Letter to Supreme Court Chief Judge Gerry Alexander: The buck stops with you!

November 25, 2002

Robert and Christine Birdwell
And Stephen L. Wozny

813 NE 133rd Street
Vancouver, WA 98685
360-566-8153
ROB-RICO@MSN.COM
http://www.4justice4all.info

The Honorable
Gerry L. Alexander, Chief Judge
Washington State Supreme Court
415 12th St W., PO Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504-0929
415 12th St W., PO Box 40929
Courtesy Copy to:
The Honorable Richard D. Eadie

In Re: We prevailed in Cowlitz County Cause Number 02-2-01408-0, September 11, 2002, by the utter and absolute default of the defendant!

You are the 'Chief.' The buck stops with you!

Dear Chief Judge Alexander:

The time has come to put the singularly American maxim: ***~"We are a nation of laws, not men"~*** to the test. The result will be so profound that the premise of our existence and very survival as a free and honorable people may have to be re-examined.

Let not one who is unwise and unlearned ascend the judgment seat, which is the throne of God, lest he change light into darkness, and lest, like a madman with a sword in his untutored hand, he slay the innocent and set free the guilty." Henricus de Brattona or Bractona *coram rege* (Henry Bracton 1210-1268)

Our experience thus far indicates that those words make up an empty phrase to which no one should attach their moorings.

I have sat in the courtroom where Presiding Cowlitz County Superior Court Judge James

CASE DOCUMENTS

Washington State Bar Association Description
Letter to County Legal Advisor (8-30-2001)
Letter to Legislature (1-26-2002)
Letter to the Editor (4-14-2002)
Court of Appeals Letter (6-2-2002)
Jury Trial Request (8-19-2002)
Letter to Washington State Supreme Court (9-24-2002)
Court Transcript (10-02-2002)
Notice to Judge Warme (10-17-2002)
Statement to Longview Police Dept. (10-23-2002)
Letter to Commission on Judicial Conduct (10-26-2002)
Paid Legal Notice & Public Warning
Letter to Supreme Court Chief Judge (11-25-2002)

Home
Law Resources
Case Documents
Send in the Clowns!

Warme holds forth and have watched as he signs default orders and judgments every 30 to forty seconds in an unending stream. The defaulting party didn't answer; didn't file a valid notice of appearance; the defaulting party didn't perform. The defaulted party…… defaulted.

The defaulting parties were just nameless, faceless, ordinary people. Judge Warme may or may not have ever heard their name. The singular issue was that a lawyer was before him who had a file; some papers and would say, "yes, your honor, I have an order of default and judgment for you to sign." Judge Warme would be handed the document…… maybe ask a question ….. maybe not, look at the papers, and sign the order and judgment and that's the end of the matter. Party A and Party B didn't matter. A default is a default. Next case!

Where that whole system fell apart, is when Party A or Party B has the name "Bridgewater." "Bridgewater" defaulted. "Bridgewater" did not answer the complaint. "Bridgewater" did not file a notice of appearance. As a matter of law, we are entitled to have the lawful order and judgment signed.

Plaintiffs in Cowlitz County Cause Number 02-2-01408-0, named Carroll C. Bridgewater, private party, natural person, as the defendant. Since the court does not have the power to re-write contracts, or use 'interpretation as a guise to re-write a contract' (See Panorama Village Condominium Owners Assoc. Board of Governors v. Allstate Ins. Co. 144 Was 07/12/2001) citing Chaffee v. Chaffee, 19 Wn.2d 607, 625, 145 P.2d 244 (1943) (citing 12 Am. Jur. Contracts sec. 228, at 749). nor does an individual have the lawful power take it upon themselves to re-write another's pleadings, why then would Michael Tardif, of the state attorney generals office (representing the state joined as an involuntary plaintiff); the Washington State bar Association, et al, commit such an obvious fraud by insisting that the defendant named in Cowlitz County Cause Number 02-2-01408-0, is **JUDGE** Bridgewater and the state his defender? The pleadings are very specific and the plaintiffs herein knew precisely whom we were suing and clearly stated the factual reasons.

A person can be a judge or they can be a criminal but no one can be both. Article III, Section 1, U.S. Constitution….. **"The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour,…"**

But when Judge James Warme saw the name "Bridgewater" on the order and judgment presented to him, he reacted as if we had handed him a poisonous snake, and declared he couldn't sign it "because he had business relationships with Bridgewater, and there's this appearance of justice thing." He stated he must "recuse himself." Suddenly the law was subordinate to either business "relationships" or the fact that the private individual "Bridgewater" we were suing happens to be employed as a fellow "judge."

How can Judge James Warme reconcile the fact that he will get on a production line type roll and sign a default order and judgment every 30 to forty seconds against defaulting parties who may happen to have job descriptions such as mechanic, engineer, scientist, professor, laborer, hooker, candlestick maker, but must "recuse himself" when the party happens to have a job description of 'judge?' Does the law care what the defaulting party does for employment when the only substantive issue before the court is simply……..default? Almost a thousand years of law says: absolutely not!

DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION MUST BE KILLED

Due to these utterly corrupt, symbiotic, alliances; too cozy relationships, allowing for systemic corruption within the Washington State Judicial Branch, we have found this to be the norm in our continuing to be denied, among other rights, the honest services of the court as some judges and officers of the attorney general are intentionally committing acts of fraud; creating delays and are engaged in illegal judge shopping to find a judge who will unlawfully agree to execute their plan which, by necessity, means violate the law in order to defeat justice. Thus, we are being deprived of the equal protection of the law and due process of law!

Judge Alexander, you were made fully aware of the post September 11, 2002 criminal activity of Clark County Superior Court Judge Diane Woolard and Michael Tardif, in this matter, in my letter of complaint to you September 24th 2002.

Instead of jumping in and properly dealing with it, you apparently elected to step into your 'prerogative court closet' and direct certain official, common, and customary, practices, of that outlawed species of court, to be brought into play. I will tell you right up front, that using those practices will have failed you as horribly as they did your 'predecessors in prerogative.'

In spite of the absolute and clear law, material to this matter, on the 29th day of October, 2002, a "private, non-profit, organization," that claims to be directed by you and, under some fiction, 'owned' by your office, calling itself the Washington State bar Association, employed members of the 25th largest law firm in the United States with instructions for them to fabricate and send a most vicious and fraudulent attack letter to the Washington State Bar Association's Office of Disciplinary Counsel (a very long and impressive title for something that does not lawfully exist) and a copy to co-prevailing party, and co-plaintiff herein, Stephen L. Wozny.

"*… it is a maxime of law, that no man shall take advantage of his owne wrong."* ~Lord Edward C. Coke, (*First Institutes*) of the Common Law Section 148b, c. 1628

Perhaps not wanting himself and others to suffer the sure and certain consequences, and the embarrassment, of an open and public trial before a jury of ordinary people, Carroll Bridgewater appears to have deliberately defaulted and chose, instead of lawfully answering our suit against him, to employ an unholy, and wholly unlawful, alternative: have a cloistered, members only, "private nonprofit organization hit squad" attack and kidnap the citizenship and attendant rights, of plaintiffs, taking those things back into their dark, dank, and secret bunkers in a concerted effort to defeat justice *out of sight*.

[This WSBA thing closely resembles a resurrected version of an outlawed 1612 Ecclesiastical tribunal. But, unlike the Seventeenth Century Church lawyers they seek to emulate, your vassals more resemble a pack of not-too-bright- but dangerous and obsequious -hounds.]

The subject letter purports to be a "FORMAL COMPLAINT" to or

"BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,
against lawyer Stephen L. Wozny.

The letter was written and mailed by two private lawyers, David Goodnight and Thuy Nguyen Leeper, of the huge, global, private law firm of Dorsey & Whitney LLP, Seattle, Washington, which is a local branch office of the Minneapolis World Headquarters, of that firm, where none other than Walter Mondale is listed as the "Senior Partner."

Its two ostensible authors purport to be the "new" "Special Disciplinary Counsel for the WSBA." Apparently, the first two, Ramerman, then Gordon, just didn't work out for the Holy Order of 'Member's Only,' the WSBA.

What's so very extraordinary is that it appears that someone has actually started to pay attention. More extraordinary,… **it's too late!**

All of the huge, global, multi-national, law firms in the world cannot change the simple facts and the law: We were absolutely truthful and correct; we followed the law and we, and the law, have prevailed!

Bridgewater was dishonest and violated the law. Bridgewater was in default September 11, 2002, and, to make matters infinitely worse for each of them, Bridgewater, Tardif, and Woolard, are all three still stuck in the Judges Chambers area of the Cowlitz County Hall of

Justice at the approximate time of 12:50 PM September 19th 2002 engaged in a conspiracy with Diane Woolard to deny our order of default and judgment we are entitled to as a matter of law; to further obstruct justice and injure us further by violating even more laws.

As befell the Bill Murray character in the movie Groundhog Day, they will be stuck there to repeat the event forever until they rehabilitate their human character through confessing their wrongdoing and taking their lawful punishment, the incompetent and corrupt state Attorney General and the might of Dorsey & Whitney LLP's 630+ global-lawyers and 800+ global-staff, and 1,000 global computers, notwithstanding.

As to Bridgewater, Tardif, and Woolard, "… *it is a maxime of law, that no man shall take advantage of his owne wrong."* ~Lord Edward C. Coke, (*First Institutes*) of the Common Law Section 148b, c. 1628 and,
"…. *An act in law shall worke no wrong*." Section 148a. and Section 149b.

Without digging through the hideous particulars, the central theme, providing the stench, of that October 29, 2002 outrage, from Dorsey & Whitney, is that private citizen Bridgewater is possessed with "absolute immunity," i.e., he can commit whatever crimes and offense against whatever person he chooses and suffer absolutely no consequences for those criminal acts, simply because he is otherwise employed as a judge.

On the other hand, plaintiffs are to be secretly and severely punished, by the "High Commission" and "Privy Counsel," for exercising our paid-for-in-a-sea-of-blood protected rights and for performing our lawful duties in reporting specific instances of endemic, systemic, criminal acts committed by state functionaries.

In essence, that little piece of utter fraud purports that everything that plaintiffs have stated and charged in Cowlitz County Cause Number 02-2-01408-0, and the included underlying causes, is false, slanderous, libelous, and, in effect, an ***insolent*** attack on the "crown."

Even a terribly 'unlearned' person would know that if we, the plaintiffs, were actually 'making this stuff up,' we would be rightfully hauled into a lawful and proper court and publicly flogged with the truth. As the 'wrongfully accused,' you and they would have to mount an aggressive and public defense of the truth and the 'rightness' of your actions in a lawful, open, and public trial, not through a secret, cloistered, and private nonprofit organization.

That has and will not happen simply because what we have charged is absolutely true. Any such action filed against us in a court would give us standing and result in absolute confirmation of what we have charged and will result in hundreds of judges of the courts of record of this state being removed and lawfully dealt with by an outraged public. A huge percentage of the 26,500+ lawyers who have silently facilitated this crime spree, and the platoons of vociferous lawyer hit-men who have actively worked to advance the judiciary's destruction of the law, will have a stunning awakening.

That is precisely the reason defendant Bridgewater refused to hire a lawyer and file an answer into the court prior to September 10, 2002. This is precisely why the Office of Attorney General unlawfully claimed to be defendant Bridgewater's lawyer, instead of representing the state as an involuntary plaintiff as the complaint itself requires.

Reading of the statutes RCW 4.92.060 and RCW 4.92.070 will show the language "the attorney general had to find…" in the case of providing a defense for a 'state official,' that means 'finding' that person acted within the scope of the official duties and acted in good faith. No one can 'find' that which does not exist. Attorney General Gorton did not find it in Herrman, nor can anyone find it in Bridgewater. Besides, it's too late. We prevailed September 11, 2002.

In STATE v. HERRMANN 89 Wn.2d 349, 572 P.2d 713, *inter alia*

> On May 7, 1976, Herrmann wrote the Attorney General asserting that "[Y]ou are required by both the Washington State Constitution and the statutes of our state to be the lawyer for me as State Insurance Commissioner." Herrmann cited RCW 4.92.060 and RCW 4.92.070 and stated: "There can be no doubt, therefore, that I am entitled to legal representation at the expense of the taxpayers in the same way as these same taxpayers are burdened by the cost of your endeavors."
>
> On May 10, 1976, Gorton responded to the request by Herrmann as follows:
>
> " You have requested that I also appoint a special assistant attorney general to represent you in STATE v. HERRMANN, ET AL., Thurston County Superior Court No. 54529.
>
> Such an appointment cannot be made. First, the 1975 amendment (Chapter 126, Laws of 1975, 1st Ex. Sess.) referred to in your letter only authorizes the defense of tort and civil rights actions under 42 U.S.C. 1981 ET SEQ. and does not authorize the defense of all actions which may be commenced against state employees. Second, the statute does not authorize the providing of the cost of defense by the state for employees when the state itself has initiated the action. **Third, you will note that the 1975 statute requires that the employee has acted in good faith and it is readily apparent from the Complaint filed in this action that there is no way in which I can find that your actions which formed the basis for this suit were performed in good faith. "** (emphasis added)
>
> The sole judge under the statute as to whether an employee acted or purported to act in good faith within the scope of his duties is the Attorney General. Previously, this decision was at the sole discretion of the administrative board which had to find, additionally, that the employee acted without negligence. The Attorney General has held Karl Herrmann did not meet the test of the statute. Although the test and the decision maker have changed, the discretionary nature of the relief has not.

The common law; the statutes; the Bill of Rights, notwithstanding, there was no way the cloistered judiciary and legal profession was going to allow this case to go to a jury! A scheme had to be devised to kill this case.

The first criminal attempt to achieve this was for Bridgewater to simply default. A default eliminates a trial and “what judge in his right mind is going to sign an order of default and judgment against a person who’s also employed as one of their own?”

The second criminal attempt to achieve this was to bring in a ‘visiting judge’ September 19, 2002, who, by plan, would first illegally deny the order and judgment, and who then would entertain a motion from Tardif and Bridgewater (prearranged in the restricted hallway in chambers prior to the sham hearing) that the case be dismissed because Bridgewater has absolute immunity and therefore the charges are frivolous, baseless, insolent, and an insult to the judiciary **requiring the most severe sanctions against plaintiffs.** The ‘fix’ was in!

The evidence shows that **that** didn’t work out very well for them. Clark County Superior Court Judge Diane Woolard didn’t have the opportunity to utter those words simply because the law declared that neither she, Tardiff or Bridgewater, were actually there: The state cannot defend a criminal; Bridgewater had already defaulted; Bridgewater was not entitled to notice nor did he receive any from plaintiffs, and Diane Woolard was merely a tourist who was only pretending to be a judge. (See the transcript evidencing the proceedings of September 19, 2002, attached hereto for your reading pleasure marked enclosure 1)

Even after fleeing the bench in utter shame and enraged at being exposed, that did not stop Woolard from, a few moments later, signing an expense voucher affidavit, under penalty of

perjury, stating her claim was true and correct and, thus, she was still entitled to be reimbursed, for her $37.55 travel and lunch expenses, from the public funds of Cowlitz County. Of course, Diane Woolard is probably under the false belief that she too has absolute judicial immunity, therefore, the perjury, false claim, and other criminal statutes simply do not apply to her majesty.

In the meanwhile, Cowlitz County Presiding Superior Court Judge James Warme refuses to intervene, on behalf of the law, and take charge under the law as the term "Presiding Judge" demands. This is not only in violation of his oath of office, it also contravenes his own admonition to James Stonier at his (Stonier's) swearing in as a judge: ***"Knowing the right thing and doing wrong is the acme of cowardice."*** Instead, Judge Warme would ignore his own words and join with the other judges in the most transparent 'judge shopping' on behalf of Bridgewater and Tardif one could possibly imagine.

On October 7, 2002, Judge Warme induced the other Cowlitz County judges to write a letter to Clark County Presiding Judge Robert Harris, this time in pursuance to RCW 2.08.150, requesting he assign another Clark County Judge to this case. We were told by Judge Warme that Robert Harris declined, stating that since the defendant was "Judge Bridgewater," a judge would have to be found outside Division II. Of course, it was "private person defendant Bridgewater" when Diane Woolard was sent up to deny and defeat justice. After she was caught by the law and thrown from the bench, it was now "Judge Bridgewater."

We were then told by Judge Warme that he was "looking in Snohomish County for a judge." Ultimately, he found one. Snohomish County Superior Court Judge George N. Bowden. After he 'found' a judge,' he then wrote the request letter in pursuance of RCW 2.08.150, signed by all four Cowlitz County Superior Court Judges.

Judge Warme denied having taken it upon himself to give notice to Tardif and Bridgewater concerning the September 19, 2002 sham hearing before Woolard when we questioned him in open court October 2, 2002. Judge Warme was most emphatic that we had properly presented the order for default and judgment September 11th and that Bridgewater was not entitled to any notice; that he had not provided any such notice, nor did he know who did. Judge Warme's only issue was that he had recused himself.

However, prior to our knowing the name of the would-be visiting judge from Snohomish County, Tardif would file a motion for summary judgment and request for sanctions directly to Snohomish County Superior Court Judge George N. Bowden. Our mere mention of this too-late-thing Michael E. Tardif filed into the court November 15, 2002, is not to be construed as any kind of response to it. This is not. Bridgewater defaulted and Tardif and Bridgewater have committed subsequent fraud and obstruction. But, simply for the enlightenment of the reader, please take note that Tardif included copies of the precise same fraud committed by unlawfully seated 'visiting judges' Haberly and Pomeroy, which is part of the court record. That 'thing' purporting to be a "Motion for Summary Judgment" is nothing more than a scheme and artifice to defraud plaintiffs and the court. It's mail fraud. Even the "Declaration of Service" signed by Apryl Jacques is a perjured statement. She states that she sent a copy of that 'thing' to Robert O. Birdwell, 813 NE 133rd Street, Vancouver, WA 98685, via United States Mail. She did no such thing. I received a copy from Stephen L. Wozny.

Plaintiffs have much experience with "unlawfully seated visiting judges," beginning with Haberly; then Pomeroy; then Woolard.

When we learned that George N. Bowden had been "selected," we simply did some checking and discovered that Judge Bowden had served as a visiting judge in Skagit County seven times. Knowing precisely what we would find, we traveled to Skagit County Thursday, November 21, 2002 and picked up four of the seven "expense vouchers' Bowden had signed to be reimbursed, by Skagit County, for his expenses. The three earlier vouchers would be dug out of archives and mailed to us.

These vouchers were even worse than Woolard's. Woolard's was signed by herself, under penalty of perjury, and Nancy Williamson the Cowlitz County Court Administrator, in violation of the statute.

Bowden's perjured affidavits are countersigned by two of the Skagit County Superior Court judges themselves. Two each. Thus far, since there are only three Superior Court Judges in Skagit County, these criminal acts take out two-thirds of the Skagit County Bench!

Then, on Saturday, November 23, 2002, I receive a copy of a letter from the four Cowlitz County Superior Court Judges, sent to The Honorable Richard D. Eadie, who happens to be the Presiding Judge of the King County Superior Court Bench. This letter too is a request made in pursuance of RCW 2.08.150. [Of course, Judge Warme, or someone in the Cowlitz County Court system, had contacted Judge Eadie by telephone and made the arrangements prior to the letter going out]

There is a curious statement in paragraph number 2, of that letter, which states **"Snohmish County had previously agreed to hear this case, but because plaintiffs insist that all matters be conducted within Cowlitz County they are no longer available."**

Oh really? Venue and jurisdiction is a matter determined and established by law. The Cowlitz County Judges were requesting a "visiting Judge," that means that a judge travels **from** the judicial district where he/she was elected and, if done according to law, is granted lawful jurisdiction in the county he/she travels **to**. There is no statute that deals with 'visiting plaintiffs.'

Paragraph 1, of that letter, lets a particularly vile cat out of the bag. **"None of the sitting judges here in Cowlitz County are able to preside this case;"**

The very reason (disability) none of the sitting judges of Cowlitz County can 'preside this case,' is precise variations of the same elements of multiple disabilities each and every judge in this state is saddled with:

1. Most Superior Court Judges have acted as unlawfully seated 'visiting judges. Under the law, the rulings in those cases are void. Not voidable; not appealable, but void!
2. Those who haven't, know of the practice and have done nothing to halt and correct it. That makes each of them accessories; (Brouwer v. Raffensperger, 199 F.3d 961 (7th Cir. 01/13/2000)
3. To allow this order and judgment to be signed, will subject each of those *who have* to enormous civil and criminal liability, and those *who knew*, and did nothing to halt and correct, the same.
4. Every Superior Court Judge has, to one degree or another, a "**personal interest in outcome"** in this matter.
5. Since this unlawful conduct goes to the very heart of the First and Fourteenth Amendments, it becomes a federal criminal matter, first, under the Federal Crime Reporting Act, Title 18 U.S.C. Section 4 easing into 3, and 2, in violating a wide variety of federal criminal statutes.
6. Not one "sought after," and "hand-picked" visiting judge is going to sign the order and judgment we are entitled to as a matter of law.

There is no reason to think that the Honorable Richard D. Eadie has any less of a disability than the others, nor is there reason to believe that Mr. Eadie will be predisposed to actually uphold the law. I can find no evidence where he has attempted to expose, or even acknowledge, that this unlawful and dangerous practice even exists, and, he is still a judge…., the Presiding Judge of King County.

He has certainly had a forum, as I have found where a whopping 71 one of his cases, some as a lawyer, have been appealed. He has not been 'hidden away.'

I repeat,…….as to Bridgewater, Tardif, and Woolard, "… *it is a maxime of law, that no man shall take advantage of his owne wrong."* ~Lord Edward C. Coke, (*First Institutes*) of the Common Law Section 148b, c. 1628 and,
"…. *An act in law shall worke no wrong*." Section 148a. and Section 149b.

These brief comments concerning the Dorsey & Whitney letter and Tardif's fraudulent motion for summary judgment and sanctions, are not in any way to be construed as an answer or response to them. They were both created as a desperate attempt to acquire standing where none exists. This is merely to expose the absurdity of them and provide you with a copy for the record, so you can never say… "I didn't know." (Both are attached hereto as enclosures 2 & 3)

Everything in the so-called Bridgewater grievance to the WSBA was just so much, and more, fraud as of September 11, 2002. Remember, Bridgewater defaulted as of September 11, 2002. Remember, it was Bridgewater and Tardif in the back room making deals and violating the laws with Judge Diane Woolard at 12:50 PM September 19, 2002.

I repeat,…….as to Bridgewater, Tardif, and Woolard, "… *it is a maxime of law, that no man shall take advantage of his owne wrong."* ~Lord Edward C. Coke, (*First Institutes*) of the Common Law Section 148b, c. 1628 and,
"…. *An act in law shall worke no wrong*." Section 148a. and Section 149b.

WHERE DO THESE PEOPLE GET THESE ABSURD IDEAS?

As to you Sir, you preside over a judiciary which, in addition to the endemic corruption thus far identified, operates a private nonprofit organization that admits and re-admits convicted felons into the practice of law; you sit idly by while a seemingly stereotypical political hack appoints a convicted criminal who is also a member of a statutorily defined 'subversive organization' which seeks the overthrow of our constitutional government, and, who is also a fugitive from justice in North Carolina, to the Pierce County Superior Court bench. My, shouldn't we all feel secure with you at the helm!

It is no wonder, then, why those lawyer-driven enterprises, over which you personally preside, would seek the help of the 25th largest law firm in the United States and the thoroughly incompetent, corrupted, State Attorney General, to try to keep everything- which the public should know; has every right to know; of which you have the duty to expose and correct,- suppressed and contained in that little 'member's only' Star Chamber-like Office of Disciplinary Counsel? My, shouldn't we all be proud!

According to these standards Sir, Al Bowden, liar, thief, embezzler-convicted felon, served 27 months in prison; disbarred-reinstated; B. Michael Clark, liar, burglar, forger-convicted felon, knowingly admitted to practice; Gary Little[1], liar, infamous serial child rapist, protected for over twenty years; Frank E. Cuthbertson, liar, fugitive, adherent, giver of aid and comfort, to an organization sworn to conquer and destroy this country- were/are all fit to be lawyer-members of not only 'members only,' the WSBA, but two of them, Little and Cuthbertson, were deemed to be perfectly "fit" to be judges of the Superior Court empowered to adjudicate matters vital to their unsuspecting fellow citizens who they openly desire to either use for their own perverted pleasures or to enslave.

But this same gaggle of moral and ethical cripples would hire the 25th largest law firm in the United States to use its appearance of political 'clout' to reinforce a false and fraudulent 'member's only' claim that a lawyer, Stephen L. Wozny, having the moral, ethical, courage and the intellectual discernment to include, in petitions for redress of grievance, the reports of endemic criminal activity within the legal profession and judiciary, in matters now ALREADY adjudicated as being true, must be punished as somehow being 'unfit' to practice law.

This vile practice of creatures of pretended regal authority considering any exposure of criminal conduct by themselves and their peers as being 'insolent,' 'seditious,' and worthy of punishment, is not only dangerous, it is a practice outlawed in 1689, *inter alia,*

"That it is the right of the subjects to petition the king, and all commitments and prosecutions for such petitioning are illegal;" ~English Bill of rights, 1689~

We're quite sure the people of this state will be 'impressed' that a man, who supports and re-institutes such outlawed practices- following a long line of such men with this type of convoluted thinking -is currently ruling over their judicial branch of this state's government.

Since all of these people 'privately' work under your aegis, at 'members only,' this particular pack of attack dogs was set upon us from your yard. As this packs' Archbishop and master, you are personally responsible for whatever criminal and destructive rampage it goes on as they at 'members only' claim to obey your every command and do nothing without your authorization. This is evidenced by a common and customary statement at the end of this typical 'members only,' WSBA, press release concerning:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
September 13, 2001

CONTACT
Allison Parker
206-733-5932
allisonp@wsba.org

Joseph H. Gordon Sr. Receives WSBA Lifetime Service Award

Seattle, Washington, September 13, 2001 **(Gordon text cut)**

The Washington State Bar Association is a private, nonprofit organization authorized by the Washington Supreme Court to license the state's 26,500 lawyers. The WSBA both regulates lawyers under the authority of the Court and serves its members as a professional association - all without public funding. As a regulatory agency, it administers the bar exam, provides record-keeping and licensing functions, and administers the lawyer discipline program. As a professional association, the WSBA provides continuing legal education for attorneys, in addition to numerous other educational and member service activities. (Emphasis mine)###

This false statement is on hundreds of WSBA letters, notices, press releases and other 'information pieces' posted on the internet (wire) and sent through the United States Mail, available to millions of people, answering, stating, defining, the question of 'what is it' by the very people operating that cloistered, members only, organization.

There's a world of difference between "an agency of the state," and a "private nonprofit organization."

First of all, let's establish what the WSBA **is not**: 1.) It is **not** operated as an agency of the state, as even the unauthorized RCW 2.48 *et seq* clearly states it is; 2.) It is **not** a law enforcement agency; 3.) It is **not** a **department** of nor a lawful administrative arm, leg, or other appendage, of, on, or within the judicial branch of our government;[2] 4.) It is **not** a lawful state regulatory agency; 5.) It is **not** a state crime investigation agency; 6.) It cannot have any so-called 'police powers' because it is **not a department** of the duly constituted, elected, Executive branch of our government! Then what **is** it? If, by its own admission, is not what the statute says it is, and, if its masters deliberately hide its definition, the only reasonable definition for it is it's a fraud operating as a criminal enterprise!

The proof of that statement is found in your benches' deliberately false statements in

Benjamin v. Washington State Bar Association, 138 Wash.2d 506, 980 P.2d 742 (Wash. 07/22/1999) Washington Supreme Court Number 66352-1, specifically, but not to the exclusion of others, by the utter nonsense to be found on page 5, paragraphs 28, 29, and 30 of that horrific 'thing' pretending to be a *learned* and *reasoned* finding of a court of law. (Go to my web site at http://www.4justice4all.info for the complete text)

How can you possibly reconcile the discrepancies between the statute; how they operate, and what they themselves publish? Even Merlin would fail in that task.

As of 1999 (and in all other such cases found since 1933), in the Benjamin case, the Judges of the Supreme Court pretended that the WSBA is a "public employer" simply to effect a fraud. That unholy 'pretense' was used to protect that members only "private non profit organization," the WSBA, wherein each of **you** is in fact a **member**, and in doing so, you would unlawfully disown, disavow, and injure Benjamin and disown, and disavow, the First and Fourteenth Amendments in perpetrating that fraud against him and all those citizens past, present and future, similarly situated.

I am compelled by the perfect reason of the law to remind you of the actual law, where… **"…** ***it is a maxime of law, that no man shall take advantage of his owne wrong."*** **~Lord Edward C. Coke, (*First Institutes*) of the Common Law Section 148b, c. 1628**

Further, as Justice Black explained in In re Murchison:

"A fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of due process. Fairness of course requires an absence of actual bias in the trial of cases. But our system of law has always endeavored to prevent even the probability of unfairness.

To this end, no man can be a judge in his own case, and no man is permitted to try cases where he has an interest in the outcome." 349 U.S. at 136.

Contrary to all legal principles, each of the Judges and lawyers in Benjamin were extraordinarily biased and each had a direct *"interest in outcome"* due to the fact that the WSBA was/is *'their own organization.'*

Following your example, Bridgewater is trying to "*take advantage of his owne wrong"* committed against us as a private person in this most recent attempt delay, deny, and to defeat justice, and to avoid personal liability by seeking sanctuary and the militant protection of the Temple Guards in that fortress of Ecclesiastical members only with its High Commission Tribunal known also as the Disciplinary Counsel of the unlawful WSBA. This failed before it began, October 29, 2002, as we and the law had already prevailed September 11, 2002.

Such thinking is not new. History bears true witness to the vile administrators and pretenders of the past who have assumed powers not granted them; prerogatives and immunities not in existence, to protect their own selves from the very law they disavow, as inapplicable to themselves, yet to be brutally enforced upon others.

HOW THE SAME NON-EXISTENT POWERS WERE PREVIOUSLY SOUGHT TO BE APPLIED… AND THE ULTIMATE CONSEQUENCES

"ON a memorable Sunday morning, the 10th of November, 1612, the judges of England were summoned before King James I upon complaint of the Archbishop of Canterbury. It appeared that the High Commission, an administrative tribunal established for the regulation of the church, had begun to take cognizance of temporal matters and to deal with lay offenders. Not only was this tribunal wholly unknown to the common law, but it decided according to no fixed rules and subject to no appeal. When, accordingly, it sought to send its pursuivant to the house of this or that lay subject and arrest him upon a complaint of a wholly temporal nature,

the Court of Common Pleas stopped the proceeding with a writ of prohibition. To meet this judicial insistence upon the supremacy of law, it was suggested that the king might take away from the judges any cause he pleased and decide it himself; and the immediate business of the Sunday morning conference with the judges was to explain this proposition and hear what they could say to it. The Archbishop proceeded to expound the alleged royal prerogative, saying that the judges were but the delegates of the king, wherefore the king might do himself, when it seemed best to him, what he left usually to these delegates. He added that this was clear, **if not in law yet beyond question in divinity,**[3] for it could be shown from the **word of God in the Scripture**. To this Coke answered on behalf of the judges, that by the law of England the king in person could not adjudge any cause; all cases, civil and criminal, were to be determined in some court of justice according to the law and custom of the realm. "But," said the king, "I thought law was founded upon reason, and I and others have reason as well as the judges." "True it was," Coke responded, "that God had endowed his Majesty with excellent science and great endowments of nature; but his Majesty was not learned in the laws of his realm of England, and causes which concern the life or inheritance or goods or fortunes of his subjects are not to be decided by natural reason, but by the artificial reason and judgment of the law, which law is an art which requires long study and experience before that a man can attain to the cognizance of it." **At this the king was much offended, saying that in such case he should be under the law, which it was treason to affirm .**[4] Coke answered in the words attributed to Bracton, that the king ought not to be under any man but under God and the law. But this was not the last of such conferences and in the end **Coke, who would give no pledge to do otherwise than administer the law as a judge should, was removed."** (Source, pages 59 and 60, The Spirit of the Common Law, by Roscoe Pound, Harvard University; Marshall Jones Co., 1921)

Coke and the common law would find themselves at war with King James I, and Coke would become more and more vigorous in his attacks against the false and destructive nature of the dual religious doctrines of Divine Right of kings and Sovereignty vested in an unaccountable state operating above the law. He would use the impeccable reason of the law and apply his considerable intellect and vigor to champion the supremacy of that Common Law working for the dissolution of all things prerogative and sovereign which had operated so destructively in the hands of James I.

Lord Edward Coke would succeed, even after his own death, as the *reason in the Common Law* would indeed become paramount when, in 1641, the Long Parliament would not only dissolve the prerogative courts, but would outlaw them.

The most destructive concept to be made subordinate to the Common Law was the Constantine/Byzantine notion of God given “sovereignty,” with its unassailable, unaccountable “inherent powers,” which ended January 30, 1649, with the trial, conviction, and execution of Charles I, for treason. What was his treason? His refusal to recognize the supreme authority of the Common Law (reason) and his incessant and arbitrary use of the destructive caprice of “royal prerogative” that came with it.

Forgetting the hard lessons, within a generation, the men of the English Parliament would take out; play with, and abuse, those same non-existent powers for which their predecessors had tried, convicted, and executed Charles I.

Our own Supreme Court, in Pulliam v. Allen 466 U.S. 522 (1984), got it very wrong when they placed emphasis on judges being sued by ‘disgruntled parties to a suit’ as the reason for judicial immunity. That would suggest ‘immunity’ from harassment or suits from citizens.

What Lord Edward Coke was stating from his role as a ‘common law mole’ in the Star Chamber, was that common law judges should be immune from arbitrary control and harassment from ‘above,’ from the king’s prerogative courts.

(PULLIAM v. ALLEN) 17th- and 18th-century rivals. See 5 W. Holdsworth, A History of English Law 159-160 (3d ed.1945) (Holdsworth). *Inter alia*

"A number of courts challenged the King's Bench for authority in those days. Among these were the Council, the Star Chamber, the Chancery, the Admiralty, and the ecclesiastical courts. Ibid. In an effort to assert the supremacy of the common law courts, Lord Coke forbade the interference by courts of equity with matters properly triable at common law. See Heath v. Rydley, Cro.Jac. 335, 79 Eng.Rep. 286 (K.B. 1614). Earlier, in Floyd and Barker, 12 Co.Rep. 23, 77 Eng.Rep. 1305 (1607), Coke and his colleagues of the Star Chamber had declared the judges of the King's Bench immune from prosecution in competing courts for their judicial acts. In doing so, they announced the theory upon which the concept of judicial immunity was built. The judge involved in Floyd and Barker was a common law Judge of Assize who had presided over a murder trial. He was then charged in the Star Chamber with conspiracy. The court concluded that the judges of the common law should not be called to account "before any other Judge at the suit of the King." Id. at 24, 77 Eng.Rep. at 1307.

[A]nd it was agreed, that insomuch as the Judges of the realm have the administration of justice, under the King, to all his subjects, they ought not to be drawn into question for any supposed corruption, which extends to the annihilating of a record, or of any judicial proceedings before them, or tending to the slander of the justice of the King, which will trench to the scandal of the King himself, except it be before the King himself; for they [466 U.S. 531] are only to make an account to God and the King, and not to answer to any suggestion in the Star-Chamber."

Then, as our own U.S. Supreme Court further stated, this Coke/Star Chamber *dicta* was somehow expanded, by whom and by what authority they do not say, but they do cite an 1868 Court of Exchequer and an 1891 *Madagascar* case:

(PULLIAM v. ALLEN) Id. at 25, 77 Eng.Rep. at 1307.

As this quoted language illustrates, Coke's principle of immunity extended only to the higher judges of the King's courts. *See* 5 Holdsworth, at 159-160. In time, Coke's theory was expanded beyond his narrow concern of protecting the common law judges from their rival courts, so that judges of all courts were accorded immunity, at least for actions within their jurisdiction. {8} *See Scott v. Stansfield,* 3 L.R.Ex. 220 (1868) (immunity extended to a county court, an inferior court of record; reliance placed on precedent extending immunity to the court of a coroner and to a courtmartial, an inferior court and a court not of record); *Haggard v. Pelicer Freres* [1892] A. C. 61 (1891) (Judge of Consular Court of Madagascar given same immunity as judge of a court of record). In addition, the theory itself was refined, its focus shifting from the need to preserve the King's authority to the public interest in independent judicial decisionmaking. *See Taaffe v. Downes,* reprinted in footnote in *Calder v. Halket,* 13 Eng.Rep. 12, 18, n. (a) (P.C. 1840) ("An action before one Judge for what is done by another, is in the nature of an Appeal; and is the Appeal from an equal to an equal. It is a solecism in the law . . . that the Plaintiff's case is against the independence of the Judges"). [466 U.S. 532]

By 1868, one of the judges of the Court of Exchequer explained judicial immunity in language close to our contemporary understanding of the doctrine:

"It is essential in all courts that the judges who are appointed to administer the law should be permitted to administer it under the protection of the law, independently and freely, without favor and without fear. This provision of the law is not for the protection or benefit of a malicious or corrupt judge, but for the benefit of the public, whose interest it is that the judges should be at liberty to exercise their functions with independence, and without fear of consequences."

Scott v. Stansfield, 3 L.R.Ex., at 223, quoted in *Bradley v. Fisher,* 13 Wall. 335, 350, n. (1872). It is in the light of the common law's focus on judicial independence that the collateral control exercised by the King's Bench over rival and inferior courts has particular significance.

The King's Bench exercised significant collateral control over inferior and rival courts through the use of prerogative writs. The writs included habeas corpus, certiorari, prohibition,

mandamus, quo warranto, and *ne exeat regno.* 1 Holdsworth at 226-231 (7th ed.1956). Most interesting for our current purposes are the writs of prohibition and mandamus. {9} The writs issued against a judge, in theory to prevent [466 U.S. 533] him from exceeding his jurisdiction or to require him to exercise it. *Id.* at 228-229. In practice, controlling an inferior court in the proper exercise of its jurisdiction meant that the King's Bench used and continues to use the writs to prevent a judge from committing all manner of errors, including departing from the rules of natural justice, proceeding with a suit in which he has an interest, misconstruing substantive law, and rejecting legal evidence. *See* 1 Halsbury's Laws of England ¶¶ 76, 81, 130 (4th ed.1973); Gordon, The Observance of Law as a Condition of Jurisdiction, 47 L.Q.Rev. 386, 394 (1931). {10}

That even the U.S. Supreme Court Judges would reach into the Star Chamber and other wholly irrelevant places and cases to find an authority that cannot exist in American constitutional law, is extremely disturbing.

Once you carefully read Pulliam v. Allen, you'll discover that the entire authority for the modern 'doctrine' of judicial immunity is based on royal prerogative and from edicts emanating from the Star Chamber. What the good judges of 1984 would like the casual reader to think is that such 'authority is virtually unbroken.' That is purely and simply a lie. What they fail to mention is that the Star Chamber was dissolved and outlawed in 1641 and royal sovereignty/prerogative ended with the execution of Charles I in 1649.

OH, WHERE DID IT ALL BEGIN

Unlike the God-Kings of Egypt, and other civilizations, who would, very un-god like, die and bring into question the legitimacy of their power and of their God, a 'new concept' was hatched which would place sovereignty in a mortal figure, backed up by the sovereignty of an immortal state empowered by an eternal church, all granted by everlasting God Almighty.

[INSERTED EXERPTS FROM THE SPIRITUAL RANTINGS AT THE FUNERAL OF CONSTANTINE]

THE LIFE OF THE BLESSED EMPEROR CONSTANTINE

~EUSEBIUS PAMPHILUS OF CAESAREA~

[The Bagster translation, revised by Ernest Cushing Richardson, Ph.D., Librarian and Associate Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary]

"...For to whatever quarter I direct my view, whether to the east, or to the west, or over the whole world, or toward heaven itself, everywhere and always I see the blessed one yet administering the self-same empire. On earth I behold his sons, like some new reflectors of his brightness, diffusing everywhere the luster of their father's character, (5) and himself still living and powerful, and **governing all the affairs of men more completely than ever before,** being multiplied in the succession of his children. They had indeed had previously the dignity of Caesars; (6) but now, being invested with his very self, and graced by his accomplishments, for the excellence of their piety they are proclaimed by the titles of **Sovereign**, Augustus, Worshipful, and Emperor."

"...With respect to the duration of his reign, **God** honored him with three complete periods of ten years, and something more, extending the whole term of his mortal life to twice this number of years. **(1) And being pleased to make him a representative of his own sovereign power, he displayed him as the conqueror of the whole race of tyrants, and the destroyer of those God- defying giants (2) of the earth who madly raised their impious arms against him, the supreme King of all. They appeared, so to speak, for an instant, and then disappeared: while the one and only true God, when he had enabled his servant, clad in heavenly panoply, to stand singly against many foes, and by his means had relieved mankind from the multitude of the ungodly, constituted him a**

teacher of his worship to all nations, to testify with a loud voice in the hearing of all that he acknowledged the true God, and turned with abhorrence from the error of them that are no gods."

"...Thus, like a faithful and good servant, did he act and testify, openly declaring and confessing himself the obedient minister of the supreme King. And God forthwith rewarded him, by making him ruler and sovereign, and victorious to such a degree that he alone of all rulers pursued a continual course of conquest, unsubdued and invincible, and through his trophies a greater ruler than tradition records ever to have been before. So dear was he to God, and so blessed; so pious and so fortunate in all that he undertook, that with the greatest facility he obtained the authority over more nations than any who had preceded him, (1) and yet retained his power, undisturbed, to the very close of his life."

The 'genesis' of "Divinely manifested Sovereignty" in the West was reserved for Constantine

~"In hoc signo vinces"~

"…It was by the Will of God that Constantine became possessed of the Empire. Thus then the God of all, the Supreme Governor of the whole universe, by his own will appointed Constantine, the descendant of so renowned a parent, to be prince and sovereign: so that, while others have been raised to this distinction by the election of their fellow- men, he is the only one to whose elevation no mortal may boast of having contributed. ~ **EUSEBIUS PAMPHILUS OF CAESAREA**

The same concept settles in England, c. 1066; takes root but doesn't actually flower 'til around 1603 and would end in 1641 when the Roundheads decide to finally begin weeding the English garden

Both King James I and Charles I understood the power of claiming unquestionable authority by *divine dispensation*. But even the Seventeenth Century English peasants weren't Fourth Century Scythians, Anatolians, Persians, or Goths. Any temporal acceptance of Heavenly endowed sovereignty would actually be severed from the physical world, along with Charles I's head, and die.

The idea of 'sovereignty,' either by divine dispensation or through the earlier claim via conquest, were such ridiculous concepts they would not be given even prohibitive mention in the American Constitution 142 years later.

The mechanism for anointing the state or a personage as 'sovereign' was forever barred, in the United States, by simply prohibiting the establishment of a state religion to anoint it. This is a profoundly important historical connection that was missed by even the pre-eminently learned Supreme Court Judges in Chisholm v. Georgia 2 U.S. 419 (1793).

To claim the existence, or to be possessed, of "sovereignty," "sovereign powers," "sovereign prerogative," and its "inherent powers," is not only a really silly and dangerous fraud, it's a serious violation of the First Amendment. It's also a declaration of war against the United States on behalf of, and to impose, a foreign "sovereign" on a religion anointed throne to rule over the people of America.

EVEN 'PRETEND' POWER CAN MAKE PEOPLE REALLY STUPID!

When I reflect upon the blinding arrogance of James I and Charles I, I cannot help but draw the analogy between the ideas they held dear and the fact that the judiciary of our own time has retrogressed so far as to reassert that same dead and buried fraud as **its** current "progressive" operating imperative:

- "That the judiciary is a wholly "independent" (separate, sovereign, not beholden to any other authority, especially the law we selectively and subjectively 'administer' to others) branch of government;".
- The judiciary has "inherent powers" (**we** can do: whatever **we** wish; anytime **we** wish on any real or contrived subject on which **we** wish to rule, with impunity) fully unaccountable and wholly protected by our exclusive "royal prerogative and Judicial (sovereign) immunity.".

This notion separates you from our constitutional government; separates the rest of us from our citizenship; disowns and disavows us, and relegates us, the people,~ those who created our state and our country~ to the status of mere chattel of those sworn to serve.

["It is not right that any one who has not yet been proved should be a teacher of others, ***unless by a peculiar divine grace****." ~S. Ambrose. The canon of Nicaea]*

The history of this state's judiciary is empirical proof that weak and untrustworthy men claiming *'a peculiar divine grace,'* will abuse even the most limited of powers they are granted. A grant of ***sovereign*** powers to anyone, or to a state, is individually and collectively suicide. The people may have been remiss in supervising you, but they are not suicidal.

THE NATURAL AND INESCAPABLE CONSEQUENCES OF THOSE BELIEFS PUT INTO ACTION

Standing alone and still defying the jurisdiction of the law he had always disavowed, at the end of his trial Charles I attempted to justify his actions before the assembled body as actually being on behalf (in the best interests) of the liberty and well being of the people of England, his erstwhile and long-suffering subjects.

After listening to Charles I, Judge Bradshaw responded, in part:

"….. there is a contract and a bargain made between the King and his people, and your oath is taken: and certainly, Sir, the bond is reciprocal; for as you are the liege lord, so they liege subjects ... This we know, the one tie, the one bond, is the bond of protection that is due from the sovereign; the other is the bond of subjection that is due from the subject. Sir, if this bond be once broken, farewell sovereignty! ... These things may not be denied, Sir ..." - Judge Bradshaw at the trial of Charles I, London, January 1649…

The very same "bond of oath" exists between the judges and the citizens consenting to the limited and lawfully defined powers and lawful jurisdiction of the court and of the judge. The contract; the bargain; the bond; the common tie, is your *mandatarius* oath and the duty to the law you owe and which we have consented by compact. ~ *mandatarius terminus sibi positos transgredi non potest*~ A mandatary cannot exceed the limits assigned him.

To paraphrase Judge Bradshaw - **"Sir, if this bond be once broken, *farewell jurisdiction,* and, forfeiture of your office!"**

Sir, this bond **has** been broken. You Sir, preside over a judiciary which refuses to abide by the laws of this state and refuses to abide by even your own made-up rules. You preside over a legal profession of individual lawyers, forced into a collective, wherein so many are either so addled; mal-educated, by whatever overpriced, mind-numbing, law school they attended; further mentally crippled by your Order's insistence on them submitting to your Order's predigested dogma disguised as CLE, and terrified of whatever evil can be directed against them by your 'member's only' attack dogs, that they heretofore have submitted to this condition in silence to avoid *'excommunication' from your Order.*

You may think the preceding is an absurd statement comparing the coercive nature of your

Judiciary to a despotic medieval religious order. Think again.

As an example of how this works, in 1215 the Barons forced King John to sign the first Magna Carta. His signing of that document sent shock waves through the Ecclesiastical 'force' all the way to the Pope. The Pope was not pleased. He did a *persona non grata* excommunication on King John and closed down the churches in England for seven years. This papal act was so powerful, King John, the 'King' of England, traveled to Rome and **surrendered England to the Pope** (in the tradition of Constantine, the **Pope** was the **TRUE sovereign**) without an arrow being launched. **The Pope *returned* England to John as a Fief.** King John surrendered England just so he could keep his lousy little King job. It confirms what Hamilton said so eloquently:

Chief Justice Berger (U.S. v Will 449 U.S. 200), citing **Hamilton** in The Federalist No. 79, p. 491 (emphasis deleted), ***"In the general course of human nature, a power over a man's subsistence amounts to a power over his will."***

How can a citizen appeal to justice when the judges operating the judiciary preside over such a heinous Fiefdom collective, and, who themselves systematically ignore and violate the laws damaging the very people who come before them? Who, Sir, do we, or anyone else, appeal for remedy of this egregious condition? You?

"...it is a maxime of law, that no man shall take advantage of his owne wrong." ~Lord Edward C. Coke, (*First Institutes*) of the Common Law Section 148b, c. 1628

BACK TO THE PRESENT

The fraudulent letter of October 29, 2002, directed against Stephen L. Wozny, referred to above, is proof of the kinds of assault 26,500+ individual lawyers have to fear will be directed against them if they dare use their own brains and speak out against such criminal acts.

In the matters of our own various causes, leading up to the one where we and the law just prevailed, we were continuously assaulted by swarms of unlawfully seated visiting judges; unlawfully seated Appellate Court Commissioners; Superior Court Judges violating their oaths in acting wholly beyond any lawful authority; inflicting unlawful punishment upon us for refusing to submit to their unlawful, void, orders and unlawful, void, prerogative shams. A practice outlawed in 1689:

"That it is the right of the subjects to petition the king, and all commitments and prosecutions for such petitioning are illegal;" ~English Bill of rights, 1689~

Indubitably applicable in 2002 Washington State:

> **RCW 2.04.020**
> **Court of record -- General powers.**
> The supreme court shall be a court of record, and shall be vested with all power and authority necessary to carry into complete execution all its judgments, decrees and determinations in all matters within its jurisdiction, **according to the rules and principles of the common law, and the Constitution and laws of this state.**
>
> [1890 p 323 § 10; RRS § 2.]
>
> **RCW 4.04.010**
> **Extent to which common law prevails.**
> The common law, so far as it is not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, or of the state of Washington nor incompatible with the institutions and condition of society in this state, shall be the rule of decision

in all the courts of this state.

[1891 c 17 § 1; Code 1881 § 1; 1877 p 3 § 1; 1862 p 83 § 1; RRS § 143. Formerly RCW 1.12.030.]

The Supreme Court of Washington stated, with regard to this statute, in Garrett v. Byerly, 155 Wash. 351, 354 (Cowlitz 1939)

"Construing this statute, we have held that the term "common law," as therein used, includes not only the unwritten law of England as it was administered by its courts, but also the general statutes of that commonwealth modifying and interpreting the unwritten laws which were enacted prior to and in force at the time of our Declaration of Independence. Wagner v. Law, 3 Wash. 500, 28 Pac. 1109, 29 Pac. 927, 28 Am. St. 56, 15 L.R.A. 784; Bates v. Drake, 28 Wash. 447, 68 Pac. 961; Richards v. Redelsheimer, 36 Wash. 325, 78 Pac 934."

When the finger-pointing begins in this sordid affair, you and your judicial subordinates would have done well to have paid closer attention to the historical subject matter of duties and liabilities respective of your and their offices. "They made me do it, and, I was just following what my superiors said was official policy and customary procedures" will get you nowhere. You and they cannot help but know the defined limits of your lawful powers and the consequences of you and they violating the laws, and commanding others to violate the law, as found cited in one of this Supreme Court's own recent cases, confirming what Secretary Donald Rumsfeld said recently about certain foreign officials:

"Occasionally, even a blind squirrel will find a nut."

In RE: Ellis v. City of Seattle, 142 Wash.2d 450, 13 P.3d 1065 (Wash. 12/14/2000)

The 'superior orders' defense failed elsewhere in history. In 1813, Justice Bushrod Washington, sitting as a circuit justice, noted why obedience to unlawful orders of a superior need not be given, even in a military context: The only remaining question of law which has been raised in this cause is, that the prisoner ought to be presumed to have acted under the orders of his superior officer, which it was his duty to obey. **This doctrine, equally alarming and unfounded**, underwent an examination, and was decided by this court in the Case of General Bright {Case No. 14,647.} **It is repugnant to reason, and to the positive law of the land.** No military or **civil officer** can command an inferior[5] to violate the laws of his country; nor will such command excuse, much less justify the act. Can it be for a moment pretended, that the general of an army, or the commander of a ship of war, can order one of his men to commit murder or felony? Certainly not. In relation to the navy, let it be remarked, that the 14th section of the law, for the better government of that part of the public force, which enjoins on inferior officers or privates the duty of obedience to their superior; cautiously speaks of the lawful orders of that superior. **Disobedience of an unlawful order, must not of course be punishable**; and a court martial would, in such a case, be bound to acquit the person tried upon a charge of disobedience. **We do not mean to go further than to say, that the participation of the inferior officer, in an act which he knows, or ought to know, to be illegal, will not be excused by the order of his superior.** United States v. Jones, 26 F. Cas. 653, 657-58 (C.C.D. Pa. 1813) (No. 15,494). (Emphasis added)

Common sense would confirm that the above would naturally apply to ***anyone*** "under the jurisdiction of another," as is the condition of the parties to a suit acceding to the lawful jurisdiction of the court and a judge.

We have forcefully exposed the "unlawful" activities of the legal profession and the judicial officers of this state. You and yours have sought to inflict egregious harm on us for doing so in direct contravention of the law.

As of September 11, 2002, we, as plaintiffs, prevailed in Cowlitz County Cause of Action 02-2-01408-0, in its entirety. That ***entirety*** had set forth details of all of the unlawful acts duly reported and consolidated into that Cause by the incorporation of the entire court record. It is over. We prevailed! The only business we now have before the Cowlitz County Superior Court is to have our order of default and judgment signed by a judge who is not tainted or corrupt and who is seated as the law requires.

We hereby provide that you read the incomprehensibly vile and corruptly drafted FORMAL COMPLAINT of October 29, 2002, and the fraudulent "thing" of November 15, 2002, sent out by Michael Tardif, and demand that you clean up this mess.

Respectfully,	Respectfully,
Robert O. Birdwell Plaintiff/co-counsel	Stephen L. Wozny Plaintiff/co-counsel Attorney for plaintiff Christine M. Birdwell

:enclosures

FOOTNOTES

[1] See the "Gary little saga" contained in the 41 page "OFFICIAL NOTICE" sent to the legislators; supreme and Div II appellate court at http://www.4justice4all.info

---

[2] Washington State Constitution; ARTICLE 4 SECTION 2 SUPREME COURT, in pertinent part: "… The legislature may increase the number of judges of the supreme court from time to time and may provide for separate departments of said court."

---

[3] Pay exceedingly close attention to these sentences spoken by the Archbishop. "In Divinity and by the Word of God," were, historically, Christian/political concepts invented and propagated by the Christian Byzantine Emperor Constantine and subsequent Popes. The 'rationale' was simple: only "Christian Kings had actual 'sovereign authority' to rule- ***In hoc signo vinces***. Pagan kings had no such 'Divine authority.' Their authority came from false gods and demons, therefore, it would be 'God's Work' to depose the Pagan kings; seize their thrones and lands; install a government under a "Divinely Sovereign Christian King;" subjugate and convert the people to Christianity - which is precisely what they did. King James I was an extraordinarily well educated scholar and historian, but a fool just the same. He spoke and wrote in at least 15 languages, including ancient Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew. He was the first and last of the English Kings to fully understand, appreciate, and successfully employ, the power of 'divine politics,' as Constantine had structured it, and understood perfectly well that claiming ownership of exclusive 'divine sovereignty,' ratified by the Church, would hopefully answer the question: "Just who the Hell do you think you are? If the question was ever seriously posed. The concept of "sovereignty," and "Sovereign authority," is a purely religious concept. First, a 'Christian' religious concept and, soon after, to the present, a very troublesome and dangerous, Islamic principle. To have a valid "Sovereign" and sovereignty vested in a person or state, you would also have to have a "valid appearing," vested, "state religion" to spiritually validate and enforce, first through belief, then by inserting those concepts into the secular law, *in dicta*, the 'divine, unquestionable, authority' of the Sovereign.

It is for perhaps this very, if subtle, reason the founding fathers' inserted a particular prohibition: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," …which is found in the very first ten words of the very first of the ten Amendments. They knew that sovereignty only exists spiritually. It does not exist in the temporal universe.

Obviously, some of our founders understood you cannot have one without the other. Bar the first, prevent the second. You will also notice that the federal Constitution does not contain the words 'sovereign or sovereignty.' Any claim of 'sovereignty;' 'sovereign immunity,' or 'sovereign powers,' being a religious claim, requires the establishment of a 'state religion' prohibited by the First Amendment. The 'United States is not a 'sovereign;' has no 'sovereignty,' nor does any of its officers possess 'sovereign powers or immunities.' Likewise, no state of the union, or officer of such state, is a 'sovereign' nor are they clothed with such powers and immunities. Such a claim would be utterly false and wholly unconstitutional.

---

[4] This is precisely the attitude of the judiciary and legal profession in general; the attorney general and Bridgewater in particular, and so many other very corrupt or simply ignorant people.

---

[5] Inferior. "One who, in relation to another, has less power and is below him; one who is bound to obey another….." Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, page 778.