A F R I E N D L Y J U D G E

The Title of this Chapter is really misleading when one reviews Court History on the American Indian seeking relief; then one must also consider the Allegiance Clause Judges in this country are held to.

"THE COURTS OF THIS COUNTRY HAVE NEVER BEEN OPEN TO INDIANS AND YOUR CIVIL LIBERTY HAS NEVER BEEN GIVEN TO US." Jaeger -v- U.S., 27 Ct.Cl.278.

That is clear as a Bell! Before one can use the Courts of a Country, they must possess a Civil Liberty. If an Indian would look at the Criminal Statutes on the American Indian, charges can only be filed if an Indian commits a crime against another Indian or if an Indian commits a crime against a non-Indians and it can't work the other way because I've tried. This same legal Rule can only be found on PRISONERS OF WAR..

If one did a certain amount of Study on HAGUE REGULATIONS of 1899 and 1907; Geneva Convention of 1929 and 1949- GUARDIANSHIP, ALIENATION and SEVERALTY of the American Indian are terms for control on PRISONERS OF WAR.

I've read alot of Court History on the American Indian including the so-called alleged scholar, Felix S. Cohan in his book--Handbook on FEDERAL INDIAN LAW, he makes no mention of this legal situation.

PRISONERS OF WAR can use the civil courts of the nation they are confine in as long as their Complaints follow the accepted Rules on the Geneva Convention of 1949. For this reason we have 43 U.S.C.A.1460,1461,1464 so no Attorney representing an Indian, will go beyond the rights of a PRISONER OF WAR and to assure Attorneys will never again make the mistake legally on court case, CARROLL -v- PATHKILLER, 3 Port.279 on Indians who were not Prisoners of War, were of Royal Bloodlines and were Kings and Queens

It has already been shown where Dakota Indians giving up their own Sovereign Indian Government and accepting an Autonomy-type with the United States which made them Nationals of the U.S., than sign the Treaty or Agreement of 1868, this encompassed over 75% of Dakota Indians leaving a small group who were still the Sovereignty and would have nothing to do with this treaty. The U.S.Government was so sure they could wipe out the Dakota Sovereignty in time using those belonging to Autonomy Governments, Congress passed 43 U.S.C.A. 1459 relieving the Secretary of State from associating with the Dakota Sovereignty, where the Secretary of the Interior would take over, but could deal with Indians who were now Nationals of the U.S. only as of March 1, 1873.

In studying HAGUE REGULATIONS OF 1899, 1907; Geneva COnventions of 1929

The Title of this Chapter is really misleading when one reviews

Court History on the American Indian seeking relief', then one must“ also

consider the Allegiance Clause Judges in.this country are held to_.

“THE COURTS OF THIS COUNTRY HAVE NEVER BEEN OPEN TO INDIANS AND

YOUR CIVIL LIBERTY HAS NEVER BEEN GIVEN TO US." Jaeger -V- U.S.f 27 Ct.Cl.2'/8.

That is clear as a Bell! Before one can use the Courts of a Country,

they must possess a Civil Liberty. If an Indian would look at the Criminal

Statutes on the American Indian, charges can only be filed if an Indian

commits a crime against another Indian or if an_Indian commits a crime against

a non-Indians and it can't work the other/gâgause I 've tried. This same

legal Rule can only be found on PRISONERS OF WAR. .

If one did a certain amount of Study on HAGUE REGULATIONS of 1899 and

1907; Geneva Convention of 1929 and 1949~ GUARDIANSHIP, ALIENATION and

SEVERALTY of the American Indian are terms for control on PRISONERS OF WAR.

I've read alot of Court History on the American ïndian inclnding the

so-called alleged scholar, Felix S. Cohan in his book-f--Handbook on FEDERAL

INDIAN LAW, he makes no mention of this legal situation.

PRISOÑERS _OF WAR can use the civil courts of the nation they are confine

in as long as their Complaints follow the accepted Rules on the Geneva

Convention of 1949. For this reason we have 43 U.S.C.A.l460,1461,l464

so no Attorney representing an Indian, will go beyond the rights of a

PRISONER OF WAR and to assure Attorneys will never again make the mistake

legally on court case, CARROLL -V- PATHKILLER, 3 Port.279 on Indians who

were not Prisoners of War, were of Royal Bloodlines and were Kings and Queens

It has already been shown where Dakota Indians giving up their own

Sovereign._Indian Government and accepting an Autonomy-type -with- the United States which made them Nationals of the U¿S., than sign the Treaty or Agreement of 1868, this encompassed over 75% of Dakota Indians leaving a

small group who were still the Sovereignty and would have nothing to do

with this treaty. The U.S.Government was so sure they could wipe out the Dakota Sovereignty in time using those belonging to Autonomy Governments,

Congress passed 43 U.S .C.A. 1459 relieving the Secretary of State from associating with the Dakota Sovereignty, where the Secretary of the Interior

would take over, but could deal with Indians who were now Nationals of the

U.S. only as of March 1, 1873.

In studying HAGUE REGULATIONS OF 1899, 1907; Geneva COnventions of 1929