of the U S Marshal in Charge

We would like to get the names of the marshals that actually tased him.

We need the name of the judge. We need all those details.

We have the name of the judge that is trying to deny him. We have that in the article.

Whenever Mumford goes into any federal court he has to disclose to all of those courts that he was kicked out of the Oregon court when he applies for permission to go into those other courts.

In the article Mumford was told that he should not talk about LaVoy Finicum and other things.

These judges believe that they have complete control over the court.

They’re not following the Constitution. They’re following a charter.

They shouldn’t be following any charter they should be following the Constitution.

Question 3:

Regarding Document 1022 Memorandum of Law in Support of Standing

Around line 62, 63, 64, and 65 you talk about resolved people then in the conclusion you use the word sovereign people. What connotation does resolved people carry and why did you use it there and what connotation does sovereign people carry and why did you change the reference in the last paragraph of that document to sovereign people?

We did go through the Something to Lose Doctrine “In fulfillment of the ‘something to lose doctrine,’ We the Resolved People are in jeopardy of losing our unalienable rights to tyrants who refuse to answer.”

“In fulfillment of the ‘chilling effects doctrine,’ We the Resolved People are unjustly jailed; denied due process in courts of law; unconstitutionally taxed; tried in jurisdictions unknown; spied upon through our phones, TV’s, cars, emails and cameras everywhere; our children are stolen; our parents are robbed of the fruits of their life’s labors and enjoyment of their twilight years and we are robbed of our homes by detestable non-judicial foreclosures to name just a few.”

Then we come to the conclusion of that part

“In fulfillment of an ‘Act of Law our founding fathers ‘expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution’ and thereby added to the Constitution a Bill of Prohibition being an Act of Law whereby We the Resolved People have declared and here today reiterate our standing.”

Then in the Conclusion we use the word sovereign a couple of times. Three times.

That fact that we are resolved in these areas so we used the wording “we the resolved people”

We concluded with the fact that we are the sovereign people with unalienable rights. It was not connected directly.

What does resolved people mean?

We are resolved that we are unjustly jailed and denied due process.

We are resolved in that this is what they are doing to us.

We are resolved in the fact that we have something to lose.

Our unalienable rights are being refused by tyrants.

We are resolved in the fact that these are the facts.

We are resolved in the fact that we have rights , that we have something to lose, that they are giving us a chilling effect.

That’s the last question

(34:37)

Ollie gave an update:

They put the jury through six weeks of prosecution lies.

Ollie went out there He talked to people He talked to people on facebook. We were instantly connected spiritually.

It was instant spiritual connection.

You realize that there are a bunch of people out there that are all on the same spiritual plane and all on the same mission.

The people in the courthouse are afraid of the spiritual connection.

It is not about property rights, land rights, it is pure evil trying to lock up spiritual people trying to shut them up trying to keep everything secret.

It’s a runaway train going full speed ahead And when you’re going full speed ahead you cannot turn and you cannot stop.

It is a spiritual battle.

Ollie concluded

(41:41)

 Robert gave the Western Patriot report:

As Ollie was saying, the jury has the case.

They haven’t come up with a verdict yet.

The biggest news today is the fact that the jury had a question today. That could be good news.

Maybe they are having difference of opinion in deliberation.

Maybe somebody understands that it is not all as the prosecutors tried to make it out to be.

So somebody is questioning.

That’s all that Robert has.

(43:13)

Brent Winters is author of Excellence of the Common Law

Brent’s website is commonlawyer.com

Brent’s comments may or may not be whatever everybody at National Liberty Alliance thinks and says.

But it probably is consistent.

What happened to Mr. Mumford is not new.

This kind of thing has been going on for a long time in the federal courts.

We shouldn’t be surprised when they pull shenanigans like they did on this fellow out there.

The question is: What can you do about it?

And all you can do about it is keep arguing.

There was a lawyer called Nicholas Fuller . This demonstrates that this is nothing new.

Nicholas Fuller lived from 1543 to 1620. He died in the year the Mayflower landed in Plymouth, Massachusetts. After studying at [Christ's College, Cambridge](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christ%27s_College%2C_Cambridge), Fuller became a barrister of [Gray's Inn](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gray%27s_Inn).  He was a common lawyer in the common law courts of England.

He was an avid student of Hebrew. He was a theologian. Common lawyers in England were lawyers in the law of the land. He defended his clients’ right to keep your mouth shut if you didn’t want to talk. In those days it meant that you could get your ear lopped off or your tongue cut out. They were exceedingly cruel if you didn’t fall down on your face and worship the priests that ran the courts. They would do nasty things like cut off parts of your body. Puritans in that day in England facing forced examinations in what was called the High Commission which was like a court under the executive branch or under the church. The High Commission they called it. And they forced you to take an oath whether you wanted to or not. If the king tried to remove a Puritan minister from his office then Fuller blocked proceedings against them in ecclesiastic courts, the High Commission, by removing these cases to the common law courts which we would today call the state courts. Unlike the church courts, the courts of the law of the city , the common law courts recognized the right to remain silent.

When this common lawyer, Nicholas Fuller , was unable to remove the client’s cases to the common law courts he still advised them to refuse the oath and remain silent. The oath, swearing to tell the truth, he said don’t even take the oath. Just keep your mouth shut. Because Fuller’s clients followed his council the Star Chamber the High Commission priests judges jailed his clients for contempt and in response Fuller, this lawyer, appealed to the judges of the common law courts. The courts of the kings bench. And he asked them for the Great Writ to get them out of jail, habeas corpus. He evoked the right to remain silent. he evoked the common law right of the writ of habeas corpus

And Fuller said this:

“My clients ought to be released because the High Commission has not been empowered by law to fine or imprison neither to administer oaths.” He was against them.

Against the church courts in England.

And his argument before the common law king’s bench threatened the power of priests it was jurisdictional jurisdiction battle

The courts are the center of our liberties

There is no freedom in America there is no group right there never has been a group right there never will be a group right there are only individual responsibilities that we call rights

They must be defended on the individual instance by instance.

He went into the king’s bench, the common law courts, and the priests and their courts summoned Fuller to appear before them to testify They thought that they would get him.

He followed his own advice to his clients and refused to take the oath. Decided to remain silent. Where upon the priests and their courts threw him in prison under heavy fine. They wanted to get rid of him.

That’s what they want to do with Mumford, they want to get rid of him.

He’s not the only one

There’s been quite a few lawyers that the federal courts have gotten rid of .

They’re getting rid of more and more all the time.

Fuller got thrown in prison

He refused to talk

It was a ghastly spectacle says a historian at that time.

that the passengers beheld skeletons held in chains swinging in the wind and those who passed beneath the temple gates saw rows of skulls grinning at them

Nicholas Fuller by insisting on the right to remain silent resisted the law of the city devices

Men and women were hanged and branded on the cheek, had their noses and their ears lopped off and anything more than that meant death.

It seems that the courts are becoming intolerant of lawyers.

The king denied Fuller’s claims to grant authority to the High Commission saying that their procedure was superior.

Fuller protested he said that their procedure was under the jurisdiction of the antichrist

That’s what he said before the High Commission and before the courts.

He added that the bishops were embezzling the fines of the poor and nonconformists. Folks that they summoned before the court. Instead of paying the fines into the treasury of the king.

Things don’t change over the centuries.

The question and the problem is always the same.

We need to continue to say the truth and seek the truth.

It is the truth that scares them

He will do anything to retain his power because it is the only protection that he has against justice being done against him.

We are facing evil in our own day. In high places.

The perversion is more than what people want to talk about.

The control goes all the way to everything.

It is blackmail.

Use things against them to control them.

It’s in every office of government.

It is in the office of being a lawyer.

There are many that are entirely controlled.

That’s what’s going on in the courts

What’s happening to this fellow is nothing new.

If freedom of speech is taken away in the courts and in the churches then freedom of speech will be gone everywhere.

Guns are not the ultimate power.

The ultimate power is words.

Men govern with words.

Words are power.

If the words are not in place and men cannot articulate what is right in the courts in the church and anywhere else they need to then the use of the guns and the use of violence and the giving of life and the taking of life is a total waste.

We had words in place

We had the Constitution in place.

And after the violence was over we had something and we still got it.

Others go from one revolution to another

That’s the characteristic of the law of the city.

They want to shut down the effective use of the jury.

If they can do that then they can destroy liberty

The reason that they want to destroy liberty is so that they can dominate everyone else and use them and kill and steal and destroy

There is no other reason That’s the only reason.

We’ve been talking about the Declaration of ‘76

Taken in large measure from John Locke’s Second Treatise of Government.

John Locke was a Biblicist

The Americans are the ones that ratified this declaration.

Congress met the first time in 1774 October the 14th

and they said that they wanted free exercise , they wrote a letter to Parliament in England, they wanted free exercise of their rights under their Constitution.

They called them the immutable laws of nature.

The laws of Nature’s God the antagonist to that is the laws of the city of Rome

The law of the land verses the law of the city

City law enslaves.

Men must do only what the government commands and where government is silent men must never act. Men must never act where government is silent. So men sit in fear that they are going to get in trouble if they try to do anything.

In common law government must do only what as law commands and where law is silent the government must never act.

Men can always act where government is silent.

In our common law tradition men can act and do what they believe to be right when the law is silent.

This is Brent Allan Winters, Common Lawyer.com

I yield back to whoever is in charge.

Gerard opened Q & A

CALLERS
(1:20:00)

Caller 1: Steve Illinois

In the event that they drag you into their kangaroo courts how do you assert yourself under Constitutional law or common law?

There is no difference between our common law and our Constitution.

Our Constitution is a brief of common law government.

When you are in court and you want to assert yourself your protections are guaranteed.

We as Americans guarantee that men when they are drug into court that your rights given to you from God we call those fundamental rights those are responsibilities of discernment that you will be free to exercise that and government won’t interfere. It’s your call not government’s.

And what we should do in our courts is always give all concern and opportunity to do right.

That means that you got to say something you’ve got to say I have a right to counsel of my choice.

That means the responsibility of discernment to choose counsel of my choice.

And I also have a right to remain silent. I don’t have to talk if I don’t want to.

I have a right to trial by jury You assert that right

You don’t ask the court for trial by jury because it’s a fundamental right.

You demand it.

You write down on a piece of paper or type on a piece of paper what you want.

And when the judge says What do you say?

You read it what you’ve already written down and as you read it have an extra copy and hand it to him. That makes it easier for him and that way you get it on the record.

All you want to do is to get it on the record.

It’s a fundamental right

You have the right to represent yourself before the court.

It is a good idea to have a lawyer because I wanted the jury to know that there is a lawyer that believes in my cause It makes a big difference It is a matter of perception.

The courts are administered by men

You don’t ever argue with a judge

If you can’t make headway with him don’t argue with him it won’t help it will make things worse.

We attribute to them respect even when we disagree with them

Even when we know that they are doing wrong.

We respect the institution

The Bible commands that of us

Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people

The word ruler applies foremost to judges and folks that sit on the jury.

When you show due respect and they refuse to acknowledge it that is one of the toughest things in the world for a man to deal with.

Because for you to show it and for them to not reciprocate does that absolve us of our responsibility to not show respect? The answer is no it does not.

Because the command is from God.

Nobody really rates respect.

No man really has honor in and of himself.

The only honor a man can have he gets from God.

Men are despicable creatures all of us.

Our Creator wants order among us

If we could bring back the Article 3 courts and bring them back under the obedience of the Constitution, obedience to the common law, if we could do that in the federal court, it would be a slam dunk on the state level because they have to be obedient to the law of the land the federal courts will enforce that.

Whenever a judge violates your unalienable right that makes it a federal case

Any case where the judge is out of proper order in other words violating your right of due process or some other unalienable right that you have automatically it’s a federal case.

Enforcement would come on a federal level in every single court.

This will cause a lot of problems in the municipal courts and administrative courts there will be no power and authority to enforce their codes, regulations or rules or whatever authority that they think that they have

Codes, regulations, and rules are written for elected and appointed individuals, bureaucrats, not for the people.

As long as we don’t injure another individual we are in good behavior.

Once we injure another person it becomes questionable whether it becomes a criminal act or a civil concern that has to be addressed.

Unfortunately they are in bad behavior

They are driven to do the wrong thing

Maybe they are being threatened in some way themselves.

Or paid off or what?

The purpose of National Liberty Alliance is to bring back the common law grand jury throughout the nation.

Whenever they are not doing their duty and they are taking you in a different direction it’s fraud.

Once you start giving their system some authority and power then you empower them.

Whatever they are doing is fraud.

It’s either due process or they are defrauding us.

If it is not the law then they are putting fraud upon us.

Depending upon the intent subversion.

Any law that controls us or empowers them is no law at all It’s fraud It’s meaningless It’s null and void It’s irrelevant

We’re in jurisdictions unknown.

You need courtroom observers

We have to change the system The only way to change the system is by going after some of these judges and indicting them and putting them in jail. Once you get one judge indicted and get one in jail the rest of the judges will get in line and get correct and that is that. They are either going to obey or they are going to go to jail.

It’s an uphill battle.

If we do an indictment and they ignore it then what do we do then?

We need to have the attorney general on our side

The President says he wants to be lawful He knows how corrupt the courts are

We’ve been communicating with him.

The attorney general has got to give us a prosecutor that will prosecute these judges for breaking the law

It’s an uphill battle

NLA is going after judges with Show Causes

and we are going after these people with indictments

It is foolish to give an indictment out if we don’t know if we can get follow through and a prosecution to follow.

That’s why we have to bring the case before the attorney general and the President of the United States concerning the judiciary because we are talking about something widespread

We are talking about a conspiracy by enemies both foreign and domestic inside our government

the entire judiciary is corrupt and most of these people need to go to jail

Restitution is required The jury has to decide what to do

You can’t go in there as a single person You need the critical mass of people.

Go to NationalLibertyAlliance.org and click on “docket” click on the memorandums that we filed in our court case

They can’t argue them they’re clear they can’t argue against these cases they’re too powerful

(1:54:42)

Robert has some late breaking information on the jury on today’s trial

The question the jury asked was:

What if we cannot come up with a unanimous verdict?

The prosecutors are probably looking at a hung jury.

In common law there is no such thing as a hung jury. The jury goes back and they stay there until they decide.

If they want to decide that they can’t decide then they acquit.

The people in this trial are all charged with the same charges.

Pray for this jury to do the right thing.

The judge allowed the prosecution five or six or seven weeks

The judge only allowed the defense two or three days.

 Robert concluded his report.

(2:00:23)

Caller 2: North Carolina Allen

no response

Caller 3: New Mexico Ann

She has a citation that she went to court over

She asked for trial by jury

The judge refused

This is going on tomorrow morning at 9:00

If anybody is in Albuquerque that can come to the courthouse at 333 Lomas Blvd 5th floor

Please come and support Ann

She had a leash on her service dog

Her service dog was diffusing an angry ranger behind the desk when Ann went in to pay the park fee and then he screamed at her He said, “Get your dog out of here” Ann got nothing but harassment.

Ann is facing four charges.

Ann wanted a trial by jury

They were going to fine Ann $30

She didn’t want to pay that.

John suggested that she pay the $30 and deal with it later

Ann does not feel that she has that option any more.

People got to figure out where they are going to make their fight and where they are going to make their battle.

Chances are you are not going to win

We have a bigger battle.

Sometimes it’s better to pay it and move on.

If you have the education to deal with it then take them to federal court and deal with it there.

It is in federal court.

Because she was in a federal park.

She was in a federal park so it is under federal jurisdiction.

It is at federal court at 333 Lomas Blvd in Albuquerque on the fifth floor at 9:00 tomorrow morning

Don’t argue with the judge

Say “I object” “Why?” “Because that’s my wish”

Caller 4: Kenny from Florida

How would you respond to those who use verses out of the Book of Romans particularly Chapter 13 about every soul be subject to the government authority? How do you respond to people who talk about that one chapter in the Bible? You need to submit to government.

The last few years the federal government has used that passage as did the Nazis to encourage leaders of churches to get their fold under control and tell them to obey the government.

The version that is often used is the King James Version. The King James Version was a government project. Not only was it a government project but it was a government project headed up by a man that believed that he was the law. And he wouldn’t let anyone on the translation team unless they also made it clear to him that they were committed to what the law of the city called the divine right of kings. The divine right of kings was an expression used back at that time to signify the law of the city and what it said was this:

The king answers to no man, he will only answer to God after it is all over.

And that he has been given all power within his realm and there is no appeal from him.

The King James version was translated for one reason. It was translated to overcome the influences of what people in England called in those days the Geneva translation.

The Geneva Translation was translated in the city of Geneva in Switzerland long before that during the 1500s. Translated by men who were exiled from England so that they wouldn’t have their heads chopped off. This was before the King James Bible was translated. It was the first Study Bible to have notes in it. And it was those notes and the translation itself that King James wanted to overcome in his own country. Romans 13 was one of the places where they bent the translation to support the divine right of kings. The King James Bible is a pretty good translation. The word translated to “power” in the first two verses should be translated to “authority” or “Jurisdiction” or even “right”.

You don’t just blindly do whatever government tells you to do.

You fall into the jurisdictions that God has delegated to men.

God has delegated jurisdiction to men to establish courts and handle juries.

And He has delegated a certain jurisdiction a certain criminal jurisdiction to judges and jurors in those courts. And He outlines that very precisely. What criminal jurisdiction the courts have. The Bible does not give jurisdiction to governments among men to tase men that are representing other people in the courtroom. He does not say obey the power of government If you want a more complete discussion of Romans 13 then go to commonlawyer.com and look for the book titled The Good Book A Common Lawyer Translates and Annotates translating the Bible from the original Hebrew, Chaldee & Greek Tongues

There is a difference between power and right, that is , authority or jurisdiction.

There are people who have the jurisdiction to do things but they don’t have the power to pull it off.

The U S marshal has power. And that judge used US marshals to exercise power and tase that lawyer , Mumford in the courtroom. But he had no right with his black robe to do that. No authority, no jurisdiction. That’s what Paul the Apostle is talking about. He’s talking about jurisdiction He is talking about right He is talking about authority He’s talking about the power of government.

A lot of powerful men in this world doing a lot of nasty things. Murder is an exercise of power without right. Unjustified killing.

In many cases you can obey government and not disobey God

In the Mumford case the judge actually told the marshals to stand down and they didn’t listen to her. They disobeyed the judge’s order.

We’re in lawlessness.

Was the judge colluding with the marshals so she could say I told them to stop but they didn’t?

Those things go on in government.

It started in the churches and now it’s in the courts

This country was powerful when the pulpits were on fire with one nation under God

They’re no longer that way

The church age has died They’re all 501C3 now

These are the rules of men this is what men have allowed things to derogate to

That’s a cult Not a religion If you let one man do stuff like that and you are following him then you are in a cult you’re not in a religion

Caller 5 Terry from New Jersey

(2:41:51)

New Jersey’s latest judicial abomination:

“K.D. Pompey, Marine veteran from Virginia convicted under New Jersey’s draconian gun laws of Unlawful Possession of a Weapon, will not have to report to State Prison on Monday.  Governor Chris Christie commuted Pompey’s sentence to time served today.

Pompey was arrested on December 16, 2011 and convicted in 2013, according to the Governor’s Order. According to published reports, Pompey brought his gun, which was licensed in his home state of Virginia, into a Fort Lee nightclub.  A friend took the gun from the Marine’s holster. No shots were fired and no one was injured.

Pompey was facing a 5 year prison term with a provision that he serve a minimum of three years.

Pompey’s application for a full pardon is still under review by the Governor’s Office, according to Chief Counsel Gregory Acquaviva’s letter to his attorney, Evan Nappen of Eatontown.”

This is not the first time something like this has happened. Christie has been commuting these things left and right for the last few years.

New Jersey people are just a bunch of sheep.

They just don’t understand the Second Amendment.

Another example of made-up crimes. Something that could be resolved without prison time.

New Jersey is so over-zealous with so-called perceived crimes that they just want to lock people up.

They identify the gun as the evil thing. They think that they are good laws.

That’s how brainwashed they are.

Those of us that believe in the Second Amendment are having our right trampled everyday.

We used to have gun clubs in school. That’s long gone

After 9 11 forget about it.

Caller 6: Jeremiah in California

In the Bible God gives us all of the green herbs God gives us all the herbs of the field to use as we want.

Whatever you do, do all for the glorification and dignity of God.

Can you smoke pot to God’s glory?

If the Holy Spirit is to indwell us then ask the Spirit of God if he would like to toke a joint.

Marijuana has a medical use. It ought to be used if it helps. But there is such a thing as abuse. There is no criminal jurisdiction that God gives to the governance of men to criminalize the use of things like marijuana.