

Armstrong Economics™

But they can't
do that!

They're coming to
take you away
Ha Ha, He He
Ho Ho,
Hum Hum!

Annually, the US
ARRESTS
MORE THAN
10 million
people; equal
to
1/2 population
OF Australia



Martin A. Armstrong
former Chairman of Princeton Economics International, Ltd.

Mail Comments to:

Martin A. Armstrong
#12518-050
FCI Fort Dix Camp
PO Box 2000
Fort Dix, NJ 08640

PLEASE REGISTER YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS
FOR ANY UPDATE NEWS

ArmstrongEconomics@GMail.COM

Copright Martin A. Armstrong, all rights reserved

This Report may be forwarded as you like without charge. It is provided as a Public Service at this time without cost. ~~The contents and designs of systems are in fact~~ copyrighted. At a future date, a book will be released The Geometry of Time. The charts are often reproductions of an earlier publication from 1986 also to be soon republished ~~The Greatest Bull Market In History covering from 1900 up to the 1980s.~~ Additional updating is underway to complete the Century and into the current time, providing a month to month history of the financial development of Western Society.

But they CAN'T do THAT

they're coming to take you
AWAY

HA HA, He He, Ho Ho,
Hum Hum



by: Martin A. Armstrong

former Chairman of Princeton Economics International, Ltd
and the Foundation for the Study of Cycles

A few years ago, I read a book on the most famous cases by Alan M. Dershowitz. This book was such an eye-opener, I regret that this is not taught in school, for if it were, there would either be a revolution or a mass exodus from the United States. One of the most famous spy cases was that of the Rosenbergs put on trial in New York. The Government knew that his wife was innocent, yet charged her anyway as leverage to force him to plead and turn over evidence they thought he had. It failed, if it was even correct, and the Rosenbergs were sentenced to death. The Government declined to drop the charges against his wife and she was executed.

So many high profile cases are bogus plays to pretend that the Government is doing its job. Some are fixed because the pressure is too great that they want to solve the crime to shut-up the press. The Boston Strangler was never caught. A mentally-ill man would routinely confess to crimes the police knew he did not do and put him out the door. This time, they could not catch the man so when the mentally-ill man showed up, they said OK, tag your it. He could never describe a single crime. Similar doubts still linger about the so called child-kidnapper of Lindbergh's baby.

The conviction rate has soared since the Congress changed the penalties in criminal cases from about 72% pre-1987 to 99% - some still commit suicide. The American legal system is a joke. There is no equal justice, fair trial, or anything of the sort. The courts have been stacked with former prosecutors pretending now to be a judge with the same hatred seething beneath the surface.

The problem is, the criminal law has for centuries been the political tool to get rid of the enemies of the state. However, America specializes in prosecuting the wrong people in order to distract the press and the public from the real criminals.

You will not see any investment banker from Morgan Stanley who came up with the idea of a CDS prosecuted. You will not see anyone from AIG who sold whatever they could never backing the insurance they wrote. And you will certainly never see any one at Goldman Sachs prosecuted. What you are about to see, are small-time mortgage brokers who they will claim encouraged home owners to lie on applications.

The criminal law is so corrupt, Senator Webb has begun at last a investigation that will most likely stay clear of the corruption in judges and the inability to obtain fair trials. It matters not who is in charge from the corruption standpoint. What we are going to see is a herd of criminal prosecutions of lesser actors to make it appear that those responsible for the economic decline are being punished and it will never happen again.

This will be a white-wash just as former Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson tried to slip in an immunity clause for all his banker-buddies in TARP. While that was struck, you will still not see anything close to fair trials unfold. We are about to be just bullshitted American style. The press will play along and report only the Government allegations, and the lawyers will just put out the denials, and inform the clients that they cannot talk to the press for anything they say, even mis-quotes, will be used against them. So you end up with a press-trial that is one sided and it just gets worse from there on out. What we ignore is the fact that this pretense for justice is the source of our own economic decline for it destroys our Capital Formation.

Thomas Jefferson believed that the Judiciary would be the destroyer of our nation. The greatest threat that we have to our long-term viability and to the foundation of what I call our Capital Formation, is no doubt the Judicial Branch. There is no other branch or department of government that is so corrupt morally than the federal Judiciary. Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) wrote about the danger of the Judiciary quite openly;

"It has long ... been my opinion ... that the germ of dissolution of our Federal government is in the constitution of the federal judiciary; an irresponsible body, (for impeachment is scarcely a scarecrow,) working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the government of all be consolidated into one."

The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Chp XV, p331-32

When I use the term "Capital Formation" I am defining something so critical to our economy, that it is far too often overlooked. Ever since Adam Smith (1723-1790) wrote his Wealth of Nations, to comprehend what is capital itself, has been a very deep subject. You may own assets, land, house, business, copyrights, yet none of this amounts to capital without the rule of law. At the 1997 seminar held in Princeton where Lady Margaret Thatcher delivered her speech, a member of the audience asked her, "Which country would you invest in, Russia or China?" She then replied - "I wouldn't invest a dime in either, because they lacked the rule of law."

This has been the root of what I call Capital Formation, yet strangely, it appears to be a subject rarely discussed. We wrongly assume that a nation's wealth is in part dependent upon its resources. Japan has little natural resources yet it had risen to the second largest economy being displaced now by China. Russia has perhaps more natural resources than anywhere, yet it has fallen behind even China. Why?

A major Australian mining company was a client. They were offered a deal by Russia to mine its gold reserves in a distant part of the country. They declined for two reasons. (1) it would have required the construction of about 1,000 miles of roads, and (2) there was no rule of law to secure the investment.

This is why the Federal Judiciary must be restructured from the ground up. It is the most serious threat we have to restoring our economy and unless Obama rises to the task, it matters not what laws are past, for it is judges who say what any

law means. We do not appreciate how the Judiciary effects our national wealth. But this single department determines if we are a vibrant progressive economy that will create jobs, or one that forces capital to leave because of the lack of any tribunal that will ever rule fairly.

Look at Africa. There is a continent rich in resources, yet it is incapable of rising as any viable economic power. Some people will try to read racism into this problem. Yet I have met plenty of Africans and find them to be smart. This is not a racial inferiority, it is a political corruption problem. The inability to form a cohesive political structure free from corruption is what prevents the resources of Africa from being turned into capital. Nigeria's nationalization of oil, was one problem that illustrated the lack of a Rule of Law and thereafter, sends warnings that this is not a place where contracts will be honored. South Africa brought the Rule of Law that was European, and thus it flourished. Even though blacks have taken control, the culture of a Rule of Law survived.

Look at Mexico. The nationalization of oil in that nation has sent also a huge warning signal that capital is also not safe in Mexico. Without the Rule of Law, there can be no Capital Formation. Poor nations can have all the assets in the world, but if they do not have a honest Rule of Law, those assets are "land locked" insofar as they are incapable of becoming capital.

This is why Gold has always been the ultimate store of wealth - the hedge against government instability, not inflation! You can have real estate. You can own vast businesses. You can have all sorts of tangible assets. But none of this has any real value if courts will only rule in favor of the government. Once the Rule of Law collapses, the economic viability of a nation is lost. The wealth that did exist vanishes. This is what I mean by the term "Capital Formation" for assets are not capital without the honest Rule of Law. Once contracts are no longer enforceable or are subject to re-interpretation to create new jurisdictions for the Government to claim authority, the long-term effects are devastating.

Gold is the ultimate store of wealth for it depends not upon the Rule of Law as does real estate, stocks, bonds, or other forms of property that rely upon a contract. If there is no Rule of Law, there can be no New York Stock Exchange. We are dependent upon the Federal Judiciary far more than any other branch, yet it is the one branch over which we have no control at all. Judges have declared themselves to be God on earth - beyond the Rule of Law, who cannot be sued for even deliberate violations of your civil rights, and only the Executive could dare criminally bring any charges against a Judge so as long as he always rules in the Government's favor, who would ever criminally prosecute him? And as Jefferson noted, impeachment is a joke because there also, the Senate will do nothing. I personally wrote in my own case to Arlan Specter and Patrick Lehey on the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Constitution imposes an affirmative duty upon them to defend the Constitution even against Judges. Neither one would bother to ever reply. So do not count on the Legislative Branch to defend a citizen. The Executive will do nothing as long as a Judge just rules in their favor, so you see how the economy can easily be destroyed by the Judiciary. Jefferson was right - the greatest threat is the Judiciary.

When people were fleeing Russia after the Revolution in 1917, they took gold and worked it into thin wire. They then wove it into a woman's skirt, and painted it black. This is how many people smuggled their gold out of Russia. These money skirts are quite rare today because most were re-melted and sold. You can't do that with real estate. As they say, when you die, you can't take your money with you, but if you have to flee a nation, you can't take most of your tangible assets either. This is the historical distinction of Gold above all other forms of capital. It is why Gold is still going to rise sharply.

As Americans, we are living a dream that no longer exists. In fact, our dream has become the worst nightmare that has sealed the fate of so many nations before our time. In the New Testament, Luke 18, you will find the story told by Christ about the Widow and the Corrupt Judge. It is a story about how this widow constantly petitions the judge for the judgment of the law. The judge refuses to ever rule and withholds from her what the law is suppose to provide.

Again we find the same complaint in Chapter 45 of Magna Carta. The revolution demanded that the king appoint judges only who (1) were competent and knew the law, and (2) would comply with the law. This problem we have with the Judiciary is a very ancient problem that constantly resurfaces.

Edward Gibbon (1737-1794) attributed one of the primary reasons for the fall of Rome to the same problem, the corruption of judges and the Rule of Law. He noted that the Roman government did the same thing that the English government did, it transformed the criminal law into a means to confiscate wealth. In England, torture became popular because a felony was not merely death, it gave the king the right to confiscate all your assets and throw your wife and children out on the street. This is why so many people endured the painful tortures and prayed for death and the strength to hold out. Those who saw Brave Heart with Mel Gibson, will recall the end where the inquisitor inflicted such pain bagging him to plead guilty and he would then end his life swiftly.

Gibbon wrote in his Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (1776), he noted that the "distinction of every kind soon became criminal." Id./Chp IV. He noted that during the reign of Commodus (180-192AD), the mere "possession of wealth" became justification and "[s]uspicion was equivalent to proof; trial to condemnation." Ibid. He noted that those who gravitated to the justice system then, as is now, were the "most worthless of mankind [who] are not afraid to condemn in others the same disorder which they allow in themselves; and can readily discover some nice difference of age, character, or station to justify the partial distinction." Id./Chp VI. The Rule of Law became "corrupted by the multiplicity of laws" that were "interpreted ... according to the dictates of private interest" and the prosecution of crimes became "pregnant with mischief and disgrace." Id./Chp XVII.

Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence for which during the Revolutionary War, the English sent troops specifically to his house to hang him. Among all the injuries listed, we again find the abuse of the Rule of Law.

- He has made judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.
- He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harrass our people, and eat out their substance.
- For protecting [his agents & judges] ..., by mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States.
- For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury.
- For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offences.
- For abolishing the free System of English Laws ... establishing therein an Arbitrary government...
- For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws,

- He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

The Republicans, manipulated by the Religious Right, stacked the federal courts as they once did before and prosecuted Catholics under the pretense of Prohibition. Indeed, Justice Holmes once wrote that it would be a Cruel and Unusual Punishment to legislate that the drinking of a single drop of wine was illegal, and then to multiply the punishment for drinking a single glass by the number of drops it in fact contained. The criminal law is being used again in the same way against the blacks (for pure racism) and the Spanish (for religion).

Federal judges as a group are some of the most inhuman people you will ever encounter. There are some who have a conscience, but they have become far and few between. Don't think just because a Democrat appointed a judge he or she is OK. Some of the worst judges in the Southern District of New York were appointed by Bill Clinton.

The appointment of a federal judge for life is absurd. This is an extreme reaction to the fact that the king would terminate judges if they ruled against his wishes. This life appointment has created a class of people who literally believe they are "gods" on earth, above the law, and no one may dare even insult them for they alone have the power of the state to imprison anyone for freely stating your mind. You can say what you want about the President, a Senator, or a Congressman. Do that with a judge, and you will be held in contempt of court and thrown into a jail that in the United States is nothing more than a snake-pit deliberately intended to deny you the same dignity as a sentenced prisoner.

In Psalm 82:6 of the Old Testament, the judges of Israel were actually called "gods" (elohim) meaning "mighty ones" for it is said "You are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High." This is the scripture that Jesus Christ even cited stating that this was part of the Jewish Law John 10:34. So to use the same book that the Religious Right uses to be so cruel to others and justify their actions, we must realize that federal judges, no matter who appoints them, flock together and bask in the glory of their power.

In 1831, Federal Judge James Peck threw a journalist in jail because he wrote a story about a judge's decision that was absurd. He sent the court's thugs to go arrest him and throw him in jail on contempt of court. The public outcry finally forced the Senate to hold an impeachment trial. But it was rigged. The judge was acquitted and restored to his reign of terror. Congress limited the contempt power by 18 USC §401 to acts in or near to the courtroom. The Second Circuit held in 2002 that Congress restricted the contempt power of the federal courts to the physical courtroom, and that anything taking place outside, required trial by jury, US v Crispo, 306 F3d 71 (2d Cir 2002). Yet in my case, Judge John M. Walker, Jr (cousin of President George W. Bush), abandoned everything, claims once more federal judges have an "inherent power" and can imprison me or any citizen for life with no trial. Just walking into a federal courtroom alone can land you in life imprisonment with absolutely nothing to defend you at all. Federal judges have the raw power they keep usurping for themselves and say - "to hell with Congress, Democracy, Separation of Powers. They are gods on earth and the Bible confirms that."

In the case of Mr. Chadwick, he is in prison for 14 years and will die there on contempt arising from a divorce case. If you think when you say "I do" before the altar or a judge, there ought to be a clause that says if in a divorce your ex-wife claims you are hiding \$1 million, you will die in prison on contempt for it is impossible to prove you do not have something. Supreme Court Justice Alito saw nothing wrong with that.

You may think that law is fixed, and stable so that business and commerce can take place. Economists agree it is the Rule of Law that actually creates all wealth except perhaps the only exception - gold!

My case appears to be headed for the big screen as a European effort to create a documentary of how I have been treated that is far more important than most would suspect. This is not purely about me. But what Judge John M. Walker, Jr. did to all corporate officers, or anyone who is in a partnership, association, or any group be it incorporated or not, is give a green light to federal judges to be able to just torture citizens without any consequences.



Judge John M. Walker, Jr.

The bible of law for this country was written by Sir William Blackstone, who wrote Commentary on the Laws of England (1769).

This work was used by the Founding Fathers. In a Four Volume set, Blackstone set down the Rule of Law. He made it clear that the punishment for a felony was death and the confiscation of all assets. People would often be tortured to force them to confess when the state had no evidence, and the mercy would be a swift painless death, yet your family would be thrown out on the streets.

Because a corporation was not a person that could be hanged, beheaded, quartered, or disemboweled, at common law at the time the United States was established, never could a corporation be criminally punished, only their officers and directors, see 1 Blackstone, chp 18, p464. When Marx was being followed by the Supreme Court, they changed to law of the land, not Congress, and in 1906 held that since a corporation had no right under the 5th Amendment to remain silent and free from torture, then neither did a corporate officer. It was judges that manipulated the law to claim that corporations had no rights (which was correct since they could not be criminally punished), then neither could their directors or officers (when they had such rights).

Judge John M. Walker extended this where it had never been applied. He allowed even a post-indictment corporate officer to be totally denied all rights whatsoever. This means a terrorist has the right to remain silent, but a corporate officer does not. There is no longer any Equal Protection of the Law, and you have to be nuts to have even a bank deposit with any firm whose headquarters is within New York. While many judges and every lawyer I have spoken to believe this decision is so anti-American and contrary to every principle of the Rule of Law, that is the law unless it becomes overturned.

Why would a Republican be so anti-corporation, to protect the Investment Banks in New York at all costs. Even Proskauer Rose, LLP one of the big lawfirms, informed me that this decision even caused a European bank not to buy into New York. There is something that capital considers above all else - "country risk" that is another way of saying "rule of law" and when federal judges play with words and take away the rights of people and property to protect special interests, where is this any different from Venezuela, Mexico or Iran that suddenly claims it is in the public interest to nationalize all assets?

The Rule of Law must be taken away from these judges to preserve not merely the liberty of a citizen, but if property rights mean nothing, there goes the economy.

But they CAN'T do THAT

Judges
Not Congress & the People
MAKE THE LAWS

There is no greater phrase uttered by those who have encountered the dark side of American Justice than - "But they can't do that." I always believed that the United States was a great nation that respected human rights. I believed that we were the beacon of liberty to the world. It was the sadest day of my life to find out that I was so stupid and never took the time to investigate the truth behind that mask.

To think we have even a free press that protects us like Woodward & Bernstein did in the days of Watergate and the fiercely independent press in Great Britain, and then you find the government has even corrupted that, turns your stomach upside down. A journalist at Bloomberg News, Marc Pittman, had interviewed me many times. He even was very familiar with our forecast back in 1997 that oil would rise to reach \$100 by 2007. When my case began, it was clear that I was not managing money for the Japanese as the Government was alleging. All we did was issue notes as part of the Japanese bailout buying portfolios of depreciated Japanese stocks liquidating them and then owing the face value of the note that matched their original purchase price. The due date was not fixed, and thus there was no trading that belonged to anyone - it was simply just proprietary. Marc Pittman's words to me, "Marty we will not let the Government do this." He saw them take my lawyers away. He even came to MCC and recorded an interview to be played on Bloomberg Radio. Then suddenly, he told me he was not allowed to cover my case and was told the reason was he knew me.

Gretchen Morgenson of the New York Times wrote several articles. When she put me on the front page questioning whether I was guilty of any crime, she too was strangely removed from covering my case. If the government can have journalists removed from covering the truth at major press organizations, do you really think you know the truth about anything? The most shocking abuse of the press was truly the Judith Miller case of the New York Times Journalist who was thrown in contempt until she would reveal her source in the Scooter Libby case. Once a federal judge ruled the Government could now throw journalists in jail on contempt until they testify who their source was, never again can you read an American newspaper or watch an American broadcast news report and trust that what they report is the full story. The courts have essentially stopped Woodward & Bernstein and Congress never had to pass a law - it's judges who make law.

Thomas Jefferson warned that "the germ of dissolution of our Federal government is in the constitution of the federal judiciary." Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Chp XV, p331-32. The American public does not realize that Congress and the President are in fact irrelevant. The government attorneys and the federal judges determine what the law is at any time. It does not take an act of Congress. The people can demand a law even amend the Constitution. None of this matters, because how it is interpreted is in the hands of a judge and whatever he says, that is the law, not what you read and not what was intended.

When my case began, they froze all my then 80 year-old mother's funds right down to her social security to prevent the hiring of any lawyers. She could not even buy medicine. Her checks bounced for whatever she had written before the freeze, was all retroactively void. They nearly killed her. My lawyers stood up and threatened to hold a press conference. Only then did the Government suddenly claim it was a mistake, and blamed her bank and I had no account at the same bank. To this day, I fail to see how her bank would freeze all her funds without some government order.

When one is first thrown in jail, you envision nothing but murderers and rapists. When you enter, you find that 95% are nonviolent and are nothing but stepping-stones to further the careers of prosecutors and the product of racism whereby the KKK of the South who hate blacks, catholics, and jews, wised-up a long-time ago and took off the sheets and filled the courts with such inhuman judges you wonder how they were raised to fester such hatred. There was a man who went to trial before then Chief Judge Mukasey (Bush's later Attorney General). The charge was bank fraud. He was dying of aids he contracted from a blood transfusion. 99% lose trial because the evidence presented to a jury is only what a Judge allows. At sentencing, even the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) did not want this guy because it was costing \$25,000 per month in medication. Judge Mukasey still sentenced him to 6 years knowing he would die in 6 months. He told him, "just do what time you can."

Another white collar case with a sentence of less than 36 months before Judge Casey also in the Southern District of New York, the man's wife and several kids showed up. He yelled at them for appearing to try to gain sympathy. In the case of Lara, the first Columbian to be extradited from Columbia on the solemn agreement that the maximum sentence imposed by the United States would not be greater than 20 years, was given life before Judge Shindlin. When he appealed, the Second Circuit ruled that the agreement for 20 years was with Columbia, not with him. They held he had no right to appeal, and Judges can revise international treaties at will.

I met people kidnapped from other countries, and federal judges refused to hear any claims of torture. I met a man from Guatemala who was friends with the President and that government would not extradite him. So they cleverly set up a party just across the border in Ecuador. Once he went to that party, he was kidnapped by the United States and brought to New York. His daughter and grandson would come to see him once a month. She was pregnant. He told his torturers he had no information on Columbian drug lords. To break him, they released a newspaper article into the Spanish press stating he was cooperating against the Columbians believing that this would force him to cooperate. They killed his pregnant daughter and grandson. He wrote to judge about these tactics, who never replied.

I met other white collar people whose wives were arrested and they were told that if they pled Guilty, they would release their wife. If they did not, their wife would be imprisoned and since they had no immediate family, their children would be put up for adoption. When in another case there was no small children, the target did not believe the threats. His wife was indicted. She was able to get a separate trial and won. He went to trial and lost and got a 18 month sentence. This phrase, "But they can't do that" is the false belief so many people have, and you find out, federal judges in general are simply horrible inhuman people who see not the liberty, justice, and honor, but how to make sure the government is never wrong.

The prison joke is an inmate is bestowed with inhuman qualities - for he can never die. Why? Because the Bureau of Prisons has no one competent to declare you dead, so no one ever dies in prison, always on the way to the hospital. The amount of suicides in New York were unbelievable. One man used the plastic straps you often

see to tie together pipes, branches, or heavy trash. The BOP would put them around your wrists to restrain you. He used them to tie a noose around his neck and hung himself. Yet before he did, he wrote a 28 page letter and sent it out to another inmate telling his story. He decapitated himself because the plastic straps cut right through his neck by his sheer body weight. When I learned he had the same court appointed counsel they gave me, Martin Siegel, I asked him about it. His indignant reply was, well he was guilty anyway. Sad to say, there are never any tears among judges, prosecutors, or most defense lawyers for an inmate. There is no presumption of innocence. Even if the jury acquits you on 9 out of 10 charges, the judge will still sentence you to the 10 charges and declares that the jury did not say you were innocent, just that at a standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, there was not enough proof, but at sentencing, he can use by judicial decree the "more-likely-than-not" standard and since rarely will a federal judge ever believe anyone is innocent, guess what happens. You are sentenced on acquitted conduct.

I spoke to members of the press about different judges. The newspapers will not allow them to ever print their observations of their character. One major journalist told me of Judge Pollack of New York, after he stabs you in the back, he then turns the knife just for fun.

After 911 World Trade Center Attack, the Government did the same thing they did to the Japanese. They started arresting every middle-east guy they could find. While some were released from Brooklyn and sued for the torture and won, those in Manhattan enjoyed little success because of the overwhelming corruption in that court. One man lived in an apartment next to the so-called head terrorist who flew the first plane into the first tower. Merely because he was from Afghanistan, he was arrested. How? The government claims it had a witness who saw him walking down the street carrying a key of heroin. The judge quickly proclaims this is good enough, and orders him imprisoned. No witness ever shows up at all.

The man was told by his court appointed Jewish lawyers that he has no hope, and unless he pleads guilty, he will get life at trial because America hates all arabs right now. The man was in my cell in tears. He came to America because he had three daughters he wanted to get away from the Taliban. He pled guilty because it was what is known as the "Prisoner's Dilemma" that the Justice Department practices all the time. You are left with a choice. You see that 99% are convicted. You are confronted with the fact you cannot obtain a fair trial. The juries are manipulated and now you are an arab on top of that. He pled guilty and was the first to receive 17 years. The sentence alone was telling. For if he was truly a terrorist, (1) he would have been in the terrorist unit, and (2) the government would never offer anything less than life. The heroin claims, were dropped.

When Timothy McVey was pronounced guilty and the Attorney General Ashcroft was shown to have withheld tens of thousands of documents, that alone should have in the free civilized world at least justified a new trial. The Judge gave the lawyers only a few days to look at what was illegally withheld. McVey told his lawyers he wanted to die and prohibited them from trying to appeal the death sentence. Why? Death is far better than being held inside a cell for the rest of your life with no human contact, and one hour per day to step outside. The guards will then harrass you and despite being under constant watch, they still do a strip search and are free at their discretion to start examining your rectum to search inside just to make sure you don't have anything. People think the death penalty is cruel, they know nothing about how inmates will commit suicide and deliberately pick a fight hoping the other inmate will kill them. Just as there is "Death by Cop" there is "Death by Inmate" and then there is the slow mental torture and living in a state of constant stress.

The one thing I have learned is the opposite of what the public thinks. Those who commit suicide are not the guilty, but the innocent wrongly charged. The Project Innocence and others like that focusing on the DNA evidence, have proven more than 1,000 people were convicted of murder or rape who were the wrong people. For every wrongful person imprisoned, there is a guilty person still running around.

The profile of a violent murderer from living among them is strange. They are cowards. Death to them is frightening. They kill inflicting what they themselves fear the most, so they will never commit suicide for they lack the courage. Those who do commit suicide are typically the innocent. They feel so betrayed by the system, so victimized, that they cannot see life going forward with everyone looking at them like they are scum. They commit suicide because they are embarrassed. In the major case in France where all the teachers were arrested for allegations of molesting little children, you cannot image what it feels like if you know you are innocent. The press only gives the government claims and trial by press has already convicted you. I believe two defendants in that case committed suicide. Then it came out that the woman that made the allegations lied and made them all up. The case was dropped, but two people died because they could not live with such a label stamped on their forehead.

Women perhaps suffer the most in prison. They have their children taken from them and threats that they will be essentially sold into adoption like some ancient form of slavery, causes many to do whatever the government tells them to say. Like hostages appearing before cameras in some middle-east cult reading from a script, the United States operates the same way. One day I was on the second floor in the library where the womens's unit occupied the other side of the floor. Suddenly, the guards were carrying a woman who had cut her wrists and legs in a suicide. There was blood everywhere.

There was a young boy who was taken in to MCC and thrown in the hole just to show them what will happen if you are to be disciplined. He had no bunkie to tell him this was not prison. He was locked in a cell 23 hours a day. By the end of the week, he killed himself. You will never read these stories about prison life. I do not believe the press will ever dare print a single word for fear of their own survival. Just go into your bathroom and close the door. Now imagine living in that cell of 75 square feet for the rest of your life. Suddenly, death begins to look mighty good when you do not fear God. What keeps you, is your family. Those who lack one, commit suicide while the guilty would never commit suicide because they fear retribution by God and are cowards to the core.

There was a good looking and polite young Spanish boy named Manny. We would talk and he seemed normal, but we never spoke about his case. One day he asked me if I would help him to write a letter to the judge for his sentencing. I said sure. I asked him what was his crime, and he replied he killed two people. I was taken back by shock. He then asked me if I wanted to see the pictures of the bodies. He ran to his cell before I could even answer and brought back the photos. He had put a shotgun in the face of his victim and blew his head apart like a pumpkin. I was stunned. He was showing me the pictures so proud like they were his children with a big smile. I thought now he is truly crazy. So I asked: "Why did you do this?" He replied, "I just wanted to see what it felt like!"

It turned out Manny was a government witness. I met the people he testified against several months later. They kept telling me about this guy known as "Crazy Manny" who testified that they ordered him to kill these two guys and threatened to kill him if he did not. They were found guilty on his testimony and given life. Manny got his \$5K1 and would go home. He never once told me he killed because he was ordered to. He said he wanted to see what it would "feel" like.

Letting the Real CRIMINALS Go Free!

For centuries, bribing or threatening others to bare false witness against a particular person has been the greatest problem with the legal system. This came to a head in England with the trial of Sir Walter Raleigh (1554-1618) who was put on trial and the witnesses who signed statements for the king, were not allowed to be questioned and did not appear in court as a witness. Raleigh was found guilty, but his charges against the injustice of the corrupt Judiciary still ring loud today. This notorious trial is why we have in our Constitution the Sixth Amendment to secure that we shall have the right to confront our accusers.

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense." - U.S. Constitution 6th Amendment

Nevertheless, despite this history, the Federal Judges still always commit the same offense against the dignity of the people. Prosecutors were extorting pleas that were scripted, giving people deals for less time as long as they just signed a paper exaggerating their crime so they could then use that against others they wanted. The pleas were read to the jury just as they were in Raleigh's trial, and no federal judge bothered to stop the practice. When you look at Supreme Court decisions, most of the criminal rights come from state cases, almost never from federal trials. The court appointed lawyers will never argue constitutional issues that would change the system in a federal court because the judges would have him removed from the panel and put him out of business. The practice of using pleas and denying the same right to confront your accuser, became standard practice in the US. Finally, in 2004, a state lawyer challenged the practice and won in Crawford v Washington, 541 US 36 (2004). For bail, they still allow "hear-say" evidence with no identification to take your liberty.

The right to trial by jury had to be reaffirmed in Apprendi v New Jersey, 530 US 466 (2000). No federal court appointed lawyer ever saw anything wrong with the Religious Right's Draconian Sentencing Commission and Guideline in 1987. It took again a state court decision to rise to the Supreme Court to declare that practice also unconstitutional in Blakely v Washington, 542 US 296 (2004). Still the Justice Department and the Federal Judges refused to apply the law to federal prisoners and argued that they should be allowed to deny trial by jury on a host of items. The Supreme Court ruled in United States v Booker, 543 US 220 (2005), that the same applied to federal courts. But it was Justice Ginsberg who joined both decisions because the law if applied fairly, meant that hundreds of thousands of federal prisoners were serving illegal sentences. She joined both sides and prevented the constitution from being followed as it had always been done.

Only when you review the criminal case law at the Supreme Court, do you see that the rights, privileges, and immunities are only enforced and honestly litigated in the States. Federal courts act more like "gods" and refuse to provide the judgment of the law ruling personal views taking away the concept of a democracy. The right to a trial by jury in contempt (denied me) was established in Bloom v Illinois, 391 US 194 (1968) and the right to remain silent was set in Miranda v Arizona, 384 US 436 (1966). There are numerous examples.

Real criminals know how to play the system. They know the prosecutor cares not about truth, justice, or the fictional American ideals. Give him more bodies to lock away, and you go free. It is called a \$5K1. The Tenth Circuit had a brief moment of honesty in a case of Singleton where it was ruled that it was correct that giving one a free ticket to leave jail if he testifies against another, was bribery. It was said that the President of the United States made a phone call and complained that this would prevent them from getting convictions. The court reheard the case, and ~~claimed that when the law states "whomever" shall not bribe a witness, that does not include the United States.~~ You cannot image how many criminals go free by agreeing to testify against other people making up stories that they "conspired" with them but did not actually participate in a crime. I watched an elderly maintenance man in an apartment building get 17 years after trial because the drug dealers testified that he opened a back door to let them take boxes upstairs that he "knew" were full of drugs, and he would look out for cops in the street.

Once you allow people with such an interest to become witnesses, there can be no fair trials. In fact, this conclusion was reached in England and at the time of the founding of the United States, not even the defendant could testify in his own defense until 1878. All the hard fought safeguards are gone. The judges have changed everything that those who fought and died in war for, because prosecutors want to throw as many people in jail as possible to further their careers.

The front page of the New York Times had reported that in a death penalty case, the defendant obtained the evidence that proved he was innocent. He filed a habeas corpus. The Prosector argued he should be executed anyway because he was late filing his petition. When this shocked many, his boss came out to defend him saying that is the law and the burden is on the President to commute the sentence. That is not in the least true, for Article II, §3 dictates that the laws shall only be faithfully executed and that the prosecutor was to be impartial only to seek justice. These are ideals long since gone.

State prisons have the violent crimes. Federal prisons have a far smaller number of violent prisoners because it is only a crime to kill another in furtherance of a drug crime or some organized crime, namely Mafia. If we imprisoned less of the non-violent offenders, we would make sure the violent are properly restrained.

The PRISON MYTH

The image created both by movies and the press is that those in prison are violent. But the statistics show, while the population has risen, the number of the violent criminal in prison remains fairly constant. The prisons are filled with non-violent people for all sorts of things from failing to file an income tax, to falling behind in child support (where they can certainly not pay) to felony of misprison, which is, you failed to report a crime (popular to imprison lawyers). Then there are healthcare frauds, lawyers who they claim aided a client, and so many variations, your head spins. I even met a man who had a photo-developing shop in the World Trade Center and when destroyed, he was arrested for bank fraud claiming he was an American citizen ~~when he was not after living here since a child, had an American wife, an 6 American kids.~~ He was deported. I even wrote asking help for him from Cardinal Egan in New York who never replied.

Prisoner Statistics	
Year	violent Prisoners
1984	400,877
1989	619,230
2000	415,573
2005	445,806
2006	448,612

Don't get me wrong. There are people in prison who belong there because they are violent. The whole Willie Horton thing is an example. Yet the problem is, we use prison as the answer for everything. The vast majority of prisoners are not violent. There are people sent to federal jail for 30 days. Judges think that unless someone is sent to jail, there is no punishment. We have on the one hand pretense of being a God fearing nation, yet we ignore the Biblical law altogether. The whole eye-for-an-eye standard is a statutory maximum. This meant that never should we inflict a penalty greater than the harm caused. But federal courts are so hateful they are off the reservation constitutionally, for 25 years. Then there was the young kid who was sentenced to nearly 30 years for having some drugs. He told the court he was but 18. The judge cared not, and the kid jumped out the window to his death.

One in 37 Americans are currently in prison or on the Supervised Release program. Either Americans are the most corrupt in the world since we have about one-third of all prisoners more than the tyrannical governments combined, or there is something wrong with the system.

In 2006, the number of Americans arrested was 10,471,287 for the year! To put this in perspective, we arrest half the population of Australia annually! We arrest almost one-third more than the population of Switzerland (7.5 million) each year. That means, we not only arrest far more people than most countries combined, but we have become the largest prison/jail state in the world. Why? At a cost of about \$30,000 per prisoner annually, are we creating merely a cottage industry for lawyers to pretend they are accomplishing something.

When I warn that the Government is about to lock up thousands more and pretend that this is called for because of the economic decline, be very careful that those being arrested are the real criminals. Most will not be, for those truly responsible will never be prosecuted.

There is No Truth in Federal Court

You cannot imagine how corrupt the entire system really is. You think there is truth in a court of law! Think again. First in my case they tried to create a contempt in October 1999 telling the court in a letter from the SEC that I snuck past guards they posted at the office, I got boxes of evidence, carried them out of the office, the guards finally saw me, and I outran them carrying all these boxes, got into a car and fled.

My lawyer Richard Altman who was a friend, called me and asked me if I was nuts? When I heard this story the SEC put in writing, I told him I was in New York and never entered the building. Richard asked me; "Are you telling me the Government is just making this up?" I told him yes! Had Richard not known me personally, he most likely would not have believed me. I told him the office was monitored by a security company and I would have had to swipe a card twice to have gotten into the office. I was at a friend's house. Richard called me back and told me the security company verified "nobody entered the office" and he told me we had to go to court the next day, but don't worry. When we went to court, as the judge was still walking into the court they were screaming there was a mistake. For about 30 minutes there were the strangest explanations to justify the letter. Judge Owen then just asked, so you are withdrawing the allegations? They said yes! And he turned to me to say "Your in good shape." It was clear, the government must have been illegally tapping my lawyer's phones for they knew already our defense. I know, - But they Can't Do That!

The worst part, Judge Owen edited the transcript removing 95% of the whole discussion to hide from the public record what the Government had tried to do then.

The most shocking revelation was how dishonest the courts are and how the Second Circuit Court of Appeals is rotten to the core. I met others who found the same problem that they would get favorable evidence on the record, and the judge would edit the transcripts removing it to sustain convictions.

There was a man who went to trial before Judge Kaplan in the Southern District of New York. The government witness testified incorrectly switching consistently two names so that Harry did everything that Joe was suppose to have done. The lawyer made a motion to vacate the conviction. The prosecutor went to the court reporter and told her to switch the two names throughout the whole testimony. I saw the letter from the lawyer complaining to Judge Kaplan what the prosecutor had done. He asked me to help him. I drafted a letter for him, and Judge Kaplan ruled that it was a normal gramatical change and it had no effect on his conviction.

Then I met a man who was a former lawyer who had a similar problem. This time the Judge Batts also of the Southern District of New York altered the transcript of how the jury was instructed. This was the first time the Second Circuit had to pretend to address the problem.

"The problem in the instant case has led lawyers on both sides to highlight a problematic practice in the Southern District of New York and has prompted one of them to ask this court to order that the practice be eliminated. ... [T]he 'standard practice' ... is for a court reporter to submit the transcript of jury instructions to the district court before releasing it to the parties. ... The district court is free to alter the transcript, and any changes are incorporated in the 'official' transcript without disclosing such changes to the parties. ...

Courts do not have power to alter transcripts in camera and to conceal the alterations from the parties. ...

Nevertheless, whether we have the power to order a change in such a practice is unclear. ... However, we invite the judges of the Southern District to consider revision."

US v Zichettello, 208 F3d 72, 97-98 (2d Cir 2000)

Of course, the Second Circuit has powers only to declare private citizens have violated the law. When it comes to policing judges, they are always above the law. For it is a crime for the judges to alter the transcripts pursuant to 18 USC §2071(a) "Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals ... any record ... filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States ... shall be ... imprisoned not more than three years..."

The entire Second Circuit Court of Appeals and the Southern District have violated the law no differently than those they sit in judgment over. When I put in an affidavit outlining all the changes Judge Owen was making, he was at least forced to answer. I had written a letter to Dorthy Heyl of the SEC complaining about the practice. I asked her why not just write whatever they want in a transcript just claim I pled guilty? She never replied. But the courtroom was packed that day and since the press was there all the time, he wasn't sure if someone would back me up. He thus publicly stated:

JUDGE RICHARD OWEN: "I don't remember ever making any change to a transcript of any substance whatever. I may have stuck in a coma, I may have stuck in a dash. But I don't remember ever changing anything of substance."

(Tr; 9/23/03, p45, L7-11)(99-Civ-9669)

They're Coming To TAKE you AWAY!

You cannot imagine how corrupt the Federal Judiciary truly is. There is no Rule of Law and it matters not what Congress even passes. Neither executive nor the courts will enforce anything against their own self-interests. This is why we need a Tribune who can criminally charge anyone in government including prosecutors and judges. Unless the people are protected, there can be no liberty from such tyranny.

They will haul into court those who made money from the mortgage boom, but did not cause it. They will use hearsay rules to deny them bail, and then use the jail to torture them into a plea that is successfully 98.5% of the time. They will threaten you family. Even Michael Milken pled to save his family for they dropped all charges against his brother to get him to plead. They threaten to indict your children when they are old enough or put them up for adoption when they are not. They will threaten your wife, brother, and in my case, even nearly killed my own mother by freezing all her funds including Social Security preventing her from getting medicine. You are just dealing with the most ruthless government attorneys you can possibly imagine. Why? Because there is no one to even investigate their conduct. Judges are only there to ensure the government wins. How else do they get a 99% conviction rate.

You can check the internet and find out that Judge John Walker, Bush's first cousin, just happened to drive over a policeman directing traffic and killed him. He was not even tested for drunk driving. Like Cheney and the shooting incident, there are two standards of law in the United States. If they were not friends of related to the President, both would have been indicted.

What you are about to witness is the grandest show of all time. The press often knows the truth, but their editors will not let them tell it. You will be fed a host of criminal prosecutions that may run into the thousands as retribution for this huge economic decline. If you lost your home, job, 401K, that's OK. Take comfort in that someone will go to jail and their family destroyed even though they might not be the one that caused anything.

This is going to be like locking up all the drug addicts, but not the drug manufacturers to pretend they are doing something. This is so engrained within Anglo-Saxon culture fueled by Calvinism, that they would prefer to execute all and let God sort it out. This is why we desperately need a Tribune. An independent department that is separately elected, not politically appointed, who will prosecute those in all branches of Government who refuse to obey the law and torture and people.

Federal Judges are so far above the law, they claim "inherent power" that is not derived from the Constitution as did Judge John M. Walker in my case that a judge can without any trial, send a citizen to jail for life as a personal power claiming it is "contempt" of court. Even a prosecutor is supposed to call a grand jury to have you indicted, but a Federal Judge and simply say - "take him away!" Not even treaties negotiated by the President with another nation is off limits, as was demonstrated in the case of Lara in the Second Circuit. There is nothing a judge cannot do, for there is nobody there to discipline him. What would your children be like if they could do whatever they wanted and never once would one even say, "don't do that!" Jefferson was never more correct. This is often why the Religious Right fights to get a president not for what he proposes, but to stack the courts who will rule in their favor, yet ignore all the economic consequences. It is time for reform.