

copy or distribute the knowledge of them, and if someone should get some of this documentation from the Secretary of the Interior and tries to use it in a court of law, the Secretary has the authority to dictate to the courts at all levels the admissibility as evidence of these records or documentation in a court of law (Title 28 Judiciary and Judicial Procedures, section 1733) and no court can by writ, force the Secretary to open for review any records or documentation so that an Indian could have a fair and just trial when charged with crimes that have been written for American citizens and the inhabitants of a ceded or conquered territory. (Lane v. U.S. Dist. Col. 1916, 36 S.Ct.599, 241 U.S. 201, 60 L.Ed.956, Stockey v. Wilbur 1932, 58 F.2d. 522, 61 App. D.C., U.S. v. Lane, 1920, 269 F.202, 50 App.D.C. 123, appeal dismissed, 42 S. Ct. 314, 258 U.S.632, 66 L.Ed.801, 43 U.S.C.A.1457 note 17) and all attorneys licensed by the various state bars and agents or persons, ("PERSON" being defined by statutes as White or European or European descent. Frazee v. Spokane County, 69 P.779, 782, 29 Wash. 278, 42 C.J.S. 1 Paragraph 1, 2, 42 C.J.S.26 Paragraph 1.) are restricted and held by an allegiance, and rules and regulations from enforcing an order or writ or even relating the legal identity and rights of the Indian, or his records, and this limitation cannot be revealed to the Indian by word, circular, letter, or advertisement, and this act and law made it impossible for an Indian to be represented by consul of law that would be fair and just, and prosecution would present that part of court procedure that would be unfair and outside the concepts of justice and the beliefs of the Indian that he was getting a fair trial and his presentation and representation could have a fair judgement, because the Judge that would lay his decision from the evidence could only come from this restrictive, presentation, and this same Judge could not protect attorneys from state or government oaths, allegiances, and restrictions, if these same attorneys decided to present the Indian problem or case that would enlighten court procedures or protocol in favor of equal facts and evidence for Indian and non-Indian. So any court or court system within the United States or possessions or territories, could not fairly judge or try by law an Indian or his rights or property or territories.

Now, the rules and regulations that the Secretary of the Interior governing the recognition (43 U.S.C.A. 1464) of such persons, agents, and attorneys which shall be permitted to practice or represent claimants before his department, it is the rules and regulations that the Secretary of the Interior must prescribe, that are influenced by Oath(s), Allegiance(s) of the country that the Secretary of the Interior represents and the country he

these records or' docwnmentation in a court of law (Title 28 Judiciary and Judicial Procedures, section 1733) and no court can by writ, force the Secretary to open for review any records or documentation so that an Indian could have a rait' 6-1.nd'just trial when charged that have been written for American citizens and the inhabitants of a ceded or' conquered ¿Lane v. U.S. Dist. Col. S.Ct. §99, 2&1 U.S._201, Ö L.Ed.95o, Stookey v. Wilbur' 1932, 58 F.2d. 522, 61 App. D.C., U.S. vl Íane, 1920, 269 F.202, 50 App.D.C. 123, appeal dismisseci, H2 S. Ct. 3111, 258 U.S.632, 66 L.Ed.801, ¿#3 note 17) and all attorneys licensed by the various state" barã and agents or' persons, ("PF.RSON" being; by statuteã

Countv, 69 P.779, 7532, '29 278, L12 C.J.S. 1 Paraâraph 1, É, ¿L2 C.J.S.28 Paragraph 1.) are restricted and held by an allegiance, and rules and regulations from enforcing an order or writ or even relating the legal identity and rights of the Indian, or his records, and this limitation _cannot be revealed to the Indian by word, circular, letter', or advertiscrment, and this act and law made it impossible for an Indian to be represented by consul of law that would 'oe fait and just, and prosecution wnuold present that part of court that would be unfair and outsIde-the concepts of' justice and the of the Indian that he was getting; a fair' trial and his presentation and representation could have a fair' judgement, because the Judge that would lay his decision from the evidence could only come from this restrictive, presentation, and this same Judge could not protect attorneys from state or government oaths, alleggiahces, and restrictions, if these same attorneys decided to present the Indian problem or case :that would enlighten court procedures or protocol in favor'

of' equal facts and evidence for Indian and non-Indian. So any court or' court sj/stem within tno United States or _ possessions of' territorios, could not judge or* try 'oy law an Indian or his rights or property or territories.

Now, the rules and regguleltiorls that the . '4<:ereta.ry of the Interior the recogmition (LI-3 U.S.C.A. of such persons, agents, and attorneys which shall be per» mí_tted to practice or represent claimants before his depártment, it is the rules and regulations that the Secretary of the Interior must prescri»-3, that are influenced by Oa.th(s), Alleggiance(s) of the country that the Secretary of the Interior represents and the country he

(21)